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Introduction

The Ithaka Modern Languages & Literatures Research Study is a collaborative, cross-institutional project designed to help librarians better understand the research practices of faculty who conduct research in literature in all languages, culture (e.g. folklore, performance studies, and literary history), and writing studies. The primary emphasis of this report is to discern trends among the language and literature faculty at Georgetown University and to offer recommendations for how the Library could better respond to faculty needs.

Georgetown University Library participated as a partner in this national study alongside eleven other institutions of higher education. This report presents the findings from interviews with thirteen Georgetown University faculty members who conduct research in language and literature. In addition to contributing to the national study, our purpose in sharing these results with our colleagues throughout the Library and on campus is to improve library services for researchers at Georgetown University.

Our report includes a description of the methodology and four sections of analysis focused on the most important themes that surfaced throughout the study:

- Faculty Research Practices & Perceptions
- Collections & Research Support
- Publishing vis-à-vis Promotion & Tenure
- Training Needs & Experiences

In Faculty Research Practices & Perceptions, we describe how faculty develop their research topics, how they view their work fitting into their departments, and whether they view their work as disciplinary or interdisciplinary.
In **Collections & Research Support**, we focus on faculty members’ experiences and expectations regarding access to the print and online collections that drive their research forward, the services and librarians who support faculty research, and challenges encountered regarding research support.

In **Publishing vis-à-vis Promotion & Tenure**, we examine the beliefs faculty members shared regarding their publications, particularly as they relate to annual merit and tenure review processes.

In **Training Needs & Experiences**, we summarize the different methods faculty have used to build and maintain their research skills in an increasingly digital research environment, their expectations for graduate students’ research skills development, and the Library’s role in supporting these skills.

In addition, we noted several threads that run across the four themes. Faculty mentioned the importance of serendipity, the role of browsing, their need for community, and their need for financial support in their research. While none rose to the level of an overarching theme, each of these threads recurs throughout our analysis. For instance, serendipity runs through both Faculty Research Practices & Perceptions and Collections & Research Support, while the need for financial support runs through the first three thematic areas.

---

**Methodology**

In consultation with liaison librarians who work with language and literature academic departments, the project team reached out to specific faculty members, ultimately meeting with thirteen faculty members from East Asian Languages & Cultures, English, French, German, Italian, Slavic Languages, and Spanish & Portuguese.¹

Interviews were scheduled for one hour and included about 30 questions and sub-questions. The topics included faculty members’ research focus and methods, their experience with archives and special collections, their work with secondary source materials, the role of scholarly communications and of the evaluation of their work’s impact, and their research training.²

The project team developed a list of themes and sub-themes, two team members coded each transcript accordingly, and a third team member reviewed and reconciled both sets of codes. To complete the analysis, quotes classified with the same codes were organized together in order to

---

¹ In order to conduct human subjects research, all project team members at Georgetown University Library completed the CITI training in August 2018. The IRB application was submitted and approved (exempt) in late September 2018. The interview instrument and participant recruitment plan were included in the application and approved. An informed consent document was developed, and verbal consent was received before the interviews began. Signed consent forms were not gathered to avoid re-identification of participants.

² The interviews were recorded and then downloaded to Box. Anonymized Box files were shared with the company Transcript Divas for transcription.
identify common themes and trends. The following report highlights the major themes identified across the thirteen participant interviews.

Faculty Research Practices & Perceptions

Language and literature faculty view their current scholarship as belonging to a larger research agenda that they have pursued from graduate school into their academic careers. Even as new projects develop that seemingly move in a different direction from their prior research, faculty identify how their current work extends, complicates, and builds off of their earlier work. While some scholars build a career researching particular authors and texts, others shift to related research questions using particular theoretical lenses (e.g., critical race theory, translation theory, and feminist theory) or questions of representation (e.g., identity, borders, gender, and sexuality). Regardless of a scholar’s individual path, each scholar sees his or her work as fitting into a cohesive research agenda. As one scholar noted, “I think they’re all culminations of things that I’ve been doing.”

