Title

"We Don't Have Time for That!" Evidence-Based Practice During a Time of Crisis

ISBN

978-0-8389-3985-7

Authors

Lopez, Balladolid (Dolly)
Foster, Britt

Publication Date

2023-12-01

Peer reviewed

CHAPTER 10

"We Don't Have Time for That!"

Evidence-Based Practice During a Time of Crisis

Balladolid (Dolly) Lopez and Britt Foster

All organizations face challenges. At the time of writing, academic libraries are mired in crises on multiple fronts. From climate change-based environmental threats to the COVID-19 pandemic to difficult but necessary reckonings with past and current practices upholding White supremacy, the ability to navigate the library, its employees, and its infrastructure through difficult situations has become a necessary skill for library employees in any role in the institution. In these times, a model can give structure and direction to this work. In this chapter, the authors explore how Koufogiannakis and Brettle's "Revised Model for EBLIP" (2016) can be applied in libraries in crisis. Crises are defined as such when parameters are unclear, low-resourced, time-sensitive, and high-stakes within the context of our profession (Soehner, 2017).

The following two case studies illustrate recent challenges in one library in which evidence-based practice was used to inform the approach to these situations: the first outlines a major collection review project in the face of significant cuts to the collection budget while the second describes building a complete library assessment program in the space of one year in order to meet accreditation requirements.

Each is presented in the order in which the crisis occurred and in alignment with the stages of the EBLIP model (Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016). Following the case studies, the authors discuss how each component of the EBLIP model was applied during these crises.

Setting

California State University, Fresno (Fresno State) is a large public university in California's Central Valley, with a student population of over 25,000 and designations as both an Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) and an Asian-American, Native American, and Pacific Islander-Serving Institution (AANAPISI). Fresno State was previously classified as a doctoral university with moderate research activity, but in 2022, the classification was updated to a doctoral university with high research activity. There is one university library, located in the center of campus. In pre-COVID times, it was not uncommon for the library to have up to 10,000 visitors daily. Librarians have faculty status, hold positions in the Academic Senate, and participate in the same promotion and tenure process as departmental faculty.

As with many libraries, there has been a significant reduction in library staff. In 2005, there were 25 FTE librarians and 43 staff members in the library. But in 2022, these numbers have dwindled to 16.5 FTE librarians and 24 staff members. In 2005, there were 43 library staff compared to 24 library staff in spring 2022. Reduced staffing, increased workloads, and low budgets have resulted in several challenges. The origin of many of these challenges is external and was made more acute due to the realities of the library's current financial and staff situation.

Case Studies

Case Study #1: Collections

Budget cuts, rising subscription costs, and staff shortages are all too familiar for many libraries. Technical services staff were just addressing the ramifications of a years-long staff shortage within its department when the collections budget was reduced by 18% in the academic year 2018–2019. In this moment of crisis, the consequences of staff shortages and lack of documentation, combined with low morale and shifting priorities, led to a years-long effort to gather information efficiently and sustainably for evidence-based decision-making.

Before the collection budget crisis, the technical services department faced low staffing due to retirements that weren't replaced. This led to spotty documentation, delayed processes, and overwhelmed staff. The department included one librarian and four staff members (a collection strategist librarian, a collections specialist, two acquisition specialists, and one e-resources specialist). This staff shortage combined with a library services platform migration resulted in a serious loss of historical information. The what, how, and why resources acquired were either scattered in different repositories of information, such as the consortial SharePoint site or staff memories, or completely lost. Due to this, when renewals were evaluated using usage data, institutional knowledge, and in consultation with subject matter experts, much of the work was done in an ad hoc manner.

ARTICULATE

In the academic year 2018–2019, the collections budget was reduced by 18%. However, this reduction was not widely known by library staff until late spring 2019. While collection expenditures for 2018–2019 were covered for that year, the collection budget reduction was carried into the 2019–2020 academic year. This reduction was a first at an institution that historically supported a robust collections budget. Therefore, this represented a problem at multiple levels. At the administrative level, the problem was the necessary cancellation of library resources. At the library faculty level, the problem was the reduced institutional support for collections and its impact on faculty, staff, and students. At the technical services department level, the problem was to provide enough information for effective decision-making for mass cancellations without overwhelming colleagues with information—in effect, framing the problem at an even more granular level by presenting what in the collections was to be considered for cancellation.

