Policy Review Committee
July 26, 2018 | 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.
Pleasants Family Assembly Room

The UNC Policy Review Committee (PRC) met for its regular monthly meeting on July 26, 2018 and the following members were present:

Carolyn Atkins                Lisa Miller
Kathy Bryant                  Christopher Payne
Linc Butler                   Tim Sabo
Jeff Cannon                   Christy Samford
Robin Cyr                     Michael Smith
Jennifer DeNeal               Kim Stahl
Catherine Gerdes             Tom Thornburg
Elizabeth Josephs             Kathi Wimmer
Janet Kelly-Scholle           Roy Zwahlen

Other individuals in attendance were:
Grace Breazeale               Rebecca Schaefer
Travis Henderson              Christine Shia
Jessica Hwang-Strickland      Matthew Teal
Mary Walker Rippe             Missy Wilson-Grissom
Janet Rupert

Opening and Introductions    10:00 – 10:05
All individuals around the table identified themselves and their affiliated school/administrative unit.

Incorporating Office of University Counsel (OUC) into Policy Review    10:05 – 10:20
Rebecca Schaefer noted that the Policy Office had presented PolicyStat to OUC which led to a larger discussion of when and how University attorneys should be “plugged in” to policy reviews. The OUC discussions revolved around a desire to create a thoughtful, efficient, review process – i.e. not commenting too early before policies are reviewed by other stakeholders, but also not at the very end of
the process when the review is effectively complete. Her recommended timeline was two weeks to one month prior to PRC that a policy would come to an attorney in OUC with content expertise. Following Rebecca’s opening comments, the floor was opened to questions and/or comments from attendees:

- Christine Shia voiced concerns regarding the extra time for review and noted that many operational policies (especially finance policies) need to be able to move quickly.
- Kim Stahl pointed out that one timeline will likely not work for everyone and that some units need OUC input much earlier than two weeks before PRC to engage all relevant stakeholders.
- Kathy Bryant agreed that the timelines on which policies are created vary widely.
- Janet Kelly-Scholle explained that Finance has a subcommittee reviewing policies prior to PRC and that OUC probably wouldn’t want to see policies until after the subcommittee review.
- Rebecca Schaefer clarified that OUC wants to have a safety net function – they want to ensure an OUC review is happening, wherever that is most convenient.
- Jen DeNeal suggested that the Policy Office could make OUC the final step in any Policy Stat Workflow and noted that attorneys can be invited to collaborate electronically on a document earlier in the process.
- Kim Stahl voiced opposition to making OUC the final step in each workflow and pointed out that OUC is often involved in policy review along the way and that creating an extra final step would slow down the work. Robin Cyr concurred.
- Elizabeth Josephs identified two major issues of discussion: 1) OUC needs adequate time to review a policy prior to PRC, and 2) OUC wants to ensure attorneys can review policies coming from units that have not been as actively seeking OUC consultation.
- Jen DeNeal suggested that the Executive Summary form be updated to explicitly ask if a policy has been reviewed by OUC and then, if not, the Policy Office can send the policy to a paralegal in OUC to route the policy to the appropriate attorney.
- Rebecca Shaefer responded that the suggestion seemed reasonable but wanted to know the comfort level of PRC members working with OUC via email rather than through PolicyStat.
- Kim Stahl recommended that the designated paralegal be added to the PRC list in PolicyStat to stay apprised of all policies coming through the committee.
- Rebecca Schaefer agreed to see which paralegal would be willing to work on this effort and to send the name to Jen via email.

Following the conclusion of the OUC discussion, Jen DeNeal recommended that the policy discussion items be moved up on the agenda so that presenters could complete their presentations and then leave the meeting. There was no disagreement or discussion of the suggestion and the agenda was modified.

Policy Discussion Forum 10:20 – 10:50

a. [Procedure on Determining Vendor Documentation](#)

- Janet Rupert provided a brief overview of the proposed policy changes to require new vendors to accept ACH payments. She noted that the policy is intended to capture larger payments going to vendors and would exempt students without bank accounts. The changes are intended to reduce the number of paper checks to vendors.
- Kim Stahl asked how big the change is for the university.
- Travis Henderson and Janet Rupert replied that currently vendor payments are approximately
50/50 checks and ACH, so the change to 100% ACH is significant. Travis pointed out that ACH is also cheaper than paper checks.
- Janet Rupert added that ACH is faster and less risky than mailing paper checks.
- Kathi Wimmer asked if the change to ACH payments would be required in contract renewals. Janet Rupert said yes, ACH would be required for contract renewals.

b. Purchasing Card Policy and Procedure Changes

- Jessica Hwang-Strickland presented a PowerPoint containing the Procurement Card (P-Card) system and policy changes.
- Tom Thornburg asked if the changed had been vetted through legal and internal audit.
- Jessica Hwang-Strickland indicated that both departments had approved the changes.
- Roy Zwahlen asked about the anticipated savings to the University by switching from campus vouchers to P-card transactions?
  - Travis Henderson said that 122,000 transactions under $250 go through campus voucher annually. Conservative estimates are that the university will save $50-75/transaction just on operational costs. He added that a conservative estimate means actual savings may be higher.
  - Roy Zwahlen asked why the use of P-Cards for travel had not been expanded further.
  - Travis Henderson indicated that travel is the next “big rock” for procurement to tackle.
  - Michael Smith asked what “student travel by request” meant in the policy.
  - Jessica Hwang-Strickland answered that there’s an online form for department to fill out.
  - Travis Henderson added that procurement would likely be very open to student travel, but it will be done on a case by case basis.
  - Kathi Wimmer said that her department has some questions about the procedures associated with these policies. She recommended the creation of more standardized forms and mandatory training for P-Card holders.
  - Travis Henderson noted that training is mandatory now and will continue to be mandatory. He stated the new training going forward will mostly be around how to use the new work system, but that procurement can revise training as policies are revised and approved, so that current P-Card holders can be recertified with the new information and system.

Policy Review Strategic Planning

For the policy review strategic planning session, Jen DeNeal asked PRC members to form into small
groups of 3-5 members and discuss the following:

a. 10 minutes: Recurrent/Difficult Issues with potential policy implications
b. 10 minutes: unit or personal policy goals
c. 5 minutes: quarterly/monthly meeting – suggest day/time if different – prepare to share
d. 5 minutes: Share out with group

Group 1: Kim, Kathi, Catherine, Tom, Michael – meetings: if less frequently than monthly, PRC will need a major change in how we review policies – we like hearing from the business owners, but can’t wait three months to schedule presentations. If meetings are quarterly, they should be longer meetings.

Group 2: Lisa, Chris, Jeff, Kathy, Tim – Prefer quarterly meetings. Guidelines on application of university policy/standard/procedures might be helpful. Group generally liked the current direction of the work – increased communication between units has been helpful. Student Affairs would like to (eventually) load unit level policies into PolicyStat.

Group 3: Roy, Elizabeth, Line, Carolyn – taking house cleaning, tactical policy work to the next level. Also, what’s the next iteration of PRC (within the context of Blueprint for Next)? Could PRC be a place where strategic leads (global engagement, convergent science) come proactively with policies that might be problematic? Health sciences in Asheville will need help with policy revision. Policy streamlining.

Group 4: Robin, Janet, Christy – Some concerns about moving to quarterly meetings because of possibly delaying policy review and losing accountability. Clarifying who is a policy owner, who is an issuing officer, what is the role of this committee? Cleaning up everything in PolicyStat. Potentially adding new liaisons to each group or a communication to policy owners about their roles and what they’ll be getting from PolicyStat, what they do when they get an email, etc.

Closing thoughts/questions/upcoming items 11:25 – 11:30

- Reminders from Jen:
  - Comment period for today’s policies closes on August 2
  - August 21 is the deadline for August PRC executive summaries
  - Policies for August PRC need to be updated in PolicyStat by August 22
  - The Whistleblower policy will go live on July 31

Adjournment

With all policy business concluded, the PRC adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

Next Meeting: August 30, 2018, 10:00-11:30 am, Pleasants Family Room, Wilson Library

Upcoming Training (registration via links below)

**Extreme Makeover: UNC Policy Edition**
Wednesday, August 15, 9:00 AM – 10:30 AM

**PolicyStat Training Webinar III**
Date TBD