



University of London
**EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF
THE COLLEGIATE COUNCIL**

Thursday, 30 April 2009
8.30am
STB9, Stewart House

MINUTES

PRESENT

Vice-Chancellor (Chairman)	Dr McDade (Heythrop)
Professor Crossick (Goldsmiths)	Professor McKellar (RVC)
Sir Howard Davies (LSE)	Professor Ogden (QMUL)
Professor Ellis (Deputising for the Dean of SAS)	Professor Rigby (ICR)
Professor Grant (UCL)	Professor Smith (SoP)
Professor Henderson (CSSD)	Professor Swallow (Courtauld)
Professor Kemp (RH)	Professor Trainor (KCL)
Professor Kopelman (SGUL)	Professor Webley (SOAS)
Professor Latchman (Bbk)	Professor Whitty (IoE)

APOLOGIES

Professor Freeman-Attwood (RAM)	Professor Haines (LSHTM)
Professor Sir Roderick Floud (SAS)	Professor Sir Andrew Likierman (LBS)

OBSERVER

Professor Kydd
(External System)

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr R Cryer	Mr M Dalton (Secretary)
Ms C Cushion	Miss C Swarbrick

0204 The Vice-Chancellor thanked members for attending the Extraordinary Meeting of the Collegiate Council which had been convened to consider the future of Senate House Library (SHL). He welcomed Professor Kemp, Acting Principal of Royal Holloway, University of London, to his first meeting of the Collegiate Council. Professor Kemp replaced Professor Hill who had stood down as Principal of Royal Holloway.

0205 The Collegiate Council agreed that Professor Ellis could deputise for the Dean of the School of Advanced Study (SAS) in his absence.

Final Recommendations of the Senate House Library Review Steering Group

Introduction

0206 The Collegiate Council received a report by the Chairman of the Senate House Library Review Steering Group (**CC038**), Professor Webley, which contained the Steering Group's final recommendations regarding the future of SHL.

0207 It was noted that, at its meeting on 12 December 2008, the Collegiate Council had received the *Final Report of the Review of Senate House Library* by CHEMS Consulting ('the CHEMS Report') (Appendix **CC038A**), together with recommendations of the SHL Review Steering Group (Appendix **CC038B**). The Collegiate Council had agreed that (CCM 0120 refers):

(i) a final decision should be delayed until the proposals of the School of Advanced Study (SAS) (Option 2) and of UCL (Option 3) were fully developed;

(ii) SAS and UCL would have a three-month deadline within which to complete their proposals;

(iii) the Steering Group should reconvene to consider all remaining Options, but with a revised membership to exclude UCL, SAS and University of London Research Library Services (ULRLS) representatives to be replaced by two Heads of Colleges;

(iv) a Special Meeting of the Collegiate Council be convened to consider the Steering Group's final recommendations; and

(v) the Collegiate Council's final recommendations be submitted to the Board of Trustees on 13 May 2009.

0208 The Collegiate Council noted that the Steering Group, under a revised membership, had met on 3 April 2009 to consider all remaining options for the future of SHL. The representatives of the ULRLS, SAS and UCL on the Steering Group had been replaced by two Heads of Colleges: Professor Hill (Royal Holloway, University of London) and Professor Ogden (Queen Mary, University of London). The Steering Group's membership had comprised:

- Professor Webley (Director and Principal, SOAS) (Chairman)
- Professor Crossick (Warden, Goldsmiths, University of London)
- Professor Hill¹ (Principal, Royal Holloway, University of London)
- Professor P Ogden (Acting Director, Queen Mary, University of London)
- Mr P Payne (Librarian, Birkbeck)
- Ms K Stanton (Chief Information Officer and College Librarian, King's College London)

¹ Professor Hill stood down as Principal of Royal Holloway subsequent to the final meeting of the Steering Group (CC0204 above refers).