ASSEMBLE

In anticipation of cancellations, the Technical Services Department worked together to digitize and consolidate documentation of electronic resources subscriptions, which were the largest expenditures in the collection budget. In this initial review, due to limited time and resources, only electronic resources subscriptions such as packages, databases, and journals were reviewed due to their outsized impact on the collections budget. This information was then added to the library services platform, Alma. Simultaneously, a "collections decision log" using Google Sheets was created and maintained by the Technical Services Department to track progress, ensure timely renewals, and verify the integrity of the information contained within the library services platform. The collections decision log was at first a simple list that only included a specific subset of subscribed content. However, it soon grew to be the first systematic iteration documenting all electronic databases and packages that included costs, usage, acquisition method, and any contextual information.

Even this relatively "simple" exercise of gathering usage data relied on informed professional knowledge of what exactly to gather and present. For example, collection cancellations relied heavily on usage data. However, it was during this time that vendors and publishers were beginning to comply with the fifth iteration of the COUNTER Codes of Practice (Project Counter, n.d.). Since not all publishers and vendors complied with COUNTER 5 at the time, the electronic resources librarian assessed the options and decided to stick to COUNTER 4 for the initial round of cancellations. The differences between COUNTER 4 and COUNTER 5 were significant enough that a mix of these standards usage would have led to more confusion. In addition, there were still questions from colleagues about some of the changes introduced in COUNTER 5 that were still unclear. Therefore, the electronic resources librarian decided to use COUNTER 4 when gathering data. Staff shortages, limited time, and urgency around cancellations meant that the intricacies of the usage data were only discussed when someone noted a number seemed off. In those cases, either the reports were explained, re-evaluated, or fixed if necessary.

As the comprehensive nature of the list grew in response to the 18% collection budget reduction, so did its implications. A public version of this same list was then shared with the liaison librarians via email to facilitate transparency of what was canceled and to provide the information needed for evidence-based decision-making. All in all, 10 out of 274 databases/packages, and 91 out of roughly 400 journals were canceled in the 2019–2020 academic year, which accounted for about 13% of the collections budget. Although much progress was made to meet the 18% collection budget reduction, library staff were only able to reduce expenditures by 13%.

ASSESS

In the academic year 2020–2021, library staff again faced a projected collections budget cut of an additional 23%. An ad hoc group of librarians, including the collections strategist, acquisition librarian, electronic resources librarian, interlibrary loan librarian, and liaison librarians, came together to comprehensively review electronic resources and print standing orders in a series of eight internal library-wide meetings. The addition of print resources for review was added by a new acquisitions librarian. This represented both an acknowledgment that a review of electronic resources only was not enough and a signal of increased bandwidth to gather additional points of evidence. The ad hoc group led library-wide discussions in a series of virtual meetings. All library employees were invited to participate. An updated copy of the collection review log was used as it contained a rich detail of information gathered in the first round of cancellations. However, the ad hoc group agreed that additional subjective criteria should be considered as low-use items were canceled the previous year. The new criteria included relevancy to the department, impact on student success or well-being, and perceived value for cost. Due to time and administrative constraints, the expertise of the liaison librarians was used to evaluate these qualitative criteria. The first meeting was spent agreeing on the criteria, developing a shared understanding of the vocabulary used, and discussing what resources would be included and how. This was an invaluable exercise as feedback from the first iterations of the collections decision log highlighted confusion over the technical wording of the information provided, the overwhelming nature of the list, and the addition of non-relevant information for the different audiences that were all using versions of the same list.

