

POLICY ON INSTITUTIONAL POLICY & PROCEDURE (GP 1)

CATEGORY	General Policy (GP)	EFFECTIVE	Spring 2025
RESPONSIBLE UNIT	Office of the President	CONTACT	president@nevadastate.edu
APPLIES TO	Students, Academic Faculty, Administrative Faculty, Classified Employees, Other Employee Types, Contractors, and the Public		
HISTORY	New Policy		
RELATED FORMS AND RESOURCES	Policy Webpage: University Policy - Nevada State University Definitions (Appendix A) IPAC Charter (Appendix B) Institutional Policy and Procedure Template (Appendix C) Policy Initiation Request Form (Form 1) Policy Request IPAC Review Form (Form 2) Policy Request Executive Team Approval Form (Form 3) Policy Impact Questionnaire (Form 4) Institutional Policy Review Routing Form (Form 5) General Policy Appeal Request Form (Form 6) General Policy Appeal Decision Form (Form 7)		

DEFINITIONS

Key terms and phrases used in this policy are defined in **Appendix A**.

Section 1: POLICY STATEMENT

General Policy 1: Policy on Institutional Policy and Procedure (GP 1) codifies the Nevada State University life cycle for institutional policy. All institutional policies and procedures are subject to the terms outlined in GP 1, unless addressed by another General Policy.

Section 2: POLICY

Nevada State University will provide accessible institutional policies through standardized development processes.

Institutional policy and procedure shall:

- Be developed using the most current GP 1 procedure;
- Support the institution in achieving its mission;
- Advance the institution's strategic plan;
- Use institutional standardized templates and format;
- Promote operational efficiency and excellence;
- Implement Nevada State Higher Education (NSHE) policy;
- Comply with statutes, regulations, ordinances, and industry standards and requirements;
- Advance commitments to diversity, equity, inclusion, accessibility and justice;
- Minimize organizational risk.

Institutional policies are developed by a Policy Development Team (PDT) and reviewed by an Institutional Policy Advisory Council (IPAC) so that impacted individuals and subject-matter experts have direct involvement in developing the policies that affect them.

Policy development timelines outlined in the GP 1 procedure are subject to change based on institutional obligations, the academic calendar, employee contracts and capacities. Any portion of policy development that requires the input of off-contract employees shall pause during off-contract times, except in the case of emergency or compliance exceptions.

The approval authorities for institutional policy and procedure are the President and the Responsible Unit Vice President, or the Vice President's designee. Vice Presidents may delegate their approval authority. Only the President may provide a final decision on policy and this authority may not be delegated. This decision becomes part of the university's official records. Policy approval and decision signatures are documented on the Institutional Policy Review Routing Form.

GP 1 shall be reviewed by the Policy Development Team, or an equivalent set of representatives as appointed by their constituents, within 18 months of implementation.

Academic policies are developed according to General Policy 2: Policy on Academic Policy and Procedure (GP 2).

Section 3: STATUTES, REGULATIONS, & ORDINANCES

Institutional policies and procedures shall adhere to governing statutes, regulations and ordinances, including:

Federal Statutes

The general and permanent laws of the United States are consolidated and codified by subject matter in the United States Code. <https://uscode.house.gov/>

Nevada Statutes

The Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) are the current codified laws of the State of Nevada. <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/law1.html>

The State Administrative Manual (SAM) is a compilation of policy statements concerning the internal operations of State government.

<https://budget.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/budgetnv.gov/content/Governance/SAM.pdf>

Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Handbook

The Board of Regents Handbook provides the governing documents and policies for NSHE.

<https://nshe.nevada.edu/wp-content/uploads/file/BoardOfRegents/Handbook/COMPLETEHANDBOOKREV306.pdf>

Accreditation

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) requires institutional compliance with relevant standards, policies, and eligibility. The criteria for NWCCU accreditation can be found at <https://nwccu.org/standards/>.

Institutional policy may also be established in the absence of specific statutes where a particular policy and procedure is necessary to conduct business.

Section 4: PROCEDURE

Institutional policy shall be developed according to the following procedure, as applicable:

INSTITUTIONAL POLICY & PROCEDURE LIFE CYCLE				
PRE-DEVELOP	DEVELOP	REVIEW & APPROVE	IMPLEMENT	MAINTAIN
Initiate Launch	Draft Edit Initial Review	Public Comment Legal Review Recommend Advance Decide	Distribute	Enforce Re-Initiate Suspend or Repeal Archive Review Cycle

PHASE 1: PRE-DEVELOP

Subsection 1: Initiate

Any Nevada State University internal community member with an active NSHE ID and portal access may identify the need for new institutional policy or a change to existing policy and submit a Policy Initiation Request Form which will be routed to the Institutional Policy Advisory Committee (IPAC). (See Appendix B: IPAC Charter).

The Policy Initiation Request Form found under Related Forms and Resources, shall include:

- A summary of the policy's purpose, scope and alignment with institutional goals;
- Recommendations for a Policy Development Lead (PDL) and Policy Development Team (PDT) members, if applicable;
- Request for expedited policy development based on standards outlined under Exceptions.

The Department of CPP shall:

- Receive, process, and track Policy Initiation Request Forms;
- Communicate with the Policy Initiation Request Form Submitter (Submitter) and IPAC Facilitator throughout the process;
- Update the policy webpage to reflect that the request has been received within 10 calendar days.

The IPAC shall review the request for the following:

- Whether the need identified by the Submitter exists;
- Whether a policy already exists that addresses the need;
- Whether a policy is necessary and valid at the institutional level;
- Whether a policy would infringe on academic freedom, freedom of speech, or create identity-based discrimination;
- Whether the request qualifies for expedited policy development, as outlined under Exceptions.

Unless the IPAC unanimously votes "Do not recommend" all proposed policy will be forwarded to the Executive Team as recommended for development.

The IPAC will complete the IPAC Review Form and provide it to the Executive Team and the Submitter.

The Executive Team shall evaluate the request and approve or deny action by completing the Policy Request Executive Team Approval Form and providing it to the IPAC Facilitator.

- If approved for action, the Executive Team shall:
 - Designate the Responsible Unit;
 - Assign a Policy Development Lead from the Responsible Unit
 - Approve or deny expedited policy exceptions;
 - Identify the timeline for action.

