

COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL AND TENURE

Draft Minutes: April 10 2014 at 2:30 p.m.

University of North Carolina General Administration, Executive Conference Room

OPEN SESSION

The following members were present: Chair, John Fennebresque; Vice Chair, G.A. Sywassink; Secretary, Jim Holmes; Doyle Parrish, Therence Pickett, Richard Taylor, and Laura Wiley.

The following staff were present: Suzanne Ortega, William Fleming, Samantha McAuliffe, Brian Usischon, and Joanna Carey Cleveland.

Mr. Fennebresque welcomed Ms. Joanna Carey Cleveland, legal counsel to the Personnel and Tenure Committee.

1. Minutes of February 20, 2014 and March 12, 2014

Mr. Fennebresque requested a motion to approve the minutes of the February 20, 2014 and March 12, 2014 meetings.

MOTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of the February 20, 2014 and March 12, 2014 meetings be approved as circulated.

Motion: Mr. Therence Pickett

Second: Mr. James Holmes

Motion Carried

2. Informational Report: Affordable Care Act Update

Mr. Fennebresque requested that the update on the Affordable Care Act be tabled until the June meeting. The Committee accepted this request.

3. Vote: Policy Clarifications

Mr. Fleming explained that Policy 300.1.1 was established to provide a framework for personnel decisions affecting Senior Academic and Administrative Officers. The changes to the policy are minimal and act as clarification in order to make the policy more easily understood and followed. There is no content impact that would change the overall purpose of the policy. Specifically, the terms "Tier I" and "Tier II" are commonly used on campuses to distinguish the policies governing SAAOs. The suggested edits incorporate this verbiage to enhance clarity.

The changes to Policy 300.1.1 require a vote of the Personnel and Tenure Committee which will forward the Policy for approval of the full Board of Governors at the June meeting.

MOTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the changes to Policy 300.1.1 be approved and forwarded to the full Board for approval at the June 2014 meeting.

Motion: Mr. Doyle Parrish

Second: Ms. Laura Wiley

Motion Carried

4. Vote: Post-Tenure Review Committee Update

Mr. G.A. Sywassink, working group Chair, reminded the Committee of the Post-Tenure Review Working Group's members and goals which were to update the policy to ensure a consistent and rigorous review of tenured faculty members. The Working Group focused on the review process in an effort to improve the feedback faculty members receive during the process. The proposed changes in the policy and guidelines fall into three categories: alignment between annual and five-year reviews, addition of training, review by Deans, and evaluation that the process and training are being completed, and creation of three evaluator categories. The current policy requires that post-tenure review be aligned with annual performance evaluations but also goes on to suggest that annual reviews are not substitutes for a "comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review." To better align annual performance reviews and post-tenure review, the working group recommends that post-tenure review be based on a set of directional goals proposed by the faculty member at the beginning of the review cycle. These directional goals should act as a guide for the professional growth of the faculty member over the coming five-year period. Directional goals will be approved by the department chair and will contain milestones to be incorporated into annual performance evaluations. These directional goals can be modified annually by the faculty member in consultation with the Department Chair.

Secondly, current policy requires that post-tenure review outcomes be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels. To increase consistency throughout the system, the proposed policy requires that Deans provide an evaluative review in addition to the peer review committee and department chair evaluations. Annually, the Provost will certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process, for that year, are in compliance with policy and guidelines.

Thirdly, in an effort to ensure the post-tenure review process is constructive and aids in strengthening faculty performance and professional growth, the proposed policy incorporates training opportunities for evaluators involved in the post-tenure review process. The proposal further specifies that to further strengthen the post-tenure review process and ensure consistency of process across the system, regular evaluations of campus process and training will be conducted to ensure that training and processes are being executed pursuant to policy.

Finally, the proposed policy requires the use of three assessment categories in the post-tenure review evaluation. These categories are, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, and does not meet expectations. Standard categories not only provide consistency across the system in terms of evaluation metrics, but also satisfy one of the main goals of the post-tenure review policy which is to recognize exemplary faculty performance.

The Working Group sought to identify areas where the post-tenure review policy and guidelines could be strengthened. Specifically, the working group wished to identify areas where greater consistency could be achieved in implementing policy across the system. An additional outcome was to increase the rigor and accountability of the process. The working group felt strongly that the post-tenure review process be positive in nature and allow for recognition of exemplary performance, as well as a constructive evaluation process by which faculty could continue professional growth. Mr. Sywassink requested that the committee consider the updated policy for approval and opened the floor for questions and discussion.

The Committee and attendees discussed the proposed changes. Committee members expressed their pleasure with the policy review process and their agreement with the proposed three-tiered performance categories. Chancellors expressed their concern for mandating the three categories and proposed allowing campuses to have flexibility in determining the categories based on their unique missions and departmental differences. The overriding goal of the review was ensuring that there was a level of consistency of the process across the system. Flexibility and consistency are often in conflict with one another.

