

March 2008

Review of HEFCE funding for research libraries

**Report to HEFCE by
Professor Sir Ivor Crewe**

Contents

Introduction	3
The History of HEFCE Special Funding of Research Libraries	4
The Consultation Exercise	9
The National Importance of the Specially Funded Libraries	12
The Level, Distribution, Mode and Conditions of Special Funding	17
Quality of Services to the National Research Community	21
Conclusions and Recommendations	24
List of Recommendations	31
Appendix A: Respondents to the Consultation	33
Appendix B: Tables 5-9: Services to External Users	37

Summary of Tables

Table 1. Streams of special funding for the support of research libraries 2005-6	8
Table 2. Stock size and expenditure 2004-5	11
Table 3. Measures of external usage, 2004-5	14
Table 4. Claimed shortfall of HEFCE Special Funding against costs of support for UK HEI external researchers, 2005-6	20
Table 5: Opening hours, reader study spaces, open access browsing and average fetching time	37
Table 6: Services to external users: main collection material online, special collection material online, pre-visit ordering, e-journals	40
Table 7: Services to external users: Percentage of material digitised/remotely available, ongoing digitisation projects	42
Table 8: Services to external users: Summary of all library charges	44
Table 9: Services to external users: Membership of collaborative collection management and national and regional access schemes	45

Acknowledgement

Professor Sir Ivor Crewe would like to acknowledge and give thanks to the libraries under review for their cooperation and flexibility in the provision of information over an extended period of time.

Professor Sir Ivor Crewe would also like to thank the Society of College, National and University Libraries (SCONUL) for permission to use their annual library statistics.

Introduction

1. HEFCE has an extended history of selective intervention in the funding and management of the higher education (HE) research library system. Its long-established policy is to ensure, firstly, that the national academic research community has access to library collections of exceptional importance and, secondly, that the host institutions are compensated for the additional cost of developing, maintaining and opening these collections on behalf of the research sector as a whole.
2. Over the years there have been several initiatives designed to bring about strategic change, which have therefore been funded for a limited period only, but a number of initiatives remain. These provide special non-formula funding in various forms for HE libraries.

University of Cambridge: Cambridge University Library (CUL)

London School of Economics: The British Library of Political & Economic Science (BLPES)

University of London: Senate House Library and the libraries of the Institutes of the School of Advanced Study (SAS)

University of Manchester: The John Rylands University Library (JRUL)

University of Oxford: The Bodleian and Oxford University Library Services, including the Bodleian (OULS)

School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS): SOAS Library

3. HEFCE wishes to review these current support arrangements for two reasons. Firstly, the existing set of initiatives has been in place for many years, with only one – the ‘access strand’ of the Research Support Libraries Programme (RSLP) – having been reviewed in the last three years. HEFCE is committed to reducing the number of special funding schemes and to attaching time-limits to those that remain. It therefore needs to be assured that there are robust grounds, in terms of national research performance, for any continuation of special funding. Secondly, new technologies, in particular digitisation, remote on-line access and the upsurge of electronic journals and data bases, have rapidly changed the practices of researchers and libraries and pose questions about the current level and focus of special funding. For example, a 2006 survey on researchers’ views on current and future provision of library services jointly conducted by the Research Information Network (RIN) and the Consortium of Research Libraries (CURL) revealed that the reported frequency of visits to other libraries was in slight decline, even among researchers in the humanities and social sciences, as a result of remote on-line access to digitised catalogues, although there was no expectation that the decline would progress further.
4. Accordingly, HEFCE commissioned a review, with the following terms:

To review HEFCE’s special funding for research support libraries, to examine the case for continued support, and to advise on the appropriate

level of support for the next five to ten years. The case for support should include:

- *Evidence **either** of unique research collections – that is to say, a significant amount of material not available anywhere else in England (or online); **or** of a critical mass of rare material making an essential contribution to the aggregate national collection;*
- *Evidence that the user community values a collection as making a significant and essential contribution to the national research base in their discipline;*
- *Evidence that the volume of research material of national significance in a collection is substantially beyond that which the host institution could reasonably be expected to maintain from its own resources.*

The review was also to examine whether any HEI institute (HEI) libraries not currently supported by the special initiatives are eligible for special funding under the criteria outlined above.

The History of HEFCE Special Funding of Research Libraries

Research Libraries Access Fund

5. HEFCE's most recent funding initiative was the Research Support Libraries Programme (RSLP), a UK-wide initiative funded by the four HE funding bodies, which ran from 1998-99 to 2001-02. Its purpose was to improve UK researchers' access to library resources, including access through collaborative action between libraries. Across its four-year lifespan the programme allocated some £30m under two main headings:
 - a. Project grants to HEIs (and consortia) to support collaborative projects in collection development and the improvement of access.
 - b. 'Access strand' grants to HEIs whose libraries were heavily used by visiting researchers from other institutions, to compensate them for the additional costs to which this gave rise. It was a condition of grant that researchers from any UK HEI be allowed access for reference on the same terms as the host HEI's own researchers. The overall value of the strand (£4.5m by 2004-5) originated from an earlier consultancy report and the allocations were based on a national survey of patterns of usage of individual libraries by external researchers, carried out in 1997.
6. The project grants element of the RSLP came to an end in 2002, as planned. The access strand was extended because the funding bodies recognised a continuing need to secure access to important research resources on behalf of visiting researchers. The access strand was further extended in 2003 on the advice of the Research Support Libraries Group (RSLG), set up by the four funding bodies to build on the work of the RSLP, which recommended:

i. “*In the short term, to continue to pay the access fund grants hitherto made available through RSLP, on broadly the present basis.*”

7. In 2005 HEFCE discontinued the access strand and returned the funds to the HEFCE quality-related grant for research (QR). For most of the HEIs benefiting from the strand, the overall grant consequences of discontinuation were very small: their share of relevant library provision costs was not greatly at variance with their share of QR grant. For six institutions, however, the consequences were comparatively significant, with net losses ranging from about £70k to over £600k per annum. These institutions – Cambridge, LSE, London, Manchester, Oxford and SOAS – provided a service to the sector at large on a scale well above what their share of national research funding could be expected to support. To protect these six institutions from significant net losses, HEFCE agreed to provide them with transitional funding from 2005-6 equivalent to the difference between their access strand allocations in 2004-5 and the amounts they gained from the increase in QR. These transitional funds were added to the QR allocation to the six institutions on the understanding that they would expire no later than 2008-9 and that researchers from any UK HEI would be allowed access for reference on the same terms as the host HEI’s own researchers. The value of the annual transitional funds (at 2005-6 prices) was:

i. Cambridge	£360.2k
ii. LSE	£199.1k
iii. London(a)	£314.6k
iv. Manchester	£122.4k
v. Oxford	£602.8k
vi. SOAS	£ 71.7k
vii. Total	£1,670.7k

(a) Senate House Library and the School of Advanced Study.

Four of the six – Cambridge, Oxford, London and SOAS – also receive further special funding, under arrangements pre-dating RSLP, in recognition of the national importance of their libraries.

Oxford and Cambridge: Copyright Libraries Fund

8. In 1994 HEFCE accepted the recommendation of the Joint Funding Councils Libraries Review Group, chaired by Sir Brian Follett, that recurrent non-formula funding should continue to be allocated to the legal deposit libraries of Oxford and Cambridge, ‘conditional on those universities providing access to all *bona fide* research staff and students within the UK at no additional cost...’. HEFCE reviewed this funding in 1998, inviting the two universities to estimate the annual *additional* recurrent costs of receiving, processing and housing a copyright library, i.e., over and above the costs that would be incurred by a major non-copyright research library, and excluding the extra

costs of access (which were to be met through the access strand). Cambridge estimated these to be £1.376m; Oxford, £1.421m (at 1996-7 prices). HEFCE agreed to continue paying Oxford and Cambridge a special annual grant at the 1997-98 level of £2.4m, since when this funding has been uplifted by the government deflator but has not been reviewed.

University of London: Senate House Library and School of Advanced Study

9. Since 1993, when HEFCE decided to fund the constituent colleges of the University of London (UL) directly, HEFCE has allocated special funding to UL for those activities for which it had responsibility but which were not funded by the colleges through UL's internal charging mechanisms. The size of this special funding was based on an earlier study carried out by the then University Funding Council's University of London Federal Policy Group. Since inception it has been uplifted each year by the GDP deflator. It was additionally increased by £552k in 2002-3 when, as a result of the 2000 Harris review of funding arrangements for the School of Advanced Study (SAS), quality-related research income for SAS, as informed by the 2001 RAE, was transferred from normal block grant into special funding.
10. Special Funding for UL is provided as a block grant but UL has distributed it to the Senate House Library and the School of Advanced Study – the main recipients – in similar proportions since inception. In 2005-6 special funding for UL was £7.675m, of which £942k was distributed to the Senate House Library and £5,666k SAS, of which £3,553k was allocated to the SAS Institutes' libraries.
11. The 2000 and 2005 Harris Reports confirmed that Special Funding (SF) was the appropriate form of HEFCE funding for SAS, including its libraries, because a significant part of its research-related activities consists of research promotion and facilitation on behalf of the regional and national subject communities, which the RAE is not designed to assess. The 2005 Report recommended that HEFCE should sponsor a review of library provision in central London, including the mechanism of funding after 2008-9, and this recommendation is being addressed as part of this report.
12. A parallel review of special funding for SAS has taken place. It confirms that SAS is a centre of international excellence with a mission to promote and facilitate research in the humanities and social sciences on behalf of the appropriate national disciplinary communities; that its specialist libraries are critical to this mission; that special funding is the most appropriate funding mechanism; and that such funding continue on a long-term basis subject to a range of assurances on academic and financial performance. The SAS review recommends a 10% uplift in the baseline funding in 2008-9 for the SAS, to take the form of a block grant covering library and non-library expenditure, subject to a number of conditions including:
 - a. *“The SAS should produce for agreement with HEFCE a definition of national research promotion and facilitation, a specification of eligible activities and an appropriate set of performance indicators;*

- b. *The SAS should produce for agreement with HEFCE a set of performance targets for monitoring at the 2011-12 funding review;*
- c. *HEFCE should explore the options for introducing a performance-based dynamic element to SF for the following five year funding period;*
- d. *The SAS should produce a five-year financial strategy and forecast showing how HEFCE-funded research facilitation activities, including library services, can become sustainable within a defined period;*
- e. *The SAS's transfer of the budgets of the five Institute libraries located in Senate House to the University of London Research Library Services (ULRLS) should continue, but this should be done in a way that protects the visibility of the total special funding provided by HEFCE and of the outputs it is purchasing. This could be achieved, for example, through an annual statement of ULRLS or by some form of service level agreement, or other appropriate mechanism of accountability”.*

13. The recommendations, if accepted, would enhance the special funding of the SAS and therefore, potentially, the libraries of the SAS Institutes, and would protect the integrity of the special funding of those SAS libraries that are being re-located to Senate House and converged with the Senate House Library under the umbrella of ULRLS. This report therefore excludes the SAS libraries from its consideration and references to the University of London are to the Senate House Library only.

