**Policy and Procedure Statement System UPPS No. 01.01.01**

**Issue No. 9**

**Revised Date: 01/02/2019**

 **Effective Date: 02/05/2018**

 **Next Review Date: 04/01/2023 (E5Y)**

 **Sr. Reviewer: Director, University**

 **Planning and Assessment**

**01. POLICY STATEMENTS**

01.01 The Policy and Procedure Statement system provides:

1. a standard form of communicating university and divisional policies and procedures;
2. a structure for regular interval reviews of university and divisional policies and procedures;
3. a means for reviewing university and divisional policies and procedures on an as-needed basis to remain consistent with current practices; and
4. a means for assuring agreement between current practices and applicable regulations and laws.

01.02 The University Policy and Procedure Statements (UPPS) and divisional Policy and Procedure Statements (PPS) impact all Texas State staff, faculty, and students by providing behavior guidelines and communicating responsibilities, rights, or regulations instituted on campus. The [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://policies.txstate.edu/) includes all official university, divisional, and Texas State University System (TSUS) policies. Recent updates to university and divisional policies are also posted on the Policies [Recent Updates](http://policies.txstate.edu/recent-updates.html) web page.

01.03 Any person within the university community may originate or recommend a new UPPS or request revisions to an existing UPPS.

01.04 Any person within a division can recommend to the division vice president a new PPS or request revisions to an existing PPS.

01.05 The appropriate persons, as listed in the reviewers’ section of each policy, will review policies routinely according to their review cycles (e.g., every year (EY), every other year (EOY), odd numbered years (ONY), even number years (ENY), every two years (E2Y), etc.) from the last action date.

01.06 The originating department will assess a policy based on its:

1. necessity;
2. ability to reflect the best practice;

1. clarity and understandability; and
2. effect on customers and stakeholders.

01.07 The official version of a UPPS or PPS is available on the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://www.txstate.edu/effective/upps/). Copies of UPPSs can be found in the office of University Planning and Assessment (UPA) and copies of PPSs can be found within each division vice president’s office.

01.08 UPPS Review minutes are provided to all division representatives upon approval of UPPS documents by the President’s Cabinet. These official UPPS review minutes note the effective date of the UPPS.

01.09 The office of UPA is the official repository for all UPPS documents, including current official documents, all past versions of UPPSs, and reduced or deleted UPPSs.

01.10 If a conflict occurs between a UPPS and a policy reflected in documents of a higher authority (e.g., federal law, state law, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board policy, Regents’ Rules, etc.), the policy as outlined in the document of higher authority will prevail.

01.11 If a conflict occurs between a PPS and the policy outlined in a UPPS, the UPPS will prevail.

01.12 All university employees are responsible for staying current on official UPPS and PPS document revisions.

**02. DEFINITIONS**

02.01 Reviewer – a stakeholder in the policy or procedure being outlined and reviewed.

02.02Senior Reviewer (SR) – typically the person most knowledgeable about the policy. If the identity of the SR is not apparent, the President’s Cabinet will identify the appropriate individual for UPPSs and the division vice president will identify the appropriate individual for PPSs.

02.03 Executive Assistant (EA) – the appropriate division’s executive assistant or a designee.

02.04Director of University Planning and Assessment (UPA) – the person responsible for maintaining and facilitating the review process and posting approved policies to the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://www.txstate.edu/effective/upps/).

02.05 Congressional Style – a method of mark-up in which deletions are lined through and additions are underlined using the Microsoft Word editing format (Track Changes).

02.06Substantive Change – a change to policy that impacts the context of the policy or procedure outlined.

02.07Non-Substantive Change – a change that does not impact the policy or procedure outlined. Examples include typographical errors, grammatical errors, and title changes.

02.08Pen and Ink Changes – any revisions where policy or process require only minimal changes or only specific sections of a policy are addressed without a review of the entire document, producing a “pen and ink” revision.

02.09 [Policy and Procedure Statements Website](http://policies.txstate.edu/) – the official website where all division, university, and TSUS policies are published and maintained.