All Policy Initiation Request details, including the record of IPAC recommendations and the Executive Team's decision and justification shall be shared using an Office of Information & Technology Services-recognized method.

If denied for action, the Executive Team shall provide justification. The justification must indicate the BOR Handbook, NSHE Procedures and Guidelines Manual, code, statute, or ordinance necessitating the denial.

The IPAC Facilitator shall inform the Submitter, IPAC, and Department of CPP of the decision.

Subsection 2: Launch

If approved for action, the Department of CPP shall, as needed:

- Schedule a consultation with the PDL or Responsible Unit;
- Provide the PDL with guidance on the creation of the PDT;
- Provide the PDL or Responsible Unit with related forms and resources;
- Assign a policy category, code and title.

Following the consultation, the PDL shall invite members to join the team. The PDL shall email all elected governance groups and school deans inviting them to nominate representative(s) to the PDT or to abstain from participation. The PDT may consist of:

- Member(s) of the Responsible Unit;
- Subject-matter experts;
- Individuals representing each elected governance group;
- Individuals representing uniquely impacted groups, if applicable.

After the submissions of nominations for the PDT, the IPAC Facilitator shall, with input from the IPAC as needed:

- Confirm that the PDT includes members in alignment with its scope and purpose and request revisions, as needed;
- Provide the Department of CPP with a PDT membership list.

The Department of CPP shall:

- Update www.nevadastate.edu/policy with the PDT membership list within 10 calendar days of receipt.

Once the PDT has been created, the PDL shall establish a means of team collaboration and communication using an Office of Information & Technology Services-recognized method.

PHASE 2: DEVELOP***Subsection 3: Draft***

The PDL shall:

- Plan and facilitate PDT work sessions;
- Draft the policy and procedure using the Institutional Policy and Procedure Template found in Related Forms and Resources;
- Consult with legal counsel to ensure compliance with statutes, regulations, and ordinances;
- Evaluate the policy and procedure using the Policy Impact Questionnaire found in Related Forms and Resources.

Subsection 4: Edit

The PDL may submit the policy and procedure draft to elected governance groups, impacted

campus groups and other subject-matter experts for feedback during the drafting process, as needed. When satisfied that all feedback on the draft has been appropriately addressed, the PDL shall move the draft to initial review.

Subsection 5: Initial Review

The PDL shall submit the policy and procedure draft via email to policy@nevadastate.edu.

Upon receiving the draft, the IPAC shall complete an initial review, confirming that:

- The need identified by the Submitter was addressed;
- The policy doesn't overlap with existing policy;
- The policy doesn't infringe on academic freedom, freedom of speech, or create identity-based discrimination;
- The policy doesn't obviously violate any statutes, regulations or ordinances.

As needed, the IPAC Facilitator shall request revisions from the PDL. Once completed, the PDL shall resubmit.

After IPAC review, the PDL shall provide the draft to the Responsible Unit Vice President who may request revisions or confirm as ready for the public comment period.

PHASE 3: REVIEW AND APPROVE

Subsection 6: Public Comment

To initiate public comment, the PDL shall email the confirmed draft to policy@nevadastate.edu.

The Department of CPP shall:

- Open a public comment period for a minimum of 30 calendar days by publishing the draft on the policy webpage;
- Inform the campus community via Office of Information & Technology Services-recognized institutional communication channels.

Any Nevada State University internal community member with an active NSHE ID and portal access may submit comments. Individual and group feedback shall be submitted via the institutional public comment mechanism facilitated by the Department of CPP. All public comment shall be captured via a non-disclosed feedback form available to the university community. Public comments are not publicly disclosed. Once all feedback has been collected, the Department of CPP shall provide it to the PDL within 10 calendar days.

The PDT shall consider all public comment period feedback and revise the policy as needed. The PDT shall track decisions to include or exclude specific feedback and document justification for excluding feedback.

- If necessary, depending on the number of comments and scope of feedback, the PDT may choose to restart the draft process at Subsection 3: Draft.
- If satisfied that all feedback has been appropriately addressed, the PDT may choose to move to draft finalization.

The Department of CPP shall update the policy website with the draft status.

To finalize the draft, the PDL shall:

- Complete the Policy Impact Questionnaire;
- Submit the final draft, completed questionnaire and the Policy Review Routing Form, found in Related Forms and Resources, to the Responsible Unit Vice President.

The Responsible Unit Vice President shall:

- Note any edits on the Policy Review Routing Form;
- Sign the Policy Review Routing Form as approved with revisions or approved as is;
- Email the Policy Review Routing Form to the PDL and copy policy@nevadastate.edu.

Once any edits are completed, the PDL shall email the final draft, Policy Impact Questionnaire, and Policy Review Routing Form to policy@nevadastate.edu.

The Department of CPP shall provide the policy and procedure final draft and Policy Impact Questionnaire to the IPAC for review within 10 calendar days.

The IPAC shall complete review of the final draft, confirming that the policy and procedure:

- Is written clearly, with thorough attention to process and procedure;
- Is formatted using the Institutional Policy and Procedure Template;
- Addresses the need identified by the Submitter;
- Doesn't overlap with existing policy;
- Doesn't infringe on academic freedom, freedom of speech, or create identity-based discrimination;
- Doesn't obviously violate any statutes, regulations or ordinances.

Facilitator shall:

- Note any edits on the Policy Review Routing Form;
- Sign the Policy Review Routing Form as approved with revisions or approved as is;
- Email the Policy Review Routing Form to the PDL and copy policy@nevadastate.edu.

Subsection 7: Legal Review

Once any edits are completed, the PDL shall email the policy and procedure final draft, Policy Impact Questionnaire, and Policy Review Routing Form to the institution's General Counsel at gc@nevadastate.edu and copy policy@nevadastate.edu.

General Counsel shall:

- Review the policy and procedure final draft for legal sufficiency and note any required edits on the Policy Review Routing Form;
- Sign the Policy Review Routing Form as approved with revisions or approved as is;
- Email the Policy Review Routing Form to the PDL and copy policy@nevadastate.edu.

The PDL shall finalize the draft and email it to policy@nevadastate.edu.

