OXFORD UNIVERSITY
GAZETTE

REPORT OF COUNCIL'S WORKING PARTY TO REVIEW THE INITIAL PERIOD OF LIBRARY INTEGRATION

The following report was presented to Council at its meeting on 17 February. Council welcomed the report, agreed with the overall conclusion that library integration should continue and at an accelerated pace, and endorsed all the recommendations in the report.

It was agreed to forward the report to the following bodies: the Curators of the University Libraries, Boards of the Academic Divisions, the Continuing Education Board, the Standing Committee of the Conference of Colleges, and the OULS Strategy Team, inviting any comments to be addressed to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Services and University Collections), at the University Offices.

REPORT OF COUNCIL'S WORKING PARTY TO REVIEW THE INITIAL PERIOD OF LIBRARY INTEGRATION

Summary

Oxford's library collections are a resource of the utmost importance for the University's teaching and research, and they are matched in this country by only the British Library and the Cambridge University Library. Our review has found overwhelmingly positive support for the principle of integration, for the positive achievements of the first three years of the integrated library service, and for what it is now poised to achieve. The process has not been without its problems, and we suggest ways in which some of these might be addressed. Our clear conclusion is that the integration process should be continued at an accelerated pace, and that the governance, financial, and technical contexts make further integration the sensible course to pursue.

Introductory

1. The arrangements for establishing the Oxford University Library Services (OULS), which were approved by Congregation in Hilary Term 2000, included a review of library integration after an initial period of three years. When the form the review should take was considered in Trinity Term 2002 it was agreed that the review should be external to the Curators of the University Libraries, since the Curators themselves were established as part of the new integrated structure. It was also agreed that the review panel should report to Council.

2. Council appointed as members of the review panel:

Professor Sir Brian Follett (Chairman)
The Warden of Keble
Mr Peter Fox, Librarian of the University of Cambridge
Professor Hugh Dickinson (as an outgoing Curator)

Mr Fox provided our link with the two bodies whose reports published in 1995 led to the establishment of OULS (Council's Working Party on Senior Library Posts (The 'Thomas Committee') and the Advisory Group on the Management Structure for an Integrated Library System (the 'Kenny Committee').

3. We were given the following terms of reference.

'Bearing in mind the wider University organisational and financial contexts, to review the operation and cost-effectiveness of the managerially integrated library structure over its first three years as measured against the stated objects of achieving:

(*a*) the distribution of resources within the service to meet users' needs most effectively;

(*b*) the improvement of the capacity of the University's libraries to respond to the needs of their users in the University;

(*c*) the maintenance and development of, and provision of access to, Oxford's collections as an international research resource;

(*d*) the provision of University-wide services such as library automation and electronic media, preservation, and library staff development;

(*e*) the fostering of the qualities of responsiveness, and of flexibility in provision.' Our method of working and the evidence we received are described in Appendix A. The evidence received, whilst raising a number of significant matters, was overwhelmingly supportive of library integration.

The integration process to date

4. On several occasions between 1966 and 1996 the University gave formal consideration to the benefits that might be expected to flow from the development of a unified and more rationally organised library system involving the many libraries funded by the University. Following the Shackleton Report (1966)[1] and the Nicholas Report (1987)[2] a number of changes intended to move the system towards

[1] Report of the Committee on University Libraries.
[2] Committee of Inquiry into the Future of Library Services.

a greater degree of integration were agreed. But it was not until the approval of the principal recommendations of the Thomas and Kenny Reports (1995)[3] that changes were introduced which were explicitly designed to lead to the creation of the kind of radically new organisational structure which would make the integrated library system envisaged in the earlier reports a practical reality.

5. The changes approved by the University during the course of 1996 were threefold. Firstly, with effect from 1 January 1997, the two bodies directly responsible for the libraries funded by the block grant from the General Board (the Libraries Board and the Curators of the Bodleian Library) were replaced by a single, interim body—the Libraries Committee—reporting jointly to Council and the General Board. Secondly, the vacancy in the post of Bodley's Librarian was filled from January 1997 by a new officer (Dr Reg Carr) with a University-wide remit as Director of University Library Services and Bodley's Librarian. And, thirdly, the new committee and its newly-appointed chief officer were charged with bringing forward within three years proposals for the creation of an integrated library service to facilitate the major objectives specified cited at (a) to (e) in our present terms of reference.

6. Those proposals were submitted to, and approved by, Congregation in Hilary Term 2000, following a comprehensive consultation process. The OULS was formally established in February 2000 and comprised the Bodleian and its dependent libraries, the Sackler Library, the Taylor Institution Library, the Cairns Library, the Institute of Health Sciences Library, the English, History, Modern Languages, Music, and Theology Faculty Libraries, the Social Studies Libraries. Since then the following libraries have joined OULS: Educational Studies Library, International Development Centre Library (QEH), Plant Sciences Library, Refugee Studies Centre Library, Sainsbury Library (Saïd Business School), Social Policy and Social Work Library (as part of the Social Studies Libraries group). There is a full list of current libraries and service units in OULS in Appendix B (i).

7. A total of thirty-five (university, as distinct from college) libraries remain outside OULS. Almost all are funded by academic departments, and thus, ultimately, by the University itself. They vary considerably in size and are listed in Appendix B (ii). Discussions on integrating a further seven of these libraries have been taking place over the past year, the most immediate prospects being for the departmental libraries of Geography, Zoology, and Continuing Education to transfer into OULS from 2003–4. Progressing matters has been put on hold pending publication of our report.

8. In discussing with us the evolution of OULS, the Director described the integration process as falling into three phases. Firstly, from taking up appointment in January 1997 to the creation of OULS, he had the hybrid role of (a) managing the Bodleian group of libraries as head of department in his capacity as Bodley's Librarian, (b) exercising a less precisely defined cross-University oversight of library automation, preservation, and library staff training and development, and (c) preparing for the creation of an integrated service. The second phase, from 2000–3, has

involved bedding down the new structures, developing a strategic overview of key issues of service delivery, space strategy, and technical infrastructure, and developing a coherent set of high level policies for the fully integrated service to which the University is committed. He believes, and we support this view, that all the preconditions are now in place for the third phase which runs across the next five years (2003–7) and involves the sustained and systematic implementation of change broadly along the lines of the policies developed over the previous three years. Central to this third phase, in Dr Carr's view, will be:

(a) embedding throughout OULS the culture that there is one library system in the central University;

(b) the introduction of a single budgetary system and a comprehensive staffing plan that covers all constituent libraries so ensuring 'the distribution of resources within the service to meet users' needs most effectively'; crucial to these processes are

(c) appointments about to be made to a number of senior posts, including that of an OULS Head of Collection Management.