02.10[Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A50b9cb38-79b3-4f45-91b8-7e09331e9875/UPPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) – a document signed by all reviewers indicating they concur with the proposed revision. In lieu of a [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A50b9cb38-79b3-4f45-91b8-7e09331e9875/UPPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc), emails from ALL reviewers may serve to indicate approval.

02.11 Reduced Document – an official policy statement that was once a UPPS but has been reduced to the division level as a PPS.

02.12 Review Cycles – a period of time when a policy is due for review by the respective divisions to incorporate updated information.

**03. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF EXISTING UPPS DOCUMENTS**

 03.01 The SR updates the document to include all necessary modifications.

a. The EA retrieves the official Word document from the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://policies.txstate.edu/) at least three months prior to the review date and forwards it to the SR for review.

b. Using congressional style, the SR prepares a revision of the UPPS Word document received from the EA based on changes, if any, in the policy or procedure since the most recent review. The SR also incorporates any non-substantive changes. A short justification statement for substantive changes should be inserted immediately after the change (in red ink).

c. The SR routes the revised draft and a [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A50b9cb38-79b3-4f45-91b8-7e09331e9875/UPPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) to all listed reviewers.

1) Multiple Reviewers – The revised UPPS will address comments from all reviewers. The SR will obtain a consensus from all reviewers regarding proposed changes. Signing the [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A50b9cb38-79b3-4f45-91b8-7e09331e9875/UPPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) or an email approval demonstrates consensus.

2) Lack of Consensus – If reviewers cannot come to consensus, the SR will determine which changes to recommend to the President’s Cabinet. The SR must make the views of the other reviewers known to the Cabinet in the comment section of the [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A50b9cb38-79b3-4f45-91b8-7e09331e9875/UPPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc).

3) Lack of Approval – If a reviewer refuses to sign off on the [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A50b9cb38-79b3-4f45-91b8-7e09331e9875/UPPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) after at least two notification attempts, the SR will notate on that reviewer’s signature line on the [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A50b9cb38-79b3-4f45-91b8-7e09331e9875/UPPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) that the reviewer refuses to sign, and the decision can be made to remove that person as a reviewer of the UPPS.

03.02 The SR emails a copy of the revised draft UPPS (with live and accurate links, where appropriate) and the completed [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A50b9cb38-79b3-4f45-91b8-7e09331e9875/UPPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) to the appropriate divisional EA. In cases where proposed changes are non-substantive only or are specific to only selected sections of the policy and not a complete review, the SR will note in the email that the revision is “pen and ink” and explain the details.

03.03 The EA should make sure all URLs link to appropriate documents, and then send the draft UPPS to all other divisions, via email to the divisional EAs, for review and comment. The EA will also send the draft UPPS and signed Reviewers’ Approval Sheet to the director of UPA for tracking. In the email, the EA will:

1. notate whether the revision is a “pen and ink” review with only minimal changes to one or two sections and clearly indicate that proposed modifications are not based on a full document review. Therefore, only comments relevant to proposed section changes will be accepted; notate whether it is a pen and ink with only minimal changes but a full review was allowed; or notate that it is a full review with substantive changes; and

\*b. ask divisional EAs to send comments directly to the director of UPA by a specified deadline, preferably within three weeks.

03.04 By the stated deadline, each EA will compile responses and send them via email to the director of UPA, noting whether the comments are substantive or non-substantive. If a division has no comments, that EA will send a “no comment” message to the director of UPA.

03.05 The senior administrative assistant in the Special Assistant to the President’s office circulates the draft UPPS to:

1. TSUS legal staff;
2. the director of Athletics; and
3. Staff Council.

03.06 The senior administrative assistant in the Special Assistant to the President’s office forwards comments received to the director of UPA.

03.07 Once all divisional comments are received, the director of UPA will compile the comments and sort them as substantive and non-substantive. The director then sends the comments document to the SR for consideration and copies the appropriate divisional EA. The correspondence will include a deadline for response.

\*03.08 The SR should address each comment in blue ink, noting whether to incorporate the change by stating “CONCUR,” or by stating “DO NOT CONCUR” if the SR disagrees with the suggested comment. Once completed, the SR should send the document, complete with appropriate responses to comments, to the director of UPA and copy the respective EA. Senior reviewer responses will be made available to faculty and staff on the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](https://policies.txstate.edu/policy-comments.html) (login will be required).

