



MEETING OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
Committee on Personnel and Tenure

May 23, 2018 at 8:00 a.m.  
University of North Carolina System Office  
Center for School Leadership Development, Room 128  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

## AGENDA

### OPEN SESSION

- B-1. [Report and Recommendations of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity, Diversity, and Inclusion](#) ..... Wendy Murphy, Matthew Brody
- B-2. General Updates ..... Matthew Brody, Kimberly van Noort
  - a. Current Chancellor Search Updates .....Lynn Duffy
  - b. HR Update ..... Matthew Brody
  - c. Academic Affairs Update..... Kimberly van Noort
- B-3. [Chancellor Search Process Review and Recommendations](#) ..... Matthew Brody, Lynn Duffy
- B-4. [Senior Administrative Officer Retirement Plan](#) ..... Brian Usischon

### CLOSED SESSION

- B-5. Executive Compensation ..... Doyle Parrish
- B-6. Executive Personnel Matters ..... Doyle Parrish
- B-7. Faculty Appeals Subcommittee Report ..... Michael Williford

### OPEN SESSION

- B-8. Adjourn

### Additional Information Available

- B-1. [UNC BOG EO Study Transmittal Letter](#)
- B-1. [UNC EO DI Study-Subcommittee Recommendations Overview](#)
- B-1. [Diversity and Inclusion Evidence Review](#)

**AGENDA ITEM**

B-1. Equal Opportunity, Diversity, and Inclusion Subcommittee ..... Wendy Murphy, Matthew Brody

**Situation:** This report summarizes the work of the Board of Governors' Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity (EO), Diversity, and Inclusion (D&I) through the Spring of 2018.

**Background:** The subcommittee's work was informed by a detailed study of EO and D&I conducted by Conduent Human Resources to meet requirements set forth in the General Assembly's Current Operations Appropriations Act of 2017. Section 10.13 of the Current Operations Appropriations Act of 2017 (S.L. 2017-57) directed the UNC System Office to study the efficiency, effectiveness, and transparency with which each of the 17 UNC constituent institutions are delivering EO and D&I services and to evaluate the feasibility of potentially consolidating these services within a single office headed by a single senior officer at each constituent institution. The General Assembly further directed the Board of Governors to submit a report that included its findings, recommendations, and policy changes to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee (Joint Committee).

**Assessment:** This document provides background on and context for the subcommittee's charge and its work, includes findings related to EO and D&I programs across the UNC System, and, for the Board's consideration, offers recommendations that are aimed at providing more effectiveness and structure around EO and D&I activities. These recommendations are made with the option of the president and the Board considering and pursuing additional steps at a later date once these initial recommendations are implemented.

**Action:** This item requires a vote by the committee and a vote by the full Board of Governors.

**UNC Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure  
Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity, Diversity, and Inclusion**

**Report of Findings and Recommendations to the Board of Governors  
May 9, 2018**

**Executive Summary**

This report summarizes the work of the Board of Governors' Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity (EO), Diversity, and Inclusion (D&I) through the Spring of 2018. The subcommittee's work was informed by a detailed study of EO and D&I conducted by Conduent Human Resources to meet requirements set forth in the General Assembly's Current Operations Appropriations Act of 2017 (S.L. 2017-57).

This document provides background on and context for the subcommittee's charge and its work, includes findings related to EO and D&I programs across the UNC system, and, for the Board's consideration, offers recommendations that are aimed at providing more effectiveness and structure around EO and D&I activities. These recommendations are made with the option of the president and the Board considering and pursuing additional steps at a later date once these initial recommendations are implemented. Specifically, as will be further detailed herein, the subcommittee recommends the following specific actions be taken during calendar year 2018 -

1. The Board should adopt a formal policy statement on D&I with certain key elements:
  - a. Require a single senior officer at each constituent institution to coordinate EO and D&I activities irrespective of underlying organization structure and reporting relationships;
  - b. Provide common definitions and standards for D&I;
  - c. Establish goal setting and measurement requirements; and
  - d. Establish regular reporting to Boards of Trustees and/or the President or designee by the constituent institutions with respect to established D&I goals and outcomes.

In the adoption of a system-wide policy, the Subcommittee believes that D&I efforts should be carried out in a manner that is positive and aspirational, should avoid actions that shame or embarrass any group or individual, should demonstrate respect for every individual's privacy, and should be balanced, recognizing that the University's primary mission is to educate, conduct research, and provide service to the public. While diversity is important, over-emphasis on race, gender, sexual orientation, and other human characteristics can prevent us from focusing on

each person as an individual and can cause unproductive and harmful divisions within the University. It is important, therefore, that the University maintain a positive emphasis on inclusion that is forward-looking and has at its core equal opportunity for every member of the University community.

2. The UNC System Office will help to establish a D&I network or collaborative that will enable the constituent institutions to share best practices, collaborate on D&I programming (where feasible), and explore master agreements for relevant external vendor products/solutions. This will be a self-governing body among the constituent institutions with general assistance from the System Office.
3. The UNC System Office will standardize the online publication of State-wide and System-wide EO policies to avoid duplicate or outdated policies being cited at constituent institutions.
4. The UNC System Office will enable the generation of specific metrics from the recently completed System-wide employee engagement survey that can inform faculty- and staff-related diversity and inclusion efforts and serve as one input to D&I goal setting by the constituent institutions.
5. The UNC System Office will develop a D&I research agenda that allows the University to be a leader in the field with regard to metrics and identifying successful outcomes over time.
6. The UNC System Office staff will periodically brief the Committee on Personnel and Tenure on progress on these recommendations and/or the option to revisit other recommendations from the Conduent Study for implementation.

In short, taken together, these recommendations are designed to assure that there is a common System-wide framework and understood structure for EO and D&I activities and initiatives, that there are increased opportunities to develop and strengthen professional E&O and D&I networks across the UNC System, and that there are accountability measures established both at the campus and system levels.

The Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee of the General Assembly will be updated on any Board action taken with respect to these recommendations.

## **Background**

Section 10.13 of the Current Operations Appropriations Act of 2017 ([S.L. 2017-57](#)) directed the UNC System to study the efficiency, effectiveness, and transparency with which each of the 17 UNC constituent institutions are delivering EO and D&I services and to evaluate the feasibility of potentially consolidating these services within a single office headed by a single senior officer at each constituent institution. The General Assembly further directed the Board of Governors to submit a report that included its findings, recommendations, and policy changes to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee (Joint Committee) by January 1, 2018. This deadline was extended to January 31 at the request of the University by the Joint Committee.