9. The integration process has not been without its difficulties. This was to be expected, given a long history where individual libraries had tended to see themselves as 'independent', even though all had been funded ultimately by the University. A degree of staff resistance to change has been encountered. And again, this is not unusual when major restructuring is taking place. Pressures have also been exerted by 'the wider organisational and financial contexts' to which our remit specifically directs our attention and whose extent was only imperfectly sensed around the corner when integration was being planned and established. The impact of these changing contexts is discussed below in paragraphs 17–22.

10. After three years, what, then, does the balance sheet look like? The position is, we think, conveniently, fairly, and, save for one issue, comprehensively summarised in the SWOT analysis at Appendix C that we commissioned from the OULS Strategy Team. The omission amongst the 'threats' is of a reference to the concerns that have been voiced about the level of foreign acquisitions. This issue we discuss below in paragraphs 35–8.

11. The improvements flowing from integration include a number of major achievements, and we draw particular attention to those focused on the user. A number of improved reader services have been introduced across OULS including:

—the closer involvement of users through a comprehensive network of COLPs (Committees on Library Provision);

—increases in opening hours through the termination of a closed week in the Bodleian;

—opening some libraries on Sundays in the run-up to examinations;

—far greater clarity in admissions procedures across the integrated library sector;

—a common photocopying card usable across a number of the libraries;

—the much-appreciated Automated Stack Request System;

—the provision and co-ordination, and thereby the accessibility and availability of electronic resources across libraries, have developed beyond recognition, and plans

[3] Report of Council's Working Party on Senior Library Posts (Supplement (1) to *Gazette* No. 4373, 21 September 1995, p. 37); Report of the Advisory Group on the Management Structure for an Integrated Library System (Supplement (1) to *Gazette* No. 4380, 13 November 1995, p. 339).

are advanced for improved electronic document delivery across libraries, as well as a system for charging for printing from electronic resources;

—the foundations for a more integrated approach to acquisitions are being laid by such measures as the subject-based approach to library services, the appointment of subject librarians with responsibilities for subjects across the University as a whole, and the planned central stock management unit.

All this has been achieved without an increase in budget and against a background of financial constraint.

12. In timely fashion, the restructuring of library services also reflected the significant changes in University governance brought about following the North Report. The new divisional structure and the positioning of Oxford University Library Services within a 'division' of Academic Services and University Collections have brought a far greater understanding and transparency of library issues across the University and have embedded library planning processes within the overall strategic planning programmes of the University. The internal library structures set up by the Director, including the establishment of a University Library Services Strategy Team (comprising senior library managers with the role of advising the Director), have made it possible for OULS to provide the University with a clear plan for the future development of libraries in Oxford. There is now in place a *Vision for 2008*, which, for the first time, incorporates in a single document long-term strategies for library accommodation and electronic resources, and a comprehensive policy framework for collection management. The provision of such documents and the articulation of a clear and agreed strategy and agenda for libraries as part of a regular University planning cycle would not have been feasible in pre-integration days.

13. The integrated library service has also made it possible for the Director to make significant improvements in library automation, staff development and training, and in conservation and preservation services. Prior to integration, Oxford libraries were supported by two systems units, one for the Bodleian, one, the Libraries Automation Service, for non-Bodleian libraries. Inefficiencies and mixed messages—and unwanted competition—resulted from this structure, which has now been remodelled to provide a single unit—Systems and Electronic Resources Services. One immediate tangential benefit from this remodelling has been the new Oxford Digital Library. And the technically complex introduction of the Automated Stack Request System was considerably facilitated by having an integrated structure.

14. Integration has also enabled some progress to be made in the implementation of the recommendations in the Libraries Board's *Preservation Report* of 1996. To date the main achievement has been the development of a Preservation Advisory Service accessible by all parts of the collegiate University. Again, much was achieved prior to integration, e.g. the comprehensive scope of the 1996 report, which provided the basis for far-reaching recommendations. However, to put these in place effectively requires something more than co-operation and general understanding, namely the central infrastructure and positioning of these developments within an agreed planning framework with deadlines for delivery.

15. Integration has also allowed greater emphasis to be placed upon staffing structures and staff development. This is essential if the integrated service is to operate 'as a single library'. This process will be reinforced by the staff establishment review that has now been put in hand and from which conclusions can be drawn as to the staff numbers and grades appropriate to the functions performed in each OULS library or unit. The establishment review is a necessary preliminary to the creation of a single OULS staff budget. This, together with an integrated staffing plan, will enable staffing priorities to be properly determined across OULS as a whole, and will facilitate the deployment and redeployment of staff resources to reflect those priorities. At present, staff costs are bundled into the allocations made to individual units. Although this allows virement between staff and non-staff heads, and therefore a measure of budgetary flexibility that might be *locally* advantageous, it gets in the way of addressing priorities in the best interests of the service overall.

16. Issues remain, as the SWOT analysis shows, but it is important to emphasise that many of these are not directly related to the process of library integration at Oxford but are occurring in all research-intensive libraries, from the British Library through those in all our universities:

—pressure on acquisition budgets when annual inflation of materials (paper and electronic) is two or three times RPI inflation;

—the rising volume of research material being published;

—the provision of electronic resources in both teaching and research, along with the opportunities and challenges of digitisation and preservation;

—the need for more efficient means of collection management and development;

—the changing roles of librarians.

The changing context

17. Changes in the institutional and financial contexts since the establishment of OULS in February 2000 are inevitably having a significant impact on the integration process. The introduction of divisionalisation and Oxford's worsening financial situation have created a perceptible shift on the part of the central University bodies in the interpretation of, and the expectations from, the library integration process. To the original objectives of the year 2000—enhanced managerial coherence, service improvements and reader benefits—has now been added an emphasis upon cost reduction. This shift has meant that restructuring to establish the cross-OULS subject and functional structures has had to be achieved with only modest priming by additional resources very early on in the process and with the limited assistance of previous rounds of OMIS. The additional tasks that managing an integrated system has entailed following the formal creation of OULS have, in the main, simply had to be added to senior managers' existing responsibilities. The additional load is particularly heavy in the areas of financial and personnel administration, because with the progressive enlargement of the integrated system by the incorporation of departmental libraries such administrative responsibilities have been transferred from the former host departments to OULS.

