The role of academic and research libraries as active participants and leaders in the production of scholarly research

A report on an RLUK scoping study

About this report

This report presents the findings of a scoping study commissioned by RLUK in partnership with AHRC to investigate the role of library staff as partners and leaders in the initiation, production, and dissemination of academic and scholarly research.
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RLUK commissioned this scoping study in partnership with the AHRC, in order to investigate the role of academic and research library staff as partners and leaders in the initiation, production and dissemination of academic and scholarly research.

**Executive Summary**

The project has taken a broad definition of ‘Library Staff’. The term refers to staff working in academic and research libraries. This also includes staff working within archives, special collections, museums and galleries reflecting the multifaceted nature of the term and structure of ‘libraries’, especially within a university context.

**Note**

The project has taken a broad definition of ‘Library Staff’. The term refers to staff working in academic and research libraries. This also includes staff working within archives, special collections, museums and galleries reflecting the multifaceted nature of the term and structure of ‘libraries’, especially within a university context.
Executive Summary

The role that research plays within universities, cultural institutions and wider society has changed considerably in the UK over the last decade. The continued development of the REF, funder mandates and institutional and societal expectations, have meant that research has needed to become more inter- and multi-disciplinary; more visible in its impact; and more collaborative and participatory. The Higher Education (HE) landscape has continued to change in response to rising and diversifying student expectations, shifting macro-political and economic circumstances (including Brexit) and wider societal challenges and events. These changes have been represented within the work of research and academic libraries, with efforts to enhance accessibility, decolonise collections, and to embrace technological change and the ongoing digital shift in collections and services. This has occurred within an environment that has progressively emphasised the importance of collaborative research.

Within this environment, academic and research libraries already play a valuable role within the research and scholarly landscape in the arts and humanities and beyond. The potential value of libraries, archives, special collections, museums, and galleries as research partners has increasingly been recognised by research funders. These conditions provide an opportunity for library staff to further contribute as active collaborators and leaders in research.

Through a mixed-methods research approach and widespread consultation, drawing on rich data, this study identifies the ways in which library staff can collaborate in research as partners and leaders; the benefits of doing so; challenges to be overcome; and factors which can facilitate the active involvement of library staff throughout the research process.

The headline findings from this research include:

Wealth of expertise
Library staff bring a wealth of expertise, skills and insight as collaborators and leaders of research. Although libraries have a unique strength and expertise around the collection, its contents, formation and arrangement, their knowledge and expertise go far beyond this. Library staff have considerable technical, curatorial and pedagogical skills which cross disciplinary boundaries and enable them to lead and contribute to a wide spectrum of research and communicate this to a broad audience.

Collaborative by default
Collaboration is in the nature of libraries and the staff that work within them. Libraries sit at the centre of a complex web of communities, whether institutional, disciplinary, or societal. These exist at local, regional, national, and international levels, which mean that libraries are in a strong position to act as conduits and catalysts of collaboration between multiple groups and disciplines. Libraries can leverage this central position to foster new collaborative relationships and to lead and contribute to innovative and cross-disciplinary research partnerships. This is reflected by the nature of collaborations in which libraries are involved, with these crossing both disciplinary and institutional boundaries.

Concept of research to libraries
Library staff are involved in a wide variety of activities which could be termed as ‘research’ but aren’t always understood or seen as such. The concept of research often varies between academic researchers and library staff. This absence of a shared understanding can affect the extent to which the contribution of library staff is recognised.
Complementarity of skills, knowledge and expertise.
Library staff bring a range of valuable skills and experience to research projects which can complement those of other research partners. These include skills around public engagement and curation, literature searching and systematic reviewing, digital scholarship and technical skills, as well as open access, bibliometrics and research data management. Collaborative research between libraries and academics is mutually beneficial.

Spectrum of engagement.
Libraries can be involved in research in a number of ways, which will vary by project, institution and staff member. Library staff add greatest value to research projects when they are involved throughout the research lifecycle, from project formation to the dissemination, and preservation, of outputs. This includes formal involvement in funded projects as Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-investigator (Co-I), as well as offering in-kind support, providing specific expertise, or in an advisory role.

Recognising the contribution of library staff.
Library staff are not always recognised as research partners. The point at which a library joins or contributes to a research partnership can affect the extent to which the contribution of library staff is recognised. The importance of recognising all contributors to research has been emphasised by initiatives such as the Technician Commitment and the hidden REF campaign. While these initiatives are to be welcomed, library staff are not always aware of how they might relate to their work.

Funding eligibility.
Library staff (working within a HEI or IRO) are eligible to apply for UKRI research council funding as a Co-Investigator or Principal Investigator, without the need for a PhD or an academic contract\(^1\). Awareness of this varies across institutions, both within the library and amongst university research offices.

Perceptions are shifting
Perceptions of the library continue to shift within institutions and amongst members of the academic community, from one of service provision to one of active and equal partnership. This progress varies between institutions, amongst individual academics, across disciplines, and is not uniform. Although less pronounced than their role as research partners, libraries are leading pioneering and cross-disciplinary research in several areas and a number are creating structures and ways of working to enhance their role within this space.

Challenges to overcome
A number of challenges exist which can limit the ability and opportunities for library staff to expand their role as research partners and leaders. These can apply specifically to externally funded research and research in general. Institutions, funders, academic staff, library leaders and library staff all have a role to play in overcoming these barriers, which will enable libraries to realise their potential as collaborative partners in, and leaders of, pioneering research.

Opportunities to be seized
There are many exciting opportunities for libraries to further develop and enhance their role as partners in, and pioneers of, academic and scholarly research. These require changes around how research is viewed within libraries; how the library is perceived within their institution; and a focus on building the research capacity and visibility of library colleagues. RLUK and the AHRC stand ready to support the research and academic library community to seize these opportunities.

\(^1\)Library staff, with or without a PhD, and working within a HEI or IRO, are eligible to apply for AHRC funds as a Co-I or PI as long as they can demonstrate their fulfilment of specific eligibility criteria. For full details of the AHRC’s eligibility criteria, please visit: https://ahrc.ukri.org/documents/guides/research-funding-guide1/ (accessed 22 Jun 2021)
Recommendations

In order to realise the opportunities for libraries to act as research partners and leaders, this report makes the following recommendations. The delivery of these recommendations will be underpinned by a joint action plan between the AHRC and RLUK which will support and shape their implementation, and progress against this will be reviewed after two years.

Supporting the research capacity and skills development of library staff

1. AHRC: Eligibility
AHRC should re-emphasise and communicate that Research Technical Professionals (RTPs), which in the arts and humanities context includes library and collections staff, are eligible to apply for AHRC funds, providing they can demonstrate professional experience and expertise equivalent to that of a postdoctoral researcher. This includes as Co- or Principal Investigator where specific criteria are met, which can include professional practice and experience. The eligibility of these categories of staff to be named on funded research projects needs to be communicated to the appropriate people within institutions, including research offices and other research support staff. AHRC should work in partnership with key sector bodies to communicate the eligibility of Research Technical Professionals to apply for research funding via the Technician Commitment activity AHRC will carry out as part of UKRI’s Technician Commitment Action plan.

2. AHRC: Research development programmes
AHRC should nurture and support research development within research libraries, and other collection-holding institutions, through professional development and research enablement schemes. These might include the award of bespoke or targeted ‘research development grants’ to library and collections staff, ‘highlight calls’ which require library colleagues to act as Co-I’s or P-I, or the creation of a Professional Fellowship scheme to enable library staff to enhance their research skills, experience, and credibility. These funded opportunities would provide a clear demonstration of the value and recognition of library and collection-holding institution staff as researchers and will support cross-sector networking through sandboxes, workshops and conferences.

3. AHRC, RLUK, and libraries: Peer Review Colleges
AHRC should encourage greater diversity within the Peer Review College and ensure that members of the Research Technical Community, such as library staff, are represented. RLUK should work to promote these opportunities throughout the research library and collections-holding community, and libraries and parent institutions should support and enable their staff to participate in such roles. Staff membership of a Peer Review College should be seen as an important element of a colleague’s career development and bring internal recognition and be endorsed by libraries.

4. AHRC and RLUK: Technician Commitment
AHRC and RLUK should work together to highlight the significant contribution that library staff can make to the research process as outlined by the Technician Commitment. This should include ensuring that library staff, and their wider institutions, are aware of the potential impact the Technician Commitment will have on acknowledging and valuing the considerable expertise and skills they bring to research.

2An RTP is ‘anyone who brings indispensable specialist technical skills, at an advanced level, to a research project, i.e. professional skills that are necessary for the development, delivery and completion of the project’ (AHRC working definition).

3For full details of the AHRC’s eligibility criteria, visit: https://ahrc.ukri.org/documents/guides/research-funding-guide1/ (accessed 22 Jun 2021)
5. Libraries: Collaborative Doctorates
Libraries should leverage and make greater use of Collaborative Doctoral Programmes, Collaborative Doctoral Awards and practice-based PhDs to develop their research capacity and confidence. Case studies should be sought and published by RLUK where this is happening already, and lessons learnt. These should highlight the mutual benefits of such programmes for both the student and host organisation, and how supervision can be an important element in staff development.

Engagement and advocacy for library staff

6. AHRC: Advocacy
AHRC should continue to celebrate and support the significant collection-holding community, within and beyond the IRO network, which engages in research and innovative scholarship, which can encompass research and academic libraries, museums, galleries, and members of the creative industries. This can include via case studies, spotlight features, advocacy campaigns and events.

7. RLUK and AHRC: Research engagement programme
RLUK should develop an engagement programme, in partnership with the AHRC, to develop a shared understanding and recognition of libraries as research partners and leaders. This should involve a structured series of events, initiatives, thought pieces and networking opportunities.

Particular elements of this programme might include:

a) Advocacy RLUK should capture, synthesise, and powerfully present the contribution of libraries to research, in its broadest sense (offering a definition and examples of this), through the creation of advocacy documents and resources. These should highlight the original contribution to research that libraries make across a range of disciplines and should be targeted at academics, institutions, and funders, not necessarily libraries themselves.

b) Best practice RLUK should publish a series of case studies, aimed at libraries, exploring best-practice and lessons learnt regarding collaboration and research leadership.

c) Cross-sector conversations Working with its partners, RLUK should continue to convene cross-sector conversations with colleagues from across the Galleries, Libraries, Archives and Museums sector, with members of the Academic community, regarding the encouragement and support of cross-disciplinary and sector research. This will include via the AHRC-RLUK joint engagement programme.

Institutional recognition for library staff: changing cultures

8. Libraries: Showcasing research expertise and capacity
Libraries should support and enable their staff to effectively communicate the research they undertake and the research skills and expertise their library holds via research profiles, featured staff publications and staff contribution to research seminar series or events. This will help potential research partners, both internal and external to the organisation, to identify expertise held within the library to support research partnerships.
9. Libraries / Institutions: Supporting research skills and capacity

Libraries should explore ways of developing and supporting staff research skills and capacity through activities such as staff research development schemes and the inclusion of research as part of core responsibilities. RLUK will support this process and a working group should be established to investigate this further, drawing on recently available resources to RLUK members such as the ARL Position Description Bank to examine how this is done internationally. Libraries, and their parent institutions, should also explore secondment and fellowship opportunities within the library, through which academic researchers can share their experience and expertise.