To complete this work, the UNC System Office engaged an outside consultant, Conduent Human Resources Consulting (Conduent). Conduent completed its study between August-December 2017 and presented its report and recommendations (Conduent Report) to the Board of Governors' (Board) Committee on Personnel and Tenure on January 25, 2018. The Committee on Personnel and Tenure recommended the report for approval to the full Board at its meeting on January 26, 2018. Following the approval of the Board, the president subsequently transmitted the study on the Board's behalf to the Joint Committee on January 31, 2018. The transmittal letter is included with this report as **Attachment A** and the full text of the Conduent Report is available on-line at the following location: <http://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/bog/doc.php?id=59024&code=bog>.

The aforementioned transmittal letter to the Joint Committee also communicated that the Board voted at its January meeting to create a special working group to further review Conduent's recommendations and requested an extension of the time period to provide the Joint Committee with its findings, recommendations, and policy changes until after the Board's May 2018 meeting. As such, the working group was charged with vetting Conduent's recommendations and presenting its findings, recommendations, and proposed policy changes to the full Board with respect to improvements for increased efficiency and effectiveness for the University's EO and D&I operations.

## **Appointment, Charge, and Work of the Special Subcommittee**

Following approval of the Joint Committee for this additional time to review and consider

recommendations and policy changes, Chair Bissette appointed a special subcommittee of the Committee on Personnel and Tenure (the subcommittee). Governor Wendy Murphy was appointed as chair of the subcommittee and its other members were Governors Kellie Hunt Blue, Robert Bryan, Steven Long, and William Webb. The subcommittee was supported in its work by President Spellings and Vice Presidents Matthew Brody (Human Resources) and Joanna Carey Cleveland (Legal Affairs).

Chair Bissette charged the subcommittee with the following responsibilities:

- (1) gathering and reviewing applicable research and information addressing the structure, focus, goals, and measurement of diversity and inclusion programs in high-performing public and private sector organizations;
- (2) recommending system-level principles, informed by research and evidence, concerning the appropriate focus, priorities, and approach to identifying and achieving measurable outcomes with respect to the University's diversity and inclusion activities; and
- (3) making recommendations as to the UNC System Office's role, if any, in diversity and inclusion programs across the UNC System.

The subcommittee met on April 3, April 26, and May 9, 2018. On April 3, the subcommittee reviewed the Charge and received a detailed presentation from a representative of Conduent of each of the recommendations contained in the EO and D&I study. The Conduent representative and System Office staff answered questions from the subcommittee regarding Conduent's study and its report as well as next steps for the subcommittee. The slide deck from Conduent from this meeting is included as **Attachment B**.

In its meeting on April 26, consistent with the first prong of its charge, subcommittee members participated in a roundtable discussion with three North Carolina-based corporate executives, facilitated by Vice President Brody. These executives were Mr. Charles Bowman (Market President for North Carolina, Bank of America), Ms. Denise Cox (Vice President for Americas Technical Services, RTP Site, Cisco Corporation), and Ms. Venessa Harrison (President for North Carolina, AT&T Corporation and NC A&T State University Trustee). Each corporate leader described the structure, focus, goals, and measurement of D&I programs in their organizations and commented on the relevance of D&I experiences for UNC's students with respect to future employment prospects.

Consistent with the second prong of its charge, Senior Vice President Andrew Kelly provided the subcommittee with a review of the academic and research literature with respect to D&I definitions, best practices, and approach to identifying and achieving measurable outcomes with respect to D&I activities. The resulting literature survey is included with this report as **Attachment C**.

Finally, Mrs. Murphy, President Spellings, and Vice Presidents Brody and Carey Cleveland reviewed with the subcommittee some initial draft recommendations for consideration based on the subcommittee's charge and information gathered from Conduent, the outside corporate leaders, and the literature review. The subcommittee spent some time preliminarily discussing these recommendations.

At its meeting on May 9, the subcommittee reached consensus on its findings and recommendations to the Committee on Personnel and Tenure and approved this report.

### **Findings**

Following its review of the Conduent Report and its associated recommendations (including previous presentations to the Committee on Personnel and Tenure in December 2017 and January 2018), the roundtable discussion with leaders from several major corporations, the presentation from Senior Vice President Kelly, and its discussions with System Office leaders, the subcommittee makes the following findings:

- (1) Equal Opportunity and Diversity and Inclusion is important to the University's mission and aligned with the University's 2017-2022 Strategic Plan.

Through *The Code of the University of North Carolina (The Code)*, the University has provided the foundation for EO and D&I across the UNC System. The University of North Carolina System is dedicated to the transmission and advancement of knowledge and understanding.<sup>1</sup> Faculty and students of the University share in the responsibility for maintaining an environment in which academic freedom flourishes and in which the rights of each member of the academic community are respected.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 600(1) of *The Code of the University of North Carolina*.

<sup>2</sup> Section 600(3) of *The Code of the University of North Carolina*.

Moreover, there shall be equality of opportunity in the University.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to these statements, one of the major themes of **Higher Expectations**, the University's Strategic Plan, is the concept of excellent and diverse institutions: "The University's constituent institutions are individually distinct and mission-focused and collectively comprise an inclusive and vibrant university system, committed to excellence and the fullest development of a diversity of students, faculty, and staff."<sup>4</sup> More specifically, Goal 11 of the Strategic Plan is that "the University will systematically focus on recruitment, retention, and development of the most talented and diverse workforce possible at all levels over the next 5 years."<sup>5</sup> **Higher Expectations** also recognizes the need to serve a more diverse student body and "to offer academic, financial, cultural, and other knowledge-based services to help all students – but particularly those who are underserved for any reason – aspire to, enroll in, and graduate from institutions that match their interests and capabilities."<sup>6</sup> To that end, Goal 1 of the Strategic Plan is that the University's undergraduate enrollments and baccalaureate degree recipients will more closely reflect the demographics and growth rate of the State by 2021-22<sup>7</sup>. This goal will necessarily increase diversity across the UNC System, particularly with regard to low-income and rural students.

