1. Jamene reported on behalf of the Sabbatical Leave and Post-Tenure Review Committee (other committee members listed above were present) and provided two documents electronic documents to the Executive Committee – the first was recommended edits to the PTR Criteria & Procedures document.
   a. In an attempt to align the procedures document with the proposed changes to the governance code, restrictions were added that would prevent a faculty member from serving on the review committee (see bullet point beginning line 123 of the Procedures document).
   b. Musa noted that line 91 of the Procedures document should read 5 to 20 percent, not 5 to 15 percent.
   c. Sara expressed concerns regarding the ability of faculty moving forward to fill vacant spots on SLPTR and LCPT and suggested that faculty could be on said committees but recuse themselves from reviewing/reporting a particular file.
   d. Sara suggested that an analysis be conducted next year to chart the fluctuating number of cases for sabbatical leave and post-tenure review and the number of resulting recusals. Jamene reported two recusals in FY2015.
   e. Karen noted that since committee members serve two-year terms, even if a member needs to recuse him or herself, they can still participate in any remaining fall sabbatical leave submissions or spring post-tenure reviews.
   f. In Appendix A of the Procedures document, clarification was added that each statement should be 500 words regarding the most recent seven-years.
   g. Substantial changes (beyond updating dates) will require approval by the whole LFPA body. The SLPTR Committee will distribute revisions to the Procedures document by April 25th for inclusion in the May 2nd LFPA meeting agenda.

2. Jamene reported on behalf of the Sabbatical Leave and Post-Tenure Review Committee (other committee members listed above were present) and provided two documents electronic documents to the Executive Committee – the second was the annual report of SLPTR.
   a. The SLPTR annual report includes a recommendation that might help address the question of unexpected recusals and committees too small to conduct business – make P&T and PTR calendars available for general access by the faculty assembly, and charging the Nominating & Ballot Committee to consult the calendars when determining candidates for election – essentially prescreening for supervisor/supervisee conflicts. This recommendation might help LCPT as well.
   b. The SLPTR annual report recommends the following topic be investigated: confidential PTR proceedings allowed access to the faculty members’ evaluations. Sherry raised the concern that constructive criticism in an evaluation can influence PTR discussions in a way that the supervisor might not have intended and can work to a person’s determinant.
c. The SLPTR annual report also recommends removing the early March meeting between the Dean and the faculty member, suggesting instead that PTR results are discussed as part of the annual evaluation process (see lines 183-184 in Procedures document). Mike Broadwell had suggested to the SLPTR Committee that a second meeting, outside of the annual evaluation process, was not necessary. Sherry stated that Lorraine had implemented the early March meeting as a new practice, and the new Dean might have their own input on the practice. Sara suggested that we change the Procedures document to include a designated meeting between the Dean and faculty member. Since the assumed annual evaluation meeting doesn’t always happen, it was agreed to not move forward with the recommendation by the SLPTR Committee to remove the early March meeting.

3. Jon expressed his concern with the annual evaluation process and specific issues with both the Unclassified Professional and Faculty evaluation forms.
   a. Changes requested to the evaluation forms include:
      i. Add a spot for the name of the employee on the cover sheet/checklist (both faculty and staff forms).
      ii. Include page numbers (both faculty and staff forms).
      iii. Add signature line for assistant deans (both faculty and staff forms).
      iv. Provide descriptions of final overall ratings in faculty form, similar to what is included in staff form.
      v. Remove ‘not to exceed one page’ restriction (both faculty and staff forms).
   b. Sherry stated that although LFPA Executive Committee does not administer or oversee the evaluation forms, the issues listed can be brought to Mike Broadwell’s attention.
   c. Jon shared with the Executive Committee examples of defined expectations he used this year when evaluating his staff, in hopes that a similar template would be piloted and implemented by other supervisors, including his own. To be fair and equitable among his staff, he created a description of what it means to ‘meet expectations’ for each job. Having this criteria, he said, is protection/benefit for employee and models better communication between supervisor and supervisee.
   d. Jocelyn noted that the new Performance Management System was unlikely to make the evaluation process any more clear/less subjective.
   e. Sherry recalled previous attempts to influence the evaluation process, including committees specifically serving that purpose, peer-reviewed evaluations, numerical systems, etc. The process has perhaps become more contentious given the lack of merit raises.
   f. General frustration was shared amongst the group that a forced bell-curve or quota seems to exist in how the ratings are distributed.
   g. General frustration was shared amongst the group that in order to get an ‘exceeds expectations’ rating you have to keep doing more and more, all the while, nothing gets dropped, only added.