Sherry Williams called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Sherry had new hires’ supervisors welcome them as new members of LFPA. The following new members were introduced to the body: Corinne Forstot-Burke (Performing Arts librarian - Content), Sunita Gandhi (Acquisitions & Resource Sharing)

Incoming Dean Kevin Smith made some remarks to the LFPA body:

- Dean Smith thanked Sherry and Sara Morris for their leadership of LFPA, and thanked everyone involved with the work to come up with a new governance structure and corresponding Code
- Noted participation in faculty governance is a new experience for him; the new Code was well-timed for him to understand how governance functions here
- Noted that supporting faculty’s professional development is important, and this is an emphasis of the Code as well as KU’s new Provost. He thanked Lars Leon for his efforts in organizational development to gather information about Libraries' research needs and indicated he was looking at ways to support these needs including a faculty writing group. He indicated that he hoped he could put some of his discretionary fund towards such professional development needs.
- Noted that he looks forward to the Libraries working with and supporting each other in being scholars and faculty at KU

Old Business

Approval of Fall LFPA assembly minutes

- Victoria Williams made a motion to accept the minutes from the fall LFPA assembly, and Heather MacBean seconded. Sherry called for discussion, and hearing none the assembly passed the minutes without amendments.

LFPA Standing Committee Reports

- Sherry Williams, LFPA Executive Committee: Introduced committee; mentioned members and roles; indicated the group met bi-weekly during the past year. She indicated the major focus was
transition to a new governance structure and the crafting of a corresponding Code through work of ad hoc committees.

- **Scott McEathron** read a report from Whitney Baker on behalf of the Library Committee on Promotion and Tenure (LCPT): Indicated LCPT reviewed 1 file for P&T and 4 for promotion; would look at 1 progress toward tenure report in the spring. LCPT met with 10 faculty members to explain the Promotion and Tenure process. The committee will have 1 librarian position open for coming year.

- **Heather Mac Bean**, Code & Bylaws: Introduced membership; indicated committee will have one opening for next year. Their special charge this year was working on rewriting the Libraries’ code. Two members of Code & Bylaws participated on the Ad Hoc Committee for Governance Structure; the other member reviewed code edits. The new Code was completed May 2. The group’s recommendations for the coming year include being prepared to assist assemblies of new governance on interpretation of new code, and proposing amendments to the Code as necessary. The group recommends that committees update their rosters frequently so quorums can be established more easily.

- **Lars Leon**, Salary & Benefits: Lars indicated the committee’s special charge was to see whether Salary & Benefits should continue as an LFPA standing committee, become an ad hoc committee, or be dissolved/take some other configuration. The committee conducted a survey, held an open forum, and accepted individual feedback/comments. A report summarizing the results of these was sent to LFPA Exec. There was no consensus in the feedback received as to what form the committee should take, but the feedback included some task ideas which could be implemented in the coming year whether the committee remains as a standing committee or an ad hoc committee.

- **Jamene Brooks-Kieffer**, Sabbatical Leave & PTR (SLPTR): Introduced committee and indicated there will be 2 openings for 2016-17. SLPTR reviewed 1 sabbatical and 5 post-tenure reviews; this resulted in some revisions to the documents on procedures for PTR, to be discussed later in the meeting.

- **Victoria Williams**, Unclassified Professionals: Committee will be dissolved in the new governance structure as there will be a staff assembly; two of the committee’s members will be rotating off, and a third will be available for a position in the new structure.

- **Betsaida Reyes**, Nominating & Ballot: This committee will be contacting Libraries staff to run for positions in the new governance structure. This year the group moved from Ballot Bin to Qualtrics for the software used for distributing ballots.

- **Sofia Leung**, Committee on Research and Scholarly Activities (CRSA): This committee will have 2 openings next year. This year’s special charge was to review project funding guidelines. The result of this consideration was that LRF funds can be applied to registration costs, but not travel. The group funded around 8 projects for 2015-2016, and still has some money left until June.

