

2:50 - 3:30pm - Breakout Session 2A

Academic review (including effects of COVID-19; also touch on Academic Freedom?)

- Moderator 1: Nina
- Back up moderator: Rachel
- Zoom link:
<https://ucla.zoom.us/j/99338467638?pwd=RExUajFzS01OUUVwVUF1L0JWdEZGUT09> -- Meeting ID: 993 3846 7638, Password: 920400)

Discussion prompts:

- Ask for a notekeeper, use designated google doc for capturing high-level notes
- What questions do you have about this topic
 - and/or What are some of the biggest challenges/most pressing issues.
 - Meta-question: can LAUC track these challenges and suggestions for ways for review candidates to address them in review packets? Maybe a document specifically for candidates and RIs and a separate document for review committees?
 - How many librarians are up for peer review in 2020, 2021, 2022?
 - Has there been any discussion between RIs and candidates about the current situation and how it relates to upcoming academic review?
 - Have there been changes in SOR or goals in anticipation of the next review in light of stay-at-home orders?
 - Has anyone decided to defer because of this impact?
 - For those with potential career status, there should be a consideration to put a hold on the calendar for the purpose of stopping the clock?
- What end goals would you like to see us (LAUC/libraries) strive for?
- What practical approaches have worked in other organizations or situations that we might draw upon to get there?
- What practical approaches would you like to see LAUC take in the near term to get started toward these goals?

Notes:

- Challenges:
 - Canceled or postponed conferences
- How many librarians are up for peer review in 2020, 2021, 2022?
 - At least 12 on the call (out of 65 participants)
- Has there been any discussion between RIs and candidates about the current situation and how it relates to upcoming academic review?
 - One person who has not yet undergone review: she was supposed to speak at a few conferences/meetings, but they have been postponed to 2021 or canceled. RI is very supportive of her work, but she is not a librarian, so the librarian will have to take the time to explain everything. Librarian is “affiliated.” It is worrisome, especially for first review.

- It will have a greater impact on Assistant and Associate Librarians due to the shorter review period (2 years, versus 3 for full Librarians)
- Have there been changes in SOR or goals in anticipation of the next review in light of stay-at-home orders?
 - No responses.
- Has anyone decided to defer because of this impact?
 - No responses.
 - Deferral has negative consequences for librarians' careers (short and long term); better to have the tools and support for ongoing reviews that take circumstances into account

Breakout Group 1:

- Recommend: official guidance (maybe recommendation to stop the clock on peer review or deferment) about what can be accomplished during COVID work from home
- Project Nina is doing is important - memorialize these issues
- Convene a task force that monitors conditions & effects--documenting issues will be important for future reviews
- Transferring professional development funds to future years so ability to travel is retained
- Use this as an opportunity to review/revise the CALL to be more inclusive of work & how it's recorded

Breakout Group 2:

- Things this document needs to explicitly mention:

- Presenting at a virtual conference is equal in value to presenting at an in-person conference
- Instruction sessions given remotely require equal amount of labor as in-person sessions (IF NOT MORE)
- If librarian chooses not to return to workplace when campus reopens, that not be held against them (address issue of vulnerability, esp when employees do not wish to disclose specific things to HR)
- From larger group: Flipping the working remotely/being onsite concerns: How do people (who are one of the few able to come back to the office & have all the PPE stuff to deal with, in-person demands) when 2/3 of your department may fall in the vulnerable population?

- Suggestions:

- LAUC could supplement this document with bulleted lists of points
- Two versions of this document: one for reviewers, one for candidates and RIs

- Include explicit statements about anything that could be ambiguously evaluated; better to make a strong statement in writing than leave "obvious" things out (that puts our most vulnerable members at risk)
- Not possible to list everything, but worth including as many details as possible

Breakout Group 3:

- Question is tricky because there are no examples we can use as a guide.
- What is the current situation? RI and Librarian need to be on the same page. Keep RI informed and make sure they co-sign on what you can and should do.
- Make sure the process is consistent from beginning to end.

Breakout Group 4:

- Create statewide oversight body (super-CAPA) that monitors any problems (esp. To determine if fewer extra points are given out in 2021 than this year).
- Important that this info be share among campus CAPAs and LAUCs to see if there is a systemwide pattern
- Follow up after this year's peer review to determine if there were any problems this year
- LAUC could create system wide resources to help junior colleagues identify alternative professional development opportunities (could be a shared doc. That all campuses contributed to). Share as a resource with RI's concerned about their newer librarians