1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the May 4, 2022 Senate Minutes (Action)

3. Special Order: Presidential Briefing

4. Report of the Chair

5. Special Order

    Reka S. Montfort
    Director, University Senate
    Orientation: Senators, Senate Meetings, and Shared Governance

6. Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks (Senate Document #21-22-21) (Information)

7. 2022 Council of University System Staff Elections (Senate Document #21-22-36) (Information)

8. 2021-2022 Senate Legislation Log (Senate Document #22-23-01) (Information)

9. Approval of the 2022-2023 Committee & Council Slates (Senate Document #22-23-02) (Action)

10. New Business

11. Adjournment

CALL TO ORDER

Senate Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

Chair Williams welcomed new Senators. She reviewed the procedures and guidelines for the virtual Senate meeting including expectations, audio recording, discussion, and voting. She provided a brief overview of voting procedures using the TurningPoint platform.

ELECTION OF THE SENATE CHAIR-ELECT (ACTION)

The Nominations Committee identified two candidates for chair elect: Christopher Jarzynski, Distinguished University Professor, College of Computer, Mathematical, & Natural Sciences (CMNS) and Peter B. Sunderland, Professor, A. James Clark School of Engineering (ENGR) were identified as the candidates for Chair-Elect. Nominations from the floor were solicited. No additional nominations were received. Christopher Jarzynski was elected Chair-Elect.

SPECIAL ORDER: PRESIDENTIAL BRIEFING

Williams welcomed President Pines to provide his briefing.

President Pines began by thanking outgoing University leaders including, Brodie Remington, Sapienza Barone, Dean Bonnie Thornton-Dill, Senate Chair Williams, and C. Dan Mote, Jr. for their contributions to UMD. President Pines also congratulated Chair-Elect Christopher Jarzynski on his election.

President Pines provided an overview of the priorities and initiatives that he announced as part of his first day initiatives and provided a status update to the Senate on their progress as follows:

Improving the student experience
- An increase in the number of staff for mental health services;
- Hired a coordinator for immigrant and undocumented student life; and
- Philanthropic support for students.

Creating an inclusive environment
- Four modules of the TerrapinSTRONG training have been developed;
- Naming of new residence halls after Pyon-Chen and Johnson-Whittle in recognition of being trailblazers within the UMD community;
- Implementation of an enhanced Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion curriculum;
- Enhanced community policing; and
    - Divested from 1033 Program
- Promoted voter registration efforts.

Advancing the University.
- Advancing Faculty, Staff, and Student diversity;
    - UMD got on the Common App for admissions and went SAT optional;

- Launched the FAMILE Program to strengthen tenured/tenure-track (T/TTK) faculty diversity;
- Launched the Research Leaders Fellows Program;
- Showcased excellence in the visual arts by Prof. David Driskell at University House; and
- Hosted Voices of Maryland listening sessions.

President Pines also described the new general education diversity curriculum for students from their Freshman to Senior years that was recently approved by the Senate.

President Pines shared an update and information about the May 16, 2022 Collins Plaza Dedication.

President Pines recognized undergraduate students Patrick Kim, George Li, and Kevin Tu for being awarded 2022 Goldwater Scholarships. He also recognized undergraduate student Sawa Kamara for being named a 2022 Harry Truman Scholar and undergraduate students Steven Jin and Naveen Raman for being named 2022 Churchill Scholars. President Pines thanked the scholarship office for their efforts.

President Pines recognized Distinguished University Professor Richard Walker in Geology and Distinguished Professor Emerita Patricia Hill Collins in Sociology for being elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and Rashawn Ray, Sociology and Sarah Cameron, History for being named 2022 Andrew Carnegie Fellows. He also recognized Dr. Cheng Gong, Electrical & Computer Engineering for winning the 2022 Invention of the Year award.

President Pines recognized the University for winning the 2022 Hedge Fund Industry Award for endowment of the year and specifically recognized Sam Gallo and Brodie Remington for their efforts.

President Pines provided an update on Provost Rice's reimagining learning at the University.

