

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this academic policy statement is to establish procedures for the development, revision, rescission, approval, and maintenance of Academic Policies. This policy is intended to supplement President's Office Policy PRE-25.

2. GENERAL

2.01 The following definitions shall be utilized for academic policies:

- a. Senior Reviewer—the highest-ranking member (or their designee) of the academic unit from which the new policy or policy revision originated. The senior reviewer typically has the most knowledge of the policy.
- b. New Policy—a newly developed academic policy. New policies require an enhanced review.
- c. Interim Policy—a newly developed or revised policy for situations when an academic policy must be immediately developed or revised and there is insufficient time for a review.
- d. Major Revision—a significant revision to an already existing academic policy affecting context or procedure. Major revisions require an enhanced review.
- e. Minor Revision—a modest revision to an academic policy, including editorial and minor compliance revisions. Minor revisions are subject to a standard review.
- f. Pen and Ink Revision—a very minor revision to an academic policy solely for the purpose of updating titles, department names, etc. Pen and Ink revisions are not subject to a review.
- g. Standard Review—the typical procedure for review of academic policies. A standard review is conducted for policies undergoing a five-year review, minor revision, or rescission.
- h. Enhanced Review—the procedure for review of new academic policies and those undergoing major revision.

- i. Policy Rescission—elimination of an academic policy that is no longer needed. Policy rescissions are subject to a standard review.
 - j. Academic Policy Review Form—the form to be used for submission of comments during a standard or enhanced review.
 - k. Academic Policy Steering Committee (APSC)—determines if the revision of an academic policy requires a standard or enhanced review. The APSC is organized by the Office of the Provost and is comprised of the Vice Provost (Chair), AVP for Academic Planning and Assessment, Faculty Senate Chair, and Faculty Senate Chair-Elect. Additional representatives may be added ad hoc per the subject matter of the policy.
 - l. Academic Affairs Council (AAC)—the voting body for academic policies. The AAC is comprised of the following academic representatives: Provost and Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs (Chair), Vice Provost, Associate Provosts, Associate Vice Provosts, Associate Vice Presidents, University Librarian, Deans, Associate/Assistant Deans, Department Chairs, Chair and Chair-Elect of Faculty Senate.
- 2.02 Stages of review preceding review by the Academic Affairs Council as described in sections 3.03 and 3.04 of this policy shall be completed within thirty (30) working days. A one-time extension of thirty (30) working days may be requested from the senior reviewer for policies of high complexity or impact. If a response is not received by either thirty (30) or sixty (60) working days as determined above, the policy shall necessarily advance to the next step in the review process, with exception to Faculty Senate review during the summer months, which shall be suspended in accordance with section 3.08 of this policy.

3. PROCEDURE

- 3.01 For consideration of policies submitted pursuant to PRE-25, faculty shall submit their policy requests to Faculty Senate or to their chairs; staff and administrators shall submit their policy requests to the Provost and Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs (hereinafter “Provost”), or their designee. New policies and policy revisions endorsed by Faculty Senate or the Provost shall be submitted to the APSC.
- 3.02 Upon receipt of a request for a new policy or policy revision, the APSC shall assign a senior reviewer and determine if any requested revision is major or minor. If any member of the APSC determines that the policy revision is major, the policy shall undergo an

enhanced review. Each APSC member shall have a minimum of three (3) working days to provide a response.

3.03 Standard Review Process. For a standard review, the proposed policy revision, policy rescission, or five-year policy review shall be sequentially:

- a. Assigned by the Provost (or their designee) to an individual or subgroup to develop a draft policy
- b. Reviewed simultaneously by the Council of Academic Deans and the Faculty Senate
- c. Reviewed by the Vice Chancellor and General Counsel for the Texas State University System or their designee
- d. Reviewed and approved by the Provost
- e. Reviewed and approved by the AAC
- f. Submitted to the President's Cabinet for notification
- g. Approved by the President
- h. Posted in the online Academic Policy Manual

3.04 Enhanced Review Process. For an enhanced review, the proposed new policy or major policy revision shall be sequentially:

