POLICY CONCEPT FORM
INSTRUCTIONS AND GUIDELINES

All policy proposals – including new policy concepts, proposed revisions, or suggested repeals – must be submitted via this form to the Office of the University Secretary with appropriate supporting information and documents. Completed submissions are forwarded to the President’s Policy Advisory Council (PAC), which ensures proper routing through the policy-making process. (See UO Policy I.03.01 for more information.)

Please keep the following definition of a university policy in mind as you develop your concept:

A University Policy (“Policy”) is a policy that (1) has broad application or impact throughout the University community, (2) must be implemented to ensure compliance with state or federal law, (3) is necessary to enhance the University’s mission, to ensure institutional consistency and operational efficiency, or to mitigate institutional risks; or (4) is otherwise designated by the Board [of Trustees] or the President [of the University] as a University Policy.

A policy establishes rights, requirements or responsibilities. Excluded from this definition are things such as, but not limited to, implementation guides, operating guidelines, internal procedures, and similar management controls and tools.

To help facilitate as smooth a process as possible, please consider the following:

1. Consult as many stakeholders as possible prior to submitting your concept. A primary role for the PAC is to ensure that appropriate offices, departments or groups are consulted.

2. Run your concept by the Office of General Counsel (OGC) prior to submission. OGC review is a required step in policy-making.

3. Please use the proper template for revisions or a new concept. The existing policy template (revisions) or a blank template (new concepts) can be obtained from the Office of the Secretary by emailing uopolicy@uoregon.edu.

4. A “redlined” version of your concept is required for proposed revisions.

5. Include any appropriate related resources. Links are preferred, but supplemental documents are of course acceptable for items not online. Examples include:
   - Other policies or procedures related to, overridden by, necessary as a result of, or otherwise affiliated with your concept
   - Statutory or regulatory citations
   - Necessary notations or a summary of changes if changes are numerous or not obvious when reading the submitted template

Please email uopolicy@uoregon.edu if you have any questions.
POLICY CONCEPT FORM

Name and UO Title/Affiliation: Angela Wilhelms, University Secretary

Policy Title & # (if applicable): Honorary Degrees – UO Policy 01.00.05

Submitted on Behalf Of: Board of Trustees, University President, Senior Vice President and Provost

Responsible Executive Officer: Angela Wilhelms, University Secretary

SELECT ONE: ☐ New Policy ☒ Revision ☐ Repeal

Click the box to select

HAS THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL REVIEWED THIS CONCEPT: ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, which attorney(s): Kevin Reed

GENERAL SUBJECT MATTER
Include the policy name and number of any existing policies associated with this concept.
Honorary Degrees

RELATED STATUTES, REGULATIONS, POLICIES, ETC.
List known statutes, regulations, policies (including unit level policies), or similar related to or impacted by the concept. Include hyperlinks where possible, excerpts when practical (e.g. a short statute), or attachments if necessary.
Examples: statute that negates the need for or requires updates to an existing policy; unit level policy(ies) proposed for University-wide enactment; or existing policies used in a new, merged and updated policy.
The Retention and Delegation of Authority Policy vests authority to grant honorary degrees with the Board of Trustees. Otherwise, none.

STATEMENT OF NEED
What does this concept accomplish and why is it necessary?
The policy needs to be updated to reflect the change in governance, specifically the elimination of the SBHE and OUS, and the authority of the BOT to grant such degrees. The draft also seeks to streamline and clarify policy language, remove unnecessary procedural details, and updates committee membership to clarify appointing authorities and grant designees for certain positions. The draft creates a “pool” of approved/vetted candidates for an honorary degree so that individuals who get through the process may be eligible for up to 3 years.
**AFFECTED PARTIES**
*Who is impacted by this change, and how?*

One could argue that current committee members are impacted, however, in actuality, some are no longer at the UO and the committee has not met for years so it’s probably an overstatement to say they are “impacted”.

---

**CONSULTED STAKEHOLDERS**
*Which offices/departments have reviewed your concept and are they confirmed as supportive? (Please do not provide a list of every individual consulted. Remain focused on stakeholders (e.g. ASUO, Office of the Provost, Registrar, Title IX Coordinator, etc.).)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schill, Coltrane &amp; staff</td>
<td>Provost, President</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Andreasen, Carlyn Shcreck (and others)</td>
<td>University Advancement</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Reed</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>2/1/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Leadership Team</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>1/17/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbaugh, Sinclair</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>2/27/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>