

LAUC Executive Board Meeting
Thursday, October 1st, 2020 1-2:30pm

Attendees: Marty Brennan, UCLA (President); Rachel Green, UCLA (President Elect); Heather Smedberg, UCSD (Past President); Kristen LaBonte, UCSB (Secretary); Ramona Collins, UCB (Chair); David Michalski, UCD (Chair); Melinda Livas, UCD (Chair-elect); Annette Buckley, UCI (on behalf of Madelynn Dickerson, Chair); Shu Liu, UCI (Chair Elect); Peter Fletcher, UCLA (Chair); Dalena Hunter, UCLA (Chair-elect); Sara Davidson Squibb, UCM (Chair); Carla Arbagey, UCR (Co-Chair); Janet Reyes, UCR (Chair-elect); Laurel McPhee, UCSD (Chair); Min-Lin Fang, UCSF (Chair); Catherine Busselen, UCSB (Chair); Jess Waggoner, UCSC (Chair); gary colmenar, UCSB (DEI: outgoing); Allegra Swift (SLASIAC); Cynthia Johnson (DOC); Marlayna Christensen, UCSD (Web Manager); Dean Rowan, UCB (Parliamentarian)

Absent: Brian Quigley, UCB (SCLG); Hilary Schiraldi (SLFB); Note: CPG, DEI representatives not yet appointed.

Agenda

1PM, call to order via Zoom

1. Roll Call (K. LaBonte)
2. Approval of [previous meeting minutes](#) from 9/10/20. (K.LaBonte)
 - a. Approved
3. Announcements (M. Brennan)
 - a. Committee reps confirmed:
 - i. SLASIAC – A. Swift
 1. The first meeting will be held in November.
 - ii. DOC – C. Johnson
4. Standing Committees
 - a. R&PD (R. Green)
 - i. The R&PD Committee will continue to offer three types of grant opportunities in the 2020/2021 academic year: research grants; mini-grants (“designed to encourage librarians to develop research ideas or to see a project to completion”); and presentation grants. The first call will be for all three types of grants, highlighting the important and broad role mini-grants play in the early stages of research development, including training opportunities. The second call will be for mini-grants and presentation grants (we will consider including research grants if adequate funding is available). Throughout the year, the R&PD Committee will vigorously advertise the available grant opportunities through emails and/or events. M. Brennan will come up with charges for R&PD, DEI, and CPG.
 - b. DEI (g. colmenar):
 - i. He submitted his final report from last year which offers some suggestions for the next committee. It highlighted drafting the statement in support of the

Black Caucus of the ALA regarding police violence, which is now on the LAUC website. It's great to continue the effort of the "Meet your Members" section of the website and thanks the executive board for recruiting new members for this.

- c. CPG
 - i. Outgoing chair is Nina Schneider. M. Brennan and H. Smedberg will work on getting chairs from the standing committees. Hopefully by next month.
- 5. LAUC Reports / Updates
 - a. Webmaster (M. Brennan)
 - i. We have a lead on a new webmaster, but M. Brennan does not have confirmation yet.
 - ii. We are suggesting this person recruits a partner and set up a rotation so that there is a more streamlined continuation of the role.
 - b. Social Media Team
 - i. No report, nobody on the call.
 - c. DOC (C. Johnson)
 - i. DOC meets every other week.
 - ii. In the last meeting, 20-30 minutes were spent on how each campus has responded to COVID-19. Issues that are arising were also discussed.
 - iii. There were discussions around the SILS governance once it's implemented.
 - iv. Survey is being planned that will go to the SILS working group members around this topic.
 - d. SLASIAC (A. Swift)
 - i. No report, the first meeting has yet to happen.
 - e. SCLG (B. Quigley) – read by K. LaBonte
 - i. Official minutes from SCLG meetings are available at <https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sclg/meetings>.
 - ii. Minutes for May to August have been posted. Discussions have focused on issues like textbook access during the pandemic, popular reading collections, the STAR team report on OSF preprints, and the Working Group for Systemwide Print Collection Management Strategy.
 - iii. We also received regular updates on the Project Transform Working Group and licensing efforts.
 - iv. Please contact B. Quigley if you have any questions or issues to raise with SCLG.
 - f. UCOLASC (M. Brennan)
 - i. No report, the first meeting is in Nov.
 - g. SLFB (H. Schiraldi) – absent (report received after the meeting)
 - i. Construction of NRLF 4 is nearly complete! Susan Swartz shared photos of the interior and exterior of the building. Staff can begin using it as soon as the last steps (including security and secondary inspection of shelving) are completed.
 - ii. The new RLF Inventory Management System went live on September 15, on schedule. The IMS will work with the new shelving in NRLF 4 and integrate with the Systemwide ILS.