The concern about mandating a three-tiered system seems to be based on a sense that there is an expectation of a proportional distribution among the performance categories. Campuses could think about the criteria and process for identifying how these categories are applied when making decisions about the distribution of merit funding. This could be a catalyst for having conversations about fairness and equity on each campus. A compromise of allowing at least three categories was suggested. Another suggestion was to approve the recommendations as a draft and over the course of the next year or two study this as a pilot. During this time campuses would bring back suggestions for edits. The Committee Chair decided that the concerns with the suggested edits did not rise to the level of requiring postponement of the action. The Committee decided to allow campuses latitude in creating the evaluation categories and to edit the policy to read that campuses must have a minimum of three categories.

Mr. Fennebresque called for a motion to approve the policy with this change.

MOTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the edits to Policy 400.3. be approved with the change of wording to allow campuses more than three performance evaluation categories. This policy will be forwarded to the full Board for approval at the June 2014 meeting.

Motion: Mr. Doyle Parrish
Second: Mr. James Holmes
Motion Carried

5. Informational Report: President's Summary Personnel Report

Dr. Ortega called the Committee's attention to the President's Summary Personnel Report

which is provided pursuant to Policy 200.6.

6. VOTE: Optional Retirement Program

Mr. Fleming provided an overview of the changes in the Optional Retirement Program noting that the President's decision regarding investment options and vendors was informed by extensive outside analysis. These changes will save the University money and will lower fees. Due to these changes, there are updates required to the Trust Agreements, including termination of contracts with two vendors. The resolution was provided to the Committee.

MOTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the North Carolina Optional Retirement Plan Trust Agreements resolution be approved as presented.

Motion: Mr. James Holmes

Second: Mr. G.A. Sywassink

Motion Carried

7. VOTE: Clinical Faculty Compensation Plan

The Committee reviewed a request from East Carolina University to have delegated authority to approve salary adjustments resulting in increases of 10% or more and \$10,000 or more pursuant to their clinical faculty compensation plan. ECU's clinical faculty compensation plan was first adopted by the UNC Board of Governors in May 1996, and allows for annual alterations of compensation (both upwards and downwards) as changing financial conditions dictate. Financial support for the plan is largely derived from income earned by the faculty providing medical care, in addition to contract awards and research grants, rather than State appropriations.

Currently, salary adjustments resulting increases of 10% and \$10,000 or more require pre-approval by either the Personnel and Tenure Committee or the President.

MOTION: BE IT RESOLVED that ECU receive delegated authority as presented.

Motion: Mr. James Holmes

Second: Mr. Doyle Parrish

Motion Carried

Mr. Fennebresque requested a motion to move into closed session.

MOTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the Personnel and Tenure Committee move into Closed Session to "consider the qualifications, performance, and appointment conditions of employees; instruct the University's staff concerning the establishment or negotiation of employment contracts and compensation; and consult with counsel."

[N.C.G.S. §143.318.11(a)(1)(3)(5)&(6)]

Motion: Mr. Richard Taylor
Second: Mr. James Holmes
Motion Carried

***The meeting was moved into closed session.
(The complete minutes of the Closed Session are recorded in Appendix A.)***

Mr. Fennebresque called for a motion to return to Open Session.

MOTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the Personnel and Tenure Committee return to Open Session.

Motion: Mr. Richard Taylor
Second: Mr. Therence Pickett
Motion Carried.

The Committee returned to Open Session.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Mr. James Holmes, Secretary

Attachment

COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL AND TENURE

Draft Minutes: May 15, 2014 at 9:00 a.m.

University of North Carolina General Administration, Executive Conference Room

OPEN SESSION

The following members were present: Chair, John Fennebresque; Vice Chair, GA Sywassink; Richard Taylor, Doyle Parrish, Therence Pickett, and Laura Wiley.

The following members were absent: James Holmes

The following staff were present: Joanna Carey Cleveland, William Fleming, Samantha McAuliffe, and Suzanne Ortega

1. Salary/Compensation Discussion

Mr. Fennebresque reminded the Committee that today's conference call was to discuss salary pre-approvals.

MOTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the Personnel and Tenure Committee move into Closed Session to "consider the qualifications, performance, and appointment conditions of employees; instruct the University's staff concerning the establishment or negotiation of employment contracts and compensation; and consult with counsel."

[N.C.G.S. §143.318.11(a)(1)(3)(5)&(6)]

Motion: Mr. John Fennebresque

Second: Mr. Richard Taylor

Motion Carried

The meeting was moved into closed session.

(The complete minutes of the Closed Session are recorded in Appendix A.)

Mr. Fennebresque called for a motion to return to Open Session.

MOTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the Personnel and Tenure Committee return to Open Session.

Motion: Ms. Laura Wiley

Second: Mr. Doyle Parrish

Motion Carried.

The Committee returned to Open Session.

There was discussion of the upcoming report on the funds raised by the new Advancement Division within General Administration as well as faculty retention reporting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Mr. James Holmes, Secretary

Attachment