

## Faculty Scholarship Collections: Identifying, Capturing, Archiving, and Accessing History

Adina Lack, Andrew Dutka, Sherman Hayes<sup>1</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** It has long been the mission of faculty to add to the world's intellectual base. Academic libraries have the opportunity to play a key role in the acquisition, preservation and management of faculty intellectual product. The goal of this article is to address important issues surrounding today's faculty scholarship collections, including the issues of explosive growth in quantity of product and the emergence of scholarship in newer, machine-readable formats. At the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, the University Archives (UA) has found that the Faculty Scholarship Collection contains valuable resources for researchers and serves to recognize university faculty for their scholarly contributions.

**KEYWORDS.** Faculty scholarship collections; college and university libraries – relations with faculty; college and university libraries – collection development; college and university archives – collection development; academic libraries

**AUTHORS FOOTNOTE.** Adina Lack is Archivist and Special Collections Librarian; Andrew Dutka is Coordinator of Archives and Special Collections; Sherman Hayes is University Librarian, all affiliated with the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

**NOTE.** This article was originally published in *Collection Management*, v. 26, no. 2 with different page formatting.

---

<sup>1</sup> © 2002, The Haworth Press, Inc.: Faculty scholarship collections: Identifying, capturing, archiving, and accessing history. *Collection Management*, 26 (2), 57-66.

## ***INTRODUCTION***

Universities speak to the life of faculty in terms of the traditional divisions of teaching, scholarship, and service. These three areas have engendered definitional books, articles, and debates. The role of this article is to not revisit these debates, but to broadly define that core product of the university called “scholarship,” and to speak to the methods used by University Archives (UA) at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington to capture and preserve this scholarship as part of the university’s heritage.

### ***WHY DEVELOP A FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP COLLECTION?***

While many colleges and universities have systems to collect and preserve their official records in archives, these institutions do not always systematically preserve and collect the work of faculty. The record of faculty’s intellectual output is an important part of the history of an academic institution and could, therefore, be part of archives. While collecting for history’s sake is important, there are many other benefits to having a faculty scholarship collection, as demonstrated by some sample and potential usage patterns in the University Archives:

- Personnel from academic departments consult the Faculty Scholarship Collection (FSC) while working on accreditation lists and other administrative matters.
- Teaching faculty—while contributing their work to the collection or obtaining a copy of an FSC article for their own use—often learn more about archives collections and services in the course of interacting with the archivist.

- Reference librarians consult the FSC to understand faculty research interests better and to support liaison programs.
- Potential graduate students considering study at UNCW may refer to the FSC to learn of faculty research interests.
- Undergraduate and graduate students doing research for coursework refer to specific articles in the collection after finding them in the public catalog.
- Undergraduate and graduate students consult articles as part of their cooperative research efforts with faculty members.

In addition to proving valuable for a variety of patrons, the collection serves to recognize faculty intellectual output in both traditional and non-traditional formats. The collection is a way to say, institutionally, “thank you” to faculty for their many scholarly efforts.

### ***WHAT IS FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP?***

Faculty scholarship comes with a highly variable definition based on the type of institution, stage of institutional development, and the parties defining the scholarship standards. The recorded scholarship of faculty has been centered on print formats such as books and journal articles. These two commonly accepted forms raise issues in areas of identification, acquisition, cataloging, and placement. Now, however, the definition of scholarship is broadening to include new formats as well as products that may not have been considered scholarship until relatively recently.

TABLE 1

Traditional recorded formats of scholarship may include:

Art originals	Manuscripts
Art reproductions	(unpublished)
Book chapters	Maps
Book reviews	Monographs
Consulting reports	Motion pictures
Display materials from	Music scores
<u>poster sessions</u>	Newspaper articles and
Grant proposals	columns
Introductions from books,	Pamphlets
<u>art catalogs, and other</u>	Photographs and slides
<u>resources</u>	<u>Realia</u>
Journal Articles (both	Screenplays and scripts
refereed and not)	Sound recordings
Magazine Articles	Technical drawings
	<u>Videorecordings</u>

In addition to the issues raised by the traditional mix of scholarship shown in table 1, the archivist struggles with decisions on how to collect scholarship in newer, machine-readable formats such as:

- Audio formats (MP3, streaming audio, Webcasts)
- CD-ROM products including interactive media, video and digital imagery produced by faculty
- “Born-digital” work, such as World Wide Web publications, electronic theses/dissertations, and other Internet resources
- Other computer files (such as datasets, databases, PDF files, and word-processed)

Collecting scholarship in newer formats presents interesting challenges. There are not always clear standards for evaluating this scholarship. Also, there are debates on how to preserve this information. It may be wise for developers of faculty scholarship

collections to devise provisional policies for collecting information in formats such as electronic articles written for electronic journals, digital theses, Web pages that are credited to faculty for their creativity and service, and word-processed material in disk or CD format. These provisional collection development policies should be flexible and open to reevaluation and readjustment, as information professionals learn more about managing collections that include these types of materials.

In reality, no one can collect everything that is listed above. Institutions need to establish a priority list and tackle old, new, and emerging formats within their individual mission statements, goals, and resources. Early on, at the University Archives, it was decided the FSC would include monographs that are written or edited by UNCW faculty, both those that were written before they came to the university and those written while at the university. The FSC policy makes no distinction between textbooks and other monographs, between scholarly and popular works, or between fiction and non-fiction. However, faculty theses or dissertations are not collected unless they are requested separately for subject content. When faculty members leave the university, their status changes to non-faculty and their books are no longer collected. However, if they stay in the region, their monographs may be collected under a regional collection policy, but not under the faculty scholarship initiative.

While monographs and journal article reprints are the first-priority collection points, the collection development policy allows for a range of materials, such as magazine articles, book reviews, introductions to books, documentaries, films, books on tape, and chapters or essays within monographs. In addition, the FSC includes published proceedings, unpublished written material if requested by a faculty member, consultant

reports, newspaper columns, audio interviews, video materials, photographs and other materials on a negotiable basis. This less traditional material helps to record the true scholarly activity of the university, but it is more difficult to systematize this part of the collection process.

As an example, the UA felt that the visual arts faculty who produce original art as part of their scholarship were underrepresented in the faculty collection. While an attempt was made to get every book and article written, it was not possible to purchase—or even receive as gifts—extensive art holdings. Therefore, a set dollar amount of original artwork was purchased from each tenure-track studio artist for the FSC. This artwork is on display throughout the library, along with descriptions provided by the faculty member.

To test the effort of collecting World Wide Web resources, the UA periodically printed departmental websites and individual faculty websites. These were termed “Web Snapshots.” However, this effort has been suspended because of the changing nature of these websites and the extensive labor necessary to keep up with this edge of scholarship. The debate on how and what to collect in electronic formats continues. Other areas that the UA would like to collect more extensively, but that are still under policy development, include unpublished presentations, radio interviews, pamphlets, results from poster presentations, and grant proposals. While there are some broad agreements on the definition of faculty scholarship, the reader should recognize that the definition is first and foremost a local decision.

### ***WHO ARE THE FACULTY?***

What seems like an obvious question with an obvious answer may well be one of the trickier policy choices to be made in a faculty scholarship collection. Each campus defines who are faculty and the definition can and usually does change over time. The obvious segment is tenure-track, full-time teaching faculty. Many other people have the term “faculty” as part of their titles including:

- Part-time faculty
- Adjunct faculty
- Lecturers
- Non-tenure track faculty
- Library faculty
- Administrators who may also be faculty
- Research faculty
- Emeritus faculty not currently on active status
- Retired faculty who may still be involved in the University and still publishing
- Visiting faculty
- Teaching assistants (usually graduate students).

All these people contribute to the history of the University, but how can a collection identify and support them? How many people should it support? Rather than providing definitive answers to these questions, the UA recognizes that defining the word “faculty” is difficult for collectors of faculty scholarship. Policy developers may find that their definition changes and evolves as circumstances dictate.

In the FSC, the work of the following people is collected:

- Tenure-track teaching faculty (full-time)
- Research faculty
- Visiting faculty who seem to be long term (more than two years)
- Administrators who are faculty
- Emeritus faculty
- Retired faculty
- Library faculty

In the FSC, the work of part-time or adjunct faculty is generally not collected; however, the archivist can make exceptions if she or he feels that the material will add to the history of the institution. The work of graduate teaching assistants is not collected as part of the FSC; however, master's theses are acquired in another collection in Archives.

