

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

**Commissioned by Implementation Steering Group**

**October 2009**

**Dr Alan F MacDougall JP, MA, PhD, FRSA  
MacDougall Consulting Ltd  
[afmacdougall@macdougallconsulting.com](mailto:afmacdougall@macdougallconsulting.com)  
02075887520**

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 The General Board’s Review of Teaching and Learning Support Services	8
1.2 Implementation Steering Group and the present study	8
1.3 The terms of reference	9
<b>2. CONTEXT</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3. METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 Meetings	10
3.1.1 University Library staff and dependant Library staff	10
3.1.2 School of Humanities (Librarians within the study)	10
3.1.3 School of Humanities and Social Sciences (Officers)	10
3.1.4 Chairman of Review Committee	10
3.1.5 Librarians from other Libraries	10
<b>4. CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1 Student experience, expectation and need	11
4.2 One size does not fit all	11
4.3 Framework clarity and transparency	11
4.4 Protect availability and accessibility	11
4.5 Embedded in the Faculty, Department and Institute structures	11
4.6 Equality of treatment	11
4.7 Overcoming the building-centric mindset	11
4.8 Transparent collections and services information	11
4.9 Inclusivity	12
4.10 Trust and honesty	12
4.11 Scalability	12
<b>5. THE CONSIDERATIONS AND WAY FORWARD</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1 Terminology	12
5.2 Governance, management and reporting considerations	13
5.3 Collections/materials regardless of format, accessibility, availability, location and organisation	14
5.4 General staffing considerations and benefits	16
5.5 Finance and related transfers	16
5.6 Publicity, promotion and logo	19
5.7 Working parties and ad hoc working groups	19
5.8 Timescale	19
5.8.1 Affiliates	19
5.8.2 College Libraries	20
<b>6. THE WAY FORWARD</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix A: List of interviewees</b>	<b>22</b>

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The contribution of all those who spared valuable time to see the Consultant is acknowledged with thanks. The three Librarians of the Faculties of History, Economics and Institute of Criminology who offered advice and counsel are especially thanked.

The Report, however, is the sole view of the Consultant and might, or might not, necessarily be the views of those three Librarians or any of the staff interviewed. Grateful thanks are also due to the University Library Secretariat, in particular Charlotte Ross and Anna Maria Ercolani, who made sure that everything went to plan and to time.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The remit of this study was:

To explore and consider the most apposite framework/ model and the steps required to implement the requirements of The General Board's Review in which, amongst other things, *de facto* Director of Library Services and the University Library should become responsible for the provision and dissemination of materials for teaching and learning across the University.

In doing so, to carry out appropriate discussion and research so as to:

- identify the critical success factors
- provide a framework in which the implementation could be delivered
- bear in mind the scalability beyond the initial three libraries
- make recommendations and suggest a timescale

In carrying out the study the Consultant was mindful that agreement had already been reached that the three Librarians of The Faculties of History and Economics and the Institute of Criminology, all in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, would be involved in initial discussions about their Libraries becoming part of a federal library service for the University of Cambridge.

The Consultant, in addition to the discussion with the three Librarians, interviewed a further 16 members of the University staff who could either be involved in any realignment of service, or, might be able to offer some insight.

Arising out of this discussion, desk research and analysis of best practice and experience the study identified some 25 recommendations which would help the University to move towards The General Board's wish that:

*"de facto* Director of Library Services and the UL should be become responsible for the provision and dissemination of materials for teaching and learning across the University"; that "The Librarian will need to work with the library staff in the faculties and departments to ensure faculty and departmental libraries can deliver e-learning support to their users." And in doing so should bear in mind the "different methods of delivery, working environments and a closer managerial relationship with the UL".

The recommendations referred particularly to the three Libraries but were shaped with scalability to the fore since there was the potential for another 43 Libraries to become part of the new federal arrangement.

The study recommended that the three Libraries should be known as Affiliate Libraries and would be part of a newly aligned Library service with a wider term than University Library; the University Librarian, to be known also as Director of Library Services; the Director to assume responsibility for the Affiliate Libraries; the Director in turn would report to Library Syndicate (or what ever term is decreed for the new body recommended by General Board); the necessary current funding including Trust, Donations and internal trading accounts, be transferred to the Director of Library Services and that the University authorities consider the new affiliate relationship in the Planning Round for 2009. Safety-net provision should also be put in place. It would be important that the Affiliate Librarians remained embedded in the Faculty and Institute structures. Overall, the Director of Library Services would recognise one size does not fit all in any federal arrangement and would look for a flexible and light touch. A range of recommendations were also made about the need for there to be a change of mindset from an building-centric approach to one of provision of services for teaching and learning across the University and the Affiliate Libraries. This would be carried through by potential restructuring; a new approach to subject specialisation; rethinking about the technical services provision; the potential for staffing continuity; succession planning and the significant opportunity for the Affiliate Libraries, together with the University Library staff, to contribute and influence the strategic and operational service across the University Libraries.

