1. No new members to LFPA
2. Report from Unclassified Professionals – Report from Rhonda, the Chair of the Committee
   a. Unclassified Professionals Award – putting together procedures, timeframe, nomination form;
   b. Similar timeframe as other employee awards, mid-January nominations, celebrated in the Fall;
   c. Late Fall meeting for Unclassified Professionals;
   d. Should be ready for 2010.
3. Revisions to Faculty Evaluation Plan Discussion
   a. Thank you to Kathy Graves who sent detailed comments and editorial assistance to Ada.
   b. History/ Background – Generally the faculty evaluation plan is reviewed every 3 years, sent to faculty governance, and approved by the provosts office. The library sent one forward in May of 07. The desire of university administration has been to align the new document with the schedule of the other parts of university. We will pass the current proposed Faculty Evaluation Plan as a group, but it still needs approval from Admin.
   c. Ada made corrections and received more suggestions during the Summer from Mary Lee Hummert about changes, then Exec worked during the beginning of the Fall to ready the document for review by the rest of LFPA.
4. Questions?
   a. Is it definitely going to be required that performance, research, service breakdown be in evaluations? A member asserts that written statements for each area (professional, research, and service) are still the appropriate places for descriptions of performance and “does not meet expectations” can still persist as a checkbox that indicates a lack of compliance. A member of Exec reinforces that we discussed this in Exec and that the old evaluation document had rankings for each area that were eventually removed because they were deemed meaningless by LPFA. Another member of the body asks why the administration should be so prescriptive about whether the Evaluation Form should have specific contents, check boxes, rankings, etc., when that is an internal document. Many agree that the descriptive/narrative section should suffice.
   b. A member asks about the unsatisfactory rating and how we came upon the timeframe of three years. A member of Exec recounts that it was once 3 years in the faculty handbook, not in the current handbook. raising it for the committee to consider (Line 271) - Section C2B1 from the faculty handbook pertains to this.
   c. A question is raised about having percentages for professional, research, and service responsibilities multiple times in the document. It is agreed that this could be clarified or removed if redundant and that other percentages will be double-checked to assure consistency.
   d. Why does it only refer to tenured librarians throughout this document? A member of Exec asserts that some of the document implies what that librarians early in their career are still striving to meet a certain standard, whereas the rest of the document describes
the level of accomplishment that needs to be maintained. Beth to draft a sentence or two to be placed in the document to clarify to whom this document applies.

e. A suggestion is made to substitute the word “manager” for “supervisor”. Someone mentions that our evaluation form uses the word “supervisor”. Most of the assembly seems to prefer to retain the word “supervisor”.

f. Lines 138-139, why place that particular language in this section? Does it imply that there are a lot of people who are only going to attempt the least amount of work necessary to maintain their position? A member asserts that we really do not need to reiterate the fact that Associate Librarians going up for tenure may not meet the expectations of a Full Librarian. Many agree that we might consider deleting that whole paragraph. Another member suggests language about “Consistent and sustained activity” on Line 129.

g. Use Minimum instead of Minimal throughout the document – such as on Line 137.

5. Further effort will be made by Exec to fix the document and make it ready to be voted on.

6. Meeting adjourned at 3:12pm