- a. Assigned by the Provost (or their designee) to a workgroup (for preparation of a draft policy) consisting of representation from all key stakeholders to include a minimum of three faculty representatives selected by the Faculty Senate, with input solicited from units outside of Academic Affairs as appropriate, and notification of formation of a workgroup to faculty and staff via the Academic Affairs newsletter
- b. Reviewed simultaneously by the Council of Academic Deans and the Faculty Senate
- c. Reviewed by the University at-large (open comment period)
- d. Reviewed by the Vice Chancellor and General Counsel for the Texas State University System or their designee

- e. Reviewed and approved by the Provost
 - f. Reviewed and approved by the AAC
 - g. Submitted to the President's Cabinet for notification
 - h. Approved by the President
 - i. Posted in the online Academic Policy Manual
- 3.05 Each group or individual conducting a review shall submit all comments via the Academic Policy Review Form (see Appendix A) to the senior reviewer for consideration at the end of each review period. Any revisions drafted in response to reviewer feedback shall be tracked on the policy and made visible to all subsequent reviewers.
- 3.06 Workgroups shall consult offices such as the Department of Human Resources and groups such as the Council of Chairs, the Council of Associate Academic Deans, and the Graduate Council, as appropriate for the subject matter of the policy. The senior reviewer shall consult with the Office of General Counsel for new policies and major policy revisions.
- 3.07 Academic policies under review shall be routed at each stage of review with a cover sheet (see Appendix B) to include at a minimum:
- a. the senior reviewer
 - b. the members of the policy workgroup and their respective units (when applicable)
 - c. the type of policy review (new policy, major revision, minor revision, etc.)
 - d. a comprehensive description of the circumstances warranting the new policy, policy revision, or policy rescission.
- 3.08 The sequence and time constraints for any Faculty Senate review shall be suspended during the summer months when nine-month faculty are not under contract. However, a faculty member serving on a workgroup for an enhanced review may elect, at the faculty member's sole discretion, to perform such work associated with the workgroup during the summer months, but there is no expectation, explicit or implied, for a faculty member to do so. Reviews which have been suspended over the summer months shall commence and/or resume at the start of the academic year.

3.09 Rarely, circumstances may warrant the immediate implementation or revision of an academic policy when there is insufficient time for a review. Such policies and policy revisions shall be initiated by the senior reviewer in consultation with the Chair and Chair-Elect of Faculty Senate for consideration by the Provost as an interim academic policy. An interim policy may be in effect for up to twelve (12) months, during which time a review shall be conducted. Should a review not be completed within twelve (12) months, the interim policy shall expire and the last fully reviewed and approved version of the policy (if applicable) shall become effective.

3.10 New academic policies shall be numbered according to the following:

- a. The first two digits shall be the last two digits of the year when the policy was first developed.
- b. The second two digits shall be the month when the policy was first routed for comment by the Council of Academic Deans and the Faculty Senate.
- c. The third two digits shall be the day when the policy was first routed for comment by the Council of Academic Deans and the Faculty Senate.

4. REVIEW OF EXISTING POLICIES

Academic policies shall undergo a scheduled review every five (5) years. Interim review of any policy is permitted. Each time a policy is revised, the next required review shall be scheduled for a date no more than five (5) years after the date the AAC last approved the policy.

APPROVED: _____<signed>_____
Alisa White, Ph.D., President

DATE: _____5/5/2025_____

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

This academic policy statement (APS) has been approved by the reviewer listed below and represents SHSU's Division of Academic Affairs' policy from the date of this document until superseded.

Original: February 16, 2021
Reviewer: Academic Affairs Council

Review Cycle: Five years*
Review Date: Spring 2030

Approved: <signed>
Michael T. Stephenson, Ph.D.,
Provost and Sr. Vice President
for Academic Affairs

Date: 4/28/2025

*Effective January 2018, Academic Policy Statements will be reviewed on a rotating 5-year schedule. To transition to a distributed review load, some policies may be reviewed prior to the 5-year timeframe, with subsequent reviews transitioning to the 5-year schedule.