



Chair

Dr Paul Adams, Dr Simon Bennet, Dr Mike Cole, Mr Mark Crawford, Dr Caroline Essex, Dr Richard Freeman, Dr Kerstin Gustafsson, Ms Louise ; Professor Philip Schofield

In attendance: Mr Ben Meunier (Assistant Director, Public Services, Library Services - *observer*); Mr Martin Moyle (Assistant Director, Support Services, Library Services - *observer*); Ms Olivia Whiteley (Secretary to Library Committee)

Apologies for absence were received from Ms Halima Begum, Dr Julie Evans, Dr Ian Giles, Mr Rex Knight, Dr Sophia Psarra, Dr John Sabapathy

Preliminary business

15 **WELCOME FROM THE CHAIR**

- 15.1 [redacted] line from UCL Professional Services to the Office of the Vice-Provost (Research) and with effect from December 2016, Professor David Price (Vice-Provost, Research) had

- 18.1 **Received** . the report on progress in the implementation of the Library Services Strategy 2015-18 at LC 2-10 (16-17), presented by Dr Paul Ayris, Pro-Vice-Provost (UCL Library Services).
- 18.2 In terms of the Library Services Strategy KPA on User Experience, the coverage and impact of ReadingLists@UCL continued to mature. The agreed target for take-up was that 65% of all current taught Portico courses across BEAMS, SLASH and SLMS have an online reading list by the end of the July 2017; LC officers were reminded that the IOE had yet to be integrated into the ReadingLists@UCL service. At the end of January 2017, coverage stood at 58%, with updates on progress sent regularly to Heads of Department. Comments from students showed that the ReadingLists@UCL service was highly appreciated and the figures were likewise encouraging, with the total number of visits for the period September-December 2016 at 234,543. At a recent UCLU Education Conference, students had been encouraged to request the ReadingLists@UCL service for their courses where currently unavailable.
- 18.3 **Value for Money (VFM)**, a VFM dashboard had been created, a copy of which was included in the report at LC 2-10 (16-17). It was reported that levels supported by positive response rates to the 2014, 2015 and 2016 NSS, in which 88% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the library services are of good value. By way of a national benchmark, this result was above the sector average for 2015-16 of 87%. The 2015-16 WOS arrival data likewise formed a positive image: 96% of new students declared that they had been able successfully to use one or more of the libraries within UCL, while 89% had been able to access online library resources.
- 18.4 During discussion, some concerns were raised regarding the validity of the NSS scores for benchmarking purposes in light of a current campaign encouraging students to boycott the Survey. It was anticipated that UCL would reserve judgement on use of the scores should the participation rate fail to meet a certain threshold. It was also noted that UCL had withdrawn from the Student Barometer and that Library Services was subsequently in discussion with the Office of the Vice-Provost (Student and Education Affairs) to determine alternative measures.
- 18.5 **Library Services Strategy** was indicated at the end of the report at LC 2-10 (16-17). Of the 90 action lines arising from across the Strategy, 27 had already been fully completed. The Library projected that, by the end of the Strategy period in 2018, it would have completed 90% of its intended 90 actions. Although there had been developments made against all 90 action lines since the beginning of the 2015-18 Strategy period, it was anticipated that eight actions might not be fully delivered, several for reasons beyond the Library's control. It was added that the Library would be developing an Engagement Strategy. A refreshed Library Services Strategy would be devised and presented to LC once priorities for the next period had been determined by the Library Services Strategy Review.

19 **COLLECTIONS ACTIVITY**
[PAPER 2-11 (16-17)]

19.1 **Received** a briefing paper

meeting in early 2017. Three principal options arose from this process, as follows:

- That the budget shortfall be divided and met by the member Colleges (this option had already been rejected, however);
- That Senate House be encouraged to make reductions in expenditure of at least £500,000, with the remaining deficit to be met by the member Colleges. Whether this would entail service reductions or greater efficiency gains was uncertain;
- That the Senate House Library work with an external partner to convert its resources into an extensive OA digital library.

Costings for the third option of an electronic library would be sought, as this suggestion had received a reasonable level of support from the Working Group. Following this, the Working Group would proceed to make recommendations for future action to the Collegiate Council. The Pro-Vice-Provost (UCL Library Services) would provide an update at the next meeting of LC.

ACTION: Dr Paul Ayris

- 21.4 During discussion, the issue of the comparative VFM of the UCL and Senate House Libraries was raised. It was reported that UCL staff and students made comparatively little use of the Senate House Library resource stock, but that the learning spaces available at Senate House were much valued.

