Edinburgh University Library Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 6 June 2012

at 10.30am in Room 1.11, Main Library, George Square, Edinburgh

Present: Professor Jeff Haywood (Convenor)
Mrs Sheila Cannell
Mr Stewart Lewis
Mr Richard Battersby
Dr John Scally
Professor Simon Parsons
Mrs Janet Rennie
Mrs Fiona Brown
Professor David Finnegan
Dr Alex Murdoch
Dr Iain Murray
Mrs Elspeth Currie
Dr Steven Morley
Mr Mike Williamson
Mr Andrew Burnie

In attendance: Mrs Anne Grzybowski (on behalf of Records Management)
Ms Liz Petrie (note taker)

Apologies: Professor David Fergusson
Ms Irene McGowan
Ms Susan Graham
Mr Abdul Majothi
Dr Anna Kenway
Mr Dai Hounsell
Mr George McKenzie

Freedom of Information: this minute is 'open' for FOI purposes unless specifically indicated for an individual section/paragraph. Similarly, the papers for this meeting are 'open', unless specifically indicated.

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Jeff Haywood welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made. Apologies were noted as above.

2 CONVENOR AND DIRECTOR OF LIBRARY SERVICE BUSINESS

Jeff Haywood advised that this would be the last Library Committee meeting to be attended by Mike Williamson and extended the Committee’s thanks to Mike for his diligence and energy during his Committee membership. He further advised that this meeting was Sheila Cannell’s fiftieth and last prior to her retirement next month, highlighting the leaving event scheduled for 19 June that all present were invited to attend. He commented that Sheila’s shoes would be difficult to fill and wished her well for the future. The Committee endorsed his thanks with a round of applause.
COLLECTIONS REVIEW

The Convenor briefly outlined the background to the Collections Review Report and proceeded to consideration of the Collections Review Group’s recommendations as follows:

i) *The Group recommends that the University allocate additional funding of about £1 million to the library materials budget.*

It was noted that 50% of this figure has been allocated through the planning round and discussions are taking place with each of the three Colleges to secure the balance.

Janet Rennie advised that should funding not be secured from the other two Colleges, HSS reserves the right to review its position in regard to the funding offered.

ii) *The Group recommends no change to the current resource allocation for current funding using the Income and Expenditure Attribution Model for allocation to Colleges and that additional funding should be allocated by Information Services, with advice from Library Committee and in consultation with Colleges, to supplement existing budgets, to support new requirements in Recommendation 5 and 6 and for staffing to support the new work. Timely communication between Schools, Colleges and Information Services is important in determining the prioritisation of activities for funding.*

The Committee noted and agreed the recommendation.

iii) *The Group recommends that it is essential that new demands in the University are supported and that subject areas with broad application, and small specialised subject areas must be supported equitably.*

Sheila Cannell highlighted the requirement for diversity in the support offered and for models that catered for small, specialised areas as well as the broader subject applications.

Discussion took place around incorporating appropriate systems to cater for the needs of new areas/appointees, in particular Chancellor’s Fellows, in order to be able to allocate resources and provide tailored support in a timely fashion. It was noted that, to date, 24 offers have been made for Chancellor’s fellows of which with a split between the Colleges of 17 for HSS, 5 for MVM and 2 for Science and Engineering, however around 90 fellowships are to be offered. The Committee agreed that such requirements could only be catered for through improved communication between the Colleges and the Library in relation to new and specialised demands.

iv) *The Group recommends that the annual planning and budgeting process in the University acknowledges the uplift required in library materials expenditure due to publisher inflation, currency fluctuations and the VAT regime in order to maintain a steady state in purchasing power.*

The Committee agreed to this recommendation, noting that to date the planning and budgeting process has generally been keeping pace with increases and noted the need to predict where major increases may occur in
order to cater for them. Sheila Cannell cautioned that some American journals may be considering significant increases in charges to European libraries in the coming years which could have a significant impact on annual budgets.

v) The Group recommends using a proportion of any new funding for pilots in new methods of procurement.

Jeff Haywood advised that it would require significant funding in order to develop a robust, user-driven system open for wider use. The Committee agreed with the approach and thought that studies of methods used by other universities would be useful. Jeff Haywood highlighted the need to discuss this over the summer period to negotiate an allocation of funding which would be confirmed with the Colleges and come back to the Committee for information.

vi) The Group recommends that the Library, through a proportion of any new funding, establishes a ‘strategic fund’ to provide support for library resources for new programmes where library collections are weak prior to the commencement of the programme and to provide immediate support to incoming researchers working in new areas of research. The ‘strategic fund’ would be managed through a regular bidding process, managed by the Library Committee.

The need to set aside funds to ensure new programmes are supported by Collections was noted and it was agreed that the most important measure is to improve communication procedures to ensure this, operating with the College Library Committees, was required. It was noted that this should not apply to increased numbers on existing courses, which should be addressed through Recommendation 5.