Proposals

- 0209 It was reported to the Collegiate Council that the final proposals by the SAS and UCL were received on the deadline date of 12 March 2009. The SAS proposal built on the School's unique research facilitation role and offered 'the possibility of refocusing and expanding the activities of the ULRSL, fulfilling a possible need for a national, regional or international arts and humanities [and social sciences] research library in London.'
- 0210 The UCL proposal had been based on 'the creation of a new library service, provisionally called the 'Bloomsbury Library' which would be 'formed by UCL Library Services, Senate House Library and 5 Institute libraries.' It was noted that the Vice-Provost of UCL had informed the Steering Group that the proposal would involve a transfer of ULRSL resources, including books and staff, to UCL, either by change of ownership, or a permanent loan arrangement.
- 0211 In addition to the proposals by the SAS and UCL, the Steering Group had received a report, *Option 1 – Refocusing the ULRSL* (Appendix **CCO38C**), which proposed the extension of Option 1A as contained within the CHEMS Report. The proposal ('Extended Option 1A') had been commissioned by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the ULRSL Restructuring Group established by the Collegiate Council at its meeting on 12 December 2008.
- 0212 It was noted that the Collegiate Council had agreed that the restructuring of the ULRSL, as outlined in Option 1A of the CHEMS Report, would be necessary regardless of whichever option was selected for the long-term. However, whereas Option 1A would still result in a recurrent deficit of £543k, Extended Option 1A had delineated a five-year Strategic Plan (2009-14) to eliminate the recurrent deficit by 2012-13 and establish a 'balanced and sustainable budget without significant increases to College or SAS contributions.' The Strategic Plan (2009-14) expanded the extant ULRSL Strategic Plan (2006-09) by the addition of three key components:
- (i) a collaborative Collection Management and Development Strategy, leading to a reduction in the space footprint;
 - (ii) a gradual but marked shift to increased reliance on e-resources and digitised materials; and
 - (iii) Service Level Agreements (SLAs) with Colleges and SAS to agree services which ULRSL would continue to provide and those it would cease to provide.
- 0213 The Collegiate Council noted that, at its meeting on 3 April 2009, the Steering Group had received presentations on all three proposals, as follows:
- (i) *Option1 - Refocusing the ULRSL* - presentation by the Director of the ULRSL, Mr David Pearson, and Mr David Perrow, consultant.

- (ii) Option 2 - *The Research Libraries of the University of London, The Way Forward, A proposal by the School of Advanced Study* (Appendix **CC038D**) - presentation by the Dean of SAS, Professor Sir Roderick Floud.
- (iii) Option 3 - *Creating the Future: a Global Library and Information Service for the University* by UCL (Appendix **CC038E**) - presentation by the UCL Vice-Provost (Academic and International), Professor Michael Worton.

Independent Financial Review of the Options by CHEMS Consulting

- 0214 The Collegiate Council noted that, following receipt of the SAS and UCL proposals on 12 March 2009, CHEMS Consulting had been asked to undertake independent financial due diligence on both proposals to ensure that they shared the same financial data, projections and assumptions as those contained within the CHEMS Report. In addition, CHEMS had also been asked to review both proposals with respect to their financial sustainability. Both the SAS and UCL had been informed of this work.
- 0215 Extended Option 1A had not been incorporated within CHEMS' financial analysis received by the Steering Group on 3 April 2009. Additionally, the Steering Group had noted that none of the financial estimates within all three options had included severance costs, which were likely to be significant. As a result, the Steering Group had asked CHEMS to revisit its financial analysis to incorporate Extended Option 1A and to outline the full transitional costs for each option, including severance costs.
- 0216 It was noted that a copy of the revised financial analysis by CHEMS (Appendix **CC038F**) had been circulated to the Steering Group following its meeting. The Steering Group had agreed, by correspondence, that the revised financial analysis by CHEMS, which incorporated Extended Option 1A and the full transitional costs for each option (including severance costs), would not alter its recommendations agreed at the meeting on 3 April 2009.

Conclusion

- 0217 The Chairman of the Steering Group commented that the Steering Group had discussed in considerable detail the advantages and disadvantages of each of the options listed within the Final Report. He added that the Steering Group had used the most up to date financial information available when reaching its conclusions. Whilst this information had been imperfect, the Steering Group had been aware of the imperative for a final decision to be made.
- 0218 The Steering Group had noted commendable aspects in common across all three proposals including efficiencies, a new governance structure and a shift towards electronic resources. The important differences, however, related to ownership, management control, focus, and recurrent and transitional costs.

