

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED LEGAL STUDIES
REPORT OF THE REVIEW PANEL

January 2005

Institute of Advanced Legal Studies

Report of the Review Panel

(Professor William Twining FBA, QC, Quain Professor of Jurisprudence Emeritus, University College London and Professor Alan Paterson FRSE, Strathclyde University, President, Society of Legal Scholars)

Introduction

1. In November 2004 we were invited by the Dean of the School of Advanced Study to review the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (hereafter IALS) and to report to the Directorate via the Dean by the end of 2004 with the following terms of reference:

“In the light of the recommendations of the Report of the IALS Review Committee (The Goode Report) in April 1999; and the Administrative Reviews of IALS undertaken in August 2002 and July 2004; to review, and report to the Directorate via the Dean on, the work and objectives of the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies in the context of:

- the appointment of a new Director in October 2004;
- the University's Information Strategy
- income streams including the HEFCE Special Funding;

and to make recommendations on the potential development of the Institute.”

2. The immediate context of this review was the appointment of Professor Avrom Sherr as Director of IALS from October 2004. The principal objective is to advise the Director about questions of policy in the short and medium term, with particular reference to a limited number of issues. It was emphasised from the start that what was required was a quick and selective report to assist with forward planning rather than a comprehensive external assessment of the Institute's past performance as recommended by the Goode Report (para. 141-42, Recommendation 31). We received extensive documentation, visited the

Institute on several occasions, and talked informally with a number of individuals, but it was not possible in the time to hold formal hearings or to invite written representations.

3. The Institute has had a number of “mission statements”, but its objectives have been consistent and continuous since its inception in 1946. The latest formulation, as recommended by the Goode Committee states:

“The role of the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies is to conduct research; to promote and facilitate, within London and nationally and internationally, research and scholarship at an advanced level across the whole field of law; to disseminate the results of such research and scholarship; and to provide to all those undertaking research in law a library facility, with up-to-date technology, that is international in character and standing.”

4. The IALS has been the subject of a number of reviews and reports. Its establishment was first proposed by the Atkin Committee in 1934. In 1938 Lord Maugham LC appointed a Committee under Lord MacMillan to advise on the best means of implementing the recommendation of the Atkin Committee, but World War II intervened, and it was the University of London that took the initiative in 1946 by creating an institute with a part-time Director and a modest budget. The first major policy review of IALS took place at a time of financial crisis in 1985-86 (the Megarry Report). The implementation of the Megarry Report ensured the survival and development of the Institute, with a full time Director and increased funding. But lack of funds hindered its main recommendation that the research role of the Institute should be strengthened so that it should become a national centre of legal research rather than just an excellent library with some peripheral activities.
5. In 1993-94 a major review of the London Inter-collegiate LLM, by far the largest postgraduate programme in the country, recommended that the costs of services provided by IALS should be paid for by the participating law schools according to a formula agreed by the Schools and the University. (LLM

Review: Second Interim Report and Final Report, 1993) These services were to be extended, but the IALS could not in future be expected to subsidise the Inter-Collegiate LLM. These recommendations were accepted in principle, but there is still a question as to the extent to which IALS recovers full costs from the Schools in this respect.

6. In 1998-99 a Committee under the chairmanship of Professor Sir Roy Goode submitted a substantial Report with 35 recommendations. This has been the basis of forward planning for the past five years. It has also been the natural starting-point for our own limited review. As we shall see, almost all of the recommendations involving no or modest costs have been implemented, but only limited progress has been made in implementing the two most substantial recommendations, viz. the establishment of five adequately staffed Research Centres and a major extension to Charles Clore House. These remain the Institute's highest level priorities, but it is unrealistic to expect that funding and implementation of these plans can be achieved within less than five years. Accordingly, our central concern has been to address the question: what can be done to sustain and strengthen the IALS pending the completion of a successful major fund-raising exercise?
7. In addition to the Megarry and Goode Reviews, IALS has been the subject of two recent internal reviews concerning management and administration. The management and administration of the central University is itself currently under review. We are advised that the concerns and problems behind these reviews are being dealt with. Accordingly, we have treated most questions concerning management and administration as falling outside our terms of reference.
8. Four themes run clearly through all of the prior reviews. First, that the core of the Institute's role is to support, facilitate, undertake, and disseminate advanced research in all fields of law. Second, that in this regard IALS's role is national and international and should not be seen as only serving the constituent Schools of the University of London and legal scholars in the Greater London area. Third, that IALS plays a unique and invaluable role in building bridges between

academic lawyers and the wider legal community. Fourth, that the IALS has been widely recognized, both nationally and internationally, as being an invaluable centre and resource for the legal academic community, but it has never realised its potential, in the words of the Megarry Report, as “the national centre for legal research with a range of scholarly activities” (cited in Goode, para. 5). The main reason for this has been lack of funding.

9. The Goode Report identified a number of strengths and weaknesses and made a wide range of recommendations. Where these recommendations have been implemented, the Institute has clearly been strengthened. Since we must necessarily be selective, we shall concentrate on issues of continuing or fresh concern. This is rather more complex than just focussing on unfinished business of the Goode Report, for three reasons: First, some questions have been raised about the realism or feasibility of some of the Goode Report’s main recommendations. Second, the Goode Report envisaged that the research role of the Institute could only be strengthened by a major fund-raising exercise, but it said rather little about ways in which research might be strengthened incrementally. Third, a number of changes in the University of London and nationally have potentially significant, in some cases threatening, implications for the structure and finance of the Institute. Fourth, Professor Sherr as incoming Director has drawn attention to some short-term issues and plans on which he would like us to comment.

Strategic Concerns

10. A preliminary question raised in the wake of the Goode Report is whether the vision of the future portrayed in the Megarry and Goode Reports is both desirable and feasible; viz. a flourishing Institute that undertakes advanced research as well as facilitates, supports, and disseminates the scholarship of others.
11. On the question of aims, almost everyone we encountered agreed that it is essential to its mission that IALS should be a centre of scholarly excellence in its own right. First, if the Institute is to be a natural meeting place for legal

scholars, it needs to have a strong research culture, in which postgraduates, young researchers, established scholars, and academic visitors from the UK and abroad can all participate on a daily basis. Second, the Institute, by virtue of its status, and independent of the constraints of the RAE, is better placed than most university law schools to undertake certain kinds of research: for example, multi-disciplinary projects and programmes; contract research of the kind currently undertaken by the Sir William Dale Centre and the team associated with the Woolf Chair; and research at the interface of scholarship, legal practice, and law reform. Third, an excellent research library needs to be used, appraised and continually renewed by close contact with active researchers. Finally, academic leadership of the kind provided by IALS and other Institutes of Advanced Study through workshops, seminars, and other events needs to be provided by outstanding scholars who themselves are active in research and who are not burdened by heavy teaching loads.

