

General Board
Review of Teaching and Learning Support Services
Implementation Steering Group

Minutes of the third meeting of the Implementation Steering Group held on Thursday 26 November 2009.

Present: [Names redacted]

4. Minutes

The Minutes of the second meeting of the Implementation Steering Group (ISG) held on 26 May 2009, with accompanying work plan as at May 2009 (ISG1b), were circulated for information.

5. Matters arising

The Group was informed that there had been a Discussion on a Topic of Concern regarding the July 2008 Report of the Review Group. The transcript of the Discussion on 7 July 2009 was available in Reporter of 15 July 2009 at: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2008-09/weekly/6157/30.html>

The Group received General Board papers (GB 09.A.26 and 09.A.26b) from the meeting of 4 November 2009 for information. The Group was informed that Council, at their meeting on 23 November 2009, had approved the Notice for publication.

6. Progress with implementation

(1) Recommendation 3: Libraries integration

The Group was informed that a report has been produced, by Dr MacDougall, dated October 2009, on a framework for developing the working relationship between the University Library and the Libraries of the Faculties, Departments and other institutions.

The Group received:

- (a) the draft MacDougall report;
- (b) a note of meeting between representatives of the Faculties of Economics and History and the Institute of Criminology, the University Librarian and the Head and Secretary of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, held on 12 November 2009 to discuss the report;
- (c) a letter from the Faculty of Economics dated 11 November 2009.

The Group noted that:

- (a) the consultant had spent some time with the Librarians of the three libraries which were the main focus of this pilot study and they were reported to be keen to proceed with affiliation;
- (b) the draft report had been compiled in very general terms, and the details were thus as yet unclear, and there was a need to clarify the most important details, i.e. resources, governance and operation, before the proposals could be subject to effective discussion;

- (c) the draft report did not make explicit any of the benefits of affiliation which should include improved effectiveness, efficiency and better value for money;
- (d) the draft report formed a basis for this discussion but the Group did not accept its recommendations in their present form and wider circulation would not therefore be constructive.

The Group agreed that:

- (a) a model governance structure should be developed for an Affiliated Library (action: Librarian, Academic Secretary);
- (b) an implementation plan should be produced to forecast the financial outcomes and benefits of the affiliation of departmental libraries, starting with the Humanities and Social Sciences examples (action Librarian, Secretary HSS);
- (c) the above items should support consultation with the institutions involved, during Lent Term 2010, and the consultation document should be clear on the reasons for, and costs and benefits of, change (action: Librarian);
- (d) the Council of the School of Humanities & Social Sciences should consider, as a transitional measure for 2010/11, identifying and isolating agreed budgets for the three Libraries earmarked for affiliation (action: Secretary HSS).

(2) Recommendation 4: CARET and the UL

The Group was informed that the UL and CARET aimed to prepare independent plans and sum them together to create a joint submission for Planning Round 2009. Subsequently they would work together to draw up a more integrated plan to be developed during the implementation process and completed in June 2010. A request for £100K funding for five years for the running costs of CamTools had been submitted to ISSS under the UL.

The Group agreed:

- (a) that it would be helpful to explore the possibility of seconding the Director of CARET to the UL for a period to create an opportunity for him to develop a vision of electronic services in the UL (action: Librarian, Academic Secretary);
- (b) that consideration should be given to the reconfiguration of the CARET Management Committee as a University Library E-services Committee or similar (action: Librarian, Academic Secretary);
- (c) that a clear business plan for CamTools should be developed to inform discussions about its future funding (action: Librarian, Director CARET).

(3) Recommendation 6: journals and the colleges

The Group was informed that the Cambridge Colleges Libraries Forum (CCLF) Journals subgroup under the chairmanship of Dr Mark Nicholls (Librarian, St. John's College) planned to recommend to the CCLF that the interests of College libraries appear in principle to be best served by greater integration with or full membership of the Journals Co-ordination Scheme. The CCLF had agreed to nominate Dr Mark Nicholls as the Colleges' nominated representative on the Journals Co-Ordination Scheme Steering Group.

The Group welcomed the inclusion of college representation on the Journals Co-Ordination Scheme Steering Group but they noted that the lack of a mechanism for managing journals subscriptions, and in particular cancellations and duplications, across the whole University including the Colleges was wasteful and very costly.