School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS): whole institution funding

14. SOAS has been regarded as the home of the leading national library for Asian and African Studies since the publication of the Hayter Report in 1961. Its collection, much of it foreign-language, is recognised to be unmatched in scope and depth elsewhere in the UK, including the British Library. The specialist library staff and collections were originally resourced through HEFCE's museums and galleries special funding. When HEFCE transferred museums and galleries funding to the Arts & Humanities Research Board it considered that SOAS did not fit within this funding scheme. It adopted 'whole institution' funding as the route of direct special funding in recognition of the specialist mission of SOAS and the strategic importance of maintaining a national centre of excellence in the fields of Asian and African Studies. The current level of 'whole institution' funding for SOAS is just over £1 million.

15. A summary of the different streams of special funding in support of research libraries is set out in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Streams of special funding for the support of research libraries, 2005-6

Library	Funding stream				Total £k
	RSLP Access strand rolled into QR £k	Transitional RSLP Access strand' £k	Whole institutional funding £k	Deposit Library funding £k	
Cambridge	206	360		1,476	2,042
London: SHL (a,b)	0	161	942		1,103
London: SAS	0	154	3,399		3,553
LSE	35	199			234
Manchester	160	122			282
Oxford	210	603		1,476	2,289
SOAS	13	72	1,007		1,092
Total	624	1,671	5,187	2,952	10,434

(a) Transitional 'access strand' funding of £315k was granted to the University of London, which allocated £154k to the libraries of the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, the Institute of Historical Research and the Warburg Institute.

(b) HEFCE grants 'whole institution' and special funding to the University of London, which in 2005-6 allocated £942k and £5,666k.(including access strand funding) to the Senate House Library and the School of Advanced Study, respectively. Of the £5,666k, the amount allocated to SAS Institute libraries was £3,553k.

The Consultation Exercise

16. A large number of university libraries serve the research as well as teaching purposes of their institutions and contain some special collections. They are all open to external *bona fide* scholars and researchers, usually on the same terms as for internal users (except for borrowing and remote access to e-journals and data bases). Each university benefits reciprocally from opening their library to outside users and is expected to resource these mutually beneficial arrangements through its HEFCE QR-grant and other sources of income. The rationale for the special funding of a small number of research libraries is that they provide external researchers with access to exceptionally large and often unique specialist collections, as well as with supporting user services, at a cost that could not be expected to be met from formula funding. They contribute disproportionately to the national research performance and thus merit additional national funding.
17. Statistical evidence of the strength of the collections of the six libraries receiving special funding and of their external national usage will be provided later in the report. In order to assess both the additional costs of serving as a national research library and the quality of the collections and accompanying services as perceived by external users, HEFCE undertook two consultations. The first was with the six university libraries in receipt of special funding, who were asked to make a case for continuing support on the basis of the criteria listed in paragraph 4.
18. The second consultation exercise was with members of the user community, which was asked to address six questions:
- *Why might you or colleagues you represent visit these libraries: a) material not available elsewhere; b) amalgamation of material makes it judicious to go there rather than to several different libraries; c) convenience; d) other?*
 - *When visiting these libraries, what services or facilities do you or the colleagues you represent require or make use of?*
 - *How does this compare with your host institution, or other libraries that you visit?*
 - *How important are the research collections held at these libraries to research in particular disciplines?*
 - *Are these collections available elsewhere?*
 - *What if any suggestions would you make about sustaining and accessing these research collections?*

Consultees included the chairs of national subject groups, RAE 2008 panel members from units of assessment panels 30 to 67, the Research Councils, the British Library, Research Information Network (RIN), Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC), Society of College, National and University Libraries (SCONUL), Consortium of Research Libraries (CURL), the Royal Society, the British Academy, and the Association of Learned Societies in the

Social Sciences (ALSS). Further details about the consultation, including a list of those who responded, are given in Appendix A.

19. The review's terms of reference also include examination of the potential eligibility for special funding, under the criteria outlined above, of libraries not currently in receipt of special funding. SCONUL data suggested that external usage of the UCL library was on a similar if not larger scale than that of the specially funded libraries¹. Accordingly, UCL was invited to submit a case for special funding even though the additional QR funding it received in 2005, when RSLP funding was wound up, compensated for its loss of the 'access strand' money at the time. The author held individual meetings with the heads of the seven libraries under review and with the presiding or senior officers of the British Academy, the British Library, JISC and RIN.

¹ For example, in 2005-6 the number of registered users under the SCONUL *Research Extra* scheme was 981 for UCL, compared with 2120 for SOAS, 1006 for LSE and 307 for Manchester. (Oxford and Cambridge do not belong to the scheme.) No other university library registered more than 330 users, except for Kings College London (570 users). Loans and renewals under the scheme numbered 13,364 for UCL, the largest of any participating library. This was followed by 9,111 for LSE, 8,343 for SOAS, 7,728 for Manchester, 4,410 for Edinburgh and 3,985 for Birmingham.

Table 2. Stock size and expenditure 2004-5

Library	Provision of stock			Acquisitions			Expenditure				
	Total catalogued book stock	archives & mss (metres)	Books per FTE user	Books per FTE student	Books and pamphlets	Journals (print and electronic)	on total information provision	on information on per FTE student	Total per FTE user (a)	Library as % of total institutional expenditure	Volumes in stock per FTE library staff
Cambridge (2005-06)	10,847,547	13,781	316	592	184,529	88,646	£5,971,000	£326	n.k.	2.4%	29,301
				12,489				£5,252			
London (b)	3,792,816	3,462	263	(b)	31,142	12,444	£1,595,018	(b)	£507	7.0%	30,102
LSE	3,683,968	2,776	242	490	34,596	22,555	£1,682,359	£224	£359	4.4%	43,290
						26,522					
Manchester	4,137,896	3,938	82	127	34,076	(c)	£5,261,566	£162	£277	2.6%	18,069
Oxford	9,250,606	7,568	250	503	120,300	82,470	£4,337,738	£236	£707	5.0%	19,337
SOAS	1,114,162	4,000	142	314	19,838	3,868	£791,654	£223	£359	6.6%	19,444
UCL	1,520,523	2,824	n.k.	88	50,995	15,072	£3,786,705	£220	n.k.	1.8%	8,175
CURL median	1,692,587	3,147	79	106	25,729	12,202	£2,981,977	£163	£271	2.5%	13,973
CURL 1st quartile	2,993,517	5,218	99	130	35,586	13,459	£3,436,490	£192	£338	2.9%	18,779
'Old' sector median	760,205	451	53	70	15,253	6,795	£1,387,027	£137	£242	2.5%	11,271
'Old' sector 1st quartile	962,449	1,524	66	90	21,434	9,180	£1,677,780	£149	£287	2.8%	14,383

Source: SCONUL statistics 2004-5. Cambridge did not submit a return to SCONUL in 2004-5 – figures are from its (unpublished) 2005-6 return

Notes: (a) Total FTE user calculated as the total of FTE students + FTE academic staff + FTE other staff+ externally registered users weighted by 0.4.

(b) Some statistics are distorted by the very small number of students registered at the University of London as distinct from its constituent colleges and schools.

(c) Manchester did not declare these figures in the SCONUL statistics 2004-05 but the calculation has been made in retrospect

The National Importance of the Specially Funded Libraries

20. It is indisputable that all seven libraries considered in this report accommodate collections of exceptional national and, in most cases, international importance, in terms of size, depth and uniqueness of material. Statistical indicators, reinforced by feedback from the research community, attest to the major part played by these libraries in the national research infrastructure, especially in the humanities and social sciences. Table 2 presents some simple indicators of collection size and acquisitions expenditure, both absolute and relative to size of institution, compared with those of other major research universities in the UK. The indicators are drawn from SCONUL statistics, which need to be treated with some caution for the purposes of inter-library comparisons, because of institutional differences in definitions of spending categories², where archives are included in acquisition figures, and whether departmental libraries are taken account of. Nevertheless, in summary it shows that the seven libraries generally occupy the full first quartile of the 20 CURL university libraries and are comfortably placed within the first quartile of the 37 'old' sector university libraries, in terms of overall collection size, annual acquisitions and expenditure on information provision. Oxford and Cambridge stand out on all the measures because they are legal deposit libraries and because of the prolonged period, spanning many centuries, over which their collections have grown. SOAS has a relatively modest collection and annual rate of acquisitions by the standards of other CURL libraries, but this partly reflects its small institutional size and specialist focus: its stock and expenditure on books and journals per FTE student (a measure which takes the marked differences in size of HEI into account) is exceptionally high. Some of the statistics for London are distorted by the very small number of students registered at the University of London as distinct from its constituent Colleges and Schools.

21. In addition to their main, fully catalogued, holdings, the seven libraries considered in this report all contain a large number of important special collections and archives. The relative concentration of such collections in these libraries is reflected in the outcome of the higher education funding bodies' Specialised Research Collections in the Humanities Initiative, which ran from 1994-5 to 1999-2000 following the 1993 Follett Review of academic libraries. Of the 321 holdings of significant research value in university libraries in England awarded grants for conservation, preservation, cataloguing, publicity and user services, 169 are held in these seven libraries.³

² For example, the considerably greater expenditure on information provision shown in Table 2 for Cambridge (£5.9m) than Oxford (£4.3m) is almost certainly an artefact of differing definitions of 'information' as distinct from 'other' by the two institutions.