12. The Goode Report envisaged a considerable enlargement of Charles Clore House and the establishment of five major centres of research based in the Institute. Some sceptics suggested that such grand plans, however desirable, were unrealistic. Some support for this view can be found in the fact that five years after the Goode Report plans for the building have had to be scaled down, final planning permission is unlikely before July 2006, and meanwhile the major public campaign to raise funds for these ambitious plans can only be launched when planning permissions have been finalised, although some preparatory work could usefully be undertaken.

13. In the long term, we do not consider the essential thrust of the Goode recommendations to be unrealistic: there is general agreement that the present accommodation is barely adequate for the Institute's current activities, let alone for any significant developments; that the scaled-down plans for the extension are sensible and attractive; that considerable incremental development in research activities has taken place; that the number of people using the building for its various purposes has increased steadily over the years; that relations with the practising profession have been significantly strengthened; and that the Goode Report itself envisaged the attainment of its two major

recommendations, the extension of the building and five major research centres, as a long-term goal, to which considerable progress has since been made. The realism of the fund-raising targets can only be tested by a major campaign at the appropriate time.

14. Since 1999 nearly all of the Goode Report recommendations that involved modest or no costs have already been implemented or are in process of implementation. These include the following:

- The Society for Advanced Legal Studies has established a number of active working groups to address issues relating to law reform and legal practice.(Recs. 10-13)
- The Institute has extended its role as a clearing-house for dissemination about legal research through a data base on research by doctoral students and its part in developing legal information resources and programmes (FLAG, BAILII, SOSIG).¹ This goes beyond Goode's recommendation 14, but a website listing all Fellows and legal scholars visiting the UK has yet to be developed.
- The number of Visiting Fellows has increased and the Inns of Court Fellowship Scheme has been revived. Discussions are ongoing about the possibility of funding additional Fellows. (Rec. 15)
- The Goode Report recommendations about numbers, admission procedures and standards, and supervision of research students have been implemented. (Recs. 16-18)
- There is annual review and negotiation with the University of London Law Schools about the capitation fee for the Intercollegiate LLM and other postgraduate students. (Rec. 20) (see further below).
- The recommendations concerning the post of Director have been implemented. (Recs. 22-26)

¹ FLAG is an internet database which acts as a gateway to the holdings of foreign, international and comparative law in UK universities and national libraries; BAILII is the British and Irish Legal Information Institute and provides access to the most comprehensive free and up-to-date collection of British and Irish primary legal materials on the Internet; the SOSIG Law Gateway is a web-based descriptive database of high quality legal information sources on the Internet and forms part of the Social Science Information Gateway.

- The Advisory Council (formerly Board) was reconstituted in 2000 and a “Development and Advisory Committee” to assist with fund-raising issues was established. (Rec. 27) (see further below)
 - The main recommendations of the two internal reviews of management and administration have either been implemented or are being worked through.
 - A recommendation for a regular review has been taken over by a procedure for the review of its constituent Institutes by the School.
 - Other significant developments not specifically recommended by the Goode Report are reported in the Annual Reports for the last five years.
15. Perhaps the most important developments since 1999 relate to research activities. The Goode proposals for five major research centres were costed and found to be too expensive for immediate implementation. Instead, an evolutionary strategy has been followed as a result of which three active groupings exist, more modest than the Goode Report envisaged, but nevertheless very active.
16. First, the Woolf Chair has been the focal point for important research into complaints against solicitors, legal ethics, the provision of legal services in the UK and in a number of other countries, peer review of the competence and quality of the work of solicitors and not-for-profit agencies involved in legal aid, public defenders, and aspects of legal education. It has also dealt with discrimination in relation to HIV/AIDS and legal services for people affected, and the provision of welfare rights in the context of medical services. Issues of professional competence in relation to other professions such as patent agents, trade mark attorneys and osteopaths have also been addressed. It is hoped that in due course a successor to Professor Sherr as Woolf Professor of Legal Education will be appointed and will continue to provide academic leadership in this broad area. Funds have been raised for the Woolf Chair through the projects on which Professor Sherr has worked.

17. Second, the Sir William Dale Centre for Legislative Studies has undertaken a number of projects in European Union law, criminal law, law reform and legislative drafting. The Centre has a growing international reputation in respect of both research and teaching and has been conspicuously successful in obtaining grants for particular projects. The Centre has just launched an MA in Legislative Studies to add to its very active programme of shorter courses and training programmes.
18. Third, the Centre for Company Law and Practice (CCLP), established 1996, became the Centre for Corporate and Partnership Law in 2001. Under the energetic leadership of Professor Rider it completed a number of projects. The departure of several researchers, including Professor Rider, has slowed down its development, but its activities are continuing under Professor Johan Henning with assistance from Dr Kern Alexander and postgraduate research students.
19. In addition to these three centres, a significant amount of research has been conducted by Visiting Fellows, Research Fellows and doctoral students, the details of which are set out in the Annual Reports. Mention should also be made of the Institute's International and Professional Training and Research Unit (IPTRU), which besides its training programmes has been involved in a number of research-related activities.
20. To sum up: Although the ambitious plans for five major centres recommended by Goode have not been realised significant progress has been made incrementally, largely financed by grants and other ad hoc funding.
21. The Goode Report also concluded that practice and policy-oriented research had been given more emphasis than theoretical and more academic research during the nineteen-nineties and that more of a balance was needed. Some progress has been made in this respect, but there is still some way to go if the Goode Report's vision of a major Research Institute is to be realized. Significant strides have been made in strengthening links between the academic legal community and practitioners, judges, and those engaged in law reform and considerable funding raised through leading edge research into issues of

legal competence. It might be argued that an appropriate balance between “pure” and “applied” research is yet to be achieved, although few would wish to insist on a sharp distinction between them especially in relation to research of national and international importance relating to the nature of legal work. In short the Institute wishes and needs to strengthen further its academic research in both areas of pure and applied research.

22. In light of the above, we suggest that the following should be the strategic objectives of IALS during the next five years:

- maintaining and developing the Library and its services;
- further evolutionary development of research activity, especially in respect of academic research;
- ensuring that there is adequate accommodation to house new developments, pending the completion of the proposed extension;
- taking further steps to making the Institute a focal point and natural meeting place both for legal scholars throughout the United Kingdom and internationally, and for activities at the interface of academic law and legal practice broadly conceived;
- continuing and developing the programme of events sponsored by or located in the Institute.

Maintaining and Developing the Library and its Services

23. The Institute’s library serves a number of discrete constituencies. First, it is recognised as one of the world’s major legal research libraries. From its inception the Institute acknowledged the importance of comparative research between the legal systems of the world and in consequence the library is one of the few which is equipped to support research into the law on a global scale. Furthermore, it forms part of an international network of major research libraries linking London to New York, Cape Town, Leiden, Melbourne, Peking and Toronto. As a result it attracts a stream of foreign scholars annually who see the Institute’s library as the first and obvious port of call for access to

material on common law and Commonwealth jurisdictions whether historic, primary or analytical in nature.