While some scholars discussed journal articles they are writing, the majority discussed scholarly books they have recently written or are currently writing. As one scholar noted, the book is “the super project” in the humanities. How faculty develop a new research project, particularly a book-length project, is a lengthy and, at-times, circuitous process. Ultimately there is no single path that scholars tread down. Some projects are the culmination of “several years of preparatory research, where after a while I decide that the topic and the scope is large enough to conceptualize as a book.” Other projects may have begun small only to balloon into fully-fledged books: “So then that’s a question that arises in the conference paper that may become an article, and you think, ‘There’s a whole book worth of material here.’” Faculty also acknowledge that while not all scholarly projects end with their intended publication, there is still value in the process:

So that experience has been really important for me, just intellectually to kind of start out with something and feel like you’re wasting energy or time because it’s not working, and then realizing actually the fact that it’s not working is showing you that that could be wrong and that’s, you know, okay.

Regardless of a research project’s final outcome, language and literature scholars require time to develop and make connections among their ideas and to discern whether a particular research path may be fruitful.

In a process inherently organic and idiosyncratic, language and literature research is both messy and productive, often relying on serendipitous discoveries made within specific works and found through

browsing broader collections. As scholars read more deeply within a particular scholarly conversation, they begin to see not only the shape of the existing conversation but also the gaps and cracks left behind by previous scholars. Within these gaps and cracks, language and literature scholars find some of their most interesting work.

Scholars characterize their research as filled with “serendipity and stumbling,” as a “strangely organic process,” as going “down a little rabbit hole,” and as finding “things through obscure pathways.” The whole process allows language and literature faculty to investigate their questions from a variety of angles, seeing which prove generative. This wandering is not aimless as it often creates a “snowball effect” as one crucial article or book leads to another and then another: “the more you read, the more you know, and the more you think you can investigate.” While there may be similarities among scholars’ approaches to research, each has a unique process for working their way into and through a project. Discussed further in the “Faculty Format Preferences” subsection, scholars’ relationship to serendipitous research is affected by their ability to physically browse materials.

Language and literature faculty frequently describe their research interests as unique within their academic departments. Particularly in departments with fewer tenure-line faculty, each scholar fills a particular role in terms of research specialization. While there can be some overlap or affinity with colleagues’ research interests, many researchers noted the uniqueness of their work within their department. As one scholar commented, “the nature of our research ... is so specialized.” The degree of specialization among scholars at times means they lack a local community of peer scholars within their field or subfield. There is a perception that scholars working in traditionally defined fields benefit from having a “premade community, the community of scholars who gather regularly, who have journals and conferences,” while scholars whose work spans disciplines may feel the lack of having “a premade community of scholars to understand it.”

Faculty have a sense of shifting boundaries within their disciplines. They perceive that they are working in a time where they “are reassessing the meaning of literary research: what is literary scholarship about, and what is it for?” Scholars are aware of changes to traditional understandings of what literature is and the move towards interdisciplinarity as scholars engage in art, cultural studies, environmental studies, film studies, music, and new media, among other areas. However, even in the midst of engaging in interdisciplinary research, scholars bring literary research methods to bear on their work.

Despite their use of digital tools and resources (see “Faculty Format Preferences” subsection below), faculty still rely on traditional research methods. While digital innovations have changed how some research materials are accessed, they haven’t necessarily changed how critical thinking and analysis happens in language and literature scholarship. Scholars’ observations about their own research processes reveal a particular humanities way of thinking that informs their research practices regardless of whether they are working with traditional or non-traditional texts (e.g., Medieval manuscripts or new media formats) or whether they are creating traditional or non-traditional outputs (e.g., a scholarly monograph or a digital humanities project).
Regardless of their particular scholarly focus, language and literature faculty encounter some common challenges in their research: inadequate time and funding. Scholars find themselves with limited time to dedicate to researching, reading, and writing, and to travel to and spend time in archival collections. With increasing demands on their schedules, scholars may find themselves struggling to find uninterrupted time “to think coherently” and to balance being “a half-time teacher and half-time researcher and a half-time reader of everybody else’s junk.”

The funding challenges faculty encounter are frequently related to needing—and not having—access to appropriate research materials. Faculty feel the strain of financial limitations in terms of funding both for travel to archives and for the library to acquire research resources. While they are aware of the budgetary limitations facing the library, scholars are also mindful that a lack of resources inhibits their ability to do research. Likewise, faculty have concerns about the limited availability of grant funding to support their research. Scholars noted the tension of grant opportunities that do not align with their research. One researcher expressed concerns about funding structures not supporting “traditional” forms of scholarship, i.e. archival work. Another researcher lamented research opportunities that don’t value “heavy language-oriented scholarship.” There was also discussion about how grant funding and research priorities intersect with promotion and tenure expectations at the university (see the “Publishing vis-à-vis Promotion & Tenure” section).