10. Institutions: Library representation and recognition

The contribution that libraries can make as research partners and leaders should be recognised and represented within their wider institutions. This can include through the library being represented on institutional research committees and panels, and members of research offices having the opportunity to develop a greater understanding of the potential contribution that libraries can make to the research process.

11. Academics

RLUK and AHRC will work to ensure a strong academic voice features within any forthcoming research development programme, and that researchers are represented across a range of disciplines and institutions. Members of the academic community are encouraged to engage with this programme and its discussions.

12. Academics

Should actively engage with library staff during the development of research and academic programmes, including Collaborative Doctoral Partnerships and Awards, to ensure that these benefit from the skills and expertise of library staff wherever possible.

13. Academics

To be conscious to cite and reference the contributions made by library colleagues to the research process, whether as a formal research partners or via informal channels, including via such frameworks as the CRediT - Contributors Roles Taxonomy.

This executive summary, and the report that follows, is an invitation on behalf of RLUK and the AHRC to colleagues working across the library, information, and academic communities to work with them to further enhance the role and ability of academic and research library colleagues to act as participants and leaders of scholarly research.
Background

This section outlines the objectives of the scoping study, the context, methods employed, scope and definitions.

Note

The project has taken a broad definition. The term ‘Library Staff’ refers to staff working in academic and research libraries. This also includes staff working within archives, special collections, museums and galleries reflecting the multifaceted nature of the term and structure of ‘libraries’, especially within a university context.
2 Background

This scoping study was commissioned by RLUK in partnership with AHRC to investigate the role of library staff as partners and leaders in the initiation, production and dissemination of academic and scholarly research. The study was undertaken by a team led by Pete Dalton at Evidence Base, Research and Evaluation Service based at Birmingham City University in partnership with associates. The study was conducted between 1st February and 30th June 2021 with the following aims:

- To understand what roles academic and research libraries are currently playing as partners and as leaders in the research process
- To understand what further roles academic and research libraries could play in the scholarly research process
- To understand the nature and extent of the barriers and challenges that exist to exploiting this potential further
- To make recommendations of what steps need to be taken to engender further collaborative research, and by whom.

2.1 Contextual review

The Higher Education landscape has changed rapidly in the UK, alongside unparalleled developments in information and communications technology and digitisation of content and services. These developments have had a significant impact on traditional library and information provision. This has occurred within an environment that has progressively emphasised the importance of multidisciplinary research. The potential value of libraries (and museums, galleries, and special collections) as research partners has increasingly been recognised by research funders. For example, through schemes such as Collaborative Doctoral Partnerships and recognition of Independent Research Organisations (IROs). However, barriers remain for many academic libraries acting as full and embedded partners in scholarly research.

Little has been reported about library collaboration with academics as co-researchers, but the benefits of collaboration in a general sense have been widely discussed. Examples include collaboration for information skills teaching; online learning delivery; space and service design; collection development; and public engagement and outreach activities.

Recent research has explored the shifting status of academic and research libraries from one of service provision to active research partnership and the pioneering of new processes and platforms. Nevertheless, reported instances of academic and research libraries as partners in, and leaders of, academic research are relatively rare. These predominately refer to overseas libraries, although within the UK, there has been some interest in the role of libraries in collections-based research for example, work taking place in RLUK member libraries, to demonstrate the contribution that unique and distinctive collections can make to research, as well as teaching and learning.

A number of recent initiatives sought to emphasise and promote the contribution of a greater variety of professionals to the research process than has been facilitated through established academic recognition frameworks. The recent Technician Commitment initiative demonstrates a move to ensure that all staff have appropriate ‘visibility’, ‘recognition’, ‘career development’ and ‘sustainability’. The hidden REF initiative similarly aims to recognise ‘all research outputs and every role that makes research possible’. Recognition of the contribution of library staff as active partners in research is important.
Kennedy et al. consider that librarians become highly productive researchers through: a positive research environment with high institutional expectations; a variety of institutional supports for research; extrinsic rewards, such as salary increases, tenure, promotion and opportunities for advancement; and the librarian's own research network. Practical suggestions for encouraging and facilitating practitioner research in an academic library include: incorporating research activity into job descriptions and annual performance reviews; facilitating peer support for research; and providing competitive research awards, research training opportunities and funding for staff presenting at external events.

Excellent communication and negotiation skills have been identified as being at the core of fruitful collaboration between academics and libraries. Literature discussing academic/library collaboration in general identifies benefits and constraints which include: librarian's skills and attributes; library mechanisms and structures; senior leadership engagement and consultation and communication.

Whilst the potential role of libraries becoming directly involved in research activity is largely missing from the literature, advanced research support is a theme that is widely discussed. This includes areas such as research data management (RDM) and research information management (RIM). An ARL review of trends and issues affecting HE, noted that some libraries offer advanced research data services, comprising training or assistance on data analysis, data visualization and data integrity. Other examples include the provision of new and advanced services for scholarly communication, such as for OA publishing, copyright support and research data management, and research impact services such as citation tracking.

The key themes in the literature regarding future opportunities focus around the further development of advanced research support services in libraries to facilitate academic research, such as the combination of traditional services with new technological developments. For example, text and data mining, bibliometrics, artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, immersive reality, and the Internet of Things. There is also a need to grow relationships between libraries and research offices to better promote the library as a support service independent of academic discipline.

Therefore, academic and research libraries already play a valuable role within the research and scholarly landscape. However, there are opportunities for them to play a more active and prominent role as partners and leaders in the production of scholarly research. Academic and research libraries have the potential to cross boundaries and facilitate and promote interdisciplinary research. Furthermore, library staff have a range of skills and qualities that can be harnessed to further support the production and utilisation of scholarly research.
2.2. Scope and definitions

The scope of this study focuses on library staff who are active collaborators in research projects. Table 1 provides key points about the scope and definition of the scoping study. The full scope statement can be found in Appendix 1.

Table 1: Scope and definitions

| Library’s active involvement as a research partner | Includes: being recognised as a collaborator in a research project. In Research Council bids this will be a named individual. Other funders might identify an organisation but within that there would be a named individual(s). Excludes: libraries’ role in supporting and facilitating institutional research activities more generally e.g. providing open access repositories, providing basic access for researchers to use repositories. Excludes internal service development research e.g. library user studies, user experience research. |
| Academic and research libraries | Includes information or cultural organisations which are integral to, or closely associated with, an academic or research library such as a university museum, gallery, archive or special collection. Includes all UK research and academic libraries. |
| Academic, researcher or scholar | Academics working across a range of disciplines. The focus was on Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (SHAPE); however, relevant examples from STEM were considered. |
| Library Staff | Includes staff working in information or cultural organisations which are integral to, or closely associated with, an academic or research library such as a university museum, gallery, archive or special collection. This includes and goes beyond the RLUK membership. |
| Research activities | Includes activities such as: ● Developing research partnerships with academics ● Collaborative conception and development of initial research ideas ● Research design ● Research proposal/grant writing ● Research project management ● Quantitative research ● Qualitative research ● Arts-based research ● Archival research ● Disseminating research via academic publications ● Disseminating research to practitioners ● Impact-related activities. |
2.3 Engagement in the research

The study undertook extensive activities to provide the opportunity for widespread engagement with stakeholders drawn from across the library, information, and research communities. This included the activities in Table 2.
2 Background

2.4 Research methodology

The research used a mixed methods approach. Quantitative data were collected via an online survey. Qualitative research consisted of semi structured interviews and focus groups. In addition, case studies providing examples of practices in the UK and overseas were produced.

2.4.1. Quantitative Research

An online survey was made live between 22nd February and 31st March 2021

There were 323 survey responses in total

- **Library staff responses**
  - 202 total responses from library staff
  - 167 responses from the UK
  - 140 UK HEI-based library staff
  - 12 responses from 8 UK Independent Research Organisations (IROs)
  - 15 responses from 8 UK research libraries that are neither part of a HEI nor an IRO
  - 35 survey responses from overseas libraries

- **Academic responses**
  - 74 responses UK-based academics
  - 40 HEIs represented
  - 64% from large research-intensive institutions
  - 19% from information/media/communications/studies
  - 35% historians
  - 9 responses from academics outside the UK

Number of responses per institution ranged from 1-6

- **UK HEI library staff**
  - Number of responses per HEI ranged from 1-22
  - 66 HEIs represented, including 85% of relevant RLUK libraries
  - 69% were from large research-intensive institutions

- **Other respondents**
  - 9 Research Facilitator responses
  - 7 University Leader responses

---

4The case studies accompanying this study are published separately on the RLUK website.

5Unless otherwise indicated, the figures presented throughout this report are taken from the survey results. (See Appendix 4 for survey respondents’ demographic data).

6University leaders included senior university managers including Vice Chancellor, Pro Vice Chancellor and equivalent.
2.4.2. Qualitative Research

72 interviews undertaken

- 8 Funders
- 8 University Leaders
- 9 Research Facilitators
- 10 Library Staff / Heritage Professionals
- 10 Independent Research Organisation (IRO)
- 11 Academics
- 16 Library Leaders

6 Focus groups

Consisting of

- 30 individuals

20 library staff
10 academics

- 4 library staff groups
- 1 academic staff group
- 1 mixed academic and staff group

10 Case studies

- 5 UK case studies
- 5 international case studies

---

1 The sample of interviewees was skewed towards large research-intensive institutions with 39 out of 47 (83%) of those associated with a UK HEI were from institutions with research income of 15% or more of total income. A breakdown of participants by TRAC peer groups is available in Appendix 5.

2 Library staff / heritage professional interviewees were those who had experience of active involvement as a research partner within the past 5 years – see 2.2 Scope and definition.

3 The scoping study focused on those outside of the IRO consortium but not to their exclusion. Interviews were conducted with representatives of the IRO consortium to provide contrasting and similar experiences with those of universities. Contributions were also sought from organisations that were neither IROs nor within universities.

4 Library leaders included staff in a senior library management position, for example, Head of Service, in a library or related service (see Appendix 1 Scope Document).

5 Focus groups provided an opportunity for library staff and academic staff to provide feedback. This included staff who had faced barriers to participating in collaborative research or had not participated at all.

6 Out of 21 (62%) of focus group participants were from UK HEIs, from institutions with research income of 15% or more of total income. A breakdown of focus group participants by TRAC peer groups is available in Appendix 6.

7 The case studies accompanying this study are published separately on the RLUK website.
This section examines the benefits that library staff as collaborators and leaders in research can bring to institutions, academics and library services.
3 Benefits of library staff involvement in research

Research enables and underpins the creation of new knowledge and can benefit all areas of society. Collaborative research brings together a wide range of knowledge and skills to benefit the arts and humanities and beyond. It is important to recognise the value and benefits that each of the various contributors to research can bring.

