



## RIN Consultative Group for Librarianship and Information Sciences NOTE FROM THE TENTH MEETING – 16 FEBRUARY 2009

*Action points in italics*

### Present:

Jean Sykes (London School of Economics) (Chair)  
Simon Bains (University of Edinburgh)  
Andrew Booth (University of Sheffield)  
Sarah Gentleman (Research Information Network)  
Stéphane Goldstein (Research Information Network)  
Catherine Gray (Research Information Network) (Minutes)  
William Kilbride (City of Glasgow Museum Service)  
Luis Martinez-Urbe (University of Oxford)  
Peter Morgan (University of Cambridge)  
Philip Payne (Birkbeck College)  
Janet Peters (Cardiff University)  
Elizabeth Shepherd (University College London)  
Stephen Smith (University of York)  
Judy Wright (University of Leeds)

### Apologies

Tamasine Ashcroft (University of Birmingham)  
Paul Clough (University of Sheffield)  
Wayne Connolly (Newcastle University)  
Michael Jubb (Research Information Network)  
Monica Schraefel (University of Southampton)  
Paul Vetch (Kings College London)

### 1. **Minutes of the meeting of 28 November 2008** (*paper RIN/LIS/09/01*)

These were agreed

### 2. **Matters arising**

#### *From item 3 – Group membership*

It was noted that Dr William Kilbride will shortly be undertaking his new role as Executive Director of the Digital Preservation Centre; he has agreed to stay on the Group. Also to note, RIN is now an associate member of DPC.

***RIN Executive Team to identify new member with a museum background in light of William Kilbride's move to DPC.***

#### *From item 4 – FoI workshop*

Duncan Tanner (Bangor University) has agreed to be involved in a second workshop in the autumn, to take place probably in Scotland. In anticipation of this, RIN is looking produce a briefing note on the relevance of FoI legislation to researchers. A four-month follow up survey of participants was undertaken after the first workshop and positive feedback was received. It was noted that the University of Dundee has recently set up a Freedom of Information Centre, which might provide valuable input into the workshop.

***RIN Executive Team / Elizabeth Shepherd to firm up workshop details and keep Group updated via email.***

#### *From item 6 – RIN report on objects and artefacts*

The wording of the recommendations was changed slightly for the summary report. RIN has received good feedback and interest from the museum community, with a number of requests for extra copies of the

report. An event is planned in June to further disseminate the findings of the study.

*From item 8 – RIN communications strategy*

As requested, Stephen Smith and Simon Bains have emailed comments about the RIN website, including: the homepage is too wordy; general website content is good, but maybe needs more of a ‘this is what we can do for you’ approach; RIN’s authority needs reinforcing (e.g. making more of RIN’s responsibility to its funders, stakeholders, having their logos on homepage).

*From item 10 – other business*

There will be a SHERPA/RIN workshop on compliance with requirements to deposit e-prints in repositories – this has been postponed but will hopefully now take place in May.

***RIN Executive Team to consider these views as part of the website reconfiguration.***

***RIN Executive Team to inform the group when date is fixed.***

### 3. RIN project on use of e-journals (*paper RIN/LIS/09/02*)

This study, undertaken on RIN’s behalf by CIBER at UCL, is nearing completion. It is based on deep log analyses, on the usage of e-journals across selected institutions and subject areas in the UK. By relating to detailed usage data, the work taps into actual researcher behaviour and thereby provides some evidence in an area where there is currently a significant lack of it.

Comments from the group were welcomed:

- ▶ It was agreed that RIN’s proposed follow up study on researchers do once they download e-journals may be useful, using different and more quantitative methodologies.
- ▶ The audience data could be segmented to take into account differences between researchers/students/librarians etc
  - The study should look at how the searcher gets to the content i.e library tools, Google/Google Scholar, publishers
  - Although the data is strong, there seems to be a tendency to over generalise and stereotype – a more qualitative approach to unpick and find differences may be needed
  - Some points aren’t explicit enough, there seems to be a mismatch between the message the report gives and the data
  - Bangor and Swansea Universities (case studies) use different approaches, therefore the study could look at how different institutions support their libraries and how much of their own analysis has been done regarding usage/data-capture
  - There is a heavy dependency on Science Direct in the study, should there be more comparative information?
  - The study touches on conclusions of open access journals but this is a big issue which needs to be unravelled
  - It is unclear if the results been shared with the case studies, however the report is still in draft form. Maybe they should be asked their opinion on the findings before publishing
  - The group advised caution with the bold headlines used, which can be seen as speculative. However, this journalistic approach does give impact. Suggestion would be to publish as an initial study with tentative conclusions and build in respondent feedback, then take forward in phases

It was confirmed that the background data and working papers will also be available with the main report. RIN will produce an executive summary with RIN's point of view towards the end of March.

