1. Discussion of date(s) for LFPA assembly meetings/strategy for discussing work of ad hoc committee on Code for new governance structure
   a. Ann Snow suggested having Libraries staff (USS and UPS) meet after March 21st deadline to submit a draft of the Code to LFPA Exec. Staff wanted to focus on their portion of the Code to discuss changes affecting them; faculty may want to meet on their own as well
   b. LFPA Exec discussed next steps for reviewing the draft code presented by the ad hoc code committee, and sharing this information with the Libraries at large. The group decided that a combination of joint assemblies with separate meetings for staff and faculty to discuss their portions of the code would make sense. Sherry to contact Nate and schedule a joint meeting of LFPA and KULSS as well as town hall meetings for both faculty and USS/UPS, followed by another two joint meetings in order to ensure we can address LFPA business in addition to discussing the draft code.
   c. Kent and Mary had asked if this code could be finished before the new Dean arrives in May; LFPA Exec did not think this would likely be possible
   d. Fran Devlin suggested consulting someone with legal experience about creating the wording for the motion that dissolves KULSS and LFPA to establish the new governance structure
   e. The group discussed the transition period between May and July in which the new governance structure would likely be implemented. Ann noted that the University Staff Senate transition included a document that governed the transitory period between having two separate senates that were combined into a single staff senate. Sara Morris indicated the ad hoc committee could look at this example and possibly consider something similar.

2. Update from ad hoc meeting on code
   a. Members of the code committee reported that they were approaching a full draft of the code. Ann noted committee is looking at putting a lot of information into a procedural document that governs the code itself. The committee thought the March 21st deadline to have a draft to LFPA Exec would not be a problem. LFPA Exec meets on the 23rd; the code committee can present the report for initial discussion with LFPA Exec on this.

3. The minutes from 2/10 were discussed and approved after some changes that clarified what parties were being referred to in the text.

4. Report on meeting with Kent and Mary
   a. Sherry reported that she and Sara met with Kent and Mary the previous week. Kent and Mary met with Mary Lee Hummert at the Provost’s office and raised these issues:
      i. Current faculty orientation doesn’t include academic staff – likely because current orientation is geared towards research and tenure-track positions. This is not likely to change.
      ii. Academic staff research requirements – Libraries may be able to make a case for positions with significant administrative requirements to not have a research requirements, but for others, the research requirements need to be 10%. This has implications for changing the Libraries’ faculty documentation.
iii. Initial discussion about how positions go forward as tenure track or academic staff - In the future the Libraries may expect to provide more justification for what a position will entail than simply discussion with the supervisor for that position.

iv. Libraries proposed recruitment for position of undergraduate engagement librarian - got pushback for including MLS/Masters’ as a preferred qualification. Provost’s office indicated the position need to require a “terminal degree” - an MLS, or a PhD in another field.

v. Teaching evaluation for faculty – if faculty are teaching on overload, this does not go under service in an evaluation. Mary Lee Hummert indicated that annual evaluations could differ from P&T. Those not teaching on overload would put teaching under service. Kent and Mary have a document that faculty can refer to currently; they indicated that this procedure would be communicated via either an LFPA meeting or separate meeting that they would call.

vi. Sherry and Sara raised the issue of including academic staff on annual evaluation procedures.

vii. Sara gave an update on the ad hoc committee for governance code.

5. Sara suggested notifying LFPA Committees to see if there are any updates on their work or special charges for the upcoming assemblies.