- 0219 The Steering Group had felt that Options 2 and 3 had not been developed substantially since the Collegiate Council had last considered the issue on 12 December 2008. The SAS proposal had been rejected firstly by the Steering Group mainly on financial grounds as it ran contrary to the Collegiate Council's principle that long-term recurrent costs should not increase – the proposal would result in a permanent increase of £630k over the College Subscription for 2007-08, excluding the transitional costs required to move from Option 1A to Option 2.
- 0220 With regard to Option 3, the Steering Group had noted, in particular, that it offered the lowest recurrent costs and that it would transfer potential risk to UCL. However, two factors had played a decisive role in the Steering Group's decision not to recommend UCL's proposal to the Collegiate Council. Firstly, the UCL Vice-Provost had indicated that Option 3 was contingent upon the receipt of funding of some £3.4M from the HEFCE, but discussions between members of the Steering Group and the HEFCE had indicated that it was unlikely that upwards of £1M would be forthcoming. A second important factor had been UCL's requirement for ownership and full control of the merged collections. Whilst the Steering Group acknowledged UCL's requirements, it felt it inappropriate for the University to cede ownership and control of a federal asset which had been valued at £400M for insurance purposes.
- 0221 The Steering Group's favoured proposal had been Extended Option 1A as it offered the prospect of a modern digital-based library with relatively low long-term costs which would retain the ULRs as a federal asset collectively owned and controlled. Although there would be transition costs of over £1.7M, excluding severance costs, the rationalisation of print holdings, through de-duplication and de-selection, married with increasing use of electronic resource, exemplified by the adoption of 'e-resource-first principle', would reduce both space and staff costs such that the long term Subscription (post 2011-12) could be maintained at its 2007-08 level.
- 0222 A member of the Steering Group commended each of the representatives for their openness during the presentations on 3 April 2009. He also informed the Collegiate Council that the Steering Group had been assiduous in its scrutiny of each of the proposals. He stressed the need for collaborative and collective management of ULRs under shared ownership, criteria which Extended Option 1A satisfied. Whilst Option 2 had been viewed by the Steering Group as the least developed and most costly, there had also been doubts with regard to SAS's potential to manage a major library and whether there would be sufficient demand for a regional or national research library in the arts, humanities and social sciences. Although Options 1 and 3 would be the most expensive in the short term, they offered the most coherent proposals. However, the transitional funding gap in the UCL proposal seemed an insurmountable obstacle.

Review of the Steering Group's Recommended Option

- 0223 In order to ensure a full and frank discussion of the Steering Group's recommendations, the Vice-Chancellor proposed that despite there being a number of interested parties present, all Collegiate Council members should remain within the room for the duration of the discussion. The Collegiate Council agreed that all interested parties should remain present during the discussion.
- 0224 A member of the Collegiate Council concurred with the Steering Group's view of Extended Option 1A and Option 3 as being the most viable. However, his College librarian had not supported the Steering Group's recommendation that Extended Option 1A be adopted. Amongst his College's concerns were as follows:
- (i) De-duplication and the shift from print to e-resources would require active management and, therefore, could be costlier than outlined within the proposal.
 - (ii) Collaboration on de-duplication already occurred at a national level through the UK Research Reserve and collaboration on purchasing was facilitated by the Joint Information Systems Committee; therefore, further collaboration at University level was unlikely to add any value.
 - (iii) Doubts existed about the ULRIS's ability to deliver on the strategy given the staff cuts already implemented and the further staff cuts being proposed.
 - (iv) The University's poor track record on collaborative collection development.
 - (v) The switch to a research focussed library when the majority of current users were taught students
- 0225 Additionally, with regard to strategic considerations, the member did not believe that a library was a pre-requisite for a federal University. Moreover, he did not share the view that a refocused ULRIS as outlined in Extended Option 1A would prove to be an asset which would strengthen significantly the Federation. His College favoured the UCL proposal despite the uncertainties about how transitional funding could be obtained. The transfer of financial risk to UCL had been of particular appeal.
- 0226 The Chairman of the Steering Group informed the Collegiate Council that Extended Option 1A was not intended to prevent usage of ULRIS by taught students; quiet space would be provided for research by whatever category of user. Paragraph 11 of the Steering Group's report had stated that Extended Option 1A would 'not seek to provide the kind of taught student learning environments increasingly common in University libraries as taught students

would be encouraged to use their own and other Colleges' library facilities first, and ULRSL collections and services for its research facilities in support of College library provision. ULRSL would concentrate on attracting research users to use individual study spaces in its refurbished but traditional quiet reading room and it is in that style of traditional library that undergraduate students would work.'