18. We have, accordingly, been conscious during our review of the need to distinguish between, on the one

hand, issues that have arisen as the result of straitened resources, and, on the other, issues that derive from the new structures of management and service delivery. As regards the level of resource, various national statistics show how well resourced Oxford's libraries are relative to other universities. There are exceptionally strong reasons for this given the importance of the collections (especially in the humanities) and the quality of the teaching and research that they support, as well as the unique importance of the historic buildings in which many of the services are delivered. Thus far, even in the serious financial situation in which it presently finds itself, the University has remained most supportive of its libraries, protecting them from the severest cuts and continuing to make allowance for above-average inflation on acquisitions. This support deserves to be acknowledged. But it must be recognised that in present circumstances it is not plausible to press a case for significant additions to levels of recurrent library funding across the University.

19. Divisionalisation, and the new resource allocation mechanism that has accompanied it, are affecting the culture of the University in numerous ways, not all of which are necessarily favourable to the libraries. The increased financial transparency has generally been reckoned a good thing by those to whom we talked; and units across the University argued in written submissions for ever more transparency in library costs and expenditure. But the shifts in funding that have accompanied the introduction of the RAM have cut both ways as far as OULS is concerned. Currently, 30 per cent of OULS's allocation comes from a central top-slice before resources are channelled through the RAM to the divisions. This proportion is deemed to cover the 'public service' element of OULS in terms of its contribution to the general good of the University and to its national and international roles. The remaining 70 per cent derives from the infrastructure charge levied on each division. In the absence of comprehensive activity costing and cost attribution models within OULS (they are currently under development by J M Consulting) some divisions have questioned the scale of their particular infrastructure charge. The new resource allocation procedures have made divisions extremely sensitive to the cost of the academic services, particularly if they are not perceived as directly supporting the work of the division. Although the University has agreed that there should be an integrated library service, commitment to each and every aspect of the provision that OULS makes is not equally shared across the University. How these differences are resolved has to be an issue for the central strategy of the University to address. Given the need for the University to run the RAM broadly in its present form for the next couple of years, we assume that there will not be any major changes to the current pattern of library resourcing at this point. But we also assume that when the RAM is reviewed after its initial period, the University will wish to address the means of funding OULS in the light of the further transparency that will have been achieved in respect of library costs. Finally, and importantly, any adjustments to the funding mechanisms may result in a more accurate reflection in the formulae of where costs are generated and services delivered, *but they will not alter the cost to the University itself*.

20. Divisionalisation has provided an institutional framework upon which the structures of OULS have been able to map fairly comfortably. The establishment of powerful divisional boards has created a strong user voice within the library structures, both at the level of the Curators and in the COLPs, particularly where these are concentrated into single divisional (or in one instance supra-divisional) bodies. As will become evident, we favour retaining this divisional approach to the provision of library services. From the perspective of the service providers, the creation of an Academic Services and University Collections 'division' with its own Pro-Vice-Chancellor has provided a framework enabling the integrated library services to achieve a higher profile on the University's agenda. It is important for this higher profile to be maintained.

21. Rapid developments in the electronic delivery of library material, first and foremost in the sciences and medicine, provide perhaps the major and most important change in context; but it is a change that in terms of how the material is acquired, managed, and delivered, is entirely congenial to integration. Indeed integration is essential for a rational response by the University to the provision of electronic resources. Many of these developments had been foreseen when the integrated service was established, and the coming years will doubtless witness the e-library rising rapidly up the agenda in importance.

22. Alongside the electronic revolution there has, however, been something of a perceived crisis in the acquisition of printed materials. This is not an issue confined to Oxford. But because of the legal deposit status of the University's library system, local concerns have focused particularly upon foreign (including US) publications, which, it is argued, are no longer being acquired in the range and depth required for Oxford's research needs. This is one area in particular where it is important for the present review to disentangle financial and organisational factors that may be contributing to the perception.

Further integration

23. The overwhelming weight of evidence presented to us, written and oral, was strongly supportive of library integration. Where problems have been identified, they concern particular aspects of the integrated system's operation, without constituting any rejection of the principle of integration itself. We have, nevertheless, asked ourselves whether there are any grounds for thinking that the process should be taken no further, or even put into reverse. Our firm conclusion, on the basis of what integration has already accomplished, is that the future lies with library integration, not with a return to 'independent' libraries. It is inconceivable to abandon a process that has enabled the University for the first time—and at a moment when the optimal deployment of resources is of critical importance—to understand and address key resource issues, financial, human, and physical in a rational and planned way. It is equally inconceivable at a time when electronic developments are radically changing the nature of information delivery in directions where integrated management of the resources is essential. The Curators recently approved a framework of collection development policies drawn up by OULS and covering both printed and electronic material, so it will be possible for the next phase of integration to proceed with a strengthened emphasis on integrated collection management and the elimination of unplanned duplication. We accordingly *recommend*

(i) that the process of library integration should be confirmed and continued. As in 2000, the primary aim is meeting user need, and the current high level of user input should be maintained via the COLP system.

It is a long-term process and requires steady nerves and a commitment by all members of the University. We make a number of suggestions below where we believe some modifications would increase the effectiveness of the new arrangements.

24. Furthermore, the following considerations lead us to *recommend*

(ii) that integration should continue at an accelerated pace.

(*a*) Lessons learned in the first wave of integrations should facilitate subsequent additions to OULS.

(*b*) Impetus needs to be maintained.

(*c*) Benefits will be delivered sooner.

(*d*) There will be a more equitable distribution across divisions of the library infrastructure charge in the RAM.

(*e*) In those areas where provision will be mainly electronic, the central management of e-resources will be essential for efficient and cost-effective delivery.

(*f*) The redeployment of resources that will be possible through an integrated e-delivery will bring benefits in terms of released space and enhanced budgets for electronic acquisition direct to desktops.

(*g*) The University's creation of a Restructuring and Investment Fund, and a further round of OMIS, offer timely potential for assisting the acceleration of the integration process.

25. Following the first round of additions to OULS, the implications for the cost of transferred administrative functions are better understood and should be reflected in the baselines agreed when further departmental libraries are integrated.

User issues and further integration in Sciences and Medicine

26. The key issues for the Sciences and Medicine are the overall cost of the library system (and how that impacts on divisional budgets through the infrastructure charge) and the need for a considerable and rapid development of electronic resources to match perceived levels of provision in certain other science-led institutions. The former is, as we have suggested in paragraph 19, a matter that will need to be addressed by the University in the light of further transparency about library costs. The latter is without doubt the central user issue for these subjects.