24. Secondly, the library is de facto the national legal research library for the United Kingdom. Although the Bodleian Law Library in Oxford and (to a lesser extent) the Squire Law Library in Cambridge are roughly on a par with it in terms of size of holdings, neither offers the same access to research scholars and each has the further drawbacks of heavy usage by undergraduates and a geographic location away from London. Its pre-eminence as the national centre of excellence for legal scholars from all institutions supported by the UK Funding Councils is evidenced by the fact that it receives the largest amount of recurrent 'Access Funding' given to any single discipline library from HEFCE. (Moreover, as the Harris Report (2000 at p.6) recognised, the national excellence of the libraries of the Institutes comprising the School of Advanced Study, in very large measure are the justification for the significant special funding that the School receives from HEFCE).
25. Thirdly, the library plays a vital and indispensable part in servicing the postgraduate students, especially those on the London University Inter-collegiate LLM programme, as well as the legal research needs of academics attached to the London law schools. The Colleges rightly expect and depend on the Institute's library to provide the national and international texts and material (in hard copy or electronic format) required to keep the LLM degree internationally competitive as well as to support the research needs of their academic staff.
26. Fourthly the library provides the legal profession, particularly in London, with a ready access to global legal source materials. In short, as can be seen, the library lies at the heart of all of the Institute's activities, justly meriting its description in the Goode Report as the "jewel in the Institute's crown" (para 90). Nevertheless, a short SWOT analysis reveals that the library's strengths and opportunities have to be balanced against its weaknesses and the threats which confront it.

Strengths

27. The IALS library's strengths flow from and account for its pre-eminent position amongst UK law libraries as set out above:

- It is one of the largest dedicated law libraries in the world.
- It has the strongest collection of national and international materials in the UK in many areas of law, almost all of which is available on site and a good proportion of which is on open access.
- It is regarded as central to library provision for legal research in the UK by HEFCE, the AHRB, the Society of Legal Scholars and other learned societies and by the Committee of Heads of UK Law Schools.
- Our own investigations confirmed those of earlier reviews that the library is excellently managed and run, with impressive levels of management information and forward planning.
- It has the largest academic law library staff in the UK, providing an unparalleled range of expertise and experience, strong links with law librarians and law libraries abroad, and the best training facilities for law librarians in the jurisdiction.
- Its involvement in research projects for academics is good for staff development, provides added value to the academics and brings with it a valuable source of external funding.
- It offers an efficient and profitable service to the practising profession and the judiciary.
- It has relatively modern accommodation which is disability compliant.
- It provides access to a broad range of the C & IT facilities, cutting edge projects in legal information retrieval, e.g. BAILII, FLAG and SOSIG, and well trained library IT staff.
- BAILII, SOSIG and FLAG staff provide a synergy of library development and research skills which enhances the overall research strengths of the Institute.
- The IT staff perform a valuable function in providing C & IT training for postgraduate students.

- Its research focus (it makes no provision for undergraduates) reduces pressure on space and the need to stock multiple copies of expensive textbooks or law report series.

Weaknesses

28. One of the strong points of the library has been its responsiveness to criticism: for example, it has extended its opening hours and improved its ability to keep up to date with new courses and changing reading lists in response to earlier library reader satisfaction surveys. The most recent library reader satisfaction surveys of 2003 and 2004 praised the helpfulness of the staff, the range of books, databases and other facilities, but the 2003 reader survey was strongly critical of the computing and printing facilities available to them. A successful application to the Vice Chancellor's Development Fund enabled the library to replace some of the computers and install a new printing system in 2004 leading to improved user satisfaction results, especially in relation to printing. Despite this work there are still insufficient computing facilities and staff are concerned that the introduction of new central charges for computing resources may restrict capacity for development. In fact, the principal weaknesses of the library are also in some measure a product of its success:

- The increased demands on the library (caused by (a) the proliferation in specialist law journals (b) the cost inflation in legal publications and (c) the resultant cutbacks in other law school libraries) are making it increasingly difficult to maintain and sustain the collection.
- The accommodation, though relatively modern, falls considerably short of the state of the art facilities now seen in the best law libraries in the United States, and this is disconcerting to international scholars. There is a need for a better working environment with more carrels, discussion rooms, separate computing areas, a skills training suite, special reading rooms etc.
- Access to computing and internet facilities is failing to keep pace with demand. The University network infrastructure requires upgrading and there are insufficient desktop computers or wireless environments for Internet access;

- There are staff recruitment and retention pressures caused by the cost of living in London and the competitive salaries offered by city law firms.

Opportunities

29. The opportunities can be divided between those flowing from the inherent strengths and positioning of the Institute's library and those from the University's Information Strategy. The unique strengths of the Institute's library offer possibilities for collaboration with other leading research libraries. Thus since March 2002 there has been a concordat with the British Library Board over collaboration in collection development and management. Indeed the British Library "regards the Institute as a key specialist collection in the fields of foreign, international and comparative law, whose holdings complement" those of their own.² We also believe that the full costs of services to postgraduates and to the profession should be kept closely under review. The "inherent" opportunities therefore are:

- Collaboration with other legal research libraries (Bodleian and Squire) could lead to consortial purchase and agreements on specialisation of holdings.
- Collaboration with the British Library over long term retention of materials.
- Collaboration with the DCA to provide library facilities for the new Supreme Court and accommodation for some of their researchers.
- Maintaining income in real terms from the LLM and other graduate students by ensuring that the full costs of services to them are kept under close review.
- Maintaining income in real terms from the profession by ensuring that the full costs of services to them are kept under review, and by extending the range of services offered to the profession.
- Extending research and librarianship skills courses.
- Developing the range of databases available to offer a virtual legal research library to the University and the profession.

² Letter to IALS librarian 30/3/00

30. A second set of opportunities potentially flow from the University of London's evolving Information Strategy. Central to this initiative is a planned convergence between the various libraries of the University inter se and also with the other forms of information storage within the University. The integration of the libraries (in some cases physical, in other, managerial) into the University of London Research Library Service (ULRLS) should provide opportunities for economies of scale and for staff career development. However, as with the whole evolving Information Strategy, much will depend on how it is implemented. It follows that, as we will discuss shortly, the University's Information Strategy is perceived as a source of potential threats to the Institute's library as well the opportunities that it will provide:

- ULRLS should provide the opportunity for greater coverage of interdisciplinary material.
- ULRLS should offer some economies of scale, e.g. cost savings with respect to combined / joint purchasing.
- ULRLS may also provide a better career structure for staff and a better entry to national funding opportunities.

