Minutes  
Faculty Library Committee Meeting  
Thursday, February 16, 2012, 2:30-4:05 pm  
Library Room 2032


Absent: Glenn Goldman, Sergei Adamovich, Jim McHugh, N.M. “Ravi” Ravindra, Jiahui (Julia) Ding

1. Minutes of September 22, 2011
   a. Discussion of Interlibrary Loan – Boris Khusid’s technical issue has been resolved. In case of any future ILL issues, please contact Doreen Mettle.
   b. Minutes Approved.

2. Report of the University Librarian – Rich Sweeney
   b. AY 2012 Library Budget – Remains the same as last year. Some items came in at a lower cost than expected while others came out a bit higher, so we should come out very close to our projected budget.
   c. Middle States Accreditation Update: Library – Rich provided a brief review of the Library’s portion of the MSCHE Reaccreditation Final Report. While the report does include information about the TeamSpot room, the use of this software will be discontinued and the room will be made available to students. The collaborative, file-sharing program went on for over one year, but the usage was too low and did not increase so we will not be continuing it.
   d. Library usage overview. Big changes are happening; they are big in aggregate, but are happening slowly. Traditional book circulation has gone down considerably over the years while eBook circulation is beginning to mushroom. We continue to see a good amount of usage of the electronic journals and databases. Usage data is provided to the committee for their department’s database votes for AY2013.
   e. Middle State Commission on Higher Education – The Middle States Reaccreditation visit is from April 1, 2012 – April 4, 2012. We are likely to be asked by one of the members of the committee to answer any questions they may have at that particular point. We did get cited in the 2002 visitation report for too few books, too few staff, and too little space.
However, a lot of that has begun to change and we think that right now that having too few books in the traditional sense is not really the issue, but we have a lot of other items that we would like if we had the money to get them.

f. Communication and Mass Media Complete. The Humanities department has elected over the years to get this one single database. Their entire budget is spent on this database and they will not be able to fund it fully for next year. Rich will be funding this off the top of the budget from funds from the Provost Set Aside (PSA); it costs about $3,000 plus and their allocated budget for Humanities is only about $2,000.


Springer package has over 2,700 journals that we can access. We only pay approximately $20,000 for this entire package. History: when electronic journals came onboard, Springer asked us to continue to order their print subscriptions (we had about 15) and we would be given access to their entire electronic journal package which has grown over time. Review of departmental contributions shows what they spent from their allocation of the journals budget. There are nine departments that share the cost of the package, but three departments contribute a total of 75% of the cost: Physics, Computer Science, and Electrical Engineering. Review of journal usage within the Springer package. Haymwantee took a look at the first 100 journals accessed and associated them with the appropriate department(s) via the journals’ Library of Congress call numbers. Compiling the data into the “Springer 2013 Journal Deductions” spreadsheet, Haymwantee analyzed the department-related journals accessed compared to the actual expenditures by department. If we were to have purchased each article accessed over FY2012 at a cost of $25 each, it would have cost the library $303,000.

Rich continued the discussion, explaining how we went from 15 titles to 2,000+ titles for basically the same amount of money. For the past two years, we have needed to fund this from the PSA. Because of the usage statistics, we cannot afford to let this subscription be dropped. As University Librarian, he has elected to take the funds for this package off the top of the journal budget moving forward. It is too critical to the general needs of the University to let this fall off the track. We do not know who is actually accessing the journals; we can only determine the subject of the journal. Rich made himself open to discussion on the topic, as he has in the past two years, during which time we have been unable to come to a consensus and move forward. Reza Curtmola spoke in support of the decision; Andrew Hill concurred. There were no more questions or comments on the issue.


Haymwantee explained to the new faculty that they will need to submit department votes for databases. Referring to the ballot and the document “FY2012 Database Procedure”, Haymwantee recommended that the representatives review these documents with their liaison librarian and other members of their department for input. Usage statistics were provided for additional guidance. A
request was made to view the prior year’s votes for each department. Haymwantee agreed to send out the allocations by department and the deadline for the ballots to be returned. (Subsequently, the documents requested – including the ballot – were emailed. The deadline was set for March 8th.)

Min Song wondered why Nature Weekly was on the database usage spreadsheet. Haymwantee commented that it has historically been on the usage list, but this journal is not one of the databases listed on the Database Ballot; there are several items listed on the usage spreadsheet that do not appear on the ballot. Rich explained that voting is binding for the year; once we decide upon subscription, it cannot be changed. He also mentioned that if any department does not vote by the deadline, they will be bound by their department’s votes for the prior year.

