|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DATE:** | Wednesday, March 27, 2019 |
| **TIME:** | 11:45 AM – 12:49 PM  |
| **LOCATION:** | Perkins 218 |
|  |  |

**DUL LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MEETING CREATED BY:** | Deborah Jakubs | **MINUTE TAKER:** | Lenora Ross |
| **FACILITATOR:** | Deborah Jakubs | **TIME KEEPER:** | Lenora Ross |
|  |  |  |  |
| **PLEASE READ:** | University of California Decision on Elsevier Journals  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

 **ATTENDEES PRESENT:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tommy Witelski | Tim Mitchell-Olds | Kim Duckett (Joel) | Deborah Jakubs |
| Dracine Hodges | David Hansen | Manoj Mohanan | Patrick Charbonneau |
| Chris Johnston | Anthony Kelly | Jennifer Ahern-Dodson | Tom Hadzor |
| James “Jimmy” Roberts | Jeff Kosokoff | Brian Murray | Henry Pickford |
| Lynn Smith-Lovin | Anna (need last name) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**MINUTES**

|  |
| --- |
| **[University of California Decision on Elsevier Journals: Contact and Impact]** |
| **TIME ALLOCATED** | **1 hour and 4 min** | **PRESENTED BY** | **Jeff Kosokoff and David Hansen** |
| **DISCUSSION**  | UC Irvine ended negotiations with Elsevier due to the publishing company not wanting to give UC their core demands: cost and dissemination. Four European countries (Germany, France, Norway and Sweden) have also backed out of deals/negotiations with Elsevier. Emphasized the differences for the UC ending negotiations verses the four European countries. Compared the traffic volume of published journals. Duke University began its relationship with Elsevier 10 years ago and a lot has changed especially the increase of cost verses the open access and journal publication. Questions were posed about the legal challenge UC faces, Elsevier’s ability to spin information where they don’t look bad with school ending negotiations and backing out of deals, what is the faculty’s feeling about this occurrence and Duke University’s stance on this issue. UC had support from its (school) system where Duke University is part of the Ivy Plus and each university is doing something different (hard to garner universal support). Duke University has cut $275,000; however, Duke University still paying $2.8 million and the initial subscription is $2.76 million. DU is paying an additional $1.0 million in small transactions and Jeff is working on determining what those small transactions are for. Duke University has been sharing this information with the other Ivy Plus universities, but also need to share with DU’s faculty so they can understand why changes are being made. The council agreed that sharing and increasing the faculty’s knowledge of the situation with Elsevier then there will be more support when it comes time to make concrete decisions about whether to continue moving forward with Elsevier. Dave explained the difference between UC and UNC Chapel terminating their relationships with Elsevier. UC was about cost, lack of innovation and the big deals –long term. UNC Chapel Hill was due to cost and the big deal due to budget pressure –short term. In addition to that comparison, Dracine explained that the difference between UC and UNC Chapel Hill is the budget: state school work from a central budget verses private schools that function with individual budgets -don’t have shared budgets. Another question asked was whether faculty can buy individual title and the answer is yes, but the cost of doing that is unknown. There was a discussion about the transparency and understanding why Elsevier is staying stagnate at 39% market value while costs for using their services are increasing. Also, there is a clear difference between schools who use Elsevier where some schools are paying far less than other schools while other school are paying astronomical amounts.Outside of cost, the council also discussed purging junk titles, proliferation of lower quality journals, trying to explain to undergraduates the difference between quality vs non quality journals, pricing system and open access. David suggested getting a small focused group together to look at long term solutions and encouraging faculty support and possibly submit a document to the Academic Council during the Fall semester. Ultimately the goal is to make tactical decisions, small actions to that allow Duke University to make long term changes that are beneficial.  |
| **CONCLUSION** | Important to continue this discussion, share the information and gather the support of faculty in order to be prepared. |
| **ACTION** | **ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY** | **DATE TO BE ACTIONED BY** |
| Putting together a small focus group | David Hansen | Fall semester |
| Discussion group about Elsevier, the scholarly publishing industry (especially journal publishing), and how we at Duke can address challenges in this area to improve our own situation and the overall scholarly publishing system. | David Hansen | Wednesday, April 3, 201911:00 am - noon |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **[Ivy Plus Library Confederation]** |
| **TIME ALLOCATED** | **5 min** | **PRESENTED BY** | **Deborah Jakubs** |
| **DISCUSSION**  | Discussion will take place at the next meeting |
| **CONCLUSION** | N/A |
| **ACTION** | **ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY** | **DATE TO BE ACTIONED BY** |
| N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |