## Development, Review, Approval, and Promulgation of University-Level Policies

Comparison of Draft V 10.02.12 and Draft V 11.09.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft V 10.02.12</th>
<th>Draft V 11.09.12</th>
<th>Explanatory Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I - Scope</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section I - Scope</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section I. No feedback, no changes.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section II – Definitions</strong>&lt;br&gt;II.A. Authoritative Version&lt;br&gt;II.B. Policy Authors&lt;br&gt;II.C. Responsible Office(s)&lt;br&gt;II.D. Primary Responsible Office(s)</td>
<td><strong>Section II – Definitions</strong>&lt;br&gt;II.A. Authoritative Version&lt;br&gt;II.B. Policy Authors&lt;br&gt;II.C. Responsible Office(s)&lt;br&gt;II.D. Primary Responsible Office(s)</td>
<td><strong>Section II.A – II.D. No feedback, no changes.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **II.E. Stakeholders.** Stakeholders are 1) individuals or groups affected by a proposed policy and/or its related procedures, 2) units responsible for implementing the proposed policy, or 3) individuals in similar positions or categories across the university who must abide by the provisions of the proposed policy. | **II.E – Stakeholders.** Stakeholders are 1) individuals or groups affected by a proposed policy and/or its related procedures, 2) units responsible for implementing the proposed policy, or 3) individuals in similar positions or categories across the university who must abide by the provisions of the proposed policy. | **Section II. E. SC feedback indicated the need to “explicitly include governance bodies, possibly trustees.”**
| **II.F. University-Level Policy.** A university-level policy is one that is reviewed and approved through the processes outlined in this policy. The scope of a university-level policy may range from minimally applying to individuals or groups in more than one college or division to maximally applying to all faculty, staff, students, and visitors. | **II.F. University-Level Policy.** University-level policies are those with a scope that ranges from minimally applying to individuals or groups in more than one division or college to maximally applying to all faculty, staff, students, and visitors. University-level policies are reviewed and approved through the processes outlined in this policy. | **Section II. F. AS feedback indicated the original definition was not clearly stated.**
| **Explanatory Notes** | **Explanatory Notes** | **Explanatory Notes** |
| **Section II. E. SC feedback indicated the need to “explicitly include governance bodies, possibly trustees.”** | **No revisions were made. The TF purposely avoided naming specific groups to ensure a broadly stated definition.** | **Section II. F. AS feedback indicated the original definition was not clearly stated.**
| **The edited version clarifies the definition by re-ordering the sentences, putting the “what” before the “how.”** | **The edited version clarifies the definition by re-ordering the sentences, putting the “what” before the “how.”** | **The edited version clarifies the definition by re-ordering the sentences, putting the “what” before the “how.”** |
Section III - Policy Statement

The primary purposes of this policy are to 1) facilitate the understanding of existing university-level policies among members of the RIT community, 2) document the basic development, review, approval, and promulgation processes for new or revised university-level policies, and 3) establish a limited set of exceptions to these processes. To achieve these purposes, the university will make current university-level policies and policy-related resources available to the RIT community through a website maintained by the policy office.

III. A. Purpose. The primary purposes of this policy are to 1) facilitate the understanding of existing university-level policies among members of the RIT community, 2) document the basic development, review, approval, and promulgation processes for new or revised university-level policies, and 3) establish a limited set of exceptions to these processes.

In addition, this policy articulates the university’s commitment to excellence in policy administration by dedicating a set of resources to carry out policy-related responsibilities (hereafter referred to as the policy office). The responsibilities of the policy office include:

- providing guidance to individuals or groups with questions or concerns about individual policies or policy-related processes,
- contributing to effective and efficient review and approval processes for university-level policies,
- ensuring current university-level policies and policy-related resources are available to the RIT community through a website,
- creating a digital archive that provides access to all available superseded versions of university-level governance policies,
- facilitating policy-related procedures outlined elsewhere in this policy, and
- implementing annual plans of work approved by the office responsible for this policy.

Section III. AS feedback indicated the need for a provision in this policy to address where and how members of the university community can bring forward questions or concerns about a university-level policy or the policy process.

Section III. AS feedback indicated the need to more completely state the nature and scope of the digital policy archive.

In response to both points of feedback, the responsibilities of the policy office are more fully stated in a new second paragraph. The first bullet addresses the first point of feedback; the fourth bullet addresses the second point of feedback.

As a result of the additional content, the format of Section III was changed to include two sub-sections:

III. A. Purpose
III. B. Types of Policies
There are two categories of university-level policies, namely, governance and administrative. Governance policies, further defined in section IV.A of this policy, are those reviewed and recommended for the president’s final approval by the applicable governance group. Administrative policies, further defined in section V.A of this policy, are those reviewed and approved by the vice president of the division in which the responsible office resides, subject to final approval by the president and/or board of trustees, when required or warranted.

In addition to university-level policies, RIT recognizes the importance of developing unit-specific policies within divisions, colleges, and departments. For purposes of clarity, consistency, and accuracy these unit-specific policies must 1) be identified as division-level, college-level, or department-level; 2) not conflict with university-level policies; and 3) when referencing a university-level policy, link to the authoritative version.

### IV. Governance Policy Development, Review, Approval and Promulgation

#### IV.A. Governance Policy Development

Any individual or group of individuals may propose revisions to an existing university-level governance policy or may identify the need for a new university-level governance policy that meets one or more of the following criteria:

- Mandates requirements of, or provisions for actions by, members of the RIT community.
- Has broad application throughout the university.
- Embraces the university’s mission, reduces institutional risk, or promotes organizational effectiveness.
- Codifies, as part of its scope, the university’s compliance with local, state, and/or federal laws or regulations and includes additional or more specific provisions or requirements.

### III.B. Types of Policies

There are two categories of university-level policies, namely, governance and administrative. Governance policies, further defined in section IV.A of this policy, are those reviewed and recommended for the president’s final approval by the applicable governance group. Administrative policies, further defined in section V.A of this policy, are those reviewed and approved by the vice president of the division in which the responsible office resides, subject to final approval by the president and/or board of trustees, when required or warranted.

In addition to university-level policies, RIT recognizes the importance of developing unit-specific policies within divisions, colleges, and departments. For purposes of clarity, consistency, and accuracy these unit-specific policies must 1) be identified as division-level, college-level, or department-level; 2) not conflict with university-level policies; and 3) when referencing a university-level policy, link to the authoritative version.

Section III.B. With the exception of the added title, there are no edits or revisions.

Section IV.A, Paragraph 1. No feedback, no changes.
Individuals or groups developing policy proposals must be faculty, staff or students at the university and are hereafter referred to as policy authors. Policy authors are expected to 1) seek legal and policy-process guidance, 2) request input from stakeholders, and 3) engage in the fact-finding, research, and analysis needed to develop a thorough proposal. The results of all these efforts must be documented separately, and submitted with the first public draft for formal review by the applicable governance group(s).

In drafting policies, policy authors are expected to use the university’s standard format and follow the general and policy-specific editorial guidelines which can be found under Resources for Policy Governance Development on the policy website. The policy office is responsible for reviewing and updating the standard format, policy-specific editorial guidelines, and other resources for policy authors; these activities should be undertaken annually and in consultation with designated representatives from the university’s governance groups and other stakeholders.

Section IV.A, Paragraph 2. SC feedback indicated the need to “include stricter guidelines on how stakeholder feedback is gathered to ensure thorough process and inclusion of all stakeholders.”

No revisions made. The TF believes the draft provides sufficient guidelines, particularly with the context of other expectations. And, naming specific groups as stakeholders, but not others, may unintentionally limit the scope of stakeholder input sought.

Section IV.A, Paragraph 2. SC feedback indicated the need to expand the communication of stakeholder input, i.e. it should “be shared as part of complete package when the policy is shared for voting and promulgation.”

In response to this point of feedback, the applicable statement has been expanded.

Section IV.A, Paragraph 3. The title of the hyperlink has been corrected.
**IV.B. Governance Policy Review and Approval.**

Policy proposals related to academic and faculty governance matters are reviewed and provisionally approved by Academic Senate, subject to final approval by the president and, when appropriate, the board of trustees. Information on faculty governance and academic issues can be found on Academic Senate’s website and in the Charter of Academic Governance. Proposals related to other types of university-level governance policies are introduced to Institute Council, reviewed for formative input by Academic Senate, Staff Council, and/or Student Government as applicable, and returned to Institute Council for final review and approval. The policy review and approval processes for Academic Senate and Institute Council are illustrated by the flowcharts in Appendix A to this policy. Information on the role of Institute Council in university governance can be found in the Institute Council By-Laws. The by-laws and information on the roles of Staff Council and Student Government can be found on their websites. In addition, brief descriptions of the four major governance groups and their compositions are included in Appendix B to this policy.

