

Keystone Shared Governance Committee

“Suggested Guidelines for Response to Policy and Procedure Proposals When Not Recommended for Keystone Endorsement.”

In 2005 Dr. Hill submitted a document titled “Keystone Guidelines for Policy and Procedure Proposals.” The rationale for the document in part states: “The desire of Keystone is to provide clear criteria for the consideration of policy proposal.” The suggested guidelines are logical and comprehensive. If on the front end of a proposal departments and individuals follow the suggested guidelines, it is logical that similar key guidelines would be followed when the proposal is not recommended for Keystone endorsement. Such an approach speaks directly to the credibility of Keystone and the rigor of U-High. This approach would ensure that policy consideration is grounded in pedagogy and best practice. Using the above referenced document as a template, we suggest subcommittees use the following guidelines to articulate reasons for not recommending a proposed policy. That narrative would then be distributed to the party (parties) submitting the proposal and to Keystone when the subcommittee makes its report to that body.

1. **Rationale:** Respond to the rationale presented in the proposal. Articulate reasons for the decision to not recommend the proposed policy based on the rationale.
2. **Impact Upon Students, Staff, and School:** How was the impact this policy would have on students, staff and school considered in the decision to not recommend the proposed policy.
3. **Relationship to Mission:** Was the proposed policy in line with U-High’s mission? Would recommendation of this policy be in opposition to our mission? Was this a reason for not recommending the policy?
4. **Collaboration:** Have all of the constituencies identified in the proposal as being affected by the policy been represented in the decision that this proposal not be recommended? What surveys or data has been compiled? How has this input contributed to the subcommittee’s decision?
5. **Learning & Research:** What research was reviewed that supports the subcommittee’s decision? Were policies at other schools reviewed?

6. **Data:** How does the data compiled by the subcommittee support the decision that the policy not be recommended? How does that data show that this proposal would not contribute to the success of UHS? Is this data as credible as the proposal data?

7. **ISU Connection:** Would the proposed policy have a negative impact with respect to ISU? If so, articulate the nature of that impact.