The report emphasises the key importance of protecting the future services to the student and staff and ensuring the accessibility and availability including opening hours, appropriate selection, organisation and deployment of materials.

As noted by The General Board, the significant potential for effecting long term efficiencies and economy might require short or medium term injection of additional funds; reference is made to that need as well.

## **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Recommendation 1**

**That the Economic, History and Institute of Criminology Libraries be designated “Affiliate Libraries” and that this title should be used for all subsequent Libraries that become part of the proposed federal Library arrangement. Further, that the University Librarian (henceforth known as Director of Library Services as recommended by the General Board) considers a change of terminology for the presently titled “dependent libraries” since there may be little reason to differentiate between the new designated Affiliate Libraries and the dependent libraries.**

### **Recommendation 2**

**That the Director of Library Services may wish to reflect upon the new relationship with Affiliated Libraries by adopting an inclusive over-arching title to reflect the new wider Library service**

### **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.**

### **Recommendation 4**

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

### **Recommendation 5**

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

### **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**

### **Recommendation 7**

**That the Director of Library Services considers the potential for a subject approach which would embrace the Affiliate Libraries as well as the University Library**

### **Recommendation 8**

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

### **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**

### **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**

**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**

**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.**

**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)**

**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**

**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**

**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**

**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**

**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**

**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**

**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.**

**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**

**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**

**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**

**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)**

**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**

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

### 1.1 The General Board's Review of Teaching and Learning Support Services

The General Board's Review of Teaching and Learning Support Services examined the University's provision for the support of teaching and learning and made recommendations for the future which included: the provision of high quality and cost effective pedagogic support services. The July 2008 report covered the UL, the UCS, the Language Centre and CARET as well as the coordination of pedagogic support. One specific area of the review was the development of the University Library system. The Report stated that "The UL has traditionally supported the research needs of postgraduate students and academics whilst the Faculty and Departmental Libraries have primarily supported undergraduate teaching". The point was made that this distinction had been breaking down especially with regard to electronic books, journals and online access to some teaching materials.

The Report observed "the current structure of independently run Faculty and Departmental Libraries does not permit the delivery of a coherent strategy, and those libraries are often keen to maintain their independence. They have considerable resource, including staff resource, which could be redirected in response to changing needs if necessary; similar skills in organising information were thought to be required in an electronic environment"

The Review, *inter alia*, reported that it considered:

- (i) The role of the University Librarian should be rapidly developed to become a *de facto* Director of Library Services and the UL should be become responsible for the provision and dissemination of materials for teaching and learning across the University.
- (ii) Consideration should be given to merging the work of the UL Syndicate and the General Board's Committee on Libraries into a single Syndicate which is able to work with, and develop with the University Librarian, a strategic vision which will ensure, amongst other things, that the UL can deliver the e-information and e-learning support for the University's institutions.
- (iii) The Librarian will need to work with the Library staff in the Faculties and Departments to ensure Faculty and Departmental Libraries can deliver e-learning support to their users. Different methods of delivery, working environments and a closer managerial relationship with the UL should be considered.

There were also a number of other recommendations more geared towards UCS, CARET and the Language Centre.

The Review also recognised that economies of scale would be possible and that it was likely there would be a need to provide some funding to enable restructuring in the short and possibly the medium term.

Recommendation 5 stated:

The UL should be given a more pro-active role in the organisation of Faculty and Departmental libraries and liaising with College Libraries with the aim of providing cost-effective, high quality delivery of Library and e-information services through the Librarian acting as Director of Library Services.

### 1.2 Implementation Steering Group and the present study

The Implementation Steering Group was then to translate the General Board's Review of Teaching and Learning Support Services in to a practical reality. It identified, in light of the fact that the Council of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences was already considering ways of coordinating Library resources, that this was an opportune moment to examine models for working together. Consequently, the Librarians from the Faculties of Economics and History and the Institute of Criminology agreed to begin work on proposed models for working with the University Library.



Taking into account the background above, MacDougall Consulting Ltd, which has previously carried out three reviews of sections within the University Library, and had acted as a facilitator to the strategic planning exercise, was asked to undertake a study

This present study concentrates on the aspects above and does not deal with matters related to UCS, CARET, or The Language Centre which are the subject of separate consideration.