Although morale was low due to the continual reduction of the library collection budget, the discussion over the series of meetings highlighted several issues. One was the nuance missed when aggregating use into a few numbers, only providing the package name and many other contextualizations that aren't always visible in use and access data. Throughout the series of meetings, liaison librarians and the subject experts weighed in on the essential nature of several resources to specific programs, questions about the usage data, and highlighted essential journal titles often hidden in generic package titles. Liaison librarians also took into consideration emerging needs, such as supporting a new ethnic studies course requirement implemented across the California State University system. Due to this process, the ad hoc group was able to identify 21 out of 66 print journals/ standing orders, 49 out of roughly 300 journals, and 25 out of roughly 258 databases/

packages to cancel. Nevertheless, the group was unable to meet the targeted 23% reduction for that year.

In response, the ad hoc group explored additional criteria including the least impact on the least number of students. However, that would have unfairly penalized smaller programs that had unique resource needs.

AGREE

Due to this process, the ad hoc group found that the library's collections had high usage, met the essential needs for specific programs, and were well-targeted to the needs of the campus community across several disciplines. This was determined by either liaison librarian's professional knowledge regarding what was essential in their particular subject areas and/or feedback from specific faculty when asked about specific resources slated for cancellations. Taking into consideration all the evidence, the ad hoc group suggested several recommendations, including advocating for additional collections funding, a campus-wide communication campaign to alert the community of pending and future cancellations, a reinstatement policy, further collections planning, and investment in research infrastructure. In spring 2021, library faculty, as members of the academic senate, shared the evidence gathered during the review process and introduced a resolution in support of a stable collections budget. It passed in fall 2021.

ADAPT

As discussed, cancellations were a multi-year project. After each review, new information or a process was improved. For example, the electronic resources librarian created one collection decision log to keep track of all the packages and databases. However, the collections decision log was used by different audiences ranging from acquisition specialists to subject matter experts. This meant that the different informational needs were on one sheet, including purchase order numbers, costs, usage, etc. It was an overwhelming list with no clear mechanism to provide feedback. This led to disengagement as people were already overwhelmed with their daily duties. Ultimately, different sheets needed to be created with only the most relevant information for each specific audience in order to facilitate effective decision-making.

Case Study #2: Assessment

Fresno State is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges – Senior Colleges and Universities Section (WSCUC). Librarians have participated in the accreditation process at Fresno State for many years, particularly supporting departments with information about library collections and resources for their accreditation and program review process and by providing tours and data for the 10-year accreditation review as well as serving on several campus committees involved with accreditation. In addition, over the last ten years, librarians have engaged in assessment within the library, including assessment of library collections, library services, and information literacy (IL) learning. This has been motivated both by the addition of "Information Literacy" by WSCUC in

2013 as a core competency to be assessed explicitly as part of university accreditation activities and by a desire on the university's part to provide evidence related to learning and student success across all student-supporting aspects of the institution (Association of College & Research Libraries [ACRL], n.d.).

In academic year 2019–2020, the library needed to submit a Student Outcomes Assessment Plan (SOAP) and in 2020–2021 to participate in a full assessment cycle, similar to that undergone by academic departments. For 2019–2020, this required the completion of the SOAP, a five-year plan that includes outcomes, assessment methods, benchmarks for achievement, an outcome assessment grid demonstrating where these methods would be assessed and at what level (basic, intermediate, or advanced), and a five-year assessment calendar. The library also submits an annual assessment report to the campus director of assessment. For 2020–2021, the assessment activities identified would need to be completed, analyzed, and reported on, including actions to "close the loop."

The culture and status of the library in regard to assessment were scattered, informal, and infrequent. In addition, the library typified many of the characteristics of an assessment-resistant culture, including concerns about surveillance, negative repercussions resulting from findings, workloads that don't support assessment activities, and a sense that assessment in the university is generally a bureaucratic exercise rather than a meaningful way to enact positive, evidence-based change for student success (Wilton & Méthot, 2020). There have been multiple assessment activities and efforts in the past, but these efforts often ended after a single assessment cycle. Reasons for this include the departure of the individual coordinating assessment activities, lack of funding or general support for these efforts, and the library's inability to respond to changing university requirements due to a lack of resources.

