



**Policy Review Committee**

October 25, 2018 | 10:00 – 11:30 am  
Pleasants Family Assembly Room  
Wilson Library

The UNC Policy Review Committee (PRC) met for its regular monthly meeting on October 25, 2018 and the following members were present:

Carolyn Atkins  
Jennifer DeNeal  
Eric Everett  
Elizabeth Josephs  
Janet Kelly-Scholle  
Ken Langley  
Ann Lemmon

Becci Menghini  
Lisa Miller  
Chris Payne  
Christy Samford  
Kim Stahl  
Tom Thornburg  
Roy Zwahlen

Other individuals in attendance were:

Elisia Ceballo-Countryman  
(McKinsey)  
Sarah Haynes  
Gabby Hubert  
Susan Kellogg

Walter Miller  
Duwain Pinder (McKinsey)  
Matt Teal  
Rick Wernoski  
Anna Wu

**Opening and Introductions**

All individuals around the table identified themselves & their affiliated school/administrative unit.

**Policy Discussion Forum**

- [1270 – Policy on Employee Moving Expense Reimbursements /1270.1 Procedure for Employee Moving Expense Reimbursements](#)
  - Walter Miller presented the Employee Moving Expense policy and procedure. Based on input from Ben Davidson in the Office of University Counsel, Walter noted that his office would be modifying and updating some of the policy language regarding

post-docs and would provide an updated version (with new FAQs) to the PRC as quickly as possible.

- [1107 - Policy on Required Payroll Taxes](#)
  - Walter also presented this policy and said that the changes to this document amounted to “policy cleanup” work.
- [1107.1 – Procedure for Completing Federal and State Withholding Tax Forms](#)
  - Walter explained that this procedure was being updated with language for using People Soft to make updated instead of a paper process at the Payroll Office.
- [1107.2 - Procedure for Payroll Reporting of Employees Who Work Outside of NC](#)
  - This is a new procedure for employees who work in other states (inside the United States) on behalf of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- [1107.2.1f – Notice of Employee Working Outside of North Carolina](#)
  - This new form for out of state employees is a combination of three existing forms.
  - Ann Lemmon asked a question about faculty members working in other states.
  - Walter clarified that there is not a systematic approach to people working on behalf of the University in another states (as opposed to an assigned duty station). He also said the most interesting case he’d encountered was a person with residency in NM and working on behalf of the university in DC.
  - Ann commented that, for tax purposes, Payroll can encounter complications in states with no income tax (e.g. Texas). Walter agreed.
- [Facilities Use Policy](#) / [Facilities Use Standard](#) / [Temporary Outdoor Signage Form](#)
  - Anna Wu presented updates to the Facilities Use policy, procedure, and temporary outdoor signage form. She listed two main reasons for the updates: 1) migration of content to the new templates, and 2) ensuring consistency and clarity. She added that Facilities had added clarifications to address the issue of banners and signage. Since many facilities are delegated to specific units for administration, Facilities also wanted to clarify that those facilities are subject to the University Facilities Use Policy (even if they have additional, unit-level requirements as well).
  - Banners and signage – no banners are allowed on the exterior of buildings or trees. Facilities has a new form for a unit to approve temporary signage/banners on the exterior of campus. In some cases, the signage/banners need to be installed (especially large banners or signage on light posts) by Facilities. Installation can sometimes be unsafe or cause damage to buildings if done improperly.
  - The policy also addresses interior signage for exterior viewing. Since the University cannot regulate personal messaging based on content, the policy applies one consistent prohibition of all interior signage for exterior viewing. Anna pointed out that Residential Life is already enforcing this rule.
  - Tom Thornburg asked how Housing approaches enforcement.
  - Chris Payne answered that it usually starts out with a conversation with residents, especially if the sign is or could be perceived as offensive. He noted that, usually, residents are understanding, and it doesn’t escalate further.
  - Tom replied that he was just trying to imagine that conversation with a senior faculty member and Chris agreed that it would likely be a different conversation.

- Anna commented that those conversations would be had by the Senior Associate Deans. She stated that Facilities has had issues with bumper stickers on work vehicles and added that they have asked the units to take the lead on enforcement so it's not just campus safety, facilities, etc. as the sole enforcement mechanism.
- Roy Zwahlen asked about "interior and interior facing" signage.
- Anna replied that those areas are already delegated to the units. She also pointed out that units should be careful to have consistent scheduling policies for facilities and could not decide to accept or deny reservations based on content.
- Paul Pogge had a question (posted on PolicyStat) about what the "extended duration" means in relation to athletic camps. Anna clarified that Facilities did not intend to exclude athletic camps and would review the language.
- Anna commented on one additional language change adding the Stone Center to the list of buildings that can administer the scheduling of their own facilities after hours (since the Registrar schedules the classrooms).