### **1.3 The terms of reference**

**The terms of reference required for this report were as follows:**

**To explore and consider the most apposite framework/ model and the steps required to implement the requirements of The General Board's Review in which, amongst other things, *de facto* Director of Library Services and the University Library should become responsible for the provision and dissemination of materials for teaching and learning across the University.**

**In doing so, to carry out appropriate discussion and research so as to:**

- identify the critical success factors**
- provide a framework in which the implementation could be delivered**
- bear in mind the scalability beyond the initial three libraries**
- make recommendations and suggest a timescale**

**The report is to be submitted to the University Librarian by the end of the first week in October 2009.**

## **2. CONTEXT**

The total Library direct expenditure in the University and Colleges is presently over £20 million p.a. Within the University Libraries about 75% of the £18.5 expended (2007/08) and 75% of the 440 FTE staff are in the University Library and its four dependent Libraries. Outside the University Library and its dependents, 46 Faculties, Departments and other institutions have their own Libraries. The College Libraries form their own constituency.

The comprehensive fulfilment of the implementation of the General Board's report would involve potentially 46 Libraries. It would be a large undertaking which would be difficult to achieve in one step; the initial smaller grouping of three Libraries, identified by the Implementation Steering Group, is a sensible first step. Matters of potential scalability could also then be taken into account.

Accordingly, this study, carried out between June 2009 and September 2009, concentrated on a framework for integrated and joined-up thinking covering three Faculty, Departmental and Institute Libraries in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. All three Libraries are geographically close to the University Library being located on the Sedgwick site. The Libraries mentioned above *viz*: the Libraries of the Faculties of History and Economics and Institute of Criminology were identified and agreement was given to be part of the study. Detailed financial profiles are listed the table in Section 5.5 below. The Libraries offer a blend and range of services to research and undergraduate communities; a combination of online digital and traditional print material; collections which have patterns of intensive and quiet periods of use over the year and all have professionally qualified Heads of Libraries. In the School of Humanities and Social Sciences there are presently thirteen Libraries: in addition to the three Libraries in the review a further three have professionally qualified Librarians at their head and a further seven are overseen by unqualified staff. The seven Libraries could include part time and/or casual members and may offer a more limited range of services. All thirteen Libraries in the School are individually striving to offer the best service possible within the constraints of the financial resource base.

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

The consultant carried out desk research, gathering together relevant documents and information. This was followed by meetings with a range of interested parties and key stakeholders within the constraints of time available to undertake the study. Finally, time was allocated to review and report writing.

#### **3.1 Meetings**

The meetings are summarized as follows:

##### **3.1.1 University Library staff and dependent Library staff**

In the first instance, meetings were held with the University Librarian and the Acting Deputy Librarian. During the study, six separate meetings were also held with University Library staff who were either already involved, or, were likely to be involved, in close collaboration and cooperation with the libraries of the faculties and departments. In addition, interviews were held with two staff from the dependent Libraries of the University.

##### **3.1.2 School of Humanities (Librarians within the study)**

The General Board had already obtained the agreement of the three out of the thirteen Libraries in the School. Accordingly, MacDougall Consulting Ltd worked closely with these Librarians from Faculty of History, Faculty of Economics and the Institute of Criminology. The extremely helpful discussion, advice and support during the span of the research from the three Librarians should not be inferred as anything but the Librarians acting in the highest professional manner looking to ensure that there would be a balance, informed and considered report. This Report, however, is the considered view of the Consultant and might, or might not, necessarily reflect the opinions of the three Librarians.

##### **3.1.3 School of Humanities and Social Sciences (Officers)**

Meetings were also held with other key people who could inform the process: these included the present and incoming Chair of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and the Secretary of the School. Invitations to discussion were passed through the Librarians of Economics, History and Criminology to the Chairs of the Faculty and Institute. The Librarians reported back that their Heads would be content for the discussion to continue to take place between Librarian and consultant during the compilation of the Report.

##### **3.1.4 Chairman of Review Committee**

A meeting was held with the Chairman of the General Board's Teaching and Learning Support Services Review

##### **3.1.5 Librarians from other Libraries**

In addition, those with useful experience were also met, for example, the Librarian of the School of Education and the Librarian of the Business School who had also been the Faculty Librarian in Oxford and thus added knowledge of the Oxford experience of assimilation of schools and faculties within a realigned Library service.

In all some 19 members of the staff of Cambridge University were interviewed at least once during the course of this study.

(See Appendix A for a list of names).

### **4. CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS**

The terms of reference for the study required the detailing of critical success factors. Without understanding or recognition of the critical success factors the implementation process might be somewhat hindered but if accepted would help to smooth the way to a successful integration of the various Libraries.

Notwithstanding, it emphasises that in the final instance any implementation plan would require of only the buy-in and commitment of the School and the Heads of Faculty, Departments and Other Institutions but also the Library staff involved in the process. It is these staff who can make and break any arrangement, however well crafted and detailed. The need to register the Library staff aspirations and motivations within the overall demands of the staff and student community is therefore borne in mind when compiling the critical success factors detailed below.

The critical success factors were derived from the detailed discussion with staff and the experience of best (and worse) experience elsewhere.

#### **4.1 Student experience, expectation and need**

Above all, there must be recognition that the delivery of a seamless and integrated teaching and learning service, under the aegis of a Director of Library Services, has to be driven by the students' experience, expectation and need within a realistic financial framework

#### **4.2 One size does not fit all**

There has to be a transparent recognition and declaration that, in any process of seamless integration, a one size solution cannot fit all circumstances. In other words there is a requirement to recognise local day-to-day operation and the need to have an agreed level of local autonomy within a wider framework of a Library service for the University. The presently named "dependent Libraries " offer some insight into the way that the procedure works at present. Clearly, there will need to be core standards but the light touch from the Director of Library Services will continue to be required along with need to capture and retain valued informality and flexibility.

#### **4.3 Framework clarity and transparency**

Notwithstanding, there will need to be clarity and transparency within an overall framework of governance and operational processes; a framework which is clear, both to the benefit of the potential user, and to the Library staff supplying that need. It would need to be teased out and promulgated.

#### **4.4 Protect availability and accessibility**

There needs to be recognition of the reality of economic constraints; stagnation is not an option, and the risk of the consequences of "death by a 1000 cuts". It will be necessary to act proactively to protect the availability and accessibility to a comprehensively maintained range of services and materials thus ensuring the continuance Cambridge University's world-class status. This prioritisation will best serve to ensure that community's needs are protected.

#### **4.5 Embedded in the Faculty, Department and Institutes structure**

There will be a continuing need to ensure those Libraries which become part of the integrated service remain embedded in the structure of the Departments, Faculties and other Institutions within which they are located.

#### **4.6 Equality of treatment**

All of the Library staff regardless of their affiliation (University Library, Faculty, Department and Other Institutions) are of equal status in the provision of the service and share the role in satisfying the need of the University's community. All Library staff in Cambridge will need to rethink their audience *viz* thinking inclusively about the needs of a unified Cambridge rather than exclusively about one specific area.

#### **4.7 Overcoming the building-centric mindset**

The understandable present building-centric perception/mindset of service by Library staff has to be overcome in favour of a coordinated University-wide access and availability to comprehensive information /materials (and differing structures). The days of attempting to provide comprehensive access and availability of resource within one building is over, notwithstanding the benefits offered by electronic provision. There will need to have some recognition that, on occasions, the user will have to travel to more than one Library for their service.

#### **4.8 Transparent collections and services information**

A recognition that there is a continuing blurring of research and undergraduate collections and that it is no longer possible to segregate collections and materials along these lines but, notwithstanding, there is a need to provide a clear and transparent collection and information resource policy, namely the availability and accessibility of the material so that the community have a clear understanding of where collections, regardless of format, are located.

#### **4.9 Inclusivity**

That Library staff, becoming part of an integrated University-wide service provision, will all have the potential to be part of the strategic and operational development of the entire service and are thus part of the strategic and operational planning and development process.

#### **4.10 Trust and honesty**

The success of any such affiliation has to be based on trust, honesty of intention and confidence.

#### **4.11 Scalability**

Any model or framework for the introduction of the implementation will need to be scalable and relevant to the Libraries beyond the initial three Libraries.

These critical success factors would have to be recognised and accepted if there were to be any real progress of implementation of The General Board's Review in Cambridge. The way forward and recommendations flow directly from these critical success factors.

### **5. THE CONSIDERATIONS AND WAY FORWARD**

The first consideration is the relationship between the University Library and the Faculty, Departmental and Other Institution Libraries in any new arrangement recommended by The General Board.

The critical success factors highlight the importance of a framework, equality of treatment, the need to consider beyond the building-centric mentality and the requirement to rethink fundamentally the mindset concerning the availability and accessibility of comprehensive materials regardless of format and levels of service.

The objective would be to ensure that students and staff of the University will be entitled to a shared Libraries resource which offer a transparent and coordinated service delivered to relevant standards. Users will be demanding access to available material and services at the appropriate time and not barriers to access and success. The recommendations identified below go some way to meet that aspiration. An aspiration which will require new thinking, a radical shift, strengthening of availability, selection, acquisition, storage, accessibility of service and elimination of unnecessary duplication. This is all within the context of the potential for local services which still retain levels of agreed autonomy of action, flexibility and individuality of service. This presents the opportunity for proactive action both locally and across the new service rather than the risk of fragmented uncoordinated service divorced from consideration of cost benefit.