- iii. The RLF's are still operating at extremely low staffing due to COVID-19. Non-returnable lending (electronic copies) was scheduled to begin in October. Returnable lending (books) will hopefully begin by the end of fall 2020.
 - iv. 2020/2021 allocations to the RLF's will be finalized at the December SLFB meeting, but are expected to be reduced by at least 50% due to COVID-19.
- h. CoUL (M. Brennan & R. Green)
- i. 45 minutes of agenda time is given to the LAUC chair and chair-elect and the following four points were brought up by M. Brennan and R. Green
 - ii. Anti-racism. Anti-racism efforts and to keep LAUC engaged this year and coordinate with COUL. There are campus-level efforts happening on most campuses. Berkeley and UCLA's efforts were mentioned. There was wide discussion of library level efforts. What can we focus on internally? What kind of efforts can we focus on in our own community? There were no major developments out of the discussion. We will keep the line of communication open if LAUC or CoUL comes up with a plan to communicate out.
 - iii. Peer Review during COVID-19. The statement on peer review related to COVID-19 was shared and asked if CoUL would endorse the statement coming out of CPG last year. There was reluctance from some ULs (including Chris Shaffer – UCSF and Jeff MacKie-Mason - UCB) because they had put out similar statements themselves. There was a claim that two similar, but different statements could create confusion. M. Brennan thinks it would only create confusion if they were opposite statements and it would do more good endorsing something at the statewide level. A request was presented that those ULs that have not created their own statements sign on with ours or create a similar statement rather than leaving it unaddressed. Peer review for this year has begun. We need to make sure that the peer review groups (CAPA, CAP) on each campus are also on board with this. (Is there another link that's not UC Berkeley specific?) https://live-staff-web.pantheon.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/staff/CAPA_2020_statement_COVID-19.pdf
ACTION ITEM: Local chairs to treat the peer review issue of COVID-19 as a campus level issue and make sure the CPG statement gets attention, especially with your local peer review groups (CAP/CAPA).
 - iv. Academic Freedom (AF) Initiative. M. Brennan will propose to this group later in the meeting. It was presented to CoUL with the understanding that LAUC has not endorsed this quite yet and will take shape as this group sees fit. This underpins a lot of other issues right now, like anti-racism, and COVID-19 effecting peer review. It allows us to speak freely and speak the truth to power. We need to be able to employ our power through this as academics. CoUL seemed to be generally supportive of this, or at least not opposed. Nobody spoke out in opposition or in favor. They did not seem to be upset for us to carry out this mission. One friendly correction was suggested regarding the distinction

of AF disputes and things that go beyond the typical definition of AF, which is teaching, research, and speaking out in campus governance. Things that are specific to the professional concerns of librarians. Let's say there was a challenge to your collection development decisions. That falls outside of the standard definition of AF, so it would not go through the APM-140 where there is a grievance process for academic employees. It will not go through the AF adjudication in the Academic Senate but go through a different process with another committee that handles these things at the campus level. Those specific things go through a different process and will rely upon other national standards that have been put together on these topics. As you'll see in the text of the initiative, we will need to do our best to define those national standards for the benefit of the university. There was that criticism, in particular from Elizabeth Cowell who was on the committee that wrote it and they shaped how that was phrased when they issued the policy this past February.