What about staff intellectual products? Professionals in Student Affairs, Human Resources, Information Technology, University Relations and from many other offices on campus produce published works both related to their work and their own individual scholarly endeavors. Is this part of the institution's history and should it be collected just as is faculty work? The UA has chosen not to systematically collect this work; however, if it comes to the Archives, it is evaluated for inclusion on a case-by-case basis. This work may not be included physically in the FSC, but it may be added to University Archives as part of a record group. The decision not to pursue staff scholarship was partly based on the realization that such a project could become too broad to manage. This decision does not reflect judgments about the quality of any particular group's scholarship. Another reason to focus primarily upon faculty members is that they are



charged by the mission statement of the institution to be scholars. The university as a whole can be—and, in fact, many times is—judged by the productivity of its faculty.

While this seemingly simple question, “Who are faculty?” is complicated, the next logical question adds to the complexity: What period of a faculty member’s productivity should be collected? Should the FSC collect work that was done before a faculty member arrived at the institution? Or, does it also include work that they did as a student? If a faculty member leaves the institution, should the FSC continue adding their new works?

The UA has decided on the following parameters: the work of faculty that was done prior to their coming to the university is collected, as well as work completed while at the institution. If a faculty member leaves the institution before retirement, their work is no longer collected. However, work by this individual may be acquired under other collection initiatives. Institutions must set parameters for their definition of “faculty,” as they see fit. For example, at Bentley College (Waltham, Mass.), while Sherman Hayes was Library Director, the policy was that after faculty members received tenure, the library would collect all of their previous work.

### ***HOW IS FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP ACQUIRED?***

The University Archives has chosen to collect actual physical items. Some institutions choose to create bibliographic databases of faculty work, but do not collect the works themselves. For example, Savitt Medical Library at the University of Nevada School of Medicine created a faculty bibliography representing work done while the faculty members were at the institution (Potter 1987, 43, 45). The “Authors Database” at

North Carolina State University includes citations to works by students as well as by faculty members (“NC State University Authors Database” 2001).

If a local collection is created, there are three logical models of item identification and acquisition: voluntary, mandatory, or a combination of these two. At the UA, items are borrowed, purchased, or received as gifts. In order not to increase faculty workload or generate ill will, the FSC does not require faculty to provide materials. By not making it mandatory for faculty to donate items, the UA has the chance to contact and work with faculty directly. However, this also presents challenges, because making personal contacts is time-consuming. In addition to acquiring materials from faculty, UA staff identifies citations in campus and departmental newsletters, commercial databases, faculty web pages, faculty vitae, departmental annual reports, and bibliographies.

The second model is to have an institutional requirement that copies of scholarly work be submitted automatically to University Archives. For small institutions, or those that already have this system in place, this is an efficient system. Although the UA does not implement such a system, the assumption is that those institutions with such requirements would still have to monitor the process to make sure all appropriate materials are being collected.

The third logical model for acquisition would be some hybrid combination of the other two. Some material would come automatically, such as books and journal articles, but gray and special format literature such as proceedings, presentation graphics, websites, and artwork might need to be solicited voluntarily.

***WHERE SHOULD THE COLLECTION BE LOCATED,  
AND HOW SHOULD IT BE ACCESSED?***

The physical location of any faculty scholarship collection is a local decision. Due to previous collection decisions, the UA has separated the various faculty products. Monographs by faculty are included in a regional special collection, which captures the region's intellectual output. Second copies of faculty monographs are added to the general collection when possible to enhance accessibility. By contrast, journal articles and reviews are located in the UA. The overall initiative to collect faculty intellectual product originated in the UA, and the project continues to be driven by an archival focus. Special formats are considered individually. The faculty art collection is currently displayed on walls throughout the library and is organizationally part of the UA. Videos, audio output, and maps are placed in the general collections, with duplicates added to the UA or Special Collections as appropriate.

Access and availability guidelines follow local rules. At Randall Library at UNCW, materials in Special Collections and the UA do not circulate, while the general collection does. Public copying follows standard library policies. The UA is considering scanning and preserving parts of the FSC digitally to allow for remote access. However, given the multiple copyright restrictions, this idea has not been pursued aggressively.