Table 2: Perceived benefits of collaborative research involving research and academic libraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Library staff strongly agree/agree (n=140)</th>
<th>Academics strongly agree/agree (n=74)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative research involving research and academic libraries benefits the Higher Education sector in general</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative research involving the library benefits my institution</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in research benefits my library</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in research has benefits for me personally</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in research has benefits for me professionally</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the vast majority of library staff and academics view collaborative research involving library staff as beneficial for universities and the sector in general, as well as providing personal benefits. In addition, 68% of library staff and 66% of academics consider that there are professional benefits to collaborative research involving academic and research libraries. The case studies produced for this project demonstrate and contextualise some of the benefits identified below.

3.1. Institutional benefits

The benefits of library involvement in research projects for universities and parent institutions include:

- Better staff retention through access to opportunities they may not get elsewhere
- Enhanced reputation of the university thorough involvement in quality research, awareness of important collections and being seen as innovative within the sector
- The development of further networks and research opportunities
- Opportunities for public engagement / impact activities.

...there’s a benefit to our research community but there’s also a benefit to the university in terms of reputation and profile, and future research funding potentially (Library Staff)

...increasingly of course research is assessed by reference to impact and libraries are good vectors for impact. So, I mean that’s definitely made libraries more attractive to academics seeking collaborators…(Academic)
3 Benefits of library staff involvement in research

Table 3. Library involvement and likelihood of contribution to REF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Library staff (n=34)</th>
<th>Academics (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-authored research publications likely to be included</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact activities likely to be included</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the proportion of respondents who had been involved in collaborative research with libraries who said this was likely to be included in their institution’s REF submission. While the figures differ between academic and library staff, for both groups some of the outputs were expected to contribute to the institutional REF submission as part of impact case studies.

3.2. Benefits for academic staff

The benefits of involvement in collaborative research projects for academics include:

- Alternative perspectives that can help to shape the research
- Enhanced reputation of the university thorough involvement in quality research, awareness of important collections and being seen as innovative within the sector
- The development of further networks and research opportunities
- Opportunities for public engagement/impact activities.

I think there is a kind of organisational contextualization that you get from working with archivists that you just don’t get as an outsider. So the ways in which I could understand the context in which these records were produced…just completely transformed the research. (Academic)

...that effort that we’ve put in to develop relationships over many years, they’re just not lost when the project comes to an end. That they’re sustainable, that they remain, that they’re used in a variety of ways. Whether that be for public events or smaller collaborations or assisting with support of one of our PhD projects for example. (Academic)
3.3. Benefits for library services
The benefits of involvement in research projects for library services include:

- Greater knowledge of collections – allowing them to be used more effectively in both research and teaching
- Development and preservation of collections
- Improved access to collections
- Equipment that could be reused for future projects
- Changing perceptions of libraries
- Credibility within the university and greater integration within the academic community
- Potential for better staff retention (though involvement in interesting work and development opportunities)
- Raised reputation and profile for the service – nationally and/or internationally
- Development of networks and new contacts that could have broader benefits for the library service.

For the library, the benefits are around credibility…being able to show that we have a part to play in that research culture is really quite important… (Library Staff)

3.4. Benefits for library staff
The benefits of involvement in research projects for library staff include:

- The development of new skills and knowledge
- Increased recognition of the skills and knowledge of library staff amongst academics
- Opportunities to build new professional links and networks
- Personal satisfaction
- Greater confidence to get involved in research activities and communities
- Learning about different perspectives and ways of working.

...these kind of things help you get the insights into what is possible through those collections. And that will help you design future teaching, future funding bids, and everything else (Library Staff)

...those additional perspectives from the arts, humanities, social sciences or working with commercial interests, will sometimes highlight the collections in different ways, help rediscover the collections, and bring to light information that is either taken for granted or forgotten about almost. (IRO Staff)

...the benefits to us are reputational…it will be a high-profile project nationally as well as regionally. There will also be practical benefits in terms of being involved in a project which will develop some innovative technologies which we will benefit from; we will hopefully learn from the project in terms of public engagement. (Library Staff)

...professional satisfaction is a huge benefit as well, because I can share my knowledge and experience, which might be relevant and useful to other academics preparing grant applications, to students as well as library and archival professionals. (Library Staff)

...the lead librarians….felt very involved because they helped shape the project and they felt very revitalised is the word that a lot of them used, because they’d never been involved in this capacity, even though many of them were qualified to be involved in this capacity. (Academic)
3.5. Motivation for involvement in research

The reasons library staff gave for becoming involved in research varied. At present, it is more usually personal motivation, rather than external impetus from the library services or wider institution. Library staff hope to develop new skills and knowledge; gain confidence in undertaking research; widen their professional networks and perspectives; and gain personal satisfaction. Whereas, in IROs, research involvement is often considered in terms of strategic direction of the organisation, this is not usually the case for HEI-based libraries at present and, as a result, research involvement is usually more piecemeal and dependent on the personal motivation of individuals.

There are people on the project who I would never have met if I hadn’t been on the project… so it’s building that wider network and wider group of people outside of my traditional networks. (Library Staff)

3.6 Summary

The value of collaborative research. Collaborative research brings together a wide range of knowledge and skills to benefit the arts and humanities and beyond.

The many benefits of involving library staff as active researchers. Overall, library staff and academic staff view collaborative research involving libraries as a partner as beneficial for universities, the sector in general as well as personally and professionally.

Benefits for universities and parent institutions. These include enhanced reputation through high quality multi-disciplinary research and increased public engagement with research outputs.

Benefits to academic collaborators. These include the provision of complementary skills and expertise; sharing of different perspectives; and access to public engagement programmes.

Benefits to library services. These include increased knowledge of, and access to, collections; enhanced external reputation; increased institutional credibility; and development opportunities for staff.

Benefits to library staff. These include development of skills and knowledge; increased recognition of the skills and knowledge of library staff amongst academics; increased confidence; and personal and professional satisfaction.
This section presents the common ways identified in which library staff can make a contribution to research projects as active researchers.
Library staff can bring a range of valuable skills and experience to bear on research projects. These skills can complement those of other contributors to research.

The research identified a number of skills and areas of experience that library staff contribute to research projects. Skills that library staff responding to the survey felt may be useful in conducting a research project included:

- Access to specialist networks
- Collaborative working skills
- Data and software management
- Data visualisation
- Digitisation / digital content creation
- Editing and publishing skills
- Information / digital literacy
- Collections knowledge and expertise
- Cataloguing and metadata creation
- Research data management
- Open Access expertise
- Research ethics expertise
- Research publishing / impact metrics
- Systematic / literature review skills

The interviews and focus groups developed some of these ideas further and introduced other areas where library staff might make an important contribution to research projects. The main themes discussed are described below.

### 4.1 Collections-based skills and knowledge

Collections-based skills and knowledge is a key area where library staff make a significant contribution to scholarly research. This might include traditional collections-related skills such as preservation, in addition to activities such as digitisation, alongside an understanding of the ways in which collections are used by researchers.

Curatorial staff, for example, can draw on extensive research backgrounds to bring deep knowledge of artefacts to the process of undertaking and designing research enquiry. This type of activity can be critical to helping academics frame a research question, understand the material and make connections.

The skills employed in collaborative collections-based research can be multi-disciplinary and multifaceted.

Current projects involve colleagues from a range of disciplines. So, utilisation of archival resources in order to push forward projects tends to be arts and humanities first and foremost....We do also have conservation-based projects, where we have chemists working with our medieval historians. Through some of the AHRC funding schemes we’ve brought in some additional infrastructure...to enable to that kind of work to be undertaken, so, pigment analysis, for example, enables us to say something really quite profound about the materiality of medieval manuscripts. (University Leader)
4 What library staff contribute to research projects

4.2 Digital skills and expertise
Libraries and library staff have developed a series of complex and pioneering skills regarding the application of new technologies and processes to collections and the research process. Often falling under the umbrella of digital scholarship or the digital humanities, library staff are able to bring considerable skills and expertise around processes such as research data management, collections as data, GIS and digital mapping, computational analysis, and text and data mining. As stated above, this research confirmed the perceived importance of key digital skills within librarians in enabling research collaboration, including around supporting digital literacy, data and software management, digitisation and digital content creation, and data visualisation.

The perceived importance of these skills in underpinning research collaborations and partnerships, confirms the earlier findings of RLUK’s 2019 research into Digital Scholarship and the role of the research library. This research confirms that the library can bring considerable technical and digital expertise to the research process that goes far beyond its expertise and knowledge of the collection. In addition to the digital and technical skills contained within the library, library staff are also able to draw on a wide variety of digital skills held across their wider institution through their participation in research groups, institutions and digital scholarship centres and units.

4.3 Library studies / heritage science / museums studies knowledge
Library staff can also contribute to research through specific knowledge within the library studies or museums studies/heritage science fields. It is in this area that their contribution is, perhaps, most akin to that of a typical academic researcher, although often with a more practical focus.

I feel like librarians are already doing a lot of research work and creating massive digital humanities resources, which is just not recognised as research, which is cataloguing and archivists have the same thing. I would love to change the culture on that. (Library Staff)

...there’s a whole professional literature around archives, librarianship, you know, librarians and archivists could be contributing to that. But there’s also stuff around the collections, so research in the history of collections, sort of doing provenances, another area would be conservation research. There’s really exciting stuff happening in conservation science and that fits very much into the library category. (Library Staff)
4.4 Literature search and review skills

An area where library staff are likely to have valuable expertise to contribute to a research project is around literature searching and reviewing, particularly systematic reviewing.

I’m often brought in by my colleagues to assist with systematic or other reviews which they are part of, or they’re providing assistance with. (Library Staff)

4.5 Supporting public engagement and impact

Library staff often make a significant contribution to public engagement and research impact activities, drawing on their networks, outreach programmes and communication skills. This is a common form of involvement of libraries in research projects and one that many academics are likely to be familiar with engaging libraries in.

…it gives the researcher the opportunity to engage directly with members of the public through a different methodology…Which wouldn’t necessarily be available to them if they worked on their own. We have this established programme of exhibitions and we have an established visitor route of people coming to campus to see our exhibitions and so on, as well. (Library Staff)

4.6 Bid development

Library staff contribute to research through idea generation and bid development. This can include cases where a member of library staff may first put forward the idea for a project and then identifies an academic to collaborate with. This might result in a library-led project, but could equally lead to a project led by an academic with specific expertise provided by library staff. In other cases, library staff may be approached by an academic with a research idea and are actively involved in developing the funding bid from an early stage.

So with that exhibition…it was my idea…I wanted to do an exhibition about it, and [named research partner] is the person who knows the most about this particular manuscript, so I approached him and he said he’d be really interested in co-curating an exhibition, and from that point we had several meetings, and he wrote the catalogue…but we sort of divided the captions up between us, so I was writing some and he was writing others…it was like having a co-author really. (Library Staff)

4.7 Offering alternative perspectives

More broadly, library staff can bring an alternative perspective to a research project compared to that of a typical academic researcher. This might, again, include a practical focus, but also an awareness of perspectives from other disciplines.