An impression may be created that the present deployment of resources between the University Library and the rest of the Libraries is fragmented. However, this is only partially accurate since there is an important degree of underlying infra-structural support provided by the University Library to the 46 Libraries and beyond. At the present time members of the staff of the University Library, at some cost, support the Departmental, Faculty and Other Institutional Libraries, for example, in respect of Voyager Library Management system and related activities.

Any new federal arrangement should be accompanied by appropriate titles and terminology, hence the first two recommendations.

#### **5.1 Terminology**

The University Library has to reflect on its new relationship with the intended libraries. It may wish to consider the term "Affiliate Libraries" as a more relevant and expressive term reflecting the new relationship. Further, this term might be extended to the presented named "dependent libraries". In doing so the University should also consider a more inclusive and comprehensive overarching title for the new arrangement; a term such as "Cambridge University's Library Services" or perhaps "University of Cambridge Library Services" might be considered but the decision should be left for the Director of Library Services to determine.

#### **Recommendation 1**

**That the Economic, History and Institute of Criminology Libraries be designated “Affiliate Libraries” and that this title should be used for all subsequent Libraries that become part of the proposed federal Library arrangement. Further, that the University Librarian (henceforth known as Director of Library Services as recommended by the General Board) considers a change of terminology for the presently titled “dependent libraries” since there may be little reason to differentiate between the new designated Affiliate Libraries and the dependent libraries**

#### **Recommendation 2**

**That the Director of Library Services may wish to reflect upon the new relationship with Affiliated Libraries by adopting an inclusive over-arching title to reflect the new wider Library service**

### **5.2 Governance, management and reporting considerations**

The existing Library governance arrangements in Faculties, Departments and Institutes (see below) embed the Librarians in the relevant structures and committees. As such there are no specific Library committees but Library matters are considered in the appropriate committees on which the Librarian is either a member or in attendance. The Librarians are embedded in the life and work as members of the appropriate Board or committee, for example, management, academic, teaching and learning, research, strategic, resource, communications, student :staff committees. This had proved to be an excellent arrangement, and in any new integrated Library service, where the Director of Library Services would be the reporting officer with responsibility, it would be very important that committee attendance by the Affiliate Librarians would continue within the Faculties, Departments and Other Institutions structures so that valuable feed back and comment could continue to be guaranteed. This model should be used as the recommended starting point for other Libraries joining as an Affiliate Library.

#### **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**

#### **Recommendation 4**

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

It would not be practical, or indeed sensible, in management terms, to have up to 46 Affiliate Librarians of varying levels and responsibilities reporting directly to the Director of Library Services but a measure of coordinated and efficient reporting procedures will be required

The present University Library would need to analyse its operational efficiency within this new structure. It would need to embrace the possibilities within any strategic and operational review. In this event it would be important to ensure that the reporting structures are managerial effective and efficient. The reporting arrangements for the Affiliate Librarians would need to be developed taking into account new structures and the appropriate knowledge and skills base. Should the Director of Library Services opt for a new subject arrangement for staffing then this would influence the type of reporting and job possibilities (see section 5.3 below) but in any event it would prudent for the Affiliate Librarian to be reporting through a senior Library officer to the Director of Library Services. Similarly, it would not be appropriate for 46 Library staff to attend the Senior Management Team (SMT). Much will depend on the new

structure adopted by the Director of Library Services and it is not therefore appropriate to recommend any framework regarding SMT at this early stage.

**Recommendation 5**

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

**5.3 Collections/materials regardless of format, accessibility, availability, location and organisation**

The realignment of Libraries on becoming affiliates offer the University, its staff and students real potential of obtaining coordinated collections, better availability and accessibility of service provision. Succinctly, where appropriate, the Librarians of the Affiliated libraries and the University Library would become part of a coordinated Library service for the University rather than disaggregated collection of libraries with separately occupied discrete buildings and discrete collections.

More specifically:

The new Affiliate arrangement will permit the fostering of a new culture of thinking where all the Library staff, in the Affiliated Libraries, and all the staff in the University Library, would be regarded as being equal contributors in and to a unified service. As such all would be part of the fundamental thinking for any new operational and strategic plan

The newly integrated service would offer the potential, where appropriate skills and knowledge exist, for the new service to move towards a subject orientated approach, regardless of format, across the University Library and Affiliate Libraries. More specifically, Affiliated Librarians could be considered for a subject-wide responsibility across the Libraries. At this time the University Library does not cater for this approach. It relies on language specialists who might also have a vital role in any subject review. This would be particularly beneficial at a time when the division between teaching/learning and research is becoming increasingly blurred in library materials terms (print and electronic). Also one might bear in mind that "teaching is research led". There could be grounds, in certain circumstances, for appropriate legal deposit material to be placed in the Affiliate Libraries. Collection development policies exist in the more established Faculty, Departmental and Others Institutional Libraries. These policies could be reviewed and blended in with the existing University Library collection development to form a new dynamic policy.