Collections & Research Support

Language and literature faculty rely heavily on the collections and research support provided by libraries and archives. Their research process often involves Georgetown University Libraries and local D.C. collections along with libraries and archives abroad. Although library collections and services are crucial to their research, faculty had mixed perceptions about their access to specific collections and services, both here and abroad.

Local Collections & Support

Whether faculty perceive Georgetown’s library collections to support their research well varies depending on the individual and his or her research needs. Many scholars consider Lauinger Library to be an ally in their research. As one faculty member noted, “I have perceived of the library as the most well-functioning and helpful resource that the university offers.” At the same time, faculty have a shared awareness that the library does not provide all of the resources needed for their scholarship. One researcher lamented that they don’t search for items in the library catalog because they assume we don’t have it. Scholars readily acknowledged the prohibitive costs of some journal subscriptions while also expressing their ongoing frustration that the Library is unable to subscribe to some essential titles in their fields. Another respondent was thankful that books needed for courses were purchased
while another felt that between Lauinger’s collections, the Washington Research Library Consortium (WRLC), and Interlibrary Loan, they are not “missing out.”

When considering Lauinger Library collections, the conversation inevitably led to Interlibrary Loan, which faculty rely on heavily. Respondents said that Interlibrary Loan is “very effective,” “exceptional,” “very helpful,” and “particularly crucial” to their research. One researcher stated that they are “addicted” to Interlibrary Loan. However, there was some concern both about having to use Interlibrary Loan for known journals (instead of the library acquiring a subscription), and the occasions when the material needed is too obscure and copies cannot be found. Some scholars reported having problems requesting specific titles and being uncertain about how to proceed.

In addition to Interlibrary Loan services, faculty greatly benefit from resources made available by the WRLC. One faculty member noted the added value that Interlibrary Loan and the WRLC provide, which enables them to “get resources quickly” without any “handicap.” Additionally, many faculty rely on local libraries, such as Library of Congress, the University of Maryland College Park Library, and the Folger Shakespeare Library. In particular, the Library of Congress is crucial in supporting faculty research and provides rich research collections not available on campus. One scholar stated, “I think if I were just at Georgetown, and if we didn’t have the Library of Congress, the Folger, Interlibrary Loan, consortium books, then it would be a real problem.”

**International Collections & Support**

Likewise language and literature scholars’ experiences with international libraries and librarians vary widely, although many noted challenges in accessing international collections and working with international librarians. They often find they are at “the mercy of different librarians with varying success.” While some scholars have been well-supported by international librarians at institutions such as the British Library, the Bodleian, and the Bibliothèque nationale de France, others reported Kafkaesque access in countries such as Italy, Japan, and Russia. On the one hand, inadequate description in online catalogs and finding aids can make it difficult to know what is available, while bureaucratic systems onsite may encumber the research process. In some cases, faculty have encountered restrictions around photography and reproductions. On the other hand, many national libraries have done significant work digitizing sources, enabling faculty to consult materials from afar. Digitized resources can supplement onsite research and facilitate the research process year-round. In one case a researcher mentioned that the National Library of Russia puts the Library of Congress “to shame” because they have digitized so much material.

Whether working locally or abroad, faculty acknowledge the value librarians add to their research experience, particularly in how librarians walk alongside them and teach them how to use databases, systems, and services that relate directly to their research. Librarians can also mitigate the loneliness

---

4 The Washington Research Library Consortium enables resource sharing between Georgetown University Libraries and the libraries at nine other local universities: American University, The Catholic University of America, Gallaudet University, George Mason University, The George Washington University, Howard University, Marymount University, and The University of the District of Columbia.
inherent to the solitary nature of language and literature research: “It’s like hand holding. It’s very lonely to do a dissertation or to do a book in our field.” While faculty are experts in their fields, they recognize that librarians can support them through expertise in library resources, searching, and navigating libraries.

In addition to librarians, scholars rely on research assistants and scholarly networks for research support. Language and literature faculty benefit from the support of research assistants; however, they also acknowledge that there are challenges to finding and training a good student assistant. Research assistants frequently require training in research resources and methodologies from the faculty member or from a subject librarian. Additionally, many faculty conduct research that requires knowledge of languages that Georgetown students may not be proficient in, which poses an obstacle to receiving student support.