### **Updates from the Provost's Office - The Carolina Excellence Initiative**

- Members of the Carolina Excellence Initiative (CEI) team (Rick Wernoski, Susan Kellogg, Elisia Ceballo-Countryman, and Duwain Pinder) introduced themselves. Rick laid the groundwork for the initiative and said the team wanted to meet with the PRC because some of the feedback they've heard so far has to do with policy questions and issues. He outlined how this effort is not about cost-savings - it's about operational efficiency and added that the team has met with 20 schools/units so far collecting feedback and learning about how the end user sees operational excellence at UNC. He identified two potential "quick win" opportunities: Human Resources (hiring) and Procurement.
- Rick outlined the scope of the conversation, asking PRC members to share some of the challenges in the business operations area of the University and then transition the conversation to how the CEI can work with PRC.
- Eric Everett asked if the team had already considered external factors (ex: visas).
- Rick replied that they're looking from the day someone says they're leaving until a new person is hired to be in that role. They want to build best practice in the schools/units, and at the central OHR level. Once Chapel Hill has optimized its internal processes, the Provost will work with the System Office to streamline system-level processes.
- Ann Lemmon clarified that the CEI team wasn't trying to address "special circumstances" (like traveling to conventions to interview faculty).
- Rick confirmed that was correct and that they're trying to create a baseline. He proposed potentially using the SHRA process as a baseline. Ex: if the appropriate timeline to post an SHRA position is two weeks, maybe EHRA is four weeks.
- Roy Zwahlen asked who we see as our "best in class" comparison universities?
- Duwain Pinder responded that there are two sets of benchmarks: 1) internal to UNC (trying to find best practice within a school) and 2) other universities and other external organizations in the private sector. The private sector standard is 30-40 days to hire.
- Rick noted that they want to be very transparent about this process.
- Ken Langley commented that transitioning IT people into EHRA has really slowed down

the hiring process and asked if we can think about different categories. For example, he noted that some EHRA roles might need national searches, but in areas like IT (where we have a lot of local talent), we might not need that.

- Rick replied that they're separating the categories (like EHRA non-faculty) into groups.
- Ken identified one of the biggest challenges from an IT perspective is getting a large enough committee with the mandated expertise for interviews.
- Rick added that, to increase efficiency, search committees should be convened, and meetings scheduled the day the job is posted (since we know how long a job will stay posted) instead of waiting to coordinate calendars and people until after the job closes.
- Kim Stahl asked if there was going to be guidance given to hiring managers or committees? She also asked if "best practices" include things we already know work (rubrics for the committee, eliminating names from apps for committee)?
- Rick replied that all those things are on the table. As the design team goes through the process, they'll be looking to pilot the system and the team is going to want to conduct thorough measurements and follow ups with whoever ends up piloting.
- Roy asked if the team was reviewing policies as well as logistics.
- Rick acknowledged that they're thinking about how policy can positively or negatively impact the process but acknowledged the need for a bigger strategy.
- Roy encouraged the team to think about how the University is interpreting external policies. He asked if this initiative and the Blueprint for Next were aligned intentionally.
- Rick noted that, at a high level, this operational excellence initiative is driven by the Blueprint for Next. But that some administrative barriers have prevented forward motion in policy development.
- Kim suggested that we need to distinguish between the "big P" policies, standards, procedures, and the things that should just be guidelines and help documents. She commented that we need to think about where we really need the weight of a University policy. She also discussed the issue that our current process doesn't give people a good idea of when they need to consult with someone and get information or when they really need approval for something. Often, people get pulled into other processes when it's ambiguous and end up creating even bigger ad hoc processes that aren't real (brought about by people trying to be collaborative).
- Ken added that "getting things done" should happen through defined processes, not because someone "knows the right people."
- Jen DeNeal asked how the PRC fits in with the larger vision and what it can do to help.
- Susan Kellogg asked what liaisons do when they run into policies from other units that don't look exactly right. She noted that they're seeing individual policies across campus that need work but are not sure how to sort through and solve the individual issues. She also commented that she's more interested in the unintended consequences of policies and asked if PRC is a group that could help work through them.
- Kim replied that similar problems exist in a lot of the "liaison" groups on campus. Usually, the committee is only a small part of peoples' jobs and it's difficult to measure effort outside of meeting attendance. We need to be able to handle this diverse, distributed, University structure and the liaison model is good except that being a

liaison is rarely someone's whole job and we don't measure them on how they do it.