Threats

31. The perceived threats to the library come both from outside the University and from within. Externally, the principal threats stem from the growing digitisation of legal information resources and the pressure on Government funding. Internally, the perceived threats come from the establishment of the ULRLS, the further refinement and implementation of the Information Strategy and the limited ring-fencing in the library's funding. Taking first the external threats:

- Library funding is failing to keep pace with the annual cost increase for legal books and serials (currently estimated as between 10% and 13%) making it increasingly difficult to maintain and sustain the collection. While expenditure on print material has risen year on year from

£302,524 in 1995/96 to £426,567 in 2003/04 (a rise of 41%)³ the average number of volumes added per year has stayed relatively stable at around 4,300 per year over the same period.

- This pressure on funding is exacerbated by the proliferation in specialist law journals.
- The cost inflation in legal books and materials is leading to cutbacks in other law school libraries which in turn is increasing user pressure on the Institute library. Thus registered readers have risen 30% in the period 1995/6 to 2003/04 and the average number of visiting readers each day has risen 70% in the same period.
- The exponential growth in digital legal information will reduce the uniqueness of the library's resources unless it is accompanied by "value-added" developments such as BAILII (which brings together electronic data in an innovative, cross-referenced way).
- The shortage of funding will erode not simply the library's ability to purchase the difficult and the rare but also its potential to harness the power of the C & IT through the continued development of enhanced databases such as FLAG, BAILII and SOSIG.

32. The perceived internal threats stem largely from the University's Information Strategy. As previously stated much will depend on how it is implemented. One major threat, that the IALS library might be re-located to Senate House as part of the library convergence, has receded with the assurances that IALS library will not be physically re-located. However, uncertainty remains on other fronts, for example over management reporting structures and the retention of specialist staffing. The perceived internal threats to the library include:

- The establishment of ULRSL and the planned convergence of the libraries that it will entail is inevitably disconcerting to the Institute's staff, the Advisory Council of the Institute and the Society of Legal Scholars and other learned societies in the legal field. Much will depend on the extent of the convergence that is ultimately implemented.

³ Expenditure on electronic materials rose 70% from £16,414 to £27,953 in the same period.

- Accompanying the convergence is a proposed restructuring of the management of the library and its staff. This may bring with it central planning, a loss of devolved initiative, and less room for localised entrepreneurship and innovation. Thus it may inhibit collaboration with other leading research law libraries e.g. over acquisitions policy, where this cuts against the central policies of the University.
- The evolving Information Strategy and the convergence of the libraries may also impact on the staff. While it will provide a wider career structure for librarians, it may pose threats to the specialist expertise required of law librarians which is essential to service the library's principal users (foreign and national scholars and the academic staff and postgraduates of London University), to train the law librarians of the future, to expand the legal research and librarianship courses and initiatives (such as BAILII) and to maximise entrepreneurial opportunities with the practising profession.
- The reporting and management structures for the Institute's librarian have yet to be established in terms of the evolving Information Strategy, but there are fears that this may lead to a loss of autonomy for the library, the Institute and its Director. Concerns have been expressed that this in turn may lead directly or indirectly to an undermining of the library's unique features which makes it special to the research community which it primarily serves.
- There is a concern that the Information Strategy may adversely affect the fund-raising capacity of the Institute and its library.
- About 54% of the library's budget comes from HEFCE, largely in recognition of its status as a centre for national excellence. The remaining funding comes mainly from the capitation fee for Master's students and from marketing the library's services to the profession and other users. The first source of funding is not ring-fenced, and the other two sources are only partially ring-fenced. This leaves open the potential for the University to direct a portion of the funding previously

applied to or earned by the library to strengthen a priority need in another part of ULRLS.⁴

Library: Conclusions

33. It was clear to us from our review of the library that it remains the jewel in the Institute's crown. It is a world ranked legal research library, which through strong and strategic management has been able to draw on non HEFCE sources of income to continually expand its holdings at a time when practically all other UK law libraries have been experiencing a period of retrenchment. The specialist expertise and experience of the library staff has been a key element in the continuing success of the library. Without this staff the library's flexibility to adapt to the changing demands of the legal information marketplace would be significantly reduced, and its value to its international, national, university and professional users will be considerably undermined.

(a) We consider that the University, the School and the IALS should assist the library to maintain its strengths as a national and international centre of excellence with its special features of:

- Outstanding collections;
- on site and largely open access to materials;
- specialist law librarians and technical staff;
- innovations in enhanced databases;
- graduate only access.

(b) We believe that the weaknesses identified above should be addressed through managing growth and that every effort should be made to avoid the imposition of deleterious cuts in provision and service which has affected the great bulk of UK law libraries in the past decade;

(c) We recommend that the library should retain its ability to react innovatively and entrepreneurially to the ever changing market for its services;

⁴ The question of funding the Institute and its library will be dealt with in greater depth below.

that it should explore the possibilities of collaboration with libraries external to the University; that it should hold under review the costing of its provision to graduate students and that it explore the extension of library services at an appropriate charge to the University and the profession.

(d) We believe that provided a payment is made for a proper and proportionate charge for the University infrastructure, the Institute and the School should explore the potential for ring-fencing all or a significant portion of a proportionate share of the HEFCE special funding for the Institutes, for the use of IALS and its library; and that the funds earned by the library should be entirely ring-fenced for the use of the library.

(e) We recommend that when the planned convergence of the ULRSL takes place every effort should be taken:

- to retain the complement of specialist law librarians in the IALS library;
- to introduce central planning for ULRSL in such a way that it does not lead to a loss of devolved initiative or reduced room for localised entrepreneurialism and innovation;
- not to introduce measures which will inhibit collaboration with other leading research law libraries;
- to implement reporting and management structures for the Institute's librarian which do not involve a loss of autonomy for the library, the Institute and its Director;
- to preserve the distinctive identity of the library; and
- to ensure that any significant changes to existing procedures, including those relating to acquisitions, access and staff reporting, should be undertaken only with the agreement of the Director of the IALS and the Dean of SAS.
- We endorse the Library's policy that as much material as possible should be kept on site and most should be available on open access.