Williams thanked President Pines for his presentation and opened the floor to questions.

Senators congratulated President Pines on his achievements and inquired if there was a way that the schedule would allow for commencement ceremonies to not conflict with the exam schedule.

President Pines stated the issue would be looked into further.

Senators inquired about the plans for development of Guilford Woods and for more specifics on how the University planned to enforce stipulations of green space.

President Pines stated that the University only owns a small fraction of Guilford Woods and the rest is owned by the county. He stated that UMD halted its portion of the project and is committed to providing short and long-term housing for its graduate students but that the rest of the project would be up to the county.

Williams stated that President Pines would take one more question.

Senators inquired about updates to the passage of a resolution to increase student worker minimum wage to $15 per hour.

President Pines stated that the administration is currently working on a plan to increase student minimum wage. He stated that the University has systematically been going through stakeholder groups and that the administration has students in mind.

Williams thanked President Pines for his time.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES, APRIL 26, 2022 MEETING

The minutes were approved as distributed.

TRANSITION MEETING SLATE 2022-2023 (SENATE DOCUMENT #21-22-34) (ACTION)

Williams stated that all Senators and Deans should have received the slates and statements for all of the candidates running in the Transition Elections for the Senate's elected committees and councils with the meeting materials. She stated that all of the elected committee and council elections will be held online starting immediately after this meeting and provided instructions for online voting for the Transition Elections.

Nominations were taken from the floor for faculty, staff, and student representatives for the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), the Committee on Committees, the University Athletic Council, the Council of University System Faculty (CUSF), and the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC).

Senator Felder, undergraduate student, College of Arts and Humanities, self-nominated as a candidate for the SEC.

Senator Vatsa, graduate student, Robert H. Smith School of Business, self-nominated as a candidate for the SEC.

Senator Kim, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, self-nominated as a candidate for the SEC.

Senator Ashour-Bailey, exempt staff, A. James Clark School of Engineering, self-nominated as a candidate for the SEC.

Senator Huynh, undergraduate student, School of Architecture, self-nominated as a candidate for the SEC.

Senator Lin, faculty, College of Education, self-nominated as a candidate for the SEC.

Gloria Aparicio Blackwell, exempt-staff, Office of Community Engagement, self-nominated as a candidate for the University Athletic Council.

Adrienne Mayo-Brown, exempt-staff, College of Education, self-nominated as a candidate for the University Athletic Council.

William Cohen, Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, nominated Lawrence Clark, faculty, College of Education, for the University Athletic Council.

Senator Braunstein, undergraduate student, College of Arts and Humanities, self-nominated as a candidate for the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC).

Hearing no further nominations, Williams stated that Senators will have until 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 10, 2022, to complete online voting. Winners will be announced after voting is closed

REPORT OF THE OUTGOING CHAIR, ELLEN WILLIAMS

Williams thanked the continuing and incoming Senators for their work and participation with the Senate. Williams provided an overview of the Senate's approved legislation over the past year. She stated that ten Programs, Courses and Curricula (PCC) actions had been approved and highlighted a number of other legislation that was completed including: the Policy on Criminal Background Checks for Faculty and Staff Employees, Revisions to the Diversity General Education Requirement, Proposal for the Establishment of a University Privacy Policy, Review of the Interim University of Maryland Grading Symbols and Notations Used on Academic Transcripts Policy, and the Proposal to Create Policy for Equitable Access to Scholarly Articles Authored by University Faculty. She thanked the Senators again for their participation.

REPORT OF THE INCOMING CHAIR, ROCHELLE NEWMAN

Chair Newman thanked Williams for her service to the Senate. Newman presented Williams with a plaque in recognition of her service as Chair.

Williams thanked the Senate for the plaque.

Newman thanked past Chair Lanford for her commitment to the Senate for an extra year. Newman also thanked the Senate Office for the level of support they provide to the Senate Chairs, leadership, and committees.

Newman went on to describe the importance and uniqueness of the University's Senate in representing shared governance, stating the Senate's role in representing the campus as a whole. Newman noted the importance of shared governance in helping to create a diverse set of responses to the challenges of the University. Newman thanked all of the Senators for their commitment to shared governance.

