Present: Glenn Goldman, Andrew Hill, Sergei Adamovich, Liping Wei, Janice Daniel, Reza Curtmola, Raquel Perez-Castillejos, Burt Kimmelman, Wei Xu, Yuan-Nan Young, Steven Tricamo, Richard Sweeney, Ann Hoang, Doreen Mettle, Maya Gervits, Davida Scharf, Heather Dalal, Haymwantee Singh, Bruce Slutsky, Erin Finnerty, Matthew Brown, Lisa Weissbard, Jessica O’Donnell


2. Report of the University Librarian

   a. Publish or Perish software
   This is free software now available to faculty that would be useful for promotion and tenure that downloads the author’s “h-index”.
   A scientist has index h if h of [his/her] Np papers have at least h citations each, and the other (Np – h) papers have at most h citations each.
   The h-index is one measure of research productivity. (i.e., a researcher with 20 articles with at least 20 citations would have h-index of “20”). It also computes alternative indexes that purport to be improvements on the h-index, which consider the currency and date of the research and the weight of citations. Haymwantee looked at the citations for one an article using Google Scholar as a citation tool. Normally we would use either Scopus or Web of Science. Although this was a very limited look at just one article, Haymwantee found that Google Scholar seems to produce more valid citations compared to Scopus. Haymwantee noted that switching over to Google Scholar from Scopus may be a challenge. Both Davida and Maya remarked that research points to Google Scholar as the most comprehensive. Maya said that she will share the studies that compare Google Scholar, Scopus and the Web of Science citation results with the committee. Rich asked that the librarians search for the citations in one article for a couple of their faculty authors within each of their liaison departments to see if this initial result appears to be valid. Google Scholar is free while Scopus costs NJIT almost $60,000 per year. There would be a significant cost savings if NJIT moved to Google Scholar from Scopus in the future.

   b. Springer Journal Usage (Now ranked as journals, not a database)
   At the previous March meeting, there was a decision to fund Springer as individual journals instead of as a database. At this meeting, Erin and Rich presented a report about the median four year usage (download data) of individual Springer titles. What they reported was that NJIT subscribes to 16 individual Springer titles that cost almost $21,000.00 per year. In order to get access to the database package, we must keep this same spend commitment. For approximately an additional $1,500.00, NJIT secures access to almost 1,200 Springer titles with the database package. The study showed that about 89% of the articles downloaded were from only about
400 titles within the Springer database package and only about 11% of the article downloads came from the 16 individual subscriptions. That meant that 89% of the usage was from journals to which NJIT does not subscribe.

When titles are ranked by faculty, the journals with low usage may be dropped and the departments with an affinity to higher used titles currently without individual subscriptions may not rank them high enough to be funded. As a consequence NJIT users may lose access to the entire Springer database package and 89% of the usage. Ideally, titles of high use and low cost will be chosen to retain so that we continue to have access.

1). Take the cost ($1,500) off the top of the journals budget, assuming $21K is spent on Springer journals. (This was the decision made at the last meeting).

2). Purchase it as a database with money transferring funds from the journal budget.

3). Treat them as journals but take both the $21,000 and the $1500 off the top of the journal budget.

Based on the usage presented in the report, we cannot afford to lose this database. There was discussion about “free rider” departments benefiting from the journals that other departments pay for. However, the sentiment was that the journals package should be supported regardless of the benefit to one’s department.

One example of pursuing the common good was the decision made by the FLC to fund Academic Search Premier from the top of the database budget and remove it from the database voting. The Architecture database and journal budget is split out from the overall library database budget so it would not be affected by the Springer decision.

It was suggested that the journal funding be more fairly distributed, but journal usage can’t be traced back to individual departments or users. Research today is typically interdisciplinary that we don’t know who is using a specific journal title.

If some individual journal titles are not funded and the library falls below the $21,000 spend, the issue could be brought to the Provost for possible funding under his set-aside. It was suggested that an algorithm be developed by Yu Wan from the Math department to determine a) which departments have an affinity to which journal titles and b) the volume of relative use.

Rich proposed to have Erin run two journal ranking ‘machines’ over the summer – 1) a new algorithm, and 2) the current process. At the September FLC meeting, long after the budget is received, we will make the final Springer decision. Reza made a motion to take the cost off the top of the journal budget, which was then seconded. Then it was asked if it comes off the top, what individual journals we will continue to fund. Another FLC member asked the maker of the motion if this motion could be tabled until more information can be gathered about what the causalities will be, but time is of the essence because this is the last FLC meeting for AY 2010-11. Glenn Goldman raised the point that departments should rank journals that they feel are important for themselves, so that they are not just received as part of the package deal and therefore would be getting a “free ride”. Raquel raised a concern that people are getting a free ride by using journals that are important for their department but “nobody” is paying for them as they are a part of the inclusive Springer package. Whoever uses those journals should pay for them. Glenn feels they should go back to the faculty in their departments and find out what they
are using and journals they are using should be ranked and “paid” for. Other faculty raised concerns with this method. A motion was made to take the cost of Springer off the top of the journal budget, and faculty felt they did not have sufficient information at this time to pass that motion, noting that a decision does not need to be made, really until September. Therefore, the motion was tabled until the first meeting in September (and Erin has received all ranking lists from representatives) because we know that people are using these journals, but don’t know exactly who.

c. Database cost per use impact
Cost per use and the total amount of use varies considerably. IEEE dropped in usage (downloads) between 2009-2010. The possible reasons include faculty downsizing, not being used as much by some groups, such as graduate students, or librarians and faculty may not be promoting the databases enough. Further exploration into the latter reason may help us to understand the drop in usage. We need to justify the cost of a database for which usage keeps dropping.

d. Final 2012 Database ranking vote
The number of databases being voted for 2012 has been reduced due Academic Search Premier, Springer, Nature Weekly, and Communications Mass Media Complete being removed from the faculty voting list. There are now 13 databases remaining on the list in rank order to be voted on. Engineering Technology and Physics did not submit a database vote so they will be locked into their vote from last year. PsychArticles is also not voted on because they are funded by distance learning fees rather than the library budget. Current Index to Statistics, Omnifile, and MathSciNet are voted for AY 2012 at the bottom of the list and are vulnerable for possible cancellation. A motion was made to move Current Index of Statistics from the databases list and to the journals, so that the math department can pay for it, and move the point voted for that database to the IOP database. Erin reminded everyone that the journal ranking list will be posted on the FLC website by end of the day Monday, April 11th and everyone will be emailed. All should revise their lists and send them back to Erin by Friday, April 29th. If she does not receive them by this date, rankings from the prior year will be used. Reza suggested that Erin share the information discussed at today’s meeting regarding journal usage to FLC members that we absent, and she agreed to do so.