



THE UNIVERSITY
of NORTH CAROLINA
at CHAPEL HILL

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE
VICE CHANCELLOR AND PROVOST


104 SOUTH BUILDING
CAMPUS BOX 3000
CHAPEL HILL, NC 27599-3000

T 919.962.2198
F 919.962.1593
gray-little@unc.edu
www.unc.edu/provost

BERNADETTE GRAY-LITTLE
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

MEMORANDUM

TO: Center and Institute Directors Reporting to the Office of the Provost

FROM: Bernadette Gray-Little
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost 

SUBJECT: Guidelines for Review of Center and Institute Directors

DATE: September 10, 2007

I have adopted the procedure described below as a guide in the evaluation of Directors of Centers or Institutes that report to the Office of the Provost. It is modeled on the review procedures we use for Vice Chancellors and Deans of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

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 Directors of Centers or Institutes. The Associate Provost for Academic Initiatives, hereafter referred to as the "appointing officer," shall be responsible for initiating the review and for developing recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost.
2. The appointing officer will appoint a review committee consisting of at least five members. All or most of the committee shall be composed of individuals outside the unit under review; one or two committee members may be members of the unit under review. The appointing officer shall appoint as chair of 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 director 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 director 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 director being reviewed (see Appendix A). 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 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 center or institute of the opportunities to provide evaluative feedback. The appointing officer also may ask the review committee to contact individuals or organizations outside of the center or institute, 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 director being reviewed and invite a response. All documents generated by the review committee shall become a confidential part of the director's personnel file.
6. The work of the review committee typically should be completed in a six-week period.

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 are available to the director of the center or institute.

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