Newman shared the Senate meeting schedule for the 2022-2023 academic year. The Senate tries to balance meetings between the Wednesday schedule and Tuesday/Thursday schedule so Senators do not have to miss all of the meetings because of class conflicts. Senate meetings will continue to be held from 3:15 p.m.– 5:00 p.m. All Senate meetings will be held on Zoom, with the exception of the State of the Campus Address, which will be held in person and have a virtual option for those who need it.

Senators asked how they might access the Senate calendar.

Newman stated that information will be shared on how to access the Senate calendar.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

Jack Blanchard, Associate Provost for Enterprise Resource Planning

Elevate Project Update

Newman welcomed Jack Blanchard, Associate Provost for Enterprise Resource Planning to provide his presentation.

Blanchard explained that Elevate's goal is to modernize the obsolete Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system to better meet the complex needs of the University. He elaborated further on the goals of the program to provide a positive user experience for students, staff, and faculty; to increase efficiency and effectiveness; to accurately collect, report, and analyze data; to ensure data security and privacy; and to make sure that ERP systems can be easily maintained and updated.

Blanchard presented an overview of the timeline of Workday. He provided specifics on Human Capital Management, Budgeting, and Student workstream implementation over the next four years.

Blanchard shared that staff and faculty engagement is a key in ensuring that Workday will be successfully implemented. He explained that Project Implementation Teams had been implemented across the University to ensure representation. He went on to describe the purpose, goals, and feedback that the Project Implementation Teams had generated. Blanchard shared that a Faculty Advisory Committee was established to ensure that the Elevate project considered the unique perspectives and needs of Faculty users.

Blanchard shared that student implementation is the highest priority, stating that students are key stakeholders. He explained that Elevate is currently executing a search for a lead staff position. He noted that student input is necessary to understand current problems. A new student summer internship has been created to bring students onto the team.

Blanchard informed the Senate of next steps and how to prepare for the transition.

Newman thanked Blanchard and opened the floor for questions.

Senators raised concerns about the program, citing an example of another Big10 institution where the student implementation was dropped.

Blanchard responded that they had been in touch with the other university to examine what had gone wrong. Blanchard described the unique circumstances of both institutions and explained that Workday-student did not fail in that instance.

Newman thanked Blanchard again for his presentation.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

Kris Philips, Director, Facilities Management, Planning, and Construction
UMD Facilities Master Plan

Newman invited Kris Philips, Director of Facilities Management, Planning, and Construction to give his presentation on the UMD Facilities Master Plan.

Philips introduced Rebecca Arnold, Planning Office, and Mike Aziz and Michael Austin, Cooper Robertson Architectural Firm. Philips explained that it has been 11 years since the University has updated its facilities master plan.

Philips gave an overview of what a university masterplan consists of and why they are used. He described that the facilities master plan will advance the University's strategic, future goals and objectives, and shared the comprehensive nature of a master plan. He also described what a facilities master plan does not achieve.

Philips shared details and highlights of the teams that will be working on the project and the timeline of the planning process.

Philips launched a survey to gather Senator feedback on issues that are important for management to consider while developing the facilities master plan.

A Senator made a motion to extend the meeting by fifteen minutes. The motion was seconded. Newman called for a vote on the motion and stated that it required a ⅔ vote to pass. The result was 74 in favor and 54 opposed. **The motion failed.**

Philips continued with the survey. Senators were polled on their opinions of what should be at the core of campus, what should be at the edge of campus, what types of academic and research spaces are most needed on campus, which interior spaces does the campus need more of, the ease of getting around campus, which measures are most needed to improve campus circulation, one word description of landscapes and open spaces on campus, what types of landscapes and open spaces are most needed, and what other ideas the Facilities Master Planning Committee should focus on.

Philips stated that there is a facilities master plan website for additional information.

Newman adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m. but encouraged Senators to stay and provide additional feedback.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Orientation: Senators, Senate Meetings, and Shared Governance

Senate's Role

Senate Meetings

This Year

?

