COMMITTEE NAME: Committee on Professional Governance Report

DATE: May 6, 2021

TO: Marty Brennan

FR: Committee on Professional Governance **RE**: 2020-2021 Mid-Year Activity Report

Committee Charge:

General Charge

For 2020-2021, the Committee is charged with fulfilling its standing charge, Article VIII. Section 1.e.1:

- a. Advise the President and the Executive Board on issues that affect librarians, peer review, and other professional governance issues.
- b. Serve as a review body for Divisions who may request evaluation of local peer review procedures.
- c. Serve as a Bylaws review committee for proposed changes to the LAUC Bylaws and Standing Rules. Be available to review the Divisions' Bylaws for consistency with the LAUC Bylaws and Standing Rules, and to consult with Divisions on request.
- d. Address other subjects at the request of the President and consider and develop recommendations on matters of librarian professional governance.

Specific Charges for 2020-2021

- 1.Investigate the controversy regarding the inclusion of UC-AFT in the CALL between UCLA Library administration and LAUC-LA. Using whatever means CPG deems appropriate (such as surveys, interviews, and documents reviews), explore historic and current policy and practice regarding the inclusion, listing or evaluation of union involvement via UC-AFT among the peer review processes at 10 UC libraries. Using evidence-based methods, analyze the issue and to the extent possible determine whether the following points are true:
- a. Participation in UC-AFT can be defined in total or in part as librarian work
- b. Such work is appropriate for inclusion in peer review packets for evaluation and consideration, and if so,
- c. It is appropriate to list UC-AFT as an example of service to the university within instructions for the peer review process.

CPG may address other aspects of the controversy, as necessary. A report to the Executive Board is encouraged by the end of this LAUC term, in September 2021. The exact format of the report will depend on your findings, but perhaps a logical result is a statement of best practices (i.e., what is appropriate to include in a peer review packet and what elements/activities would not be appropriate to include, and how that should be reflected in peer review instructions ideally)

2. Due to intense interest in this matter expressed to the LAUC Executive Board, CPG is further charged to conduct a session as part of the Spring Assembly addressing this issue. CPG can report findings if your work is complete or using the session to spur member discussion or feedback to help inform your investigation.

Summary of Action Items:

- 1. Reviewed and approved a By-laws request submitted by UC-Merced.
- 2. Extensive review and discussion re: Specific Charge #1. This charge is currently under deliberation and revisions of a recommendation to Chair, Marty Brennan over the summer.
- 3. The CPG Committee declined to conduct a session at the Spring Assembly citing a preference to continue our discussions of the charge.

Discussion and Recommendations:

- 1. Approved the Merced By-Laws request.
- 2. No additional discussion or recommendations are forthcoming at this time.

Names of Committee Members

Berkeley: I-Wei Wang (1st Year, 2020-22), iwang@law.berkeley.edu

Davis: Adam Siegel (1st Year, 2020-22), apsiegel@ucdavis.edu

Irvine: Audra Eagle Yun (1st Year, 2020-22), audra.yun@uci.edu

Los Angeles: Sanghun Cho (1st Year, 2020-22) sanghuncho@library.ucla.edu

Merced: Jim Dooley (3rd Year, 2018-21) jdooley@ucmerced.edu

Riverside: Cherry Williams (2nd year, 2019-2021) cherry.williams@ucr.edu

San Diego: Marlayna Christensen (2nd year, 2019-21) mkchristensen@ucsd.edu

San Francisco: Peggy Tahir (1st Year, 2020-22), Peggy.Tahir@ucsf.edu

Santa Barbara: Andrea Duda (2nd year, 2019-21), andrea.duda@ucsb.edu

Santa Cruz: Sarah Lindsay (2nd year, 2019-21) silindse@ucsc.edu