The Group agreed that a paper should be produced to highlight the issues to Bursars etc. including proposals for pragmatic solutions for the benefit of Cambridge as a whole (action: Librarian).

(4) Other recommendations

The Group reviewed progress on the other recommendations and agreed that the creation of the Teaching & Learning Services Steering Group should be a priority for the General Board in the Lent Term.

7. Procedure of the Group

The Group noted that it was to be the final meeting under the Chairmanship of Professor Andrew Cliff and thanked him for the energy and drive he had put into its work.

The Group noted that the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Planning & Resources and Education), with the Academic Secretary, would make a recommendation about future chairmanship of the Group.

JGE
30 November 2009

General Board
Review of Teaching and Learning Support Services
Implementation Steering Group

The third meeting of the Implementation Steering Group will be held at 9am on Thursday 26 November 2009 in the Academic Secretary's office in the Old Schools.

AGENDA

Note agenda and papers are circulated electronically as a single file with papers indexed by page number [p1-41] in the agenda.

1. Minutes

The Minutes of the second meeting of the Implementation Steering Group (ISG) held on 26 May 2009 [p3], with accompanying work plan as at May 2009 (ISG1b) [p5-8], are circulated for information.

2. Matters arising

The Group are informed that there was a Discussion on a Topic of Concern regarding the July 2008 Report of the Review Group.

The transcript of the Discussion on 7 July 2009 is available in Reporter of 15 July 2009 at: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2008-09/weekly/6157/30.html>

Circulated for information are papers (GB 09.A.26 [p9] and 09.A.26b [p10]) received by the General Board at their meeting on 4 November 2009 on the subject.

3. Progress with implementation

(1) Recommendation 3: Libraries integration

The Group are informed that a report has been produced, by Dr MacDougall, dated October 2009, on a framework for developing the working relationship between the University Library and the Libraries of the Faculties, Departments and other institutions.

Circulated here are:

- the draft MacDougall report [p11-32];
- a note of meeting between representatives of the Faculties of Economics and History and the Institute of Criminology, the University Librarian and the Head and Secretary of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, held on 12 November 2009 to discuss the report [p33-34];
- a letter from the Faculty of Economics dated 11 November 2009 [p35-41].

(2) Recommendation 4: CARET and the UL

The Group are informed that the UL and CARET aim to prepare independent plans and sum them together to create a joint submission for Planning Round 2009. Subsequently they will work together to draw up a more integrated plan that will be developed during the implementation process, to be completed in June 2010. A request for £100K funding for five years for the running costs of CamTools has been submitted to ISSS under the UL.

(3) Recommendation 6: journals and the colleges

The Group are informed that the Cambridge Colleges Libraries Forum (CCLF) Journals subgroup under the chairmanship of Dr Mark Nicholls (Librarian, St. John's College) plan to recommend to the CCLF that 'the interests of College libraries appear in principle to be best served by greater integration with or full membership of the Journals Co-ordination Scheme'. The CCLF agreed to nominate Dr Mark Nicholls as the Colleges' nominated representative on the Journals Co-Ordination Scheme Steering Group.

(4) The Group are invited to review progress and outline a timetable of next actions.

JGE
23 November 2009

Minutes of the ISG held
on 26 May 2006 and
accompanying work plan
already supplied as part
of the response to

FOI-2009-145

Papers GB.09.A.26 and
09.A.26b already
supplied as part of the
response to

FOI-2009-143

Draft Macdougall report
already supplied in
response to

FOI-2009-142

Note of a meeting held on 12 November 2009 to discuss the working relationship between the University Library and the Libraries of the Faculties, Departments and Other Institutions.

Present: [Names redacted.]

Apologies: [Names redacted.]

The meeting was convened to discuss the draft report by Dr Alan MacDougall (October 2009) on the implementation of the General Board's Review of Teaching and Learning Support Services. The report focussed on the Libraries of the Faculties of Economics and History and the Institute of Criminology. The Faculty of Economics had also provided a response to the report in a letter dated 11 November 2009.