The importance of D&I understanding and skills for interacting with a diverse population was reinforced through our conversation with leaders from several highly respected and high performing corporations, including Bank of America, Cisco, and AT&T. All three of the corporate leaders appearing before the subcommittee emphasized the need for employees to work successfully in diverse teams, sometimes on a global basis.

Given the visibility of these issues and implications for our workforce and student body, we find that institutional efforts, metrics, and successes and challenges should be reported periodically to the Boards

---

<sup>3</sup> Section 103 of *The Code of the University of North Carolina*.

<sup>4</sup> **Higher Expectations**, Strategic Plan for The University of North Carolina 2017-2022, p. 33.

<sup>5</sup> **Higher Expectations**, Strategic Plan for The University of North Carolina 2017-2022, p. 35.

<sup>6</sup> **Higher Expectations**, Strategic Plan for The University of North Carolina 2017-2022, p. 7.

<sup>7</sup> **Higher Expectations**, Strategic Plan for The University of North Carolina 2017-2022, p. 9.



of Trustees and/or president or designee.

- (2) The Board of Governors and President have provided system-wide direction and guidance on EO issues.

Equal opportunity has traditionally been driven more by compliance obligations, as required by federal and state laws and executive orders.<sup>8</sup> In its report, Conduent describes EO as “the right for individuals to be considered for admission to, employment by, and promotion within the institution on the basis of merit, experience and qualifications, without unlawful or impermissible discrimination with respect to Federal (sic) or UNC constituent institution protected classes.”<sup>9</sup> Through the following provisions of *The Code* and Policy Manual, the Board of Governors and the president have assured that there is a framework supporting equal opportunity and that there are System-wide prohibitions on discrimination:

- [Section 103 of The Code](#) (Equality of Opportunity in the University)
- [Section 604 of The Code](#) (Appointment, Nonreappointment, and Requirements of Notice and Review)
- [Section 300.1.1 of the UNC Policy Manual](#) (Senior Academic and Administrative Officers)
- [Section 300.2.1 of the UNC Policy Manual](#) (Employees Exempt from the State Personnel Act)
- [Section 300.2.14 of the UNC Policy Manual](#) (Non-Salary and Deferred Compensation)
- [Section 300.7.2.1\[G\] of the UNC Policy Manual](#) (Guidelines for Implementation of the University of North Carolina Phased Retirement Program)
- [Section 700.4.2 of the UNC Policy Manual](#) (Policy on Student Conduct)

In conjunction with the annual Equal Opportunity Plan for the UNC System Office, President Spellings issues an annual letter to the System Office staff underscoring the importance of equal opportunity and each chancellor similarly does so for their respective institutions. Over the past three years, the UNC System Human Resources Office has also periodically convened EO officers from across the system to

---

<sup>8</sup> The Conduent Report lists nearly 50 federal and state laws related to equal opportunity. See Conduent HR Consulting, The University of North Carolina Equal Opportunity and Diversity & Inclusion Study, Findings and Recommendations Report, January 11, 2018, pp. 31-32.

<sup>9</sup> Conduent HR Consulting, The University of North Carolina Equal Opportunity and Diversity & Inclusion Study, Findings and Recommendations Report, January 11, 2018, p. 14.

discuss current developments and best practices. They have also established a listserv to share information across this group.

- (3) The University can increase efficiency by standardizing the online publication of State-wide and System-wide equal opportunity policies and related EO information.

As noted above, there are number of University policies related to equal opportunity. Similarly, there are multiple State-wide EO policies as well.<sup>10</sup> In order to assure consistency in disseminating this information and to assure that only current information is available (and avoid duplication or outdated policies and links at each constituent institution), we find the UNC System Office website should provide an EO landing point with this policy information and other information as the System Office determines would be useful and helpful to its institutions, faculty, staff, and students.

- (4) The Board of Governors has not yet provided System-wide direction and guidance on D&I issues. As such, there is a need for common D&I definitions and standards to guide the University and its institutions in effective outreach, programming, and work in this area.

In its report, Conduent described D&I as “the efforts undertaken to create an institutional culture and environment that offers safety, acceptance, support, tolerance and respect for individuals as they pursue their academic, research, and professional ambitions and interests regardless of their diverse backgrounds, personal characteristics, and beliefs, including, *but not limited*, to (sic) both federal and UNC constituent institution protected classes.”<sup>11</sup> The report further found that there is limited collaboration and communication between constituent institutions in terms of sharing D&I best practices, policies, and approaches.<sup>12</sup>

We find there is an opportunity for the Board to reinforce the importance of D&I – broadly defined -- in supporting the University’s mission and achieving its strategic goals, while providing a shared framework

---

<sup>10</sup> See Conduent HR Consulting, The University of North Carolina Equal Opportunity and Diversity & Inclusion Study, Findings and Recommendations Report, January 11, 2018, pp. 32-33.

<sup>11</sup> Conduent HR Consulting, The University of North Carolina Equal Opportunity and Diversity & Inclusion Study, Findings and Recommendations Report, January 11, 2018, p. 14.

<sup>12</sup> Conduent HR Consulting, The University of North Carolina Equal Opportunity and Diversity & Inclusion Study, Findings and Recommendations Report, January 11, 2018, p. 45.

for such activities and developing common standards to apply to the programming, outreach, and work in this area. Some additional ways to consider diversity would be incorporating diversity of thought/ideology, socio-economic diversity, diversity in professional background and experience such as veterans, considering return-to-work initiatives that help those who have taken time off from their careers to reintegrate into the workforce, and similarly considering initiatives for students who are enrolling at our institutions in non-traditional ways.

We also find there is an opportunity to develop a stronger System-wide D&I network, similar to the work being done through the UNC System Human Resources Office with the System-wide EO Officers. This could be a relatively simple first step without demanding much in terms of additional resources.<sup>13</sup> Finally, we find this work would benefit from having a single coordinator at each UNC institution to assure effective connection between EO and D&I communications and programming, provide transparency and ease of access to resources, and track progress against objectives, as noted in the Conduent Report.<sup>14</sup> The single coordinator role does not imply a specific single organizational structure, which would still be left to the discretion of the individual chancellors.

(5) The University can improve goal-setting and metrics with regard to D&I activities.