27. Across almost all of the sciences and medicine electronic delivery is already pervasive. By the end of the decade it is likely to be universal, not only in research but also in many teaching materials. Acceleration of e-delivery is therefore central to further integration of provision to the science and medical divisions, and we envisage this technical development—driven in the case of the science and medical divisions bottom-up from the departments and integrated by the Radcliffe Science Library (or the Cairns Library, where appropriate)—as being the cornerstone for much more extensive integration and the transfer of many departmental libraries into OULS. The reasons why departments have valued having their own libraries

have been proximity, speed of information retrieval, and twenty-four-hour access. Until those features could at least be matched, there was little incentive for departments to contemplate alternative, centrally managed, provision. Electronic management and delivery has the potential to trump that performance by delivering to the desktop. The challenges are not trivial since resources will have to be redeployed from elsewhere in order to provide the necessary range of electronic material and the requisite quality of service. However, this may well be possible by a combination of more efficient collection management and a major reduction in the number of physical sites from which library services are delivered.

28. We have seen the OULS paper *Outline proposals for the use of restructuring and investment funds in the library services of the central University* and fully endorse the proposals for the accelerated development of the e-library approach through the rationalisation of the departmental libraries. We believe that with firm central University and divisional board support for the plan it should be possible in the next five years to see the disappearance of separate departmental libraries, either through closure as having been replaced by desktop delivery with paper-based archiving as required in the Radcliffe Science Library (RSL), or by integration with OULS. Joint OULS/departmental proposals are ready to come forward for the integration into OULS of the libraries of the School of Geography and the Department of Zoology. Also, Physiology and Experimental Psychology, having previously stood back, are now understood to be interested in opening discussions on possible integration. We do not expect all departments to be equally enthusiastic at this prospect; but, as the process is seen to provide readers with an improved service, we expect all or virtually all to become incorporated within OULS.

29. We therefore *recommend*

(iii) that Council and its committees and the divisional boards endorse the policy of accelerated development through the rationalisation of departmental libraries, with the objective of providing all library/information provision in the sciences and medicine through OULS by the end of 2007.

A clear timetable will assist OULS in planning for the enlargement.

User issues and further integration in Social Sciences

30. What was striking in the submission from the Social Studies COLP was its very positive views about the benefits that had been delivered through integration of various libraries into a Social Studies Libraries Group under the overall management of the Social Studies Librarian. Significantly, Social Studies committed itself to library integration in advance of the creation of OULS, when in 1996 a retirement provided an opportunity to bring the Social Studies Faculty Library and the Library of the Institute of Economics and Statistics under single management. The group has been enlarged since then, and the further concentration that will be possible through Stage 2 of the St Cross Site development has given an added impetus to further integration of the remaining smaller departmental libraries into OULS. The commitment to integration manifested in this submission, and in our discussion with the Chairman of the Social Studies COLP, argues strongly for integration initiatives coming from the

bottom up, and we drew the lessons in making our recommendation concerning the future of the science and medical libraries. Managerial co-ordination across the OULS Social Sciences Libraries (Social Studies, Law, Management Studies, Educational Studies, Development Studies and Refugee Studies) will be strengthened by the creation of the Social Sciences Subject Management Group reporting through a Head of Subject Area—in this case the present Social Studies Librarian (see paragraph 46).

31. Submissions from some of the subjects where libraries had most recently been integrated (Development Studies, Educational Studies) perceived a loss of local autonomy; and dissatisfaction was expressed at a lack of consultation over the Curators' decision to make redistributions within the 2002−3 budget to reduce the estimated shortfall in the Bodleian budget. (This was referred to in a number of other submissions too.) The senior managers in OULS are aware of these issues, which in our view are for resolution within OULS.

User issues and further integration in the Humanities

32. Almost all of the University libraries supporting the Humanities are already part of OULS. The exception is Modern Middle Eastern Studies, one of two area studies libraries, the other being Latin American Studies (which comes under the Social Sciences Division), in St Antony's with acknowledged University-wide roles and financially supported by both university and college funds. Discussions about possible integration have already been taking place. There are a number of issues remaining to be resolved, but in principle integration of these libraries is regarded as feasible, and ongoing consideration should be pursued.

33. Where, then, our discussions have focused on the needs and concerns of the Humanities within the integrated system, library integration has been a given, and the dominant topics have been (1) the future adequacy of the University's collections as a basis for research of the highest quality, and (2) the model, presented to us by a number of individuals, which in effect creates two humanities library collections at Oxford: primary and secondary research material within the existing Central Bodleian; and a teaching/'first-level research' collection in a new building on the Radcliffe Infirmary site, adjacent to improved faculty accommodation.

34. We did receive some comments relating to instances of problems in obtaining material from the collections rapidly and reliably. Rather than regarding these as a basis for any general observations, we have preferred to relay them to the Director to pursue as specific operational or logistical matters.

35. Without doubt the OULS collections are amongst the finest in the world for research in the humanities and constitute one of Oxford's particular treasures. At the heart of these, for very many scholars, are the great collections housed in the Bodleian. It is therefore all the more serious if those collections are perceived to be falling behind or not providing what is needed. We have already referred to expressions of concern that foreign (including US) acquisitions in the Bodleian are falling below the level required to support research of the highest quality. This concern has been publicly voiced with regard to other major research libraries in this country. So the first point to make is that it is a perception which is not confined to the Bodleian; although it is, arguably, a more serious matter

here because of the Bodleian's recognised pre-eminence. A second point is that acquisitions budgets have not kept pace with the growth in published material, i.e. what the library actually acquires as a proportion of what ideally it ought to acquire in order to maintain its potential as a research base has declined. Moreover, in real terms 2001−2 OULS expenditure on library materials is slightly less than 90 per cent of the value of its 1997−8 equivalent. This represents a drop of £475,008 in real terms for the OULS as a whole, £105,274 of which is the reduction in real terms of expenditure from special funds.[4]

36. We have not had time to gather specific instances of what is *not* being acquired, and, in any case, such negative examples can be quite difficult to pin down. Nor have we come to any definite conclusion on whether things are not being bought because of shortage of funds or because nobody is ordering them. But what our terms of reference did make it relevant to explore was whether *organisational* factors are contributing in any way to a situation in which researchers feel that they can no longer assume that the library will meet their needs with a high degree of comprehensiveness.

