

Rutgers University Libraries Faculty Meeting

Date: Friday, June 10, 2016

Time: 9:15 a.m. -11:35 a.m.

Location: Teleconference Lecture Hall, 4th floor, Alexander Library

Attendees: Grace Agnew, Katie Anderson, Consuela Askew, Ka-Neng Au, Stephanie Bartz, Ron Becker, Natalie Borisovets, Jeanne Boyle, Leslin Charles, Judy Cohn, Adriana Cuervo, Vibiana Cvetkovic, Melissa De Fino, Kayo Denda, Bonnie Fong, Tom Frusciano, Rebecca Gardner, Melissa Gasparotto, Francesca Giannetti, Tom Glynn, Pam Hargwood, Karen Hartman, Ron Jantz, Michael Joseph, Melissa Just, Nancy Kranich, Yu Hung Lin, Mei Ling Lo, Megan Lotts, Christie Lutz, Tara Maharjan, Krisellen Maloney, Laura Mullen, Jill Nathanson, Jim Niessen, Jane Otto, Laura Palumbo, Jessica Pellien, Caryn Radick, Jonathan Saucedo, Elizabeth Sosnowska, Julie Still, Li Sun, Roberta Tipton, Bob Vietrogoski, Zara Wilkinson, Ryan Womack, Connie Wu, Tao Yang.

1. Adoption of the agenda. Agenda was adopted as presented
2. New Business

- a. Librarian Bios (Pellien)

We have been using the website and newsletters to communicate information on librarian activities. It would be useful to have faculty bios and headshots. Need images to go with the information especially on social media. It will be also good for PR purposes. More efficient rather than going back and forth with a person to get information. Online there is mostly basic contact information on faculty. There is a profile system. Out of over 200 employees there are very few who have gone beyond the bare information. Most academic departments at RU are much more robust than RUL in this respect. Our websites can indicate that we are faculty in the same way as other academic departments. Some model professional profiles were shown. It would be good to include the workshops and classes that we teach. Language and technology skills should be included. Pellien is hopeful that faculty will participate by completing one sheet bios that can be uploaded.

Process: Optional program. Strongly encouraged that people participate. Initially, the focus will be faculty and later on, there will be a certain tier of staff that will be reached out to. One-time service for faculty to get as many people in as possible. As new faculty members come on board they will be approached. Faculty will have complete control on the back end for the maintenance. An annual update reminder would be sent from Jessica's office. She would like to hire a

professional photographer to be available after the fall faculty meeting.

- b. Possible changes to promotion and tenure calendar (Glynn)
Glynn presented possible changes to the deadlines on the University Libraries Faculty Personnel Action Calendar 2017-2018. The intention is to give candidates more time to prepare and submit materials. Consequently there will be less time for the peer group to review those materials. The changes to the calendar were approved.
- c. Process and support for tenure and promotion (Glynn)
A number of faculty members have expressed concern regarding tenure track faculty getting consistent advice. There was an acknowledgement that this might be a delicate issue and encouraged faculty to speak frankly.

We have had a mentoring program where the mentor is in a different unit. It appears that the advice given may not be the best for the person in the unit. The Futures Group should probably be integrated into the Mentoring Program. The UL does not believe that the program should be run from the administration.

Reference to the email sent out by Barbara Lee was made. She mentioned the concept of co-mentoring among peers and this might be something that is explored. Perhaps there should be a meeting with mentors and mentees and directors along with the UL.

Acknowledgement that there are units doing a very good job was made. In NB the way the unit director, the faculty coordinator, and the faculty deputy coordinator have been working together is useful. Others are doing well also but this NB model is particularly helpful.

Feedback that came back from the University Peer Review Committee regarding external letters was reiterated. These must be at arm's length. In Form 3 the candidate must disclose the relationship with the writer of the letter. Even if there is disclosure, it does not mean that it will be seen as arm's length. You should have seven letters that are considered acceptable. External letters are very important in the tenure process. Without seven letters it will be a weaker packet. Mentors, dissertation advisers, co-authors, former colleagues are considered not at arm's length. There will be a red flag if the letter writer and the candidate describe the relationship differently.

NBLF will have a conversation on this on July 22. PlanCo will discuss this based the faculty's discussion and possibly propose improvements to the mentoring program.

3. Old Business

a. Discussion of reconfiguration of library groups (Glynn)

Part 1 is what we want our faculty groups to do. This had been discussed at length in other venues. We know that faculty groups are advisory. Long-range planning is mentioned specifically in the University regulations. "Visioning" the future of the Libraries and the faculty's philosophy on big-picture issues have also been identified as important responsibilities of faculty groups.

We conducted a straw poll (appendix C), on which faculty members voted anonymously, to move towards consensus on some basic issues.

The UL has removed herself from PlanCo. This committee should be bringing agenda items to Cabinet. Over time Cabinet will have open agendas but because of the significant backlog of items currently being addressed it is best that those who directly report to the UL attend right now. There was also some concern expressed that on the current PlanCo there are 3 tenured faculty members. All others are untenured. There should be a mix of experience and fresh perspectives.

Plan Co can take under advisement the results of the straw polls. They will create a steering group to help the faculty as a whole create new faculty groups. There will be ample opportunities for input from everyone as we move forward.

4. Report of the University Librarian (Maloney)

a. Budget provided us with new resources (approx. one million). We will only receive funding for half of the salary increases. Therefore, we will have to fund approximately \$200K in salary increases with existing funds. That means that we have to make \$200K in cuts from existing ongoing expenses to cover the salary increases. (see PlanCo cuts)

b. Libqual results will be made available

c. Priorities: Cabinet will have 2 planning meetings over July that revolves around identification of priorities for future budget planning
Vacant lines: Business & Biology lines will be taken by Melissa Just to the University Librarian for approval

5. Report of the Faculty Coordinator (Glynn)

- a. The minutes of PlanCo and faculty meetings that have not yet been posted will be out soon. Most of the recent PlanCo meetings have been in preparation for this meeting and the discussion of faculty groups..
- b.
- c. PlanCo has also discussed its role regarding faculty lines. In the past, PlanCo discussed lines extensively. That will change somewhat now that campuses/universities have greater autonomy. Reports will be presented for informational purposes from the different campuses as needed.

c. Thanks to all the members of PlanCo for their hard work this year. We are in good hands with our new faculty coordinator and deputy faculty coordinator. Regardless of how we configure our new faculty groups, you are encouraged to ensure that we have a strong and relevant faculty. This will also be Ron Becker's last meeting as a part of the faculty. He has given over forty years of service to the university. Thank you and congratulations.

6. Communications (All)
7. Reports of Members Serving on University Bodies
8. Reports of Standing Committees

Meeting adjourned at 11:33 AM.

Submitted by Leslin Charles (Faculty Secretary)

Rutgers Libraries Faculty Meeting Minutes
Appendix A
Reports to the Rutgers University Libraries Faculty:
Members Serving on University Bodies
June 2016

Camden Faculty Council – Julie Still

The Camden Faculty Council has met monthly. We developed draft language on best practices concerning lecturers. We are also starting to examine the role of Rutgers within the Camden community. We amended our bylaws as needed.

Newark Faculty Council Report – Minglu Wang

Newark Faculty Council Meeting
3/7/16

1. Chancellor Cantor Reports on Strategic planning update/Strategic plan initiatives, and she requests for feedback from the NFC regarding NTTs and PTLs
2. Executive Vice Chancellor Shirley M. Collado provides an overview of the Chancellor's Commission on Diversity and Transformation.

5/9/16

1. Joe Markert, Co-chair of the University Senate Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee gives a summary of the Senate Resolution on "Greater Integration of Contingent Faculty in the Rutgers Community."
2. Chancellor Cantor discusses her address to the University of Pennsylvania Faculty Senate, "Reconnecting with a Shared Public Mission in Sharing Governance."

New Brunswick Faculty Council – Melissa Gasparotto & Li Sun

The NBFC has met twice since the last RULF meeting.

On [March 25](#) the Council discussed its report and resolution concerning the use of Academic Analytics at Rutgers University - New Brunswick.

On [April 22](#) the Council passed two statements indicating priorities for AY 16/17. The first statement addresses the next RU Presidential Search and Selection and the second addresses the role of NTT faculty.

Minutes for both meetings are forthcoming on the NBFC website:
<http://nbfc.rutgers.edu/>

University Senate Report – Natalie Borisovets & Jane Otto

The University Senate has met twice since the March Library Faculty meeting, on April 1st and April 29th.

April 1, 2016 [In New Brunswick]

Committee Reports:

The University Structure and Governance Committee (USGC) presented their [Response to Charge S-1403 on Process for Unit Mergers or Other Structural Changes](#). The

recommendations include some language changes and the process for Senate response to the establishment, dissolution, merging, or major restructuring of colleges, schools, institutes, and other units, as listed in Rutgers University policy 10.1.2.

Adopted unanimously.

Presentation on Rutgers Connect

Stan Kolasa, Director of Enterprise Messaging, Enterprise Application Services, of the Office of Information Technology, presented a summary of Rutgers Connect (Microsoft Office 365 migration) plans and features. [PowerPoint](#)

April 29, 2016 [In New Brunswick]

This was the last regular meeting of the 2015-2016 University Senate.

Committee Reports:

The Instruction, Curricula and Advising Committee (ICAC) presented their [Revised Response to Charge S-1504 on Determination of Student Participation](#). The report presented recommendations that would allow units and individual instructors to comply with U. S. Department of Education requirements that Rutgers keep records for students receiving federal financial aid that substantiate student participation in the classes for which they are registered.

Adopted.

The Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC) presented their [Response to Charge S-1409 on Greater Integration of Contingent Faculty in the Rutgers Community](#). The report recommended best practices for the professional growth and fuller integration into the Rutgers community of contingent faculty.

Adopted unanimously.

The Faculty and Personnel Affairs Committee (FPAC) presented their [Response to Charge A-1603 on Evaluation of Administrators, Part II: Evaluation of Chancellors](#). Procedures for the periodic review of chancellors.

Adopted unanimously.

April 29, 2016 [In New Brunswick]

This was the organizational meeting of the 2016-2017 University Senate. Peter Gillette (Rutgers Business School) was elected chair. Natalie Borisovets and Jane Otto were both elected to the Executive Committee.

Rutgers Libraries Faculty Meeting Minutes
Appendix B
Reports to the Rutgers University Libraries Faculty:
Standing Committees
June 2016

Committee of Review – Connie Wu

Committee of Review had a case, but then it was withdrawn during the academic year.

Committee on Scholarly Communication (CSC) – Laura Mullen

Committee on Scholarly Communication (CSC) Minutes
Alexander Library, UL Conference Room
May 23, 2016
10. a.m.-12 p.m.

Present: Judy Cohn, Karen Hartman, Rhonda Marker, Aletia Morgan, Laura Bowering Mullen, Jane Otto, Minglu Wang (recorder), Krista White, Yingting Zhang

Excused: Janice Pilch, Caryn Radick, Tao Yang

1. AVP Report (Cohn)

- 1) Cabinet minutes now have links to source documents, providing more detailed information on agenda items.
- 2) LibQUAL survey results were shared with cabinet, and will soon be released to RUL. Results by libraries including coded comments (positive/negative) are available.
- 3) Cohn shared a draft charge for a "Discovery Working Group". The goal is to improve user experience via the website, link resolver and catalog, streamlining access, retrieval and instructions. This requires careful planning and there have been ongoing discussions in Cabinet to refine the charge. Agnew and Pellien will be resources for the working group. A multi-year process is expected. Tasks will include how to improve access to resources via the website and simplify instructions. Initial work will focus on improving discovery and the link resolver. All content, regardless of format, should be retrievable. CSC members are welcome to send Cohn suggestions or comments about the Discovery Working Group charge via email. Work will commence once the charge is finalized and members of the group identified. Members suggested that this working group should consider including repository material, open textbooks, and other open access material in general as part of discovery.
- 4) Maloney was officially asked to chair the RU ORCID Implementation Working Group.

2. Chair's Report (Mullen)

- 1) Five of our OA journals have successfully made it through the reapplication process and are on the new DOAJ platform. It will take more than 4 months to be added to SHERPA/RoMEO.

- 2) RU participates with SCOAP3, and this Open Access initiative (high energy physics journals) has been extended for 3 more years.
- 3) OpenCon, SPARC's conference for early career researchers is coming up this year in Washington in November. Rutgers participated two years ago. It's an application/invitation only conference and all SPARC members were urged to participate. For this year, Mullen is not aware of plans to send anyone. We should keep this in mind for the future. Last year, the conference was held in Brussels, but will alternate with a US location, probably Washington, D.C.
- 4) Pellien has reached out to CSC in case there are any CSC items for the newsletter or other communication channels.
- 5) Mullen handed out Alexandra Elbakyan's legal response to the Elsevier lawsuit against Sci-Hub, and pointed out that this is not likely to be resolved via the courts at this point.
- 6) ACRL announced their 2016 Legislative Agenda. One of two main items are access to federal funded research data.
- 7) Acquisition of SSRN by Elsevier is the biggest news recently. Everyone is concerned about the documents deposited in SSRN, the largest subject repository. Now usability and sustainability of institutional repositories become even more important. Many RU authors are part of SSRN, so this is likely to come up in discussions with faculty and other scholars.
- 8) Reminder that after the June meeting, CSC will need a new chair.

3. Round Robin Updates:

- 1) Report from the Library Publishing Forum (Marker)
Marker attended the Library Publishing Forum (LPF) in Denton, Texas. The topics included more than OA journals; there were workshops on Open Educational Resources (OER), focusing on getting faculty to adopt OER and creative authors of OER. There were programs on helping faculty adopt open textbooks, for example providing funding for faculty to integrate OER. In terms of encouraging authors to actually write open textbooks, funding could be available at \$15,000 and above for authoring a single textbook. Different libraries have different approaches in their efforts to help faculty find and adopt open textbook resources. Marker suggested it would be advantageous to think about organizing some panels to educate faculty about open textbooks. Mullen has a LibGuide on the topic in use by departmental faculty, and RUL now has a task force on it.
The LPF has only had three annual conferences so far. There was an interesting paper presented by Charlotte Roh on publishing and social justice, talking about the lack of diversity in scholarly publishing. Undergraduate publishing and research is another topic that was emphasized in multiple sessions.
- 2) SOAR Twitter/other Twitter issues (Zhang)

Zhang attended the RUL social media summit. The CSC Twitter account does not have many followers right now. Zhang suggested some tips/strategies to improve. For example, use both handle and hashtag to increase interest; retweet; improve our profile by using an official looking picture; add a brief description of SOAR; CSC members take turns to tweet; and to have one tweet every day. Members suggested this could be one of the tasks for CSC to work on in this coming year.

3) ORCID update (Otto)

Mullen handed out the letter from Barchi in response to the University Senate resolution on university-wide ORCID implementation. He supports the Senate's recommendations for RU to become a member of the CIC ORCID consortium and the establishment of an ORCID Implementation Working Group. The SVPAA's office will put a group together. Dr. Barchi's response to the report is at

<http://senate.rutgers.edu/RLBBackS1505ImplementingORCIDIdentifiersMay2016.pdf>

Mullen and Otto are already getting requests to fold ORCID information into the SOAR/OA Policy presentations. Otto's understanding is that the annual membership fee will not fall to the Libraries, although the Libraries' role in promotion and education is expected to be significant. ORCID can automatically import metadata from SOAR. Although there will be institutional implementation later, there is no downside for faculty to register now. It could be suggested to faculty that if they are registering for an ORCID ID, they should include additional information to distinguish themselves, for example, institutional affiliation, claim an article, etc. This fuller ORCID record is one of the benefits of a university-wide implementation. ORCID is linked to other IDs. Zhang's SciENCv workshop was also asked to include ORCID information. Publishers and funders often require ORCID now.

Some faculty may conflate ORCID and Academic Analytics, to which some faculty are opposed. In fact, in SOAR/OA policy presentations, we do not reference "reporting" for this reason; instead we talk about using SOAR statistics to "create narratives" for departments or individuals. We use SOAR's pie chart geographic download statistics to demonstrate "global reach" rather than comparative downloads.

4. SOAR report (added to the agenda, Otto):

In April, there were two more SOAR departmental presentations: one at the Economics Department with Womack, and one to all SEBS chairs. On the schedule going forward are presentations at the New Faculty Expo and more departmental sessions in the Fall.

Since the last CSC meeting, SOAR received 36 new deposits, about one per day, and with the majority coming from librarians. We need those numbers to grow and that suggests a need to begin contacting department chairs for

presentations; we had previously tabled this until we had a better handle on the number of deposits and staffing. We should be able to keep up with things at the current rate, although Marker noted there was a small backlog due to travel, system testing and staff evaluations.

Otto asked Cohn about the March Cabinet discussion on 1) a “push” for SOAR deposits (which Otto and Mullen were not advocating at that time); and about RUL directors coordinating their local outreach activities (which was apparently not discussed). Cohn clarified that the message from Cabinet is that SOAR outreach falls into individual university priorities as seen by the director. Otto suggested that when she is back from sabbatical, it will be a good time to go to the chairs of all the schools since keeping up momentum is essential to successful OA policy implementation via SOAR.

There are questions about whether there are any consequences of not complying with the OA Policy. Our strategy is to start with our strong campaign and promoting researchers’ behavioral change to deposit at the time of acceptance for publication, and there might be harvesting later.

Funders will also start to require compliance. RUL has an implementation policy that could be an example.

Discussion ensued about scholarly communication work going forward. Cohn reminded members that CSC is going into its transition from carrying on work to a faculty body group. There will possibly be a scholarly communication working group with dedicated sponsors from cabinet in the near future. Mullen mentioned that some issues are time sensitive and have to move quickly (or keep going). Cohn suggested that at the CSC June meeting we could talk about this transition. CSC members shared concerns that the working groups envisioned could be silos and that we might lose the broader context that has usually emerged among faculty. How exactly would we clarify the faculty body’s advisory role? Cohn thinks the end of this academic year is a good time to make the transition. Marker mentioned the complication caused by the mixture of different librarians’ complete or partial responsibilities within a working group. This discussion will likely continue at the June CSC meeting.

5. Discussion of scholarly communication-related Sakai sites (Cohn)

CSC discussed how the CSC Sakai site has not been used very effectively for communication of committee business. Cohn suggested possible scenarios to address this issue: one is to have an owner and bring the existing Sakai site up to date by adding retrospective material. This could be a site for all, which people go to for training on the material archived there.

It was also suggested there should be a completely new Scholarly Communication site for liaisons and all others wanting to access outreach materials for SOAR, ORCID, or any other scholarly communication-related initiative. A newly-formed working group might be responsible for designing this new Sakai site. A separate new site for everyone is preferred

among CSC members, and members did not want to update the CSC Sakai site that exists now.

6. ETD update and discussion (Marker)

Marker reminded CSC members that Stephanie Bartz has a dissertation LibGuide at <http://libguides.rutgers.edu/rudissertations> with information about Rutgers ETDs. The University has schedules for degree dates. Accordingly, RUL has schedules to process deposits after degree dates, and then we release the PDFs to the ETD server to be cataloged. RUL staff checks information in order to make sure everything is correct and assigns LC subject headings. ETDs are then added to RUcore. We send ProQuest a copy after an ETD is cataloged in RUcore, but before it is included in the library catalog. Not every school sends ETDs to ProQuest though. There are approximately 30% of ETDs that are embargoed, and the most common embargo is for 2 years.

7. CSC Webpage: Proposed Scholarly Networking Tools panel: final recommendation after revisions (Wang)

Wang handed out the final copy of the informational panel on Scholarly Networking Tools. This final copy includes all previous revisions suggested by members and also has been updated with Radick's final copyediting. Wang shared a list of links to a selection of other institutions' statements about scholarly networking tools. Most of them are on LibGuides. However, there are also web pages and blog posts. Usually these tools are discussed under a broader scholarly communication context, for example, research impact or open access repositories. Our final version of the new panel has taken members' advice on clarifying the nature of the tools, and on promoting use of SOAR/RUcore. The focus is on providing information about collaboration tools that we know are widely used by researchers. Wang will send the final copy (and the handout about other institutions' information) to the CSC email list. Members at the meeting all agree to the recommendation that Cohn bring this panel to Cabinet for approval.

8 June special meeting on data: Planning (Cohn, Mullen)

Mullen had originally proposed that the June CSC meeting might be an information sharing meeting on a special topic (similar to the meeting on Open Access Collection Development, where we had a structured agenda with invited guest presenters). "Research data" was the proposed topic. CSC members and guests would update each other on current projects different librarians are working on separately, for example, our medical librarians attended informatics training recently, several subject librarians are conducting data literacy instruction, or updates on which funding agencies will focus on institutional repositories (rather than other solutions).