Min Song inquired if the departments could vote for databases that were not on the list, specifically the Web of Science. Rich explained that we cannot add anything unless we get additional funds. Web of Science has been on our wish list for a very long time, but the subscription price is prohibitive. He recommended that faculty use Scopus if they can, but if Web of Science is needed, they can go across to Rutgers for access. Reza Curtmola asked if there was any danger of losing access to the lowest-ranked database. Rich said that while he cannot know what is going to happen, the one at the bottom of the list is the one that is mostly likely to be dropped.

Stephen Tricamo asked if we could provide usage by department. Rich responded while it is theoretically possible, there will be many serious issues such as privacy concerns (who will use this data and to what end?) so it has never been pursued. The best we can do at present is to provide overall usage statistics. Rich reaffirmed that the best way to go about voting, is to talk to other people in your department, share the available usage statistics with them, and then come to a final, informed decision.


Haymwantee directed attention to the document “Library Self Help Answer Service Powered by IntelliResponse.” This service has been utilized by the library since March 2008. It is a self-service program where you can type in a question and ideally receive an accurate response. It is meant to provide easy-to-find answers to frequently asked questions. It is a self-service program that is available 24/7. Students have been using the form to try to find answers to their homework questions. Reviewing the data, we have had over 39,000 questions answered to date through IntelliResponse. Haymwantee continued by reviewing the total questions asked, response rates, average number of questions per day, and the most commonly-asked questions. Our response rate lately is due to users typing in their homework questions more than ever before. There were no additional questions or comments.

6. **EBL Pilot with PDA – Ann Hoang**
Ann began discussing one of the pilot projects currently ongoing, the EBL (electronic books) Pilot. All Librarians have been contributing to the success of this new project. Ann directed everyone’s attention to the spreadsheet on EBL usage statistics, which shows the success of the program. The departmental usage matched our expectations; as a technical university, this service supplements our collection well for the humanities. Architecture usage was also high on the list. We digitally borrow the book for a short, pre-determined period of time. By way of renting the books and allowing the students and usage to dictate which books we rent and/or purchase, we have saved a lot of money. She continued to explain the purchasing model: after a book has been accessed five times, we will buy the book on the sixth time it is accessed.

David Lubliner asked where these eBooks could be located/selected. Ann explained that the students would search through the catalog. Haymwantee gave a demonstration. Burt Kimmelman asked about the company that we contact to make purchases. Ann explained that the librarians make the purposes. Davida added that the users are not aware of the rental/purchase business model behind the scenes. Ann mentioned that the digital rights management (DRM) allows for a 24-hour rental. David Lubliner asked if any of the eBooks were textbooks. Ann answered that we cannot purchase electronic textbooks any easier than print textbooks because if we started doing so, all of our money would be spent on textbooks. Haymwantee also interjected that the vendors are not providing textbooks in these series.

Rich brought attention back to the graph of usage statistics by department. He showed that, particularly with humanities, several different items must have been accessed as we only purchased 3 eBooks while there were 126 items loaned. Davida clarified that when we mention humanities, we attributed the costs to the humanities department. However, there are a lot of social science books included; it is not strictly literature. So those 126 loans are one-time, occasional uses. This is a very good solution because we would not have the ability to purchase all of those additional titles.

Rich mentioned that we do not catalog all possible EBL eBooks. Strictly from a cost issue, we cannot afford to offer the full array of items available. We are also seeing a drop in hard copy, print books at the same time that we are seeing an increase in eBook usage. Rich continued to explain that this is just one of the providers and purchase options for eBooks that exist. We are also researching other vendors and purchase options.

Burt Kimmelman had several more questions regarding vendors and pricing options. Davida explained that there is still a selection process involved. We have taken some categories of material and excluded other categories. As new books come in each month, we review the list of new items available to add and only add those items that match the needs of our NJIT profile. She reinforced that with this model we are no longer purchasing books hoping that they will be used; we are now only purchasing the books that are being used.
Maya Gervits asked if we could show a data correlation that separates the usage of electronic and print copies of the same item. Ann said that you would need to look up the title of any item that was accessed electronically and you could do a comparison with the print collection in the circulation model.

David Lubliner asked if we compare eBooks in our collection with any of the free eBooks online (such as Google Books) before we even pay to rent them. Ann explained that we do not have any mechanism capable of such a search. Davida responded that the eBooks we have are commercially-published books from publishers. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that anything we have in our eBook collection would be in the public domain. David Lubliner asked if we had any local pages that direct people to books available for free online. Ann and Haymwantee demonstrated the “Find Ebooks” tab on the library homepage where the free, public domain book lists are. Heather and Ann commented that we can add any item to the catalog upon request. If there is a specific free eBook that you find online, we can add that to our catalog so we can create one searchable index for our users.

Burt Kimmelman asked if it would be worthwhile for departments to provide librarians with their syllabi in order to help guide purchasing information. Davida Scharf said that we are always glad to have that information.

