1. Introduction of New Members to the Assembly
   a. Marianne Reed introduced – Center for Digital Scholarship
   b. Mary Rapel – International Area Studies
   c. Congratulations to Judith Emde’s move from Associate Librarian to Full

2. Any other Announcements?

3. Approval from November’s previous meeting minutes? Motion to Approve. 2nded. Yayed. No Nays.

4. The chair begins: Lots of issues came to the Assembly in many different ways. The chair proposes that changes that the assembly is “in agreement for” will be moved to a ballot. Controversial issues will be moved to a meeting for a later date. Agenda will be dealt with by issue and topic, not linearly through the Code & Bylaws. Explanations are provided in the document but the chair encourages questions. Any other issues that the chair did not hear about, the chair would like them to be kicked to the end of the Agenda unless they are pertinent to items already on the agenda.

5. Starting on the topic of: Committee on Promotion & Tenure - “Ways that We Could Make Sure there is no Confusion of Elected Committees for LFPA vs. Appointed Committees”
   a. Beginning on pg. 4, line 162 – attempting to make it clear that elected body vacancies must go to a vote. Non-elected committee terms that cannot be completed will be appointed by Exec.
   b. A member asks about how explicitly it must be stated that Exec can nominate or appoint someone who has already just completed a term.
   c. A member asks about what the document is trying to do. A member of LFPA Exec responds that the purpose of changes is to address filling interim position on committees.
   d. We move to 3.2, page 10, line 374 to discuss what the Bylaws say about Vacancies. The chair reads the different subsections of 3.2 to make it clear for everyone.
      i. Question concerning 3.2.1.4 – for those committees where you can serve 2 consecutive terms, when do these new rules apply. Beth says that serving that half a term as a replacement should count as a full term. Lars references line 91, 3.3.1 of the code as a guide. The chair does a thought experiment with someone who is elected into a position to complete a 9 month term. Can that person be re-elected or appointed 2 more times? Scott interjects that it wouldn’t be a “full year”.
      ii. What about more than one half asks a member? Yes that’s covered 3.2.1.3.
      iii. A member suggests language around 3.1.1 of the Code to include the principle that more than half a term equals a full term in cases where someone is completing another’s term.
      iv. A member asks about why less than half or more than half? The chair explains the need or misuse of time for the special election.
v. A member asks about LCPT being a special case. The chair assures her and the assembly that it is a special case, depending on the work for LCPT that needs to be done.

e. The chair returns to line 161, rereads it, and asks if there are any questions.
   i. A member likes story problems: Ralph has served on LCPT, and he has left KU, still part of his term, still left to be done. Mary filled out her term. Is she eligible to complete Ralph’s term? Yes.
   ii. Would 161 be more clear if “However” on line 162 were removed? Who thinks however should be included? 1 person thinks left in, several think it should be left out.

f. Also related, line 181, Code# 3.3.4.7, the chair reads.
   i. A member asks about why this needs to be added. The vice-chair replies that this clarifies that, 3 Full Librarians must be there to promote someone to a Full Librarian.
   ii. Could it just be “Regarding the membership required to review” at the beginning of the sentence? Yes this makes more sense. People seem to like this. The chair clarifies that there have been a few minor edits since she last sent out the code.

6. Topic: Sabbatical Code Change
   a. 3.3.5.4 – The chair reads the change.
      i. A member asks about nominees from Exec and if there will always be 2 nominees. The chair explains that this came up in the meeting, and that there would always be 2 nominees from Exec.
   b. The chair reads 3.3.5.4.1. No questions.
   c. The chair reads 3.3.5.4.5.
   d. A member wants to go back and ask about line 218. Does rank matter on Sabbatical? The member does not believe it does, so the word “qualified” can be removed. People generally agree.
   e. The chair reviews Sabbatical Leave issues to make sure that we have covered this issue.

7. Topic: The chair explains 2.1.4 of the Code on pg 1, allowing all unclassified staff to be members of the assembly. No questions.

8. Topic: Nominating & Ballot – Change to 3.1.3 on in the bylaws. The chair explains that preferential balloting is not advantageous unless there are more than 3 candidates. No questions.

   a. A member asks about the numbering.
   b. A member asks about the use of the word “University Council” in line 14. This should be changed to the University Senate. “And unclassified professionals,” will be added to the end of the last sentence.
   c. We will go back to 1.1 and 1.2 at the beginning of the document.
   d. Confusion over Code 3.3.2.3, changed to “see 3.1.1” instead of what is currently proposed in the parenthesis.
10. Topic: “Number 5 on the Agenda” – University Senate & Faculty Senate, following their lead, empowering the Exec to make technical editorial changes. Things like “renumbering articles & sections.” No questions.

11. Topic: “Number 6, an easy one too I think” – Issue addressing untenured librarians, how they can vote on criteria, but not issues relevant to faculty.
   a. What form do these people use? Well we don’t vote on that as an assembly, so that is not pertinent. Good question though.
   b. The chair reads changes to 2.2.1 of the Code. Basically allowing them to vote on criteria.
   c. Question about numbering of the sections. The chair suggests parity between sections.

12. Topic: CRSA
   a. The chair describes the issue and transition of some of CRSA’s responsibilities moving into HR.
   b. Call into a member on Edwards Campus
   c. Questions or issues about removing the paragraph?
      i. A member asks about whether or not removing it from the code changes the involvement of librarians in this process. The chair argues that this process is now being distributed across other parts of the organization. Susan reiterates that she is not concerned about whether CRSA does it, but just whether or not someone in the assembly is responsible. The chair believes that it the assembly is capable of dealing many of these issues based upon who votes for what and where. Whitney agrees that this seems like a valid concern.
      ii. A member says that LCPT already deals with this.
      iii. Movement to move this language to Exec’s responsibility from Erin.
      iv. A member specifies where it is in the section on LCPT.
      v. A member of LFPA Exec motions that this kind of thing be moved to the first page covering what the purpose of the assembly is.
      vi. Let’s go ahead and strike it and then send back to Exec for possible inclusion in some other section. Agree to remove with this understanding.

13. Motion to move the first 7 items on the expanded agenda to a ballot.
   a. Show of hands.
   b. None opposed.
   c. All those in favor of moving them all to the same issue to be voted on.

14. Topic Issue #8 on the Agenda: Unclassified Professionals serving as Chair of LFPA.
   a. One minute Background on #8
   b. What about vice-chair, chair-elect for next year? What about the unclassified professionals? Would they actually be able to serve as chair, when most of the business of the committee is faculty issues and tenure issues?
   c. The chair reads 3.3.2.3, lines 117-118.
      i. A member asks about whether or not the role is facilitating?
      ii. A member says that she does like the current language but it would depend on what the role of the LFPA Exec chair truly is, a facilitator or something more.
iii. A member stresses the research and service requirements of faculty are very different needs for LFPA. The member mentions other bodies at the university that we may follow as examples.

iv. A member is concerned that this would cause more confusion at the same time. The chair is not supposed to give opinion when there is a tie-break scenario. What about the quorum, what would that be?

v. Chair of LFPA declares this topic as too complex to resolve this year. No Code changes are accepted.

Meeting ends 3:06pm