



Library Committee

Wednesday 17 February 2021, 10.00am
Web-conferencing meeting via MS Teams

Minutes

Present Members:

Dr Paul Ayris (Chair); Dr Simon Banks [from Minute 19]; Dr Richard Freeman; Dr Oliver Gerstenberg; Dr Liza Griffin; Dr Charles Inskip; Mr Ben Meunier; Mr Martin Moyle; Professor Vivek Mudera; Dr Jim Onyemenam; Dr Rachel Rees; Dr John Sabapathy; Dr Harriet Shannon [for Minutes 15-18]; Mr Andy Smith [from Minute 18.2].

Apologies:

Mr Ayman Benmati
Professor Diane Koenker
Mr Zak Liddell
Ms Kate Pearce
Professor David Price
Dr Hazel Smith

In attendance:

Mr Vincenzo Carrara (Finance and Business Affairs)

Office

Part II: Strategic Items for Discussion

17. Report from the Pro-Vice-Provost (UCL Library Services) (2-02)

- 17.1. The Pro-Vice-Provost (UCL Library Services) introduced the report on Library developments in the areas of the UCL Library Services Strategy 2019-22 since the last meeting of LC. The following key points were highlighted:
- a. Students in the School of Arts and Humanities and Social and Historical Sciences (SLASH) in particular were experiencing challenges accessing a number of resources during the pandemic. The Pro-Vice-Provost was liaising with the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities who had asked whether there was opportunity for publishers to open up access to content free of charge until July 2021. Library Services had sent a list of some 170 resources to Jisc, who were engaging with publishers to request resource access to support Postgraduate Taught (PGT) and final year Undergraduate (UG) students in particular; the Pro-Vice-Provost awaited news on whether publishers would work with libraries in this way. Publishers had opened up resources much less during the current lockdown than previously, an issue compounded during the pandemic by the closure of libraries and pressures on library budgets.

made considerable investments in e-books, major efforts to support teaching through textbook investment had begun only recently. UCL figures were expected to increase and a further report would be brought to LC in the summer. It was suggested that Library Services undertake a communications exercise to raise awareness of resource availability.

d. Both the Library's investment in e-books and the Scan and Send service implemented during the pandemic were welcomed. In respect of the latter, a comment was made concerning the current backlog of requests and that it was difficult to advise how long a request would take. UCL had granted capital funding of £51k to extend the Scan and Send service until July 2021. From 1 March 2021, the service would be extended to cover nearly every Library site, bar some difficulties accessing collections due to the locking up of sites during lockdown.

e. Notwithstanding the Library's comparatively low FTE student spend against benchmark partners, there was ambition and opportunity for the Library to undertake a flagship project as part of its future vision rather than seek only incremental investment in existing areas. It was noted that

this should be considered as a priority for the Library. It was noted that the Library should consider the possibility of a flagship project as part of its future vision rather than seek only incremental investment in existing areas. It was noted that

tbe

h n.

Library Committee –

- f. Enhanced spend on Special Collections and on a digital-first record management system was a central focus of the Systems, Collections and Processes KPA.
- g. Under the Communication, Outreach and Open Science KPA, the Library sought to prioritise both research support and the expansion of UCL Press in line with UCL's growth and to support UCL's assessment in the

necessarily be expected to travel off campus to attend a livestream lecture, which would place pressure on the Library estate.

- c. In response to a question, it was noted that UCL Estates were considering a range of solutions including the possibility of expanding UCL's footprint in Bloomsbury through acquisition or through pop-up spaces.
- d. As a result of possible space pressures, there was some support generated across UCL for swift implementation of digital learning environments to augment UCL's provision. LC noted that to roll this out at pace might require an urgent decision to be taken on funding.

21. Open Science and Scholarship (2-06)

21.1. The Pro-Vice-Provost (UCL Library Services) presented the paper, which represented the culmination of 18 months of work by the League of European Research Universities (LERU) on a series of recommendations for member universities in their implementation of Open Science based on their shared learning. The following key developments in the UCL context were highlighted:

- a. UCL was one of the most advanced LERU universities in terms of its Open Science programme. Despite this, there were some question marks as to how UCL would continue to progress its Open Science agenda in the post-Brexit context.
- b. There were significant challenges ahead in implementing the European Commission's ambitious endeavour for a European Open Science Cloud (EOSC), the purpose of which was to bring together global research data into one portal. With an estimated half a million core data experts required to deliver the EOSC vision, and limited funding opportunities available, the Pro-Vice-Provost stressed that the EOSC would need to increase its engagement age

- 21.2. During discussion, the following comments were made:
 - a. While there was support for academics retaining the choice of where to publish, there was praise for the