03.09 Based on the feedback received from the SR, the director of UPA will determine whether to submit the draft UPPS for electronic approval or to add it to the agenda for the next President’s Cabinet meeting.

1. Electronic Approval – The director of UPA sends the SR comments, electronically, to the President’s Cabinet after incorporating or resolving all comments or indicating no comments were submitted.

1) If electronic approval of a UPPS fails, the director of UPA will request that the draft UPPS be added to the next President’s Cabinet agenda for further discussion and possibly invite the SR to the meeting.

2) If the UPPS is approved electronically, that approval is reflected in the UPPS Review minutes, which are then sent to all EAs and Cabinet members.

3) The appropriate EA will incorporate all approved comments into the electronic version of the UPPS based on the SR response to comments previously submitted and approved. The EA then sends the UPPS with approved comments incorporated, making sure all links are active and working, to the director of UPA via email for final processing and posting to the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://policies.txstate.edu/).

1. President’s Cabinet Meeting

1) If required, the director of UPA will request that a UPPS discussion be added to a President’s Cabinet agenda.

(a) The director of UPA will notify all EAs of the time and date for the Cabinet meeting discussion.

(b) If necessary, the director of UPA will invite the SRs with UPPSs on the agenda to the meeting, noting the specific time scheduled for each.

(c) The President’s Cabinet will then meet to review the disputed UPPSs.

2) Upon receipt of the President’s Cabinet minutes, the appropriate EA will incorporate approved comments.

(a) The appropriate EA will incorporate all comments based on the SR’s written response and any further instructions from the President’s Cabinet.

(b) The appropriate EA will email the UPPS with comments incorporated, making sure all URLs link to the appropriate document, to the director of UPA for final processing and posting to the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://policies.txstate.edu/).

03.10 The “pen and ink” change process is also used to document changes to existing policies that result from President’s Cabinet deliberations and presidential decisions. In such cases, the president will determine on a case-by-case basis whether the change requires further immediate campus-wide review or whether such review will be deferred until the next regular review cycle.

**04. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF EXISTING PPS DOCUMENTS**

 04.01 The SR updates the document to include all necessary modifications.

a. The EA retrieves the official Word document from the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://policies.txstate.edu/) and forwards it to the SR for review.

b. Using congressional style, the SR prepares a revision of the PPS Word document received from the EA based on changes, if any, in the policy or procedure since the most recent review. The SR also incorporates any non-substantive changes. A short justification statement for substantive changes should be inserted immediately after the change (in red ink).

c. The SR routes the revised draft and a [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A2d75607f-2cc4-4c04-8407-680230535be0/PPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) to all listed reviewers.

1) Multiple Reviewers – The revised PPS will address comments from all reviewers. The SR will obtain a consensus from all reviewers regarding proposed changes. Signing the [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A2d75607f-2cc4-4c04-8407-680230535be0/PPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) or an email approval demonstrates consensus.

2) Lack of Consensus – If reviewers cannot come to consensus, the SR will determine which changes to recommend to the divisional vice president. The SR must make the views of the other reviewers known to the divisional vice president in the comment section of the [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A2d75607f-2cc4-4c04-8407-680230535be0/PPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc).

3) Lack of Approval – If a reviewer refuses to sign off on the [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A2d75607f-2cc4-4c04-8407-680230535be0/PPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) after at least two notification attempts, the SR will notate on that reviewer’s signature line on the [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A2d75607f-2cc4-4c04-8407-680230535be0/PPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) that the reviewer refuses to sign, and the decision can be made to remove that person as a reviewer of the PPS.

04.02 The SR emails a copy of the revised draft PPS (with live and accurate links, where appropriate) and the completed [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A2d75607f-2cc4-4c04-8407-680230535be0/PPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) to the appropriate divisional EA for tracking. In cases where proposed changes are non-substantive only or are specific to only selected sections of the policy and not a complete review, the SR will note in the email that the revision is “pen and ink” and explain the details.

04.03 The EA should make sure all URLs link to appropriate documents, and then sends the draft PPS with the recommended changes noted to the divisional vice president for final approval.