**University Governance Committee Reports**

- **Nate Chamberlain and Brian Moss**, Staff Senate: University staff will be voting for the president-elect of this assembly; over the summer further charges will be determined as this is the first year operating as a combined university staff and support staff assembly. The group is purchasing a number of copies of the Common Book for discussion. The tobacco policy will be
implemented this July. New stipulations of the Fair Labor Standards Act regarding receiving overtime pay below a certain salary cap will be implemented, affecting some Libraries staff. The assembly is asking for nominations for a Diversity and Inclusion Chair position.

- **Amalia Monroe-Gulick, Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FacEx):** An ad hoc committee will be created on the Freedom of Speech policy. FacEx endorsed the Sexuality and Gender Consortium at KU to support equal health care benefits. The group passed a new faculty code which will be examined this coming year. The biggest changes include administrative leave without pay being non-punitive to comply with the KBOR policy; due process language was also changed. Weapons policy implementation group will be completed by July or August; this group is determining any changes to implement when weapons are allowed on campus in July 2017.

- **Amalia Monroe-Gulick, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee:** Group completed a CORE curriculum review; sent to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and the CORE committee

- **Amalia Monroe-Gulick, University Assessment Committee:** This committee will be dissolved in the coming year but will continue work in connection with university governance; a recommendation for the coming year was that KU establish a university Office of Assessment

- **Sarah Goodwin Thiel, Academic Computing and Communications Committee:** This group discussed the ramifications of the fiber cut at KU; Bob Lim sent out a formal summary to university employees as a result, making the issue more transparent.

- **Sara Morris, University Parking Committee:** Parking prices are going up as approved last year, continuing for the next 5 years. Parking is self-funded; budget issues led to this proposal.
  - Question: Will assigned parking be moved to other lots?
  - Students with yellow permits will have assigned parking zones. The university is building a new garage, but losing parking by Burge Union, leading to likely difficulty during next couple of years.

- **Lea Currie, University Senate’s Academic Policies and Procedures Committee (AP&P):** Committee reviewed the policy for students taking a class 5 times and applying the highest score towards their GPA. This policy passed, allowing students to repeat a course 5 times. This proposal also passed in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The group also examined the Pharmacy internship process, in which students receive a pass/fail grade. Most students passed this course with honorable mentions, so an “Exelled” category was created to provide a higher level of recognition for students who passed their internship with outstanding merit.

- **Pam Lach, Faculty Senate Research Committee:** This group conducted their 3-year review of GRF funds in March and did not make changes to the policy, but did recommend that Faculty Senate examine the policy in the spring to ensure funds are equally dispersed among disciplines. The group recommended a survey about the PRO project be dispersed to department chairs next year. The group also recommended examining faculty entrepreneurship evaluation in relation to productivity.

**Transition progress towards new governance structure**

- Sherry reported that LFPA approved a new Code governing the Libraries’ new governance structure, which would also incorporate KULSS; this code takes effect July 1st. Sherry indicated she and and Sara met with Dean Smith, Kent Miller, and Mary Roach, and are in the process of getting Dean Smith’s approval of the Code. The current Nominating & Ballot Committee will be
working with Sherry and Sara to recruit positions for committees in the new structure. LFPA Exec is also looking into designing a governance website to reflect the new structure. LFPA Exec confirmed that new Code will need to be included in policy library.

New Business

Revisions to the current Promotion and Tenure criteria and procedures were addressed this year by the SLPTR Committee. Jamene Brooks-Kieffer presented the documents with proposed changes highlighted in red; the floor was opened for comments and questions before discussing the committee’s recommendations. Jamene noted that the proposed document includes language consistent with the newly passed Code. If this revised document does not pass, there will be some inconsistencies in language. Discussion followed:

- Regarding restrictions for serving on committee: Will the Nominating & Ballot committee be responsible for determining eligibility to serve on the committee? Or will SLPTR list who’s going up for promotion so those who may need to recuse themselves will be aware?
  - Listing those going up for promotion is one of SLPTR’s recommendations.

- Does PTR occur instead of, or in addition to the candidate’s annual evaluation for that year? In Line 185, the revised document indicates PTR is part of the evaluation process.
  - The annual evaluation would likely still occur since the timeline for completing the annual evaluation is much earlier than PTR documents are due. If the candidate’s evaluation required meeting with the Dean, these meetings would not necessarily need to be separate, but the annual evaluation and PTR processes are separate.