As we learned from Senior Vice President Kelly's literature review, there is limited information about the success and outcomes of D&I programs, both within the University and nationally.<sup>15</sup> Even so, we believe that we can more effectively measure the success of our D&I activities and gather information on our diversity and inclusion efforts. This approach is consistent with the expectation set out in **Higher Expectations** that the UNC System Office will create an implementation plan to systematically measure – at all levels – engagement, retention, succession planning, and investment in professional development in order to promote system-wide improvements in these areas.

We also learned that high performing corporations – the future employers of our students – instill D&I throughout their organizations and provide multiple opportunities and entry points for D&I experiences,

---

<sup>13</sup> Conduent HR Consulting, The University of North Carolina Equal Opportunity and Diversity & Inclusion Study, Findings and Recommendations Report, January 11, 2018, p. 46.

<sup>14</sup> Conduent HR Consulting, The University of North Carolina Equal Opportunity and Diversity & Inclusion Study, Findings and Recommendations Report, January 11, 2018, pp. 43-44.

<sup>15</sup> See Attachment C.

support, and growth, all championed by their boards, CEOs, and other senior leaders. As one corporate leader noted, it is important that the organization “not just talk about it, we must be about it.” During a roundtable discussion with the subcommittee, several corporate leaders emphasized the need for assuring that talent coming in to their organization feels welcomed and comfortable and that each employee is capable of working with a diverse team in a diverse environment. This mirrored statements made by Chancellors Martin and Woodson in their presentation to the Committee on Personnel and Tenure in January 2018. There is definitely more to be learned in this area and the subcommittee supports broad sharing of knowledge, experiences, and organizational best practices across the UNC System to help develop our own goals and metrics.

(6) There is an opportunity for the University to be a leader with regard to D&I research and effectiveness.

As noted in Finding 5, there is limited information about the success and outcomes of D&I programs, both within the University and nationally. Due to its strength and diversity, the University is well-positioned to leverage academic expertise and administrative experience across the entire UNC System in developing a research agenda on D&I staffing models, programs, and offerings and aligning with Strategic Plan Goals 1 and 11. Doing so will similarly provide opportunities to showcase D&I successes that can translate into System-wide gains and expertise, with regard to both personnel and students.

### **Subcommittee Recommendations**

The Conduent Report presented a series of recommendations to support both EO and D&I at the University, while ever mindful of the need to pursue this objective in a more consistent, efficient, and cost effective manner. Consistent with its findings, the subcommittee explored with the president and the UNC System Office staff taking some incremental steps that could advance the University’s need for more consistent, efficient, and effective D&I activities while still retaining the option to pursue more substantial transformation efforts at a later date. The following table summarizes the Conduent Report recommendations and the recommendations of the Subcommittee on EO and D&I based on its findings through this review.

	<b>CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>RATIONALE</b>
1	Consolidate accountability for EO and D&I under a single coordinator at each UNC system constituent institution  <i>(see Conduent Report, pp. 43-45)</i>	Adopt a Board policy that requires a single senior officer at each constituent institution to serve as a coordinator for EO and D&I activities irrespective of formal reporting relationships	<b>ACCEPTS CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION</b>  See Subcommittee Findings 1, 4, 5
2	Have UNC System provide greater guidance and support, where deemed value-add, to the constituent institutions on: EO and D&I definition; program and policy development, content, and implementation; process and communications frameworks; and consistent tools and technology  <i>(see Conduent Report, pp. 45-46)</i>	Establish a D&I network or collaborative among the constituent institutions to share best practices, collaborate on D&I programming (where feasible), and explore master agreements for relevant external vendor products/solutions  <i>Note: This will primarily be a self-governing activity among the constituent institutions with general assistance from the UNC System Office.</i>	<b>MODIFIES CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION</b>  See Subcommittee Finding 5
3	For EO and D&I policies (and programs, where appropriate) reported among multiple institutions system-wide, create standards at the system level that each constituent institution can leverage and adapt if required, limiting adaptation to what is legally, regionally, or institutional (sic) required  <i>(see Conduent Report, pp. 46-47)</i>	Adopt a Board policy that provides common definitions and standards and also establishes regular reporting to boards of trustees and/or the president or designee regarding constituent institution D&I goals, measures, and outcomes	<b>MODIFIES CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION</b>  See Subcommittee Findings 1, 2, 4, 5

	<b>CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>RATIONALE</b>
4	Create a centralized webpage for the UNC System that links to webpages for each constituent institution to outline the structure of EO and D&I points of contact, offices, programs, and policies and include links to institution-specific web pages for more insights and information where appropriate  <i>(see Conduent Report, pp. 47-48)</i>	Standardize the online publication of State-wide and System-wide EO policies by the System Office to avoid duplicate or outdated policies at each constituent institution; at present, leave D&I-related web content to be the sole responsibility of the constituent institutions	<b>MODIFIES CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION</b>  See Subcommittee Findings 1, 2, 3
5	Utilize the soon to be launched system-wide employee engagement survey as an opportunity to do more systemic measurement of EO and D&I progress across the constituent institutions  <i>(see Conduent Report, p. 48)</i>	Produce specific metrics from the recently completed employee engagement survey that can inform faculty- and staff-related diversity and inclusion efforts and goal setting by the constituent institutions	<b>ACCEPTS CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION</b>  See Subcommittee Findings 1, 2, 5, 6
6	Have all UNC system constituent institutions explicitly address EO and D&I in their strategic plans (many constituent institutions already do), with specific objectives, success measures, and timelines for their achievement  <i>(see Conduent Report, pp. 49-50)</i>	Adopt a Board policy that provides common definitions and standards and also establishes regular reporting to boards of trustees and/or the president or designee regarding D&I goals, measures, and outcomes	<b>MODIFIES CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION</b>  See Subcommittee Finding 1, 2, 5
7	Implement a single data system for EO case and D&I-related activities tracking across all constituent institutions	Establish a D&I network or collaborative among the constituent institutions to share best practices, collaborate on D&I programming (where feasible), and explore master	<b>MODIFIES CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION</b>  See Subcommittee Finding 5