**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**

**Recommendation 7**

**That the Director of Library Services considers the potential for a subject approach which would embrace the Affiliate Libraries as well as the University Library**

**Recommendation 8**

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

This new service would allow the potential scope for the collections to be re-examined across the Libraries with a view to providing comprehensive and appropriate coverage in times of diminishing resource. The case for a working Party, with appropriate terms of reference, could be made to facilitate this process. It would also offer the opportunity to reduce unnecessary duplication, save space, reallocate space and materials and create space to allow additional faculty Library collections to be accommodated, or placed in close proximity, to other collections. This rationalisation would assist in the relevant accessibility and availability of collections to the University community. The opportunity provided by the addition of three Affiliate libraries would immediately offer the potential for a review of materials between the University Library and the Sedgwick site Libraries, and for other collections, if so deemed by the University authorities. In a report of this type the

detail could not be defined but the Affiliate Librarians could be to the fore in shaping the future shape of the collection development. Nonetheless, there may be a case for the creation of posts as Heads of areas which take into account subject groupings. Any fundamental review of this kind will inevitably involve the expenditure of resource both to restructure at a senior level and to obtain suitable help at lower levels, for example, to analyse use, transfer of materials and re-catalogue/change records. The General Board made reference to the possible additional expenditure of resource to effect short term and possible medium term changes; this area would be a prime candidate for financial subvention.

**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**

**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**

**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**

In conjunction with the better redeployment of materials there would also be the opportunity to review and protect the services to the student community by ensuring coordinated opening hours between the University Library and the Affiliate Libraries. At present there is an uncoordinated approach to the provision of opening hours. The Affiliate status and reporting procedures could be used to good purpose so that a coordinated provision could protect and guarantee opening on an apposite and systematic basis. This has more relevance as more Libraries obtain the same online facility while there is some evidence to suggest that students wants quiet study space and not always specific material during the evening hours. More specifically the University Library and the three Affiliate Libraries on the Sedgwick site could agree and source opening hours which would ensure agreed levels of availability and accessibility within optimum resource costs.

**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**

There would also be the potential to explore how the Affiliate Libraries could protect the front-of-house service support and explore the potential to reduce workloads that might be done more efficiently (economies of scale) by a technical support team employing appropriate technology within the overall new service. The potential for such matters as ordering, cataloguing, classification, standard of cataloguing records, standards in general, shelf-ready material as well as many other areas could be determined by this new grouping. In any such arrangement it would be necessary to ensure that Affiliate/subject material was not held up in backlogs and identified for fast tracking. It would also be hoped that the realignment of back-of-house services would allow a more targeted efficiency and might give an added impetus to increased standardization of cataloguing records and the possibility of a faster turn round time (a study would be needed).

### **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)**

#### **5.4 General staffing considerations and benefits**

The staff in the model being advanced should be afforded equal treatment whether in the University Library or affiliate libraries. It thus follows that the Affiliate staff who retain their contractual rights and conditions of service would also benefit from being afforded clearer and more obvious opportunities for promotion and, where appropriate, be able to be considered for transfer to other jobs to provide more rounded career opportunities and development. This should assist the service in underpinning the potential for continuity of staffing and succession planning. The University will therefore benefit from retaining and developing a wider pool of staff drawn from the University Library and Affiliate Libraries

The Affiliate Library staff would also be able to avail themselves of the support in the areas of human resources and administrative support. As more Affiliates join there will be a need to explore additional human resource and financial administrative support.

It would also be an excellent opportunity for staff in the University Library to acquire and share specialist information and advice from the Affiliate Library staff and vice versa.

The new service model will also offer Affiliate Library staff wider training and development opportunities and permit them to enrich the process by offering their expertise too.

Further, the new model with the inclusion of Affiliate Libraries will also enrich the strategic planning process for the new library services of the University.

### **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**

### **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**

#### **5.5 Finance and related transfers**

The predicated new model and opportunities proposed above is not only dependant on the need for a Director of Library Services but also on there being a guaranteed and protected stream of revenue with which the Director can administer support to the new Library service.

The University Library would not have sufficient funds within its own remit to support the newly designated Affiliate Libraries.

The thirteen Libraries of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences Libraries have had an allocation of the order of approximately £1.5 million annually and of that approaching £200,000 is ring fenced for the Journal Coordination Scheme, £1,200,000 for staffing, and the remaining allocated to other headings including materials. In addition funds are also allocated from Trust, Donations Funds and Internal trading accounts.



The 2008/2009 actual expenditure as provided by the School of Humanities and Social Sciences for the three Libraries (Economics, History and Institute of Criminology) is presented below in the table.