- Jamene noted that in the PTR form, Appendix A, there are some changes to highlight that the evaluation needs only to reflect the most recent 7 years of service; there is also a reminder not to exceed the evaluation’s maximum length limits.
  - Scott McEathron moved to send the proposed changes to a mail ballot for voting by those eligible for PTR (tenure-track faculty and academic staff); Lyn Wolz seconded. Discussion then followed regarding the committee’s recommendations: How will the committee be populated?
    - The committee recommends making calendars for who is going up for PTR, PTTR, available in hopes of limiting recusals. This is a practical issue, not one that requires a ballot.
  - Will this be made available on the intranet?
    - Yes – in some non-public but shared location
  - Someone may go up for promotion or get approved for sabbatical after SLPTR membership is determined – the proposed changes will not protect against 100% of potential recusals, but should help.
  - Since some committees are 2 year commitments and some are 3, how to deal with conflicts that are only 1 year of these? Can someone step off for 1 year and re-join?
    - Can give this a try and see how much of an issue this is; members still free to recuse themselves.
  - Have you looked into how other schools/departments manage this process?
Promotion & Tenure Documentation

Judith Emde spoke about the issues of updating and re-approving the Libraries’ criteria documents for Promotion and Tenure (P&T) in light of recent issues regarding formatting of the documents as well as inclusion of information regarding academic staff research requirements. She indicated that when the issues with academic staff requirements arose last fall, the Libraries submitted P&T documentation to the University’s Standards and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Committee (SPPT), hoping they would support the Libraries’ contention that permission was granted to include positions without a research requirement. While this did not happen, SPPT indicated that the Libraries never submitted their updated documentation in 2014 when academic staff were added as an employment category. (The Libraries originally submitted their 4 criteria documents to SPPT in 2009, which were approved; the 2014 documents were approved by LFPA but not subsequently sent to SPPT.) SPPT is now requesting that the Libraries combine the 4 promotion and tenure criteria documents (discipline expectations, code & bylaws, criteria documents, and procedures) into a single document, as they find the disparate documents difficult to review, though they do contain all required information. Judith recapped her meeting with an SPPT member in November, and indicated that because the 2014 documents were not approved by SPPT, there are currently Libraries staff following unapproved criteria. There is a Libraries employee going up for promotion next fall who will be affected by this. Next steps regarding the issue include:

- Documentation needs to be updated based on information on unclassified academic staff issue
- Documentation needs to be combined and re-submitted to SPPT for review using the standard template provided by the College. Judith recommended this be completed by October.

Discussion on the issue followed:

- Could the new Libraries Faculty Assembly (LFA) look at this issue as a new charge?
- People were hired assuming criteria/expectations they were asked to follow were current; these criteria were approved by LFPA. Staff now being told they have to do research. This should be discussed with Mary Lee Hummert.
  - Kent & Mary indicated that this was discussed with affected faculty in the Libraries, as mentioned in the fall assembly. All affected members accepted a research requirement of 10%, although they were made aware that they could choose to be grandfathered in without a requirement.
- Some faculty expressed concern that this was a larger governance issue – that the Provost’s office was able to change expectations for the Libraries’ criteria at will. SPPT often has a back log of documents to review, so being “out of compliance” with them is not as large an issue.
- Are our standards for tenure-track faculty out of compliance?
  - No; approved in 2009; good until FY18
- How are current Academic Staff to prepare for evaluation?
  - If the Libraries submit updated documents by fall, they could be approved before it becomes an issue. However, academic staff expressed concern that they would like to
know what is expected of them much earlier than the time of promotion so they can prepare adequately

- Mary Roach: Libraries has some flexibility in controlling the date academic staff go up for promotion. Ideally would keep in sync with faculty, but can differ if necessary
- Should the Libraries use the opportunity not only to re-format, but to revise criteria as well? This will be a time-consuming process; may be the responsibility of LFA

Sherry asked the LFPA body if there was any other new business to report. Hearing none, Ada Emmett made a motion to adjourn, and Gaele Gillespie seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 4:15.