³ JISC, *Accessing Our Humanities Collections: A Subject Guide for Researchers* (n.d.). The number of grants to individual universities was: Oxford 78, Cambridge 30, London (excluding SAS) 23, SAS 16, UCL 9, SOAS 7, LSE 3, Manchester 3. The distribution of grants is not, of course, a robust measure of the quantity or quality of special collections in university libraries and undoubtedly under-represents

22. Statistical measures of external usage (i.e. usage by those other than the staff and students of the HEI) broadly confirm that these libraries stand apart from other research libraries (see Table 3). In terms of absolute number of registered external users, Cambridge, London, LSE, Manchester, Oxford and UCL occupy the first full quartile of CURL universities and SOAS is well above the CURL median. As a proportion of all users, and of academic staff and student FTEs, external usage is much heavier than for the typical CURL member. For example, the typical CURL university library registers almost three external users for every FTE academic staff member; in the libraries considered by this report the number varies from 3.5 (UCL) to 22 in SOAS (excluding the artificially high figure of 333 in London). However, these figures need to be treated with caution on a number of counts: some of the University of London figures are distorted by its tiny number of formally registered academic staff and students; and 'external usage' includes use made by the staff and students of physically proximate neighbour institutions, which is very considerable in the case of the Bloomsbury libraries of Senate House, UCL, SOAS and LSE. This report seeks to distinguish 'genuine' external usage from 'very local' external usage later on.

Table 3. Measures of external usage, 2004-5

Library	Registered external users	External users as % of total FTE users	External users as % of FTE academic staff	External users as % of FTE students	Consultations of special collections	Consultations of special collections per 1,000 visitors
Cambridge (2005-6)	21,678	0.63	5.7	1.18	n.k.	n.k.
London	34,811	2.41	332.8	114.63	6,359	8.65
LSE	14,880	0.98	18.1	1.98	3,958	2.64
Manchester (a)	26,784	0.53	5.2	0.82	115,330	56.17
Oxford	28,435	0.77	7.3	1.55	55,723	14.94
SOAS	9,034	1.15	21.8	2.54	4,851	8.91
UCL	12,936	n.k.	3.5	0.75	2,142	1.15
CURL median	6,783	0.26	2.8	0.39	5,429	3.55
CURL 1st quartile	12,161	0.40	4.2	0.60	14,904	7.90
Old sector median	1,981	0.15	2.5	0.21	1,086	1.40
Old sector 1st quartile	3,384	0.22	3.3	0.27	3,190	3.37

Source: SCONUL statistics 2004-5. Cambridge did not submit a return to SCONUL in 2004-5 – figures are from its (unpublished) 2005-6 return.

(a) The Manchester figure of 115,330 denotes the number of items consulted from special collections rather than the number of consultations and was the figure supplied by the special collections for 2004-05.

23. Table 3 also provides a measure of the use of special collections, which are a major element of the distinctive profile of all seven libraries. The annual number of consultations, or maybe items consulted, varies markedly. This is partly an artefact of definition and it may also reflect the varying state of cataloguing of these collections and of access to them. Consultations of special collections, whether measured as a total number or as a proportion of annual visits to the library, are in the top quartile of CURL libraries in the case of London, Manchester, Oxford and SOAS but below the CURL median in the case of LSE and UCL. This pattern of figures is a useful reminder that although special collections constitute an important part of the unique material in a library's stock, their use by the national academic community varies markedly.
24. In response to the consultation, the national research community overwhelmingly supported the continuation of HEFCE special funding for the six libraries currently in receipt of it, with many calls for increased resources. Some respondents to the consultation referred in general terms to the strength of collections not in receipt of special funding, but there was no call for any particular library to be added to the list. There was some mention of the concentration of national research libraries in London and Oxbridge and the importance of a geographically more equitable distribution of special resources. The principle of special funding outside the formula was endorsed on the grounds that the quality of UK research and scholarship in the humanities and social sciences was world class; that it was critical that such pre-eminence be maintained and protected in an increasingly competitive international environment; that the libraries in question made an exceptional contribution to the national research infrastructure in the humanities and social sciences ('the arts equivalent of a national laboratory'); that the costs to the host institution significantly exceeded what formula-based funding alone could support; and that HEFCE had a special responsibility under dual support for sustaining research infrastructure. This review concurs with these views. A number of consultees emphasized the importance of explicitly delineating special funding for research libraries, whatever the channel through which it flowed, so that HEIs in receipt of it were clearly aware that the funding was earmarked for library expenditure.
25. A recurrent theme was the place of HEFCE special funding in a broader national strategy for collection development and access, based on collaboration between the major research libraries (including the British Library), such as COPAC, and their participation in the national access schemes UK Research Reserve and SCOUNL Research Extra.⁴ A number of

⁴ COPAC is a free access library catalogue that includes details of materials held in libraries throughout the UK, plus Trinity College Dublin Library in Ireland. It includes the catalogues of all the UK National Libraries, a wide range of major university libraries, as well as specialist collections such as the National Art Library (V&A Museum).

respondents emphasized the importance, in a world of scarce and possibly shrinking resources, of libraries building on their strengths, of coordinating acquisitions and avoiding unnecessary duplication. Some called for a national strategy for the digitisation of monographs, manuscripts and images. It emerged from responses that some research libraries not in receipt of special funding deliberately pursued specialization in their collection development on the assumption that HEFCE's special support for the collections of the six major research libraries would continue. HEFCE funding has also been used to lever funding from additional sources. For example, Cambridge undertook two major retro-conversion projects to put their catalogues online and the availability of the Access funding enabled the library to offer partnership funding to grants of over \$2m with the Mellon Foundation

26. Feedback from the consultation recognised that, in return for special funding, libraries not only had a duty to make their collections accessible to external researchers on the same terms as the HEI's own researchers, but should also enhance access and services for external users. A repeated point in the feedback was that on-line access to catalogues and material, although an enormous and exciting boon to research in the humanities and social sciences, was a supplement and indeed impetus to, not a substitute for, access to printed material, preferably through browsing open shelves. There was generally praise for the access and services available to external researchers by the specially funded libraries, with many claiming that their own research, or research specialism, would be bereft without it, but there were also calls for specified improvements in particular libraries.
27. In view of the evidence from statistical indicators and the response of the academic community regarding the critical contribution made by some outstanding libraries to the national research performance, ***it is recommended that HEFCE continues to provide additional special funding, on a renewable long-term basis, to research libraries that meet four criteria: a unique collection or a holding of a critical mass of rare material; a significant and essential contribution to the national research base; associated costs beyond those which the host institution could reasonably be***

UK Libraries Plus is a cooperative venture between most of the UK's higher education libraries. It enables part-time, distance learning, full-time postgraduate and placement students to borrow material from other libraries.

SCONUL Research Extra is a borrowing scheme for UK HE researchers. It allows academic staff and postgraduate research students to borrow from participating HEIs.

CoFoR (Collaboration for Research) was a CURL initiative set up to provide its members and other research libraries with practical tools for collaborative acquisition and retention. It also paid special attention to techniques for serial de-duplication and to the mapping of relationships between research activity and library provision. This project ended in 2004 and further details are available on the CURL website: www.curl.ac.uk

expected to maintain from its own resources; and a track record of high-quality services and facilities to external researchers.

The Level, Distribution, Mode and Conditions of Special Funding

28. The principle of selective special funding for a small number of outstanding research libraries presents HEFCE with a number of questions. What are the true costs to the libraries of providing for the needs of its exceptional number of external researchers? What is the appropriate contribution for a national funding body to make towards those costs? What proportion of them should be met by the host institution and by users (or their institutions)? What terms and conditions should be attached to special funding to ensure that the receiving libraries provide an acceptable quality of service to external users and collaborate in a national strategy for the development of the UK's research libraries?

Costs

29. HEFCE did not commission an analysis of the full economic costs incurred by the seven libraries in meeting the needs of external researchers. Instead it asked each of the libraries to provide their own estimates. Table 4 presents these estimates, in some cases with adjustments and projections made by the author. The estimates vary markedly in their robustness and are not comparable across institutions; they provide a very broad indication of the difference between the costs of provision for researchers in external UK HEIs and the special funding made available for this purpose by HEFCE. The figures cannot be taken as a precise measure of the funding shortfall (or in some cases funding surplus) incurred by any of the individual institutions. However, it is safe to conclude, firstly, that the overall level of HEFCE special funding, including that given for legal deposit libraries, fails by a considerable margin to meet the true overall costs of providing for national research needs and, secondly, that Cambridge, Manchester and Oxford are heavily subsidising the national research community, while by contrast the four London university libraries are receiving a level of special funding that ranges from appropriate to excessive. The annual shortfall in overall special funding, excluding special funding for the libraries of the SAS, is in the order of £7.5-8.0m, and possibly more.

30. The most robust analysis of costs is provided by Oxford, which commissioned an independent consultant to produce a TRAC-based full economic costing of Oxford University Library Services for UK HEI external researchers. It should be noted that OULS regard the consultant's estimate of costs as too low – in particular the heritage costs of maintaining the collection for posterity – and estimates the true annual shortfall of HEFCE funding to be £6.6m rather than £5.1m. The estimates include the cost of capital but are net of external grants and endowment income applied to the library. One would expect Cambridge and Oxford to incur broadly similar costs in providing for external usage

because both are legal deposit libraries and both accommodate collections of a similar scale and distinction. Cambridge puts the cost of external usage much lower than Oxford because it excludes space costs (other than an annualised capital charge for additional accommodation) and the 'heritage' costs of maintaining its collection for posterity and estimates the external UK HEI proportion of active users to be 12% as against Oxford's estimate of 34%. Nonetheless, Cambridge's costs in meeting demand from UK academic researchers are clearly a long way from being met by HEFCE special funding.

31. The costs claimed by Manchester for meeting the demands by external UK academic researchers are less robust in their calculation, but are almost certainly an underestimate. In parallel with Oxford and Cambridge they are based on the proportion of registered users who are external UK academic researchers (20%). But they exclude academic researchers from the thirteen institutions in the North West Academic Libraries (NOWAL) consortium (who are not registered as external) and omit the costs of space and other overheads. Moreover, the number of registered users in 2005-6 will have been affected by the disruption to user services and reduced access to collections caused by the closure and major refurbishment of the Deansgate building. The comparatively modest level of special funding for Manchester – which is third only to Oxford and Cambridge in the scale and depth of its holdings and in the volume of external usage – is well below the costs the library bears for supporting the national research community, particularly in the northern half of England.