	<b>CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>RATIONALE</b>
	<i>(see Conduent Report, pp. 50-51)</i>	agreements for relevant external vendor products/solutions	
8	Expand the availability of EO and D&I-related “shared services” to constituent institutions  <i>(see Conduent Report, pp. 51-52)</i>	No action at this time	<b>NO ACTION ON CONDUENT RECOMMENDATION (FOR NOW)</b>
9	N/A	Develop a D&I research agenda that allows UNC to be a leader in the field with regard to metrics and identifying successful outcomes over time	<b>NEW RECOMMENDATION</b>  See Subcommittee Findings 1, 5, 6
10	N/A	Provide periodic briefings to the Committee on Personnel and Tenure on progress on these recommendations and/or the option to revisit other recommendations for implementation	<b>NEW RECOMMENDATION</b>  See Subcommittee Findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

The subcommittee offers these recommendations as a well-rounded means to take steps towards implementing the recommendations in the Conduent report and providing more structure, efficiency, effectiveness, networking opportunity, and accountability around D&I activities while preserving the option to evaluate and pursue additional steps at a later date once these initial recommendations are implemented. It would be the intention of the System Office to extend Conduent’s consulting engagement with the University to assist in carrying out some of the recommendations of the subcommittee pending their approval by the Board.

## **CONCLUSION**

It is clear that D&I is an important topic not only for universities, but also for leading and high-performing organizations of all kinds, and that equal opportunity requires special attention as well. Subcommittee members appreciated the opportunity to develop a better knowledge of EO and D&I issues as they apply to students, faculty, and staff across the UNC System and its constituent institutions, and to consider the breadth of groups, topics, and programming that are encompassed in this area. We are grateful for the willingness of outside corporate leaders to share their experiences, approaches, and organizational values with us, and acknowledge the support we have received from the UNC System Office staff throughout this process.

**Approved by the Board of Governors Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity, Diversity, and Inclusion  
on 5/9/18**



## AGENDA ITEM

B-3. Assessment of the Chancellor Search Process and Recommendations..... Matthew Brody/Lynn Duffy

**Situation:** As competition for outstanding chancellor talent intensifies nationwide and as some of our current chancellors approach the later part of their careers, it is essential that the University System has effective policies and practices in place to conduct searches to fill chancellor vacancies. Recognizing these issues, and after a discussion among the president and the members of the Committee on Personnel and Tenure in late 2017, the Committee on Personnel and Tenure chair requested that UNC System Office staff conduct a review of the chancellor search process to identify opportunities for improvement and address known gaps and deficiencies.

**Background:** The chancellor search process is governed by both statute and Board policy, such as:

- North Carolina General Statute § 116-11(4), which defines certain expectations for the chancellor search and selection process,
- Section 500 B. of *The Code of the University of North Carolina* which sets the role of the Board of Governors and the President in electing and fixing compensation for new Chancellors,
- Appendix 1, Section I.D. of *The Code of the University of North Carolina* which describes the appointment and role of chancellor search committees, and
- Section 200.8 of the UNC Policy Manual (“Policy on Chancellor Searches; Board of Governors Participation”) which establishes the roles, responsibilities, and certain procedures for chancellor searches.

**Assessment:** Based on a comprehensive review of the existing chancellor search process by the UNC System Office of Human Resources, UNC System Office staff have identified ten possible areas of process improvement for consideration by the Committee on Personnel and Tenure. Some of these process improvements have already been implemented and others require formal consideration and policy change by the Board of Governors. The attached report describes in more detail the various options, opportunities, and recommendations for process improvement for the committee’s consideration.

**Action:** This item is for discussion only.



# THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA SYSTEM

## ASSESSMENT OF THE CHANCELLOR SEARCH PROCESS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND OPTIONS GOING FORWARD

**April 30, 2018**

University of North Carolina System  
Office of Human Resources  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

## OVERVIEW

As competition for outstanding chancellor talent intensifies nationwide and as some of our current Chancellors approach the later part of their careers, it is essential for the University System to have effective policies and practices in place to conduct searches to fill Chancellor vacancies.

Recognizing these issues, and after a discussion among the president and the UNC Board of Governors' Committee on Personnel and Tenure in late 2017, the committee chair requested that the UNC System Office staff conduct a review of the chancellor search process to identify opportunities for improvement and address known gaps and deficiencies. This document summarizes the results of this review.

## SCOPE OF REVIEW

In response to the Board's request, over the past several months, the Senior Associate Vice President for Leadership and Talent Development Lynn Duffy interviewed 24 individuals who had some involvement in prior chancellor searches to obtain their observations and feedback. These included:

- ◆ 13 current and former Board members (2 of whom served as search committee chairs and others who had involvement in serving as liaisons to searches or interviewing chancellor finalists),
- ◆ 5 boards of trustees (BOT) members from different institutions (3 of whom served as search committee chairs and 2 of whom also served as Board members and are therefore included in the Board count above),
- ◆ 5 chancellors, and
- ◆ 3 members of UNC System Office senior leadership, including the president.

These interviews were supplemented by discussion at Board meetings as well as individual feedback offered by Board members to the president, senior vice president and general counsel, and vice president for human resources.

As part of this review, policies from other university systems were also considered. States examined include Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania, New York, and Texas. Each state has a somewhat unique governance structure and freedom of information ("sunshine") protocols that influence how executive searches are conducted. While our process is generally similar to those observed in these other states, the way search committees are formed, the nomination process, and protocols for maintaining confidentiality or transparency of the selection process do vary. The Office of Human Resources also completed a review of relevant published literature on university chancellor/presidential search strategies, but much of this material was authored by the search firms directly and not from independent sources.

## KEY POLICY CONTEXT

G.S. 116-11(4) establishes that the Board of Governors will elect, on nomination by the president, the chancellor of a constituent institution and set the chancellor's compensation. The statute requires that the president will present the nominee from a list of not fewer than two candidates recommended by the institution's board of trustees. Existing Board policy exceeds this requirement and provides for not fewer than three candidates.

Section 500 B. of *The Code of the University of North Carolina* sets forth the role of the Board of Governors and the President in electing and fixing compensation for new Chancellors.

Appendix 1, Section I.D. of *The Code of the University of North Carolina* describes the appointment and role of chancellor search committees.

Section 200.8 of the UNC Policy Manual (“Policy on Chancellor Searches; Board of Governors Participation”) establishes the roles, responsibilities, and certain procedures for chancellor searches. A copy of the policy is attached to this document.

