

## **Rutgers University Libraries Faculty Meeting**

Date: March 10, 2017

Time: 9:15 am – 11:15 a.m.

Location: Teleconference Lecture Hall, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, Alexander Library

### **Minutes**

**Present:** Stephanie Bartz, Natalie Borisovets, Jeanne Boyle, Leslin Charles, Janet Croft, Adriana Cuervo, Melissa De Fino, Kayo Denda, Bonnie Fong, Rebecca Gardner, Melissa Gasparotto, Mina Ghajar, Francesca Giannetti, Tom Glynn, Erika Gorder, Pam Hargwood, Karen Hartman, Triveni Kuchi, Angela Lawrence, Megan Lotts, Christine Lutz, Tara Maharjan, Rhonda Marker, Kevin Mulcahy, Laura Mullen, Jim Niessen, Jane Otto, Laura Palumbo, Vincent Pelote, Janice Pilch, Wen-Hua Ren, Li Sun, Elizabeth Surles, Roberta Tipton, Lily Todorinova, Ryan Womack, Mary Beth Weber, Judit Ward, Krista White, Zara Wilkinson, Ryan Womack, Connie Wu, Tao Yang

- 1) Adoption of the agenda
  - a. Agenda adopted as presented
- 2) Introduction of new Faculty and Guests (Maloney)
- 3) Report of the University Librarian (Maloney)
  - a. Over the summer, Cabinet will have 3 planning retreats. In the first, we will review the status of 2017 priorities and discuss new priorities coming forward from the libraries. In the second, we will assess our infrastructure, review the budget decisions, determine what we have capacity to do in 2018, and finalize 2018 priorities. The purpose of the final retreat will be to determine a strategy for the 2019 budget request. As we review the 2017 priorities, we are reminded that we have yet to set priorities for Advanced Scholarly Research and Communication and Special Collections and University Archives. Many of the initiatives in these areas will use our shared resources. We have also seen numerous priorities emerge related to advanced support for undergraduate education. Our infrastructure is limited and shared among libraries. Over the coming year, we will need to develop strategies and initiatives that have the greatest benefit to our communities. We were reminded that there are two faculty members on cabinet, encouraged to talk with directors and AULs, and to participate in local planning efforts.
  - b. There are some university initiatives including ORCID, New Brunswick metrics, learning management system that are currently underway. Although the libraries are not represented on the learning management system group, the group will

consult with a group of faculty and staff within the libraries before making a final decision.

4) Report of the Faculty Coordinator (Borisovets)

- a. Based on the wishes expressed by the Faculty at our December meeting, the Faculty Groups Subcommittee has done an extensive by-laws revision and drafted an “Intentions” document that are to be voted on at this meeting.
- b. In light of University policy 50.1.8.A, as part of the by-laws revision we will be voting on making RBHS librarians, as well as the SMLR librarian, members of the library faculty and not just guests.
- c. PlanCo has been looking at exactly what external reviewers are being asked to review, and how that impacts the materials that candidates are preparing for their packets We’ve asked for some language changes in the initial solicitation letter and the more specific one that reviewers receive when they when they agree to serve.

Hartman and Borisovets attended the January workshop for untenured faculty led by Maloney on the promotion and tenure process.

- d. Reorganization of library faculty units. On February 14 PlanCo had a forum to discuss possible ways to reorganize ourselves in terms of faculty, as opposed to administrative, units. There was no consensus and the discussion continues. PlanCo members have been asked to speak to their local constituents and bring their suggestions and preferences back to the committee for further discussion at the March 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting
- e. PlanCo is hoping to develop some guidelines as to the distinctions between tenure-track and non-tenure-track positions. Planning for further discussion at the March 22<sup>nd</sup> PlanCo meeting
- f. The Mentoring sub-committee has looked at mentoring programs at some peer institutions, and has prepared a survey to gain feedback on our experiences with the Futures Group and the mentoring program. This will go out to all RUL librarians.
- g. Last meeting we were able to use Poll Everywhere, which worked very well. Cuervo and Wilkinson have arranged with Digital Classroom Services for us to have access to this software at least through August.

5) Revision of Faculty By-Laws (Glynn and Wilkinson)

- a. The faculty voted to accept a by-laws change not discussed at the December meeting in Section I Membership: RBHS colleagues and the School of Management and Labor Relations (SMLR) librarian are "designated as members of the Rutgers University Libraries Faculty, shall be invited to attend the Rutgers University Libraries meetings, and shall be entitled to vote". The remaining proposed revisions in the faculty bylaws that reflected the changes voted on at the faculty meeting on December 2, 2016 were also adopted.
  - b. Intentions document. The intentions document that was circulated before the meeting was accepted as a guide to be used in the future for organizing faculty meetings and for creating faculty groups apart from those required in the faculty by-laws.
- 6) Communications- All (2 minutes)
- a. None
- 7) Reports of Members Serving on University Bodies (5 minutes)
- a. See appendices attached
- 8) Reports of Standing Committees (5 minutes)
- a. See appendices attached

June meeting will be held in the Pane Room. We were not able to use the Pane room today as it was already booked.

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 am

**Appendix A**  
**Reports to the Rutgers University Libraries Faculty**  
***Members Serving on University Bodies & Standing Committees***  
**March 2017**

**New Brunswick Faculty Council** – Triveni Kuchi and Melissa Gasparotto

The New Brunswick Faculty Council met 3 times since the last RULF meeting.

At the December 2, 2016 meeting, Chancellor Edwards reported on the results of the Rutgers Scarlet and Black initiative and the knife attack at the Business School. The Council passed a resolution to President Barchi calling on him to condemn attempts to intimidate faculty members based on political views (attached). President Barchi responded to this resolution in an email sent to all faculty on December 7. The Council heard a presentation from Digital Classroom Services about new classroom construction. The Evaluation of Teaching committee gave an update on its work, noting that the group had already received feedback from the administrators of SIRS, and would be soliciting feedback from other Big Ten schools. (Minutes: [http://nbfcrutgers.edu/year16\\_17/Minutes120216.html](http://nbfcrutgers.edu/year16_17/Minutes120216.html)).

At the January 27, 2017 meeting, Chancellor Edwards reported about an Inclusion Task Force and the MLK program that was holding a “Dream Week” with films and other events planned around the main theme of the holiday. He specifically mentioned about a “brilliant” speech that was presented by a History grad student. A faculty development program and mentoring survey led to an attitudes and practices handbook to give to Deans. Mentoring program RUConnection has been expanded to University wide and is now under Barbara Lee. The program to link mentors and mentees is being planned. STEM leadership for women program is now expanded to all campuses. Diversity initiatives related to mentoring diverse faculty is a president’s initiative. Edwards also mentioned that New Brunswick is planning and working with the theme of “America Converges here.” Next, NBFC committee Academic Standards Regulations and Admissions (ASRA) reported about the current scenario of academic advising. The current practice/scenario of academic advising is a model run by professional staff. Students are discouraged from declaring their major before the end of their second year as of now, so the departments do not even know who their students are until they start the junior year. Discussion ensued and setting up a task force to address how advising can work with faculty was recommended. Next, a preliminary report by Killingsworth was presented about the evaluation of teaching. The final report will be shared on April 21<sup>st</sup>. In addition, there was an invited report presented by Prof.Cornilliat (French) on the topic of language requirement at Rutgers. Among the BTAA, RU is the only school without a language requirement (except the SAS honors program). General concerns of the decline of language proficiency across the world as well as the implications of not having such requirements to help the internationalization of the curriculum at Rutgers, and the difficulty for RU students to participate in Study Abroad was shared. The task force requested input from NBFC. Next, Sr.VP Norin addressed NBFC’s concerns about RU Connect and 365 email systems, privacy/confidentiality issues, and the

timing of implementing of such large scale and fundamental system changes during the busiest time of the Fall semester. [Minutes forthcoming].

At the February 24, 2017 meeting, the council heard from Chancellor Edwards on continued implementation of recommendations from Scarlet and Black, including the renaming of Kilmer Library to the James Dickson Carr Library. He also discussed efforts at RU to expand opportunities for study abroad to students who may not have the financial means or schedule flexibility to take advantage of existing programs. The Council discussed a draft report on the search and hiring of President and other higher administrators in the University. The Council also discussed issues relating to PTLs at the University, including the issue of academic freedom. The Council also passed a resolution calling for the establishment of an Academic Advising Task Force. A report about the financial situation of the Rutgers Athletics program was presented. The following links were shared for discussion:

<http://www.mycentraljersey.com/story/opinion/2017/01/30/rutgers-big-ten-subsidies/97247404/>

[http://www.nj.com/rutgersfootball/index.ssf/2017/01/rutgers\\_athletics\\_borrows\\_against\\_future\\_big\\_ten\\_r.html](http://www.nj.com/rutgersfootball/index.ssf/2017/01/rutgers_athletics_borrows_against_future_big_ten_r.html)

[http://www.nj.com/opinion/index.ssf/2017/02/relying\\_on\\_big\\_ten\\_revenue\\_a\\_terrible\\_business\\_pla.html](http://www.nj.com/opinion/index.ssf/2017/02/relying_on_big_ten_revenue_a_terrible_business_pla.html).

A draft “resolution on the financial situation of the Rutgers Athletics program” was shared and commented on by the Council. Based on the comments, it was decided that the draft resolution after further evaluation by Executive Committee would be brought back for approval to the next NBFC meeting. ASRA of NBFC presented a report about “student evaluation of teaching” and the user of teaching evaluation scores. A Teaching Evaluation conference has been planned for April 21<sup>st</sup> morning on Busch Campus. Speakers include Barbara Lee and Edwards. [Minutes forthcoming].

### *Watchlist*

#### Background

The Executive Committee of the New Brunswick Faculty Council recently adopted a resolution that calls on President Barchi to assume a very public leadership role in condemning the hate-based acts of intimidation and violence targeting students on college campuses, triggered by recent political events in the United States.

In the past few days a more general and more dangerous political attack has been launched against higher education by an organization called Turning Point USA. This organization has created a website called the Professor Watchlist, whose “mission... is to expose and document college professors who discriminate against conservative students and advance leftist propaganda in the classroom.” The managers of this website go on to ask for help to “identify, and expose more professors who have demonstrated liberal bias in the classroom.” So far about 160 faculty members, including four from Rutgers, are on this Watchlist.

Such political attacks on higher education have a long history, but they may be more dangerous now than ever before. It is therefore critically important that universities speak out as forcefully as possible against such fundamental attacks on academic freedom and indeed on independent thought.

## Resolution

The Executive Committee of the New Brunswick Faculty Council calls on President Barchi to assume a very public leadership role in condemning Watchlist and all other such attempts to harass and intimidate faculty members.

We further call on him to pledge that his administration will guarantee that any Rutgers faculty members identified on such lists will suffer no negative consequences within the university as a result.

## **Scholarly and Professional Activities Committee (SAPAC)** – Elizabeth Surles

Since the last RUL faculty meeting, the Scholarly and Professional Affairs Committee hosted two luncheon presentations: one on December 12th with Ryan Womack presenting, and the other on February 16th with Jane Otto presenting. Upcoming presentations will occur on March 29th (Christie Lutz), April 19th (Lily Todorinova), and May 17th (Kevin Mulcahy).

SAPAC members:

Bonnie Fong  
Leslin Charles  
Christie Lutz  
Caryn Radick

## **User Assessment and Engagement Librarian Search Committee Report** – Bobbie Tipton

The Search Committee's activities in 2016-2017 resulted in the hiring of Stephanie Mikitish as our new User Assessment and Engagement Librarian for the Dana Library. Stephanie will join us on March 20.

Our thanks to the folks in Human Resources for all their help with this process.

Bobbie Tipton, Chair  
Ka-Neng Au  
Adriana Cuervo  
Ryan Womack

## **University Senate Report** – Natalie Borisovets and Jane Otto

The University Senate has met three times since the December Library Faculty meeting, on December 9<sup>th</sup>, January 20<sup>th</sup>, and February 17<sup>th</sup>.

### **December 9, 2016 [In New Brunswick]**

#### **Committee Reports:**

1. The Research and Graduate and Professional Education Committee presented their [Response to Charge S-1508 on Responsible Conduct of Research](#). Core recommendations:

1. The Office of Research and Economic Development:
  - a. review and finalize RGPEC's draft University Policy on Responsible Conduct of Research
  - b. create a new position (RCR coordinator) within ORED
  - c. form an advisory board (appointed by the Senior Vice President for Research and Economic Development, with representation from the graduate schools and senior-level faculty currently involved with RCR, from a range of disciplines such as life sciences, physical sciences, social sciences, and arts and humanities)
2. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs charge all graduate and professional schools, and other academic units as appropriate, with
  - i. designating a contact within the unit to liaise with the RCR coordinator
  - ii. identifying and reporting to the ORED RCR coordinator all RCR resources and training materials currently in use in their areas, including any required CITI modules or other classes, with funding agency-specific requirements in mind if applicable
  - iii. establishing within the academic unit responsibilities for training and training-the-trainers program development and implementation

Adopted

2. The Executive Committee presented a resolution on [Rutgers, A Safe and Welcoming Environment](#). The resolution endorsed the following principles:

1. Rutgers provides a safe, diverse, inclusive, and welcoming environment for the advancement of research, education, health care, and community outreach.
2. Free expression, privacy, and safety are cherished rights that are afforded to all members of the Rutgers community.
3. Rutgers faculty members, students, alumni, and staff are free to express their viewpoints in public forums as private citizens, including viewpoints that the University itself may not share, with the full expectation that they will be heard and respected.
4. Rutgers celebrates diversity and all members of our community, no matter their viewpoint, political view, ethnicity, religious beliefs, race, gender identity, sexual orientation, nationality, citizenship, or immigration status are owed our respect, our support, and our best efforts to provide safety and security.

5. Rutgers opposes all forms of intolerance, bigotry, and oppression and supports mutual respect for the dignity of all persons.

Adopted

### **RBHS Chancellor's Report**

Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) Chancellor Brian Strom then presented an RBHS Chancellor's Report. The report is available at:

<http://senate.rutgers.edu/RBHSCancellorsReportDecember2016.pdf>

**January 20, 2017 [In New Brunswick]**

### **Committee Reports:**

1. The Academic Standards, Regulations and Admissions Committee presented their [Revised Response to Charge S-1609 on Revisions to Rutgers University Academic Integrity Policy](#). Core recommendations:

1. That Rutgers University develop a single academic integrity policy that will apply to all schools and colleges of the University, including the professional schools in RBHS and elsewhere.
2. That the Rutgers central administration, in consultation with the University Senate, appoint an ad hoc Rutgers-wide academic integrity committee to draft such an academic integrity policy for all of Rutgers and to determine the extent to which the associated disciplinary procedures should be different for different types of schools in order best to serve the needs of all Rutgers schools and colleges while ensuring that every Rutgers student accused of a violation of academic integrity receives the same fair and equitable treatment and is accorded the same level of due process.

Adopted.

2. The Instruction, Curricula and Advising Committee presented their [Response to Charge S-1614 on Acceptable Use Policy for Information Technology Resources](#). Core recommendations:

1. A separate employee email policy document—distinct from the Acceptable Use Policy— be developed for the University.
2. The Acceptable Use Policy, and any new email policy, not specify any particular product to be used.
4. Rutgers develop specific email guidelines for health-related communications.
5. Rutgers develop specific email guidelines for other confidential communications, including any communications involving or concerning students
9. A separate policy relating to privacy and access to records, based on the University of Michigan model whereby there are clear definitions of different types of records and the access to those records as well as what constitutes legitimate business need to access those records, be developed to replace Section 5C of the Acceptable Use Policy.



Adopted.

3. The Executive Committee presented a [Report and Resolution on the Proposal to Form A School of Graduate Studies](#). Resolved that:

1. The Rutgers University Senate approves the creation of a new School of Graduate Studies that merges and replaces the existing Graduate School—New Brunswick and the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, as described in the proposal submitted by Deans Jerome Kukor and Kathleen Scotto, and urges the Board of Governors likewise to approve it.
2. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs present a progress report on the new unit to the Executive Committee of the Rutgers University Senate a year after the proposed merger takes effect.

Adopted.

4. Jane Otto, on behalf of the Executive Committee presented a [Report on Senate Parliamentary Procedures](#). In accordance with established Senate practice regarding proposed changes to Senate bylaws, the report was docketed for introduction and discussion but would not be voted on until the February meeting.

New Brunswick Chancellor's Report

New Brunswick Chancellor Dick Edwards presented his annual report. The report is available at: <http://senate.rutgers.edu/NewBrunswickChancellorsReport2017.pdf>

**February 17, 2017 [In Newark]**

**Committee Reports:**

1. Jane Otto, on behalf of the Executive Committee presented a [Report on Senate Parliamentary Procedures](#). This report had previously been introduced at the January meeting.

Adopted.

2. The University Structure and Governance Committee presented their [Response to Charge S-1404 on Revisions to the University Policy Library](#). Core recommendations:

- 1: Representatives from the University Secretary's office and University Senate office
  - i) meet at least once per semester to determine all reports that are still pending decision and
  - ii) ii) catalog and determine timelines for dispensation by the Boards, i.e., Rutgers University's Board of Governors and/or Board of Trustees.
- 5: The University Secretary's Office will prospectively create an archive of superseded versions of each university policy from the University Policy Library, to act as a tracking

mechanism for the evolution of each university policy; each document within the archive will also clearly designate that it is now out of date.

Adopted.

The Student Affairs Committee presented their [Response to Charge S-1616 on Absentee Ballots in Special Student Organization Funding Referenda](#). Core recommendation:

All students eligible to vote in a referendum conducted via paper ballot may submit a request to vote by mail.

Adopted.

### **Newark Chancellor's Report:**

Newark Chancellor Nancy Cantor presented her annual report.

## **Appendix B Intentions Document Rutgers University Libraries Faculty March 10, 2017**

In December 2016, the RUL faculty voted to reconfigure our faculty groups. The purpose of this document is to record the intentions of the faculty in making these changes, since many of these matters were not codified in the bylaws in March 2017. Nonetheless, they are still an important part of the changes the faculty agreed to at that time. This document is meant to provide guidance to faculty in the future and is not meant to be prescriptive.

The objective of these changes was to create a straightforward organizational structure with clear scope, leadership roles, and clear lines of communication, including two-way communication between the faculty and the Libraries administration. The changes were meant to strengthen the faculty's advisory role, complement working groups that report up through directors, and provide sufficient flexibility and agility to respond in a timely manner to issues of relevance to faculty and/or administration.