The involvement and perspectives of colleagues who come from different disciplines, with different knowledge. I think that combination is key for the project working, it couldn’t work without the contribution, the participation, the expertise and the organisational priorities that the different partners bring to it. (Academic)
4.8 Networking

Linked to this interdisciplinary nature of libraries, library staff can have a networking role in research projects, both across their university and beyond. Some interviewees remarked how library staff often had links with many departments across a university and could draw upon these links to benefit research. In doing so, libraries can act as both conduits of collaboration between different audience and user groups, and catalysts for collaboration, which reflect their joint roles as both partners and leaders.

This process can be aided by the library’s central position, both physical and psychological, on campuses’ and within the information and research landscape. Libraries can offer a variety of physical and digital spaces to support collaboration between multiple groups. The creation of research hubs, digital scholarship labs and maker spaces, all demonstrate the important convening power of libraries as places of collaborative research between multiple groups and disciplines. In doing so, they can act as both conduits of collaboration between different audiences and users, and catalysts for collaboration, which reflect their joint roles as both partners and leaders.

4.9 Summary

**Valuable skills and experience.** As research partners and leaders, library staff provide a range of unique and valuable skills. This includes collections-based skills and knowledge, and those relating to the digital curation, presentation, and manipulation of the collection.

**A powerful combination of expertise.** Library staff combine traditional skills such as cataloguing and systematic reviewing with those that support the digital shift and opportunities provided through new technologies and ways of working including open access expertise, data visualisation and research data management.

**Conduits of collaboration.** Libraries can act as both conduits of collaboration between different audience and user groups, and catalysts for collaboration, which reflect their joint roles as both partners and leaders.
This section examines ways in which library staff are actively involved in research projects as well as exploring expectations about future involvement in research.
Library staff can be involved in research in a variety of ways. This ranges from formal recognised roles within funded projects through to less formal non-costed contributions. The nature of involvement can affect the extent to which the contribution of library staff is recognised.

5.1 Current library involvement as recognised partners in research projects

Survey respondents involved in one or more funded research projects with a library as a recognised partner or collaborator (e.g. a Co-I, PI or equivalent) over the last 5 years:

From the survey, 34 (24%) of library staff respondents and 31 (42%) of academic respondents had been personally involved in one or more funded research projects as a recognised partner or collaborator (e.g. a Co-I, PI or equivalent) over the last 5 years. Table 6 shows the types of involvement amongst library staff and academic respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of involvement</th>
<th>Library staff (n=34)</th>
<th>Academics (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library as a formal partner (such as a Co-I) on one or more projects</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library as a lead organisation (e.g. PI) on one or more projects</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library as informal partner (e.g. in-kind contribution only) on one or more projects</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History; English Language and Literature; and Communication, Culture & Media Studies, Library & Information Management were the most common disciplines for library staff to partner with academics from.

Across library staff and academic survey respondents

- 23% had partnered with colleagues from their own institution only
- 20% had partnered with colleagues from other institutions only
- 57% had partnered with both
5.1.1 Potential Co-I involvement

The following are the most common ways in which library staff might take on a Co-I\(^{15}\) role in a research project.

**Collection related expertise**
This is the most common form of library staff involvement in research. The expertise of library staff in relation to specific collections, as well as collections-related skills, is an important aspect of a number of research projects and this expertise is widely acknowledged and highly regarded by academics.

**Library related skills (e.g. cataloguing, digitisation)**
Library staff can also bring specific expertise in professional librarianship or heritage management.

**Research in the information studies / archives / museums studies field**
Within information studies, museums studies or heritage science, library staff may have subject knowledge that they can bring to a research project in a similar way to an academic might, although perhaps with a more practical focus.

In addition to these three key areas in which library staff might make an important contribution as Co-Is, there are also examples of individuals who are well-placed to take on this role because of their unique career path or other circumstances. These are important to acknowledge, but not likely to be replicated widely.

**Technological or digital skills**
This research has reemphasised the importance of the library’s technical and digital expertise in underpinning research collaboration, confirming the findings of RLUK’s previous research regarding the valuable contribution that library colleagues can make around digital scholarship.

\(^{15}\)”A Co-Investigator assists the Principal Investigator in the management and leadership of the research project”. (AHRC)
5.1.2 Potential PI involvement
The most likely opportunities for library staff as a PI are in projects around the development and provision of access to research resources and infrastructure, rather than what most would consider original scholarly research in its own right. In this case, a project might be led by a library service with academics advising in areas of context expertise for example. As with Co-Is, there may be other circumstances where a member of library staff could be a PI because of their specific career path or other factors, but this is likely to be unusual in the UK at present.

5.1.3. Other types of involvement
Acting as a PI or Co-I is only appropriate in specific circumstances: when the library is expected to take on a management or leadership role within a project. Of course, there are many other ways in which library staff make a valuable contribution to scholarly research. Whilst this scoping study was primarily focussed on the library involvement in a Co-I or PI capacity, other ways of contributing were also mentioned by participants. These include:

1. Individuals costed in to provide specific expertise, but not expected to have a management role (e.g. support for systematic reviewing, outreach/impact activities)

2. Projects where a number of library staff might be expected to each provide a very small amount of support (i.e. activity is not led by/undertaken by one person). In such circumstances, it may be appropriate to cost in the library service as a partner with some in-kind support and other items costed for within project budget (e.g. support for hosting an exhibition)

3. Advisory role, for example, advising on data management plans or subsequent archiving/deposit of research outputs. This might be a more reasonable way for library staff with limited capacity, but a keen interest, to become engaged in research projects.

Library staff contribute to research across a wide spectrum of areas. This is indicated in examples of other forms of research partnership identified including: co-author on publication; collaborative curation of exhibitions; collaborative PhD placements and supervision; digitisation activities; focus group facilitation; public engagement activities; technical support; support with funding applications; unfunded (internally funded) research; co-curation; research-based pedagogy; and depositing research outputs.

Opportunities such as co-authorship or advisory roles can provide benefits such as involvement in stimulating activities and the development of skills and are likely to be much more realistic than leading a research project for the majority of library staff.

The ideal level of involvement of library staff in research will vary between each institution and library service and will reflect practices, priorities and prevailing strategies. Similarly, individual library staff will vary in the extent to which they expect to, or want to, be involved actively in research.

---

16 “The Principal Investigator takes responsibility for the intellectual leadership of the research project and for the overall management of the research or other activities” (AHRC).
5.2. Recognition of involvement in, and contribution to, research

The roles of PI or Co-I in externally funded projects provide library staff with formal recognition of their contribution to research. Even in cases of formal involvement it is important that contributions that were not foreseen at the start of a funded project, for example at the bidding stage, are recognised, through actions such as updating project websites, recording by institutions and updating funders’ systems.

Whilst much of the focus of this research was on formal involvement in research projects, when library staff are involved in projects in other capacities, the ways in which they are recognised may not be so clear. Although, in some cases, library staff with less formal roles in projects are recognised, for example, being acknowledged in outputs, this is not universally the case. In particular, informal involvement in research is less likely to be recorded and acknowledged within institutional processes.

Other ways in which library staff contribute to research should be adequately recognised. Systematic reviewing, for example, was an activity cited in which library staff actively contribute to research although their contribution may not always be adequately acknowledged.

Research in the broadest sense is the production of knowledge, the original contributions to knowledge. Research is an activity that is undertaken by many constituents and that all of those need to be recognised. The library and collections staff and all of those who are often at the very cutting edge of their practice are still not fully recognised as researchers. Even though what they bring to the table, their skills and their expertise can materially influence how a research question is formulated and approached and methodology developed to address it. (Funder)

...systematic reviews, which is I think a really under-appreciated area in which libraries do a lot of genuine research...They get published. But sometimes it’s the case that the librarians don’t even get credited on them because an academic will commission a systematic review. It’ll get done by a librarian. It’ll go to that publisher with the academic’s name with maybe a footnote. So I’ve been pushing to change that. (Library Staff)
5.2.1 Definitions of research

Perceptions of what defines research activity can vary. There may be blurred boundaries in what library staff do that is considered research and this can affect the extent to which involvement in research is recognised:

Some interviewees hoped that the work that library staff do, such as cataloguing and resource creation, would be more widely recognised as research.

Feedback via a poll at the 2021 RLUK Conference showed that producing ‘definitions of how libraries make original contributions to research’ was considered important by many respondents.

As with definitions of research, forms of recognition can vary by discipline, for example, conventions around authorship, and for library staff working with academics from across a range of disciplines, this can be complex.

5.2.2 Initiatives to recognise research contribution

The challenge of fully recognising the contribution of all staff to research have been reflected in a number of initiatives.

The Technician Commitment

The Technician Commitment aims to “ensure visibility, recognition, career development and sustainability for technicians working in higher education and research, across all disciplines”.

Generally, awareness of the Technician Commitment was low amongst survey respondents with just 26% of library staff being aware of it. Of those, just 27% felt that it includes staff working in libraries, archives, special collections and museums (Table 7).

Table 4: Awareness of Technician Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Aware of</th>
<th>Feel it includes staff working in libraries, archives, special collections and museums</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-based library (or museum/archive) staff</td>
<td>26% (37/140)</td>
<td>27% (8/37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IROs</td>
<td>17% (2/12)</td>
<td>100% (2/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>26% (19/74)</td>
<td>58% (11/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research facilitators</td>
<td>50% (4/8)</td>
<td>25% (1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University leaders</td>
<td>57% (4/7)</td>
<td>0% (0/4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

17 In a Mentimeter poll of 86 respondents at the RLUK conference in 2021, ‘definitions of how libraries make original contributions to research’ was considered to be one of the top three desired outputs from the scoping study.
The hidden REF

The hidden REF\(^{18}\) initiative recognises that formal measurements of research impact such as the REF “overlooks many of the people who are vital to the success of research”. It lists 22 categories of research contribution including: exhibition; community building; website content; training materials and courses; and research datasets and databases.

**Academic Citizenship**

One possible form of recognition for less formal involvement in, or support for, research, is academic citizenship. Academic citizenship can be defined as service carried out to benefit the higher education institution staff belong to, the scientific community, and the wider society. Whilst this notion did not feature explicitly in the data, approaches to recognising and rewarding academic citizenship amongst academics may also be useful in acknowledging some of the research-related activities undertaken by library staff.

These and other initiatives such as the [CRediT - Contributors Roles Taxonomy](#) demonstrate a growing acknowledgement that appropriate recognition should be given to all contributors to research.

**5.3. Future library involvement in research**

Responses to the survey showed that library staff and academic staff expected to increase their level of involvement in research over the next 18 months.

---

\(^{18}\) The hidden REF provides a ‘Hidden Role’ category recognising that “a number of people provide skills that are fundamental to the pursuit of research, but their role is not always recognised in traditional research outputs...These roles can include, but are not limited to, data stewards and managers, librarians, technicians, Research Software Engineers, Professional Services Personnel, RMAs (Research Managers and Administrators), PRISMS (Professional Research Investment and Strategy Managers) and Lived Experience Contributors”.\
5.4. Summary

**Library staff involvement.** Involvement in research can take place in a variety of ways. These range from formal recognised roles with management responsibility within funded projects through to less formal – but often highly valued -non costed contributions.