### HSS 2008/09 actual

#### Economics Library

##### Expenditure

Stipends ABAA	90,490.00	<i>89,454.00</i>
Wages ACAA	70,748.00	<i>78,539.00</i>
Other Costs AAAA	57,115.00	<i>60,061.00</i>

##### Income

Marshall Library Fund AAAA	-21,384.00
Other Costs Credits AAAA	-16,994.00

##### *Budgets*

#### History Library

##### Expenditure

Stipends ABAA	56,093.00	<i>55,776.00</i>
Wages ACAA	87,657.00	<i>99,500.00</i>
Other Costs AAAA	35,244.00	<i>44,330.00</i>

##### Income

Seeley Fund AiA	-4,342.00
-----------------	-----------

#### Criminology Library

##### Expenditure

Stipends ABAA	37,516.00	<i>41,216.00</i>	
Wages ACAA	39,642.00	<i>65,599.00</i>	(CS5 Vacancy)
Other Costs AAAA	4,891.00	<i>4,431.00</i>	

##### Income

Trading GAAA	-153.00
--------------	---------

An analysis of the three budgets would indicate that the overwhelming portion of the budget is absorbed by staffing. With the recent decision to deduct a sum for the Journal Coordination Scheme, which is administered by the University Library, a relatively small amount is left for purchase of other materials. Trust funds, donations funds and internal trading accounts are increasingly being used to support core material and balance the budget.

It is, therefore, of paramount importance that the necessary funds be transferred from the Faculties, Departments and Other Institutions to allow the effective and efficient running of the integrated service by the Director of Library Services. The allocation to be transferred must be fair and equitable. It should be based on an average allocation given over the last five years rather than the last year. Information from the School secretariat will need to be sought.

It will also be important to ensure that the necessary Trust funds, Donation accounts, and internal trading accounts are also transferred. It is recognised that Trust fund clauses need to be explored and honoured.

The University Library can only work with the money it is allocated. It has no spare funds to supplement the desirable new service proposal. Its major advantage will be that it can pool funds and service to make a more coherent cost effective service.

However, caution is required. Should an actual reduction, or, a 0% increase in the University Library budget for the coming years be equally applied to the new Affiliate Libraries then, in effect, there will be a double hit applied to the Director of Library Services who would then also be required to cover for any shortfall in funding particularly arising from the Affiliate staff budget. It is recommended that a safety-net provision be applied to increase costs caused by the addition of the Affiliate Libraries.

**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.**

**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**

There are additionally two areas in this model which will require further discussion, clarification and resolution between the Library service and the Faculties, Departments and the Other Institutions.

Firstly, as part of the transfer of the Library service there may be a need to draw up a service level agreement together with appropriate payment/arrangements covering how the defined library service space will be paid for in terms of heating, lighting, maintenance, cleaning, fixtures and fittings and the fabric. Various arrangements both formal and informal exist at present within the Faculties and Departments and Other Institutions. It may be appropriate to decide on a one-to-one basis for the best way forward through a flexible solution which ensures recurrent funding. It is understood that minor works and structural matters are dealt with through Estates but it may be important to be assured of this arrangement before transfer. There would be no possibility of the University Library paying for the above from its existing funds

**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**

Secondly, there will also need to be a resolution about the responsibility for delivering and financing, through recurrent subvention, IT equipment, staffing support and IT maintenance, the networks and equipment. Again, the University Library would not be able to pay for this additional cost from its own present budget. It might be wise to be mindful that local site service support is normally preferable to meet the needs of the staff and students.

**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**

## **5.6 Publicity, promotion and logo**

The model which combines the University Library with the Affiliate Libraries would require for there to be much clearer and transparent information about the availability and accessibility of the collections and service levels. The whole student and staff community would be entitled to know of the services available across the libraries. It would be incumbent on the Library service to promote and publicise the types and levels of service to be enjoyed by the community.

In order to signal the equality of opportunity and equality of service it may be timely for the University Library, as well as deciding on a new title to describe the service, to consider the commissioning of a new logo which more accurately represents the Library service rather than sustain the building-centric perception.

### **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.**

### **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**

## **5.7 Working parties and ad hoc working groups**

Once the framework for a new federal model for Library services of the University is agreed between the University Library and Affiliate Libraries, there will be a need to get down to a level of complexity concerning the detailed implementation (beyond the scope of this report).

However, it is important to recognise that the extent of the success of this new working arrangement will be dependent on this detailed examination of each of the areas. The Faculty and Departmental and Other Institutional Library staff, together their Heads, and the staff of the University Library, share the onus to deliver solutions. The Library staff will be the key to the identifying and proposing of such solution. No one solution will necessarily suit all. It is therefore imperative that a range of working parties and ad hoc groups, with appropriate terms of reference, be established to address the work programmes and resolve details, standards, rules, regulations and make further informed recommendations and decisions.