Faculty also rely on networks of colleagues to provide research support. This can come in the form of digital scans of needed materials, as feedback on their writing and research, and as support with specialized digital skills, paleography, and other languages. Sometimes these scholarly networks form locally at Georgetown, but often language and literature faculty rely on colleagues across the country and around the world. In spite of local, national, and international networks, at times faculty feel isolated in their research.

**Faculty Format Preferences**

How language and literature scholars find and use information varies depending on the resources and research the faculty member is engaging in. Faculty acknowledge that while both print and electronic resources play a role in their scholarship, each has particular affordances. Researchers consider online access to books and articles an asset, especially when traveling or spending long periods abroad. As one respondent pointed out: “e-books don’t weigh as much,” and “you don’t lose them.” Another researcher relayed the joyful epiphany that they no longer needed to carry dictionaries around. Researchers also use databases for journal articles and newspaper articles. 5 While the scholars in our study lauded electronic access to materials across the board, there were also some complaints about broken links and about e-books that disappear after the borrowing time has ended, causing scholars to lose their annotations and notes in the process. Overall, the convenience of online access is preferred although lingering usability and access issues create frustrations.

While appreciating the increased convenience of electronic materials, scholars note the loss of browseable, physical collections, particularly journal collections. One researcher said, “I miss the physical serendipity of going to the library and wandering through the shelves, and going to the periodicals room, and looking at the new periodicals.” Browseable periodical collections, in particular, not only allow for serendipitous discoveries but also serve to educate scholars and students about what it means “to be part of the profession” by allowing them to encounter “journals as wholes, to

---

5 Interviewees mentioned the following databases: CiNii Articles, Google Scholar, Literature Online (LION), JSTOR, LexisNexis, MLA International Bibliography, and Project Muse.
see the way they’re organized, to see what’s included, to see the way things are formatted and cited. That’s one of the best sort of memetic ways of understanding what your discipline does or what your field does.” In spite of nostalgia for browsing the periodical stacks, faculty generally agreed that going to the periodicals room is no longer necessary.

Print book collections, however, have retained their value. Faculty noted the importance of being able to go physically to the stacks and browse. Because serendipity plays a crucial role in literature and language research, the library’s organization and the availability of browseable collections can directly impact faculty research. Even so, some faculty comments indicated contradictory feelings about format preference. As one scholar noted: “I do miss [browsing] and now I have the sense that you need to know what you’re looking for in a way that you didn’t before. But I also like—I’d like knowing that I can probably find it from my desk.” Faculty value both the physicality of research materials and the convenience of electronic access.

With regard to electronic access, the Library’s new catalog—HoyaSearch—is recognized as a barrier for accessing library materials. Scholars experience confusion about which items are held at a consortium library and which are held at Georgetown. HoyaSearch is “not user friendly” and is less comforting than Google Scholar. One researcher stated that “the move to make search engines sort of everything all at once often leads to a lot of irrelevance in the results.” Respondents were also frustrated with the known item searches, where their results do not match their expectations. One faculty member said, “And in many cases I know the work is there because I’ve used it before. I can’t find it.” Another respondent expressed frustration with being unable to copy and paste call numbers.

### Publishing vis-à-vis Promotion & Tenure

The tenure and annual merit review processes heavily influence faculty members’ decisions about their publications, and they lack consensus about how the processes should evolve to support digital scholarship and other innovative and collaborative approaches to research and scholarly publishing. Traditional forms of publication are still at the heart of annual merit and tenure evaluations, including single-author monographs, scholarly journal articles, and book chapters. This view was widely held and generally accepted by our respondents, although many scholars acknowledged that there are challenges to the university’s heavy focus on traditional forms of publication. For example, one faculty member stated that this approach “leads to a kind of more conservative view of scholarship and what counts for tenure and promotion.” Additionally, some faculty members lacked clarity on whether scholarship in emerging areas and publications in foreign languages are accurately judged by their departments.

