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The shared governance process must result in effective policies that are reviewed and updated regularly to meet the needs of a changing university while supporting and protecting students, staff, faculty, and academic freedom. This policy process is intended as a broad guideline for how this process can be established and executed, but care must be taken to notice when a particular policy needs to deviate from this guideline.

Policy charges may come from administration, or from charges left undone by a previous committee. New policy or policy change ideas may also come from faculty, staff, or even students. Whenever possible, the suggestion is to take up the issue driving the change, and address that issue within the relevant policy or policies.

Some complex or contentious issues may call for preliminary information gathering from constituents and stakeholders before the drafting of policy. More straightforward issues can move directly to drafting, at the discretion of the policy committee.

Draft policy should be made available to faculty, the faculty senate, administration, and other stakeholders for comment for at least three weeks before the policy committee moves forward with that policy. This gives all stakeholders the opportunity to read, consider, confer, and express themselves both to their representative on the policy committee, as well as their representatives on senate, and for a senate meeting to take place. During this time, representatives on the policy committees should be communicating with their constituents and soliciting feedback through the preferred feedback capture mechanism.

With due consideration to stakeholder feedback, the policy committee creates a proposed policy and forwards it onto the Academic Affairs Council. In extraordinary cases, a proposed policy might circle through the stakeholder feedback loop a second time before being forwarded to the AAC.

As the proposed policy is moved forward to AAC, it is also made available to stakeholders through the relevant communication channels at least three weeks prior to the AAC meeting that will take up the policy for consideration.

Stakeholders should review the proposed policy and communicate ideas and concerns to their AAC representative. Stakeholder feedback received by the policy committee during this time should be forwarded to AAC for consideration.
The Academic Affairs Council should consider proposed policy only after it has been widely available for at least three weeks. However, the AAC should consider the proposed policy promptly thereafter. The AAC should NOT make changes to policy or policy language, but should either forward approved policy or kick policy requiring changes back to the policy committee.

5a:

Should proposed policy require no changes whatsoever, the AAC may approve the policy outright and forward it to the president.

5b:

If proposed policy is approved, but required non-major changes before forwarding to the president, the AAC may declare the policy “Approved pending non-major changes” and send it back to the policy committee to implement these changes. The policy committee will then forward the approved policy directly to the president.

5c:

Policy that the AAC deems correct, in principle, but requiring revision before approval, may be declared “Revise and resubmit” and returned to the policy committee. In this declaration, AAC does not require that the revised policy be reviewed by stakeholders a second time. The policy committee, however, can decide that the recommended changes need to be discussed by the stakeholders, and may initiate such a feedback process. In making this choice, the policy committee might consider whether the requested changes substantively change the intent of the proposed policy in a way that most stakeholders would wish to weigh in on.

5d:

Policy that is deemed unacceptable to AAC may be declared “Rejected for major changes” and returned to the policy committee. The policy committee may re-draft the policy, but must send that policy through the stakeholder feedback process at least once before re-submitting to AAC, as the re-drafted policy would be substantially changed.

6a:

The president may reject proposed policy. In such cases, it is for the policy committee to determine whether to modify the proposed policy for new consideration, or to move on to other business.

6b:

Policies approved by the president are immediately considered “in force,” and will remain so until formally rescinded or updated by this process.