Subsection 8: Recommend

Elected Governance Groups Recommendation:

- The Department of CPP shall provide the final policy draft, Policy Impact Questionnaire, and Policy Review Routing Form to each elected governance group chair or their designee.
- Each elected governance group shall independently facilitate recommendation to approve according to their standards. The elected governance group chair or their designee shall electronically sign the Policy Review Routing Form indicating whether the elected governance group recommends, does not recommend, or abstains. The elected governance group recommendation indicates the group's review and support for a policy to proceed to approval. The chair or their designee does not act in his or her individual capacity; rather they make recommendations based on the decisions or action of the elected governance group.
- Non-response within the allowed timeline shall be noted as abstention. In this case, the Department of CPP shall confirm abstention from each constituency group chair or their designee prior to advancing. CPP will notify that the process is moving forward.

If any elected governance group does not recommend the policy, the chair or their designee shall indicate the decision justification on the Policy Review Routing Form.

Subsection 9: Advance

Once all constituency groups have signed the Policy Review Routing Form or have been deemed to have abstained, the Responsible Unit Vice President shall review the recommendations.

- If any elected governance group did not recommend the policy, the Responsible Unit Vice President may request that the PDL incorporate edits to the draft. If substantial revisions are completed, the draft may be routed back to Phase 3: Review and Approve.
- Once edits are completed, the elected governance group chairs or designees shall be provided with an opportunity to change their recommendation.

Once the Responsible Unit Vice President approves the draft, they shall indicate their approval on the Policy Review Routing Form and meet with the President to advocate for the policy's approval. In advance of their meeting, the Responsible Unit Vice President shall email the policy and procedure final draft, completed Policy Impact Questionnaire, and completed Policy Review Routing Form to president@nevadastate.edu and copy policy@nevadastate.edu.

Subsection 10: Decide

The Office of the President shall:

- Facilitate obtaining the President's electronic signature on the Policy Review Routing Form;
- Email the completed Policy Review Routing Form to policy@nevadastate.edu.

If the policy is approved against the recommendation of an elected governance group or is denied, the President shall provide a justification on the Policy Review Routing Form. The justification may indicate statutes, regulations, ordinances, or existing institutional policies and procedures necessitating the denial, if applicable.

The policy is effective immediately upon approval by the President and until suspended or repealed.

The Department of CPP shall maintain the Institutional Policy Review Routing Form and Policy Impact Questionnaire in the policy file for historical reference.

PHASE 4: IMPLEMENT

Subsection 11: Distribute

The Department of CPP shall:

- Publish the final policy and procedure to the policy webpage within 10 calendar days of receipt;
- Notify the community that the policy has been published using officially recognized, by Office of Information & Technology Services communication channels.

The Responsible Unit shall:

- Verify the policy is published correctly and notify policy@nevadastate.edu if there are any errors;
- Facilitate communication and training related to the policy and procedure, if applicable.

PHASE 5: MAINTAIN

Subsection 12: Enforce

The Responsible Unit shall coordinate the enforcement of the policy and procedure.

Subsection 13: Re-Initiate

Policies and procedures may be revised for several reasons, including but not limited to:

- Changes in federal, state, regulatory, statutory, or local legislation;
- Changes to institutional operations.

Revisions may be initiated by the Responsible Unit or any Nevada State University internal community member who submits a Policy Initiation Request Form, including a summary of the recommended revisions to the policy or procedure. Revisions should be completed by the Responsible Unit or its division.

The Department of CPP shall update the policy webpage to show that the policy initiation request for revision has been received.

The IPAC shall determine if the revisions requested are considered substantial or non-substantial. The decision as to whether a revision is substantial or non-substantial will be made by a majority vote of the IPAC members.

For non-substantial revisions:

- The Responsible Unit will appoint the PDL;
- The request does not need to go through the normal procedure in Phase 2 and may skip the feedback stage;
- The request may skip the procedure in Phase 3 including the recommend or advance stages, though it is recommended that the non-substantial revisions are communicated with internal community members;
- The Responsible Unit Vice President shall indicate approval of non-substantial revisions in the Policy Review Routing Form. If approved, a completed Policy Review Routing Form shall be emailed to policy@nevadastate.edu.

For substantial revisions:

- The Responsible Unit shall appoint the PDL and a PDT will be formed with input from the IPAC;
- The request may be considered for fast-track exception;
- The request will be routed to the beginning of Subsection 4: Feedback and proceeds through Phase 3.

The Department of CPP shall publish revised policies and procedures within 10 calendar days of receipt.

Subsection 14: Suspend or Repeal

If a policy becomes temporarily or permanently invalid, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary, the Responsible Unit may submit a request to suspend or repeal it by email to policy@nevadastate.edu.

After a request for suspension or repeal, the policy will be routed to Phase 3 for review and recommendation, unless required by law, regulation or NSHE policy. The policy will remain in effect until the completion of Phase 3.

Subsection 15: Archive

The Department of CPP shall document versions and dates in the History field of the summary box at the top of the policy and procedure. They shall also archive and make available upon request:

- Historical versions of policies and procedures;
- All forms related to a policy.

Any individual can request an archived policy, procedure and/or related forms by emailing policy@nevadastate.edu.

Subsection 16: Policy Review Cycle

Policy and procedure reviews may be prompted by, but not limited to:

- Emergency situations;
- Regulatory or statutory changes;
- Institutional operational changes which impact how the policy is implemented;
- Audit;
- Time.

All policies shall be reviewed within four years from the date the policy version was published and every four years thereafter if there is no revision to the policy.

If any elected governance group voted to not recommend a policy, the initial review timeline shall begin within 18 months.

Section 5: COMPLIANCE

All policies and procedures are developed in alignment with our institution's mission and vision statement; NSHE policies and procedures; Accreditation requirements; and Federal, State, and local laws and regulations. Every member of the institution including students, employees, contractors, and the public, while on campus, shall comply with all policies and corresponding procedures and are subject to progressive discipline in cases of non-compliance.

