

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW AND REVISION OF UNIVERSITY POLICY STATEMENTS

In alignment with the University's commitment to inclusive excellence, all policy development and revision processes must actively reflect the principles of diversity, equity, inclusion, accessibility, and social justice as described in UPS 100.007.

These guidelines are designed to support committees in creating equitable, transparent, and responsive policies. These guidelines are developed and maintained by the Academic Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Committee.

The guidelines are organized into three key stages of policy work:

1. Before review or development
2. During review or development
3. After review or development.

These guidelines include lists of questions for the committee to consider. However, the guidelines are not intended to require committees to answer every question listed. Rather, they are meant to serve as a tool to help committees identify which equity-related considerations are most relevant to the specific University Policy Statement (UPS) or Academic Senate Document (ASD) they are developing, reviewing, or revising.

Committees are encouraged to use the guiding questions to inform discussion, uncover potential impacts, and strengthen the inclusivity of their work. At any stage of the process, committees are encouraged to consult with the Academic Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Committee for guidance on how to interpret and apply the guidelines within the context of their work.

Before Review or Development

Focus: Setting intentions, identifying impacted community members, assessing need and scope.

Before drafting or revising a document, it is important to consider the context surrounding the policy. This foundational step ensures that decisions are rooted in transparency, accountability, and an understanding of institutional history, equity implications, and community impacts.

Committees should begin by reviewing the origins and rationale behind the proposed policy or revision. This step helps ensure that the committee's work is grounded in evidence, aligned with institutional values, and responsive to the concerns of constituents. In their discussions, the committee should consider the following prompts and questions.

Category	Key questions to consider
<p>Policy Origins and Purpose</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How was this policy developed initially, and who was involved? 2. If a new policy is being developed, why is it being developed, and how was it decided who should develop it? 3. Why is the policy under review now? 4. Have specific concerns or criticisms been raised about this policy? If so, by whom? 5. Is the issue or problem clearly defined and supported by relevant data or context? 6. What institutional data, research, or best practices from other institutions inform this policy?
<p>Institutional Context and Alignment</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have previous efforts to address this issue been documented and evaluated? 2. Have unintended outcomes of prior policies been identified? 3. Is the policy consistent with laws, system policies, executive orders, or collective bargaining agreements? 4. How might external parties (e.g., public, officials, accreditors) view this policy?

<p>Equity and Inclusion Impacts</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who is affected by this policy, and who benefits from it? 2. How does the policy impact workload, especially for those already culturally taxed? 3. What supports are in place for those impacted by the policy? 4. Does the policy consider specific needs based on gender, race, disability, class, etc.? 5. Does the policy acknowledge and address systemic inequities? 6. Does the policy promote anti-racism or help dismantle inequitable practices? 7. What accountability measures are in place to assess the impact of the policy?
--	---

2. During Review or Development

Focus: Centering equity, incorporating diverse perspectives, documenting rationale, and maintaining transparency.

In this phase committees should engage in thoughtful dialogue about the key areas listed below and document the rationale behind their decisions.

Consultation

To ensure that campus community members are given an opportunity to provide input and influence policy development and revision, committees shall consult with relevant parties regarding potential additions or changes to the policy statement. This may include, but not be limited to, HRIE, faculty and staff associations, union representatives, student groups, general counsel, and others. Committees shall ensure that perspectives from historically marginalized groups are intentionally included.

Policy Language

To ensure that the policy language aligns with the university’s values and does not unintentionally or intentionally marginalize or exclude any group, committees shall ensure the language throughout the document is inclusive, non-discriminatory, and reflects a commitment to inclusion, clarity, and accessibility.

Impact: To ensure that no group is disproportionately burdened or negatively impacted by the policy, committees shall evaluate how the policy affects various groups, particularly those from historically marginalized communities, to prevent unintended disparities.

Implementation

To ensure that the responsibilities for implementation of the policies are clearly assigned, equitably distributed, and supported with necessary resources, the committee shall discuss how the roles and responsibilities are defined, the availability of support and training for those responsible for the policy implementation, and the resources required for policy implementation. Committees should consider that policy documents can influence the priorities which guide the allocation of budget and other resources, such as personnel and infrastructure, which may change the impact of the policy.

Category	Key questions to consider
Consultation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were the changes informed by consultations with stakeholders (e.g., using surveys)? 2. Was there transparent communication with impacted communities throughout the policy development or revision process, ensuring that those impacted by the policy were informed and had opportunities for feedback? 3. Were perspectives from historically marginalized groups intentionally included? 4. Was the consultation process transparent, inclusive, and documented?
Language	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the policy use gender-neutral, inclusive language and consider the needs of campus members from diverse cultural and religious backgrounds? 2. Are terms that are used clearly defined, or are references made to documents in which the terms are defined?
Impact	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will the changes increase the workload of those already culturally taxed, and if so, what supports are in place?

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Will the changes disproportionately affect some campus members more than others? 3. Can the committee identify potential unintended impacts of the changes that may increase disparities, and if so how can these be mitigated? 4. Do the changes acknowledge systemic inequities and incorporate an intersectional lens to identify impacts across diverse populations? 5. Are the changes transparent and is there a plan to inform affected campus members? 6. What accountability measures are in place (e.g., how will impacts be assessed)? 7. Do the changes promote anti-racism and dismantle policies that promote inequity?
Implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are roles and responsibilities clearly defined and assigned for policy implementation? 2. Is the implementation workload distributed equitably, with attention to cultural taxation? 3. Is there adequate support or training to help those in various roles meet their responsibilities? 4. How were power dynamics between implementers and affected individuals considered? 5. How can the policy influence allocation of resources (e.g., funding, time, personnel, training, infrastructure) with attention to promoting equity? 6. Have resource needs of impacted groups been assessed?

3. After Review or Development: Accountability, Communication, and Feedback

Focus: Accountability, transparency, communication, and institutional memory.

After the policy revision process is completed, it is critical to establish clear processes for accountability, communication, and ongoing improvement. This section outlines the importance of documenting the review and revision process, ongoing communication with

relevant community members, and planning for regular reassessment to ensure that the policy remains aligned with institutional goals.

Record Keeping

It is important that all discussions, especially when there is disagreement or lack of consensus, are thoroughly documented to ensure transparency and clarity for future reference. This includes keeping a record of consultations with relevant parties, providing a complete account of how the guidelines were applied, and addressing any sections of the guidelines that did not apply.