## SUMMARY OF KEY RECOMMENDATIONS AND OPTIONS

**This document identifies a series of options for policy change and/or process improvements for the Board’s consideration in the following areas related to the chancellor search process:**

1. Better Define the Role of the Board Liaison
2. Ensure Continuing Involvement from Professional Human Resources Staff
3. Provide Suggested Templates for the Chancellor Leadership Statement
4. Provide Suggested Search Committee Composition in Policy
5. Establish a Pre-Approved List of Well-Vetted Search Firms
6. Use a Confidential Search Process
7. Recruit for a Diverse and Exceptional Candidate Pool
8. Clarify Board and UNC System Office Interviewers for Finalists
9. Conduct Detailed Executive Background Checks
10. Separate Board Final Selection Vote and the Candidate’s Attendance at a Board Meeting

## DISCUSSION

### 1. Better Define the Role of the Board Liaison

The role of Board liaison was created in Board Policy in April 2015. Since that time, a Board liaison has been assigned for searches at ECU (former Governor Hinton), North Carolina Central University (former Governor MacNeill), UNC Asheville (Governor Webb), and Western Carolina University (Governor Powers).

The Board liaison role in the chancellor search process has had varied impact during its short tenure. Interviewees have reported a lack of clarity about the role as part of the day-to-day operations of the search committee, concern for the time commitment of the liaisons when they have only an observational role in the chancellor search, and concern that the Board may appear excessively involved in the early stages of the process. Other interviewees thought this aspect of the process is working fine as is.

More specificity in the liaison’s responsibilities and points of involvement in the process may help to avoid misunderstanding and leverage the role more effectively as a key point of representation and information flow to the full Board and the president. There were also comments and suggestions that it would be better for the process if the liaison was not strongly affiliated with the institution and its community to minimize any perceived conflict of interest.

### Options

a) Retain the Board liaison role as is. This allows the liaison to participate as an observer in a non-voting advisory capacity and have first-hand knowledge of the entire search process. The current policy states that the Board liaison shall “attend search committee meetings as an additional resource to the search committee...” but “refrain from actively participating in interviews of candidates and in search committee deliberations regarding candidates.”

b) Retain the role of the liaison, but eliminate the liaison’s direct participation in search committee meetings and in observing pre-finalist candidate interviews. Instead, this individual would serve as the Board’s principal liaison to the president and to UNC System’s Office of Human Resources regarding:

- ◆ Selection of search committee members;
- ◆ Selection of a search firm;
- ◆ Charging the search committee; and
- ◆ Developing the chancellor leadership statement.

The UNC System Office would still keep the Board liaison updated on the progress of the search, and the Board liaison will be a designated participant in finalist interviews.

c) Eliminate the Board liaison role entirely and initiate the Board’s involvement at the point when three finalists are forwarded to the president by the applicable BOT.

d) In combination with options a) and b) above, the Board could choose to define policy criteria outlining who can be appointed as a Board liaison so that such assignments are less tied to individuals who are likely to have pre-existing relationships at the institution for which a chancellor search is being conducted. These criteria could include by policy:

- ◆ Not be an alumnus of the institution;
- ◆ Not be a former member of the institution’s board of trustees; and
- ◆ Not be a resident in the community in which the institution is located.

## **2. Ensure Continuing Involvement from Professional Human Resources Staff**

Several interviewees expressed appreciation of the recent deeper involvement of the UNC System Office’s human resources professionals. Many also raised concerns about having to reinvent the wheel with each search and suggested an emphasis on more standardization and quality control of the search process generally.

### Status Update:

The president has designated the senior associate vice president for leadership and talent in the UNC System’s Office of Human Resources to serve as a liaison to chancellor search committees and to oversee each active chancellor search on behalf of the president. The senior associate vice president will represent the president in all search-related matters and provide periodic updates to the president, the vice president for human resources, the Board liaison, and the Board Committee on Personnel and Tenure on the status of each search as it progresses. This process change has already been implemented.

The UNC System Office of Human Resources will also create a series of candidate search tools (e.g., search committee handbook, sample meeting agendas, and candidate evaluation templates) and make these materials available to search committees for future use.

### **3. Provide Suggested Templates for the Chancellor Leadership Statement**

Given the concerns of interviewees regarding the duration of searches and the need for more standardization, the inputs used in the development of the chancellor leadership statement were identified as a process improvement opportunity.

#### **Recommendation:**

The UNC System Office of Human Resources will provide a format and template for developing the chancellor search leadership statements. The template will allow for the incorporation of institution-specific information and criteria, as well as sample language on leadership qualities and competencies typically included in chancellors' profiles.

### **4. Provide Suggested Search Committee Composition in Policy**

Interviewees reported positive experiences and satisfaction with search committee membership, with a strong preference for continuing a broad-based approach to constituency representation. For chancellor searches over the past several years, the search committee size has ranged from 17 to 23 members, with an average of 20. There is an opportunity to provide more specific policy guidance on membership composition, which may facilitate more efficient decision making on search committee appointments.

#### **Recommendation:**

Search committee membership is determined by the search committee chair in consultation with the president and the Board liaison. The search policy could be amended to offer a suggested committee composition as a starting point, subject to further modification to meet the unique needs of each search. A suggested composition would be representative of the following constituencies of the institutions:

1. Chair of the Board of Trustees (BOT), who shall generally serve as search committee chair
2. Vice Chair of the BOT, who shall generally serve as search committee vice chair
3. No less than three additional BOT members
4. Representative from institution's faculty governance organization; typically, the faculty chair
5. Representative from institution's staff governance organization; typically, the staff chair
6. Representative of graduate student government (if applicable for the institution)
7. Representative of undergraduate student government; typically the student body president
8. Dean or academic department head who is a tenured member of the faculty
9. Individual member(s) of the faculty
10. Member(s) of the local business and/or not-for-profit community
11. Member(s) of the institution's alumni base
12. Local governmental and/or education leader(s)

The policy would still provide discretion to the search committee chair in consultation with the president to appoint additional members as deemed appropriate.