Some researchers also raised concerns about the negative consequences of the pressure to publish in traditional formats. One faculty member felt that the pressure to publish resulted in superfluous publications that do not contribute meaningfully to a scholarly exchange of ideas: “It’s just something I observe about the evaluation of scholarship that really clashes with what I think scholarship should
also do and be.” Faculty members also expressed differing views on the role of collaboration in scholarship. Some scholars saw the increasing opportunities to work on collaborative projects as “diluting” rigorous, refereed scholarly outputs, while others regretted that collaboration is not more highly valued in the annual merit and tenure review processes, particularly when research funding opportunities often reward collaborative research initiatives.

When asked to describe how changes in scholarly publishing were affecting their annual merit and tenure review processes, respondents generally seemed aware of and interested in digital projects that related to their areas of study. However, there was not a shared view among faculty members across departments about the extent to which these projects count toward annual merit and tenure reviews, and there appeared to be a lack of understanding about to what extent the university valued these digital projects. Some faculty members have advised their junior counterparts to wait until after they are safely tenured before pursuing a digital scholarship project. As one faculty member explained:

I feel like it’s probably ethically not the right thing for me to encourage my untenured colleagues to apply for one of these grants because am I just encouraging them to devote their time and energy to something that will mean that they don’t get tenure.

Furthermore, digital projects often involve collaborative, interdisciplinary teams, sometimes working across universities, and it is unclear how those types of projects and partnerships will be evaluated. However, as one faculty member commented, “it seems like what is being offered is ... funding for collaborative projects or for digital projects or for the kind of projects that don’t map onto what the existing tenure and promotion standards are for humanities scholars.” Complicating this matter further is a sense that while many scholars have found the tenure and annual merit processes to be predictable and fair, others have felt that “the opacity of the process means that I don’t know how [work on a collaborative digital humanities project] was regarded by deans, provosts, rank and tenure committees, and so on.”

While the use of rubrics and standard point assignments was widely noted, some faculty commented that the point system seems out of step with innovative forms of scholarship, and others expressed the difficulty of quantifying their scholarship with citation counts and other forms of quantitative assessment. One faculty member characterized this situation as “the tyranny of quantitative assessment,” elaborating:

Quite frankly, my personal view on this is that the system doesn’t really reflect the quality of what you do. ... What we do is foster critical skills and help students or scholars build discourse, critical discourse. So how many points does that get you, you know?

It was also suggested that being involved in the merit award process can strain intra-departmental collaboration. “If I just took a bite out of your merit raise because I said I didn’t agree with your
Training Needs & Experiences

When it comes to research methods and navigating sources, researchers credit their doctoral programs, at times pinpointing a specific methods course. They look back on their time as graduate students as the moment when they learned how to research, how to use the library, and, for some, how to do archival research. One scholar pointed out that their training in regards to research was “minimal,” “indirect rather than direct,” and “trial and error.” Many respondents mentioned aspects of self-teaching and experiential learning. “There wasn’t that sense of nurturing the grad students,” one faculty member remembered. This theme continued when it came to navigating the library and archives, here and abroad. “I just threw myself in the archives,” one researcher said. “Learn by doing” was a repeated sentiment as faculty advanced their research while learning their own way forward.

In the intervening years (and sometimes decades), faculty have continued their education through specialized summer courses and conference workshops in areas such as digital humanities and paleography. Although faculty have looked outside the university for continued professional development, the vast majority expressed interest in receiving training or attending a workshop at Lauinger Library. This potential training might include an emphasis on searching strategies, skills, and “hacks.” One scholar requested a refresher on databases, while another requested sessions on new or obscure databases available to the Georgetown community. Again, these possible sessions were seen as an opportunity for faculty to review available resources and search strategies. As one researcher pointed out: “I don’t know what I don’t know.” Another stated: “In an era where so much is available it’s not always intuitive how to get at it.” These sentiments are especially poignant when considering the tension many scholars have described between the serendipitous research process that physical collections facilitate vs. the current emphasis on digital collections and research. Scholars feel like they haven’t received ongoing assistance with library resources as the information landscape has evolved. They reported that they were aware of library services, but they had not tapped into one-on-one consultations or a group session.

The need for continued learning at the Library also pointed to some specific needs, such as understanding what materials in Special Collections relate to their research focus. Respondents reported embarrassment at not knowing what Special Collections has that could help them. They are also interested in learning how to better use HoyaSearch. Lastly, some technology needs were identified: Excel, GIS, graphics, video making, and web design.

