

Rutgers University Libraries
Faculty Planning Committee Meeting
Wednesday, September 27, 2017
10:00am-12:00pm
University Librarian's Conference Room

Attendees: Natalie Borisovets, Melissa DeFino, Joseph Deodato, Pam Hargwood (Faculty Secretary), Karen Hartman (Faculty Chair), Kevin Mulcahy (Faculty Vice Chair/Chair Elect), Laura Mullen, Caryn Radick, Ela Sosnowska, Zara Wilkinson (remote)

1. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted as presented. The August minutes were approved with minor changes.

2. Revised mentoring report-brief discussion

The revised proposal of the Faculty Mentoring Program was reviewed to see if the revisions matched the discussion from the August Planning Committee meeting.

It was felt that some changes to the document may need to be addressed.

- Where the RUL website is mentioned, there should be links to the site
- There is need for clarification regarding what happens to current mentoring pairs. A statement addressing this issue could include a timeline where current pairs could continue on an informal basis but after a specific date, there will be this new procedure.

Borisovets will review page one of the document and suggest edits.

Hartman will send the proposal to the University Librarian to get her perspective.

The committee would like to thank Leslin Charles, Kayo Denda, Christie Lutz, and Mary Beth Weber for their comprehensive analysis and hard work drafting this proposal.

3. Faculty forum debrief and next actions (ALL)

The Faculty forum held September 15th was well attended and promoted good discussion. Key issues that came forward include:

Tenure criteria-Significant concerns were expressed at the forum regarding our promotion and tenure criteria. Do the current criteria reflect the demands of newer faculty positions? Faculty question whether the criteria account for the kind of librarianship, scholarship, and service librarians in these new positions are expected to perform—and to demonstrate excellence in.

It was decided to form a committee to review the tenure guidelines/criteria. (see the guidelines under Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions for University Library Faculty [here](#)) Mulcahy will chair the committee. Membership will be from volunteers and recommendations. There will be representation from all four campuses and tenured and non-tenured track librarians. We should look at other Big10 Academic Alliance institutions to see what they are doing. The committee will also reach out to recently tenured librarians to get their suggestions and opinions on the tenure process.

Central Positions - There is some confusion concerning the responsibilities of central technical services and shared user services and the distinction between central and local. The AUL for Collection Development is an example of a central position for which faculty will provide input.

Contemporary Research Services- We need to address how we can move forward with this issue

There is a lot of stuff percolating but no method to disseminate the information now that CSC disbanded. We need to figure out the components of the definition of “scholarly communication”. Information control became a big issue due to the LibQual survey but there was nothing in the survey about scholarly communication. There are university mandates that need to be addressed such as OAT, ORCID, and the Open Access Policy with the 3-year report coming due.

Some suggestions for moving forward with this issue are to redefine liaison work with regard to scholarly communication; providing input to a future posting for an AUL for Collection Development; and going through the directors and bringing this issue to them.

At the appropriate time, the committee will offer input into the job posting for the AUL for Collection Development & Management, and may recommend that the position be broadened to include scholarly communication. Mullen will pull together a definition for scholarly communication. Hartman and Mulcahy will approach the University Librarian and get her perspective on scholarly communication in early October.

Ad hoc Groups/Interest Groups/Community of Practice-Hartman and Mulcahy will come up with guidelines for these groups.

4. TT/NTT statement revised draft-final discussion (Borisovets)

Glynn revised Borisovet’s draft of the RUL Faculty Statement on Tenure. DeFino will create examples of when a NTT position maybe needed for TAS. The revisions will be distributed to the committee by email and will be brought to the October Faculty meeting.

5. Travel funds for faculty (Mulcahy)

The committee is concerned that there is a discrepancy between the high expectations for faculty professional service on a national and international level and the limited financial support for travel. There is a good argument for bringing funding more in line with

expectations. The situation is complicated by quite different levels of support within different units. Hartman and Mulcahy will propose this issue as a cabinet agenda in the near future.

6. Report of the Faculty Chair/Faculty Members of the UL Cabinet (Hartman and Mulcahy)

A preliminary budget presentation was discussed.

7. Summary of outcomes (Hartman)

Borisovets will look over and suggest edits on page one of the Faculty Mentoring Report and members of the Mentoring Task Force will walk through the document at the October Faculty meeting.

Mulcahy will chair a committee to look at tenure criteria/guidelines.

Mullen will create a definition for “scholarly communication” and Mulcahy and Hartman will approach the University Librarian to get her opinion in early October.

Hartman and Mulcahy will come up with guidelines regarding ad hoc groups, interest groups and communities of practice.

DeFino will send examples of when an NTT may be needed for TAS. Revisions for this document will be sent to the Planning Committee by email and the draft will be brought to the October Faculty meeting.

The travel fund discussion will come back to the next Planning Committee meeting.