It was noted that at least 2 Colleges were less concerned with providing support for incoming researchers because most incoming researchers would be working in fields already well supported, and they felt that this was the responsibility of the Schools.

vii) The Group recommends the re-establishment of the Resource Discovery Board to continue its work in improving the discovery layer.

The Committee noted that this has been re-established.

viii) The Group recommends that an annual report on metrics of usage is produced, and appropriate changes are made in consultation with the academic community through College Library Committees.

The Group recommends that, from August 2012, after the initial resource allocation by the Income and Expenditure Attribution Model, the funding for and the management of higher value bundles which are of interest in 2 or more Colleges or in 3 or more Schools are moved to a central library account code. There should be a triennial academic review of these bundles.

The Committee agreed these recommendations.
The Group recommends that the Library continues and increases its leadership role in collaborative activity in procurement of library materials, where these are in the interests of the University of Edinburgh.

The Group recommends closer links be made to the National Library of Scotland (NLS), and that the University support reciprocal access arrangements with other libraries.

The Committee agreed with the first part of this recommendation. It was noted that the NLS has been going through a restructuring process. On an informal basis relationships have been working well but with the introduction of the National Library of Scotland Act it was agreed there was the opportunity set up a more formal relationship to promote services within Edinburgh. The Committee agreed that closer, formal links should be sought.

The Group recommends that the Finance Office establish and Open Access job code for the payment of all Open Access fees from August 2012.

The Group recommends that the Library works with publishers to understand the multiple routes by which publishers may be paid for the same item, and seeks to reduce this through renegotiation.

The Group recommends pursuing discussions with Research Councils and major charities on library materials and open access fees.

The Committee noted the recommendations and that a paper on Open Access was to be presented later in the Agenda.

In further discussion, Mike Williamson questioned if new acquisitions planned were physical or digital. Sheila Cannell advised that already in CS&E and CMVM the majority of acquisitions are digital and that this is increasing in CHSS. It was noted that different Colleges have different demands and it is important to understand them.

Discussion took place on the perception of within the Colleges of the cost of the resource provision made by the Library. Jeff Haywood commented that with materials increasingly available on the internet, the sense and of their cost was diminishing. Steven Morley advised that academics within CMVM have little understanding of how the library materials budget is allocated. He suggested a ‘roadshow’ or similar event to inform the Colleges of how money is being spent. The Committee noted and agreed the need for greater transparency and that ways of achieving this should be considered.

4 MATERIALS BUDGET 2012-13

Sheila Cannell spoke to the tabled paper advising that the budget uplift for the coming year is 3% for core activity which will be allocated amongst the college funds giving using the Income and Expenditure Attribution Model, resulting in an uplift for CHSS has an uplift uplift of 5.45% (reflecting the inclusion of ECA), for CMVM 2.62% and for CS&E a marginal reduction in real terms of 0.06%.

In regard to costs of library materials Sheila Cannell advised that a 5% increase should be allowed for across the board for Colleges and highlighted that CS&E in particular may be subjected to higher increases for some resources.
Janet Rennie questioned the accuracy of the 3% core uplift. Sheila Cannell advised that the additional 0.5% uplift had been allocated to Information Services but this was directed exclusively to fund the ‘personal tutor’ scheme and it had not been possible to make a case for the Library to benefit from this. Jeff Haywood reinforced that the fixed increment to the core budget for coming year is 3%. The £0.5 million allocated centrally on a recurrent basis is additional funding.

The Committee noted the report.

5 COLLECTIONS POLICY

John Scally gave a presentation on the work being undertaken to review the Collections Policy. It was noted that the last review took place in 2005 with some minor revisions in 2009. He summarised the main aim of the review to make the Policy more open and accessible and described the structure which is being developed to facilitate this, and some of the new developments which will need to be incorporated.

It was noted that consultancy groups have been established to contribute to the review and it is proposed that the revisions to the Policy be presented to the Library Committee in stages over the coming year with a view to approving the full Policy in a year’s time.

The Committee noted that the outcomes of the Collections Review will also feed into the Collections Policy which should contain guidelines to allow sufficient flexibility to react to the disparate – and changing - needs within the Colleges.

Alex Murdoch raised the issue of the disposal, without consultation, of the microfiche collection of BBC press cuttings.

John Scally explained that due to space and cost constraints it was necessary to review micro-card and micro-fiche holdings. The BBC press cuttings were surrogate rather than primary source material so had been placed in the workflow for possible disposal, transfer to another library or return to the BBC. John Scally advised that the disposal prior to consultation had been in error and was not in line with policy or procedure. John Scally advised that the collection had been consulted only three times over the past five years and on one of these occasions the search of the archive had produced no results. He emphasised that micro-fiche collections are difficult to use and highlighted that the cost of maintaining this archive was in the region of £8,000 per year. In light of the history of its use and its cost, John Scally cautioned that even had consultation taken place as it should have, the result may have been the same.

Alex Murdoch advised that the BBC has offered to gift the University the original archive material. The Committee noted that there would be cost implications in accepting the donation, and advised thorough investigation of the options prior to decision making.

6 OPEN ACCESS

Sheila Cannell advised that the Research Policy Group had requested a paper on Open Access. She invited discussion of the paper and suggestion of amendments prior to its submission to the Research Policy Group.
Sheila Cannell highlighted that Open Access has been a recurring theme over the years which has gradually gained momentum and advised that the Finch Report which is due to be published in mid June is likely to impose challenging changes in the access requirements for publicly funded research. Sheila Cannell outlined the model of Gold Open Access where the majority of research publishing is through traditional journals, funded at the point of publication whilst retaining peer review, leading increasingly to a change in the way research publishing is paid for. This has implications for additional costs being borne by universities – transferring publication costs to research budgets and a requirement to fund the transition from one model to another.

The Committee was advised that the Finch Report should put the UK in the lead and Sheila Cannell stated the view that the University – and Committee - should embrace this change. Janet Rennie questioned how publishing would be funded in the future in cases where research budgets are not available.

Jeff Haywood agreed that Open Access was an aspiration which in reality may take some time to achieve. He asked that further comments on the paper be forwarded to Sheila Cannell. It was noted that on Sheila’s departure Stuart Lewis will be progressing this.

7 MAIN LIBRARY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

The Committee noted the terms of the report and discussed its recommendations.

The Committee noted, as covered in the Collections Review and Policy, the need to maintain a watching brief of the sizes of the collections and how they may impact on the nature of space in the building.

The Committee noted that the Annexe had originally been set up as a decant store for the Main Library Redevelopment and has therefore been funded through the redevelopment project budget. It was noted that this funding will cease at the end of February 2013 but since its establishment the Annexe has become an accepted part of the library service. It was noted that additional study space was required due to the significant increase in Main Library usage since the redevelopment project commenced. David Finnegan stated that staff should be congratulated on making the service of the Annexe work so well. The Committee agreed that the Annexe has become a core component of the Library Service and agreed to support the proposal that its funding should be continued by the University as a core component.

The Committee noted the need for increased study space which may be best addressed through an extension to the Main Library. Sheila Cannell stated that, modelled on the Main Library redevelopment, students will continue to demand increased study space within the Main Library where the general environment is most supportive to providing appropriate space. Agreement was expressed by Janet Rennie, Mike Williamson and Alex Murdoch. The Convenor expressed the view that good study space could be created outwith libraries and it may be possible to meet expectations by creating further space elsewhere, with suitable motivation to encourage students to use it. The Committee noted that space is being created elsewhere and its success will be monitored.

It was suggested that to free up more space within the Main Library Student Services could be moved to another building. It was noted, however, that this would impact on costs and services with the requirement to keep a second building open for the long hours now offered within the Main Library building, and that the usage of the
Student Services was increasing because of their presence in the Main Library.

8 LIBRARY SERVICES FOR ONLINE DISTANCE LEARNERS

The Committee noted the report outlining the expected needs of Online Distance Learners (ODLs) as programmes and student numbers increase.

It was highlighted that digital materials are being increasingly acquired and John Scally considered that if key print resources were required it may be possible to digitise these if copyright allowed.

The proposal of the two year pilot postal scheme was discussed. It was highlighted that the 12 week loan could deprive other students of a text for an extended period. It was agreed that exact demand for texts is difficult to predict and acknowledged that there will be resource implications for the budget in future years.

9 PROJECTS

The Committee noted the report giving brief updates on the projects ‘Towards Dolly’, Open Journal Publishing, Reading List system, 3 JISC projects and the University Card.

10 BUILDING AND OPENING HOURS

a) Main Library Redevelopment Update
   The Committee noted the report.

b) Library and Study Space Developments at KB in summer 2012: overview
   Richard Battersby advised that a paper would be brought to Committee in the autumn. The opening date for the King’s Buildings Library is Tuesday 31 July with hand over expected in late June. Disruptions are detailed in the College/IS websites. Following the re-opening of King’s Buildings, work will commence on the Darwin Library.

11 College Library Committees

a) College of S&E
   Richard Battersby advised that work is currently concentrated on the redevelopment of space within the libraries and consideration of library materials budgets.

b) College of MVM
   Steve Morley advised that over the summer period a co-opted group within the College is meeting to consider library services.

c) College of HSS
   Janet Rennie advised that a recent review of HSS committees had established the Library and Academic Computing Committee with the remit for dealing with library matters. She advised that under a current review of committees this is likely to remain in place but be renamed ‘Knowledge Strategy Committee’ and the membership and attendance of academic representatives will be mandatory.
12 **EUSA Report**

Stuart Lewis advised that the new system Talis Aspire on which consultation had taken place with students would be piloted shortly.

13 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 APRIL 2012**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee of 11 April 2012 were noted and approved.

14 **MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising.

15 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

16 **DATES OF MEETING 2012-13**

The proposed dates, times and venues of the meetings were noted and approved, with the request that the next meeting of the Committee, scheduled for 2pm on Wednesday 10 October, should be relocated to King’s Buildings.