For issues or to report non-compliance, contact the unit responsible for oversight of the individual:

Non-compliance by	Responsible for Oversight	Contact
Students	Division of Student Affairs	studentaffairs@nevadastate.edu
Employees	Office of Human Resources	hr@nevadastate.edu
Contractors/Vendors	Division of Finance and Business Operations	fbo@nevadastate.edu
Public	Division of Finance and Business Operations	fbo@nevadastate.edu

Section 6: EXCEPTIONS

Fast-Track Policy Development

Policy recommenders may request fast-track policy development by indicating their request on the Policy Initiation Request Form and providing justification. Fast-track policy development may include shortened timelines or altered development steps and shall vary on a case-by-case basis to meet the specific situational requirements.

A policy may be eligible for fast-track development if the IPAC deems the justification valid and necessary. Policy development may also be eligible for fast-track development in order to

address a real-time emergency or adhere to compliance requirements, including but not limited to:

- NSHE policies and procedures;
- Accreditation requirements;
- Statutes, regulations, and ordinances.

Emergency and compliance are the only reasons a policy may be implemented during off-contract periods. In this situation, the Executive Team would act as the IPAC.

The IPAC reviews all fast-track requests and makes a recommendation to the Executive Team for approval of both the policy and the fast-track request. The IPAC Facilitator shall inform the campus community of all fast-track approvals.

In instances of fast-track, the IPAC Facilitator shall work with elected governance group executive committees to discuss methods to expedite review.

Fast-track policies may:

- Have smaller PDTs which do not request members from elected governance groups;
- Have shortened timelines.

Academic Policy Development

Academic policies are developed according to General Policy 2 (GP 2): Policy on Academic Policy and Procedure.

Section 7: APPEAL

Any Nevada State University internal community member who believes there has been an error, injustice, or oversight may submit a formal written appeal request via the General Appeal Request Form found under Related Forms and Resources. This request allows for reconsideration, review, or revision of a policy or procedure decision directly affecting them. The Department of CPP shall assign a policy appeal number. All appeals will be reviewed by Responsible Unit Vice President and the elected governance group chairs and decided by the President. Recommendations and decisions will be documented in the General Policy Appeal Decision Form found under Related Forms and Resources.

Section 8: RELATED FORMS & RESOURCES

- Policy Webpage: [University Policy - Nevada State University](#)
- Definitions (Appendix A)
- IPAC Charter (Appendix B)

PHASE 1: PRE-DEVELOP

- Policy Initiation Request Form (Form 1)

- Policy Request IPAC Review Form (Form 2)
- Policy Request Executive Team Approval Form (Form 3)

PHASE 2: DEVELOP

- Institutional Policy and Procedure Template (*in development/ based on this template*)
- Policy Impact Questionnaire (Form 4)

PHASE 3: REVIEW & APPROVE

- Institutional Policy Review Routing Form (Form 5)

APPEAL

- General Policy Appeal Request Form (Form 6)
- General Policy Appeal Decision Form (Form 7)

APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS

Capitalized terms in this list are proper nouns (e.g. titles of documents, personnel titles, organizational units, formal groups, and roles), and are capitalized when referenced in the body text. Acronyms (in parentheses) are defined on first reference in each section, and as needed for clarity within the document.

academic policy (AA): policies which fall into academic categories and govern academic operations, ensuring standards for curriculum, academic personnel, academic operations, and research.

administrative policy (AD): policies that fall into administrative categories ensure operational efficiency and alignment with legal and ethical standards.

Institutional Policy and Procedure Template: a standardized document that models the formatting to be used and content areas to be completed when creating or updating institutional policy and procedure.

Department of Culture, Planning, and Policy (CPP): this institutional department facilitates the policy development process. The department of CPP provides standardized policy development tools, templates, and timelines. The department of CPP does not independently develop or implement policies and procedures.

elected governance group: this term refers to officially recognized elected bodies within Nevada State University that represent distinct constituencies to ensure their voices are included in institutional decision-making. Currently, these groups include Classified Employee Council, Faculty Senate, and Nevada State Student Alliance.

Executive Team: President and Vice Presidents of Nevada State University.

fast-track: an expedited development process applicable to policies approved for shortened timelines or altered development steps.

General Appeal Request Form: a data collection tool provided by the Department of CPP that is completed and submitted by an individual seeking a reconsideration, review, or revision of a policy or procedure decision or action.

General Policy (GP): open category of policies that apply to the institution at large and do not fall into another designated category.

institutional policy: an academic or institutional rule with university-wide applicability that has been officially approved by the Nevada State University President. An institutional policy may either mandate or constrain action; it may promote compliance with laws; or it may reduce the university's risk. All institutional policies will also include a procedure outlining implementation steps.

institutional procedure: standardized step-by-step instructions to complete a task related to a policy with a concise beginning, middle, and end, that generates consistent outcomes.

Institutional Policy Advisory Council (IPAC): a standing council charged by the President to review all institutional policy initiation requests. The council is comprised of representatives who come together to support the development of institutional policies.

Institutional Policy Advisory Council (IPAC) Facilitator: the Department of CPP employee who is appointed by the Division of CPP Vice President to serve as the liaison between the Executive Team, General Counsel, and IPAC, the Policy Development Team (PDT), and the policy initiation requestor.

institutional policy and procedure life cycle: the phases of policy development.

launch: to decide to move forward with a proposed proposal development.

legal sufficiency: the adequacy of a policy or procedure to comply with all relevant legal statutes and regulations. This involves the review and endorsement by the General Counsel to ensure that the proposed policy or procedure is legally sound and does not expose the university to legal risks.

Nevada System Higher Education (NSHE): the state government unit in Nevada that oversees its public system of colleges and universities.

non-substantial revisions: changes to the text of a policy including: reformatting, grammatical and punctuation revisions, and editorial or technical updates that do not materially affect the substance of the policy and do not change the rights or what is expected of the individuals to whom the policy applies. For example: changes in unit names, individual titles, related forms and resources listed, or contact information; or corrections for broken links or typographical errors.

Institutional Policy Review Routing Form: tracking sheet used to document feedback, review, and pre-approval signatures.

Policy Development Lead (PDL): the individual accountable for and charged by the Nevada State University Executive Team with the responsibility for the development of a specific institutional policy and/or procedure. The PDL is the primary point of contact throughout the policy development process. The PDL must be a member of the Responsible Unit or its division.