\*04.04 Once approved by the divisional vice president, the EA will incorporate all agreed-upon changes in the policy and email the policy to the director of UPA for final processing and posting to the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://policies.txstate.edu/). For AA/PPSs, senior reviewer responses will be made available to faculty and staff on the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](https://policies.txstate.edu/policy-comments.html) (login will be required).

**05. PROCEDURES FOR INTRODUCING A NEW UPPS**

05.01 The appropriate vice president will identify reviewers when a new UPPS has been proposed. As necessary, the President’s Cabinet will select a SR in cases of more than one assigned reviewer.

1. Reviewers develop a draft UPPS that addresses the identified needs (see [proper format](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A8cb03a6b-204e-4d23-be34-9d2f81a0c949/Proper-Format-for-University-Policy-and-Procedures-Statements-%28UPPSs%29.doc) for detailed instructions). Please refer to the [Editorial Style Guide](https://brand.txstate.edu/editorial-style-guide.html) adopted by Texas State.
2. All key stakeholders must have an opportunity to comment.
3. Reviewers must consider legal ramifications.
4. Reviewers must address conflicting issues with the policy across divisions.

05.02 The SR forwards the completed UPPS draft with live and accurate links, where appropriate, along with the signed [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A50b9cb38-79b3-4f45-91b8-7e09331e9875/UPPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc), to the appropriate divisional EA.

05.03 The EA will double check that all URLs link to appropriate documents and email the proposed UPPS to the director of UPA for an assigned UPPS number.

05.04 The EA then sends the draft UPPS out to all other divisions, via email to the divisional EAs, for review and comment:

\*a. The EA will direct reviewers to send comments via their divisional EA to the director of UPA by a specified deadline, usually within three weeks.

b. The EA will also forward the reviewed draft to the director of UPA, along with the signed [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A50b9cb38-79b3-4f45-91b8-7e09331e9875/UPPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc).

05.05 Follow steps outlined in Sections 03.04 through 03.09.

05.06 Special procedures for the approval of a UPPS without prior review:

a. If the president determines that circumstances require the immediate implementation of a new UPPS, the president may waive any or all steps outlined above and approve a UPPS without following the review cycle described above. The president has approval authority of any waiver or exception to a UPPS not otherwise specified in the UPPS.

b. Such presidential approval authorizes immediate implementation and dissemination of the policy, with a substantive review to follow.

**06. PROCEDURES FOR INTRODUCING A NEW PPS**

06.01 The appropriate vice president will identify reviewers when a new PPS has been proposed and select a SR in cases of more than one assigned reviewer.

a. Reviewers develop a draft PPS that addresses the identified needs (see [proper format](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A42a1c6f5-425f-45a0-844a-7cc5297ebfdd/Proper-Format-for-Divisional-Policy-and-Procedures-Statements-%28PPSs%29.doc) for detailed instructions). Please see the [Editorial Style Guide](https://brand.txstate.edu/editorial-style-guide.html) adopted by Texas State.

b. All key stakeholders must have an opportunity to comment.

c. Reviewers must consider legal ramifications.

1. Reviewers must address conflicting issues within the division.

06.02 The SR forwards the completed PPS draft with live and accurate links, where appropriate, along with the signed [Reviewers’ Approval Sheet,](https://gato-docs.its.txstate.edu/jcr%3A2d75607f-2cc4-4c04-8407-680230535be0/PPS-Reviewers%27-Approval-Sheet.doc) to the appropriate divisional EA.

06.03 The EA will double check that all URLs link to appropriate documents and email the proposed PPS to the director of UPA for an assigned PPS number.

06.04 The EA then sends the draft PPS to the appropriate vice president for review and approval.

\*06.05 The EA will send the final PPS to the director of UPA for processing and posting to the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://policies.txstate.edu/). For AA/PPSs, senior reviewer responses will be made available to faculty and staff on the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](https://policies.txstate.edu/policy-comments.html) (login will be required).

**07. GUIDELINES FOR FACILITATING PPS DOCUMENTS**

07.01 The affected offices will negotiate concerns resulting from PPSs and, if necessary, refer those concerns to the President’s Cabinet via the appropriate divisional vice president.