While language and literature scholars’ focus on technology needs and digital tools for themselves were widespread, their focus for graduate students’ training needs were more oriented on how to use sources. There was an emphasis on the importance of not overly relying on what is easily available online. Indeed, a preference for convenient, online materials was seen as a potential pitfall for
graduate students. One researcher said, “I think it’s enormously important and productive to have parts of the semester where [graduate students] have to go to the library and look in the stacks, sit down with the books that they’re going to pull out and look at a page here and there and then put back.”

A number of scholars emphasized learning objectives for graduate students, who through graduate training and library training, should be able to:

- search for primary and secondary sources,
- gauge source reliability,
- historicize older sources and not dismiss older sources, and
- navigate paywalls using library services.

Faculty expressed concern that as digital natives, graduate students may fall into bad research habits, with an over-reliance on Google Scholar and Wikipedia. Going physically into the stacks and getting experience at archival research were ways that graduate students could fight against “intellectual laziness.” Ultimately, faculty want their students to become well-rounded researchers rather than limit themselves to the comfort of known Internet tools. Where faculty, as noted above, are aware of their need to keep up with advances in research, they identified the need for their digital native students to become grounded in traditional methodologies. For both faculty and graduate students, balance is needed.

### Conclusion and Potential Actions

From these observations, we can see that the shifting boundaries of research in the language and literature fields present more nuanced challenges than the traditional limitations of inadequate funding and time. New challenges for researchers include:

- Building a strong scholarly community among super-specialized and interdisciplinary colleagues.
- Realigning the university’s well-established procedures for annual merit and tenure review processes with collaborative and innovative approaches.
- Accessing library resources online without losing the serendipitous experience of the physical stacks.

A university library cannot directly solve all of these challenges, but by developing an awareness of how our researchers approach their work, engage with other scholars, and use our resources, we can prepare ourselves to help manage these changes. The collections and services that the library provides will more effectively support faculty research if we are mindful of the pressures and expectations fueling the production of advanced academic scholarship.
The following potential actions focus on the Library’s future work with language and literature faculty members at Georgetown University.

**Potential Actions**

1) Research Services—in collaboration with the Digital Scholarship Committee, the Booth Family Center for Special Collections, the Gelardin New Media Center, and the Center for New Designs in Learning & Scholarship (CNDLS)—will create a multi-year plan for faculty research support. This plan may include new initiatives, programs, and activities, such as:

   a) Organizing and hosting an annual series of virtual or in-person workshops on the following (or similar) topics:
      i) Little known but extremely useful databases, or databases with updated interfaces
      ii) HoyaSearch
      iii) Technology tools such as Excel, GIS, graphics, video making, and/or web design, and their applications for research.

   b) Identifying collections within the Booth Family Center for Special Collections that may pertain to faculty research, and developing a targeted communication plan with researchers about these collections.

   c) Customizing outreach and training approaches to specific faculty members’ needs, including options for workshops, one-on-one consultations, and virtual meetings, with opportunities to meet with faculty in their space and at their point of need.

   d) Collaborating with faculty to design a research skills checklist for graduate students, including topics such as:
      i) Searching for primary and secondary sources
      ii) Evaluating sources for reliability and credibility
      iii) Effectively using both contemporary and historical sources
      iv) Navigating paywalls using library services

   e) Designing research method training (e.g., a bootcamp or topic-specific workshop) to address gaps in the graduate student research skills checklist (see above) that are not covered by all methods courses.

2) Research Services librarians will work with the Electronic Resources & Serials Unit and the Standing Committee on Collections to develop a model to assess journal subscriptions in order to improve holdings. Any assessment measures should take the following into account:

   a) Providing meaningful opportunities for faculty feedback on journals that support their academic work.

   b) Providing a mechanism for realigning journal subscriptions by cancelling nonessential titles and replacing them with new subscriptions as needed by academic departments.
3) Research Services librarians, in collaboration with the Program and Events Coordinator, the Faculty Library Advisory Committee (FLAC), and other library departments as appropriate, will develop meaningful, timely avenues for gathering faculty feedback about potential changes to the use of library space and the makeup of the collection. This could include initiatives such as:

a) Building communication plans into major library initiatives from the ground level with the aim of fostering two-way communication throughout the lifespan of a given initiative.

b) Hosting faculty forums to foster open-communication between the faculty and library regarding significant changes to library collections and operations.

c) Working with the FLAC to bolster communication between faculty and the library.