The meeting noted that:

1. The environment was changing and it was necessary to find a framework within which the University's Libraries as a whole could provide best service.
2. The report had been compiled in very general terms and the details were thus as yet unclear.
3. The consultant had spent some time with the Librarians of the three libraries which were the main focus of this pilot study, to gain an understanding of their characteristics and differences, as it was thought to be especially important that the Librarians were clearly a part of the process – each Librarian saw the sense in rationalisation but were proud of what they currently provided.
4. The text book was still important to undergraduate students, the transition to electronic textbooks and other materials was slow, but the vision was to be able to provide a virtual teaching and research environment and eliminate duplication of materials in the process.
5. The Faculty of Economics were concerned at the detailed recommendations in the report and surprised at some of the proposals, but they were also aware of replication of materials and that Economics students made use of the UL's online services. They stressed that there had not been any consultation within the Faculty on the proposals. The Faculty also emphasised that there should be financial savings as a result of any restructuring.
6. The Faculty of History were generally enthusiastic but keen to work further on the details.
7. The Institute of Criminology were not yet convinced of the benefits and were concerned that their current provision may be diluted by distanced management arrangements.
8. All three Faculties considered that their libraries currently delivered an excellent service to students and staff, and feedback surveys supported this. It was important that any restructuring should enhance, rather than jeopardise this.
9. There was general agreement that economies of scale should be possible through affiliation of Libraries and that other clear advantages for the site included the potential for arrangements for extended hours and for a coordinated approach to rethinking the nature of Library space.

The meeting agreed that:

1. There was a need to clarify the most important details, i.e. resources, governance and operation, to enable the proposals to be subject to effective discussion.
2. There were lessons to be learned from current successful examples, e.g. The Squire, and the Squire Librarian could be asked to present on how that arrangement works in practice.
3. When the report is received by the General Board's Implementation Steering Group the meeting were keen that it be to provide a basis for discussion, only, and that it had been noted that all participants had concerns about some of its recommendations.
4. There should be formal consultation with the institutions involved, probably during Lent Term, and the consultation document should be clear on the reasons for, and costs and benefits of, change and the important details noted above.
5. If there were found to be insufficient time for the three Libraries to be affiliated effective 2010/11, there may be some transitional phase which could introduced then for full implementation to follow in 2011/12.

JGE

13 November 2009

Professor Hamid Sabourian
Chairman of the Faculty of Economics

Mrs Anne Jarvis
University Librarian
University Library
West Road



**UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE**

Faculty of Economics

11 November 2009

Dear Mrs Jarvis

Thank you for forwarding a copy of the report written by Dr Alan Macdougall, commissioned by the Implementation Steering Group, following the General Board's Review of Teaching and Learning Support Services.

The Marshall Library is a thriving, successful and essential part of the faculty, valued by students and staff for its specialist collection and high service levels. The Marshall Library is consistently rated extremely highly by students in survey returns and we are naturally anxious that any proposals should not affect this success.

Our main concerns are the following:

- What would the governance/management structure look like? How would students and staff feed into this? What role would the faculty play in the proposed new structure?
- What level of service could students and staff expect following any agreement? In particular, does the proposed rationalization mean a reduction in the service level?
- What are the implications for the use of the space currently occupied by the Marshall Library? The faculty is planning to use the Stats room in the Library for graduate students due to the current and future planned increases in MPhil and PhD student numbers. The faculty is not in a position to commit additional space within the building, including additional space in the basement area.
- That faculty/library reserve balances and trust fund investments cannot be committed to this proposal. The trust funds are linked explicitly to the Marshall Library and the other reserves are part of the faculty's general reserves.

- In terms of chest funding, the faculty (for its part) would agree to support the status quo in terms of current staff members and their existing grades, but there is concern over the suggestion in the proposal of promotions prospects as part of this re-structure, at this financially-difficult crossroads. The faculty has recently seen a 15% reduction in expenditure on stipends and wages due to pressure on the chest budget. Any re-structuring should help with achieving savings, particularly on staff costs, not lead to an increase in expenditure on salaries.
- It is unrealistic to expect the Marshall Library to achieve affiliate status by August 2010. The Faculty Board has not yet had the opportunity to discuss or comment on this report.

Appended to this letter are some of the specific recommendations from the report which we seek further clarification on.

Yours sincerely

Hamid Sabourian
Chair of the Faculty of Economics

A draft report on the implementation of the General Board's Review of Teaching and Learning Support Services with specific reference to a framework for the working relationship between the University Library and the Libraries of the Faculty, Department and Other Institutions

Recommendation 3

That the overall responsibility for the governance will be assumed by the new Syndicate (NB the recommendation of the General Board Review was that the present University Library Syndicate should be merged with the General Board's Committee on Libraries) through the Director of Library Services. The Chair of Faculty would therefore no longer have the responsibility for a Faculty, Department or Institute Library.