**5. Establish a Pre-Approved List of Well-Vetted Search Firms**

There were mixed assessments with respect to the utilization of and experience with search firms. Several reported very positive experiences with these firms, while others found that the firms may be too reliant on their standard “rolodex” of candidates and that they do not perform adequate vetting of candidates. The cost and the time involved in selecting search firms were also raised as concerns. The cost of contracting a search firm ranged from \$119,000 to over \$200,000 with an average cost for more recent searches of around \$140,000.

**Recommendation/ Status Update:**

The UNC System Office of Human Resources should maintain a list of pre-vetted search firms (including pre-negotiated pricing) for use by search committees, subject to the final approval of the president. This avoids the time delay of soliciting proposals for search firms as part of each individual search and also assures quality control over search firms that may be utilized. The cost of any search firm would continue to be borne by the constituent institution.

The UNC System Office of Human Resources has already initiated more intensive monitoring and oversight of search firm performance for active searches in concert with search committee chairs.

It is worth noting that nothing in the Board’s current policy requires the use of a search firm and the University could choose to conduct more high-level executive searches without the use of search firms with the addition of more staff capacity within human resources.

**6. Use a Confidential Search Process**

Interviewees reported a strong preference for a closed search process, noting that leaked information can damage search outcomes and that open processes have a greater tendency to reduce the pool of interested, highly-qualified candidates due to the lack of confidentiality during the process.

**Recommendation:**

Specify in policy that all searches will be accomplished in a confidential or closed format to protect the identities of the candidates and to maximize the quality and diversity of the applicant pool. This is consistent with how most chancellor searches within the UNC System have been conducted in recent years. Closed searches are also consistent with requirements in the State Human Resources Act to protect applicant information.

**7. Recruit for a Diverse and Exceptional Candidate Pool**

Assure that search firms and search committees deliver three exceptionally qualified finalist candidates from which the president may choose. Recent chancellor searches have incorporated recruitment of both traditional and non-traditional candidates. One interviewee noted that a chancellor may need to demonstrate certain skillsets and experience needed at that particular time for that particular institution, which may not align with a more traditional vision of a chancellor with respect to background and experience.

**Recommendation:**

Emphasize in policy that all searches shall be conducted in a manner that promotes the recruitment of a diverse set of candidates with respect to gender, race, professional experience, and educational background. This means that searches shall seek candidates with traditional academic experience as well as those with experience outside of academia, including business, government, the military, and the not-for-profit sector.

**8. Clarify Board and UNC System Office Interviewers for Finalists**

Specify in policy who from the Board of Governors and the president's senior team will participate in finalist selection.

**Recommendation:**

**Finalist Interviews.** Finalists submitted to the president by the BOT shall be subject to interview by the following individuals (or designee) in addition to the president:

- ◆ Board officers
- ◆ Board liaison
- ◆ Chair of the Board's Committee on Personnel and Tenure
- ◆ A UNC System chancellor
- ◆ Other members of the UNC System Office leadership team as designated by the president

All of the participants in the finalist interview process shall provide input to the president facilitated by System's Office of Human Resources.

**9. Conduct Detailed Executive Background Checks**

As a part of due diligence, it is essential that the selected final candidate is thoroughly vetted by the search firm and scrutinized by HR staff before the Board considers a final candidate. Additional due diligence is strongly recommended to avoid any "surprises" that may later harm the reputation of the University or compromise the credibility of a selected chancellor.

**Status Update:**

The UNC System Office has selected a third-party investigative firm to conduct executive background checks for *up to three* proposed finalists for each chancellor search. Starting with the UNC Asheville and Western Carolina University searches, the results of these background checks will be provided to the president, the senior vice president and general counsel, the senior vice president and chief of staff, the Board liaison, the Board officers, and the chair of the Board's Committee on Personnel and Tenure for review and consultation prior to recommending any finalist to the Board for election.

This information shall be available for viewing by other Board members on request and a summary of the background investigation shall be provided to the entire Board with any finalist recommendation. The results of this investigation will be retained in a confidential personnel file and shall be considered confidential personnel information.

**10. Separate Board Final Selection Vote and the Candidate's Attendance at a Board Meeting**

There was a strong opinion, particularly from Board members interviewed, that the final selection process is hampered when tied to the candidate's attendance at the Board meeting.



Because of heightened media attention on the selected candidate in that moment, several Board members voiced concern that this made the voting by the Board appear to be a “done deal” when the Board as a whole had not previously discussed the recommended finalists’ background.

**Recommendation:**

In order for Board members to have sufficient time to review any chancellor materials, the Board must have no fewer than five calendar days from the date the president presents her recommendation before any final Board vote is scheduled or occurs. Unlike in past practice, recommended finalists shall not attend or be introduced at any Board meeting where their election is the subject of discussion or vote. Care should be taken not to prematurely release the name of the candidate prior to his or her formal election.

Upon the election of the new chancellor by the Board, the UNC System Office will handle media relations and outreach, announcing the new chancellor in coordination with him/her and his/her institution.

Following this public announcement/media release, the chancellor-elect shall be presented and introduced at a special meeting or the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board, at the Board chair’s discretion.

###



# ASSESSMENT OF THE CHANCELLOR SEARCH PROCESS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

# Methodology

---

- Interviewed 24 individuals who had some involvement in prior chancellor searches to obtain their observations and feedback.
  - 13 current and former Board members (2 of whom served as search committee chairs and others who had involvement in serving as liaisons to searches or interviewing chancellor finalists)
  - 5 boards of trustees (BOT) members from different institutions (3 of whom served as search committee chairs and 2 of whom served as Board members as well and are therefore included in the Board count above)
  - 5 chancellors
  - 3 members of UNC System Office senior leadership, including the president

# Summary of Key Recommendations and Options

---

- Better Define the Role of the Board Liaison
- Ensure Continuing Involvement from Professional Human Resources Staff
- Provide Suggested Templates for the Chancellor Leadership Statement
- Provide Suggested Search Committee Composition in Policy
- Establish a Pre-Approved List of Well-Vetted Search Firms
- Use a Confidential Search Process
- Recruit for a Diverse and Exceptional Candidate Pool
- Clarify Board and UNC System Office Interviewers for Finalists
- Conduct Detailed Executive Background Checks
- Separate Board Final Selection Vote and the Candidate's Attendance at a Board Meeting