The university's assessment work is led by a director of assessment, along with a team of representatives from the eight university colleges and the library. Formal university assessment requirements are the responsibility of the library assessment coordinator, a two-year appointed position that coordinates library participation in the assessment process. There is no release time provided for the library assessment coordinator, and, like many libraries, the assessment coordinator has multiple job assignments beyond appointment to this service role. There is no other position dedicated to assessment in the library.

ARTICULATE

Facing these challenging conditions—an assessment-resistant culture, no resources dedicated to assessment, and a very short timeline to create a comprehensive SOAP—the library assessment coordinator recognized the need to frame assessment activity in a new way. Rather than building an entire assessment program from scratch, the assessment coordinator and the newly formed Library Assessment Committee decided to begin this process with a survey of existing data and data-gathering practices throughout the library as well as collecting questions, concerns, and priorities from library units to establish objectives and outcomes. This approach to evidence-gathering was meant to support multiple goals: (1) focusing on high priorities and existing questions of library units to engage library staff in the assessment process by making it valuable to their daily work, (2) avoiding duplicative and/or redundant work where data gathering was already occurring, and (3) creating a facilitative process rather than a separate or directed process to draw on the expertise of the units where the assessments would occur.

The Assessment Committee faced a tight deadline with scarce resources, which was the most pressing concern initially. In the first meeting of the committee, however, it became apparent that knowledge of campus assessment activities, engagement with the assessment process, and sustainability of data gathering and "closing the loop" activities also presented areas to investigate in order to build a successful assessment program.

ASSEMBLE

To accomplish this, the Assessment Committee began by surveying the professional literature and drawing on American Library Association (ALA) and Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) standards and core competencies (ACRL, 2018) as well as researching other libraries that had completed data audits or similar, such as the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (Hoffman, 2019), and Brigham Young University (Zaugg et al., 2017). Using these documents, the committee created a list of variables, such as data owner (library employee or library unit), data platform (software, website, Google Drive), frequency of collection, frequency of reporting, etc. These variables were then used as the foundation for a data audit survey distributed to all library employees. Units and individuals likely to be involved in data collection, maintenance, and storage were then identified for follow-up contact after the initial survey.

In assembling the evidence through a data audit, the Assessment Committee drew from the experience of other libraries that underwent a similar process to shape the procedures for this aspect of the assessment plan. While the data gathered was ultimately local evidence, the method of gathering data was pulled from professional evidence, saving energy and perhaps eliminating time-consuming pitfalls (Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016).

ASSESS

After launching the initial survey, the resulting data was cleaned and analyzed for duplications and inconsistencies or marked as "more information needed." Committee members then met with the individuals managing the data identified to review and finalize. Once the data had been collected and cleaned, the data spreadsheet was shared with a staff member who has expertise in Tableau. This staff member built a visualization, so the Assessment Committee, development and advancement coordinator, and library administration can tell at a glance who holds what data, where, and how to access it. The data visualization and spreadsheet were also shared at a staff meeting in order to make potential additional users aware of the resource. Finally, a maintenance plan was created to ensure the information collected through the data audit remains clean and current. The maintenance plan includes an annual evaluation and update. By including a data audit as part of the work of designing an assessment plan, the assessment committee was able to achieve buy-in and save labor in assessment practices. As subsequent assessment activities were completed by using the evidence from the data audit, reports and findings were shared with the entire library as well as a special meeting with library administration to connect the audit to "closing the loop" activities and library-decision making. As an example, data from Technology Lending was used to inform purchase needs for additional equipment needs, particularly relevant during the virtual learning period of the pandemic.

AGREE

The result is an easy-to-use index of data and data-gathering practices the assessment committee used to inform the next stage of their work. When writing the SOAP, the Assessment Committee aligned desired goals and objectives to collected data, designing an appropriate measurement method that could use these identified sources of data. See Table 10.1 for an example.

TABLE 10.1
EXAMPLE DEMONSTRATING ALIGNMENT OF EXISTING DATA SOURCE TO DESIRED LIBRARY OUTCOME.