If the governance is to be assumed by the new Syndicate, by what mechanism does the faculty have input into the governance of the Marshall library.

Recommendation 4

That the Faculty, Department or Institute be encouraged to retain the Affiliate Librarians within the existing School structures/committees

Minor clarification: In what sense would they be in the School structures? As committee members?

Recommendation 5

The Affiliate Librarians should report through an appropriate senior Library officer to the Director of Library Services

Currently the Marshall Librarian reports directly through to the Chair of the Faculty and therefore to the Faculty Board. What is the detail of the vision of the governance and management structure under this proposal for affiliate libraries?

For instance, currently if the tripos or the MPhil or a research area of the faculty wishes to pursue new areas, the Marshall Library purchases the materials.

By what mechanism could the Faculty Board be assured that the Marshall Library would be able to properly support new courses or new MPhil programmes? The faculty is currently reforming its MPhil programme so this is pertinent at the present time.

Recommendation 6

That the opportunity afforded by the incorporation of Affiliate Libraries be used to encourage a new culture of thinking and purpose across the libraries

Currently, the Marshall Library has a culture of supporting the faculty's students as well as staff (teaching and research) to a very high standard and this is consistently demonstrated in student feedback. How would that culture

differ under this proposal and is there a risk that service to economics students and staff would suffer under these proposals?

Recommendation 8

That the potential for placing appropriate legal deposit items within the Affiliate Libraries be considered

If there is the possibility that legal deposit items are to be transferred to affiliate libraries this might lead to issues with space in the Marshall Library. The faculty would wish to retain and develop the Stats room in the Marshall Library for graduate student space, particularly due to the current and forecast rise in graduate student numbers.

Recommendation 9

That the Director of Library Services should, at an early stage, consider setting up a working group, including representation from the Affiliate Libraries, University Library, and others of relevance, and with appropriate terms of reference, to make recommendations on a more effective redeployment of materials and resource for the pursuit of better accessibility and availability to the student and staff community across Cambridge University

It might be reassuring to faculties and department if such a working group, were set up in advance of any commitment to these proposals, so that faculties could be assured that any recommendations would not be of detriment to their library?

Recommendation 10

That, in any review and restructuring, the potential for creation of posts as Heads of area which take into account subject groupings be considered

Are there funding implications in this recommendation?

Recommendation 11

That the effective and efficient redistribution of materials to provide an improved coordinated coverage, accessibility and availability, be accompanied by appropriate additional resource

Is this redistributing materials down to affiliate libraries in accordance with subject specialism? Is the Marshall Library expected to commit its own funds as appropriate additional resource to take on materials from the University Library (and or other departmental libraries)?

Recommendation 12

That the Director of Library Services explore the potential with the University Library and Affiliate Libraries for agreed optimum opening hours which would protect the accessibility and availability of material within cost effective resource provision.

What input would the faculty staff and students have in such explorations? And at what stage would they happen?

Recommendation 13

That the Director of Library Services, in any subsequent strategic review, which would include affiliate representation, should bear in mind the potential for a realignment of front-of-house and back- of- house across the new library service arrangement (that is including the Affiliate Libraries)

What might this mean, in practice, for any faculty library staff? Is it a centralization at the UL of functions such as purchasing, cataloguing etc?

Recommendation 14

That the Director of Library Services be mindful of the specialist expertise that the University Library staff and Affiliate Library staff would bring to the new service, the potential for promotion, training and development opportunities and the enrichment of service to the staff and students of the University by involvement in the planning of the future service and the benefit for continuity of service and succession planning

Many faculties and departments are currently facing severe cuts to their stipends budget and also facing the possibility of not filling crucial teaching and research posts. This faculty has recently seen a 15% cut in its stipends and wages expenditure

At a time with salary and pension costs rising at an alarming rate across the university, (with no easy solutions) is this, politically a sensible time to consider potential promotion and development opportunities among the university's cohort of library staff? And if so, faculties might expect that any additional costs of the re-structuring be found among savings from the re-structure. The faculty would be looking for value for money from any re-structuring proposals at this time.