32. The position of the four London libraries is less certain, partly because their estimates are less reliable and inter-comparable, and partly because a substantial proportion of 'external' users are the staff and students, including undergraduates, of neighbouring HEIs. A detailed analysis of University of London users of the Senate House Library in 2005-6 reveals that over 70% were from Bloomsbury institutions.⁵ These should not count as external users for the purposes of special funding because each institution benefits from the use made of the others' libraries by their own researchers. In Table 4 the estimate of external UK HEI usage for the Senate House, UCL and LSE libraries has accordingly been adjusted by a 0.3 weighting for users from the University of London (such users are not separately designated by SOAS). In the cases of LSE and UCL, the current level of special funding (which for UCL is wholly incorporated within QR) appears to be broadly appropriate. Both institutions measure external usage in terms of library visits rather than registered users (in contrast to Cambridge, Manchester and Oxford), which is a more restrictive but perhaps more realistic measure for assessing additional cost. LSE used TRAC-based analysis to estimate the proportion of staffing,

⁵ These are Birkbeck College, the Courtauld Institute, the Institute of Education, KCL, LSE, the London School of Tropical Hygiene and Medicine, SOAS, the School of Pharmacy and UCL. These institutions accounted for 73% of University of London registered users, 77% of user visits, 75% of total time spent in the library and 68% of offsite accesses to e-resources.

non-staffing and capital costs that could be attributed to the research function of the library and in Table 4 the parameters of its analysis are applied to UCL, which provided only the undifferentiated operating costs of its family of libraries.

33. In the case of the Senate House Library (excluding the libraries of the Institutes of the School of Advanced Study) it appears that HEFCE's special funding exceeds the cost of meeting the needs of the national, as distinct from local London, research community. It accounts for about 30 per cent of the library's annual income whereas UK academic researchers from beyond Bloomsbury constitute about 15 per cent of the library's registered users. Table 4 suggests that SOAS too is over-funded, but the figures are the least reliable for any of the libraries. The SOAS data base does not enable us to make a dependable estimate of the number of external users who are academic researchers from other UK HEIs; nor can it provide an acceptable estimate of the research as distinct from teaching costs of the library. The most that can be concluded with any confidence is that the proportion of registered and actual library users from outside the institution appears to be exceptionally large.

Table 4. Claimed shortfall of HEFCE special funding against costs of support for UK HEI external researchers, 2005-6

Library	Cost of external usage £k	Cost of legal deposit library £k	Total cost of provision for external users and posterity £k	HEFCE SF for external usage £k	HEFCE SF for legal deposit library £k	Total HEFCE SF £k	Shortfall £k
Cambridge (a)	1,635	2,389	4,024	566	1,476	2,042	1,982
London SHL (b)	397		397	1,103		1,103	-706
LSE (c)	265		265	234		234	31
Manchester (d)	2,122		2,122	282		282	1,840
Oxford (e)	3,777	3,577	7,354	813	1,476	2,289	5,065
SOAS (f)	485		485	1,092		1,092	-607
UCL (g)	268		268	199		199	69
Total	8,887	5,966	14,853	4,128	2,952	7,080	7,773

(a) Gross costs; excludes external grants, endowments etc; legal deposit costs assume a major research library would have acquired 13% of legally deposited material

(b) Based on broad-estimate 2005-6 annual operating costs of SHL and ULRLS for research, including space charges, and the proportion of registered users estimated to be PGT, PGR and academic staff in non-Bloomsbury UK HEIs (16%).

(c) Based on FEC of 2005-6 research costs, including space charges, and proportion of visitors estimated to be PGT, PGR and academic staff in non-Bloomsbury UK HEIs (2.3%). The proportion of registered users in this category is much larger: about 20%.

(d) Excludes space and other overhead costs; based on proportion of registered users in 2005-6 who were PGT, PGR and academic staff in UK HEIs (excluding members of North West Alliance of Libraries (NOWAL) Consortium)

(e) Based on independent TRAC-based FEC analysis (challenged as too low by the university); gross costs exclude substantial external grants, endowments etc

(f) Based on broad estimate 2005-6 annual operating costs of SOAS for research, excluding space charges, and proportion of registered users estimated to be PGT, PGR and academic staff in non-Bloomsbury UK HEIs (27%).

(g) Based on 2005-6 annual operating costs of UCL, excluding space charges, and proportion of visitors estimated to be PGT, PGR and academic staff in non-Bloomsbury UK HEIs (2%).

Quality of Services to the National Research Community

34. The case for a select group of research libraries receiving special funding from HEFCE must rest on the quality of facilities and services they provide the national research community as well as on the additional costs they incur. Evidence of recent (and prospective) quality of service was obtained from factual information provided by the libraries about their facilities and services as well as through consultation of the user community. Tables 5 to 9 in Appendix B set out broadly comparable indicators of the scale and quality of support for external users available from each of the libraries under review, in terms of physical access and facilities, on-line access, the digitisation of catalogues and collections, charging and participation in collaborative projects. A brief evaluative summary for each of the libraries follows.

Cambridge

35. The scale, distinction and uniqueness of the Cambridge University Library collection are reflected in the quality of the services and facilities it offers external users. Particularly strong features include the complete digitisation of, and thus remote on line-access to, the main catalogue and all rare books, the almost complete digitisation of the manuscript catalogue (at the collection level), the ambitious rolling programme of digitisation of special collections and the extensive volume of e-journal subscriptions. The immensity of CUL's holdings restricts open access to about 30% of its collection but this is mitigated by an on-line advance ordering system and a rapid fetching time (18 minutes). Comment from external users in the consultation was overwhelmingly positive (all 46 user-respondents rated it 'excellent' or 'good'), with particular reference to the quality and depth of the collection. Opening hours (59.25 hours a week for most of the year), which exclude Sundays and mid/late evenings, are more restricted than in some other major research libraries. CUL participates in the inter-library loan system but does not permit borrowing by external users (for which some respondents expressed disappointment) and has not joined the two main national borrowing schemes, *UK Libraries Plus* and *SCONUL Research Extra*, on the grounds that it would be overwhelmed with borrowing requests were it to do so.

London School of Economics

36. The quality of support for external users of the LSE Library appears to be high. Of particular merit is the open access to 95% of the main collection and the fast fetch time (15 minutes) from the archive; the near complete digitisation of both the main collection catalogue (the exception is government documents) and of the special collections (but at the collection, not item, level); free access and borrowing for all researchers; participation in the *UK Libraries Plus* and *SCONUL Research Extra* national borrowing schemes; and very extensive opening hours for the main collection, particularly in term time (97-108 hours per week). The special collections are not yet in an on-line

catalogue but this does not appear to have led to complaint. Digitisation of the archive and print collections is not as advanced as in some other leading research libraries and the programme of future digitisation is relatively limited. A large majority of the 28 user-respondents in the consultation exercise regarded BLPES services and facilities as ‘excellent’ or ‘good’.

Manchester

37. The quality of support for external users of the JRUL appears to be very high. All 24 user-respondents judged its services and facilities to be ‘excellent’ or ‘good’, many mentioning unique holdings and special collections. A number of respondents emphasized the advantages to the research community outside the ‘golden triangle’ of having an outstanding research library located in the north of England. In addition to the range and quality of its collections, the JRUL’s particular assets for the external researcher are the large number of reader study spaces, including those designated for the John Rylands Library archives; the unusually large number of e-journals; exceptionally long opening hours for the main collection (99.5 hours per week in term; 57.5 hours out of term), free access and borrowing for all UK researchers and postgraduates; and its membership of the *UK Libraries Plus* and *SCONUL Research Extra* national borrowing schemes. The bulk of the main collection (75%) is open-access, although all special collections are closed-access with a 20 minute fetching time. Almost the entire main collection (95%) is in an on-line catalogue, together with all special collections printed books. The remaining special collections are not, although there is a programme of online cataloguing of archival collections, but many catalogues and hand-lists remain in hard copy only. There are more than 4,500 digital images available through the library website, although this is negligible compared to the holdings, and currently there is only one digitisation project in hand.

Oxford

38. The world stature of Oxford’s library collections is reflected in the feedback from the user-respondents in the consultation exercise, who in most cases emphasized the depth and uniqueness of material available. However, in contrast to Cambridge, LSE and Manchester, some features of Oxford’s library services and facilities were found wanting, notably the combination of closed access (73% of the main collection) and very slow fetching times (almost two hours for same day requests from the main stack, half a day from the repository and 2-3 days from store). Users expressed disappointment at the absence of borrowing rights: the Bodleian is a reference-only library and in parallel with Cambridge does not belong to the two national borrowing schemes. External users were also frustrated by the limited opening hours, especially at weekends and out of term. A partly compensating feature of OULS is the comprehensive on-line catalogue comprising almost the entire Bodleian collection and the significant future digitisation programme for holdings, including the Oxford-Google Digitisation Project (one million items alone), by far the most ambitious of any of the research libraries.

School of Oriental and African Studies

39. The quality of service provided to external researchers by the SOAS library appears to be high and the number of external users has almost tripled over five years. The overwhelming majority of the 46 user-respondents regarded the service as ‘excellent’ or ‘good’. In the feedback there were repeated references to the uniqueness of the foreign-language holdings (many of which are not available in the British Library) and to the quality and usefulness of the cataloguing. The entirety of the main collection is on open-access, reference access and borrowing are free to UK researchers and the SOAS Library belongs to the national borrowing schemes. However, a third of the main collection (and almost all of the social collections) have yet to be put in an on-line catalogue and almost no material has been or is in prospect of digitisation.
40. One aspect of existing resource allocation in the SOAS library raises questions about its capacity to sustain an internationally excellent research library over the medium-term. Although acquisitions spending per FTE student is high (see paragraph 20), the proportion of the library budget spent on acquisitions is unusually low by the standards of other research libraries⁶. At a time of burgeoning publications from the rapidly developing countries of Asia, as well as the growing importance of disciplines outside the humanities for research in Asian and African Studies, there is a danger that acquisitions – currently only 15,000 items added a year – will fall short of what an outstanding research library in these fields requires. Expenditure on acquisitions appears to be constrained by the exceptionally large proportion of the budget spent on staff. Although the highly specialist nature of the SOAS library holdings, in particular the concentration of foreign-language material, requires unusually intensive use of commensurately specialised staff (e.g., for ordering from overseas publishers, cataloguing of non-standard material and provision of guidance to enquirers) and although the specialist staff are themselves a research resource, the current division of spending between staffing and information acquisition gives some cause for concern.