**Who gets involved in collaboration?** 24% of library staff survey respondents and 42% of academic staff survey respondents had been involved in at least one funded project. In each case, the library was a recognised partner or collaborator.

**Co-I role.** Library staff taking a recognised Co-I role in a research commonly contribute collection-based expertise; library and information related skills; and research in the information studies/archive/museums. Both contribute digital and technological skills.

**PI role.** The most likely opportunities for library staff as PI are in projects around the development and provision of access to research resources and infrastructure.

**Additional contributions by library staff.** Apart from formal involvement in a research project as PI or Co-I, library staff make additional and valuable contributions to research in a number of ways. This includes various roles including as a partner with in kind support, offering specific expertise and taking an advisory role.

**Wide spectrum of possibilities for involvement.** Library staff can be involved in research project in a host of different ways. This ranges from: co-authoring publications, collaborative curation of exhibitions, collaborative PhD placements and supervision, digitisation activities, focus group facilitation, public engagement activities, technical support, support with funding applications, unfunded (internally funded) research, co-curation, research-based pedagogy and depositing research outputs.

**Recognition across the sector is uneven.** The extent to which library staff are recognised as contributors to research projects varies.

**Less formal involvement.** Where involvement in projects are less formal there can be a lack of recognition for the contribution library staff make to research.

**Different definitions of what constitutes research.** Different definitions research can affect the extent to which the contribution of library staff is recognised within some institutions.

**Limited awareness of new initiatives.** The importance of recognising all contributors to research has been emphasised with initiatives such as the Technician Commitment, the hidden REF and academic citizenship. However, there was limited awareness of the Technician Commitment amongst survey respondents with 26% of academic staff and 26% of university based library staff being aware of it. Of the latter, only a small proportion considered that the Technician Commitment included staff working in libraries, archives and special collections.
This section examines the barriers and challenges identified from the research.
In order to fully realise the benefits of involving library staff as partners and leaders in research, a number of challenges and barriers need to be addressed. These barriers can prevent participation entirely or hamper the ease with which library staff can actively participate as collaborators or leaders in scholarly research. Some barriers relate specifically to externally funded research whilst others are more general.

6.1. Perceptions of libraries and library staff

Some library staff feel that academics see them primarily as service providers rather than potential research collaborators. Some have the impression that academics view collaboration with a library as being weaker than one with another academic.

Academics are aware that there is often a lack of ‘parity of esteem’ between academics and staff with technical and other skills. Unsurprisingly, most academics have more experience of collaborating with other academics within their discipline than they do with library staff. In the survey, 77% of academics rated their experience with academics in their own discipline as good or very good whereas only 46% rated their experience with academic and research libraries as good or very good. Indeed, some academics have the impression that it is libraries themselves that are not particularly interested in being seen as researchers (rather than this being something that was imposed on them) and there is work to be done to help libraries to think of themselves as partners and knowledge creators.

Although it was perceptions of libraries which were most often discussed, it is not only attitudes towards libraries that present a barrier. There are often misunderstandings on both sides; academics may not appreciate the contributions libraries might make, but equally, library staff may not always have complete oversight of academics’ work. The potential perceptual barriers may contribute to academics and library staff being unaware of what each party can offer to a research project.

A poll at the 2021 RLUK Conference showed that ‘image and status of library staff’ was considered the biggest challenge to being involved as active partners in research. In a Mentimeter poll of 102 respondents at the RLUK conference in 2021 ‘image and status of library staff’ was considered to be the top challenge to library staff being actively involved in research. This was scored as a 4 out of 5 on a rating scale where 5 was the highest possible rating.
The current emphasis on inter-institutional collaboration can sometimes make it harder for libraries to engage academics in their own institution than those in other institutions. For some funders, it is also difficult for researchers to cost in their own library service as an official project partner because they are part of the same organisation. Academics and library staff could benefit from other opportunities to build relationships and develop understanding that could lead to collaborative research.

Equally, libraries acknowledge that they could do more to make their research-related activities and resources more visible among academic staff and in particular engage in fora where research-active academics might be active. However, more positively, some interviews described how networking between academics and library staff within an institution could help to engage academics in their own collections.

6.2. Different definitions of research

Whilst differences in what is considered to be research can present a challenge to recognising contributions to research (See section 5.2.1) it can also be a barrier to engaging in research. Funders such as AHRC view research as any activity that contributes to the creation of knowledge. It may be possible that having a narrow view of what constitutes research activity can limit the activities library staff get involved in.

There are, of course, different perceptions of research between disciplines and consideration of what does, and does not, count as research is particularly relevant when library staff and academics work together. Even when exploring the same research problem, academics and library staff can have quite different views on what would make a strong piece of scholarly research.

...we know...that what we have and what we do is intrinsically interesting but we’re not necessarily very good at making that visible and known (Library Staff)

...academics do this all the time. You go out, you get involved, you go to seminars, you get to know people, you kind of hustle for projects and contacts. (Library Staff)

...if we have a bright idea then we try to keep that in the family so would always go to a [name of institution] academic as the first, “What do you think about this as a research project?” They’re the ones that then do any fundraising that’s required or see if they can find funds within the department or the research centre. (Library Staff)

...it’s quite common for a museum curator to say research and they might mean the kind of question-driven, hypothesis-framed research that an academic researcher would recognise as research. But it’s also the case sometimes that what they mean is, looking up information to put into an exhibition label or a catalogue entry, which is research of a different kind. (Library Staff)
6.3. Professional services vs academic division

One of the most important issues in relation to library involvement in research is the division between professional services and academic staff within university structures. Although details differ between universities of course, this can have a strong impact on the way in which library involvement in research is viewed by academics, but also library staff perceptions of themselves as potential researchers.

In polls at the Town Hall meetings, just under half of the respondents cited ‘attitudes to library involvement in research’ as a significant barrier to greater active academic and research library involvement in research. Similarly in the survey, 46% of library staff responding cited ‘attitudes to library involvement in research in my institution’ as a barrier to involvement in research.

In some institutions, there have been efforts to overcome the traditional academic-professional services divide. New models that bridge the gap between academic and professional staff are becoming more common, supported by developments such as collaborative doctorates and collaborative partnership awards. If library staff are to become more actively involved in research, this is likely to require changes to contracts. However, it is important to consider that some library staff may have entered the profession precisely because they want a professional services role and have little interest in taking on research responsibilities, especially if this may mean changes to their employment contracts and conditions.

As well as differences in the way in which libraries and library staff are viewed, the division between academic and professional services also has practical implications, for example, different ways of working.

The position of library staff within the university structure, both in the organisational management structures, and also in terms of committees and networks can have an impact. Where libraries cross the traditional professional services sphere and become more involved in academic structures and decision making, this can be advantageous.

I think the attitudinal problem is, in universities, it’s so divided between the academics who do the research and professional services who support (Library Staff)

That’s something that in terms of job descriptions and job profiles, I think over time will likely need to change...if we’re really looking to effect a culture shift. (Library Staff)

It’s one of those awkward disconnects, I think, between academic work, where it’s kind of - you don’t have the same nine-to-five structure, so there’s almost an expectation…that you will work outside your hours, because that’s what they do, because they don’t really have strict hours. (Library Staff)

...we, as a library, are quite well connected into the research through research themes that exist in the university and research centres. So, for example, I’m a member of the Research Directors’ Forum and we meet on a monthly basis where the various Research Directors report on activity that’s underway and we try and intersect tasks and activities that are happening within the library...We actually have a joint research agenda with arts and humanities where we do long term planning over a period of three years looking at what projects we expect to develop or to participate. (Library Staff)

In MentiMeter polls at the two Town Hall meetings 49/103 respondents cited ‘attitudes to library involvement in research’ as significant barrier to greater active academic and research library involvement in research.
6.4. The importance of institutional support

Institutional support for involving library staff in research is important. In a poll at the 2021 RLUK Conference ‘institutional support’ was cited as the most important factor enabling library staff to be actively involved in research\(^1\). There can be a lack of institutional support for library staff to be actively involved in research; this might be either because the institution as a whole has different priorities or because involvement in research by the library specifically is not encouraged. Largely, as a result of the division between academic and professional departments, libraries often lack institutional support that could enable them to become more actively engaged in research\(^2\).

Research office support

Research support and grant administration in universities is largely designed around the academic faculty/department model, which can leave library services excluded. Libraries rarely have the dedicated research support that is normally available to academic faculties. As a result, library staff can lack clarity about who to approach for help with costing, bid writing etc. Types of support commonly offered to libraries by institutional research offices include training, support and mentoring for grant development; costing support; reading drafts of applications; circulating relevant calls; and post-award management. Library staff often need more basic or introductory support because they were less familiar with research funding procedures, so this may fall outside standard research support provision designed around the anticipated knowledge level of academics.

However, a potential downside of lobbying for the same level of research support for the library as for an academic department is that the library may well then be subject to the same types of income generation and other research performance targets.

---

\(^1\) In a Mentimeter poll of 89 respondents at the RLUK conference in 2021, ‘institutional support’ was considered to be the most important enabling factor in library staff being actively involved in research.

\(^2\) In the survey 63% (88/140) of library staff reported that ‘involvement in research is supported by my university / parent institution’ and 72% (101/140) reported that ‘involvement in research is supported by my library’. This is likely to reflect the demographic of respondents to the survey.
6. Challenges to library staff being involved in research

**Buyout and cost recovery**

Contracts and workloading models for library staff often do not fit well with models of buyout/backfill common in research grants. Whilst universities are used to implementing a buyout model to release academic staff, usually from teaching-related duties, to allow them to work on research projects, there is a lack of clarity of how a similar model might be implemented in libraries, even if buyout costs are included in a funding application.

Cost recovery models used in some institutions are also a barrier to libraries participating in research projects. Again, this links to the division between academic and service departments which are treated differently, or have different levels of support, with regards to costing.

**6.5. Capacity and prioritisation**

Time, or capacity, issues were identified as a ‘significant’ or ‘very significant’ barrier to library involvement in collaborative research by 93% of library staff survey respondents, making it the most frequently cited factor.

Sitting within professional services, there is not the same pressure on libraries as that which exists within academic departments to carry out research, bring in research funding, or prepare REF submissions. This usually means that research is not a priority for libraries, especially if they are under pressure to meet other targets, for example, around student experience.

Research is not commonly included in library staff contracts and workloads and it can be particularly difficult for staff in teaching-focused and smaller institutions with limited staff to find time to engage in research.

In addition, there can be a lack of impetus from within library services for staff to engage in research. Even where there is encouragement from library leaders, this does not necessary translate into practical support.