Policy Development Team (PDT): the group led by the PDL that executes the development of the policy. This group is usually made up of the PDL, Responsible Unit representative, elected governance group representatives, subject-matter experts, and representatives of impacted groups.

Policy Impact Questionnaire: a worksheet for assessing impact used to develop efficient policies that benefit the most diverse range of community members possible.

Policy Initiation Request Form: data collection tool facilitated by CPP that is completed and submitted by an individual seeking to recommend a new policy.

Policy Initiation Requestor: any faculty, staff member, or student who identifies an institution-wide issue and submits a Policy Initiation Request Form.

policy review cycle: process of regular assessment and revision, as needed, of a specific policy to ensure continued accuracy and relevance.

policy statement: a brief summary of the purpose and content of the policy.

procedure: a detailed set of instructions or steps outlining how to implement and comply with a specific policy. Procedures offer guidance for executing tasks consistently, ensuring adherence to university standards.

public comment: feedback captured to allow internal community members to provide input or raise concerns while a policy is being drafted.

regulations: regulations are official directives issued by governing bodies, such as NSHE or state and federal agencies, that must be followed by Nevada State University. They outline legal requirements and are mandatory for compliance by the institution.

repeal: to withdraw formally or officially, or revoke, a policy by a later action or higher authority.

responsible unit: a single department, division, office or school that is designated to implement a specific policy upon approval. Once a policy is posted, the Responsible Unit is accountable for ongoing accuracy of the policy and procedure as well as policy modification, suspension, or archive if it becomes obsolete.

standard: a specified expectation.

Statutes: statutes are formal laws enacted by legislative bodies, such as the Nevada State Legislature or the U.S. Congress, which define the legal framework within which Nevada State University operates. These laws establish broad mandates and principles that the university must follow. Statutes serve as the authoritative source of law, and their implementation and interpretation often guide the development of policies and regulations at the university.

subject-matter expert: individual who contributes to policy development to ensure the facts and details are correct so that the policy will meet the needs of the community members and comply with legal statutes.

substantial revisions: changes that alter the meaning or scope of an existing policy or procedure, or any other changes that are not considered to be non-substantial revisions. For example: updating a policy or procedure statement, changing who a policy applies to, adjusting the responsibilities of a specific unit, or altering the impact on community members.

APPENDIX B: Institutional Policy Advisory Council Charter

Institutional Policy Advisory Council Charter

Article I: Name and Purpose

Section 1 | Name: The name of this advisory body shall be the Nevada State University Institutional Policy Advisory Council, hereinafter referred to as IPAC.

Section 2 | Purpose: The purpose of the IPAC is to serve as a support and advisory body to the Executive team and Policy Development Teams on matters related to institutional policies. The IPAC shall provide recommendations, feedback, and strategic guidance to ensure the development, review, and implementation of valid and necessary policies that align with the university's mission, values, and goals.

Section 3 | Responsibilities: The IPAC represents the broader institutional perspective in policy development. It shall:

- Review and evaluate Policy Initiation Request Form submissions for alignment with the institution's goals and values;
- Provide recommendations and feedback to the Policy Development Team.
- Review policy and procedure drafts using standards outlined in GP 1 Policy on Policy and Procedure with an eye toward diversity, equity, inclusion, justice, and policy standardization;
- Determine which category applies to the request and route accordingly.
- Request that Policy Development Teams revise and resubmit drafts as necessary;
- Track draft policy and procedure through the public comment period, governance review, and legal review, monitoring and recording the progression and status of policies and procedures throughout development.

Article II: Authority

Section 1 | Authority and Scope: The IPAC's authority is advisory in nature. The IPAC's role is to review Policy Initiation Request Forms and provide feedback on policy and procedure drafts to ensure alignment with the university's mission, values, and goals, rather than making decisions based on legality or regulatory compliance.

Section 2 | Decision-Making Authority: The IPAC does not have approval authority for final policies. The IPAC's decision-making authority is limited to managing specifically outlined tasks during the policy development process.

Article III: Membership

Section 1 | Composition: The IPAC shall be composed of a facilitator and representatives from various elected governance groups within the university, including faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Membership shall be diverse and inclusive, reflecting the university community's perspectives and expertise.

Section 2 | Appointment: Members shall be appointed by their respective constituencies or designated university authorities. Appointing groups shall appoint members according to that group's eligibility criteria.

- Two academic faculty representatives shall be appointed by Faculty Senate;
- Two administrative faculty representatives shall be appointed by Faculty Senate;
- Two classified staff representatives shall be appointed by Classified Employee Council;
- Two student representatives shall be appointed by Nevada State Student Alliance;
- One representative shall be appointed by the Office of the President.

Section 3 | Proxy Membership: When a primary member cannot attend a meeting or fulfill their duties temporarily, it is their responsibility to assign a proxy to act on their behalf.

Section 4 | Facilitator: The Facilitator shall be appointed by the Vice President of the Division of Culture, Planning, and Policy. IPAC Facilitator shall track draft policy and procedure through the public comment period, governance review, and legal review, monitoring and recording the progression and status of policies and procedures throughout development.

Section 5 | Terms: Members shall serve a two-year term and two members from the same elected governance group (i.e. academic faculty) shall serve on staggered terms beginning in the fall semester. Student members may serve shorter term lengths for no less than one semester. Nonparticipation may result in early termination of term and immediate replacement of the member.

Section 6 | Term Limits: Individual members are permitted to serve for two terms, ensuring regular turnover and fostering a dynamic exchange of perspectives and expertise. The IPAC Facilitator is not subject to term limits.

Article IV: Roles and Responsibilities

Section 1 | Members: Members are responsible for attending all meetings or designating a proxy. Members are also responsible for voting on all submitted policies to either recommend or not recommend the policy to move forward. Members should demonstrate good faith effort to communicate with their constituents to both provide and solicit feedback.

Section 2 | Facilitator: The Facilitator shall:

- Set meeting agendas and distribute them in advance, allowing members to prepare for discussions;
- Schedule in-person and/or remote meetings and work to accommodate the schedule of the members;

- Review and receive Policy Initiation Request Forms to avoid redundancy and ensure that the request is complete prior to submission to the IPAC;
- Act as the liaison between the Executive Team, General Counsel, and IPAC;
- The Facilitator is not a voting member.