Goal	Objective/ Outcome	Data Source	Metrics	Method
The library will plan and promote inclusive programming to engage the campus and broader community.	The library will provide access to events and programming that highlight different voices and cultures within our community.	Event and programming booking information	Number, frequency, topic, audience, attendees, and sponsors	Quantitative and qualitative review of event metrics

In some instances, selecting the method meant identifying an existing tool to apply to the data gathered (e.g., using an ALA-designed rubric to evaluate existing privacy policies).

ADAPT

Initially, when designing the assessment plan timeline, the Assessment Committee reviewed the data gathered through the audit and identified library events, exhibits, and lectures as an area with robust existing data infrastructure. This meant less work and time to set up assessment methods and metrics. Several groups in the library also had high interest in the data related to these events due to pressures related to space and facilities, staff time, and donor relations work. For these reasons, library outcomes related to this aspect of the library were selected by the committee for the first year of assessment activities and identified as such in the five-year assessment plan to be submitted to the university director of assessment.

The arrival of the pandemic and its related uncertainties in the United States in spring 2020, however, meant the committee had to set these plans aside, revisit the data, and build consensus and engagement around another set of outcomes. The committee discussed several issues when building consensus, including what could be achievable, the cognitive impact on already overstretched staff, and the timeframe. With this in mind, the committee settled on a Library Diversity Committee Survey and a Library Technology Resources and Spaces Survey. The final report was submitted to the university director of assessment and reviewed by the university-level Learning Assessment team as part of the standard assessment activities review. The data audit was critical to the committee's successful pivot during the pandemic. However, an improvement for the following year would be to share the report more widely with library staff. There are opportunities to present the report during staff meetings or to hold an Assessment Committee open house.

Discussion

Returning to Koufogiannakis and Brettle's "Revised Model for EBLIP" (2016), there are unique considerations for this model in times of crises, as experienced by the authors in the case studies described above. Some of these considerations demonstrate the value of applying an evidence-based model in times of crises; others require special awareness of how these aspects may be shaped or applied differently in these times.

Articulate

Defining the problem to be solved and articulating the questions to be answered in challenging times seems an easy exercise. The problem is defined by its significance, urgency, and demand for a solution (Soehner, 2017). In these instances, the problem is usually so all-consuming that there is a ready agreement, at least on the surface, about what the problem is. The experiences described in these case studies, however, indicate that the root cause may be more obscure, larger in scope, or more entrenched than the immediate surface issue to be solved. This discovery may become quickly apparent in the process of investigating the evidence around the problem or it may not emerge until the evidence has been assembled and assessed.

These examples are indicative of the additional challenges associated with articulating the problem in times of crisis: (1) there may be less agency by the investigators in defining the scope of the investigation, the problem, and the associated questions, and (2) the ability of the investigators and stakeholders to agree on a solution, especially as more evidence emerges and continues to redefine the problem, will likely add complexity to the articulation process.

Assemble

For a variety of reasons, the *assemble* step may be the most challenging EBLIP cycle step to implement during a crisis. In the case studies described above, evidence assembly was complicated by several situations that contributed to the "crisis" feeling of the problem. As an example, if the crisis is budget-related, other problems associated with finances may also be present, such as staff shortages. This hampers the ability of the investigators to draw on the expertise of staff in those roles or institutional knowledge and transmission of documentation and/or workflows. The heightened stakes during a crisis may also mean information-sharing is discouraged or feels risky, particularly for those in marginalized or vulnerable positions (Nataraj et al., 2020).

Library staff and stakeholders may be exhausted from the crisis and are likely to be asked to provide additional support and labor in managing the crisis or preventing it from growing. When assembling information, the focus should be on only the most critical information and paring it down to prevent further overwhelming participants. Time is also an important factor to consider in evidence-gathering, as deadlines (external and internal) and pressure to resolve the issue quickly likely exist. As in the original model, this makes the experience of other institutions a valuable component of assembling evidence (Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016). The process may be ready-made, with questions, types of evidence, and methods of evidence-gathering already provided in an existing case study or article or available through a network of colleagues. Models for assembling, assessing, and applying evidence developed by other librarians were critical in providing a framework for both cases above.