University College London

41. In addition to the size of its holdings and the quality of its special collections, UCL Library offers a number of attractive features to external users, including an on-line catalogue of its complete main collection and free access and borrowing to all researchers, including those from outside the UK. It leads and hosts SHERPA-LEAP, the London E-prints Access Project, established in 2004 to develop open-access e-print repositories for seven University of London institutions. However, in some respects, the UCL Library is not geared up to provide a national service to external researchers. Only 50 per cent of its main collection is open access and 24 hours’ notice is required to

⁶ SOAS spends 54% of its budget on library staff and 28% on the provision of information. In the median CURL research library, these figures are 43% and 38% respectively. Figures are taken from SCONUL Annual Library Statistics 2004-05.

obtain material from its repository in Essex. Its special collections are not catalogued on-line and few of its main or special holdings have been digitised, although it has three digitisation projects in hand. Opening hours are fairly limited for the special collections (37.25 hours a week). Although all 18 user-respondents described UCL facilities and services as ‘excellent’ or ‘good’, a significant number were unconvinced that UCL’s library offered research support to the national community superior to that available from other good research universities in London or the provinces and doubted whether it merited special funding.

University of London: Senate House Library (SHL)

42. Although the Senate House Library (defined as excluding the Institute libraries of the SAS) contains some important special collections and its holdings are distinguished by their size more than their uniqueness or rarity: a very large proportion overlap with holdings in other central London libraries. SHL struggles to provide first-class services and facilities to the national research community. It has a relatively small number of reader study spaces and only 25% of its main collection is available on open access, although fetching times are reasonably fast for closed access items on site. (The Institute libraries, with the exception of part of the Institute of Commonwealth Studies library, are entirely open access.) A fifth of the collection remains to be put in an on-line catalogue, although almost half of the special collections have been entered into a digitised catalogue. All the material which is not in the online catalogue is recorded in a more rudimentary way in a card catalogue, which has been copied and made searchable online, but involves a separate search process on the website, making it difficult to find and use.. Subscriptions to e-journals are relatively limited for a general research library, (although SHL does not cover the sciences, where many e-journals are concentrated). SHL does not participate in *UK Library Plus*. A significant part of the Goldsmiths Library, housed in SHL, has been digitised but only one modest digitisation project is currently underway. There was strong praise for collections accommodated in Senate House that are central to the Institutes of the School of Advanced Study (e.g., history, philosophy, classics, romance languages, English literature, African, Latin American and American Studies) but also for psychology and for palaeography. However, comments from the 29 user-respondents were more negative than for any of the other libraries under review, with particular criticism directed at the IT and reading facilities, the limited progress made on the digitisation of the catalogue and restrictive access policies.

Conclusions and Recommendations

43. The evidence presented in this report offers compelling justification for the continuation of supplementary funding for a select number of research libraries on grounds of the excellence and strategic importance of their collections, the quality of service and facilities provided to external researchers and the exceptional costs incurred in doing so. The national

research infrastructure would benefit if supplementary funding were provided on a coherent, equitable, transparent and renewable basis and formed part of a national strategy for the enhancement and sustainability of England's national research libraries. The current special funding arrangements, which are the product of a number of separate fixed-term initiatives originating in the 1990s or earlier, do not meet the criteria of coherence, equity and transparency and are not linked to mechanisms for developing and sustaining the excellence of the nation's foremost research libraries.

44. On the basis of available data it is not possible to make robust judgements about the appropriate baseline for long-term supplementary funding for individual libraries. Instead interim funding arrangements for the two years 2008-9 and 2009-10 are proposed and recommendations are set out for the development over this period of a system of quinquennial supplementary funding to begin in 2010-11.

Interim funding 2008/9 and 2009/10

45. Although reliable estimates of precise comparative costs are not available, it is clear that the amount and distribution of current special funding are not well aligned to the additional expenditure incurred by the libraries under review in providing acceptable service and facilities to the national research community. This partly arises from the existence of three separate funding streams – for transitional access strand funding, for legal deposit libraries and for special institutions ('whole institution' funding) – with different budget levels and allocation formulae. The most glaring anomalies are the under-funding of Manchester and the over-funding of the University of London SHL (see Table 4 and paragraphs 29-33). The merging of these special funding streams into a single supplementary fund would bring advantages of equity, transparency and administrative simplicity. ***Accordingly, it is recommended that:***
- ***HEFCE should merge the separate special funding schemes for the support of research libraries into a single identifiable budget, for the purposes of supplementing QR funding for those universities with designated 'National Research Libraries' (NRLs);***
 - ***The new supplementary funding budget for NRLs should comprise the combined total of the existing transitional access strand, legal deposit and whole-institution funding streams, uplifted annually by the government deflator;***
 - ***For the years 2008/09 and 2009/10, as an interim measure, supplementary funding for the libraries of Cambridge, LSE, Oxford and SOAS should remain at the same level as the current level of special funding;***
 - ***There should be no supplementary funding for the library of University College London;***
 - ***The part of the special funding to the University of London currently allocated to the Senate House Library that is proportionate to the relative costs incurred by SHL in its development and management of the collections in English Studies, Music, Philosophy, Romance Studies, US Studies and***

*immediately cognate studies, should be transferred to the special funding for the School of Advanced Study;*⁷

- *The remainder of the special funding for Senate House Library should be phased out over the period 2008-9 to 2009/10 and the resulting savings should be re-allocated as supplementary funding to the John Rylands University Library at the University of Manchester.*

Long-term funding from 2010-11

46. There is a strong case for establishing a continuing long-term system of supplementary funding for a small number of outstanding research libraries. The funding system should be designed to ensure an appropriate overall level of funding, an equitable basis for the distribution of supplementary funding and conditions of funding that assure and enhance the quality of service and facilities provided to external researchers. The recommendations set out below offer a framework for such a system.
47. Libraries that clearly meet the three criteria set out in paragraph 4 and that have demonstrated the capacity to provide a high standard of support to external researchers should be designated by HEFCE as National Research Libraries entitled to renewable long-term supplementary funding in return for a specified and periodically assessed quality of provision. The libraries of Cambridge, LSE, Manchester, Oxford and SOAS meet these criteria, although in some cases specific weaknesses need to be addressed and their progressive elimination should be made a condition of long-term funding.
48. Despite the strength of the UCL library collection, including many important special collections, and extensive use by outside researchers (although many of them from other London institutions), the case for designating it a National Research Library is not sufficiently compelling to justify supplementary funding. The Senate House Library also houses large and comprehensive holdings as well as important special collections, notably the Goldsmiths Collection, but it has found it a challenge to operate effectively as a national research library. An important exception consists of the identifiable libraries of some of the Institutes of the School of Advanced Study, as well as of holdings in disciplines and fields critical to the work of the school, which are accommodated in Senate House and managed by University of London Research Library Services (ULRLS). These form a critical part of the nationwide research facilitation and promotion of the humanities and social sciences undertaken by the SAS, incur special costs and merit special funding (see paragraph 20). This is dealt with in the recommendations made in the review of the School of Advanced Study. The special funding of the SAS libraries and the proposed supplementary funding for the libraries of SOAS and LSE, as well as the proximity of the British Library, render it unnecessary to designate Senate House Library as a National Research Library.

⁷ This recommendation appears in the Review of HEFCE Funding for the University of London's School of Advanced Study.

Accordingly it is recommended that the HEFCE designate the libraries of Cambridge, LSE, Manchester, Oxford and SOAS as National Research Libraries (NRLs) entitled to renewable long-term supplementary funding in return for a specified and periodically assessed quality of provision and collaboration in national strategic programmes for collections development and services.

Allocation of supplementary funding

49. Supplementary funding is intended to contribute to the exceptional additional costs incurred by National Research Libraries for servicing external UK researchers. It should do so on a transparent basis, taking account of, inter alia, additional cost of provision, volume of external usage and quality of service and facilities. It has not been possible to arrive at robust estimates of costs on the basis of the information provided by the libraries in question. To establish a baseline for supplementary funding from 2010/11 onwards, ***HEFCE should commission a TRAC-based full economic cost (fEC) analysis of the net additional recurrent and capital costs encountered by the NRLs. It should also require the libraries to create mainstream data bases that provide the data necessary for such an analysis on a standard template*** (e.g., TRAC staff time diaries and appropriate categorisation of external users). ***The use and cost of provision of access to special collections and archives (as distinct from the main collection) should form the subject of a separate analysis.*** In addition, to address the argument that the substantial costs of maintaining two substantially overlapping legal deposit libraries relatively near to (and equidistant from) the British Library are incommensurate with the research benefits, ***a special but comparable analysis should be undertaken of the cost experienced by Oxford and Cambridge of acquiring, maintaining and providing access to its legal deposit material and of the use made of the material by UK researchers.***
50. Supplementary funding from 2010-11 should be provided on a quinquennial basis, subject to HEFCE's approval of a five-year plan for the maintenance and enhancement of research support services and facilities to the UK academic community.⁸ The plan should include a set of performance targets, of which a substantial core should be common to all NRLs, to be monitored when supplementary funding is reviewed in the fourth year of the five-year funding period. It should also include participation in strategic national initiatives designed to rationalise collections development and user services. Monitoring should include performance metrics agreed with each NRL and surveys of the user community. Each plan should address any specific major weaknesses revealed in this review (e.g., the level of acquisitions at SOAS, fetching times in Oxford).