- 0227 A member of the Collegiate Council on the ULRSL Restructuring Group reported that significant restructuring (efficiency savings of almost £750k) had taken place within ULRSL over the past year. As a result, he was now positive that Extended Option 1A could be implemented in full. Furthermore, without guarantees regarding the funding of the ca. £3.4M transitional costs contained within the UCL proposals, it was his view that Extended Option 1A presented the only feasible solution.
- 0228 The Provost of UCL informed the Collegiate Council that he had contacted the HEFCE regarding Option 3. Although the HEFCE had stated that Strategic Development Funding was generally limited, it had not given an indication as to the potential limit to the quantum of funding which might be provided for Option 3. In addition, the HEFCE had been enthusiastic with regard to providing assistance so that the future of SHL could be ensured.
- 0229 The Provost expressed concern about any possible unequal treatment of the cost of space within Option 3 from the cost of space within the other two options, especially as the 'Bloomsbury Library' would be providing a new world class library service to all staff and students of the University of London. Whilst acknowledging the £400M insurance value of the ULRSL collections, he believed that the usage value of the collections would be considerably less than this amount. He took the view that UCL should not be expected to pay the University a consideration for the collections because Option 3 would enhance the current provision. Although he did not support closure of SHL, it was an option which should remain on the table as Extended Option 1A would, in his view, result in Colleges paying more for a reduced service. With regard to the allocation of the Subscription, he supported the Steering Group's recommendation of a move to payment on a usage basis.
- 0230 A member reported that his College Librarian had been enthusiastic about the collaborative aspect of Extended Option 1A and had expressed confidence that SHL could be refocused successfully by the University. He viewed Extended Option 1A as the most appropriate option given ULRSL's current financial predicament. In addition to retaining the libraries as federal assets, it also offered the opportunity to emerge with a modernised library service which took into account the national context. The member's College, like other Colleges, had contributed significantly to SHL for several decades and its collections had evolved in such a way as to complement his College's collections. He commented that the Collegiate Council needed to recognise that transition costs would be substantial regardless of whichever option was chosen and suggested that if HEFCE funding was possible for Option 3 then it might also be available for Extended Option 1A.

- 0231 A member of the Collegiate Council reported that his College had expressed an interest in Option 2 in view of its expansive collection policies. He queried whether Extended Option 1A could refocus and develop collections simultaneously. He also expressed concern about the limited influence in collection development which small and specialist Colleges would have under the UCL proposals. He informed the Collegiate Council that his College had initiated discussions with the ULRLS about collaborating on collections in the performing arts.
- 0232 The Provost of UCL informed members that Option 3 would ensure that all Colleges paying a subscription to the Bloomsbury Library would have input into collection development. With regard to potential for expansion within Extended Option 1A, a member of the Steering Group commented that much would depend on the success of the collaborative collection development policy and whether any proposals for the ingestion of collections could meet the full costs of support and space. However, Extended Option 1A had been designed to serve as a platform for future development or expansion.
- 0233 A member of the Collegiate Council enquired about the basis for the allocation of transition costs under Extended Option 1A. The Collegiate Council was informed that the basis upon which the recurrent subscription was allocated would serve as the basis upon which transitional costs would be allocated. Therefore, the historic model would be applied for the allocation of both recurrent and transitional costs initially, but any future change in the model for the allocation of recurrent costs to a usage based formula would be applied simultaneously to the allocation of transition costs.
- 0234 The Deputy Dean of SAS informed the Collegiate Council that Option 2 had been predicated upon the efficiencies outlined in Option 1A within the CHEMS Report and not those contained within Extended Option 1A. There was concern within the SAS that the efficiencies within Extended Option 1A were similar to those within Option 1B of the CHEMS Report. The Deputy Dean drew members' attention to the HEFCE Special Funding to the ULRLS of £2.06M, which was routed through the SAS. She stressed the need to ensure that any agreed option offered value for money in relation to this contribution and that it continued to serve and promote the SAS's unique role in research facilitation. Given that this financial contribution to the ULRLS amounted to more than that of the Colleges collectively, she suggested that the SAS should have enhanced representation and input to collection development.
- 0235 The Collegiate Council agreed to vote by a show of hands on the Steering Group's recommendation that Extended Option 1A be implemented with transitional costs to be met by Colleges. The Collegiate Council voted 14 to 3 in favour of recommending to the Board of Trustees the implementation of Extended Option 1A, including transitional costs to be met by Colleges.

