

---

**LAMAR UNIVERSITY**  
**MANUAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

**SECTION: Academic Affairs**  
**AREA: General**

**MAPP 02.01.01**

<b>University-level Academic Policies</b>
---

**I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE**

- A. The purpose of this policy is to establish and describe the procedures for developing, approving, revising, rescinding, and maintaining university-level academic policies.
- B. This policy is intended to enhance operational processes, best practices, shared governance, compliance, effective decision-making, and transparency with respect to the manner in which university-level academic policies are established and maintained.
- C. The development, approval, revision, rescission, and maintenance of unit-level academic policies—policies with application only to the issuing unit (e.g., department, college, center)—shall be excluded from the procedures set forth in this policy, granted the unit-level policies do not conflict with other Lamar University policies and the Texas State University System (TSUS) *Rules and Regulations*, Texas Education Code, Title 3, Higher Education, Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Education, or state and federal laws.

**II. DEFINITIONS**

- A. **Policy Initiator.** The faculty, staff, or administrator who develops a new academic policy proposal or offers proposed changes to an existing academic policy.
- B. **Academic Policy Proposal.** A policy proposal pertaining to academic personnel, programs, facilities, and services.
- C. **New Policy Proposal.** A newly developed academic policy proposal. New policy proposals require a comprehensive review.
- D. **Interim Policy.** A newly developed or revised academic policy necessitating immediate implementation to address unforeseen circumstances most suitably.
- E. **Policy Revision.** A modification to an existing academic policy affecting wording, context, or procedure.
  - 1. **Minor Policy Revision.** A slight-to-modest editorial revision to an existing academic policy affecting wording and/or compliance issues that does not directly change the meaning or intent of the policy. Minor policy revisions require a conventional review.

2. **Major Policy Revision.** A substantial revision to an existing academic policy affecting context or procedure. Major policy revisions require a comprehensive review.
- F. **Conventional Review.** The review procedure for academic policies undergoing a scheduled periodic review, minor revisions, or proposed rescission.
- G. **Comprehensive Review.** The review procedure for newly proposed academic policies and those undergoing major revisions.
- H. **Academic Policy Advisory Council (APAC).** A standing committee of LU representatives involved in the coordination and maintenance of academic policies. The APAC is composed of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (Chair), Faculty Senate President (or designee), Faculty Handbook Committee Chair (or designee), Council of Instructional Departments President (or designee), and one academic Dean (appointed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs).

### III. PROCEDURES

- A. The policy initiator will submit the academic policy proposal for consideration. Faculty shall submit their policy proposals to the Faculty Senate; staff and administrators shall submit their academic policy proposals to the Provost. Policy proposals must be accompanied with a detailed description and justification statement for the new policy, policy revision, or policy rescission.
- B. New policy proposals shall follow a standard format to ensure consistency. Policy initiators shall adhere to the format described in the Academic Policies Template, which can be accessed through LU's Academic Policies website and is also available upon request from the Office of Academic Affairs.
- C. Proposals for new policies or policy revisions submitted to the Faculty Senate or the Provost will be forwarded to the APAC Chair. The Faculty Senate and the Provost may return proposals that are incomplete, lack the required description and justification statement (III.A), or conflict with TSUS or State of Texas laws, rules, and regulations. The Faculty Senate and Provost will include with the returned proposal a written explanation of the reasons that the proposal has been returned. The proposal's authors may revise the proposal and resubmit it to the Faculty Senate or Provost. New policies or policy revisions that violate TSUS or State of Texas law, rules, and regulations cannot, under state law, be adopted by the University.
- D. Upon receipt of the policy proposal, the APAC will determine if the policy proposal requires a conventional or comprehensive review. Each APAC member will have a minimum of five (5) working days to provide a response to the Chair.
- E. **Conventional Review.** For a conventional review, the proposed policy revision, policy rescission, or periodic policy review shall be sequentially:
  1. Reviewed, formatted, and prepared for electronic routing by the APAC.
  2. Reviewed independently and simultaneously by the Council of Instructional Departments, Faculty Senate, and Academic Affairs Council.