- Becci Menghini agreed that resources and decentralization are both part of the problem. In the hiring example, everyone looks at HR, but 2/3 of the hiring process happens at the unit level. Bringing people from across campus together to think about how to improve the process doesn't necessarily translate to change at the hiring manage level. She pointed out that we have a larger issue of not managing change well and looking to policies instead of having conversations about "what's right."
- Susan replied that she's not trying to get to the "I don't like it" response (change management is hard), but more thinking about how units are paying contractors instead of using volunteers because the process for vetting volunteers is too difficult.
- Ann Lemmon commented that there is no structure to our policies and that we need a manual. She agreed with Becci that we sometimes use policy as a cudgel, but that part of the issue is that there are so many policies, people are just lost. She also noted that policy approval can be confusing, especially with Board of Trustees policies.
- Matthew Teal commented that policies are no longer carved in stone, because of annual review in PolicyStat and that we need people to adopt a more iterative mindset.
- Susan asked if a layperson could initiate a review.
- Matthew replied that the standard template includes contact information and an Issuing Officer anyone can contact with questions.
- Kim provided context that, when the Policy on Policies (POP) was created, there was concern about a new central policy unit and the unintended consequence is that the policy office has little authority – their role is more consultative. We need them to have the ability to say, "this is how things look, these are our structures, this is our process."
- Susan commented that we need to help change the culture to one of looking at policies and recognizing that when policies are reviewed, they don't have to change.
- Jen commented that the current reality is that basically every policy does need to be changed and edited (even if just to align with the "new" templates). She added that there is a resource issue here (with liaisons doing this work plus their regular jobs).
- Ken described Relative Value Units that allow medical school faculty to participate on committees or other activities and get credit for their regular work.
- Elizabeth Josephs observed that the PRC is very reactive instead of proactive, looking at policies when a change is immediately needed, instead of looking at the bigger picture.
- Janet Kelly-Scholle commented that units have managed their own policies for a long time and that's why we have a lot of duplication. Enforcement of the policy process is challenging because the "owners" are often senior staff members who are rarely the people editing and managing the policies.
- Kim added that dedicating additional resources for policy before the creation of the Policy Office would probably have been ineffective, but not there is a more defined process and we need more resources to support it.
- Becci commented that responsibility and authority for policies needs to be clear. She described concerns regarding the consensual relationships policy that successfully came through the PRC process, but stalled when Deans did not agree with the policy. Since Deans will eventually be responsible for enforcing the policy, their collective

agreement is important, but that isn't built into the process.

- Kim noted that, when policy violations occur, it's hard to get any enforcement. Some of our policies have conditions/consequences, but they rely on humans to enforce.
- Lisa Miller commented that the School of Nursing tries to address the risk of not having a policy within their policy process and it results in a more thoughtful review.

## **Policy Liaison Updates**

Becci Menghini, EOC – Working on the consensual relationships policy

Tom Thornburg, Government – No policy updates to report.

Kim Stahl, Information Technology – One-year password standard and ISL standard

Elizabeth Josephs, University Counsel – Non-solicitation policy, list of high-risk policies for PRC

Lisa Miller, Nursing – Updating unit policies in PolicyStat

Christy Samford, University Registrar – Unit policies on teleworking and flex time, academic policies

Ken Langley, Medicine – Unit policies: change management, vendor management, & access control

Chris Payne, Student Affairs – Working with the Alcohol Task Force on PRC comments

Caroline Atkins, Development – No policy updates to report.

Janet Kelly-Scholle, Finance – No policy updates to report.

Roy Zwahlen, Pharmacy – No policy updates to report.

Eric Everett, Dentistry – Uploading unit policies and standards into PolicyStat

Matthew Teal, Policy Office – The PolicyStat technical working group has met twice, working on updates and timelines for next month. Looking at creating a RACI (responsible, accountable, consulted, informed) Chart for university policies and the PRC.

## **Adjournment**

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

**Next Meeting:** Thursday, Nov 29, 2018, 10:00–11:30 am, Pleasants Family Room, Wilson Library

## Upcoming Training

### **Extreme Makeover: UNC Policy Edition**

Thursday, February 14, 10:00 – 11:30 a.m., AOB 1501-C

Tuesday, April 8, 10:00 – 11:30 a.m., AOB 1501-C

### **University Policy Management System (PolicyStat) Training**

TBA following new PolicyStat UI release