#### 4. RIN/UUK guidance on payment of publication fees (paper RIN/LIS/09/03)

Following on from RIN's brief guidance for institutions in 2006, this new RIN/UUK-lead report will be released in March. It is a practical report in response to demand, which will hopefully shed some light on the issues of open access publication charges.

Comments from the group were welcomed:

- There is a limited group of people who would be interested in the whole report, therefore dissemination may be better split into sections targeting particular messages at specific audiences
- Should paying for open access content considered in this report?
- We should find out what UUK are intending to do with report, and what their dissemination strategy is
- Regarding dissemination, it was agreed there needs to be a strong pushback to the high level of the working party representative's company. RIN could advise how they would like to disseminate and ask working party members to help write briefings
- Tie in funding with ref process? Centres of excellence disseminating through open access more widely **\*I'm not sure what the point was here...\***

It was noted that all Research Councils are now signed up to open access and RCUK are to publish a position statement to clarify their joint position.

#### 5. The value of research information services (paper RIN/LIS/09/04)

RIN is looking to undertake a new project to build evidence of the value of information services to the UK research community. The issue of defining value and beginning to frame a series of questions is a difficult challenge.

Suggestions from the group were welcomed:

- Using metrics as key performance indicators, including those which measure digital as well as physical libraries
- Look at previous research which might help with the approach, for example RLG work on measuring benefits, JISC special data services (Lorraine Estelle), British Library studies, also the health discipline has lots of methodologies to measure value
- It was thought that RIN should look further into the Tenopir and King research as it has been received with scepticism by some for generalising disciplines
- Decide what it is you want to show the value of, and set out what values are present before looking at how to examine them
- Undertake a literature review looking at other disciplines as well as the information world to identify gaps and bring up similar research. Suggestion of tapping into industrial librarians also, as there may be more papers in this area.
- JISC are doing a study looking at the value of research libraries to universities – their methodology may be useful e.g how they defined value/impact
- It was agreed this would need to be a long term study over 2-3yrs

*AB to give SG contacts in health*

- RIN should define the UK research community in terms of this study i.e will it only look at post grad or the wider research community?

## 6. Options for future RIN projects (*paper RIN/LIS/09/05*)

A paper detailing RIN's current and forthcoming projects was circulated.

As always, suggestions of new areas of research are welcomed:

- Suggestion of a follow up to the Discovering Physical Objects report to look into differences across disciplines i.e arts and sciences. Also consider the question is digitisation a substitute for being able to touch physical objects?
- Case studies project – this rolling study started off with life sciences (which will conclude in May/June), with the aim to cover all areas eventually. RIN envisages the second round will begin in September and is open to suggestions as to which area that should cover
- Suggestion that the next steps for REF project should look at the interest around impact and also how different disciplines use citation
- It was noted how important it is to keep the knowledge base up to date regarding RIN's longitudinal studies
- Regarding collaboration with NHS, it was suggested RIN targets a specific activity to make contact with, such as looking at how NHS deals with open access, rather than trying to go in at top level for communications
- UK Data Archive – RIN should help to frame advice as to whether data should be kept. Also there is value at looking at other well established data centres such as NERC and the research departments at Oxford to compare. It was noted that DPC may also be interested in becoming involved in part.

*SG to liaise with LMU re Oxford*

*SG to liaise with WK and Kevin Schurer*

## 7. Joint Consultative Groups away day (*paper RIN/LIS/09/06*)

The joint consultative groups away day will be held in Cheshire on 7 & 8 May. RIN will be looking for volunteers to lead discussion groups.

Suggestions for topics of discussion were welcomed:

- ideas on how to undertake the value research project; look at how researchers work and what they want, how libraries and publishers fit in and how they will work in future, what information services are available
- Evidence for advocacy toolkit – how should we champion information services? **\*Not sure about this bit\***
- Maximising the value of previous RIN reports – something to contextualise everything and demonstrate how various strands of work help change agenda

*SG to circulate email next week with away day details.*

## 8. RIN update (*paper RIN/LIS/09/07*)

RIN will be making this paper shorter and more accessible in the future, with clearer strands relating the projects to main themes and the three core aims of developing the evidence base, providing authoritative advice and guidance and promoting change.

It was suggested RIN should produce regular updates to specific audiences,

and consider more niche marketing as well as the current general updates to the wider audience.

**9. Other business**

None.

**Next meeting will be the joint Consultative Groups awayday on 7-8 May 2009**