AGREED

- 0236 (i) To recommend to the Board of Trustees that Extended Option 1A be implemented, including transition charges to be met by Colleges.

- (ii) That assurance be sought from the HEFCE that implementation of Extended Option 1A would not impact upon Special Funding to the University of London.

ULRLS Subscription Allocation Model

- 0237 The Collegiate Council noted the Steering Group's conclusion that, regardless of whichever option was chosen for the long-term future of SHL, the inequities within the historic Subscription allocation model must be addressed. Whilst the Steering Group's remit had prevented it from discussing this issue in detail, a majority of Steering Group members had recommended that there should be a shift to a usage-based model.
- 0238 A member of the Collegiate Council commented that agreeing a usage-based model might not be straightforward as it could prove difficult to settle on an appropriate definition of usage. However, the Collegiate Council agreed with the Steering Group that the Subscription allocation model should be reviewed as a matter of urgency with the aim of moving to a usage-based model. Accordingly, it was agreed that the Working Group of Heads of Colleges which had been a predecessor to the Steering Group should be reconvened in order to draft proposals for a new Subscription model.

AGREED

- 0239 To recommend to the Board of Trustees that the ULRLS Subscription allocation model be reviewed as a matter of urgency, with the aim of moving to a usage-based model.

Libraries of the Warburg Institute and the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies

- 0240 The Collegiate Council discussed the Steering Group's recommendation that it affirms the commitment contained within Extended Option 1A to the organisational integration of the libraries of the Warburg Institute and the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (IALS) into the ULRLS.
- 0241 The Collegiate Council received and noted a letter of 20 April 2009 (copy in Minute Book) by the Chairman of the Advisory Council of the Warburg Institute which had requested that in making its final recommendations, the Collegiate Council be mindful of the Trust Deed relating to the Warburg Library which stated that it should be kept 'adequately equipped and staffed as an independent unit the whole to be known as 'The Warburg Institute...'. The letter also stated that the combined deficit of £330k of the Warburg Institute and the library of the IALS had not appeared in the CHEMS Report. The Advisory Council, therefore, wished to bring it to the attention of the Collegiate Council that the revised version of Option 2, which purported to include the Warburg and IALS, was based on CHEMS figures and excluded the combined deficit. It was the opinion of the Advisory Council that this deficit could not be reduced substantially by further convergence within the ULRLS.

0242 The Collegiate Council was informed that the University had taken legal advice on the issue of the Warburg's independence. The opinion of the University's solicitors had supported the University's position that the IALS and Warburg were not stand alone operations completely outside the University's aegis and that, as a result, the convergence agenda did not breach the terms of the Trust Deed. The issue of the Warburg's stated position on convergence, together with the legal advice received, would be discussed in detail at the Board of Trustees meeting on 13 May 2009. Given that the organisational integration of the libraries of the Warburg Institute and the IALS into the ULRIS was an existing policy to which the Collegiate Council was already committed, and that the Board of Trustees would be discussing in detail the legal advice received on convergence, it was agreed to withdraw recommendation (iii) from the Collegiate Council's recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

0243 The Vice-Chancellor closed the meeting by thanking Professor Webley and members of the Steering Group for their hard work and he thanked also those that had submitted proposals and made presentations to the Steering Group.