⁸ Reference is to the UK academic community on the assumption that all the national funding councils will arrive at mutually acceptable arrangements for the supplementary funding not only of the five English NRLs, but of their equivalents in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Level of funding and additional sources of income

51. The annual shortfall in overall special funding for the five proposed National Research Libraries amounts to about £8.3m and probably more (see Table 4). The current level of HEFCE special funding, through the three streams, totals just over £7m (excluding the SAS). Even if HEFCE agreed to increase the overall volume of supplementary funding from 2010-11 in the light of the full economic cost analysis, it is very unlikely that it would be in a position to close the funding gap more than marginally. The NRLs' financial plans should therefore make provision for additional sources of income or for savings, although it is recognised that the scope for savings, without an unacceptable deterioration of quality of service, is limited.
52. Although all the NRLs benefit to a varying degree from endowments, benefactions and special programme grants, this source of additional income is too episodic and project-focussed to provide a basis for sustaining the core costs of a National Research Library. Other sources of income such as low-level charging for non-UK or non-academic users, photocopying charges, late-return fines, etc. provide only modest amounts of additional income⁹. Although the Research Councils and JISC fund national digitised data archives that form the Economic and Social Data Services and Arts & Humanities Data Services (e.g. the UK Data Archive at Essex and MIMAS at Manchester) there appears to be no prospect of their agreeing to contribute to the recurrent or capital costs of the National Research Libraries.
53. In developing a system of supplementary funding, HEFCE, in partnership with the NRLs, should explore the case for introducing a more realistic cost-based level of charging by means of institutional subscriptions – an annual subscription which entitles the institution's academic staff and research students access to, and in some cases borrowing of, the NRL's holdings. There are principled grounds for institutional subscriptions. 'User pays' has many merits, even when the payment is only a contribution to full costs. Institutional subscriptions would focus research priorities within universities and reinforce the NRLs' responsiveness to UK research users' needs. They would produce a fairer sharing of the burden of NRLs' exceptional costs between the NRLs' host institutions, HEFCE and the researcher's university. Current arrangements mask a subsidy provided to the majority of research universities (especially those with strengths in the humanities and social sciences) by a small minority of institutions with NRLs and by HEFCE with responsibilities for teaching-led as well as research-led institutions.
54. There are also practical grounds for institutional subscriptions. They are probably the only means of injecting a substantial addition of resource into

⁹ For example SOAS has a range of charges for the general public or commercial users. The general public are allowed 5 free day visits before charging £10 a day, commercial researchers are charged £200 a year for 3 reference tickets, £400 for 3 borrowing tickets. These charges yield a total income of some £46,000 a year, about 1.7% of total expenditure.

NRLs. About a hundred HEIs make submissions to the RAE in the humanities and social sciences and are awarded research funding by the AHRC and the ESRC. An average annual subscription of, say, £50k, covering all five NRLs (well below the typical full salary costs of one professor), could meet a large part of the current shortfall in their sustainable funding. It would also justify more realistic levels of charging for non-academic users and non-UK users. The institutional subscription would constitute an indirect research cost and therefore be partly recoverable through research grants awarded by the Research Councils and other external research funders; the individual fee payment would be a legitimate direct charge on a research grant.

55. Institutional subscriptions also have drawbacks and raise some difficult practical issues. They carry a risk of a beggar-my-neighbour spread of subscription charging beyond the five National Research Libraries, so this risk would need to be assessed before embarking on such a scheme. It would be necessary to allow individual researchers from institutions unwilling or unable to pay the subscription (or without an institutional affiliation) to ‘pay on the door’; determining a realistic but non-penal tariff that did not discourage institutions from subscription might be problematic. The position of visiting researchers from outside the UK would need careful consideration. Many visiting academics come from universities abroad with important libraries of value to UK researchers; selective international agreements for matched or zero subscriptions might be the most appropriate approach. HEFCE would need to consider whether the level of supplementary funding should be linked to the establishment of institutional subscriptions or to the income generated. There are other practical difficulties, as well as a long and no doubt deep-rooted tradition of ‘free’ access to research libraries, which need to be balanced against the current permanent shortfall in funding to sustain the nation’s world-class research libraries.

Senate House Library

56. The Senate House Library finds itself in the difficult position of aspiring to maintain its historic role as one of England’s foremost research libraries without fully benefiting any longer from the managerial and financial backing of a major research university. It is dependent for its funding on subscriptions from the collegiate members of the University of London, from special funding allocated by HEFCE (including funding for some of the libraries of the Institutes of the School of Advanced Study) and from miscellaneous other sources. It considers that its collegiate subscriptions fall well below what is required to sustain a leading research library whereas some colleges of the University of London complain that their subscriptions are poor value for money and are paid at the expense of investment in their own libraries.
57. For reasons set out earlier (see paragraphs 33 and 42), it is difficult on either strategic or financial grounds to justify a continuation of special funding for SHL, other than for the protection of the libraries and holdings that support the

work of the School of Advanced Study. SHL would not have been sustainable over the medium term on the current funding model, even if HEFCE special funding had been maintained. The future mission and funding of SHL should be collectively determined by the collegiate University of London, in the light of the colleges' individual and collaborative plans for their own libraries. A number of models might be considered, whose elements could include, for example: the concentration of ULRs on the accommodation and management of its special collections and archives and the SAS libraries; the dispersal of part of its main collections to other University of London libraries and the leasing of space made vacant; a more concerted effort to implement a complementary rather than overlapping collections policy; and higher subscriptions from collegiate members (and the extension of membership to HEIs outside the University of London, such as Westminster, London Metropolitan and South Bank).

58. It is recognised that the long-term future of SHL raises acutely difficult decisions for the University of London and its constituent colleges. A secure future will require deeper and more sustained collaboration between the college libraries and SHL. There is scope for cost savings from inter-London library agreements on de-duplication, collections development and common services, of which the currently proposed idea of a London Digital Library Platform is a fledgling but encouraging example. ***HEFCE should encourage the University of London and the constituent colleges to undertake a fundamental review of the future role of the Senate House Library in the light of the cessation of special funding and should contribute to the costs of such a review. It should also consider continuing to meet a portion of the exceptional costs of access for external UK users to the special collections and archives, for the five-year period from 2010-11, in the light of a comparison of fEC and user analyses with those conducted for the NRLs.***

List of Recommendations

1. HEFCE should continue to provide additional special funding, on a renewable long-term basis, to research libraries that meet four criteria: a unique collection or a holding of a critical mass of rare material; a significant and essential contribution to the national research base; associated costs beyond that which the host institution could reasonably be expected to maintain from its own resources; and a track record of high-quality services and facilities to external researchers.
2. HEFCE should merge the separate special funding schemes for the support of research libraries into a single identifiable budget, for the purposes of supplementing QR funding for those universities with designated 'National Research Libraries' (NRLs)
3. The new supplementary funding budget for NRLs should comprise the combined total of the existing transitional access strand, legal deposit, and whole-institution funding streams, uplifted annually by the government deflator
4. For the years 2008/09 and 2009/10, as an interim measure, supplementary funding for the libraries of Cambridge, LSE, Oxford and SOAS should remain at the same level as the current level of special funding
5. There should be no supplementary funding for the library of University College London
6. The part of the special funding to the University of London currently allocated to the Senate House Library that is proportionate to the relative costs incurred by SHL in its development and management of the collections in English Studies, Music, Philosophy, Romance Studies, US Studies and immediately cognate studies, should be transferred to the special funding for the School of Advanced Study;
7. The remainder of the special funding for SHL should be phased out over the period 2008-9 to 2009/10 and the resulting savings should be re-allocated as supplementary funding to John Rylands University Library at the University of Manchester.
8. HEFCE should designate the libraries of Cambridge, LSE, Manchester, Oxford and SOAS as National Research Libraries (NRLs) entitled to renewable long-term supplementary funding in return for a specified and periodically assessed quality of provision and collaboration in national strategic programmes for collections development and services.
9. HEFCE should commission a TRAC-based full economic cost (FEC) analysis of the net additional recurrent and capital costs encountered by the NRLs. It should also require the libraries to create mainstream data bases that provide the data necessary for such an analysis on a standard template.
10. The use and cost of provision of access to special collections and archives (as distinct from the main collection) should form the subject of a separate analysis

11. A special but comparable analysis should be undertaken of the cost experienced by Oxford and Cambridge of acquiring, maintaining and providing access to its legal deposit material and of the use made of the material by UK researchers.

12. HEFCE should encourage the University of London and the constituent colleges to undertake a fundamental review of the future role of the Senate House Library in the light of the cessation of special funding and should contribute to the costs of such a review. It should also consider continuing to meet a portion of the exceptional costs of access for external UK users to the special collections and archives, for the five-year period from 2010-11, in the light of a comparison of fEC and user analyses with those conducted for the NRLs.

Appendix A: Respondents to the Consultation

Name	Research Institute or Body	Research Interest
Professor A. S. Adair	University of Ulster	Engineering & Built Environment
Professor Peter Alcock	University of Birmingham	Social Sciences
Professor Stephen H. Bailey	University of Nottingham	Public Law
Professor David Baker	Marjon affiliated to University of Exeter	
Prof Peter Banister	Manchester Metropolitan University Association of Heads of Psychology Departments	Psychology
Professor Martin Barker	Aberystwyth	Film & Television Studies
Andrea Beddard	ARUP	
Professor Diane Berry	University of Reading	Psychology
Dr Alistair Black	Leeds Metropolitan University	Library & Information History
Ken Booth	University of Aberystwyth	International Politics
Professor Stephen Bottoms	University of Leeds	English & performing arts
Professor Peter Bowler	Queen's University Belfast	History & Anthropology
Maxine Bristow	University of Chester	Art & Design
Chris Brookes	ICMA Centre, University of Reading.	
Margaret Brown	Kings College London	Education & Professional Studies
Roger Brownsword	Kings College London	Law
Professor Steve Bruce	University of Aberdeen	Social Science
Professor Vicki Bruce	University of Edinburgh	Experimental Psychology
Professor Terry Brugha	University of Leicester	Psychiatry
Professor Judith Bryce	University of Bristol Modern Languages	Italian Renaissance
Theresa Buckland	De Montfort University	Performing Arts
Dr Jennifer Burns	University of Warwick	Italian Language
Dr Mike Byfield	University of Southampton	Civil Engineering
Professor G. D. Caie	University of Glasgow	English Language
Heather Campbell	University of Sheffield	Town & Regional Planning Social Sciences Humanities & Languages
Angela Claus	University of Westminster	
Mark Clegg	Open University	Music
Dr Matthew Isaac Cohen	Royal Holloway, University of London	Drama & Theatre
Professor James A. Coleman	Open University Education & Languages	French Literature
Professor Martin Conway	British Psychological Society	Psychology
Professor Malcolm Cook	University of Exeter (MHRA) Humanities	10th C French Studies
Professor Diana Coole	Birbeck University of London	Politics & Sociology
Professor Sally-Ann Cooper	University of Glasgow Psychological medicine	Learning Disabilities
Professor Penelope Corfield	Royal Holloway	History
Professor Roger Cotterrell	Queen Mary & Westfield College University of London	Legal Theory & Law
Michael Crawford	Hellenic & Roman Societies	Classics
John Scott Cree	Government Social Research Unit HM Treasury	Social Science
Professor Catherine Davies	University of Nottingham Modern Languages	Hispanic & Latin American Studies

