



Policy Review Committee

February 28, 2019 | 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Pleasants Family Assembly Room
Wilson Library

The UNC Policy Review Committee (PRC) met for its February 2019 meeting and the following members were present:

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Natalie Albertson | Kristen Lewis (interim) |
| Kathy Anderson | Lisa Miller |
| Carolyn Atkins | Christopher Payne |
| Jessica Brinker | Tim Sabo |
| Jennifer DeNeal | Christy Samford |
| Betsy Faulkner (interim) | Stephanie Schmitt |
| David Kass | Kim Stahl |
| Janet Kelly-Scholle | Susan Sylvester |
| Derek Kemp | Tom Thornburg |

Other individuals in attendance were:

- | | |
|----------------|--------------|
| Grace Gibson | Cara Mills |
| Amy Kaufmann | Matthew Teal |
| Stephanie Kidd | |

Opening and Introductions

All individuals in attendance identified themselves and their affiliated school/administrative unit.

Policy Discussion Forum

Password Policies & Standard

Kim Stahl presented these edits and explained there are currently two policies and a standard which are being consolidated into one standard. She added that the plan is to move to onyen passwords that last one year but would need to be longer and stronger for security. Actual changes to the standard document include updating the structure for readability and for people

to find the information they need based on their roles.

Tom Thornburg asked what kinds of community feedback has IT received about the 17-character requirements?

Kim responded they have received some feedback. She said that IT went back and forth with the security office about how many characters we needed and 17 was the bare minimum

Dave Kass asked if the requirement supports pass phrases.

Kim replied that it does, and that IT is moving to the term "passphrase" and prefer people use phrases instead of just passwords.

Kathy Anderson added that this is truly best practice and that the Gillings School is encouraging people to use passwords sites like Key Pass.

Dave asked if there would be a recommended password site.

Kim and Kathy agreed there probably would not be a formal recommendation.

Mobile Device Policy

Stephanie Kidd presented the updates to this policy and noted that some employees are eligible for a stipend to cover some of the expenses for voice/data/cell expenses. She said that the edits were simply codifying current practice into policy. With the new language, mobile devices are defined as "cellular telephones and other devices allowing for cellular communication." Finance has removed "university-owned devices" language as this policy is for personal devices. She discussed the procedure language, commenting that the initiation is handled through an EPAR form and that the procedure includes information about changing funding sources. She also noted that the team was split on moving to a paperless process because the initiation was in EPAR but the termination forms have been on paper. The new vision is to move away from the paper termination form and go to a Remedy-based process for now (and using EPAR in the future).

Kathy Anderson said that the policy updates are very welcome and asked whether the policy only applies to cellular communications.

Stephanie responded that Finance is using language from the Office of State Budget and Management (cell, mobile, or wireless telephones, and other devices allowing for mobile communications). She also noted that some of the language in the policy included procedures and that language has been moved. Finally, she pointed out that this is a stipend, not a reimbursement.

Dave Kass commented that the stipend was initially intended to save the University money and to be compliant with the IRS. He asked if we've analyzed how much the University is actually saving?

Stephanie replied that her office had not and that no one has requested that data.

Janet Kelly-Scholle pointed out that the Mobile Device Policy has traditionally lived in Procurement and is just now moving to Finance, so she would be happy to ask Procurement that question.

Kim Stahl asked if the procedure could actually just be guidance listed in ConnectCarolina since the procedure is effectively telling people to “go complete a form.”

Stephanie replied that the feedback her office received was “We need instructions” and more details. The procedure was born out of the request for more formal guidance.

Kim recommended eliminating the word “Remedy” from the procedure since that’s a specific product and could be replaced in the future.

Derek Kemp directed a question to Kristen Lewis about whether what employees do on a mobile device was “discoverable” (in legal proceedings) was dependent on the receipt of the stipend or on the content of the communications.

Kristen replied that it’s the content of your communications. She continued to say that the discovery process can be messy and that her office has had to do line item redactions of some communications to sort out personal and professional content.

Kathy – stated that Derek was asking a really important question and that, if the device is owned by the University, it’s clear that the University has a claim. She said that IT informs its staff that, if you use your personal device for work (email, calls, etc.), it can be subject to confiscation and/or public records request. It’s not the receipt of a stipend.

Janet Kelly-Scholle clarified that personal emails and texts would not necessarily be subject to Public Records Requests.

Kristen agreed and stated that OUC will do its best to protect employee privacy but that someone from Public Records and/or OUC would be reviewing basically everything on the device.

Janet commented that there’s a lot of misunderstanding about the stipend and public records. She also commented that it might be a good idea to do a reminder training with people about what is subject to Public Records Requests and what is not.

Kristen replied that the Office of Public Records would probably be happy to do a speaking tour.

Amy Kaufmann added that separating personal and professional content is a big concern for the Public Records Office. She pointed out that best practice is to not put in writing anything you wouldn’t want other people (besides the intended recipient) to read.

Stephanie asked about employees who work from home, specifically if their phones could be confiscated because they receive work emails on their personal phone.

Kristen replied no, because UNC emails are hosted on the server. She did note, however, that Public Records would need any work-related text messages on the phone.

Media Guidelines

Amy Kaufmann from University Communications outlined the changes to the Media Guidelines policy, including changing “professor” to “appointed designee” for flexibility. She noted that this designee could also be a departmental communications person or other designee. Additionally,

media credentials are now required on campus (instead of being preferred). The policy now addresses the issue of filming minors and requests media RSVPs for public events if they will bring a lot of technical equipment so University staff can be prepared.

Campus Film Guidelines

Amy Kaufmann presented the changes to the Campus Film Guidelines and noted that the title has been changed to be more inclusive of all types of filming and devices. She clarified that UNC rarely allows commercial advertising and feature films to be filmed on campus. The policy has been updated to add Wilson Library as a prohibited filming location and that filmmakers are now required to submit a full synopsis and script instead of a storyboard prior to filming.

Tom Thornburg asked what the remedies are if people don't do what they're supposed to?

Amy responded that there are not currently consequences, but that the guidelines exist as preventative measures.

Derek Kemp pointed out that we have consequences for people filming with drones, but that's more because of the drones in the airspace, not because of the filming.

Amy asked Derek what that looks like and Derek responded that Campus Safety mostly just asks people to stop but would consider escalating consequences for repeat offenders.

Dave Kass asked how the policy relates to someone doing voice recordings in meetings?

Amy and Tim Sabo responded that's outside the scope of this policy.

Kristen Lewis clarified that NC is a one-party consent state. So recording a meeting without telling anyone might be shady, but it's not illegal.

Carolyn Atkins asked if a unit videotapes a university event, does that fall under this policy?

Amy answered that, if the department was using the video for anything other than internal department use, Communications would probably want to know.

Tim added that internal or University-use, is probably fine, but for uses with with Media or Commercial impact, Media Relations would like a heads up.

Janet Kelly-Scholle commented that Finance does internal filming as well and noted that since the word "Commercial" is no longer in the title, it's a little confusing. She pointed out that this policy seems to be more about internal filming with branding/logo, but not a lot of other internal filming.

Amy said she would take Janet's feedback to the team for clarification.

Janet added that some clarification around possible exceptions would be helpful.

Kim Stahl suggested adding the language "third party filming" to the policy.

Jennifer DeNeal asked whether we want this policy to be a University Procedure (instead of a guideline) since these procedures don't appear to be optional. She also asked a clarifying question about the exclusion language regarding Wilson Library.

Jessica Brinker asked if individual minors could be filmed, since the policy language referred to minors in school groups. She pointed out that UNC often hosts community events with kids that are not necessarily school groups.

Amy responded that individual minors could not be filmed and agreed to clarify the language.

Kristen offered to help with the clarification and suggested language like “identifiable minors.”

Tim said that he and Amy would move the guidelines into the University Procedure template and take the PRC feedback to the Media Relations team.

Matthew Teal offered to help transition the content into the appropriate template.

University Policy on Policies

Jennifer DeNeal presented the overview of changes for the University Policy on Policies (including a potential title change) and framed this conversation as the first of many regarding the definitions of academic vs. non-academic policies, handling of sensitive policies, and formatting.

Christy Samford commented that the University Catalog has archival requirements for what was policy at a certain time for students at the time of their attendance.

Kim Stahl commented on the potential name change that we want to make sure people still know it’s a policy.

Janet Kelly-Scholle asked where the specific policy statement is in the document.

Matthew Teal responded that there’s a section called policy development, etc. and restructured language. He noted that the Policy Office is open to continuing to tweak this in terms of formatting like the lack of a specific policy statement.

Kim added that the section on Unit documents appears to be missing.

Tom Thornburg commented that he likes the idea of including Unit policies in PolicyStat in theory, but not in practice. He added that people in units don’t understand the concept of policies/standards/procedures right now. It would be nice to make that aspirational and do more training before we make this a requirement.

Derek Kemp noted that some of the hard-to-find unit documents are not actually unit-level policies. Some of them have University policy implications.

Christy added that we need to clarify the definition of “unit” in the new document. Jennifer replied that she would double check and make sure that was included.

Kathy Anderson asked what behaviors the policy updates were trying to drive. She commented that, at the Gillings School, they try not to create unnecessary policies.

Jennifer responded that the Policy Office is specifically trying to address finding University policies masquerading as unit policies, making all policy documents easier to find, eliminating redundancies, and finding opportunities for collaboration. She agreed that PolicyStat is the most intuitive platform and that the Policy Office doesn’t want to “jam” everything in the system simply

for the sake of having everything there.

Derek asked how we find what is common across units and simplify.

Kim responded that part of the redundancy problem is people feeling like they need written policies to get anything done. She pointed out that a lot of what's in PolicyStat is instructional.

Jennifer replied that putting everything in PolicyStat is one way to find the duplicates.

Kim agreed, but noted that the entire world doesn't need to see that kind of duplication – perhaps if we could do the sorting behind an onyen wall, that would make more sense.

Stephanie said the telecommuting policy is a good example. She asked if the document is a policy? Guidance?

Jennifer replied that this is the larger question of what is policy and what is just management.

Kim commented that more language about what is **not** policy, standard, or procedure would be helpful. She also listed two concerns: (1) "Sensitive" has a specific meaning in the UNC Information Classification system, and (2) the Policy & Procedures Working Group intended to change the culture of policy writing but that we're not there yet. One important thing from that working group was to have policies approved at the Dean/Vice Chancellor level. Creating "policymakers."

Jennifer noted that the Policy Office is simply trying to reflect current practice in who does the vast majority of work on policies.

Kim suggested potentially adding Deans and Vice Chancellors into the workflows but not making them the actual Issuing Officers.

Derek expressed concerns about individuals in upper leadership being bottlenecks to the process.

Janet added that Finance has department heads using designees in PolicyStat to get things done.

Kim suggested we think about moving to a few big "policies" and push everything else done into standards and procedures.

Jennifer added that then the main policies could be approved by the Dean or Vice Chancellor.

Jessica Brinker pointed out that not all units have a Dean or Vice Chancellor. The Friday Center reports directly to the provost.

Stephanie clarified that the Provost would be the Vice Chancellor role for almost everything.

Jennifer replied that the Policy Office would keep working on the language and thanked everyone for their feedback.

Updates from the PolicyStat Technical Working Group

Matthew Teal announced Gary Wilhelm as a new member of the Working Group. He reported that the new User Interface is still on track for the end of Quarter 2, 2019 and will be called "PolicyStat Everywhere." Matthew will be attending the national PolicyStat conference in June and will report back. He hopes to be able to better educate the developers on our needs in higher education. He

then briefly outlined the question of sensitive policy documents and the need to store them in a more restricted part of PolicyStat.

Derek Kemp asked why these documents need to be in PolicyStat at all.

Jennifer DeNeal responded that philosophically it's just about having everything in one system instead of stored more disparately across different systems on campus.

Kim Stahl added that we could create a new policy stating that nothing "Tier II" or higher goes into a "big P policy" and could be kept off of PolicyStat.

Derek commented that compartmentalization of sensitive information is fairly standard.

Social Media Policy Discussion

Jennifer DeNeal gave an overview of the Social Media policy research conducted by the Policy Office and opened the discussion for comments from PRC members.

Kristen Lewis provided background that First Amendment concerns killed the last attempt to create a University Social Media Policy because some peoples' job responsibilities have different implications for the university. It was politically worrisome, and one-size fits was unlikely to work.

Kim Stahl pointed out that Social Media is showing up on more and more audit questions. IT folks are more concerned with data protection, which doesn't explicitly need a social media policy.

Matthew Teal commented that UVA's social media policy explicitly cross references the high-level data protection policy.

Jennifer noted that peer institution policies largely have statement about first amendment protections, but that the policies may not hold up in court.

Kristen agreed that some of those policies could be facially unconstitutional.

Matthew added that many of the policies at other institutions govern school-affiliated accounts and differentiate between school accounts and personal.

Kristen commented that it sounds like those schools have made the policy decision to have university standards on social media vs. our decentralized system with a diverse web presence.

Kathy Anderson added that the discussions in the School of Public Health have focused more on "who gets to speak as the school of public health or dept. of statistics, etc." And said that her focus is on sorting out those kinds of questions.

Derek Kemp noted that high-level employees can still be speaking on behalf of the University from their personal accounts and shared an anecdote about the rumored Obama visit to campus.

Tom Thornburg asked why, strategically, the PRC was discussing a potential policy.

Jennifer responded that the intent of the discussion was to get feedback from a large group of stakeholders and then pass along the research and feedback to the unit responsible for the topic area (in this case, University Communications). She clarified that PRC itself would not be the source of new policies.

Tim Sabo commented that there is a lot of interest in solutions to social media questions and that Communications would like to revisit the question with the Office of University Counsel.

Jennifer agreed to send the social media research to Tim to share with Communications staff.

Nuts and Bolts of Being a Policy Liaison

Jennifer DeNeal began by noting that the PRC had experienced some natural turnover in Liaisons. She passed out a document containing a few expectations of Liaisons and commented that the beginning of the year was a good time to refresh everyone on the expectations and “reset.” She also thanked the Liaisons for their work and noted that she appreciated all the work they do above and beyond their job descriptions. She also pointed out that formal appointment letters would be coming to each Liaison via email for their records. The high-level expectations from the document are summarized below:

1. Use the two-week comment period each month to review all policies/standards/procedures submitted to the Policy Review Committee.
2. Engage in Policy Communication
3. Attend PRC Meetings
4. Involvement in policy drafts from respective school/college/department

Tom Thornburg commented that he has appreciated the executive summary documents prior to each meeting because he is not always able to review policies in their entirety.

Policy Liaison Updates

Dave Kass, Development – reviewing our “policies” and discovering most of what we have is procedure. Gift Acceptance policy is under review

Kristen Lewis, OUC –free speech policy based on the System policy. It’s in the template.

Tim Sabo, Communication – Policies being presented today at PRC, and agreed to look at the social media research currently completed by the Policy Office.

Natalie Albertson, Business – Will look into the branding/logo social media policies

Lisa Miller, Nursing – working through first year review of everything in PolicyStat. Challenge of the week is faculty governance and who is the issuing officer for faculty governance.

Kim Stahl, ITS – revising the suite of HIPPA policies, beginning work Incident Management policies

Kathy Anderson, Public Health– No policy updates to report, but indicated an interest in a potential university-wide social media policy and any progress on that front.

Jennifer DeNeal, Policy Office – Unit policy research is still underway.

Janet Kelly-Scholle, Finance – capital assets policy being formatted and renumbered. Communications coming soon about Mobile Device Change and minor procedure changes

Derek Kemp, Finance & Operations –Facilities Use policy and standard underway

Stephanie Schmitt, Graduate School – No policy updates to report.

Jessica Brinker, Friday Institute – No policy updates to report.

Susan Sylvester - No policy updates to report.

Tom Thornburg, Government – No policy updates to report.

Betsy Faulkner – No policy updates to report.

Adjournment

With all policy business concluded, the PRC adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Next Meeting: PRC Office Hours, March 28, 10:00 a.m., Zoom Call

Upcoming Training

Extreme Makeover: UNC Policy Edition

Tuesday, April 9, 10:00 – 11:30 a.m., AOB 1501-C

University Policy Management System (PolicyStat) Training

TBA following new PolicyStat UI release