LFPA Executive Committee, Fiscal Year 2011-12
Meeting Minutes:
Date: January 26, 2012
Time: 4:00-5:00
Location: Watson 3rd floor
Approved:

Present: Sarah Goodwin Thiel, Nikhat Ghouse, Amalia Monroe-Gulick, Brian Rosenblum, Mary Raple, George Gibbs, Carmen Orth-Alfie

Discussed Handout: Confidential--2012 Evaluation Process from Lorraine Haricombe, sent to Sarah Goodwin-Thiel & LFPA Exec Members

How many people have complained?
Mostly from Collection Development, Sarah has received complaints from at least 12 people.

What are the complaints?
- DC Exec & Lorraine think that having the administrative review first, will lead to more accountability and consistency. People are worried that “exceptional” ratings may get dropped and acceptable ratings will not get raised.
- Changing admin review process might supersede the original supervisor’s decision
- LFPA as a group didn’t get an opportunity to look at the ad hoc committee’s suggestions that were turned in to DC Exec
- DC Exec wanted to increase accountability for 2011 evaluation cycle, and so the process has been rushed. However, since the ad hoc committee had done the research, they were at least able to inform DC Exec with a report of their findings.

Carmen--Is there something in the code that would imply that what was done isn’t proper?
Sarah—No. Most complaints are based around the faculty evaluation . . .
And the fact that the ad hoc committee had no lead time to submit a good report. It had not been vetted by faculty.

Sarah--There were short and long term recommendations from committee that DC Exec took into consideration. DC Exec at least had our input, even though it was on short notice. Lorraine sees us (LFPA Exec) as reps of LFPA – Handling the situation this way allowed for a fast turnaround.

At the “extraordinary” meeting on Monday, Jan. 30, people will have the opportunity to express concerns about the process. This will be looked at again in the 3-year cycle of reviewing the process.

This is strictly an opportunity for discussion. Not a vote. The most we could do is to agree to hold a vote.

Nikhat—How different is Lorraine’s document (confidential version) from the one in Monday Musings?
Sarah--Not much. She focused more on the benefits.

Amalia—Asked a question about the timeline.
Sarah?--Ad hoc comm. came back with recommendations—some to be voted on and some procedural. DC Exec decided what was procedural—not the ad hoc comm. report.
Who are people most upset with?
Sarah--People are up in arms about changing the evaluation process in the middle of the process. George--Supervisors are unhappy. Nothing has really changed for individuals--only for supervisors. Some people don’t follow the plan as stated, anyway.

George--If the ADs are not sharing information across with each other, then what will change? –not sharing doesn’t address the problem. It could help at one level, but not all. People whose supervisor is strict could be loosened up. If all the lines are brought into sync, some ratings will rise, some will fall. Some will get “exceptional”, some will lose it.

Sarah--At the end of the meeting, ideally, people will go away with a feeling about what DC Exec is trying to do. It also should give DC Exec a feeling of accountability to LFPA.

Mary—Please don’t let anyone run away with the meeting. Will DC Exec have access to meeting questions?
Sarah—Yes.

Carmen—at least there was a desire for our input from DC Exec.

Nikhat--We took the opportunity to give DC Exec a report and our ideas. Sarah??--All ADs liked our ideas. They were happy with report. They misrepresented our goals a little—report addressed long term suggestions, but it was used to address a short term situation by DC Exec.

Should we release the ad hoc report?
George--Wait and see how people react in meeting. Would have been inflammatory to release report at 5 pm when meeting was 8 am next day.

Nikhat—Suggested scheduling a monthly meeting rather than quarterly for LFPA to facilitate conversation and discussion.

Next Meeting:

Extraordinary meeting of LFPA: Monday, January 30th from 2 – 3 p.m., in 455 Watson. Submit questions before 10:00 a.m. on Monday, January 30th to Sarah Goodwin-Thiel via email, or anonymously in writing to her mailbox, located in the CRMDA reception area, rm. #470, across from CDS.

Scheduled regular meeting: Feb. 8, 2012