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Seton Hall University

- One the country’s leading Catholic Universities
- 9,000 FTE students- undergraduate/graduate
- Opened Medical School July 2018
Survey: Activity Tracking Systems

Do you have Faculty Activity tracking systems at your campus?

(Examples of systems include Digital Measures, Pure, Faculty 180, PeopleAdmin, or others)
Activity Tracking Systems, part deux

How many librarians support the Activity Tracking Process?

A. We don’t support it
B. We support it in our own functional area (other Faculty at the Library)
C. We support certain Faculty in other areas of our institution (we support Faculty and schools with whom we have strong partnerships)
D. We support any/all Faculty at the institution (we support the system).
Why Track Activity?

- Information regarding faculty was spread throughout several systems and offices and departments
- No centralized picture of the scholarly output of the faculty
- Each college collected data on faculty activity in different ways making annual reports and accreditation processes more difficult.
- What is in it for faculty?
  - For all faculty, ease of annual report production: teaching, advising, scholarship, presentations, etc. Also an export to CV function
  - For junior faculty, the system maintains documents for tenure packets
## DM Activity Insights Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Innovation and Curriculum Development</td>
<td>Scheduled Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed Student Learning (e.g., theses, dissertations)</td>
<td>Non-Credit Instruction Taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Yearly Advising Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scholarship/Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Exhibits and Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Intellectual Property (e.g., copyrights, patents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts, Fellowships, Grants and Sponsored Research</td>
<td>Research Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Service</th>
<th>Public Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Training Process

- Office of the Provost hosted several informational sessions for faculty to learn about the implementation of Digital Measures on campus.
- Library faculty provided individual and small group pilot training sessions to teach faculty members how to import their publications into Digital Measures.
- Training will be provided by the Digital Measures Project Managers (Office of the Provost and Teaching, Learning, and Technology Center) and library faculty for each college/school.
Your publications may exist in other systems—and we want to make adding them easy. Import your citations using one of the options below, then follow the prompts to address duplicates, match collaborators, and perform a final review to complete the process.

**Import from a BibTeX file**

Import publications from other software or databases such as:
- EndNote
- Mendeley
- HeinOnline
- Google Scholar
- RefWorks
- Zotero

Choose File...

**Import from a Third Party**

Select a service:
- Scopus
- Crossref
- PubMed

Search criteria:
- Author
- Publication Date: 2013/12/12 to 2018/12/12

Search Crossref
Importing Scholarship

- **Crossref**
  - Best starting point
  - Cleanest data
  - Easy, direct import to DM’s Activity Insight

- **Google Scholar**
  - Opportunity to talk with faculty about creating an account
  - Export as BibTeX file

- **Discipline-specific**
  - **Scopus** - Sciences
  - **PubMed** - Health Sciences
  - **HeinOnline** - Legal scholarship
Reception from Faculty

- Pleased with the ease of the process to upload scholarship
- Current initiative is to import the last year’s worth of publications but most faculty opted to import all of their recent work
- Different levels of technical expertise, varies across disciplines
Takeaways

Strengths

• Provost’s mandate to automate faculty reporting and departmental content
• Each department has opportunity to design departmental template in new format to showcase output
• Cross pollination of faculty from different schools and departments

Opportunities

• Broadens and continues discussion about scholarly communications with faculty and administration
• Demonstrates value of library as partners in technology rollouts and scholarly communication
• Collaboration with library and Teaching, Learning & Technology Center (TLTC) and law and medical librarians on separate campuses
Takeaways

Weaknesses

• Adoption critical to success
• Stress of adoption minimized because required by Provost’s and departments
• Significant time commitment for librarians - planning meetings and live sessions during heavy instruction periods
• Need to ensure there is tie in to Institutional Repository efforts

Threats

• Collision or competition with other faculty profile systems
Future Plans

• Linking to Institutional Repositories
  – Import/export feature for Digital Commons with SelectedWorks
  – Agreement to share publication information for IR ingest
Discussion
Thank You!
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