

## **Library Committee**

Thursday 25 June 2020, 11.00am-1.00pm

Web-conferencing meeting via MS Teams

### **Minutes**

#### **Present Members:**

Dr Paul Ayris (Chair for items 27-29, 31-36); Dr Simon Banks; Dr Richard Freeman; Dr Oliver Gerstenberg; Professor Diane Koenker; Ben Meunier; Martin Moyle; Professor Vivek Mudera (Chair for item 30); Jim Onyemenam; Dr Rachel Rees; Steve Ridge (for items 27-30.3); Dr John Sabapathy; Ashley Slanina-Davies.

#### **Apologies:**

Professor David Price; Dr Charles Inskip; Zak Liddell; Kate Pearce; Dr Harriet Shannon; Andy Smith; Dr Hazel Smith.

#### **In attendance:**

Angela Young, Head of Library Skills [for items 27-29].

#### **Officer(s):**

Olivia Whiteley

### **Part I: Preliminary Business**

#### **27. Key decision and action points Arising from 6 February 2020 meeting (3-01)**

27.1. Library Committee (LC) received a summary of the key matters considered at its last meeting held on 6 February 2020 including arising decision and action points. The Minutes of the 6 February 2020 meeting were not currently available but would be circulated to LC in due course.

27.2. For the purpose of the minutes, a correction to paper 3-01 was noted in that Dr Richard Freeman had not been present at the 6 February 2020 meeting.

#### **28. Matters Arising**

28.1. In response to the request for an update on the matter of UCL usage and the operating budget of the Senate House Library, it was noted that no further federal board meetings had taken place, however there was a group

considering issues of equality, diversity and inclusion which had been raised with the UCL Executive Director of Human Resources.

## **Part II: Strategic Items for Discussion**

### **29. Library Skills Framework (3-02)**

29.1. The Head of Library Skills introduced the report on recent progress in the planning and delivery of Library Skills services, including the development of a library skills framework and the accelerated move to online delivery of library skills during the COVID-19 outbreak, as well a vision and objectives for future skills teaching delivery.

29.2. The following key points on the Library Skills Framework were reported:

- a. The Library Skills Framework essentially brought together three established literary frameworks, providing a single overarching strategy for UCL Library Services to support skills provision. It had been formulated through a process of mapping provision across Library Services, identifying gaps and consulting with literacy speciove,olrf1 0 0 1 182.9 800.94



## Library Committee Minutes – 25 June 2020

model in the wake of the coronavirus pandemic. The following key points were highlighted:

- a. A Gold-Silver-

Library Committee Minutes – 25 June 2020

consider and feed back to the Education and Operations Delivery Group on provision with social distancing measures in force.

- c. There were discussions as to whether the reopening of spaces, as was being piloted in the Student Centre on a limited basis for staff and Postgraduate Research (PGR) students, would be extended to include Postgraduate Taught (PGT) students who would currently be working on dissertations. A general steer was awaited from UCL on extending access to PGT students, however it was hoped to be in a position to provide enhanced support from UCL on

this, UCL would be organising online training sessions on next generation metrics. UCL was notably ahead of other institutions in adopting an Open Science approach.

- 32.2. The following points were addressed during discussion:
- a. It was highlighted that some research data was necessarily confidential due to its sensitive nature and could not be made open, though it may be possible to share an anonymised form in some cases. In response to a query on dealing with confidential data, it was noted that neither UCL nor research funders mandated Open Data and that this was up to the judgement of the Principal Investigator (PI) or researcher. In the case of the recently retracted Lancet article, sensitivity of data was not given as a reason for non-disclosure; the issue that it had highlighted concerned existing peer review practices.
  - b. Increasingly, time pressure for turnaround was a concern in peer review practices, with potential negative impacts on standards and integrity. It was suggested that a model in which a pre-print article (identifiable as pre-print via metadata) was made available weeks ahead of the peer-reviewed version might relieve time pressures, though there were some concerns raised about the status of articles subsequently rejected following peer review. Pre-prints were noted to be more common in some disciplines than others.
  - c. It was highlighted that, while a good quality peer review would take into account the underlying data, vast datasets would need time and/or code for thorough analysis. Exposing weaknesses in the peer review process such as this could help to illuminate limitations in the practice.
  - d. It was questioned whether a model for peer review could be developed and tailored for different disciplines.
- 32.3. Library Committee:
- a. Received the report on Open Science;
  - b. Noted that feedback from LC members given during discussion would be relayed to the Open Science Platform for consideration.

### **Part III: Other Business for Approval or Information**

#### **33. Project bidding in UCL Library Services (3-06)**

- 33.1. Library Committee received the latest termly summary of the Library's progress in project bidding applications.