Cohn expressed concerns about the ultimate purpose of such a meeting, whether it is to share our status quo, for example, the Research Data Task Force submitting a final report last year and there is a Research Data Exploratory Team prototyping ingesting data. But this area has not been identified as a RUL priority. A meeting on research data right now might cause pressure or expectation that we cannot currently meet. CSC members agreed that we would use the June meeting for pressing scholarly communication-related organizational transition discussions instead, and propose a larger research data-focused meeting at a later date if there is continuing interest.

9. Announcements/Adjourn. There were no announcements, and the meeting was adjourned.

Instructional Community of Practice – Leslin Charles

The following is a list of items that the Instructional Community of Practice is working on this academic year:

1. Information Literacy Tools
 - a. ADA Compliance
 - b. Updating the RIOT suite of tutorials or finding alternatives
 - i. Proquest Research
 - ii. Credo
 - iii. Working with OIRT
 - iv. Challenges presented by different universities using different course management systems such as eCollege, Sakai, Blackboard, and Moodle
2. Professional opportunities related to instruction and assessment
 - a. ACRL Immersion opportunities
 - b. TeachMeets
3. Recording our instruction and the ability to run system-wide reports
 - a. BiStats database has been endorsed by all 4 universities and unique instruction/data fields have been compiled. IIS is currently working on the development site.

Library Resources Council – Julie Still

The LRC has been discussing its role as a faculty committee within the new committee framework. We have also had reports or discussions on the open textbook initiative, e-book collections, how to deal with print versions of indexes now available online, and other day to day issues.

Rules of Procedure Committee – Stephanie Bartz & Katie Anderson

Since the [March 4, 2016](#) faculty meeting, the Rules of Procedure Committee has engaged in the following activities:

- Updated the bylaws to incorporate changes approved at the [March 4, 2016](#) faculty meeting.
- Completed the election for a representative to the New Brunswick Faculty Council.
- Solicited nominations and conducted the 2016 Rutgers University Libraries Faculty elections.
- Conducted a run-off election for representatives to the Research Leave Review Committee.
- Currently investigating the alternatives for filling a temporary vacancy in an elected office.

Scholarly and Professional Activities Committee (SAPAC) – Leslin Charles

Members of SAPAC for the 2015-2016 academic year are: Leslin Charles (Chair), Bonnie Fong, Caryn Radick, Elizabeth Surles, and Zara Wilkinson.

Activity

October 21, 2015: Adriana Cuervo

The Newark Citizen Historian Initiative: Opportunities for University-Community Collaboration

December 16, 2015: Peggy Dreker and Sarah Jewell

So, You Want to Do a Systematic Review?

January 27, 2016: Jim Niessen

Supporting Refugees in Central Europe: Hungary and Austria in 1956

February 24, 2016: Yu-Hung Lin and Chad Mills

Create and Manage Permanent Links (DOIs) for the Ocean Observatories Initiative (OOI) Data

March 23, 2016: Caryn Radick

Romance in the Archives

April 6, 2016: Kevin Mulcahy

A Citation Analysis of English Dissertations at Rutgers University

April 27, 2016: Megan Lotts, Lily Todorinova, and Leslin Charles

Survey of Undergraduate Student Workers at Rutgers-New Brunswick University Libraries

User Services Council – Rebecca Gardner & Yu-Hung Lin

The following is a list of activities of the User Services Council since the March 2016 RUL faculty meeting:

- Received update from the Digital Humanities Lab and its future implementation plan.
- Received report from the Research Data Exploratory Team on its activities of storing research data into RUcore.
- Received final report from the USC/LRC Joint Task Force on E-Books Packages.
- Reviewed and gave feedback on the policies on proctoring exams and study halls and recommended they be sent to Cabinet for final approval.
- Reviewed the implementation of RUL website news and events.
- Reviewed charge for a Discovery Working group and provided constructive feedback.
- Received update from the Chat Reference Task Force and reviewed its last year chat usage results.
- Received the implementation results of LibCal Group Study Room Reservation Project.
- Received update on and provided feedback for the implementation of the EBSCO “Full-text Finder” feature
- Reviewed and discussed the future role of USC.