07.02 Divisional PPSs specify policies and procedures that guide each division in executing areas of responsibility.

07.03 In order to avoid conflicts among divisional PPSs, each vice president will assure consultations between appropriate stakeholders in other divisions.

**08. GUIDELINES FOR ACCEPTABLE LINKS WITHIN POLICIES**

08.01 Official UPPSs and PPSs may include links, but will not include “attachments” to other documents (e.g., forms, templates), as the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://policies.txstate.edu/) will not maintain or publish such documents.

08.02 If a SR would like to include or reference forms or documents, these should be maintained on the department’s own website and a web address link (i.e., a url) should be provided within the policy.

08.03 It is never acceptable to include links to “unofficial” or “unapproved” policies or procedures within an officially-approved UPPS or PPS. Policies or procedures that are maintained on an individual department website and that are subject to update or revision without following the formal policy review and approval process, could potentially impact the integrity of the officially-approved policy.

08.04 Acceptable links within a policy include:

a. forms:

1) include a “latest revised” date at the bottom of each page (e.g., “UPA – 12/21/2016”); and

2) include an ownership identifier at the bottom of each page (e.g., “UPA – 12/21/2016”);

b. templates:

1) include a “latest revised” date at the bottom of each page (e.g., “UPA – 12/21/2016”); and

2) include an ownership identifier at the bottom of each page (e.g., “UPA – 12/21/2016”);

c. links to other officially-approved policies referenced;

d. links to state or federal laws or mandates;

e. other referenced official departmental and external websites (e.g., [Texas Education Code](https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/Docs/SDocs/EDUCATIONCODE.pdf), [TSUS Office of the General Counsel](http://www.txstate.edu/tsusgencoun/)); and

1. links to figures, tables, or resource manuals in support of the policy, as long as they do not include actual policies and procedures that have not been formally approved by the appropriate division vice president (for PPSs) or the President’s Cabinet (for UPPSs).

**09. RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNIVERSITY PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT**

09.01 Send a monthly reminder to EAs to check the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://policies.txstate.edu/) for policies up for review three months prior. Distribute a rolling 12-month list of documents up for review monthly, along with review dates to EAs.

09.02 Ensure receipt of comments in a timely manner and send any needed reminders to EAs.

09.03 Guide the UPPS and PPS review processes in accordance with this policy.

\*09.04 Facilitate the electronic approval process and record and distribute minutes. For UPPSs and AA/PPSs, senior reviewer responses will be made available to faculty and staff on the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](https://policies.txstate.edu/policy-comments.html) (login will be required).

09.05 Edit final UPPS and PPS documents for style and voice consistency and route for signature approval to the SR and his or her chain of command. If a “pen and ink” memo is drafted in lieu of making corrections within the UPPS or PPS, the final UPPS or PPS document does not need to be routed for approval. In this instance, the director of UPA will notify the appropriate EA of the web posting.

09.06 Post the official version of all UPPS and PPS documents on the [Policy and Procedure Statements website](http://policies.txstate.edu/).

09.07 Maintain an index of all UPPSs and PPSs, the most recent review date, names of reviewers, and all other pertinent information to facilitate the review process.

09.08 Submit a list of delinquent UPPSs to the President’s Cabinet and a list of delinquent PPSs to the appropriate vice president monthly.

**10. RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRESIDENT’S CABINET**

10.01 The President’s Cabinet will assure the timely review and approval of all official UPPS documents.

**11. REVIEWERS OF THIS UPPS**

11.01 Reviewers of this UPPS include the following:

Position Date

 Director, University Planning and April 1 E5Y

Assessment

 Senior Administrative Assistant, April 1 E5Y

 Academic Affairs

 Executive Assistant, Finance and April 1 E5Y

 Support Services

Executive Assistant, Information April 1 E5Y

 Technology

 Executive Assistant, Student Success April 1 E5Y

 Executive Assistant, University April 1 E5Y

Advancement

Senior Administrative Assistant, April 1 E5Y

Special Assistant to the President

**12. CERTIFICATION STATEMENT**

This UPPS has been approved by the following individuals in their official capacities and represents Texas State policy and procedure from the date of this document until superseded.

 Director, University Planning and Assessment; senior reviewer of this UPPS

 Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness

 Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

 President