Davida asked for any feedback about the eBooks. Luis Gonzales, Student Representative, said that the students generally like the eBooks, but the 24-hour DRM is sometimes restrictive. The only regret of the students that use the eBooks is that they don’t have more resources available to them in that format yet. Rich said that we are in the process of shifting our traditional book budget to electronic books.

Burt Kimmelman asked about printing the book. Davida responded that you can print small snippets, but you cannot copy and paste but these are publisher restrictions.

Min Song asked if there is any way that we can extend the time of our DRM privilege. Rich suggested that if someone wants something for longer than 24 hours, keep downloading it. After a week of downloads, we’ll buy it.

7. **NJIT Alumni Access to JSTOR for 2012 – Ann Hoang**

JSTOR is a full-text pdf archive database. For a small fee, they have agreed to pilot a project wherein we can provide alumni remote access to JSTOR. This is a pilot project for calendar year 2012. We will monitor usage. If it is a success, we can go to the alumni association and ask for support for moving forward. Rich elaborated on the benefits to alumni and asked the committee members to spread the word to help us promote the use of this service among our alumni.
8. **Report of Library Loaning of iPads – Ann Hoang**

Another pilot project of the library, iPads are available for borrowing by students (3-hour rental in the library) and faculty (24-hour out of library rental) through the Circulation Desk. We presently have only four iPads so we cannot yet host classes with the iPads (interest expressed by David Lubliner). One of Ann’s goals is to get more iPads as these four are very popular.

9. **Circulation Report – Doreen Mettle**

Doreen drew attention to the “Print Circulation” spreadsheet, comparing circulation for July 2011 – February 12, 2012 to the same period of the prior year. Print circulation is trending down. Rich commented that even though EBL eBooks are increasing in circulation, it is not increasing at the same rate that print circulation is decreasing.

Luis Gonzales stated that student confidence in our collection is declining. The books that we have are outdated and the students’ perception is that our collection is unnecessary for the fields of study in NJIT. They think the books are dusty, old, and generally un-needed and it is generating the image that the library is outdated.

Rich said that we ordered about 1,500-2,000 print books this past year, but those new books are just a small percentage of the entire collection. We spent over $107,000 on print books and about $10,000 on eBooks. Next year we are going to spend about $100,000 on print books and about $15,000 on eBooks; that allows us to be about 1,100 print books next year. We have over 150,000 books in the collection so Luis is right: 1,000 new books out of a 150,000-book collection is a very small percentage.

David Lubliner suggests other options, including putting together composite, online books for students. This may be a good option across departments. He also suggested that we receive copies of all handouts electronically for the next meeting. Rich and Davida agreed that it was a lot of papers, but that we have tried directing people to the online documents in the past and it hasn’t worked; sometimes to get the point across we need to get to direct people’s attention to a printed handout.

Returning to the subject of our overall collection, Davida defended our collection. She reminded us that a collection is not built overnight, but rather across several decades. And that no one has ever asked her for an item that she was unable to purchase. She suggested that the departments remind their students to reach out to their subject liaison librarian if assistance is required in finding current, relevant print books.

10. **Student Issues – Luis Gonzales**

The overall consensus among the students is that while they recognize that the library is underfunded, there are some issues that should be addressed in order to increase students’ perceptions. The library’s overall setting is viewed as though it is falling apart: bathrooms are not
clean, outlets do not work, lights out at study desks. He suggests that the library try to work with
the physical plant to bring our building up to working, useable order. A student who wants to work
in the library finds the library computers filled. He or she tries to use a personal laptop, but then
the outlets don’t work. What is compelling that student to stay in the library? Luis and other
students are really frustrated and they want to see us “brought up to code.”

Rich asked for assistance from the Student Senate to get these items addressed. All of the items
that Luis mentioned, and other items that he did not mention, have been brought to Facilities’
attention: broken electrical outlets, broken lights, and broken chairs.

Luis brought up the point that we were cited in 2002 for too few books and too little room. At the
exponential rate that our campus is growing, he is concerned that we will be facing these same
complaints the next time we are reviewed. He suggested that maybe there could be a possibility for
additional study room space on the other side of the building once space is freed up in Fenster
Hall. Something needs to be done because the students should not have to feel that their library’s
physical facility is impeding their studies.

Rich asked Luis to provide him with a complete list of the students’ complaints and comments.
These will be welcome improvements.

11. Dismissal
Due to time constraints, the following items on the agenda were not addressed during this meeting:
• Upgrade of Voyager May 21-May 23; no catalog access – Ann Hoang
• End of TeamSpot Pilot– Ann Hoang
• VALID--Kuali OLE Project Update – Ann Hoang
• Information Literacy Status Report & Middle States – Davida Scharf
• ILL & Rapid ILL Report– Doreen Mettle
• Group Study Use Report – Doreen Mettle
• Other Old Business
• New Business

Submitted by Kate Wiggins