- v. Professional Development (PD). M. Brennan tried to get a temperature read from the ULs on what their approach is for PD going into this year. Even still with the restricted ability to employ LAUC funds by the fact that so many things were cancelled this last year, we still spent more than we have available to us in our contract. Past LAUC President, H. Smedberg augmented the grant funds with the presidential funds last year. Consensus from some of the campuses is that contractual minimums may be all that is available to librarians this year. HR or the business office should have let members know what is available to them this year. If you have not heard this, please ask them on behalf of your local librarians. R. Green noted that as an affiliated librarian, last year they received funds through their libraries. Contractually, all represented librarians should have these funds. P. Fletcher noted that online conferences are now more open to all library workers instead of just librarians and they are less expensive to attend (in general).

ACTION ITEM: Local chairs to find out what level of PD funds are available to librarians on your local campus and convey that to them if your HR has not yet done so.

6. New business/Continuing Business:

- a. [LAUC Academic Freedom Education Initiative](#)
- b. M. Brennan apologized for the timeline that happened. He would normally share with this group first.
- c. CoUL asks us for pre-reads in advance to their meetings. He shared the CPG COVID-19 statement, the BCALA endorsement that came out of DEI, the most recent diversity survey, H. Smedberg's president's reports and they wanted something related to Academic Freedom (AF) because all he had was a bullet point. He quickly put together this initiative with what he had in mind in terms of the components we could integrate into the assembly (we could have lots of content and sessions and guest speakers to handle these different aspects), or additional aspects as we identify. We could do some

of it at the assembly and some of it through other venues and techniques as appropriate. He wants to make sure that this is a worthwhile endeavor for him and the board to pursue. It is laid out into seven different aspects (project goals) and there is a suggestion at the end as far as project components. One aspect is the definition of AF and how it's defined. Maybe we don't want a broad AF definition or exploring all the ways that the definition has changed or been treated differently in different places and how it separates from intellectual freedom and freedom of speech and instead just go to Point 3 and go to APM11 as this is AF and how it applies to us. Point 1 and 3 may merge in a more cohesive way. Point 2. Spoke with Danya Leebaw and Alexis Logsdon (University of Minnesota Libraries) during our fight for AF last year about how academic librarians experience AF as they were conducting research on it. Generally, you'll find that faculty status librarians have a better experience than those who do not have it when dealing with AF issues. It's respected and handled better and they feel more confident about their ability to express AF if they have faculty status. All of the problems are still there for both groups, but they are more pronounced for those that do not have faculty status, like us. That, to M. Brennan, makes it more pronounced; the need for education and understanding as to what our AF rights are and what we can do with them. M. Brennan reached out to the two authors (Danya Leebaw and Alexis Logsdon) and would like to explore to invite them to speak to the assembly or as part of a different event. It would be speaking to their research and how it has an impact on what we are doing. This may be better handled after we speak about APM-11. Point 2, talking about a wide range of different experiences with AF, and in their research, talk about intersectionality and people's relative safety and comfort in their roles is tied to their presence in an under-represented group. That intersectionality can make their AF more fragile to them when we're talking about perceptions of librarians in these situations. Point 4, M. Brennan wants to do the work that's laid out in APM-11 in reference to applicable national professional standards and responsibilities that (and this is where they wanted a correction) this is actually handled under the process in APM-140, for the grievance process for non-senate academic employees. And that's a little different and you wouldn't actually have to appeal to the AF committee of the Academic Senate/Academic Federation but you would instead appeal to the grievance officer on your campus for non-senate academic employees and they have their own process for handling these things. If that is to occur, if something specific in relation to national librarians' academic responsibilities outside of education, research and speaking out in professional governance, we should be ready with a statement from LAUC statewide that says, "here are the national professional standards as we recognize them". It's important to put that out there and assert that there is nobody better equipped in the UC to identify these standards on behalf of the 10 campuses than this group. These standards will be at the discretion of the provost to determine what are the applicable standards. They decide what the applicable standards are, but hopefully they will accept our standards. This is good work for us to do over the course of the next year. We could do this as a group or task a small working group to create the standards based on other