I think it’s harder in libraries for that sort of formal buy-out to be achieved than perhaps in academic departments where academic’s time is allocated for teaching and learning, research, admin and what have you. That dividing up of the cake is not common practice in libraries. (Research Facilitator)

…there’s no expectation by my line manager that I should apply for funding really. It’s like, if you do great, lovely, but not particularly going to support you to do it. And if you don’t do it, nothing much will happen. (Library Staff)

…their [academics’] accounting goes through one of our schools and faculties; our accounting goes through the library and professional services. Obviously the two do talk to one another but there are different processes. We can’t do full economic costing, for example, in the library; we have to rely on the faculty to support us with that. So there’s some practical intra-institutional challenges. (Library Staff)

I recognise that I am lucky enough to work in somewhere that has scale and so we can try some things which many people can’t… when I worked in [name of other universities], a lot of this we simply couldn’t be doing because all you can do is run to keep your service running. (Library Staff)
6.6 Recognition and reward

57% of library staff survey respondents cited institutional reward and recognition structures as a barrier to engaging in research. Challenges around library staff being recognised for the contribution made to research are discussed in Section 5.2).

Providing adequate incentives and rewards for library staff who contribute to research can be a barrier to involvement. Interviewees spoke about the lack of incentives within current reward systems in place in university libraries. Although lack of reward for involvement in research was mentioned, it was unclear what suitable rewards would be for library staff.

6.7. Expertise and knowledge

Libraries need staff with particular skills, expertise and knowledge of academic research processes if they are to be more actively involved in research. At present, these are perceived as lacking in some cases.

Knowledge of funding procedures

Amongst library staff survey responses

- 52% rated their knowledge of research proposal / grant writing as ‘limited’ or ‘very limited’.
- 46% rated their knowledge of collaborative conception and development of initial research ideas as ‘limited’ or very ‘limited’.

Anyone applying for funding needs knowledge of bidding procedures and grant writing. In addition, few libraries appear to have strong connections to their research offices, which puts them at a disadvantage in this respect (See 6.4).

If the RLUK really wants librarians to do research I think we need a different generation of librarians, maybe different contracts. I just think we need different kind of librarians to be hired to do research in the library.

(Research Facilitator)

I think a challenge for librarians…is ensuring that there is the skill base across their staff to be able to support these ambitions.

(University Leader)

...how to learn those better I think is make the connections within the RKE community within the university and once they know that you’re out there and interested they start to send you little snippets of things.

(Library Staff)
6. Challenges to library staff being involved in research

Project management skills
If library staff wish to take on a management role in a project (e.g. PI or Co-I), they need research project management skills. Whilst some staff are trained in project management, others are not.

Research skills
Few library staff survey respondents considered themselves to have a high level of academic research experience. Furthermore, interviewees indicated that, even amongst those with a doctoral level qualification, few are currently research active. It is rarely possible for library staff with PhDs to be research active in the same way as expected of an academic. In this respect, the situation in the UK differs from countries such as the US where library staff are often expected to be consistently research active.

41% of library survey respondents rated their research project management skills as limited or very limited.

...if it came to trying to initiate a larger project, a larger research project, I wouldn't know where to begin. (Library Staff)

I think partly having done a PhD and tried to remain research active it's very difficult on top of a very demanding full time job, so I feel that perhaps my currency of knowledge is slipping a little bit in terms of my own area of research and just not being fully embedded in the academic life of the university (Library Staff)

![Figure 1: How would you rate your own level of experience in each of the following research activities? (n=140)](image-url)
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Library staff who do choose to apply for the same research funding schemes in competition with academic researchers, are therefore likely to be at a disadvantage through their lack of experience and are less likely to succeed than a research active academic with funding applications as an integral aspect of their role.

As might be expected, out of the library staff surveyed, those who had previous experience of involvement in research projects rated their experience in many of these research skills more highly than those who had not. This suggests that providing opportunities to use these skills is important for library services and staff who want to be actively involved in research.

In some cases, lack of confidence amongst library staff can be a barrier to engagement as active researchers.

However, it is important to remember that some library staff, quite reasonably, have little interest in engaging in academic research debates themselves:

6.8. Funding misperceptions

This scoping study has highlighted a number of common misconceptions around research funding, in particular, a widespread perception that library staff and/or university staff without a PhD are not eligible to apply for UKRI funding. Of course, it is important to remember that different funders (and funding streams) have different – and sometimes complex – criteria, and that institutions can, quite legitimately, introduce their own criteria about which types of funding bids they wish to support. However, these misperceptions do not appear to be from one source, but are prevalent amongst library and academic staff, and occasionally research office staff.

There is an almost lack of confidence from the library profession in assuming responsibility and assuming a role in research. It’s almost as though people haven’t quite thrown off the shackles of being a supporting infrastructure to research rather than the originator of new discoveries (Library Staff).

I don’t have a background in research. I’m an archivist, a curator, a manager, but not a researcher. Our business is really looking after the material the primary source for other people to do the research... I get lost in abstract, abstruse, obscure academic research questions that I just can’t keep up with where they’re using language I don’t need to use and... I kind of glaze over. (Library Staff)

I think there is still a presumption [by the research administrator at the university] that to be a PI or a Co-I you have to have a PhD... Whether the AHRC states that you do or don’t have to have a PhD there’s certainly I think a general cultural assumption that you do... (Library Staff)

23 There was a statistically significant difference between the ratings for those who had taken part in a research project in comparison with those who had not. This was true for all activities except qualitative research; creative and arts-based methods; archival research; and dissemination to non-academic audiences. For these, there was no significant difference in ratings regardless of previous research involvement.
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Comments from participants at the Town Hall meetings and the RLUK conference workshop also suggested that some of these attendees shared this perception. This might be reinforced by the fact that, although library staff (and others from non-traditional backgrounds) are technically eligible to apply, this may not always appear to be the case from the application guidance and greater clarity from funders would be helpful, for example, in types of outputs that might be included in a publications list.

Potential applicants may be unclear about the role of a PI and Co-I itself. This is often seen as the only way in which to be costed into a research project, rather than taking a specific role with management responsibilities for the project. Again, whilst funders themselves are open to the idea of library staff as Co-Is and PIs (providing this results in a strong bid), there could be greater clarity about different ways of costing project leadership, but also project support, and what (and who) is and is not eligible. However, greater clarity within written guidelines may not be enough on its own and more active promotion of eligibility criteria is likely to be needed. In addition, although funder guidance might allow for applications from library staff, it is equally important that internal peer reviewers, or other decision makers, are aware of this and do not discriminate against a bid involving library staff.

Currently library staff representation on peer review colleges for the AHRC are low. Increasing library staff representation on peer review boards can help improve understanding of funders criteria as well as broadening out the range of experience brought to bear in judging funding applications.

6.9. Lack of Funding Opportunities

Three-quarters of library staff survey respondents (76%) believed a lack of appropriate funding opportunities to be a significant or very significant barrier to library involvement in research. Only 47% of academics and 34% of library staff agreed that collaborative research was supported by funders. However, it is not clear whether this refers to a lack of funding in specific fields, or indeed within the UK HE community overall. It may also reflect some of the misconceptions around research funding highlighted through the qualitative data.

In relation to funding, some interviewees referred to funding that helped open up collections for further research. In this context, examples that were mentioned included: the Wellcome Research Resources Scheme24, and previous funding through Jisc25.

---

24The Wellcome research resources scheme aims to ‘help collection and information professionals develop library and archive material for humanities and social science researchers’. https://wellcome.org/grant-funding/schemes/research-resources-awards-humanities-and-social-science

25https://www.jisc.ac.uk/
6.10. Summary

In order to fully realise the benefits of involving library staff as partners and leaders in research a number of barriers and challenges need to be addressed. This study has identified a number of potential barriers that can act to prevent library staff being involved as collaborators or leaders in scholarly research. Some barriers reflect a focus on externally funded research, while others are more general. These include the following.

**Perceptions of libraries and library staff.** There can be perceptions that library staff are viewed more as service providers than as potential active collaborators in research. The extent of this perception varies across institutions but is persistent in places.

**Different definitions of research.** Academic staff and library staff sometimes have different views of what constitutes research. Funders have a broader view of research than library staff may sometimes appreciate.

**Academic and professional services divisions.** The division between academic and professional services within universities can create both attitudinal and structural barriers.

**Level of institutional support.** Libraries cannot easily become involved in research without adequate institutional support. Even though support may be available, libraries are often unsure how to access this.

**Capacity and prioritisation.** Time and capacity are significant barriers to library staff being actively involved in research; research activity is not always viewed as a priority.

**Recognition and reward.** Library staff often lack sufficient incentives to become engaged in research.

**Expertise and knowledge gaps.** Some library staff may lack skills in project management, navigating funding procedures and some research-based activities. Staff with research experience rated their research skills more highly than library staff without research experience. Library staff can lack confidence in being active researchers.

**Funding misperceptions.** Library staff, academics and research support staff may have various misperceptions about eligibility to apply for funding and greater clarity from funders would be helpful in this respect.

**Lack of appropriate funding opportunities.** Most library staff believe that the lack of appropriate funding opportunities is a significant barrier.

Institutions, funders, academic staff, library leaders and library staff all have a role to play in overcoming these barriers if they wish to realise the benefits of increasing library staff engagement in, and contribution to, collaborative research.
This section presents some of the factors which have been found to contribute to the facilitation of library staff as active researchers.
There are a number of factors which can assist in enabling library staff to contribute to research as active partners and leaders. These consist of the practices of institutions, library services, funders and academic staff. In addition, there skills, experience and attitudes that can assist individual library staff in being involved in research.

The scoping study identified factors which contributed to facilitating and enabling library staff to be active partners in research. The following presents enabling factors that have been cited through the course of this research. It is not within the remit of the scoping study to identify a comprehensive list of possible enabling factors and the following should be seen as elements of ‘good practice’ for consideration.