37. In this context it was put to us that the restructuring of responsibilities in OULS with a much greater emphasis on the provision of subject-based services, tailored to the particular needs of user constituencies, both within and beyond the University, while making a great deal of sense, particularly as regards undergraduate and taught-course postgraduate provision, carries with it a risk to the development of the research collections, where interdisciplinarity is a factor, and runs the risk of sidelining the special collections, which are themselves interdisciplinary. As a corollary, it is represented that the new subject librarians will find that their ability to engage in book selection for research beyond the unavoidable demands of taught courses will be compromised by the pressures on their time and attention exerted by their parallel roles as managers of site libraries.

38. These are important concerns to raise. The collections housed in the Central Bodleian, because of their superlative depth and breadth, have a pre-eminent role for research in many humanities fields. Reduction of available specialist staff time to complement the collections would represent a threat to the effective fulfilment of that role, and any irretrievable deterioration would have serious consequences for the Humanities. The subject librarian approach is still in relative infancy, and it is, in our view, too soon to say whether either of the fears described in the preceding paragraph is being realised. On the other hand, benefit in terms of the coherence the subject librarian approach can bring to provision across a number of sites is already commented on in the submission from English. However, user confidence in the acquisitions process is crucially important, and we *recommend*

(iv) that this be considered by OULS as a matter of priority and monitored carefully.

Overall responsibility for ensuring that readers are confident in the selection mechanisms will lie with the new Head of Collection Management currently being recruited.

[4] The inflators used are the higher-than-average figures for library materials, which run at around 10 per cent per annum. The inflation rates for STM material, based on non-UK serials, have generally been above this average inflation for library materials, those for humanities below it.

39. The Head of the Humanities Division confirmed in discussion with us that there is considerable and growing support within the division for the proposal for a Humanities Library at the Radcliffe Infirmary (RI). From the University's perspective this is the one area in the Humanities where there is the potential for significant savings in running costs through rationalising the library estate at the same time as improvements in the service are delivered. There is, though, a clear message from the division that what is required at the RI is not just a humanities lending library for undergraduates and taught-course postgraduates, but also a 'first-level research library' for faculty based on the site, with open access to reference material and journals and as a location for appropriate legal deposit material. In this scenario Central Bodley would then become the locus for research using the collections of primary research materials.

40. We share the enthusiasm for a Humanities Library on the RI site. The RI has now just come over the five-year planning horizon, and we think that exploration of what would be possible on the site should not be delayed. There will be stiff competition for space on the site and this will limit any vaulting ambitions for a library development. We understand that there have been problems in obtaining information from the Health Trust about the buildings that might be allocated for library use. However, it can readily be appreciated that eventual decisions about what might be relocated to the RI will have implications for the provision that is made for humanities research in Central Bodley, particularly with regard to planning for the Newbold project. And the size and nature of any allocation on the RI site will determine the extent to which first-level research material can be housed there. We therefore *recommend*

(v) that more detailed exploration of the capacity and content of a potential Humanities Library on the Radcliffe Infirmary site should begin as soon as possible, not least in order to inform strategic decisions about developments in other parts of the OULS estate, and that this should include a 'business plan' to show whether savings would result.

41. The post of Head of Special Collections and Western Manuscripts which is due to be refilled following the retirement of Mrs Mary Clapinson will be expected to play a leading role in developing plans for an integrated approach to the management and administration of special collections across the University.

OULS and the college libraries

42. Over the period to the end of 2007, during which, we are recommending, the integration process should be extended to cover all of the central University's libraries, consideration will also need to be given to the longer-term relationship between OULS and the college libraries. As more and more teaching and research material becomes available electronically, it seems likely that the traditional division of labour between university and college provision will change. (Not that that division has ever been formally defined except in special cases of minority subjects.) We *recommend*

(vi) that the Curators, OULS, and the Committee of College Librarians jointly keep this matter under active review and plan for what might be a different future.

Management issues

The structure of OULS

43. OULS is one of the biggest departments in the University. In staff numbers—632 on 1 January 2003—it is the largest; in turnover it comes second after the Nuffield Department of Clinical Medicine (2001−2 'Blue Book' accounts: NDM £37m, OULS £21.5m, Physics £21m, Chemistry £16.6m), and it operates over thirty widely distributed sites including some of the most historically sensitive buildings in the University. As more libraries enter OULS it is important that the management structures in place should be capable of driving such a large organisation. Everybody is keenly aware that the new department is having to establish itself in a period of severe financial difficulty for the University. Against this background, we think that the Director has made real progress in fashioning, on the basis of extensive consensus seeking, a rational and comprehensible structure from previously disparate elements, and we support his and the Strategy Team's observations that further changes are required.

44. This process has not been accomplished without some discomfort; and there are ways in which we believe the structure can now be clarified and strengthened. The Director emphasised in discussion that he had been anxious to respect the institutional ethos and to work through consensus rather than *diktat*. The transition from independent libraries with their own governing bodies, in many of which the Librarian reported to a chairman or other faculty officer, to a departmental structure in which librarians-in-charge now report to the Director as head of department, has had to be handled sensitively, as has the interaction between the libraries that were part of the Bodleian group and those that were not. Given that hitherto restructuring has had to be conducted on an opportunistic, ad hoc basis where vacancies permitted, and on contingent factors such as whether OMIS might be available, a clean transition to a transparent and logical management structure has not been possible, and different parts of the structure have been evolving at different rates, with different degrees of line managerial devolution down from the Director. There has, consequently, been some uncertainty about the overall picture; so it has been a useful by-product of our discussion with the Director to have been supplied with the organisational chart at Appendix D, which (*a*) shows the current position, (*b*) registers recent changes in reporting lines, and (*c*) sets out the eventual departmental structure aimed at.

45. We talked at some length about management issues with the Director and with the Head of OULS Administration in the light of issues raised in the OULS Strategy Team (OULSST) SWOT analysis and in a covering paper from the Director, which identified a 'pressing need for management tools to effect desirable change.' One of our aims was to explore the extent to which the OULSST served as a senior *management* group for OULS, with members having executive roles. Covering remarks from the Director to the OULSST submission to the review state that the Strategy Team 'was established in 2000 to advise and support the Director in his overall responsibilities for OULS. The Team generally functions quite well now ... and represents a valuable force for the implementation of change, having recently undertaken a review of its own functions and devising new ways of developing its effectiveness in assisting the Director to *manage* [our italics] the OULS.'