Empirical evidence will be required and such information can be derived from user surveys and use data, for example, the Arcadia Studies at Cambridge University Library or individual use studies such as that of Faculty of Economics Library which measured number of uses of collections.

### **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**

## **5.8 Timescale**

### **5.8.1 Affiliates**

The sections above provides a framework which demonstrate the potential and benefits to be derived for the staff and students of the University and for the Library staff, from the creation of a new service consisting of University Library and Affiliate Libraries. The time is now right to offer an integrated and seamless service and work towards its delivery. The alternative is a reactive approach with the risk of stagnation and death by a thousand cuts.

The genuinely proactive approach advocated in this Report pools the resources to protect the collections, availability and accessibility to the Cambridge community. The student is not interested in who offers the service but rather that his or her needs are readily available and accessible at the right time and will support their teaching and learning endeavour (research is

not the subject of this report). The Report demonstrates that there is sufficient symbiosis to offer services of quality in a time of diminishing resource. This is not the moment for inward looking service provision but rather a time to ensure that there is a joined-up service.

However, to achieve this will require a change of culture in which the wider service demands across the University are foremost rather than specific building-centric approach. It has to be a type of thinking which recognises that no building can be self-sufficient. The only sustainable way forward is to share and coordinate resource and utilise the existing staff experience across the University, reduce unnecessary duplication and protect the student learning and teaching experience.

Accordingly, it is now time to act. Officers of the University should be alerted to the desirability of the three Affiliate Libraries being included with the University Library in the 2009 Planning Round (for 2010-2011). Further that these three Libraries assume Affiliate status in August 2010.

During, and following the smooth transition of the first tranche of Affiliate Libraries, it is envisaged that there would be a timely, coordinated and systematic programme, in conjunction with the Schools and their Departments, Faculties and other Institutions, to increase the number of Affiliate libraries. Early and prioritised admission to the new arrangement might be desirable as it could increase the potential for the Affiliate Librarians to contribute to the future operational and strategic direction.

This process is likely to be time consuming and the Director of Library Services, although not expressed as a recommendation, might wish to give some detailed consideration as to the staffing required to ensure the process is overseen and achieved in a seamless and timely manner.

#### **Recommendation 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**

#### **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)**

#### **5.8.2 College Libraries**

It will be important for the newly configured university-wide Library service to enter into even closer liaison with the College Libraries over the extent of provision and availability of resources between the two groupings. (Colleges were not part of this study). It is recommended that the new Board which replaces The General Board Committee on Libraries and the Library Syndicate will deliberate on this matter and provide some guidance.

#### **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**

## **6. THE WAY FORWARD**

It is suggested that, at the appropriate time, this Report be circulated, *inter alia*, to all appropriate authorities and to the Library staff of the University Library and the Library staff of the three Faculty, Departmental and Institute Libraries.

The staff in those three Affiliate Libraries can be involved in influencing the strategic and operational developments and any restructuring requirements. Subsequently, more Affiliates will join on a coordinated and consistently agreed basis with the Schools.

The framework in this Report has been proposed which offers an incremental and coordinated approach. It is one that ensures a proactive approach will be taken and the service protected for the good of the entire University of Cambridge community. It is not designed to protect only one group but offer economies of scale and a pooled resource to all the staff and students of the University.

Finally, in view of the express need to keep the staff fully informed, it may be appropriate for a facilitated session to be convened to discuss the Report in the event that such a demand becomes apparent.

7 October 2009 AFM /JJM

## Appendix A

### List of those interviewed one or more times for this study

[name redacted]	Past Chair, Council of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences
[name redacted]	Chair, Council of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences
[name redacted]	PVC, Human Resources and Chairman Review of T and L Support Services
[name redacted]	Research Skills and Development Librarian, University Library
[name redacted]	Librarian, Faculty of Education
[name redacted]	Secretary of School of Humanities and Social Sciences
[name redacted]	Librarian, Institute of Criminology
[name redacted]	Head of Reader Services, University Library
[name redacted]	University Librarian
[name redacted]	Systems Support Librarian, University Library
[name redacted]	Head of Electronic Services and Systems, University Library
[name redacted]	Head of European Collection and Cataloguing, University Library
[name redacted]	Acting Deputy University Librarian
[name redacted]	Librarian Central Science Library
[name redacted]	Librarian, Judge Business School
[name redacted]	Head of Collection Development and Description, University Library
[name redacted]	Librarian, Economics Faculty
[name redacted]	Librarian, History Faculty
[name redacted]	Librarian, Law School