Assess

During a crisis, consideration for the assessment method must be grounded in the context of situational pressures. In the case studies above, not only were staff operating in a pandemic where change was constant, information was overwhelming, and personal safety was a real concern, but staff were also asked to address multiple time-sensitive crises simultaneously. As a result, what may have been group discussions over data quality and quantity gave way to professional expertise of what is "good enough for now."

In both of these examples, the evidence was assessed at different levels of the process. Professional knowledge, experience, and expertise were all used when assessing the evidence to ensure the information was applicable and relevant to overstretched library staff.

Agree

As with *articulate* and *assemble*, *agree* requires the consideration of the emotional and mental culture around the crisis or challenge. Establishing consensus in times of crisis is a challenge when the stakes are high or emotions are high due to the pressures of the situation. It is also likely that while consensus may be reached at the level of investigators, when results or actions are presented to a broader audience, such as other units of the library or library and university administration, disagreement reenters the conversation and the process of assessing the evidence and agreeing on a consensus begins again. It is also possible that the ideal solution, or at least an acceptable one, may not be achievable due to the constraints of the crisis. These constraints could be financial, temporal, structural, cultural, and/or political.

Adapt

Some challenges of using the EBLIP model may be exacerbated during a crisis. Individuals and groups may disagree with the problem. Due to time limitations, they may assemble the most available evidence instead of the best evidence. They may need to make quick assessments of the existing evidence "as is," although there could be further avenues to check its validity. In times of crisis, being willing to take a flexible approach is key and can improve engagement and participation in the process. Finally, it may be necessary to take a unified action, even if deep disagreements remain.

It is only when the crisis is over, or in a lull period, that a group or individual can revisit goals and reflect on the known avenues not taken or avenues only revealed after the initial cycle. Investigators must be prepared to be flexible and creative in finding a solution that can be agreed upon, especially as new challenges and complications of the crisis arise. As the crises resolve, reevaluating and revisiting these areas can also point toward future solutions that prepare staff and the library for the next challenge, or, ideally, implementing "lessons learned" into policies, procedures, and practices that can prevent or mitigate a crisis in the future.

Reflections

The authors both played an active leadership role in the committees charged with navigating the situations outlined in the case studies in this chapter. Reflecting on the application of evidence-based practice in crises, we offer the additional considerations for choosing to apply an EBP approach:

Communication

The literature related to EBP in crises, either in the library or in other fields where the evidence model has been adapted, is minimal. Literature on managing crises in general, however, is abundant. A key area where the above experience and this literature converge is communication. Communication is a key element of successfully navigating a crisis, both internally and externally, and frequent process check-ins, share-outs, and transparency in documentation engage teams in this work (Wilkinson, 2015). Using evidence gathered to inform stakeholders of ongoing decisions, resulting actions, and expected outcomes is a positive side effect of the EBLIP model in crisis and communication.

Treurniet and Wolbers (2021) illustrate why the type of communication matters during a crisis. As discussed previously, a Google Sheet with an overwhelming amount of information was shared with library stakeholders to communicate decisions, evidence, and more related to collections cuts. However, this falls on just the first level of information sharing (Treurniet & Wolbers, 2021; Uitdewilligen & Waller, 2018). In a crisis, that may not be enough to facilitate a consensus. A space to make sense of the data, share interpretations of the data, and discuss the implications of that data may be necessary to reach an agreement.

In both case studies, a meeting or several meetings were held to discuss the interpretation of the evidence. The discussions were informed by professional practices and institutional documents and then grounded by facilitated discussions using shared vocabulary and definitions. Once the groundwork was completed, discussions revolved around interpretations of the data, which were often informed by professional knowledge and experience. The implications of the shared understanding were then discussed. Does the data already collected by colleagues address the assessment needs of the library? Will additional cancellations jeopardize the ability to support all programs offered by the university? In both case studies, a consensus was reached only after interpretations and implications were discussed and communicated with internal and external stakeholders.

Empathy and Emotional Intelligence

Crisis or challenging situations are stressful and wear on both the leaders and teams involved. Leaders approaching these situations must consider the impact this has on their colleagues and use emotional intelligence to navigate with empathy (for themselves as well as their teams). Considering potential participant skill sets and reactions to the various steps in the EBLIP process may help with buy-in. Project leaders can then more thoughtfully distribute the work of evidence collection and analysis.

Participants' feelings and reactions are also important to consider as participants move through the EBLIP cycle itself. Historically, much of the research on decision-making dealt with scenarios with optimal choices (Bruch & Feinberg, 2017). Recent research has taken into account how intuition, emotions, ethics, and social context inform decision-making and consensus-building in scenarios without optimal choices. These factors are important to consider as participants may be unaware of how these factors may impact participants engaged in the EBLIP cycle. Examples include emotions detrimentally affecting data collection or increasing ethical concerns depending on emotional states (Sayegh et al., 2004). In a crisis, participants must be able to articulate why certain evidence was gathered and why certain problems were framed a particular way. Was it a past experience? Were there resource constraints? Was it a moral consideration? Or were there ethical concerns?

While structure is helpful for crisis situations, being flexible and accommodating as an already-fluid situation changes reduces stress for all participants and can help people remain motivated while working through the crisis. This kind of adaptability serves well in a crisis. Additionally, during the evidence assembly and analysis, new information is likely to emerge that will challenge existing understandings, and new information, methods, or paths forward will be proposed (Wilkinson, 2015). Being open to this aspect of inquiry is critical for those leading their colleagues through any EBP exercise—and even more so in times of crises.

References

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2018). Standards for libraries in higher education. https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/standardslibraries

Association of College and Research Libraries. (n.d.). Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (WASC-SCUC). https://www.ala.org/acrl/issues/infolit/standards/wasc-scuc

Bruch, E., & Feinberg, F. (2017). Decision-making processes in social contexts. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *43*(1), 207–227. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053622

Hoffman, S. (2019, April 11). Creating an assessment plan & data inventory: Aligning & managing success metrics [Workshop]. Association of College and Research Libraries Conference, Cleveland, OH, United States.

Koufogiannakis, D., & Brettle, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Being evidence based in library and information practice*. American Library Association.

Nataraj, L., Hampton, H., Matlin, T. R., & Meulemans, Y. N. (2020). "Nice White meetings": Unpacking absurd library bureaucracy through a Critical Race Theory lens. *Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *6*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.33137/cjal-rcbu.v6.34340

Project COUNTER. (n.d.). The COUNTER Code of Practice for Release 5. Retrieved July 21, 2022, from https://www.projectcounter.org/code-of-practice-five-zero-two/

Sayegh, L., Anthony, W. P., & Perrewé, P. L. (2004). Managerial decision-making under crisis: The role of emotion in an intuitive decision process. *Human Resource Management Review*, *14*(2), 179–199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2004.05.002

Soehner, C., Godfrey, I., & Bigler, G. S. (2017). Crisis communication in libraries: Opportunity for new roles in public relations. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *43*(3), 268–273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2017.03.003

Treurniet, W., & Wolbers, J. (2021). Codifying a crisis: Progressing from information sharing to distributed decision-making. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, *29*(1), 23–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12323

Uitdewilligen, S., & Waller, M. J. (2018). Information sharing and decision-making in multidisciplinary crisis management teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(6), 731–748. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2301

Wilkinson, F. C. (2015). Emotional intelligence in library disaster response assistance teams: Which competencies emerged? *College & Research Libraries*, *76*(2) 188–204, https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.76.2.188

Wilton, S., & Méthot, M. (2020). Moving forward or holding back? Creating a culture of academic assessment. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2020.2.8009

Zaugg, H., McKeen, Q., Hill, B., & Black, B. (2017). Conducting and using an academic library inventory. *Technical Services Quarterly*, *34*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/07317131.2017.1238192