**7. Enabling Factors**

We have to be really mindful that something might be a really interesting academic question but if it doesn’t improve the accessibility of discovery or interpretation of collections, somebody should just go and do that using the library as a stand-alone sort of service rather than actually involving us because... it’s not clear what the benefits to us would be in that regard. (IRO Staff)

**Fostering collaboration, increasing visibility and ensuring a strategic fit**

The British Library provides a range of valuable information for potential research collaborators on its website https://www.bl.uk/research-collaboration. This outlines staff expertise, the current portfolio of research and provides an annual report on research activity. It also provides clear guidance on how to propose a new research collaboration with the library. This raises visibility of the collaborative research opportunities available and enables staff at the British Library to assess proposals based on criteria such as benefits, impacts, and outputs to ensure that efforts are focussed on collaborations which have a suitable strategic fit. (IRO Staff)

It’s quite a nice process to be involved in bid creation, because the classic problem that often comes in academic funded research bids is, as the archive or the content holder, or potential collaborator in terms of digitisation, for instance, you are often involved too late...[when] the ideas are very firmly formed...they come to you three weeks before the bid deadline and say, “We want you to give us costs for this”... So actually being involved in the process as effectively content experts from day one was really good. (Library Staff)

And in terms of the library, we’ve recently launched a new vision for the library, replacing our previous version...it does very much focus on things like wanting to increasingly be a partner, as well as just a service provider, you know, aspirations to be even more involved in the wider university in areas that are not traditionally seen as library business, in areas where we act as a connector to bring different parts of the institution and externally, you know, together...as a hub for acting in many senses. (Library Staff)

Revisioning the library

Being clear about the benefits of being involved in a research project

Involving library staff from an early stage in the development of a funding bid

---

**Being clear about the benefits of being involved in a research project**

We have to be really mindful that something might be a really interesting academic question but if it doesn’t improve the accessibility of discovery or interpretation of collections, somebody should just go and do that using the library as a stand-alone sort of service rather than actually involving us because... it’s not clear what the benefits to us would be in that regard. (IRO Staff)
Library staff

To enable library staff to become effective active research collaborators, they must have relevant skills and knowledge, together with a positive attitude and some research experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills and knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of relevant skills and expertise e.g. project management, bidding, collections knowledge, research methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communication and networking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of funding procedures and different roles on projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to develop trust with academic staff and other partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


7. Enabling Factors

**Libraries and their parent institutions**

Institutional managers, including library heads who wish to realise the benefits of library staff as active research partners, should consider how to enable this activity and how to engender a research culture within the library and its staff. Circumstances and contexts will vary by institution as will the applicability of the following enabling factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions for managers</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries providing clarity about what areas of research are in and out of scope for them to be involved in</td>
<td>Enabling buy out of library staff time and backfilling for library staff working on research projects</td>
<td>Undertaking foundational work to make collections accessible for research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the benefits of, and wanting library staff to be active leads and partners in, research projects and valuing the contribution they can make</td>
<td>Fostering relationships between academic departments and professional services e.g. embedding academics staff in libraries or library staff in academic departments</td>
<td>Showcasing the digital skills contained within the library to enable the manipulation, curation, and presentation of the collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing the value of library staff as active partners in research and their specialist skills</td>
<td>Providing library staff with consistent links to research support services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making visible and promoting the skills and expertise of library staff and the potential of collections</td>
<td>Providing clarity around costing and fully costing library staff into research projects where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving library staff in academic and research structure, networks, decision making and dialogue</td>
<td>Recognizing the contribution of library staff to research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing sustainable networks and contacts</td>
<td>Providing rewards and incentives for research involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering a culture of research collaboration</td>
<td>Facilitating opportunities for idea generation and exploration between library staff and potential partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considering hybrid contracts containing an element of research and a library role as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting collaborative research agendas involving academics and library staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesizing formal structures connecting library &amp; academics departments, including library representation on institutional research panels and boards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considering the appropriateness of research active library staff contributions in REF submissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Academic staff**

Potential academic partners can enable library staff to be research collaborators by understanding their skills, and proposing equal status in projects where appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Partners</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing the value of library staff as active partners in research and the specialist skills that library staff can bring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing academic and library staff as equal (if different) partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving library staff and managers in networks relating to research and in dialogue (formal and informal) around project idea generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with libraries around CDP/CDAs to enhance collaborative research opportunities and capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising the breadth and variety of skills and expertise contained within the library, which extends beyond the collection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funders and bidding for funding**

Funders have a positive attitude towards library staff as research investigators, but application eligibility is not always clear. Project design should involve librarians at an early stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funders and Bidding</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
<th>Funding bid processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funders, as far as their funding streams allow, have been very positive and open to library staff applying as leads and collaborators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of funders’ eligibility and experience criteria amongst library staff, academics and research office staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness of the need to recognize the contribution of all to research. Technician Commitment gives more recognition of the contribution of all staff to research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving library staff at an early stage, ideally as early as possible, which could include the idea development and bidding stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that there are benefits to all parties in being involved in a particular research project and these are explicitly understood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring clarity of roles on research projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and enable library representation on the Peer Review Colleges to ensure that the latter are representative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Enabling Factors

Converging Factors

A range of enabling factors converge to support library staff in being active partners and leaders in research. Figure 2 highlights some examples.

Figure 2: Example Converging Factors

7.1. Summary

Good practice. The scoping study identified factors which contributed to facilitating and enabling library staff to be active partners in research. These should be viewed as examples of good practice which can be implemented as appropriate to suit individual institutional contexts.

Convergence of opportunities. These factors above point to a number of areas which converge including: library staff skills and confidence; development of networks and relationships; institutional culture and support including capacity, processes, reward and recognition and suitable funding opportunities.

Stakeholder support. Good practice involves a range of stakeholders in the research process: library staff, library managers and institutional managers, academics and funders.
This section presents the headline findings from this research.
8. Conclusions

RLUK commissioned this scoping study, in partnership with the AHRC, in order to investigate the role of academic and research library staff as partners and leaders in the initiation, production, and dissemination of academic and scholarly research.

The headline findings from this research include:

Wealth of expertise
Library staff bring a wealth of expertise, skills and insight as collaborators and leaders of research. Although libraries have a unique strength and expertise around the collection, its contents, formation and arrangement, their knowledge and expertise go far beyond this. Library staff have considerable technical, curatorial and pedagogical skills which cross disciplinary boundaries and enable them to lead and contribute to a wide spectrum of research and communicate this to a broad audience.

Collaborative by default
Collaboration is in the nature of libraries and the staff that work within them. Libraries sit at the centre of a complex web of communities, whether institutional, disciplinary, or societal. These exist at local, regional, national, and international levels, which mean that libraries are in a strong position to act as conduits and catalysts of collaboration between multiple groups and disciplines. Libraries can leverage this central position to foster new collaborative relationships and to lead and contribute to innovative and cross-disciplinary research partnerships. This is reflected by the nature of collaborations in which libraries are involved, with these crossing both disciplinary and institutional boundaries.

Concept of research to libraries
Library staff are involved in a wide variety of activities which could be termed as ‘research’ but aren’t always understood or seen as such. The concept of research often varies between academic researchers and library staff. This absence of a shared understanding can affect the extent to which the contribution of library staff is recognised.

Complementarity of skills, knowledge and expertise
Library staff bring a range of valuable skills and experience to research projects which can complement those of other research partners. These include skills around public engagement and curation, literature searching and systematic reviewing, digital scholarship and technical skills, as well as open access, bibliometrics and research data management. Collaborative research between libraries and academics is mutually beneficial.

Spectrum of engagement
Libraries can be involved in research in a number of ways, which will vary by project, institution and staff member. Library staff add greatest value to research projects when they are involved throughout the research lifecycle, from project formation to the dissemination, and preservation, of outputs. This includes formal involvement in funded projects as Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-investigator (Co-I), as well as offering in-kind support, providing specific expertise, or in an advisory role.
8. Conclusions

Recognising the contribution of library staff
Library staff are not always recognised as research partners. The point at which a library joins or contributes to a research partnership can affect the extent to which the contribution of library staff is recognised. The importance of recognising all contributors to research has been emphasised by initiatives such as the Technician Commitment and the hidden REF campaign. While these initiatives are to be welcomed, library staff are not always aware of how they might relate to their work.

Funding eligibility
Library staff (working within a HEI or IRO) are eligible to apply for UKRI research council funding as a Co-Investigator or Principal Investigator, without the need for a PhD or an academic contract. Awareness of this varies across institutions, both within the library and amongst university research offices.

Perceptions are shifting
Perceptions of the library continue to shift within institutions and amongst members of the academic community, from one of service provision to one of active and equal partnership. This progress varies between institutions, amongst individual academics, across disciplines, and is not uniform. Although less pronounced than their role as research partners, libraries are leading pioneering and cross-disciplinary research in several areas and a number are creating structures and ways of working to enhance their role within this space.

Challenges to overcome
A number of challenges exist which can limit the ability and opportunities for library staff to expand their role as research partners and leaders. These can apply specifically to externally funded research and research in general. Institutions, funders, academic staff, library leaders and library staff all have a role to play in overcoming these barriers, which will enable libraries to realise their potential as collaborative partners in, and leaders of, pioneering research.

Opportunities to be seized
There are many exciting opportunities for libraries to further develop and enhance their role as partners in, and pioneers of, academic and scholarly research. These require changes around how research is viewed within libraries; how the library is perceived within their institution; and a focus on building the research capacity and visibility of library colleagues. RLUK and the AHRC stand ready to support the research and academic library community to seize these opportunities.

26 Library staff, with or without a PhD, and working within a HEI or IRO, are eligible to apply for AHRC funds as a Co-I or PI as long as they can demonstrate their fulfilment of specific eligibility criteria. For full details of the AHRC’s eligibility criteria, please visit: https://ahrc.ukri.org/documents/guides/research-funding-guide1/ [accessed 22 Jun 2021]
Recommendations

This section presents the recommendations to help realise the opportunities for libraries to act as research partners and leaders.
9. Recommendations

In order to realise the opportunities for libraries to act as research partners and leaders, this report makes the following recommendations. The delivery of these recommendations will be underpinned by a joint action plan between the AHRC and RLUK which will support and shape their implementation, and progress against this will be reviewed after two years.

**Supporting the research capacity and skills development of library staff**

1. **AHRC: Eligibility**
   
   AHRC should re-emphasise and communicate that Research Technical Professionals (RTPs)\(^{27}\), which in the arts and humanities context includes library and collections staff, are eligible to apply for AHRC funds, providing they can demonstrate professional experience and expertise equivalent to that of a postdoctoral researcher. This includes as Co- or Principal Investigator where specific criteria are met, which can include professional practice and experience\(^{28}\). The eligibility of these categories of staff to be named on funded research projects needs to be communicated to the appropriate people within institutions, including research offices and other research support staff. AHRC should work in partnership with key sector bodies to communicate the eligibility of Research Technical Professionals to apply for research funding via the Technician Commitment activity AHRC will carry out as part of UKRI’s Technician Commitment Action plan.

2. **AHRC: Research development programmes**
   
   AHRC should nurture and support research development within research libraries, and other collection-holding institutions, through professional development and research enablement schemes. These might include the award of bespoke or targeted ‘research development grants’ to library and collections staff, ‘highlight calls’ which require library colleagues to act as Co-Is or P-I, or the creation of a Professional Fellowship scheme to enable library staff to enhance their research skills, experience, and credibility. These funded opportunities would provide a clear demonstration of the value and recognition of library and collection-holding institution staff as researchers and will support cross-sector networking through sandboxes, workshops and conferences.

3. **AHRC, RLUK, and libraries: Peer Review Colleges**
   
   AHRC should encourage greater diversity within the Peer Review College and ensure that members of the Research Technical Community, such as library staff, are represented. RLUK should work to promote these opportunities throughout the research library and collections-holding community, and libraries and parent institutions should support and enable their staff to participate in such roles. Staff membership of a Peer Review College should be seen as an important element of a colleague’s career development and bring internal recognition and be endorsed by libraries.

4. **AHRC and RLUK: Technician Commitment**
   
   AHRC and RLUK should work together to highlight the significant contribution that library staff can make to the research process as outlined by the Technician Commitment. This should include ensuring that library staff, and their wider institutions, are aware of the potential impact the Technician Commitment will have on acknowledging and valuing the considerable expertise and skills they bring to research.

