



## Process for Developing Policy

### Pre-development

#### Identify Issues requiring a policy statement

1. **Raise awareness** of the issue
  - a) alert key stakeholders that a policy will be forthcoming
  - b) provide a policy issue brief with relevant background information

### Development

**Draft Initial Language**, giving consideration to the specific needs of KU, best practices followed at other Universities, and professionally developed industry standards

#### Review and Revise

2. **Ensure technological consistency** by routing for internal review by Information Services groups (and groups functioning as an “extension” of our organization), in order to proactively address as many potential problems as possible prior to wider circulation of a draft policy; revise as appropriate.
  - a) Security Council
  - b) Information Services Management Council
  - c) Tech Partners
  - d) Field Security Officers
3. **Ensure administrative consistency** by routing for review by critical stakeholders external to Information Services; revise as appropriate.
  - a) Stakeholders included in all policy reviews are:
    - i) Privacy Officer
    - ii) Human Resources Office
    - iii) Internal Audit
    - iv) General Counsel’s Office
    - v) Provost’s Office
4. Route for a **minimum 1 week Technical Liaison Preview Period** to TLs in academic/administrative departments campus-wide prior to campus comment period; revise as appropriate.

5. **30-day campus comment period** to solicit comments from campus:
  - a) Key campus constituency groups to query:
    - i) Information Services Planning Council
    - ii) Deans, Directors, & Department Chairs (via dddc-l listserve)
    - iii) Governance groups
      - (1) Presidents/chairs of the following bodies: Faculty Senate, Unclassified Senate, University Senate, University Support Staff Senate, and Student Senate
      - (2) Chairs of the following University Senate committees: Academic Computing and Telecommunications, Libraries
  - b) Comments should be focused on anticipated impacts of the policy:
    - i) Does the policy create onerous operational burden (including administrative, fiscal & staff impacts)?
    - ii) Does the policy result in technological incompatibility with existing resources?
  - c) Work with adversely-impacted groups to proactively address concerns while still addressing the original policy need.

### **Final Review & Approval**

6. Route for final review by **General Counsel's Office**
  - a) provide summary of anticipated impacts and other concerns
7. Obtain **signature approval from Provost and/or Vice Provost for Information Services/Chief Information Officer.**
  - a) provide summary of anticipated impacts and other concerns

### **Implement**

8. **Announce approved policy** to entire campus or affected parties via email to campus-wide list serves
9. **Post to KU Policy Library** [www.policy.ku.edu](http://www.policy.ku.edu).
10. **Educate the community**, providing training if necessary

### **Maintenance**

**Periodic Review** on a scheduled basis

11. **Encourage feedback**
12. **Monitor compliance** and reasons for non-compliance