46. The question in our mind was the extent to which the name 'strategy team' was an accurate description, and the extent to which, under that name, this body was responsible for day-to-day management, with 'ownership' of objectives and problems. It seemed to us that a clearer management remit for the OULSST (and a corresponding change of name—'Central Management Group', for instance) would be invaluable. We therefore welcome recent clarification in this direction through the establishment of five new Subject Management Groups reporting directly to the OULSST through those members who have been acting as Chairs of the various OULS Subject Teams, and by redesignation of those Chairs as Heads of the five broad subject areas represented by the new Subject Management Groups: Medical Sciences/Health Care, Science (including the mathematical, physical, life and environmental sciences), Social Sciences (including law), Humanities, and Area Studies.

47. The organisational chart at Appendix D shows that the heads of the various sections within OULS (some lining up with the divisional structure, some with library functions) will constitute a body similar in composition to the present OULSST. These posts are not envisaged as all being at the same level in the staff structure, but the Director is clear that involvement at a top management level of all interests is critically important, not least for embedding the culture of the single library service. The group is quite large, and, while taking the Director's point and recognizing that the OULSST has been playing an increasingly important role in strategic planning, we share the thought expressed by some of those to whom we talked that it currently falls somewhere between being a truly strategic body (for which three-weekly meetings would seem to be too frequent) and a senior management group keeping a tight grip on shared problems and issues (which would characteristically be a more compact body and more frequent in its meetings). At present the closest approximation to the latter is the interaction between the Director, the Deputy Director, and the Head of Administration. Senior OULS managers are evidently aware of these questions of management dynamics, and we refer to them here in the expectation that they will be addressed and an optimal *modus operandi* arrived at. We *recommend*

(vii) that the Director and his senior colleagues consider the type of day-to-day management structure needed to ensure that the next phase of library integration can be taken forward with vigour.

Role of the Deputy Director

48. We are concerned at the demands made on the Director's time by the Libraries Capital Campaign in particular. This has come as a considerable additional burden on top of the many other external commitments that a post of this seniority in the profession involves. However, we were persuaded by the Director's view that the cultivation of major prospects (of which there are now a significant number following the launch of the Capital Campaign) could not be delegated to some other eminent Oxford figure, since at a critical point in every major negotiation, the Director needs to be there in person. The Director is also clear in his mind that the amount of time that he will have to devote to the Campaign will increase further over the next three to four years.

49. In these circumstances, it is essential for there to be a clear definition and understanding of the extent of the Deputy Director's delegated authority, as otherwise there is a risk of 'decision blight' when the Director has to be away from Oxford. The Director's unequivocal view is that his Deputy has full authority to act on his behalf in his absence. Dr Carr does not favour a model of library management in which the Director tends to look outwards whilst the Deputy Director focuses upon day-to-day decisions. Instead he sees the Director and the Deputy Director seamlessly sharing responsibility across all functions. However, if this is the model of choice, it needs to be clearly understood that decisions made by the Deputy have the force of decisions made by the Director. We *recommend*

(viii) that this point be taken into account in the review of the day-to-day management structure proposed in the previous recommendation.

50. As some of our earlier observations suggest, we do not think that nomenclature is necessarily trivial, particularly if it results in confusion about the role of individuals or bodies. We might, then, suggest in passing that a more concise title for the Deputy than the cumbersome—and possibly counterproductive—'Deputy to the Director of University Library Services and to Bodley's Librarian' would recognise the particular importance of the post at the present time.

Committee structures

51. The establishment of the Curators of the University Libraries as a single governing body for the OULS and its constituent libraries, reporting directly to the University Council and its main committees, has been a most significant step forward. The coherent strategic planning that has for the first time become possible has resulted in clear plans and policies for accommodation, an integrated e-strategy, and collection development.

52. We are satisfied that the composition of the Curators guarantees an appropriate balance of representation of internal and external interests, including Council, other academic services, the divisions, college libraries, and graduate and undergraduate students. The two external members have been valuable in bringing wider library and user perspectives to bear on local concerns, and in influencing the Curators' response to national initiatives and consultative documents.

53. We have received strongly positive feedback on the work of the Committees on Library Provision (COLPs), both for their detailed contribution and, more broadly, as an effective and powerful interface between users and library staff. Frequent reference has, of course, been made to the large number of COLPs, and the burden that attendance at them places on library staff; particularly those who attend more than one COLP in the interests of interdisciplinarity and overlapping clienteles. To a significant degree the wide consultative base has had an important part to play in the legitimisation of the new structures. It is also the case, though, that the divisional approach to COLPs has varied to suit local conditions and administrative styles: in science divisions the COLP functions have been concentrated in single committees, with LES and MPS combining in a Joint Committee for Library Policy in the Sciences, and in the case of Medical Sciences also covering divisional ICT. This is in contrast to the situation in Humanities, where there are nine COLPs, some of which have subgroups of their own. We have discussed with the Head of the Humanities Division whether a single Humanities COLP with some less onerous substruc-

ture would bring benefits in terms of 'clout' at divisional level. Dr Walker confirmed our impression that the COLPs were greatly valued, and were doing good work, albeit in a labour-intensive way. He thought that if the COLP structure in the Humanities was modified, his division would still want ample opportunity for faculties and subgroups and individuals to pass up suggestions, especially for acquisitions. We therefore agreed to *recommend*

(ix) that the Humanities Divisional Board should be invited to consider whether a more streamlined COLP structure could be devised to suit the division's needs in a less labour-intensive way.

54. Finally, given emergent management structures in the OULS and the prospect of further extensions of the integrated system, we *recommend*

(x) that the Curators review the appropriateness of their own committee substructure.

Conclusions

55. This review has taken place when the integration process is still in a state of transition. The complexity of the process has been increased by the financial situation within the University and by the adoption of the RAM and the divisional structure. Overall, we believe that those responsible for carrying forward this process with verve and determination are to be congratulated. As a result, we have argued for accelerating the processes of integration not only in terms of functional aspects within OULS (overall management structure, collection management and development, the Oxford Digital Library, reader services, preservation and digitisation) but also in terms of integrating departmental libraries currently within the academic divisions. The particular model to be developed must, of course, reflect the priorities within academic areas.

56. The University has one of the world's great library systems, matched in this country only by those of the British Library and Cambridge, and we believe that the integration processes are essential for this to be maintained.