The primary finding device for the FSC is the online library catalog. This reflects a major difference between faculty bibliographic databases and faculty scholarship collections. Some faculty publication databases use software such as Microsoft Access as their platform and are made accessible via a web browser and an Internet database connector (Bai and Kelly 2000, 190). In contrast, the UA's goal was to enable a patron to do an "author" search in order to find a faculty member's work. The UA has chosen to

use different levels of cataloging to access this material bibliographically. To save time, money, and staff resources, the UA decided to use a brief MARC format to create local records for journal articles, reviews, newspaper columns and similar materials that are held in the FSC. Monograph titles, audio-visual output, and original art pieces are cataloged fully using MARC tagging and LC subject headings. Table 2 shows a sample of a local record in the Randall Library catalog for a journal article reprint.

TABLE 2

<i>Author</i>	<u>Baden, Daniel G.</u>						
<i>Title</i>	<b>Conformational analysis of the sodium channel modulator, brevetoxin A, comparison with brevetoxin B conformations and a hypothesis about common pharmacophore of the "Site 5" toxins / Daniel G. Baden ... [et al.]</b>						
<i>Publisher</i>	[1994]						
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>LOCATION</th> <th>CALL #</th> <th>STATUS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>UNCW Archives</td> <td><u>WRG FSC-B</u></td> <td>LIB USE ONLY</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	LOCATION	CALL #	STATUS	UNCW Archives	<u>WRG FSC-B</u>	LIB USE ONLY
LOCATION	CALL #	STATUS					
UNCW Archives	<u>WRG FSC-B</u>	LIB USE ONLY					
<i>Description</i>	6 p.						
<i>Note</i>	Published in: The Journal of organic chemistry, 59(8), 2101-2106						
<i>Alt author</i>	<u>NIEHS Marine and Freshwater Biomedical Sciences Center, Rosenstiel School for Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Miami, Miami, Florida.</u>						

Since the FSC is split among several collections and physical sites, it is important that collection procedures and policies be negotiated across several library units. At Randall Library, both the UA and Special Collections are library departments. Good communication among library departments is necessary for the collection to grow and be made accessible. To date, the UA has managed the FSC project with valuable input from

Special Collections, the University Librarian, Cataloging, Systems, Acquisitions, Reference, and Interlibrary Loan.

### *CONCLUSIONS*

At UNCW, the FSC is administered by the University Archives in Randall Library. Other institutions may choose to develop a faculty scholarship collection via other departments in the library or the university. However it is administered, the UA believes that faculty scholarship is important to the history of higher education and each individual institution.

In the case of the University Archives, creating this collection has opened new gateways for interaction between the UA and the faculty, as well as the library and faculty. In addition, faculty and other patrons have found the resources in the FSC valuable for their administrative and academic projects. Integral to the success of a faculty scholarship collection is to clearly identify and define goals, procedures and collection policies. It is also important that collection policies be flexible enough to adapt to the changing formats of scholarly production.

The purpose of a faculty scholarship collection is two-fold. The short-term goal is to identify and capture scholarly output, in essence to create a snapshot of an institution's scholarly output at a given time. The bigger and more far-reaching goal is the preservation of institutional memory. By identifying and collecting faculty scholarship, a faculty scholarship collection helps to preserve a portion of the college or university history that otherwise may be lost.

## References

- Bai, Sheryl and Pamela Kelly. "Development of a Web-based Faculty Publications Database at the University of Connecticut Health Center." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 88, no. 2 (2000): 189–92.
- Mansheim, Renee E. and JoLinda L. Thompson. "Faculty Publications Databases in Academic Health Sciences Libraries: A Comprehensive Survey." *Medical Reference Services Quarterly* 13, no. 4 (1994): 21–34.
- "NC State University Authors Database." [World Wide Web site]. Raleigh: North Carolina State University, 1997- [cited 23 July 2001]. Available at <http://libntapp1.lib.ncsu.edu/cataloging/Authors/>.
- Pennell, Charley. "NC State University Authors Database on the Web." *Focus* 19, no. 3 (1999): 6.
- Potter, Laurie A. "Creating a Faculty Publications Database Using Sci-Mate™." *Medical Reference Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (1987) 43–62.