Rutgers University Libraries
Faculty Planning and Coordinating Committee Meeting
Wednesday, February 22, 2017
10 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
University Librarian’s Conference Room
Minutes

Attendees: Natalie Borisovets (Faculty Coordinator), Leslin Charles (Faculty Secretary), Melissa De Fino, Kayo Denda, Tom Glynn, Karen Hartman (Deputy Faculty Coordinator), Christie Lutz, Elizabeth Sosnowska, Mary Beth Weber, Zara Wilkinson (remote)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
   The agenda was adopted as presented

2. Report of the Faculty Coordinator/Deputy Faculty Coordinator (Borisovets & Hartman)
   a. The Cabinet has met twice since the last PlanCo meeting. The last scheduled meeting was canceled because the Dean had a scheduling conflict.
   b. Library Town Halls will be hosted at different locations. The next one is scheduled for Newark.
   c. Media Hosting Services Task Force is looking to see where to host streaming media. OIRT has dropped NJVID and is moving to Kaltura, which currently doesn't include commercial media.
   d. Cabinet continues to discuss the revision of the library staff pages. A group of principles have been agreed upon. The document ‘Principles of Library Staff Pages’ was distributed. We will also need to determine how student staff will access the materials that they need. There will be an opportunity for feedback once a prototype has been established.
   e. There is a need to collect statistics for courses with embedded library components. The term “embedded” needs to be defined. Perhaps ICOP will be assigned this.
   f. ARL Data Refuge project. Rutgers University Libraries have been invited to participate. Suggestions have been compiled and they will be taken to the next Cabinet meeting. Those who responded to the call were very enthusiastic at the possibility of RUL participating in this activity.
   g. We will need to consider what should be done to accommodate the changes needed with the new name of the Kilmer Library.
   h. At the February 14th Cabinet meeting there was a discussion on “Advanced Research and Scholarly Communications Strategy for Moving Forward.” The Infrastructure unit managers (SUS, CDM, TAS, and Communications) will convene a self-study group that will focus on what services we are providing and associated costs.
   i. RUL Faculty meeting is scheduled for March 10. Poll Everywhere will be available for audience participation because of the extensive by-laws on which we will be voting. Wilkinson will contact the Digital Classroom Services department to make this software available. Following the June 9 faculty meeting, ICOP will host a panel discussion on revising our information literacy learning outcomes to
reflect the changes inherent in the new ACRL Framework for Information Literacy.

j. The February 14 faculty forum to discuss faculty units reorganization was well attended and there was a robust discussion. No consensus was reached; as we have missed the deadline to make changes this year there is opportunity for continued discussion.

3. Faculty By-Laws Revision Draft (Glynn & Hartman)
   a. This will form the core of the discussion at the March 10 faculty meeting. In addition to the by-laws changes, we will vote on an “Intentions” document. If approved, this will be housed on the faculty page.
   b. The incorporation of RBHS librarians as members of the library faculty body was addressed under Section I. Membership, item 3. Assuming that this segment passes, RBHS librarians would then be eligible to serve on committees for which their positions allow. They can then be added to the nominations form.
   c. These documents will be distributed to faculty by Friday February 24 to provide a two-week window in advance of the faculty meeting.

4. Organization of Faculty Units (Borisovets & Hartman)
   a. In light of a suggestion made at the February 14th faculty forum to organize as a single faculty unit, Borisovets spoke with the Rutgers Business School (of Newark and New Brunswick) about how they are organized to conduct personnel actions. They are divided by departments (Accounting, Finance, etc) which meet as the peer group. Most members are usually physically present, although sometimes they attend via videoconference.
   b. This year’s promotion and tenure instructions specify that members must be physically present to vote. It is not clear why this has been added or if videoconferencing is considered as “physically present.” Borisovets will investigate. Following clarification, PlanCo members will reach out to their local units about their suggestions, concerns, and preferred organization. These, in the form of a short written summary, should be brought to the March 22nd PlanCo meeting for discussion. Small units need to be approached. Melissa De Fino will talk to IJS and with Ron Jantz (SUS).

5. Mentoring Subcommittee (Denda, Weber, & Lutz)
   a. Draft survey that is intended for distribution to all Rutgers librarians was discussed and revisions to the document were recommended
   b. The following were noted in the discussion
      i. The survey will allow us to gauge the level of interest in providing a mentoring program and support such as the Futures Group.
      ii. Weber reported on mentoring that is provided at three Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) libraries.
         a) Ohio State has onboarding and mentoring program for faculty.
         There is a different but parallel program for staff.
b) At Michigan State there is a Library-wide mentoring program coordinated by the Education Librarian. Participants are encouraged to collaborate on a project. Pairings are for one year in duration. Mentees are credited with scholarly activity and the mentor counts the activity as service.

c) Librarians at the University of Wisconsin Madison have faculty-equivalent process for review and promotion. A small number achieve indefinite appointment (tenure equivalent). Mentors and mentees commit to a one-year relationship. They complete a goal chart prior to the commencement of the mentoring relationship and again at its conclusion.

6. TT/NTT Discussion (Tabled to the March meeting and will be placed earlier on the agenda).

7. Summary of outcomes (Borisovets)
   a. Faculty by-laws revision
   b. What is the rationale behind the language of being physically present for tenure and promotion actions? Local discussions and short report back to PlanCo March 22
   c. Mentoring sub-committee will revise proposed survey and send to PlanCo then distribute widely
   d. NTT/TT discussion will take place at the March meeting
   e. RULF meeting
      i. Poll everywhere needed for March meeting
      ii. No after meeting program in March at this time
      iii. ICOP will host a program in June

Submitted by
Leslin Charles (Faculty Secretary)