Rosemary Deem	University of Bristol Graduate School of Education	Education
Maria Delgado	Queen Mary UoL	English & Drama
	University of Exeter	History
Professor Robert Dingwall	University of Nottingham Science & Society	Law & Social Sciences
Jean Duffy	University of Edinburgh Language & Culture	French
Brian Durrans	British Library	Anthropology & Asian Studies
Richard Dyer	Kings College London	Film Studies
Diane Edwards	Cardiff University	Ocean, Earth & Planetary Sciences
Professor Roy Ellen	University of Kent	Anthropology
Professor J. Cheryl Exum	University of Sheffield	Biblical Studies
Professor David Fergusson	University of Edinburgh	Divinity
John Field	University of Stirling	Education
Professor Allan Findlay	University of Dundee	Arts & Social Sciences
Professor C. Mary Fowler	Royal Holloway UoL	Geology
Penny Franks	University of Leeds	East Asian Studies
Professor Michael Fulford	University of Reading Human & Environmental Sciences	Archaeology
Paul Furlong	Cardiff University	Italian
John Gaffney	Aston University Languages & Social Sciences	French
Maureen Galbraith / Richard Smith	University of Glasgow / Cambridge Economic History Society	History
Annabel Gallop	British Library	Malaysian & Indonesian Studies
Professor John Gardener	Queen's University Belfast	Education
Professor Simon Gaunt	Kings College London	French
Helen Gilbert	Royal Holloway UoL	Drama & Theatre Studies
Professor Peter Golding	Loughborough University	Sociology
Professor Susan-Mary Grant	University of Newcastle	History – 19th Century USA
Judith Green	University of Edinburgh	History & Classics
Robin Green	CURL Consortium of Research Libraries	
Professor Lorna Hardwick	The Open University Arts	Classical Studies
Professor Jonty Harrison	University of Birmingham	Humanities
Professor C. S. Hay	University of Birmingham	Political Science and International Studies
Professor Roy Harrison	University of Birmingham Geography & Environmental Sciences	Environmental Health & Risk Management
Nick Hewlett	Oxford Brookes	French
Mr Robert Hodgkinson	Institute of Chartered Accountants	Accountancy
Professor Keith Hoskin	University of Warwick	Business and Management
Professor Peter Humphrey	University of St Andrews	Art History
Dr Robin Jackson	The British Academy	
Professor Frank A. J. L. James	Royal Institution –The British Society of the History of Science (BSHS)	History of Science
Professor Richard Jardine	Imperial College London Civil Engineering	Geomechanics / Geotechnics

Geraint Jenkins	University of Wales Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies	Celtic Studies
Professor Timothy Jickells	University of East Anglia	Environmental Sciences
Stephanie Jordan	Roehampton University	Dance
Dr Michael Jubb	Research Information Network (RIN)	
Professor David Langford	Glasgow Caledonian University	Construction Management
Paul Lawless	Sheffield Hallam University Dept Economic & Social Research	Urban Policy & Problems
Professor Judith M. Lieu	Kings College London Theology	New Testament Studies
Professor Peter Rolf Lutzeier	PVC – University of Hull	
Professor Anthony MacFarlane	University of Warwick	History – Latin American
Professor Heidi MacPherson	University of Central Lancashire (DeMontfort)	Humanities – American Literature
Professor Tony Manstead	Cardiff University	Psychology
Professor R. J. Marsh	University of Bath Modern Languages	Russian Studies
Professor Graham Matthews	Loughborough University	Information Science & Management
Professor James McLaverty	Keele University Humanities & English	Textual Criticism
Professor Simon McVeigh	Goldsmiths University of London	Music
Professor Jane Millar	University of Bath	Social & Policy Sciences
Professor Elizabeth Moignard	University of Glasgow	Classical Art & Archaeology
Professor Michael Moriarty	Queen Mary University of London	Modern Languages
Liam Murphy (Chief Exec)	Copeland Borough Council	Sociology
Professor George Newlands	University of Glasgow	Theology & Religious Studies
Professor Judith Newman	University of Nottingham	American Studies
	Roehampton University VC's office	
Professor Sheina Orbell	University of Essex	Psychology
Professor Mair Parry	University of Bristol	Italian
Dr Diana Paton	University of Newcastle	History
Prof A. J. Payne	University of Sheffield	Politics
Professor Ruth Pearson	University of Leeds	Politics & International Studies
Professor Judith Petts	University of Birmingham	Geography, Earth & Environmental Sciences.
Professor Tony Prosser	University of Bristol	Law
Professor James Campbell Quick	Lancaster University	Business Administration
Gareth Rees	Cardiff University	Social Sciences
Tom Reilly	Liverpool John Moores University	Sport & Exercise Sciences
Jonathan Rigg	Durham University	Geography
Professor Christopher J. Rowe	University of Durham	Classics & Ancient History
Professor Patricia Rubin	Courtauld Institute of Art	Renaissance Art
Professor Rick Rylance	University of Exeter	Arts, Languages & Literature
David Sanders	University of Essex	Government
John Saunders	Aston University	Marketing
Lynne Innes Schofield	University of Kent	
John Scott	University of Essex	Sociology

Steven Scrivener	UAL University of the Arts	Arts
Professor Adrienne Scullion	University of Glasgow	Theatre, Film & Television
Lesley Sharpe	University of Exeter Modern Languages	German
Professor Michael Silk	Kings College London	Classics
Professor G. Singh	University of Birmingham	Theology & Religion
Professor John Sloboda	University of Keele	Psychology of Music
Penny Sparke	Kingston University	Art, Design & Music
Steve Sparks	University of Bristol	Earth Science
Professor J. Jan Sress	University of St Andrews	Russian
Prof Peter Stoneley	University of Reading	English & American Studies
Nigel Tallis	British Library	Middle Eastern Studies
Helen Taylor	University of Exeter	English
Jane Taylor	Durham University, Collingwood College	Medieval French
Jonathan Taylor	British Library	Middle Eastern Studies
Peter Taylor-Gooby	University of Kent	Risk in Social Science
Jonathan Thomas	Edinburgh University	Management & Economics
Professor Nigel Thrift	University of Warwick	
Prof Galin Tihanov	University of Lancaster	Comparative Literature & Intellectual History
Professor Rick Trainor	Institute of Historical Research, Senate House	History
Professor Rick Trainor	Kings College London	
Professor Graham Turpin	University of Sheffield	Clinical Psychology
Sarah Tyacke	The National Archives	History
Ginette Vincendeau	Kings College London	Film Studies
Professor Peter Waldron	University of East Anglia	History
Dr Jonathan P. Wainwright	University of York	Music
Professor Susan Ward	University of Leeds	Sport & Exercise Sciences
Professor Shearer West	University of Birmingham	History
Professor John Whenham	University of Birmingham	Music
Michael Whitby	University of Warwick	Classics
Michael Whitby	University of Warwick	Medieval Studies
Professor Iain Whyte	University of Edinburgh	Architectural History
Professor Chris Wickham	Oxford University - All Souls.	Medieval History
Helen Wilson	University of Leeds	
Sharon Witherspoon	The Nuffield Foundation	
Professor Greg Woolf	University of Edinburgh	Classics
Susan Woodhouse	British Library	Ancient Egypt & Sudan
Professor Elizabeth Yeague	Foreign & Commonwealth Office	
Professor David Yeandle	Kings College London Graduate Studies	German
Professor Nira Yuval-Davis	University of East London Social Sciences Media & Cultural Studies	Gender, Sexuality & Ethnic Studies

Appendix B (Tables 5-9): Services to External Users

Table 5: Services to external users: Opening hours, reader study spaces, open access browsing and average fetching time

	University of London Senate House	University of Oxford OULS inc. Bodleian	University of Cambridge Library (main library only)	University of Manchester John Rylands University Library	London School of Economics British Library of Economic and Political Science	School of Oriental and African Studies Library	University College London Library
Main collection term time	Mon-Thurs 9am-9pm Friday 9am- 6.30pm Saturday 9.45 am-5.30pm	Bodleian Mon-Fri 9am- 10pm Saturday 10-4pm (other libraries vary)	Mon-Fri 9am- 7.30pm Saturday 9am-5pm (longer during Easter term)	Main Library Mon-Thurs 8am- 11.30pm Friday 8am-9.30pm Saturday 9am- 9.30pm Sunday 12pm- 11.30pm	Mon-Fri 8am- 11pm Saturday 10am- 9pm Sunday 10am- 9pm (24 hr opening after Easter week until 3 rd week in June)	Mon-Thurs 9am- 8.45pm Friday 9am-7pm Saturday 9.30am- 5pm	Times vary by library Bloomsbury campus libraries: 9.30am-10.00pm (open till midnight for reference during third term and Easter vacation)

Main collection vacation period	Mon-Fri 9am-6pm Saturday 9.30am-5.30pm	Bodleian Mon - Fri 9am-7pm, Sat 10am-4pm	Mon-Fri 9am-7pm Saturday 9am-5pm	Mon-Thurs 8am-7pm Friday 8am-5.30pm Saturday 9am-1pm	Mon- Fri 9am-8pm Saturday 10am-8pm	Mon-Fri 9am-5pm Saturday 9.30-5pm	Times vary by library Bloomsbury campus libraries: 9.30am-9pm (open till midnight for reference during third term and Easter vacation)
Archive/Special collection term time	The same as the main collection	The same as the main collection	The same as the main collection	<u>John Rylands Library, Deansgate</u> Tuesday, Sunday 12pm-5pm All other days 10am-5pm	Mon-Thursday 10am-8pm Friday 10am-5pm Saturday 11am-6pm	The same as the main collection	The same as the main collection
Archive/Special collection vacation period	The same as the main collection	The same as the main collection	The same as the main collection	<u>John Rylands Library, Deansgate</u> Tuesday, Sunday 12pm-5pm All other days 10am-5pm	Mon-Thursday 10am-8pm Friday 10am-5pm	The same as the main collection	The same as the main collection

Reader study spaces	538	3,892 reader seats	900	2669, of which 49 in Special Collections Division at Deansgate	c.1360	1000	1163
Open access browsing	Y 25%	Y 2.4 million c. 27%	Y 2 million + items c. 30%	Y 75% of main collection is open access. All special collections closed access.	Y 95%	Y 100% main collection special collections closed access	100% of open shelf collections. Material in UCL Special Collections, in restricted teaching collections and shelved in the off-site store, is on closed access
Average fetching time	25 mins (if at Egham repository needs 24 hr notice)	114 mins for same-day requests (main stack; other, local stacks ca.30 mins); ½ day if at repository, 2-3 days if in store	18 minutes	20 minutes for special collections. Depends on location of material (on or off-campus) for other material.	Hourly fetch service main collection Archive: 15 mins	N/A	N/A for open shelf materials. 24 hrs notice if at Wickford

Table 6: Services to external users: main collection material online, special collection material online, pre-visit ordering, e-journals

	University of London Senate House	University of Oxford OULS inc. Bodleian	University of Cambridge Library (main library only)	University of Manchester John Rylands	London School of Economics British Library of Economic and Political Science	School of Oriental and African Studies Library	University College London Library
% Main collection material online	80%	78% of the entire Oxford collection (most of the Bodleian)	100%	95%	<100% (Government documents accessed by print and online indexes)	66%	unknown
Archive/ Special collection material online	47%	Books/journals: 99%; maps 15%; music 20%; MSS 10%; Ephemera 8%	All rare books (except incunabula) Manuscripts: 95% catalogued on-line at collection level; 30% catalogued on-line in detail. Available via local online catalogues or Access to Archives. Small proportion of maps and music	Unknown – work ongoing	Catalogued at level of collection, but not individual items (c.20yr backlog)	In the early stages of being separately catalogued on CALM online. c.2% work ongoing	Approx 1,200,000 not catalogued, mostly archives and manuscripts
Pre-visit ordering	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

E-journals	10,000 Majority walk-in access subject to individual licences	25,000, 99.4% with walk-in access subject to individual licences	29,000 Majority walk-in access subject to individual licences	41,000 Majority walk-in access subject to individual licences (This is as of July 2007)	21,000 Majority walk-in access subject to individual licences	20,000 Majority walk-in access subject to individual licences	12,000 Majority walk-in access subject to individual licences
-------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------

Table 7: Services to external users: Percentage of material digitised/remotely available, ongoing digitisation projects

	% material digitised	ongoing digitisation projects
University of London Senate House	c.35,000 pre-1850 vols from Goldsmiths' Library (so 13% of Special Collections)	Selections from the Harry Price Library of Magical Literature (in association with Adam Matthew Publications)
University of Oxford OULS inc. Bodleian	Difficult to gauge as files not same as items. Approx. 300K items (50M files) free, 60K items in subscription databases (NB inc. Google: figures)	<p>Oxford-Google Digitization Project, part of the Google Books Library Program; c.1M items within scope of the project,</p> <p>Electronic Ephemera -- Selections from the John Johnson Collection, funded by the JISC under Phase II of their mass digitization programme; c.150K+ images, and comprehensive metadata records created for c.65K items of printed ephemera mainly from C18-C19th.</p> <p>Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership, a major collaborative effort involving the University of Michigan and ProQuest; to produce quality-assured full-text transcriptions of 25K texts from 1470 to 1700.</p> <p>Eighteenth Century Collections Online Text Creation Partnership, a collaborative effort involving the University of Michigan and Thomson Gale; to produce quality-assured full-text transcriptions of 10K C18 texts.</p> <p>First World War Poetry Archive (JISC)</p> <p>Artstor: Approx 30,000 images of medieval manuscript illuminations available through http://www.artstor.org</p> <p>15th century digitization project: Digitization of 15th century printed and manuscript material</p> <p>Digitization of non-western printed and manuscript treasures as preservation surrogates</p>

University of Cambridge Library (main library only)	Over 3000 manuscript images including Newton and Darwin papers, Royal Commonwealth Society Photographic Collection and medieval manuscripts. The library is engaged in a rolling programme of digitisation of its special collections. There are also thousands of CUL items in national and commercial online services such as EEBO, ECCO, BOPCRIS, etc	Genizah collection – c.150,000 documents being digitised at present. The library is engaged in a rolling programme of digitisation of its special collections, including medieval and scientific manuscripts, and the Royal Commonwealth Society Photographic collection
University of Manchester John Rylands	Not known	Wellcome Trust. Archiving Clinical Radiology. Image digitalisation. AHRC Genizah Project (11,000 documents being digitised). JISC-funded 19 th century pamphlets project will deliver 3,800 pamphlets.
London School of Economics British Library of Economic and Political Science	Archives: 1.7% of records on the archive catalogue contain links to digital versions of the originals. Here the main focus has been in visual materials e.g. photographs/posters which are not well served by traditional catalogues. Print collections: 0.5% of volumes will have a digital version available by the end of 2008.	JISC funded pamphlet digitisation project.
School of Oriental and African Studies Library	Unknown c.2000 images digitised on University of Southern California's IMPA website	Part of the Furer-Haimendorf slide collection (c.800 images) in conjunction with the University of Zurich; digitising the Anvar-i-Suhaili for a 'Turning the Pages' project as part of the 'Treasures of SOAS' exhibition, opening October 2007
University College London Library	UCL Special Collections digital archive of 1500 images. JISC-funded 19 th century pamphlets project will deliver 4,200 pamphlets. Small in-house Judaica digitisation project about to start. All commercially-purchased e-journals and e-books are remotely available to authorised users, subject to the constraints of publishers' licence	CURL digitisation project 19 th C Hulme tracts; in-house Judaica digitisation project; in-house digitisation of images from UCL Special Collections

Table 8: Services to external users: Summary of all library charges

University of London Senate House	PGR students and academic staff UK HEIs have free reference. Free access and borrowing to UK HEI-registered researchers under the terms of the SCONUL Access scheme. Overseas PGRs and staff reference access £31.50 pa, borrowing access £142 pa. Private researchers £164 pa. One day tickets £5. 7-day passes £25
University of Oxford OULS inc. Bodleian	Bodleian is reference only. UK academics and PGRs free of charge, for reference only. UGs and PGT free during university vacations. Other researchers (non-UK and unaffiliated) £12.50 for each six months up to a maximum of four years. Applications to special collections (pre-1801) require application with 3 rd party corroboration.
University of Cambridge Library (main library only)	Free reference for UK PGR and academic staff. UK UGs and PGT free during university vacations. Private or commercial users £10 for 6 months or 7 consecutive days without charge. Borrowing is restricted to members of the university.
University of Manchester John Rylands	Free access and free borrowing to UK researchers
London School of Economics British Library of Economic and Political Science	Part of reciprocal borrowing schemes, academic staff and students gain access with library card free of charge.
School of Oriental and African Studies Library	Free access and borrowing to UK researchers. The public get 5 free day tickets, then £10/day, reference only. Commercial researchers charged £17.50 per day for reference, £200 pa 3x reference tickets; £400 pa 3x borrowing tickets. Alumni £10 pa reference, £60 pa borrowing. Charges for overseas researchers are higher.
University College London Library	Free access and borrowing to UK HEI-registered researchers under the terms of the SCONUL Access scheme, Band A. Access to overseas university researchers and postgraduate students free. Researchers not affiliated to UK or overseas HEIs: free access if holdings are unique, or £7 per day, or £20 per week (other longer-term charges also available). Commercial rates available on request

Table 9: Services to external users: Membership of collaborative collection management and national and regional access schemes

	University of London Senate House	University of Oxford OULS inc. Bodleian	University of Cambridge Library (main library only)	University of Manchester John Rylands	London School of Economics British Library of Economic and Political Science	School of Oriental and African Studies Library	University College London Library
COPACⁱ	Y	Y	Y	Y (available from end 2007)	Y	Y	Y
UK Libraries Plusⁱⁱ	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
SCONUL Research Extra Schemeⁱⁱⁱ	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
CoFor^{iv}	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SHERPA-LEAP^v	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	Y
M25^{vi}	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	Y
North West Universities Association	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

ⁱ Copac is a free access library catalogue that includes details of materials held in libraries throughout the UK, plus Trinity College Dublin Library in Ireland. Copac includes the catalogues of all the UK National Libraries, a wide range of major university libraries, as well as specialist collections such as the National Art Library (V&A Museum).

ⁱⁱ UK Libraries Plus is a co-operative venture between most of the UK's higher education libraries. It enables part-time, distance learning, full-time postgraduate and placement students to borrow material from other libraries

ⁱⁱⁱ SCONUL research extra is a borrowing scheme for UK HE researchers. It allows academic staff and postgraduate research students to borrow from participating HEIs.

^{iv} CoFoR (Collaboration For Research) was a CURL initiative set up to provide its members and other research libraries with practical tools (templates, guidelines and recommendations) for collaborative acquisition and retention. It also gave special attention to techniques for serial de-duplication and to the mapping of relationships between research activity and library provision (2002 – 2004).

^v SHERPA-LEAP (the London E-prints Access Project) was founded in 2004 to develop open access e-print repositories for seven University of London institutions. The LEAP Consortium is led by UCL (University College London), which also hosts the repositories in the SHERPA-LEAP partnership.

^{vi} The M25 Consortium of Academic Libraries is a collaborative organisation that works to improve library and information services within the M25 region and more widely across the East and Southeast. Since its formation in 1993 the Consortium's work in three strategic areas has produced services and resources for the benefit of learners and researchers