Section 3 | Proxy Member: The proxy member takes over the responsibilities of the primary member, participating in discussions and carrying out any other responsibilities assigned to the primary member.

Section 4 | Quorum: A quorum constitutes 100% of IPAC membership. Proxies count towards a quorum. A quorum is required for the IPAC to meet. Votes may be made in absentia and will count towards quorum.

Article V: Meeting Frequency

The IPAC shall meet regularly, with a frequency of at least monthly, unless otherwise determined by the IPAC, Facilitator or Executive Team according to needs. Timelines shall adjust based on institutional obligations, the academic calendar, and employee contracts.

IPAC does not meet during off-contract periods.

Article VI: Recommendation-Making Processes

The IPAC shall record all members' recommendations. Recommendations shall be forwarded to the Executive Team. The Executive Team shall consider and respond to IPAC recommendations and provide an explanation as to their decision. The Facilitator shall document recommendations.

Article VII: Reporting

The IPAC Facilitator shall submit quarterly reports to the Executive Team, including a record of each member's vote and summarizing data related to its activities, recommendations, and any concerns regarding the institutional policy development process. Reports shall be publicly available via the Policy webpage.

Article VII: Evaluation and Review

Section 1 | Periodic Review: The IPAC charter shall undergo periodic review and evaluation every year in order to evaluate the IPAC's effectiveness and impact on policy development and may include feedback from university internal community members.

Section 2 | Revisions: This charter may be revised through the procedure outlined in Section 13: Re-Initiate of GP 1 Policy on Policy and Procedure.

Section 3 | Dissolution: The IPAC charter may be dissolved if it becomes obsolete, or its functions are absorbed into another entity. If there is a need to dissolve the charter, a formal proposal explaining the reasons for dissolution shall be submitted to the President.

Article IX: Resources and Support

The Division of Culture, Planning, and Policy shall provide resources to the IPAC, such as administrative support, access to relevant information, and any necessary budget considerations. The Division of Culture, Planning, and Policy shall also manage campus communications and updates related to institutional policies and procedures via officially recognized, by Office of Information & Technology Services methods.

Article X: Inaugural Charter

Recognizing the dynamic nature of governance, this document anticipates future revisions and enhancements in response to the forthcoming recommendations from the Governance Taskforce. As the first iteration in a series of many, the IPAC charter underscores Nevada State University's commitment to continuous improvement and collaborative governance.

Effective Date: [insert date].

FORM 1: Nevada State University Policy Initiation **Request Form (Qualtrics)**

(Cover Page)

This form is required for any faculty, staff member, student, or campus group who identifies an institution-wide issue and wants to recommend the development, revision, suspension, or repeal of an institutional policy. Your submission will be reviewed by the Institutional Policy Advisory Council (IPAC) and the Executive Team, who will evaluate whether the proposed policy request is **valid** and **necessary**.

- **Valid:** A policy is considered valid if it aligns with the university's mission, strategic goals, and regulatory requirements. The policy should address an institutional need and support the institution in fulfilling its objectives, ensuring that operations remain consistent, effective, and compliant with external regulations.
- **Necessary:** A policy is deemed necessary if it addresses an existing gap, compliance requirement, or operational need. This can include filling an area where no policy currently exists, updating outdated policies to align with new laws or institutional priorities, or mitigating risks that could affect internal community members or university operations.

Before submitting this form, we also encourage you to review the institutional glossary and explore our policy library at www.nevadastate.edu/policy to ensure your request aligns with existing policies, terms and definitions.

Initial Review

Upon submission, the Division of Culture, Planning, and Policy will confirm receipt of your request and communicate next steps via email. Please allow 10 business days for the initial review. For any questions or additional support, contact us at policy@nevadastate.edu.

IPAC Recommendation & Executive Team Review

The IPAC will assess your request based on these criteria, and the Executive Team will review the IPAC's recommendations to determine the next steps for the policy's approval, development, and implementation.

By submitting this form, you acknowledge that it will be shared with the IPAC and the Executive Team for their review and approval, and you may be contacted for further input during the policy development process.

Ready to Submit?

(SECTION 1)

I am submitting as a(n) (select one)

- ☐ Individual > (goes to 1A)
 - ☐ Campus Group Representative > (goes to 1B)
-

(SECTION 1A)

Individual Request

I am a (select one)

- ☐ Academic faculty member
- ☐ Administrative faculty member
- ☐ Classified employee
- ☐ Student

Name:

Title (if applicable):

Department/Unit (if applicable):

Major (if applicable):

Email:

- ☐ By submitting this request, I acknowledge that I may be contacted for additional input during the policy's development, review, and implementation phases.

(SECTION 1B)

Campus Group Request

Select the campus group you are submitting on behalf of:

- ☐ Classified Employee Council
- ☐ NSU Faculty Senate
- ☐ Nevada State Student Alliance
- ☐ NSU Department/Unit
 - Name: _____
- ☐ NSU Recognized Student Club or Organization
 - Name: _____
- ☐ Other:
- ☐ Committee (ex: Sustainability Council):

Point of Contact Name:

Email:

(SECTION 2)

Proposed Policy Recommendation Information

Select one:

- ☐ New Policy > (goes to 2A)
- ☐ Revision of Existing Policy > (goes to 2B)
- ☐ Request for Suspension or Repeal > (goes to 2B)

(Section 2A1)

Suggested Policy Name:

Explain why you think the proposed policy is valid and/or necessary. How does it align with the university's mission, strategic goals, and regulatory requirements? How does it address a specific gap, compliance requirement, or operational need? (500 word max)

(Section 2A2)

Policy Development Participation

Would you like to participate as a member of the **Policy Development Team**, helping to draft this policy?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I'm not sure, please contact me with more information

Suggestion for a **Policy Development Lead**:

Suggestions for members of the **Policy Development Team**:

Identify the **Responsible Unit** for overseeing this proposed policy:

(Section 2B)

Existing Policy Name/Number:

Responsible Unit:

Current Status: (Active, Suspended, Repealed)

Explain why the proposed revision is valid and/or necessary. How does it align with the university's mission, strategic goals, and regulatory requirements? How does it address a specific gap, compliance requirement, or operational need? (500 word max)

(SECTION 3)

Impact Assessment

Describe how this proposed policy will impact internal community members, university operations, and other relevant areas. Consider both potential challenges and benefits, including contributions toward promoting diversity, equity, inclusion, accessibility and justice:

Internal Community Member Involvement

Recommend the key internal community members or campus groups to be consulted in developing this proposed policy (e.g., faculty, staff, students):

Supporting Documentation

Attach, link or describe any relevant documents, drafts, data, or community feedback that support this recommendation.