- a. Each constituency group will respond to the APAC with written comments indicating an approval (with stated rationale), rejection (with stated rationale), or suggestions for substantive changes. All written comments will be electronically recorded by the APAC. An updated draft—complete with markups of the proposed changes, notations to the constituency group(s) recommending the changes, and the date when the changes were made—will be forwarded to the Provost for review.
3. Reviewed by the Provost.
    - a. After all constituency groups have had an opportunity to review and comment upon the proposed policy, the Provost shall examine the policy proposal carefully and endorse or veto the proposed policy. If endorsed, the Provost will return the proposed policy to the APAC with detailed procedural instructions. If vetoed, the Provost will submit a written justification to the APAC, which will be disseminated to the constituency groups. Any policy proposal vetoed by the Provost may be revised and resubmitted to the APAC by the policy initiator.
  4. Submitted to the President’s Leadership Team for notification upon approval by the Provost.
  5. Reviewed and approved, vetoed, or returned to the Provost by the President.
  6. Posted in the online MAPP upon final approval by the President.
- F. **Comprehensive Review.** For a comprehensive review, the proposed new policy or major policy revision shall be sequentially:
1. Reviewed, formatted, and prepared for electronic routing by the APAC.
  2. Reviewed independently and simultaneously by the Council of Instructional Departments, Faculty Senate, and Academic Affairs Council.
    - a. Each constituency group will respond to the APAC with written comments indicating an approval (with stated rationale), rejection (with stated rationale), or suggestions for substantive changes. All written comments will be electronically recorded by the APAC. An updated draft—complete with markups of the proposed changes, notations to the constituency group(s) recommending the changes, and the date when the changes were made—will be forwarded to the Provost for review.
  3. Reviewed by the Provost.
    - a. After all constituency groups have had an opportunity to review and comment upon the proposed policy, the Provost shall examine the policy proposal carefully and endorse or veto the proposed policy. If endorsed, the Provost will return the proposed policy to the APAC with detailed procedural instructions. If vetoed, the

Provost will submit a written justification to the APAC, which will be disseminated to the constituency groups. Any policy proposal vetoed by the Provost may be revised and resubmitted to the APAC by the policy initiator.

4. Submitted to the President's Leadership Team for notification upon approval by the Provost.
  5. Posted online for a period of 30 calendar days to allow faculty, staff, and administrators an opportunity to submit written comments. All written comments will be evaluated by the APAC. If necessary or appropriate, the APAC will prepare and share an updated draft with the Provost. Council of Instructional Departments, Faculty Senate, and/or members of Academic Affairs Council may request to review the updated draft of the policy.
  6. Reviewed and approved, vetoed, or returned to the Provost with suggestions for changes by the TSUS Office of the Vice Chancellor and General Counsel.
  7. Reviewed and approved, vetoed, or returned to the Provost by the President.
  8. Posted in the online MAPP upon final approval by the President.
- G. Each review period other than the 30 calendar-day public comment period for a policy undergoing a comprehensive review shall span 45 working days. A one-time extension of 15 working days may be requested from the APAC Chair. Reviews not received by either the 45 or 60 working days as determined above will not be considered and the policy proposal shall necessarily advance to the next step in the review process.
- H. The procedures established in this MAPP shall be suspended during the summer months when nine-month faculty are not under contract. Conventional or comprehensive reviews suspended over the summer months shall resume at the start of the academic year.
- I. Unforeseen circumstances may warrant the immediate implementation of an interim policy.
1. Interim policies developed by the TSUS Office of the Vice Chancellor and General Counsel shall be implemented in accordance with the TSUS guidelines.
  2. Interim LU policies shall be developed by the APAC in consultation with the Provost. Faculty Senate will be included in the development of an interim policy should the proposed interim policy directly affect the faculty. The Provost shall approve the interim policy and forward it to the President and the TSUS Office of the Vice Chancellor and General Counsel for final review and approval. The policy will be posted in the online MAPP as an Interim Academic Policy. Interim LU policies may be in effect for up to 12 months, during which time a comprehensive review shall be conducted. Should a comprehensive review not be completed within 12 months, the interim policy shall expire, and the previously approved version of the academic policy (if applicable) shall be reinstated.
- J. Academic policies shall comply with the *TSUS Rules and Regulations* and any law or mandate promulgated by a higher authority (e.g., state or federal law; accrediting body). In the event of a conflict, the academic policy will be rescinded and/or revised to bring it into compliance.

**IV. REVIEW OF EXISTING ACADEMIC POLICIES**

A. All academic policies shall undergo scheduled reviews every three (3) years. The review schedule and the constituency group(s) responsible for conducting the academic policy review shall be posted on each academic policy. Interim review of any academic policy is permitted.

**V. APPROVAL**

Dr. Daniel A. Brown	01/03/2024
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs	Date

Dr. Jaime R. Taylor	01/03/2024
Lamar University President	Date

**POLICY LOG**

Date	Description
10/30/2023	Policy development and campus reviews completed.
01/03/2024	Policy approved by President.