Summary of recommendations [paragraph]

(i) The process of library integration should be confirmed and continued. As in 2000, the primary aim is meeting user need, and the current high level of user input should be maintained via the COLP system. [23]

(ii) Integration should continue at an accelerated pace. [24]

(iii) Council and its committees and the divisional boards should endorse the policy of accelerated development through the rationalisation of departmental libraries, with the objective of providing all library/information provision in the sciences and medicine through OULS by the end of 2007. [29]

(iv) User confidence in the acquisitions process should be monitored by OULS as a matter of priority. [38]

(v) More detailed exploration of the capacity and content of a potential Humanities Library on the Radcliffe Infirmary site should begin as soon as possible, not least in order to inform strategic decisions about developments in other parts of the OULS estate, and that this should include a 'business plan' to show whether savings would result. [40]

(vi) The Curators, OULS, and the Committee of College Librarians should jointly keep under active review the traditional division of labour between university and college provision as more and more teaching and research material becomes available electronically and plan for what might be a different future. [42]

(vii) The Director and his senior colleagues should consider the type of day-to-day management structure needed to ensure that the next phase of library integration can be taken forward with vigour. [47]

(viii) The full extent of the Deputy Director's delegated powers should be taken into account in the review of the day-to-day management structure proposed in the previous recommendation. [49]

(ix) The Humanities Divisional Board should be invited to consider whether a more streamlined COLP structure could be devised to suit the division's needs in a less labour-intensive way. [53]

(x) The Curators should review the appropriateness of their own committee substructure. [54]

APPENDIX A

The review panel met for two full days on 25 and 29 November 2002. Broadly the theme of the first day was the impact of integration on users, and of the second, the impact of integration on the service deliverers. Before the panel convened, the Chairman also spent half a day in the OULS.

Over the two days we had discussions with:

Dr Reg Carr, Director of University Library Services and Bodley's Librarian

Mrs Mary Clapinson, Keeper of Special Collections and Western Manuscripts

Professor Martin Ceadel, Curator Mr Ronald Milne, Deputy to the Director of University Library Services and to Bodley's Librarian

Dr Judith Palmer, Keeper of Scientific Books

Dr Senia Paseta, Member of the Modern History COLP

Dr Mark Philp, Chairman of the Social Studies COLP

Professor Paul Slack, Chairman of the Curators

Professor George Smith, Curator

Dr Ralph Walker, Head of the Humanities Division

Mr Steve Waterman, Head of OULS Administration

The following written submissions were considered:

Curators of the University Libraries

Divisional submissions

CLOIS (= Medical Sciences Division)

Continuing Education

Humanities

Committees on Library Provision

Classics, Archaeology, and Art History

Development Studies

Education

English

History

Japanese

Law

Management Studies

Modern Languages

Philosophy

Refugee Studies

Social Studies

Departmental submissions

Engineering Science

Materials

Mathematics

Physics

Statistics

OULS Strategy Team

Department of Oriental Collections

Committee of College Librarians

Individual submissions

Mrs M. Clapinson

Dr J. Elsner

Professor M. Hermesdorf

Professor R. Mayou

Mrs S. Miles

Dr Judith Palmer

Professor Richard Sharpe

Mr J.P. Tuck

Other documentation

New Bodleian Library Development Project (NEWBOLD): a revised plan.

OULS Submission to the University's Restructuring and Investment Fund (RIF).

OULS Collection Management Policy Statement (as an example of the sort of policy document on a key strategic issue that has been facilitated through the creation of an integrated service).

A report presented to the Curators of the University Libraries in Trinity Term by the former Deputy Director on the prospects for the integration of further libraries into OULS.

APPENDIX B (i)

Libraries and Services in OULS

Bodleian Japanese Library

Bodleian Law Library

Bodleian Library of Commonwealth and African Studies at Rhodes House

Cairns (Medical) Library

Central Bodleian

Classics Lending Library

Eastern Art Library

Economics Library

Educational Studies Library

English Faculty Library

History Faculty Library

Hooke Library

Indian Institute Library

Institute for Chinese Studies Library

Institute of Health Sciences Library

International Development Centre Library (QEH)

Modern Languages Faculty Library

Music Faculty Library

Oriental Institute Library

Philosophy Library

Plant Sciences Library

Politics, International Relations, and Sociology Library

Preservation Services

Radcliffe Science Library

Refugee Studies Centre Library

Sackler Library

Sainsbury Library (Saïd Business School)

Service Assessment and Planning

Social Policy and Social Work Library

Staff Development and Training Service

Systems and Electronic Resources Service

Taylor Institution Library

Theology Faculty Library

Vere Harmsworth Library

APPENDIX B (ii)

University libraries not currently in OULS

Archaeology, Institute of

Archaeology and the History of Art, Research Laboratory for

Balfour Library, Pitt Rivers Museum

Biological Anthropology, Institute of

Careers Service

Computing Laboratory

Continuing Education, Department for

Criminological Research, Centre for

Dyson Perrins Laboratory (Organic Chemistry)

Earth Sciences, Department of

Engineering Science, Department of

Geography and the Environment, School of

History of Medicine, Wellcome Unit for the

History of Science, Museum of the

Human Anatomy, Department of

Human Sciences, The Pauling Centre for

Language Centre

Latin American Centre

Materials, Department of

Mathematical Institute (Whitehead Library)

Middle East Centre Library

Ophthalmology, Nuffield Laboratory of

Oxford University Museum of Natural History (Hope and Arkell Libraries)

Pathology, Sir William Dunn School of

Pharmacology, Department of

Physical and Theoretical Chemistry Laboratory

Physics, Department of

Physiology, University Laboratory of

Psychology, Department of Experimental

Ruskin School of Drawing and Fine Art

Socio-Legal Studies, Centre for

Statistics, Department of

Transport Studies Unit

Tylor Library (Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology)

Zoology, Department of

APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SERVICES STRATEGY TEAM: INTEGRATION REVIEW—SWOT ANALYSIS

Strengths

User-focused

—Development of a new subject-oriented focus including:

    Subject consultants

    Visibility of library staff working across libraries

    Committees On Library Provision—new mechanisms for users' views and input

    Subject-based induction across OULS as a whole

—A collection management framework and team

—Stock transfers between libraries

—Electronic resources

    Improved financing leading to expansion of provision

    Co-ordination, leading to greater usability and coherence

—Safeguarded opening hours

—Common photocopy card

Staff-focused

—Much improved and expanded staff development

—*Outline* (OULS weekly staff newsletter)

—OULS-wide social events

—OULS conference

—More staff focused on integration, looking beyond their own libraries, through the team approach