The executive committees of these governance groups are expected to refer policies that meet the criteria of an administrative policy to the appropriate vice president for review and approval. If a question is raised as to whether a policy proposal should be reviewed through the governance process or administrative process, the president will make the determination.

---

**IV.B. Governance Policy Review and Approval.**

Policy proposals related to academic and faculty governance matters are reviewed and provisionally approved by Academic Senate, subject to final approval by the president and, when appropriate, the board of trustees. The charter of academic governance and information on the role of Academic Senate in university governance can be found on its website. Proposals related to other types of university-level governance policies (including, for example, this policy) are introduced to Institute Council, reviewed for formative input by Academic Senate, Staff Council, and/or Student Government as applicable, and returned to Institute Council for final review and approval. The by-laws and information on the role of Institute Council in university governance can be found on its website. The policy review and approval processes for Academic Senate and Institute Council are illustrated by the flowcharts in Appendix A to this policy. The by-laws and information on the roles of Staff Council and Student Government in university governance can be found on their websites. In addition, brief descriptions of the four major governance groups and their compositions are included in Appendix B to this policy.

The executive committees of these governance groups are expected to refer policies that meet the criteria of an administrative policy to the appropriate vice president for review and approval. If a question is raised as to whether a policy proposal should be reviewed through the governance process or administrative process, the president will make the determination.

---

**Section IV.B, Paragraph 1.** SC indicated the need to add links to SC and SG by-laws in addition to their websites.

Rather than insert additional links, the paragraph now includes one link to each governance group website to provide consistency and brevity. (Note...IC’s website is not launched, but is expected to go live in early 2013. Until the website is launched, the hyperlink will go to the IC by-laws.)

**Section IV.B, Paragraph 1.** SC indicated the need to revise the statement, “…returned to Institute Council for final review and approval” to “…returned to Institute Council for final review and approval, subject to final approval by the president.”

No revision made. IC’s current by-laws do not state that its approval (on any matter) is provisional, pending final approval by the president. Further evidence of this; the president is a voting member of IC, which is not the case in AS.

**Section IV.B, Paragraph 2.** No feedback, no changes.
IV.C. Governance Policy Review Cycle. Existing policies may undergo revisions at any time deemed necessary; however, all university-level governance policies must be systematically affirmed or, if needed, revised on a regular review cycle. Specifically, all policies must be formally reviewed within five years of the date of the 1) initial approval, 2) most recently-approved revisions, or 3) most recent review and affirmation. For example, a policy that was last revised in October 2013 must be reviewed no later than October 2018.

IV.D. Governance Policy Promulgation. Upon recommendation by Academic Senate or Institute Council and approval from the president, policy authors submit the final approved version of the policy to the policy office. The policy office is responsible for the promulgation process, including:

- Posting approved new or revised policies in the governance policy library.
- Retaining and preparing superseded versions of revised policies for archiving.
- Preparing and sending e-mail announcements of new and revised policies to the RIT community within 30 days of approval.
- Maintaining a section on the policy website that includes information on 1) policies reviewed and approved during the previous academic year and 2) policies being reviewed or considered for approval during the current academic year.

IV.E. Governance Policy Exceptions. Provisions for unusual issues or circumstances related to governance policy matters are covered in this section.

IV.E.1. Establishing an Interim Policy. On rare occasions, a governance policy may be needed 1) for a finite period of time, or 2) within a time period that does not allow for its complete development and review as outlined in procedures described elsewhere in this policy. In these
circumstances, policy authors may submit a draft interim policy and request approval from Institute Council Executive Committee (ICEC) to allow promulgation of that policy on an interim basis. ICEC must give explicit permission to issue a policy as interim.

Interim policies that are established for a finite period of time are effective until the ICEC-approved expiration date. Interim policies that are approved without full development and review are effective for six months from the date of ICEC approval or less if specified by ICEC. Extensions of up to six additional months can be sought from and approved by ICEC; however, no interim policy of this type can be in effect for more than 18 months.

If policy authors seek to remove the interim status of a policy, they must complete the applicable review and approval procedures described elsewhere in this policy within one year of the issuance of the interim policy.