---

\(^{27}\) An RTP is ‘anyone who brings indispensable specialist technical skills, at an advanced level, to a research project, i.e. professional skills that are necessary for the development, delivery and completion of the project’ (AHRC working definition).

\(^{28}\) For full details of the AHRC’s eligibly criteria, visit: [https://ahrc.ukri.org/documents/guides/research-funding-guide1/](https://ahrc.ukri.org/documents/guides/research-funding-guide1/) (accessed 22 Jun 2021)
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5. Libraries: Collaborative Doctorates
Libraries should leverage and make greater use of Collaborative Doctoral Programmes, Collaborative Doctoral Awards and practice-based PhDs to develop their research capacity and confidence. Case studies should be sought and published by RLUK where this is happening already, and lessons learnt. These should highlight the mutual benefits of such programmes for both the student and host organisation, and how supervision can be an important element in staff development.

Engagement and advocacy for library staff

6. AHRC: Advocacy
AHRC should continue to celebrate and support the significant collection-holding community, within and beyond the IRO network, which engages in research and innovative scholarship, which can encompass research and academic libraries, museums, galleries, and members of the creative industries. This can include via case studies, spotlight features, advocacy campaigns and events.

7. RLUK and AHRC: Research engagement programme
RLUK should develop an engagement programme, in partnership with the AHRC, to develop a shared understanding and recognition of libraries as research partners and leaders. This should involve a structured series of events, initiatives, thought pieces and networking opportunities. Particular elements of this programme might include:

   a) Advocacy  RLUK should capture, synthesise, and powerfully present the contribution of libraries to research, in its broadest sense (offering a definition and examples of this), through the creation of advocacy documents and resources. These should highlight the original contribution to research that libraries make across a range of disciplines and should be targeted at academics, institutions, and funders, not necessarily libraries themselves.

   b) Best practice  RLUK should publish a series of case studies, aimed at libraries, exploring best-practice and lessons learnt regarding collaboration and research leadership.

   c) Cross-sector conversations  Working with its partners, RLUK should continue to convene cross-sector conversations with colleagues from across the Galleries, Libraries, Archives and Museums sector, with members of the Academic community, regarding the encouragement and support of cross-disciplinary and sector research. This will include via the AHRC-RLUK joint engagement programme.

Institutional recognition for library staff: changing cultures

8. Libraries: Showcasing research expertise and capacity
Libraries should support and enable their staff to effectively communicate the research they undertake and the research skills and expertise their library holds via research profiles, featured staff publications and staff contribution to research seminar series or events. This will help potential research partners, both internal and external to the organisation, to identify expertise held within the library to support research partnerships.
9. Libraries / Institutions: Supporting research skills and capacity
Libraries should explore ways of developing and supporting staff research skills and capacity through activities such as staff research development schemes and the inclusion of research as part of core responsibilities. RLUK will support this process and a working group should be established to investigate this further, drawing on recently available resources to RLUK members such as the ARL Position Description Bank to examine how this is done internationally. Libraries, and their parent institutions, should also explore secondment and fellowship opportunities within the library, through which academic researchers can share their experience and expertise.

10. Institutions: Library representation and recognition
The contribution that libraries can make as research partners and leaders should be recognised and represented within their wider institutions. This can include through the library being represented on institutional research committees and panels, and members of research offices having the opportunity to develop a greater understanding of the potential contribution that libraries can make to the research process.

11. Academics
RLUK and AHRC will work to ensure a strong academic voice features within any forthcoming research development programme, and that researchers are represented across a range of disciplines and institutions. Members of the academic community are encouraged to engage with this programme and its discussions.

12. Academics
Should actively engage with library staff during the development of research and academic programmes, including Collaborative Doctoral Partnerships and Awards, to ensure that these benefit from the skills and expertise of library staff wherever possible.

13. Academics
To be conscious to cite and reference the contributions made by library colleagues to the research process, whether as a formal research partners or via informal channels, including via such frameworks as the Contributor Roles Taxonomy CRediT - Contributors Roles Taxonomy.
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# Appendix 1 RLUK Scoping Study Scope and Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Library staff and academics who have engaged in scholarly research involving an academic or research library | Includes academics who have worked in partnership/collaboration with a library  
This does not include academics who have simply used a library in their research |
| Research Technical Professional                                      | Anyone who brings indispensable specialist technical skills, at an advanced level, to a research project, i.e. professional skills that are necessary for the development, delivery and completion of the project (working definition supplied by the AHRC). |
| Academics who have worked in partnership/collaboration with a library | Named staff/role within a library service (expertise)                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Libraries active involvement as a research partner                   | Includes: being recognised as a collaborator in a research project  
In a Research Council bid it is a named person. Other funders might identify an organisation but within that it would be a named person(s) i.e. individuals  
Excludes libraries’ role in supporting and facilitating institutional research activities more generally e.g. providing open access repositories, providing basic access for researchers to use repositories.  
Excludes internal service development research e.g. library user studies |
| Being recognised as a collaborator in a research project             | Named as Co-I or equivalent  
Or undertaking the work of a Co-I without being formally named |
<p>| Leaders of research within a named research project                 | Named as PI or equivalent |
| Equivalent to principal investigator                                 | Leading on the project/bid. Named and likely costed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Equivalent to co-investigator                                       | Named in project/bid with individual role.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Worked on project funded by AHRC, other funding councils and non funding council funders | Includes: AHRC and other research councils. Where funding is provided for fund academic and scholarly research e.g. Wellcome, British Academy, Mellon, Wolfson, Leverhulme.                                                                                                          |
| Formal partner                                                      | PI, Co-I, otherwise named and costed in bid                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal partner</td>
<td>In-kind support only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Time based activity including: aims objectives, outcomes. (Excludes personal projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and research libraries</td>
<td>Any UK HE library University Museum University Gallery University Archive University Special Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic, researcher or scholar</td>
<td>Academics working across a range of disciplines Included: Arts Humanities and Social Sciences (SHAPE) Any career level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Employed by an academic funding and grant giving body responsible for awarding research funding including with and beyond the arts humanities and social sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University leader</td>
<td>Senior decision maker responsible for setting overarching institutional direction and strategy (e.g. VC, PVC, registrar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research facilitator</td>
<td>Responsible for facilitating the research process (e.g. research offices, finance departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Research activities                 | - Developing research partnerships with academics  
- Collaborative conception and development of initial research ideas  
- Research design  
- Research proposal/grant writing  
- Research project management  
- Quantitative research  
- Qualitative research  
- Arts-based research  
- Archival research  
- Disseminating research via academic publications  
- Disseminating research to practitioners  
- Impact-related activities |
Shaping the future funding landscape

Two AHRC Town Hall events hosted by RLUK

Recording available at: https://www.rluk.ac.uk/recap-ahrc-town-hall-meetings/

26 February 2021 and 03 March 2021

Summary of feedback

These events were well attended (some 300 participants in all) with a low attrition rate. The mix of presentation, survey, panel discussion and question and answer sessions worked well. The majority of attendees were from a library background but there was also a good representation of academics. The majority of attendees were either established or mid-career professionals.

Voting data from participants (Mentimeter polls):

- Approximately half of 113 voters had been involved in collaborative research projects with a library as a lead or named partner.

- 63% of these respondents had been involved in unsuccessful bids with a library as a lead or named partner.

- 55% of voters (108) have no firm plans to develop a collaborative research bid with a library as a lead or named partner but are interested if opportunities arise.

- Expertise is the key quality of research and academic librarians that make them good research partners.

- Lack of capacity and time is the biggest barrier to greater active academic and research library involvement in research (68% of 103 voters).
The role of academic and research libraries as active participants and leaders in the production of scholarly research

RLUK21 workshop

Recording available at: https://www.rluk.ac.uk/rluk21-workshop-research-libraries-as-active-participants-leaders-in-scholarly-research/

17 March 2021

Summary of feedback

The event was well attended, with some 140 participants in all and a high level of interaction through a mixture of presentation, polling, discussion, chat and question and answer session. The aim of the workshop was to provide an update; gain feedback and seek input.

Voting data from participants (Mentimeter polls)

- ‘Image and status of library staff’ (rated 4 out of 5) and ‘lack of clarity about eligibility and experience criteria on the part of funders’ (rated 3.7 out of 5) were rated as the primary challenges to library staff being actively involved in research (102 participants in total voted).

- Institutional support is the primary enabling factor (89 voting participants).

- The three most useful outputs of this scoping study will be (86 voting participants)
  (i) a framework for academic recognition for libraries and librarians (52/86)
  (ii) definitions of how libraries make original contributions to research (49/86)
  (iii) categorization of barriers to meaningful involvement in research and proposed ways of overcoming them (46/86)

- The one most important outcome of the scoping study and of the follow-up work is that librarians are costed, acknowledged partners/Co-Is in future research (49/82).
### Representation by TRAC group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAC peer group (2018-19)</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Research Facilitator</th>
<th>University Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>83 (59%)</td>
<td>30 (41%)</td>
<td>5 (63%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
<td>17 (23%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>11 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response/other</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representation by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Academic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>24 (17%)</td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>24 (17%)</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>19 (14%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
<td>11 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>11 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of service represented by library staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special collection</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=140 (respondents could choose more than one option)
Responses from non-university libraries
12 responses were received from 8 IROs. All but one had been involved in one or more research projects over the last 5 years. 15 responses were received from 8 research libraries that are neither part of a HEI or an IRO.

Responses from overseas libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australasia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 work in libraries, 4 in archives, 3 in special collections and 1 gallery.

Responses from academics

Career stages of academic respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which best describes your career stage?</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early career (typically up to approx. 8 years post PhD)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-career (typically 8-15 years post PhD)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior researcher (typically over 15 years post PhD)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject specialisms of academic respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Culture &amp; Media Studies, Library &amp; Information Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language &amp; Literature</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music, Drama, Dance, Performing Arts, Film &amp; Screen Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages &amp; Linguistics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Built Environment &amp; Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography &amp; Environmental Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work &amp; Social Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology &amp; Religious Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=74 (respondents could indicate more than one subject area)
### Appendix 5. Interviewee TRAC Code Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Peer Group A</th>
<th>Peer Group B</th>
<th>Peer Group C</th>
<th>Peer Group D</th>
<th>Peer Group E</th>
<th>Peer Group F</th>
<th>N/A Group G</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage professional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO/Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library leader</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research facilitator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University leader</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 6. Focus Group Participant TRAC Code Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAC Code</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group E</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group F</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 30 individuals participated in the focus groups. 9 were not linked with UK HEIs with TRAC codes.
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Disclaimer

Evidence Base and Associates are not liable for the accuracy of any information gathered to compile this document. All data collected is to be construed as contributions towards meeting the aims of the scoping study. Evidence base and Associates accepts no liability for errors or omissions in this document and accepts no responsibility for loss or injury which may occur as a result of reliance placed on any part of its contents.