

## **Reviews of Administrative Officers**

Reviews of Administrative Officers occurs on a 5 year cycle based of the governing Code of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and with the supplemental document, "Policies Concerning Senior Administrative Officers of The University of North Carolina," approved by the Board of Governors.

Reviews of administrative officers are conducted by a review committee uniquely appointed for each specific review by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Executive Associate Provost. Generally the work of a review committee is accomplished in a brief 6 week period. The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Executive Associate Provost meets with the Review Committee to discuss UNC's expectations of the Administrator under review at the first meeting. The individual being reviewed provides the Committee with a self-study and informational document by the date of the first meeting of the Review Committee. That document will include:

Self Assessment

Reports to the Provost

Current CV

Position description

Organizational chart

Mission statement

Strategic plan or other planning documents

Annual reports for the last four years

Budget Reports

Program evaluation reports

Program and project reports to funding agencies

Internal and external communications materials (press releases, reports, newsletters)

The primary responsibility of the review committee is to serve as a conduit and organizing mechanism for feedback concerning the performance of the administrator being reviewed. This feedback should be solicited from faculty, staff, and students, as well as from others inside and outside of the unit, as appropriate. The review committee provides faculty, students, alumni and staff with an opportunity to provide written and/or verbal feedback.

A final written report of the review committee will be presented to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Executive Associate Provost and they may then meet with the committee to discuss any issues that require elaboration or clarification. They will share the report and discuss its content with the administrator being reviewed and invite a response. All documents generated by the review committee become a confidential part of the administrator's personnel file.

Formal guidance on Administrative Reviews can be found in a June 29, 2001 document on the HR website: <https://hr.unc.edu/epanf/general/adminreview?printFriendly=true> and <https://hr.unc.edu/epanf/general/AdminRevAppA>

## **Guidelines for Review of Certain Administrative Officers at UNC-CH**

June 29, 2001

### **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Administrative Review File  
**FROM:** James Moeser, Chancellor  
**SUBJECT:** Guidelines for Review of Certain Administrative Officers at UNC-CH

I have adopted the procedure described below as a guide in the evaluation of Vice Chancellors and Deans of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This procedure is consistent with the provisions of the governing Code of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and with the supplemental document, "Policies Concerning Senior Administrative Officers of The University of North Carolina," approved by the Board of Governors.

While this procedure is required to be followed in the performance review of officers whose evaluation is the direct responsibility of the Chancellor, officers conducting reviews at other levels may well wish to apply the same or a similar procedure.

1. Not later than the fourth year following the initial appointment, and not less frequently than every five years thereafter, a review will be conducted to evaluate Vice Chancellors and Deans. For the reviews of Vice Chancellors (with the exception of the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost) and the Deans, the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, hereafter referred to as the "appointing officer," shall be responsible for initiating the review and for developing recommendations to the Chancellor. The appointment of an evaluation committee for the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost will be initiated by the Chancellor, who shall be considered the appointing officer for this position.
2. Each review committee shall consist of at least seven members, of whom at least three are members of faculty of the unit under review, or, in the case of Vice Chancellors, members of the units under their purview. The majority of the committee shall be composed of individuals outside the unit of the officer under review. The appointing officer shall appoint to chair the review committee an individual who is employed outside the unit of the individual being reviewed. The appointing officer shall also appoint at least one faculty member from a list of at least six prepared by the Chair of the Faculty, who will consult with the faculty and/or staff members of the unit under review. The appointing officer shall invite the person being reviewed to nominate individuals to serve on the review committee. The appointing officer may select the remaining review committee members at large and may include EPA Non-Faculty and SPA staff members. Where appropriate and possible, one or two additional faculty or administrators from similar universities may be invited by the appointing officer to serve on the review committee.

3. The review committee will meet with the appointing officer to be informed of his or her expectations for the administrator under review and the relevant unit. The appointing officer will provide guidance on the types of information that might be most helpful for the committee to collect and summarize. The review committee will also meet with the administrator being reviewed to discuss his or her goals and to obtain relevant information, such as the unit's annual reports and planning document, if one is available.

4. The primary responsibility of the review committee is to serve as a conduit and organizing mechanism for feedback concerning the performance of the administrator being reviewed (See [Appendix A](#)). In the case of the review of a Dean, this feedback should be solicited from faculty, staff, and students, as well as from others inside and outside of the University, as appropriate. The review committee shall provide faculty and staff in the unit of the administrator under review with an opportunity to provide written feedback. The review committee's consultation with faculty, staff, and students does not relieve the appointing officer of the duty, or the faculty of the right, of direct consultation with each other. It is expected that this will occur, and that the appointing officer will inform individuals in the relevant administrative unit of the opportunities to provide evaluative feedback. The appointing officer also may ask the review committee to contact individuals or organizations outside of the administrative unit, either on or off campus, if such participation will assist in the review process.

5. A final written report of the review committee shall be submitted to the appointing officer, who may then meet with the committee to discuss any issues that require elaboration or clarification. The appointing officer will share the report and discuss its content with the administrator being reviewed and invite a response. In the review of a Dean or Vice Chancellor other than the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost will submit the review committee report, the administrator's response, if one is generated, and his or her recommendation to the Chancellor for review and action. All documents generated by the review committee shall become a confidential part of the administrator's personnel file.

6. The work of the review committee typically should be completed in a six week period.

### **Guidelines for Review of Certain Administrative Officers at UNC-CH - Appendix A**

There are a number of ways that individuals can communicate with review committees. Listed below are four communication methods that have been reviewed and approved by University legal counsel. The aim of these various mechanisms is to provide an honest, frank, and reliable method for review that is fair both to the individual being reviewed and the reviewers.

1) Letter to the committee. Written communication with the review committee may be by signed letter. Written comments become part of the permanent personnel file that is sent to the appointing officer's office at the completion of the review and is available to the candidate. Unsigned or anonymous letters will not be accepted.

2) Email to the chair or any member of the review committee. According to University policy, email is treated as written correspondence. As such, email comments are printed and become a part of the committee's file which is turned over to the appointing officer at the end of the process and which is part of the personnel file of the candidate.

3) Telephone call to or personal meeting with the chair or any member of the review committee. Notes relating to information provided by telephone or personal meeting are the property of the individual committee member and do not become part of the committee's file and are therefore not turned over to the appointing officer at the end of the process. Such personal notes cannot constitute a "shadow file" on the candidate under review. Such notes should be used only as memory aids for purposes of discussion and then discarded.

4) Personal appearance before the review committee. As with telephone calls or personal meetings with the chair or members of the review committee, notes generated by the committee member during a meeting with the committee as a whole are the property of the individual committee member and do not become a part of the committee's file and are not turned over to the appointing officer. Individuals appearing before the review committee may declare at the beginning of their appearance their wish to remain anonymous, insofar as attribution in the committee minutes of specific comments. However, a list of all persons appearing before the committee shall be kept by the committee chair and shall be part of the official records of the review committee's work. No allegation by any individual of misconduct on the part of the candidate under review will be accepted except upon the basis of a written, signed statement from the individual making the allegation.

5) The chair of the review committee is responsible for keeping minutes of the committee's discussions in accordance with State law, and shall assure that information on which any aspect of the committee's recommendations is based is reliable, including attribution to sources, especially in the case of expressed concerns regarding performance of the candidate and any allegations of misconduct.

6) It is the responsibility of the appointing officer and the candidate under review to assure that the open exchange of views envisioned by this process remain free of any act or threat of reprisal for responsible use of this process to express opinions about the job performance of the candidate under review.

Updated 3/12/02