national standards. Other kinds of sessions that M. Brennan is anticipating are using tools, or presenting a set of tools for respecting AF in our day to day work. M. Brennan would also like to get to the scenarios in #6 to present scenarios of AF challenges on a bread and butter nuts and bolts level, like when you're talking to your RI about your research goals and your intentions. How do we make sure your RI is respectful of the fact that it's your right to decide what your research goals and interests are? There are examples of RIs pushing into librarian's research interests and being told that "you shouldn't be doing that, but you should be doing this". It wasn't about the librarian's day to day work, but it was about their professional development. There has to be a better understanding about the appropriateness of broaching those topics in those discussions and recognizing when you hit a grey area. We all have these kinds of situations where it is appropriate to speak to your RI about your research interests and make sure they are in some alignment with your day to day work. You have the authority to determine your own research interests, that's what AF is all about. The ultimate decision is not the RI's, it is yours. It's an important educational effort not just for our members, but also for the supervisors to understand that we have these rights and they need to be respected in certain ways. If we do all this education and it still fails and AF is violated, we need clear pathfinders for adjudication for AF disputes. On each campus there are two things they need to know about; how to submit an AF dispute to your AF committee in your senate and how to submit something that doesn't fit well into the different definitions but is still an AF dispute for our discipline through the APM-140 process which is different. Each campus will have a different contact person and a different process to know all about and how to carry it out. M. Brennan would like to see at least each of the division heads taking this on as making sure to seek those instructions and/or pathfinders out and gather them at the LAUC statewide level. This is a lot of work to pull off in the next year, but M. Brennan thinks we can. There are project components laid out in the document like educational webinars. Some work will be good for asynchronous collaborative work (like gathering statements and creating nationwide professional standards) and we will also need to have a lot of discussion on it including engaging with others about what this means for and how it applies to our daily work.

- d. Task Force. It makes sense for this group to create a task force which M. Brennan will be happy to lead. There is at least one person at UCLA that's interested in joining and M. Brennan would be looking for people from across the 10 campuses to assist, but he first wants to make sure everyone is ok with the initiative and the overall goals of it. A round robin with everyone on the call followed and consensus was reached. M. Brennan will send an email soon to the board and ask local chairs to send out the information about the initiative. Interested people can contact M. Brennan. He will have next steps by our next meeting.

7. Round Robin: Past month highlights and issues from the campuses

- a. UCB Chair: R. Collins: Berkeley has a new digital project archivist on a National Park Service funded Japanese American Confinement Sites Grant in the Bancroft Library. The University Librarian, Jeff MacKie-Mason, has distributed a statement regarding guidelines for academics for review during the pandemic.
- b. UCD Chair: D. Michalski: DEI committee rep nominated, who is Xiaoli Li, CPG is Adam Siegel, they have both worked in this capacity before and will be productive members.
- c. UCI Interim Chair: A. Buckley: CPG rep is Audra Eagle Yun.
- d. UCLA Chair: P. Fletcher: Had the first board meeting and are having another this month. Some committees have begun work including bylaw updates. On the agenda for new business is telecommuting as a professional issue. It's very interesting because it's become a big issue. It went from being extremely restrictive and of course now it's moved because we all telecommute. The University Librarian, Ginny Steel, liberalized it considerably before the pandemic, and it seems like a new fact of life and now P. Fletcher is thinking LAUC-LA can think about it and weigh in on it. He's not sure how but their local executive board will discuss it.
- e. UCM Chair: S. Davidson Squibb: Joe Ameen, who served on statewide last year will be our RPG representative. In the September meeting, the Merced executive board decided to potentially try to connect more with some of the academic groups on campus. Working remotely has been hard to stay connected with people on campus. They are thinking of how LAUC can be a venue to invite people in to hear about what they are doing.
- f. UCR Co-chair: Carla Arbagey: Co-chair structure with Judy Lee. Decided to split the work between statewide and local. Carla will be the statewide representative. They had the kickoff meeting last week and are moving forward with quarterly membership meetings.
- g. UCSD Chair: L. McPhee: The first executive board and membership meetings will be taking place over the next two weeks.
- h. UCSF Chair: M-L. Fang. Had the transition meeting two weeks ago. The campus did not open as expected at the start of the school year due to COVID-19. UCSF education unit currently only has two full time and two part time librarians, and LAUC put together a new job description and presenting them to the UL. Hopefully they will have one additional position filled as a result of their work.
- i. UCSB Chair: Catherine Busselen: No report.
- j. UCSC Chair: J. Waggoner: The first executive board meeting is happening next week.

Adjournment 2:28