22

[PAPER LC 2-13 (16-17)]

- 22.1 **Received** . the paper at LC 2-13 (16-17) highlighting current developments in the re-accommodation of displaced libraries at the Ear and Eastman Dental Institutes, as well as progress with plans to develop the libraries at the Institute of Orthopaedics (Stanmore), GOS ICH and School of Pharmacy. The paper, in which risks and opportunities were highlighted, was presented by Ben Meunier, Assistant Director (Public Services), UCL Library Services.
- 22.2 A working group including representatives of UCL and UCLH had completed an options appraisal for the relocation of the Ear Institute/Action on Hearing Loss and Eastman Dental Institute Libraries in 2019. As reported at the last meeting of LC, the preferred option originally identified was to re-accommodate the libraries in the basement of 250 Euston Road; however, UCLH Estate subsequently raised some significant deliverability concerns with this option. As a result, UCLH and UCL were in discussion regarding a way forward, with UCL Library Services and Estates currently working to identify space that could meet key requirements. The University of London was also considering possible means of accommodating these libraries. Other possibilities included the digitisation of resources; however, it was recognised that this would have a significantly detrimental impact on user experience, particularly in the case of the Action on Hearing Loss resources which comprised a national, public collection dedicated to the deaf community. Notably, a separate review of the future use of the Bloomsbury Healthcare Library was underway to consider space usage after the expiration of its lease in 2022. There was a possibility that this might be used as a decant space. There was, however, a significant risk that neither the Ear nor Eastman Dental Institute Libraries could be rehoused.

- 22.3 Following the investment of £120,000 by the Central Estate Strategy Board in September 2016, plans were progressing for the refurbishment of the main reading room space in the GOS ICH. The project, which would see the number of social study spaces increase from 10 to 34 and the possible installation of 100 new computers, was expected significantly to improve the student experience. It was hoped that this would drive usage of the GOS ICH Library and thereby mitigate the pressures placed across Library Services.
- 22.4 Plans to establish a new Orthopaedics Hub as a joint UCL and RNOH Trust project were to be placed on hold until the outcome of an internal RNOH review was complete, with a UCL Estates review to be conducted in the meantime. Concerns were expressed that the Hub project should not lose priority, given the benefits that it would potentially afford both SLMS and the Trust.
- 22.5 A feasibility study to redevelop the School of Pharmacy Junior Common Room into a new biomedical hub had been approved for implementation in 2017. The hub, providing in excess of 100 study spaces, would complement the learning spaces available in the Cruciform Hub.

23 PIQS AND THE LIBRARY BUDGET

[PAPER LC 2-14 (16-17)]

- 23.1 **Received** . the paper at LC 2-14 (16-17) on PIQs and their implications for the Library's effective budgeting of new taught programmes, presented by Martin Moyle, Assistant Director (Support Services), Library Services.
- 23.2 During the 2015-16 session, the UCL Planning Team carried out an Operational Impact Assessment in which operational risks linked to the impact of growth were identified. In April 2016, Library Liaison and Support Services submitted to the Planning Team a paper identifying a number of risks relating to the Library's ability to provide adequate resources to support projected increases in the number of students and taught programmes at UCL. These risks, appended in the paper at LC 2-14 (16-17), included negative impacts on student attainment, satisfaction, retention and recruitment and formed the basis of an argument to { } c
- 23.3 The paper at LC 2-14 (16-17) highlighted a number of caveats with the PIQ process, the principle mechanism by which Library Services identified funding to support new taught programmes. Previously, the PIQ process had allowed the Library to identify start-up and recurrent resources required to support a new taught programme, for inclusion in a business case. Prior to programme approval, nominated staff within Library Services would have the opportunity to review resource requirements with the programme proposer via the student information service known as Portico. The outcomes of the process had not been wholly satisfactory, however, as the nature of the UCL contribution model was such that the funding identified for resources was not subsequently protected. The PIQ process had recently been removed from Portico entirely, thereby halting the systematic flow of information to Library Services about new programme proposals. Resourcing methods had also changed, such that business cases for new programmes were prepared at the departmental or divisional level, authorised by the relevant School and reviewed centrally by UCL Finance and Business Affairs. Since these process changes, Library

- 27.1 This would be the last LC meeting attended by Dr Caroline Essex, who would be moving on from UCL in April. V@ Ô@ã cã \^â Ö! Ô•^ç †† •^ç^} ^^ã•q of commitment to LC as ngot0 144.08h45m 0 0 1 302.59 784.92 T fEYxl&š@ E%\$Eë xWě5ç