(SECTION 4)**Fast-Track Request**

Does this policy require expedited development due to emergency, compliance, or other justifiable reasons?

☐ Yes (If yes, please provide a justification in the space below)

☐ No

☐ I'm not sure

Additional Notes or Justification (optional)

Please provide any additional context that affirms this request is valid and/or necessary:

Thank you for contributing to the continuous advancing of Nevada State University.

FORM 2: Nevada State University Institutional Policy Advisory Council (IPAC) Recommendation Form (PDF Fillable Form)

In support of continuous improvement and transparent governance at Nevada State University, this form is used by the Institutional Policy Advisory Council (IPAC) to evaluate policy recommendations and determine if the creation, revision, suspension, or repeal of a policy is **valid** and **necessary**.

(SECTION 1)

IPAC Recommendation Information

Policy Initiation Request Form Submitter Name/Title:
Date submission was received:
IPAC representative(s) submitting the recommendation:
Date provided to Executive Team:

(SECTION 2)

Rationale for IPAC Recommendation

(Section 2A)

Is this proposed policy/revision required to meet federal, state, or NSHE compliance standards?

☐ Yes > (Go to section 2c)

If yes, provide the specific compliance requirements or regulations that apply:

☐ No > (go to Section 2B)

(Section 2B)

VALIDITY STATEMENT: Summarize how the policy aligns with the university's mission and strategic goals and/ or outline points of concern. (text box)

NECESSITY STATEMENT: Identify what critical issue, existing gap, or operational need it addresses and/ or outline points of concern (text box).

(Section 2C)

Does the IPAC recommend the development of this proposed policy?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If no, please provide a justification for why the policy request does not meet the criteria for development.

(SECTION 3)

Additional Feedback

Are there additional considerations of how this recommendation will impact internal community members, university operations, and other relevant areas? Consider both potential challenges and benefits, including contributions toward promoting diversity, equity, inclusion, accessibility and justice:

Identified Internal Community Members

Recommend the key internal community members or campus groups to be consulted in developing this policy (e.g., faculty, staff, students):

Supporting Documentation

Attach or describe any relevant documents, drafts, data, or community feedback that support this recommendation.

Fast-Track Request

Has an fast-track process been requested for this proposed policy?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Does the IPAC recommend a fast-track process?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If yes, provide a justification for why this proposed policy needs to be expedited:

(SECTION 4)

IPAC Recommendation

☐ Recommend for Immediate Action

☐ Recommend for Delayed Action

Date: (fill in recommended date)

☐ Recommend for Rejection

Please provide a justification for your timing recommendation, considering institutional priorities, the academic calendar, and resource availability:

IPAC MEMBER VOTES	
VOTE	NAME
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	

<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	

FORM 3: Nevada State University Institutional Policy **Request Executive Team Approval Form (Fillable PDF)**

Executive Team Review

Following the IPAC review, the Executive Team will assess the recommendation to determine the next steps.

Executive Team Decision:

- ☐ Approve for Immediate Action
- ☐ Approve for Delayed Action
- ☐ Do Not Approve
- ☐ Send Back for Additional Review

Date of Executive Team Decision: _____

PDL:

PDT members:

Explanation for Non-Approval:

If the Executive Team does not approve the recommendation, they shall provide the justification or rationale for this decision. The justification must indicate statutes, regulations, ordinances, or existing institutional policies and procedures necessitating the denial, if applicable:

IPAC Review

IPAC Facilitator Name: _____

Date: _____

GP 1 | APPENDIX

Executive Team Review

Executive Team Representative Name: _____

Date: _____

FORM 4: Policy Impact Questionnaire

Nevada State University Policy Impact Questionnaire

Instructions:

In order to develop accessible, flexible and efficient policies that benefit the institution and the most diverse range of internal community members as possible, Policy Development Teams should review and answer the questions below. This tool should be referenced throughout the Policy Development Life cycle.

Completed worksheets should be emailed to policy@nevadastate.edu with the final policy draft. Add “N/A” to any questions that are not applicable.

The completed questionnaire shall be provided along with the final policy and procedure draft during Approval Phases (Policy Review & Recommendation and Policy Approval).

This tool was developed using content from these and additional resources:

- Association of College and University Policy Administrators <https://acupa.org/>
- University of Nevada, Las Vegas <https://www.unlv.edu/policies/checklist>
- The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking Concepts and Tools
https://www.criticalthinking.org/files/Concepts_Tools.pdf
- White Supremacy Culture, A Summary from Dismantling Racism: A Workbook for Social Change Groups, by Kenneth Jones and Tema Okun, Change Workbook, 2001

Instructions: Feel free to edit this document to make it work for you. Take the prompts into consideration in drafting your responses. You can answer each question separately, or summarize your responses in the boxes provided.

Policy Code & Title: _____

Policy Development Lead (Name & Title): _____

Date completed _____

Mission & Vision Alignment

MISSION: *At Nevada State, excellence fosters opportunity. Excellence in teaching leads to innovative, technology-rich learning opportunities that promote the acquisition of interdisciplinary knowledge and skills. Quality, affordable degree programs open doors to career success and an enhanced quality of life for a diverse population of students. Our graduates, in turn, foster the greatest opportunity – the promise of a stronger community and a better future for all of Nevada.*

VISION: *Nevada State University will deliver on its promise to Nevada by becoming a model of teaching excellence, a pioneer in innovative student support, and an agent of economic growth and social justice.*

All Nevada State University policies and procedures are developed in alignment with our institution's mission and vision. **How will this policy foster excellence, opportunity, and a stronger community to reinforce our role as a model institution?**

Also consider the following:

1. How does this policy support Nevada State's mission to foster excellence and opportunity?
2. In what ways does the policy align with our strategic goals and core programs?
3. How will this policy positively impact students, faculty, staff, and the larger community?