Recommendation 15

That attention will need to be given to the provision of additional resource for human resources and financial administrative support as the number of Affiliate Libraries increase

It is not obvious there is additional resource to be provided for this activity, which (presumably) is carried out presently in faculties (and/or central HR). How is it proposed that this be resourced?

Recommendation 16

That the funds presently granted to the Faculty, Department and Other Institutions (calculated over the average expenditure over the past 5 years) be transferred to the Director of Library Services for the financial year 2010 -2011 onwards. The sum should include provision for the finance given from Trust Funds, Donation Funds and internal trading accounts

The Marshall Library has two trust funds, donations and internal trading accounts. This forms a substantial part of the faculty reserves. Is this recommendation requesting the total sum of all these accounts (including investments and library reserves) or just the average expenditure from these accounts over the last five years? It is not clear how the current service to staff and students from the Marshall Library could be improved by this recommendation. And the faculty would not acquiesce to release balances of

reserve accounts which are presently being committed to support faculty activity.

Recommendation 17

That the Director of Library Services should receive safety-net funding to protect against the shortfall of funding for the University Library and Affiliate Libraries should a reduction or 0% increase be applied to its budget in the coming years

At the current time, no faculty or department is immune to shortfalls in funding. The case does not seem to be made that the UL ought to be considered a special case. It is also not clear, if the UL is treated differently, what negative impact this might have on other activities within faculties/departments.

Recommendation 18

That where appropriate service level agreements concerning heating, lighting, cleaning, maintenance of the building, fixtures and fittings, furnishing be identified and future funding agreed with the Faculty, Departments and Other Institutions and that whatever arrangements made to ensure that the University Library would not be able to take on such commitments without guaranteed recurrent funding

At present, many faculties are attempting to maintain and where possible, improve services with increased efficiency, whilst having either zero-inflation budgets for consumables or falling expenditure budgets for stipends. Utilities costs (along with pensions costs) are expected to continue on a sharp upwards trajectory in the future.

If, for instance, the Marshall Library opening hours were to be lengthened, or staff numbers/salaries increased, this would create additional costs to faculties, that would not be acceptable.

Recommendation 19

That the type and cost of IT equipment, associated maintenance and computing support be identified and agreement reached with the Faculties, Departments and Other Institutions. The University Library would not be able to take on this additional cost without recurrent financial subvention

Equipment budgets have fallen drastically in the last few years and are not currently sufficient. It is not clear where additional resource would be found.

Recommendation 20

That the Director of Library Services consider the desirability of providing clear and transparent on-going information about the new services following the addition of the affiliate libraries.

It would be helpful if this information could be made available in these proposals. Currently, it is difficult to see clear benefit from these proposals to a faculty such as Economics.

Recommendation 21

That the Director of Library Services may wish to consider the desirability of a new logo being commissioned which more accurately reflects the new service provision

Is this of relevance to this consultation? Cambridge University Library is already a well-established brand. But more importantly, it would be helpful at this stage, to know what the new service provision would consist of.

Recommendation 22

That, with regard to the detailed arrangements required for the new relationship, the Director of Library Services draws upon the expertise from the University Library staff and the Affiliate Library staff through the medium of working parties and ad hoc working groups with appropriate terms of reference

It seems that the detail will be all important in these proposals and it is difficult to make an informed decision about the best way forward for the Marshall Library without knowing the detail.

Recommendations 23

The Economics, History and the Institute of Criminology Libraries assume Affiliate status in August 2010 and that the time before then be used to progress the detailed requirements to ensure a smooth transition

Given that November is the first opportunity that faculty chairs will have to consider this document, at what stage would Faculty Boards be asked for their input? This report helpfully focuses attention on many questions, but they are yet to be discussed, and it seems at this preliminary stage, much greater detail will be required. It is unrealistic to expect this transition to occur by next summer.

Recommendation 24

That the University authorities be requested to consider the three Affiliate Libraries, in conjunction with the University Library, for the 2009 Planning Round (referring to the year 2010-2011)

The 2009 planning round has already happened at the initial stage between faculties and the School, so it seems this is too late for consideration with faculties.

Recommendation 25

That the new Library Board give consideration to the closer working relationship between the newly formed wider Library Service and the College Libraries

This would seem sensible.