IV.E.2. Decommissioning a Policy. When a policy outlives its usefulness, is superseded, or is incorporated into another policy or policy library, the policy may be decommissioned through the applicable review and approval procedures described elsewhere in this policy. Proposals must include documentation that demonstrates 1) the rationale for decommissioning and 2) the review and agreements of stakeholders affected by the proposed decommissioning.

V. Administrative Policy Development, Review, Approval and Promulgation

V.A. Administrative Policy Development. Responsible offices for existing university-level administrative policies serve as the policy authors and may propose revisions or identify the need for a new university-level administrative policy that meets one or more of the following criteria:
• Codifies, as its full scope, the university’s compliance with the requirements of a law or regulation that is promulgated by the city, state, or federal government.
• Governs the university’s standards or principles for a specific business transaction or administrative practice that has broad application throughout the university.
• Outlines the university’s required procedures for a specific business transaction or administrative practice.

Policy authors are expected to 1) seek legal and policy-process guidance, 2) request input from stakeholders, and 3) engage in the fact-finding, research, and analysis needed to develop a thorough proposal. In drafting university-level administrative policies, policy authors are expected to use the university’s standard format and follow the general and policy-specific editorial guidelines which can be found under Resources for Policy Development on the policy website.

V. B. Administrative Policy Review and Approval. Policy proposals related to administrative matters are reviewed and approved by the vice president of the division in which the responsible office resides, subject to final approval by the president and/or board of trustees, when required or warranted. Additional steps in the policy review processes for administrative policies, if applicable, are determined and communicated by the division vice presidents in consultation with their leadership teams. The policy review and approval processes for administrative policies are illustrated by the flowcharts in the Appendix to this policy. Vice presidents are expected to refer policies that meet the criteria of a governance policy to the applicable governance group for review and approval. If a question

• Codifies, as its full scope, the university’s compliance with the requirements of a law or regulation that is promulgated by the city, state, or federal government.
• Governs the university’s standards or principles for a specific business transaction or administrative practice that has broad application throughout the university.
• Outlines the university’s required procedures for a specific business transaction or administrative practice.

Policy authors are expected to 1) seek legal and policy-process guidance, 2) request input from stakeholders, and 3) engage in the fact-finding, research, and analysis needed to develop a thorough proposal. In drafting university-level administrative policies, policy authors are expected to use the university’s standard format and follow the general and policy-specific editorial guidelines which can be found under Resources for Policy Development on the policy website.

V. B. Administrative Policy Review and Approval. Policy proposals related to administrative matters are reviewed and approved by the vice president of the division in which the responsible office resides, subject to final approval by the president and/or board of trustees, when required or warranted. Additional steps in the policy review processes for administrative policies, if applicable, are determined and communicated by the division vice presidents in consultation with their leadership teams. The policy review and approval processes for administrative policies are illustrated by the flowcharts in the Appendix to this policy. Vice presidents are expected to refer policies that meet the criteria of a governance policy to the applicable governance group for review and approval. If a question

Section V.A, Paragraph 2. Similar to IV.A, SC indicated the need to specify governance groups as stakeholders.

No revision made. The TF believes the policy, as drafted, provides sufficient guidelines, particularly within the context of the other expectations. In addition, naming specific groups as stakeholders but not others, may unintentionally limit the scope of stakeholder input sought.

Section V.B. No feedback, no changes.
is raised as to whether a policy proposal should be reviewed through the administrative process or governance process, the president will make the determination.

V.C. Administrative Policy Review Cycle. Vice presidents are expected to establish and maintain a regular review cycle for university-level administrative policies under their purview to ensure they are systematically revised or affirmed.

V.D. Administrative Policy Promulgation. Upon approval, the responsible office publishes the final approved version of the policy on its website. The responsible office promulgates the revised or new policy to its key stakeholders and provides the policy office with the active link to the new or revised policy. The policy office is responsible for assisting the promulgation process by posting links to new or revised university-level administrative policies on the policy website.

V.E. Administrative Policy Exceptions. Vice presidents are expected to establish provisions for exceptions to administrative policies and related processes under their purview, such as approving interim policies and decommissioning policies, as needed.

Section V.C. SC noted that there is no mandated timeframe for the review cycle for administrative policies.

No revision made on this point of feedback. As noted in V.B, paragraph 1, procedural details for administrative policies are determined by vice presidents.

The language, “revised or affirmed,” was edited to “affirmed or revised,” to be consistent with IV.C.

Section V.D. SC indicated need to define “key” stakeholders if different than stakeholders.

Revision made.

Section V.E. No feedback, no changes.