Strengthening the Institute's Research Capacity

33. As was indicated above, the research activities undertaken by the Institute have steadily increased and been strengthened since 1999. In addition to the research and development activities of the library, the doctoral programme, and the research of Visiting Fellows and other individuals, three groups have emerged which represent at least nuclei of the kinds of research centres envisaged in the Goode Report. These groups have achieved an impressive amount with quite limited funding. But they are fragile, not least because they are so heavily dependent on ad hoc grants and “soft” money.
34. This evolutionary approach is justified and should be continued. At the next stage, three aspects need to be given priority. First, efforts should be made to build on the existing activities relating to legal education and legal services, legislation, information technology, corporate law, and so on. Second, largely because of specific project funding streams many of these projects tend towards the “applied” end of the spectrum. Much valuable work has been done, but there is a gap in providing the kind of balance envisaged by the Goode Report. The theoretical side needs to be strengthened. Third, the research activities of the Institute need to be put on a more stable footing. A successful Research Institute needs regular core funding, a reasonable degree of job security, and a nucleus of long-term programmes. The exact form recommended by the Goode Report is not so important as achieving a “critical mass” of co-ordinated activities within a single research community.
35. These needs cannot be met overnight. For the time being adopting an evolutionary approach is the only realistic option. However, the creation of one new senior academic post, preferably backed by support at post-doctoral level, could make an immense contribution to stabilising the Institute's research activities, strengthening the theoretical/academic side of these activities, assisting with fund-raising, and planning and co-ordinating the development of a medium- and long-term research strategy. In short, what is needed is the creation of a new Chair and the appointment of an established scholar whose role would be to act as a Co-ordinator of Research as well as pursuing his or

her own scholarly agenda. Such an appointment or appointments could also greatly strengthen the Management team and provide further academic leadership directed towards achieving the next stage of evolution towards realising the IALS's mission to become a major centre of advanced research.

Accommodation

36. The Institute occupies eight floors (6536 sq. m.) of Charles Clore House. The first floor and some other rooms are leased by the University to the British Institute of International and Comparative Law (hereafter BIICL) on favourable terms. The accommodation in Charles Clore House has been fully stretched for several years. It is generally accepted that the building of a new extension is a very high priority. Since the nineteen-nineties it has been recognized that the building has some serious deficiencies for the comfort of users, lack of efficiency (for example, high heating costs) and the accommodation of the materials in the library collections, as well as shortage of space for accommodating staff, Visiting Fellows, readers and other users. It is also recognized that the building gives a rather dated and gloomy impression and needs to be refurbished and redecorated.

37. In 1999-2000 plans for the refurbishment and extension of the building were drawn up. During the past five years these have been cut back and modified to meet planning requirements, in light of the fact that building was listed in December, 2000. The revised plans are currently the subject of a planning application that is not expected to be finally determined before July 2006. Meanwhile, plans for a major fund-raising appeal (currently estimated at over £14.5 million, including VAT, for the building) are held up. Even if planning permission is granted in the near future and fund-raising for this purpose is successful, it seems rather unlikely that the extension will be ready for use for at least five years. And the funds may not be forthcoming. So the question arises: what can be done to meet the growing needs for accommodation up to, and possibly beyond, 2010?

Space - Library

38. The library collection grows at the rate of about 150 metres of shelving a year; about 4,500 print volumes are added annually to the collection. The numbers of staff, readers and other visitors continue to grow, and, if the Library is to develop, this trend will continue.

39. So far as the library is concerned, planning and measures to maximise usable space and to adjust to changing circumstances, especially in respect of information technology, are a continuous process. Measures already taken include the introduction of compact moveable shelving, a steady shift to reliance on electronic sources, collaboration with other libraries to reduce unnecessary overlap, disposal consistent with archival responsibilities, and the transfer of little used books and materials to the University's depository at Egham. These measures are described in a useful memorandum on "Space Planning Interim Measures etc.". They seem very sensible and do not require detailed comment. Overall, the library is coping as best it can with using existing space efficiently, but it cannot hope to continue to do so indefinitely, if it is to maintain its current level of services, let alone to develop them.

40. Two points are worth stressing. First, it has been the policy of the library, strongly endorsed by the Library Committee, that as much material as possible should be kept on site and most should be available on open access. This is not only desirable for regular readers, but it is essential if the library is to continue to function as a national and international resource readily accessible to scholars and postgraduates from all over the United Kingdom and beyond, many of whom come to London for short visits, often for a single day. We strongly endorse the continuation of this policy. Only a limited amount of more material can be moved off-site without damaging the national and international role of the library.

41. In addition to keeping the great bulk of the collections on site, the library needs expansion space for modern research facilities that are normal in a major academic library, including a periodicals reading room, separate computer and group study rooms, classroom(s) for electronic teaching and so on.

Other space

42. We are told that the balance between office and library accommodation is currently about right, but that both are under pressure. In addition, common room space and circulation areas are not satisfactory. Since the Institute, as required by School policy, began to charge the London schools for use of teaching rooms, demand has declined, but not to the extent of making a significant amount of extra space available (although one classroom might be converted for use for electronic teaching). If the Institute's own research activities are to expand significantly, more office space will be needed in addition to better common room facilities. At present, Visiting Fellows and other short-term visitors are provided with carrels in the library. These are recognized to be inadequate both in numbers and quality. In the short term, improving common room facilities and accommodation for Visitors deserves to be given a high priority.

Tenants

43. One floor of the building is currently leased to the BIICL and from time to time the possibility of the BIICL moving to other premises has been discussed. There are, however, several practical difficulties. The first floor has not been strengthened for books; a financial settlement would need to be agreed; and it would be hoped that the Institute could continue to be associated with the scholarly research and public events of BIICL, which give an important international and comparative dimension to the activities that take place in Charles Clore House. Moreover, if an extra floor became available for the Institute's use, this would give some temporary breathing space, but in the longer term the case for a further extension is overwhelming if the Institute is to fulfil its mission.

Interim improvements and refurbishment

44. Professor Sherr has made it clear that one of his first priorities is to make the building more welcoming for its users and visitors. He proposes a number of measures including an improved coffee bar, a catering facility at lunch-time, improved disabled access and signs, and redecoration of the circulation areas.

45. In addition, at present there are serious problems of security and cleanliness in the area outside the main entrance to the building which have been of concern to the University, as landlord, and the Institute. A draft plan for closing the front corner of the building is under consideration by English Heritage and the Camden planners. This would make the mess near the entrance easier to control, improve security, and will give an opportunity to make the foyer more welcoming. It is hoped that this might also create extra space within the building for a coffee bar, which is sorely needed. The estimated cost of this highly desirable development in the front corner of the building is £150,000.
46. All of these measures, if implemented, would not only improve the situation for existing users, but also further the objective of making the Institute a natural meeting-place for the academic legal community, both within London and nationally.

Teaching, Training, and Events

Teaching and training

47. At present the Institute is involved in a limited amount of teaching, including a doctoral programme, training of law librarians, some IT teaching, short courses offered by the Sir William Dale Institute, continuing education, and the new MA in Advanced Legislative Studies. The Institute also hosts and contributes to a semester abroad programme run by Dickinson Law School. Visiting scholars are encouraged to make some contributions to LLM courses, but this seems in practice to be quite limited. Traditionally the Institute has not offered courses in the inter-collegiate LLM.
48. It is appropriate for the Institute to have a doctoral programme related to its other research activities and this has now been put on an acceptable basis. It is obviously healthy for the Institute to offer some other teaching and training in areas in which it has expertise, but is also sensible to ensure that the amount of teaching it undertakes should not become a diversion from its primary objectives. It could probably generate some extra income by undertaking more

teaching, but we recommend that it should only do so where this kind of activity would further its general mission. In other words, the Institute should not take on teaching solely or mainly in order to make money.

