Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 18th May 2021 via MS Teams

Present: Lynne Meehan (Chair), Penelope Butler (JCS Team), James Caudwell (JCS Team), Nicholas Cutler (Computer Laboratory), Joanne Farrant (JCS Team), Charlotte Smith (Engineering), Helen Stevens-Smith (Chemical Engineering)

Apologies: Sue Lambert (Moore Library)

Membership: Dr Ljiljana Frug had agreed to join the Consultative Committee as the academic representative for the Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology.

1. Declaration of interests
There were no declarations of interest.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting
The minutes of the meeting held on 11th February 2020 were approved.

3. Matters arising
None.

4. Relaunching the consultative committees
Paper 21-2, explaining the rationale behind relaunching the consultative committees, had been circulated prior to the meeting.

5. Elsevier
(i) Approach to Elsevier negotiations
The Committee discussed Paper 21-3, which had originally been drafted for the University’s Research Policy Committee. The following comments regarding plans for academic engagement were made:

- it is vital that departmental librarians be kept up-to-date with what is happening and that they know what action they should be taking and when
- it looks as though things will ramp up considerably in June/July it would be better to start consulting with academics sooner rather than later, especially as many librarians in the School of Technology will be involved in the move to new library facilities later this year
- names/contact details for key contacts for each of the five project workstreams would be useful
- rather polarised views can emanate from facilitated discussions, town hall meetings etc., whereas a survey, for example, can elicit a wider range of views
- it is crucial to gain a sense of the resources our researchers regard as critical
- titles should not be evaluated on usage statistics alone
- focus must not be purely on the read aspect, we also need to look at where our academics publish.

It was noted that the Office of Scholarly Communication (OSC) webpages relating to the University of Cambridge and Elsevier (https://www.openaccess.cam.ac.uk/publishing-open-access/university-cambridge-and-elsevier) were expected to be updated in the near future.

**ACTION:** Lynne Meehan to follow up on issue of comms if nothing heard within one month.

(ii) Position paper

The Committee considered Paper 21-4, which had originally been drafted for the University’s Research Policy Committee. There was support of the strong stance laid out, but some scepticism that all of the requirements would be met. This raised the question of what would ultimately be acceptable or unacceptable; the feeling of the JCS Team was that this was still be established.

(iii) Elsevier Freedom Collection broken down by subject

Paper 21-5, listing the titles in the Freedom Collection of relevance to the School of Technology, had been circulated prior to the meeting.

**ACTION:** ALL members of the Committee to familiarise themselves with high usage titles and with those with a high cost per download.

The following points were highlighted:

- prices given are not 100% accurate as are based on list prices, but they give a good guide
- people do not necessarily realize which titles are included in the Freedom Collection; it was noted that there is the possibility of creating a website for data which would help to address matters such as this
- care must be taken to consider academic perception of titles as well as usage.

6. New needs

Paper 21-6, giving details of resources subscribed to using “Covid-19 Fighting Fund” monies (FY2019/20) and JCS monies (FY2020/21), had been circulated for information.

7. Portfolio review

The Committee welcomed the intention to undertake a portfolio review in 2022. However, the following concerns were raised:

- staff resources are already stretched due to the opening of a new library later in 2021 and the Elsevier negotiations, which may not be concluded in 2021
- IEEE, which is a major subscription for the School of Technology, could potentially be opted out of
- usage statistics do not tell us which departments titles are being used by
- a significant number of titles are interdisciplinary and care must be taken to consult with all relevant departments
- user voice must be considered alongside usage statistics.

8. Financial matters

(i) Planning Round submission

The JCS submission to PR20 (Planning Round 2020), Paper 21-7, had been circulated for information. The outcome was as yet unknown.

(ii) JCS Risk Register

Paper 21-8, the JCS Risk register, had been circulated for information as it was felt that the consultative committees should be made aware of its existence.

9. Dates of future meetings

The Committee were asked to consider whether more frequent meetings would be beneficial during the Elsevier negotiations. Consensus of opinion was that this would depend on what needed to be done and when, which was not yet clear but would become so over the next month or so. For the time being, it was agreed to stick with the usual Michaelmas term meeting.

10. Any other business

None.