Administration-focused

—Strategic direction identified (OULS five-year strategic plan)

—Managers able to think of OULS as a whole

—The establishment of an OULS Strategy Team, together with subject and functional teams

—Raised profile of library services as a coherent body in University governance, speaking authoritatively with a common voice

—Building of an operational infrastructure—platforms and policies to ensure we are well-placed to respond to initiatives and pressures, including

    Preservation (Planning and Advisory Service established)

    Activity-based costing (two reports commissioned, outlining further work)

—Creation of Systems and Electronic Resources Service including

    A unified systems support and development service

    Groundwork for Oxford Digital Library laid

    OULS Imaging Service established

    An electronic resources co-ordinator appointed

[*OLIS*

Although not a result of integration, it is important to identify OLIS (the Oxford libraries union catalogue) as a major factor in enabling integration and in promoting it. Specific post-integration benefits include:

—Addition of libraries to the system

—Automated Stack Request for major libraries]

Weaknesses

Communication

—Difficulties in getting the vision across in a large and complex organisation

    The ideas and the steps necessary to realise them

    Creation of a visible OULS identity

—Communication within the system is patchy, not robust enough

—Clarity about directions has taken time to elaborate and share widely

—The conversion of policy ideas into practice is not followed through quickly enough

—Role of component parts of OULS not yet sufficiently defined

Administration

—The system is large and complex

—Lack of time and resources to carry additional responsibilities

—Management of meetings could be improved

—ULSST does not have enough time with the Director

—Integration of new libraries could have been better—lessons have been learned and need to be implemented

Staff

—There is as yet no coherent OULS staffing plan

—Staff resistance to change

Users

—Insufficient monitoring of quality of service

—Need to know more about our users

—Still some way to go in improving users' access to materials

Space issues

—Lack of space (especially for storage of growing collections)

—Fragmented space

[*Not directly integration related*:

OLIS has limitations—unpopular and outdated interface]

Opportunities

Collections

—Exploitation of electronic legal deposit

—Appointment of Head of Collections Management to drive forward the Collection Management Policy Framework

—Integration of budget allocation for printed and electronic resources by subject

—Exploitation of strong collections

Identity/Publicity for services

—OULS Web pages

Administration

—Using activity-based costing information as a basis for strategic resource reallocation

—Restructuring using RIF, leading to lower recurrent costs

—Opportunity to use new Deputy's post as spur to accelerating reorganisation

Collaboration

—Future opportunities for collaboration at national level: collection development with BL, preservation, linked e-strategies

—Collaboration with other university sectors, e.g. museums

—New funding opportunities arising from RSLG (Follett) report

Space

—Planning for restructuring of sites for users

—New Library H-floor reading room (NewBOLD project)

—Osney Mead newspaper/journals storage and reading facility

—Radcliffe Infirmary site, enabling rationalisation of humanities sites

—Closure of science departmental libraries, leading to acceleration of e-strategy

Staff

—Rationalising technical services across OULS

—Further staff development improvements

—Restructuring using OMIS

—Extension of subject consultant scheme

Technical

—Using OLIS/ASR to improve delivery to point of need

—Common computing environment across OULS

Threats

Understanding integration

—Variant and changing expectations from integration, both internal and external

—Lack of awareness by those outside the service about the precise aims of OULS

—Operating in a new Oxford regime of disaggregated/devolved funding, in which integration runs counter to the current University trend

Staff

—Continuing resistance to change

—'Project fatigue'

—Over-reliance on short-term contract staff

Resource constraints

—Continuing downward pressure on resources

—Need for cost-savings without reduction of service

—Uncertainties arising from reliance on fundraising

—Additional unfunded administrative burdens

—Costs of enhanced management information systems (a prerequisite for informed strategic decision-making)

—Funding essential new developments from 'soft' money

—Failure to take sufficient advantage of RIF

—Physical rationalisation difficult to achieve in the face of uncertainty on the availability of sites

Wider issues

—The persistence of the myths 'The book is dead' and 'It's all on the Web'

—Capital Campaign launched at a time of world economic downturn

Current (and evolving) organisational structure of OULS

OULS
Strategy Team

DULSABL
Deputy DULSABL

Senior Executive
Assistant

Head of Staff Training & Development	Head of OULS Collection Management	Head of Systems & Electronic Resources	Head of OULS Service Assessment Planning and Provision	Head of OULS Preservation & Collections Care	Social Sciences Librarian	Director of Health Care Libraries
Staff Training & Devpt. Team	Collection Man. Team	Manager of SERS	Secretary of OULSST	Preservation Team	Social Sciences Subject Team	Medical Sciences Subject Team
					Head of Social Sciences Subject Area	Head of Medical Sciences Subject Area

Head of Social Sciences Subject Area:
- Economics
- PIRS
- Bodleian Law
- IDC (QEH)
- Refugee Studies
- Business Sch.
- Educ. Studies
- Social Policy

Head of Medical Sciences Subject Area:
- Cairns
- IHS
- Other medical libraries

Head, Staff Train. & Devpt.	Head, Collection Man.	Head, Systems	Secretary OULSST (OULSMG)	Head, Preservation	Soc. Sciences Librarian	Medical Librarian
Partially	Partially	Yes	Yes	Partially	Partially	Yes

Organizational chart of Oxford University Library Services (OULS)

DULSABL / Deputy DULSABL

Head of OULS Administration and Secretary of Bodleian Library

	Keeper of Scientific Books	Sackler Librarian *vice* Taylor Librarian	Keeper of Oriental Collections (Bodleian)	Keeper of Special Collections (Bodleian)	Head of Technical Services (Bodleian)	Head of Reader Services (Bodleian)
OULS Team chair of	Science Subject Team	Humanities Subject Team	Area Studies Subject Team	Special Collections Team	Technical Services Team	Reader Services Team
New title/role from Nov. '02	Head of Science Subject Area	Head of Humanities Subject Area	Head of Area Studies Subject Area			
OULS Libraries overseen	• RSL • Hooke • Plant Sci.	• Taylorian • Sackler • English • History • Theology • Music • Mod. Langs • Philosophy	• All Oriental Studies librs. • Bodleian Libr. of African & Commwlth Studs. (Rhodes House) • Vere Harmsworth (Amer. Studies)			
'Ultimate' title/role in OULS (?)	Science Librarian	Humanities Librarian	Area Studies Librarian	Head, Special Collections	Head, Technical Services	Head, Reader Services
Currently responsible for all relevant activities/resources in OULS?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No