49. The question arises whether the special expertise of the Institute's staff and Visitors is sufficiently exploited by the inter-collegiate LLM and other existing postgraduate programmes. For example, the current staff have special, in some cases unique, expertise in relation to legal education and legal services, legislation and law reform, and aspects of information technology and law. In most years there are distinguished visitors who might have much to offer to postgraduate teaching.

50. In the past there has been sensitivity on the part of the London Law schools that the Institute might enter into competition with them, if it offered courses on the intercollegiate LLM. Given that at most the Institute could offer or contribute to a maximum of 3 or 4 courses out of a total of nearly 140, and given that the Law Subject Panel has to approve any new courses that are proposed, fears of competition from the Institute now appear exaggerated and outdated. Limited participation by the Institute in LLM teaching is more likely to strengthen the LLM rather than undermine it. Some contribution by Institute staff and visitors might further integrate the IALS into the London academic community. Accordingly, we suggest that the Law Subject Panel might reconsider this policy while taking into account any financial implications.

51. The Sir William Dale Centre has recently started a new MA in Advanced Legislative Studies. If this is a success, there may be scope for a further modest extension of specialist MA courses.

Events

52. The wide range of conferences, workshops, seminars and lectures, many of them open to the public free of charge, is described in detail in the Annual Reports. They are generally considered to be one of the most impressive features of the Institute's activities and they have generally succeeded in attracting good audiences. The Institute sponsors many of these activities,

including the highly successful annual W. G. Hart Workshop and it hosts others organized by BIICL, the Society for Advanced Legal Studies, the Statute Law Society and other organizations.

53. These events are a key aspect of building bridges between the legal academic community and practitioners, judges and government lawyers. Given the range of similar events also taking place in London, it seems unlikely that there will be much demand for an increase in quantity. It is probably fair to say that a balance has yet to be struck between lectures and other events oriented towards practitioners and ones which might attract academics from Greater London and beyond, as recommended by the Goode Report. This lively programme is regularly under review and the Director tells us that he hopes to introduce a greater degree of informality into some of the activities. It is not necessary for us to comment in detail on this aspect of the Institute's work except to commend it and to suggest that it can be an important vehicle for involving the Institute more in interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary occasions and at the frontiers of legal research.

The Institute as a Meeting Place

54. In addition to sponsoring, hosting and accommodating a wide range of events, the Institute provides facilities for the Heads of University Law Schools, the Society of Legal Scholars, The Society for Advanced Legal Studies and other bodies to hold committee meetings in Charles Clore House. The Subject Panel in Law also meets there and the classrooms are used for some LLM teaching. Through the activities of the Society for Advanced Legal Studies, BIICL and the Institute's own events, significant steps have been taken to promote interchanges between academic lawyers and leading practitioners, judges and those involved in law reform. All of these activities bring people to the building, but there is a general recognition that the Institute has not yet realised its full potential as an intellectual centre, as the national headquarters of the academic legal community and a natural meeting-place for legal scholars who work in, or are visiting, the Greater London area. As one person put it: "Academic lawyers, including those in London, still tend to perceive the

Institute as a library with a few peripheral activities". In this regard, some of the other University of London Institutes, for example, the Institute of Historical Research, could be held up as role models.

55. The strengthening of the Institute's own research culture, redecoration and refurbishment of key parts of the present building, and a coffee bar and luncheon facility, can all help to make Charles Clore House a natural meeting-place for legal scholars. More could be done in addition to improving the ambience. For example, further consideration could usefully be given to the following suggestions:

- Closer links with younger law teachers in the University of London Law Schools and in the Greater London area, for example by holding one or more regular social events, which might also serve to introduce visitors to the local academic community;
- the holding of a regular series of informal seminars or workshops to discuss issues at the frontiers of legal research;
- if funding becomes available, the establishment of a second annual conference along the lines of the very successful Hart workshops;
- offering office space and possibly administrative backup for law-related learned societies and other associations that do not have premises of their own. Some previous involvements left the institute out of pocket and it would be necessary to ensure that such a facility would be largely self-financing. However, the costs might be met by a combination of contributions from the participating societies and a possible subvention from private sector sources, for example publishers with strong academic law lists who might welcome closer links with the Institute. A precedent has been established by the arrangement with the British Insurance Law Association, who are provided with administrative services for a fee calculated at full economic cost.

Relations with other Institutions

University of London Law Schools

56. The extent of the dependence of the University of London Law Schools on the Institute is easily underestimated. In addition to being the main research library for all of the London law schools, for academic staff as well as postgraduates, the Institute has an essential relationship with the large and complex LLM (nearly 1500 students in 2004): the LLM Co-ordinator has his office in Charles Clore House (the costs are met by the participating law schools), some LLM classes are held there, library staff provide IT instruction, and the building is the focal point for many postgraduates from the University of London law schools. Conversely, LLM students constitute over 60% of the readers in the library. LSE has withdrawn from the Intercollegiate LLM, but continues to depend on the Institute's Library for its own LLM. The Inter-Collegiate LLM seems set to continue for the foreseeable future, but even if each University of London law school offered separate LLMs and other Masters' degrees (as they do now on a small scale), they would still rely very heavily on the IALS library and its services.
57. The costs of the Institute's contributions to the intercollegiate LLM are in theory met by a capitation fee based on a formula agreed with the Schools. The Goode Report observed that the formula in 1999 did not adequately capture the heads of expenditure attributable to the intercollegiate LLM and recommended some increase in the capitation fee to take account of these costs and the setting of a higher fee for full-fee students. (para 99, recommendation 20). These matters are reviewed annually and some adjustments have been made. During the past ten years the arrangement seems to have worked quite well. However, the situation needs to be kept under careful review as student numbers, fee levels change, courses proliferate and develop, and library costs increase. The guiding principle should be that the IALS should recover full notional costs for the services that it provides to University of London postgraduates.

58. The University of London law schools are well represented on the Institute's committees and close contact is maintained with the Heads of London law schools. However, from time to time it has been suggested that these contacts take place mainly in formal meetings and that there is scope for making the relationship even closer, through joint projects, contributions to teaching (see above, teaching), and the strengthening of the intellectual community centred on the Institute (see above, the Institute as a meeting place).

Links

59. Over time both the Institute and the library have developed a substantial number of overseas links. As was noted above, the library is part of a thriving network of relations with other libraries. Particularly noteworthy from the Institute's point of view are the arrangement with Dickinson School of Law (semester abroad) and the joint Research Centre with Columbia Law School. Details of these are given in the Annual Reports. As tends to happen with such arrangements, they appear to have developed in a somewhat ad hoc fashion and there is a need for a coherent policy. However, as the Director plans to review the overall situation in the near future, we need not comment on this in detail.