# Better Define the Role of the Board Liaison

---

## Options

1. Retain the Board liaison role as is.
  - Allow the liaison to participate as an observer.
2. Retain the role of the liaison, but eliminate their direct participation in search committee meetings or observing pre-finalist candidate interviews.
  - This individual would serve as the Board's principal liaison to the president and to the UNC System Office of Human Resources regarding:
    - Search committee members
    - A search firm
    - Charge search committee
    - Chancellor leadership statement

# Better Define the Role of the Board Liaison

---

## Options continued:

3. Eliminate the Board liaison role entirely and involve the Board at the point where there are three finalists.
4. In combination with options one and two above, let the board define the criteria for who can be appointed as a Board liaison. These criteria could include by policy:
  - Not be an alumnus of the institution
  - Not be a former board of trustees member of the institution
  - Not reside in the local community in which the institution is located

# Ensure Continuing Involvement from Professional Human Resources Staff

- The president has designated the senior associate vice president for leadership and talent to serve as a liaison to chancellor search committees.
- Create a series of candidate search tools (e.g., search committee handbook, sample meeting agendas, and candidate evaluation templates) and make these materials available to search committees for ongoing use.
- Format and template for developing the chancellor search leadership statements.

# Search Committee Composition

---

- Search committee membership is determined by the search committee chair in consultation with the president and the Board liaison.
- The search policy could be amended to offer a suggested committee composition as a starting point.



# Provide Suggested Search Committee Composition in Policy

---

1. BOT chair, who shall generally serve as search committee chair
2. BOT vice chair, who shall generally serve as search committee vice chair
3. No less than three additional BOT members
4. Representative from institution's faculty governance organization
5. Representative from institution's staff governance organization
6. Representative of graduate student government (if applicable)
7. Representative of undergraduate student government
8. Dean or academic department head
9. Individual member(s) of the faculty
10. Member(s) of the local business and/or not-for-profit community
11. Member(s) of the institution's alumni
12. Local governmental and/or education leader(s)

# Establish a Pre-Approved List of Well- Vetted Search Firms

---

- The UNC System Office of Human Resources would maintain a list of pre-vetted search firms for use by search committees
  - Subject to the final approval of the president.

# Use a Confidential Search Process

---

## Recommendation

- Specify in policy that all searches will be accomplished in a confidential or closed format to protect the identities of the candidates and to maximize the quality and diversity of the applicant pool.

# Recruit for a Diverse and Exceptional Candidate Pool

---

- Assures that search firms and search committees deliver three exceptionally qualified finalist candidates.
- Promotes the recruitment of a diverse set of candidates with respect to gender, race, professional experience, and educational background.
- Searches shall seek candidates with traditional academic experience as well as those with experience outside of academia (e.g. business, government, the military, and the not-for-profit sector).

# Clarify Board and UNC System Office Interviewers for Finalists

---

## Recommendation

- Specify in policy who will participate in finalist selection from the Board of Governors and the president's senior team:
  - Board officers
  - Board liaison
  - Chair of the Board's Committee on Personnel and Tenure
  - A UNC System chancellor
  - Other members of the UNC System Office leadership team as designated by the president

# Conduct Detailed Executive Background Checks

---

- It is essential that the selected final candidate is thoroughly vetted by the search firm and scrutinized by the UNC System Office of Human Resources staff before the Board considers a final candidate.
- Additional due diligence is strongly recommended to avoid any “surprises” that may later harm the reputation of the University or compromise the credibility of a selected chancellor.
- The UNC System Office has selected a third-party investigative firm to conduct executive background checks.
- The executive background checks have started with the UNC Asheville and Western Carolina University chancellor searches.

## Separate Board Final Selection Vote and the Candidate's Attendance at a Board Meeting

- The final vote of the Board on any recommended finalist shall not be scheduled or occur less than 5 calendar days before the Board is presented with the details of such recommendation by the president.
- A recommended finalist shall not attend or be introduced at any Board meeting where their election is the subject of discussion or vote.
- Upon the closed session election of the new chancellor by the Board, the UNC System Office will handle media relations and outreach announcing the new chancellor in coordination with him/ her and his/ her institution.

THANK YOU



# QUESTIONS?

**AGENDA ITEM**

B-4. Senior Administrative Officer Retirement Program..... Matthew Brody

**Situation:** The Board of Governors has established the Senior Administrative Officer Retirement Program (SAORP) for the benefit of the president and chancellors. The plan became effective on January 1, 2013. The SAORP is a qualified executive retirement plan designed to receive regular and special contributions. The SAORP is administered by the UNC System Office under the president's direction.

**Background:** Discretionary contributions to the Senior Administrative Officer Retirement Program for the chancellors are made in accordance with Board Policy 300.2.14[R]. The funds for these contributions shall not, under any circumstance, originate from state funds or tuition sources. Contributions are voluntary and may cease at the discretion of the Board of Governors or the board of trustees of a constituent institution. In addition, contributions shall not be made in any year in which the funds identified and described are insufficient to support the annual contribution.

**Assessment:** The attached report provides the amounts contributed for the president and each chancellor currently participating in the plan during the calendar year 2017.

**Action:** This item is for information only.

## Senior Administrative Officer Retirement Program

Inst	Chancellor	Executive Retirement (SAORP Contribution for 2017)
Sys Ofc	Spellings, Margaret*	\$ 122,500
UNC-CH	Folt, Carol	\$ 61,463
NC State	Woodson, Randy	\$ 62,509
UNCC	Dubois, Philip	\$ 45,563
ECU	Staton, Cecil	Not Participating
UNCG	Gilliam, Franklin	\$ 38,538
N.C. A&T	Martin, Harold	\$ 36,997
ASU	Everts, Sheri	\$ 35,129
NCCU	Akinleye, Johnson	\$ 16,250
WCU	Belcher, David	\$ 35,129
UNCW	Sartarelli, Jose	\$ 36,411
UNCA	Grant, Mary	Employment Ended
ECSU	Conway, Thomas	Not Participating
FSU	Anderson, James	\$ 33,400
UNCP	Cummings, Robin	Not Participating
UNCSA	Bierman, Lindsay	\$ 29,803
WSSU	Robinson, Elwood	Not Participating
NCSSM	Roberts, J. Todd	Not Participating

\*The president's regular contribution to the SAORP for 2017 was \$77,500. She received an additional \$45,000 contribution under the terms of the Executive Performance Incentive Program for the President.