### **The Planning Committee**

The purpose of a Faculty Planning Committee is to ensure a faculty voice in library directions, initiatives, and priorities, and to solicit and cultivate ideas. The Planning Committee might best be conceptualized as an executive committee of the faculty body, elected by that body, representative of that body, and acting on behalf of and in consultation with that body. It will also serve as a conduit from faculty to the University Librarian and her Cabinet, and vice versa. The coordinating function of the Planning and Coordinating Committee has been removed. The

faculty voted to eliminate the councils, so that function is no longer necessary. Renaming the Faculty Coordinator and Deputy Faculty Coordinator as Faculty Chair and Faculty Vice Chair aligns with those changes as well.

In terms of membership, we should aim for a good mix of fresh eyes and experience, and a group that has a range of perspectives and expertise. As a faculty committee charged with advising the Libraries administration, the Planning Committee will not include faculty currently serving in administrative roles; administrators may attend by invitation. However, we strongly recommend to the Libraries administration that the Faculty Chair and Vice Chair continue to serve on the University Librarian's Cabinet.

### **Open planning meetings and ad hoc groups: a mechanism to advise the Planning Committee**

The faculty planning meetings are separate from those required by University regulations and presided over by the University Librarian. Like the Planning Committee, they will not include library administrators. The planning meeting, led by the faculty chair, is intended to discuss long-term, "big-picture" issues to investigate and address during the course of a semester, issues that we feel are not being adequately addressed by the working groups or elsewhere. These planning meetings will be less formal than a regular faculty meeting, and the procedure has not been written into the bylaws. The scheduling of the meetings can be flexible, but once a semester seems reasonable.

The following process is suggested to advise the Planning Committee:

- a. The Planning Committee issues a call to faculty for issues of concern at regular intervals (once a semester is suggested as a good starting point);
- b. The Planning Committee meets and selects key issues to discuss for that semester;
- c. The Planning Committee convenes an open planning meeting of faculty (separate from the University Librarian's faculty meeting) to discuss and prioritize the key issues;
- d. The Planning Committee takes the issues and the will of the faculty under advisement, and forms ad hoc group(s) as needed to address the issue(s) and report back to the Planning Committee;
- e. The Planning Committee coordinates the ad hoc group's presentation of reports/recommendations at the next formal faculty meeting, over which the University Librarian presides;

Faculty input should be clearly invited and welcomed by the Planning Committee, with many avenues for communication made available. Issues could also come to the faculty from RUL administration through the Planning Committee or arise from within the Planning Committee itself. The format of the open planning meeting of faculty should be flexible and determined by the Planning Committee and might include formal presentations, etc. All meetings should provide easy access for colleagues at all four universities, either in-person or virtual. Those initiating a proposal should prepare a discussion document or other information for distribution

in advance of the meeting. Ad hoc groups should be tailored to bring together the experience and expertise required to address the issue at hand and should consult with staff and other experts and stakeholders as appropriate. At the formal faculty meeting where an issue is presented, the faculty will in most cases vote; for example, it might vote recommend to bring the issue to Cabinet via the faculty chair.

### **Issue Groups**

Like the ad hoc groups referred to above, the creation of these groups will be initiated by the faculty and managed by the Planning Committee. Colleagues interested in creating such a group will present a proposal at a meeting of the committee, and the committee will deliberate on whether to endorse the group. In most cases there will be a charge and either a timeline or a date to consider sun setting the group. Once a year the Planning Committee will review existing groups. Issue groups will be expected to present reports or recommendations at a formal faculty meeting, in the same way that the ad hoc groups will bring their work back to the faculty as a whole.

These issue groups are intended to be an additional channel, like the ad hoc groups, for the faculty to investigate important issues and make our voice heard. By virtue of the process by which they are created, the ad hoc groups will, in most cases, have a fairly narrow focus. But the issue groups might have a broader or more narrow focus, depending upon the intentions of the colleagues proposing the group. They should be flexible, responding to concerns among the faculty and issues as they arise. But, as they will ultimately be responsible to the faculty's elected representatives, the Planning Committee, they should be productive, proactive bodies, rather than solely a discussion group. Planning Committee should ensure that there is experience, expertise, geographic representation, and accountability to function effectively.