The School of Advanced Study

60. It is not necessary for us to comment on relations between the Institute and the School of Advanced Study, except to note that the Institute wishes to extend its inter-disciplinary activities and would welcome closer intellectual contacts with all or some of the other Institutes.

Finance and Fund-Raising

Funding

61. Funding for the Institute comes from four principal sources. In inverse order of importance they are: conference and short course fees, research grants and contracts, fees from library users,⁵ and HEFCE Special Funding.

⁵ This includes the LLM capitation fee and HEFCE funding for Access.

Conference and Short Course Fees

62. This represents less than 10% of the Institute's funding. From 1995/96 to 2003/04 it rose from £216,357 to £275,501 an increase of 27%. Although this source of funds has expanded less than the other principal sources, on current staffing levels and with the current space constraints on the Institute there is only a relatively limited scope for expansion of this source of income.

Research Grants and Contracts

63. This represents around 16% of the Institute's funding. From 1995/96 to 2003/04 it rose from £310,818 to £548,436 an increase of 76%. On current staffing levels and with the current space constraints on the Institute there is some, limited scope for expansion of this source of income. However, if a new Professor with responsibility for research activity is appointed as we recommend, we consider that there is considerable scope for expansion of this source of income.

Library and Information Services

64. This represents around 28% of the Institute's funding. From 1995/96 to 2003/04 it rose from £591,357 to £930,456 an increase of 57%. This increase represents success in generating project funding as well as charges. The 2003/04 total includes £393,366 from the LLM capitation fees and £223,040 from professional subscriptions and external user fees. We consider that the level of the capitation fee for the LLM and other graduate students should be kept under review to ensure that it is keeping pace with inflation, with the rising graduate demand and other changes. Similarly, the charges to the profession and other external users should also be kept under review, bearing in mind the fluctuating demand from the profession for the library services and the need not to charge in excess of what the market will bear.

HEFCE Funding

65. The fourth and largest single source of Institute funding comes from HEFCE. From 1995/96 to 2003/04 it rose from £865,251 to £1,278,631 an increase of 48%. In 2003/04 this Funding contained a T element of £203,500 and Special Funding of £1,015,174. The special funding is non-formula driven and derives

from the London Whole Institution grant made by HEFCE on an annual basis. In the case of the Advanced Institutes of the University (of which IALS is one) this funding is in recognition of their role and status as centres of national excellence and their libraries in particular. The overall block grant from HEFCE to the University is now sent to the Heads of Colleges Working Group to agree the appropriate division between Central University Services (17.6% in 2003/04), other initiatives e.g. Staff development, the School of Advanced Study and several smaller institutes. The 2003-04 total also includes £59,957 by way of Access Funds from HEFCE, a grant that has remained at the same level for the past three years since it was introduced. We consider this funding to be important, since it pays for a key post, and for outreach activities for the national research community, in recognition of the increasing national demand on the library. We believe that the School should seek to safeguard this funding, which is understood to be precarious.

66. The School of Advanced Study divides its funds between the Institutes retaining a portion for central services and the SAS Board (4.5% in 2003/04). It is understood that in the current year the Heads of Colleges Working Group retained the allocations between Central University Services, the School of Advanced Study and other activities in line with previous years. However, there is no guarantee that this approach will be followed in the future. This makes the HEFCE special funding source to the SAS (and IALS as a constituent part of SAS) vulnerable to strategic decisions to increase substantially the central costs from the university or to a decision to boost the funding of the Senate House Library.
67. With the average cost of law books and serials increasing at over 10% per annum it can be seen that the growth in special funding is running at under half the required rate to maintain the status quo. Accordingly we believe that there is a strong case for increased special funding to the Institute and its library from HEFCE. However, were such a bid to be successful it is also necessary that the HEFCE special funding be ring-fenced (at least to a significant extent) in recognition of the fact that the primary purpose of the special funding (as the Harris report recognised in 2000 at p. 7) is to sustain the specialist library

collections as centres as national excellence. This would not be the case if the special funding was vulnerable to strategic decisions to direct it to other University priorities.

Funding: Conclusions

68. We consider that the vital importance of the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies and its library as a national centre for excellence merits not only retaining the physical identity of the library but also a large measure of fiscal autonomy. This is already the case for the bulk of its income, but not in the case of the special funding which it receives from HEFCE. Accordingly we recommend that:

- the fiscal autonomy of the Institute be preserved and enhanced;
- a bid be made to increase the HEFCE special funding of the Institute and its library in line with the inflation in staffing salaries, and law book and serial costs;
- the School should seek to ensure that a proportionate share of the special funding grant from HEFCE to the SAS should be ring-fenced to a significant extent for the IALS;
- the School should seek to preserve the Access Funds grants from HEFCE in the light of the ever increasing demands on the library from legal scholars from other English universities, whose own library holdings are being eroded;
- the Institute keep under review its capitation charges to its graduate student users and its charges to users from the profession.

Fund-raising

69. Some of the documents initially seem to have given the impression that major fund-raising for the Institute is on hold, pending the completion of the planning process for the extension to the building. This is misleading, because there have been extensive efforts to raise money for particular purposes over the past five years and these are ongoing. Some of these have been successful, as is illustrated by the funding of the Woolf Chair of Legal Education, grants for

activities associated with that Chair, grants raised by the Sir William Dale Centre for Legislative Studies, and funding of complete retrospective conversion of the card catalogue to on-line form. However, the eccentrically named Development and Advisory Committee has not met since February, 2003 and there does not appear to be a coherent fund-raising strategy which is integrated with plans based on the regular income streams.

70. With the appointment of a new Director, the time is ripe for a review of the Institute's fund-raising activities. It is clearly a sensible position that a formal public appeal for private sector funding of the proposed extension would be premature pending completion of the planning process. However, within the context of a general strategy, funds need to be raised for developments other than the extension to the building; the relationship between a major public appeal for the building and other fund-raising activities need to be clarified; what are realistic goals need to be assessed; and preliminary planning for the major appeal could usefully be started in the near future.
71. Accordingly, we recommend that:
- the title, the terms of reference and the constitution of the Development and Advisory Committee should be reviewed; and
 - that an overall fund-raising strategy should be prepared, in consultation with the new Committee, dealing with all the main potential sources of revenue, including both public, private and international sources.

Appraisal

72. The Goode Report recommended that there should be an external appraisal every five or six years and suggested some criteria for assessing the overall performance of the Institute. The first such exercise was due to take place in 2004 or 2005. However, given the time devoted to two administrative reviews in 2003 and 2004, and our own review (which is selective and concerned with the future rather than comprehensive and concerned with past performance), and given that the new Director has only recently taken up his appointment, it

would be reasonable to postpone a comprehensive external appraisal for a further period. The question of regular peer review is now a matter for the School of Advanced Study and awaits the HEFCE Review on the School undertaken by Sir Martin Harris, who is expected to report in the Spring of 2005.