Mission & Vision Considerations:

Student-Ready Approach

1. How does this policy center on students' unique needs and aspirations?
2. In what ways does this policy recognize and build upon students' existing strengths and potential for growth?
3. How does this policy contribute to creating an engaging, supportive, and enriching experience for all students?

Student-Ready Considerations:

Employee Affairs

1. How does this policy support the well-being and interests of employees?
2. How does it recognize and promote employees' strengths and contributions?
3. How will this policy improve the work environment for academic and administrative staff?

Employee-Centric Considerations:

Accessibility & Efficiency

1. Is the policy written in a concise and accessible way that is easy to understand?
2. How does the policy avoid redundancy or overlap with existing policies?
3. What mechanisms will ensure the policy is accessible to all community members?

Accessibility and Efficiency Considerations:

Finance and Capacity

1. What are the financial and resource needs for implementing this policy (e.g., staffing, technology)?
2. Will implementing this policy result in any cost savings or increased efficiency?
3. Is there adequate staff capacity to support this policy year-round?

Finance and Capacity Considerations:

Commitments to DEIJ & Anti-Racism

1. How does this policy promote equitable treatment and support for underrepresented groups?
2. In what ways does the policy prevent discrimination and promote inclusivity?
3. Does the policy address or mitigate any impacts of historic, systemic inequities?

DEIJ & Anti-racism Considerations:

Risk Mitigation and Compliance Assurance

1. How does the policy comply with relevant laws, standards, and university regulations?
2. Are there any potential risks this policy addresses or mitigates?
3. How will the effectiveness and compliance of this policy be tracked and reported?

Risk Mitigation and Compliance Assurance Considerations:

Responsibility Assignment

1. Who is accountable for ensuring this policy is followed?
2. How does the policy outline roles and responsibilities across departments or units?
3. Who needs to be informed about this policy, and how will they be updated?

Responsibility Assignment Considerations:

FORM 5: Institutional Policy Review Routing Form

Policy Number _____

Policy Title _____

Policy Development Lead _____

Policy Development Team Members _____

Indicate if this is for a new policy, a revision to an existing policy, to suspend or repeal a policy.

- ☐ New
- ☐ Revision
- ☐ Suspension
- ☐ Repeal

POLICY PROCESS TYPE

This policy was developed using the following process:

- ☐ Standard
- ☐ Fast-track
 - Emergency or Compliance
 - Other Justification

INTERNAL COMMUNITY MEMBER INPUT

Select one:

- ☐ Public Comment Period Date Opened _____ Date Closed: _____
- ☐ None (Fast-Track without Public Comment)

NOTES

Add bullet points outlining key findings and actions resulting from community input.

FINAL DRAFT REVIEW

- ☐ Vice President Final Draft Review Date Completed: _____
- Approved with revisions (note revisions below)
 - Approved as is
- ☐ IPAC Final Draft Review Date Completed: _____
- Approved with revisions (note revisions below)
 - Approved as is
- ☐ General Council Final Draft Legal Sufficiency Date Completed: _____
- Approved with revisions (note revisions below)
 - Approved as is

NOTE ANY REQUIRED REVISIONS

Add bullet points outlining necessary revisions required to proceed to approval.

ELECTED GOVERNANCE GROUP RECOMMENDATION

E-SIGNATURE	DECISION	NAME & TITLE	DATE
	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	Faculty Senate Name, Elected Position Title	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	Classified Employee Council Name, Elected Position Title	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	Nevada State Student Alliance Name, Elected Position Title	

JUSTIFICATION IF NOT RECOMMENDED

Include group name and title.

POLICY REVIEW CYCLE DATE

Add scheduled review date (a maximum of four years from the date this policy version was published)

RESPONSIBLE UNIT

APPROVAL DECISION		
E-SIGNATURE	NAME & TITLE	DATE
	Name, Vice President or Designee	
	Name, President	
JUSTIFICATION IF NOT APPROVED		
<i>President: Provide a justification for this decision.</i>		

FORM 6: Nevada State University General Policy Appeal Request Form (Qualtrics Form)

This appeal form is designed for internal community members who want to formally appeal a policy or procedure decision for reconsideration, review, or revision that directly affects them.

All appeals will be reviewed by Responsible Unit Vice President and the elected governance group chairs and decided by the President. Recommendations and decisions will be documented in the General Policy Appeal Decision Form found under Related Forms and Resources. Please complete all sections below. Incomplete forms may delay the review process. Ensure that any supporting documentation is attached to support your appeal. Please allow 10 business days for the review. Contact policy@nevadastate.edu to receive the General Policy Appeal Request Form or for any questions/additional support.

Submitter Information

Name:

Title (if applicable):

Department/Unit (if applicable):

Email:

Submission Date:

Policy Information

Policy Name/Number:

Effective Date of Policy:

Responsible Unit:

Appeal Details

Reason for Appeal

Please provide a detailed explanation of why you are appealing the policy decision. Include information about how the decision does not meet the criteria of being valid or necessary, or fails to align with the university's mission, strategic plan, or regulatory requirements.

Desired Outcome

Please describe the resolution or revision you are seeking.

Supporting Documentation

Attach or describe any relevant documents that support your appeal, including communications, data, or community feedback.

Acknowledgment

- ☐ By submitting this appeal, I acknowledge that the information provided is accurate and truthful to the best of my knowledge. I understand that this form and all attached documentation will be reviewed by the President.

FORM 7: Nevada State University General Policy Appeal Decision Form (PDF Fillable Form)

Policy Name/Number:

Appeal Tracking #:

APPEAL REVIEW		
E-SIGNATURE	NAME & TITLE	DATE
	Responsible Unit Vice President Name, Title	
	Faculty Senate Designee Name, Elected Position Title	
	Classified Employee Council Designee Name, Elected Position Title	
	Nevada State Student Alliance Designee Name, Elected Position Title	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Abstain	JUSTIFICATION:	

President's Decision:

- ☐ Approve
☐ Do Not Approve

Rationale for Decision:

Provide a justification below for this decision.

Name: _____

Title: President, Nevada State University

Decision Date: _____