



Executive Summary of Feedback Received from the Policy Portal to the Policy on Policies

1. Shared Governance Authority for Academic Policies and Governance Routing Matrix

One respondent raised concerns that the draft did not explicitly define the role of Faculty Senate and the Academic Policies Committee (APC) in the development and review of academic policies. The respondent also suggested creating a formal governance routing matrix identifying review authority across policy domains to ensure consistency and transparency.

Administrative Response

After reviewing the comments received, the College revised the policy to provide clearer guidance on governance authority and policy review requirements.

A new Shared Governance Purview Matrix was created to identify the appropriate governance body for each policy area and its level of review authority. The matrix designates the Faculty Senate and Academic Policies Committee (APC) as the primary bodies responsible for reviewing and recommending policies related to academic affairs, curriculum, academic standards, instructional delivery, student academic requirements, and faculty academic responsibilities.

The College also made additional updates to incorporate shared governance requirements into the policy review process.

2. Clarification of When Faculty Senate Voting Is Required

One respondent recommended that the policy distinguish between policies that require formal Faculty Senate review and vote and the broader College-wide 30-day comment period. The respondent suggested that any policy falling within Faculty Senate or shared governance responsibilities should include a formal governance vote as part of the approval process.

Administrative Response

The College agreed that the distinction between formal governance review and the College-wide comment period should be clarified. As a result, the policy was revised to establish a dedicated Shared Governance Review stage within the approval process. The revised policy now states that policies falling within the purview of specific governance bodies must be formally reviewed and, when applicable, voted upon before advancing to the Executive Leadership Team. For academic policies, this includes formal review and recommendation by both APC and Faculty Senate.

The policy now clarifies the timeline. The 30-day College community comment period happens after the governance review and voting are finished. The public comment period is separate and does not replace the formal governance vote.

3. Interim Policy Duration and Policy Decommissioning Process

One respondent raised two questions for consideration: whether interim policies should remain in effect for a shorter period of time and whether policy decommissioning should be subject to the same stakeholder review processes as policy creation.

Administrative Response

After careful consideration of the comments submitted, the interim policy provisions were revised to shorten the allowable duration of an interim policy. The policy now limits interim policies to a maximum initial term of six (6) months, with a single renewal of up to six (6) additional months upon written justification. This change reduces the overall interim period from eighteen (18) months to a maximum of twelve (12) months and reinforces the expectation that interim policies proceed through the full policy review and approval process as promptly as practicable.

The College also agreed that policy decommissioning should undergo the same level of review as creating a new one. The revised language requires proposed policy retirements to undergo appropriate stakeholder consultation, shared governance routing, and review processes consistent with the policy's established governance framework. Decommissioning decisions must also include consideration of legal, regulatory, operational, and institutional impacts before approval.

4. Scope Language, Documentation Requirements, Shared Governance in Interim Renewals, and Expedited Review Participation

One respondent recommended expanding the scope language to include implementation, enforcement, review, and decommissioning activities. The respondent also suggested changing "shall" to stronger mandatory language regarding documentation of stakeholder feedback, questioned the role of shared governance in extending interim policies, and recommended adding Shared Governance Leadership to the expedited review process.

Administrative Response

The College have incorporated several of the suggested revisions into the final draft. The Scope section was revised to more comprehensively describe the policy lifecycle. The language now expressly includes policy development, implementation, enforcement, periodic review or assessment, revisions, and rescission or decommissioning activities. The stakeholder review section was also updated to strengthen accountability and documentation requirements. Language was revised to state that stakeholder feedback must be documented and evaluated as part of the policy review process.

In response to the question regarding interim policy renewals, the policy now provides that if an extension beyond the cumulative twelve-month interim policy period is sought from the Board of Trustees, the relevant shared governance leadership body must be consulted and given the opportunity to provide an advisory statement to the Board before any extension is considered.

Additionally, the Expedited Review Process section was expanded to expressly include Shared Governance Leadership among the parties consulted during expedited policy reviews. This change helps ensure that governance partners are informed and involved even when circumstances require a shortened review timeline.