Conclusions and Recommendations

General

1. Since its foundation in 1946 the Institute has consistently pursued the objective of being the primary national centre in the United Kingdom for advanced legal research in all fields of law. It is widely recognized as including one of the three premier law libraries in the country, with an outstanding record in the provision of services and in the use and development of modern information technology. It has successfully promoted and facilitated a wide range of events, it has undertaken valuable research, but it has yet to reach its full potential as a Research Institute in its own right that is recognized as the focal point of legal scholarship in the United Kingdom.
2. The Institute and Library are well-managed and we understand that past concerns about administration and management have been taken in hand.
3. Since 1999 the planning and development of the Institute have been guided by the recommendations of the Report of the Review Committee, chaired by Professor Sir Roy Goode (1999). Nearly all of the recommendations of the Goode Report involving only modest costs have been or are in the process of being implemented; research activities have developed incrementally; but lack of funds has delayed the full implementation of its two most important recommendations viz. the establishment of five major research centres and a major extension of Charles Clore House.
4. In our view the vision of the Goode Report is both desirable and feasible in the long term, but it is unrealistic to think that it can be fully realised for at least five years, possibly longer.

5. The following should be the strategic objectives of IALS during the next five years:
- Maintaining and developing the Library and its services;
 - further evolutionary development of research activity, especially in respect of academic research;
 - ensuring that there is adequate accommodation to house new developments, pending the completion of the proposed extension;
 - taking further steps to make the Institute a focal point and natural meeting place for legal scholars nationally and internationally and for activities at the interface of academic law and legal practice;
 - continuing and developing the programme of events sponsored by or located in the Institute.

Library

6. It is clear to us from our review of the library that it remains the jewel in the Institute's crown. It is a world ranked legal research library which, through strong and strategic management has been able to draw on non HEFCE sources of income to continually expand its holdings at a time when practically all other UK law libraries have been experiencing a period of retrenchment. The specialist expertise and experience of the library staff have been a key element in the continuing success of the library. Without this staff the library's flexibility to adapt to the changing demands of the legal information marketplace would be significantly reduced, and its value to its international, national, university and professional users will be considerably undermined.
7. We consider that the University, the School and the IALS should assist the library to maintain its strengths as a national and international centre of excellence with its special features of:
- Outstanding collections;
 - On site and largely open access to materials;

- Specialist law librarians and technical staff;
 - Innovations in enhanced databases;
 - Graduate only access.
8. We believe that the weaknesses identified in our section on the library should be addressed through managing growth and that every effort should be made to avoid the imposition of deleterious cuts in provision and service which has occurred the great bulk of UK law libraries in the past decade.
9. We recommend that the library should retain its ability to react innovatively and entrepreneurially to the ever changing market for its services; that it should explore the possibilities of collaboration with libraries external to the University; that it should hold under review the costing of its provision to graduate students and that it explore the extension of library services at an appropriate charge to the University and the profession.
10. We believe that provided a payment is made for a proper and proportionate charge for the University infrastructure, the School and the University should explore the potential for ring-fencing all or a significant portion of a proportionate share of the HEFCE special funding for the Institutes, for the use of IALS and its library; and that the funds earned by the library should be entirely ringfenced for the use of the library.
11. We recommend that when the planned convergence of the ULRSL takes place every effort should be taken:
- to retain the complement of specialist law librarians in the IALS library;
 - to introduce central planning for ULRSL in such a way that it does not lead to a loss of devolved initiative or reduced room for localised entrepreneurialism and innovation;
 - not to introduce measures which will inhibit collaboration with other leading research law libraries;

- to implement reporting and management structures for the Institute's librarian which do not involve a loss of autonomy for the library, the Institute and its Director;
 - to preserve the distinctive identity of the library; and
 - to ensure that any significant changes to existing procedures, including those relating to acquisitions, access and staff reporting, should be undertaken only with the agreement of the Director of the IALS and the Dean of SAS.
12. We endorse the Library's policy that as much material as possible should be kept on site and most should be available on open access.

Research

13. Since 1999 the research activities undertaken by the Institute have increased and developed incrementally with quite limited funding, but its activities need to be further strengthened in respect of both pure and applied research.
14. In the next phase, we recommend the establishment of a new Chair and of a post-doctoral research post. The holder of the Chair should be an established scholar whose role would be to act as a Co-ordinator of research and to provide further academic leadership as well as pursuing his or her own scholarly agenda.
15. The Institute's lively programme of events is commendable. The balance, style, and target audiences need to be kept under review.

Accommodation

16. In the longer term the case for a major extension is overwhelming, if the Institute is to fulfil its mission.
17. Improving common room and catering facilities and accommodation for Visitors deserves to be given immediate priority.

18. The plan for enclosing the front corner of Charles Clore House is a highly desirable development.
19. The possibility of the first floor becoming available to IALS, if the BIICL were willing to re-locate its offices to other nearby premises (while continuing to use the library and public rooms for meetings and other events), deserves to be explored further. This would give some temporary breathing space, but would not meet all of the Institute's long-term needs for accommodation.

The Institute as a National Centre

20. The Institute has not yet realised its full potential as the national headquarters of the academic legal community and a natural meeting-place for legal scholars who work in or visit the Greater London area. Further consideration could usefully be given to the following suggestions:

- Fostering closer links with younger law teachers in the University of London Law Schools and beyond;
- Holding a regular series of informal seminars or workshops to discuss issues at the frontiers of legal research;
- If funding becomes available, establishing a second annual conference along the lines of the very successful Hart workshops;
- Offering office space and possibly administrative backup on a self-financing basis to law-related learned societies and other associations that do not have premises of their own.

Finance

21. Funding

- The fiscal autonomy of the Institute should be preserved and enhanced as far as possible;
- A bid should be made for an increase of HEFCE special funding of the Institute and its library to keep pace with inflation in staffing salaries, and with rising law book and serial costs;

- The School should seek to ensure that a proportionate share of the special funding grant from HEFCE to the SAS should be ring-fenced to a significant extent for the IALS;
- The School should seek to preserve the Access Funds grants from HEFCE in the light of the ever increasing demands on the library from legal scholars from other English universities, whose own library holdings are being eroded;
- The Institute should keep under review its capitation charges to its graduate student users and its charges for external library services.

22. **Fund-raising**

- The title, the terms of reference, and the constitution of the Development and Advisory Committee should be reviewed; and
- An overall fund-raising strategy should be prepared, in consultation with the new Committee, dealing with all the main potential sources of revenue, including public, private and international sources.

Teaching and training

23. The Institute undertakes a limited amount of teaching and training. We recommend that the Institute should only expand such activities where they further its general mission.
24. If the Law Subject Panel is willing to reconsider the policy which precludes the Institute from participating in the Intercollegiate LLM, the Institute could make some modest, but useful, contributions to the programme in areas where the its staff or visitors have special expertise.