Senate's Role

- The Senate advises the President of the University

  - Policy Matters

  - Guiding Documents

  - Academic Programs

Role of Senators

- Put forward recommendations to the President for his review and approval;
  - Senators review & vote on committee recommendations;
    - Review materials prior to Senate meetings
    - Attend Senate Meetings
    - Discussion
    - Vote
  - Submit proposals

Materials

Meetings

Committee Reports

Discussion

Voting

Meeting Elements

Senate Materials

- Materials are posted publicly on the Senate website 1 week in advance of the meeting

- The Agenda identifies **(Information)** and **(Action)** items

Meeting Elements

- Call to Order

- Minutes (Action)

- Chair's Report (Information)

- Committee Reports (Action)

- Special Order Presentations (Information)

- New Business (Info/Action)

Senate Meetings

- 2022-2023 Senate Meetings will be held on Zoom*

  - *The President's State of the Campus Addresses will be held in person with a virtual option (November & March)

- Senators who are unable to attend a meeting or plan to arrive late **MUST** submit an excused absence form at https://senate.umd.edu/senate-meeting-excused-absences

  - Excused absences subtracted from total when calculating quorum

Committee Reports

• Transmittal – Overview

• Report
  • Background
  • Current Practice
  • Committee Work
  • **Recommendation***
  • **Policy Revisions***

• Appendices

*voted on

Recommendations

Recommendations

- **Policy Revisions**
  - The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that its proposed revisions to the University of Maryland Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Grievances (II-4.00[A]) be revised as shown immediately following this report.

- **Administrative Recommendations**
  - The University **should** update any references to the policy in other associated policies.

  - The University **should consider** whether current smoking cessation resources will be adequate to meet the needs of incoming cohorts of students disproportionately affected by vaping and e-cigarette use.

Policy

Discussion

- Senators discuss and debate the merits of the committee's recommendations;

  - Senators can:
    - Ask questions;
    - Speak in support of or against the proposed recommendations; and
    - potentially make a motion to amend a recommendation prior to the vote.

Voting

Quorum Slide

Voting Slide

- All Senators must use Point Solutions (formerly TurningPoint) to vote at Senate meetings

  - Senators may use the Point Solutions web app (ttpoll.com) or the mobile app to vote;

  - Senators must sign in on Point Solutions

  - Enter the Session ID - Different for each meeting, found in red bold font on the slide presentation, and only available at the Senate meeting.

  - Click Join Session

Quorum Slide

- Will only be available at the start of the meeting;

- Only used for quorum and not attendance purposes;

- After Clicking "Join Session" in Point Solutions, Senators will see a slide asking them to press **1** if they are present.

  - Your choice has been submitted when the circle or box with the **1** becomes blue and is filled in.

Present

Voting Slide

Vote

Results

• Following the presentation of committee recommendations and any associated discussion, Senators will vote on each Action item on the agenda.

   • Use Point Solutions to select:
      • 1 – In Favor
      • 2 – Opposed
      • 3 – Abstain

   • Can make changes until the voting period on that item closes;

   • Last button pressed will be vote cast;

   • Results will be displayed on the screen immediately after the voting ends.

This Year

- UMD Plan of Organization for Shared Governance Review
- Interim Policy on the Naming of Facilities and Programs
- Student Codes of Conduct
- Revision to the Final Exam Provision in the UMD Policy on the Conduct of Undergraduate Courses and Student Grievance Procedure
- Promoting Mental Health & Equity in the Excused Absence Policy
- Revisions to the Disability Policy
- Development of Policies on Service & Emotional Support Animals
- College Plans of Organization

Legislation Tracker

Review of the Interim University Policy on Criminal Background Checks (Senate Document #21-22-21)

TO	**Darryll J. Pines	President**
FROM	**Ellen D. Williams	Chair, University Senate**

I am pleased to forward the accompanying legislation for your consideration and approval. William Reed, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and Lisa Klein, Chair of the Staff Affairs Committee, presented the committees' Review of the Interim University Policy on Criminal Background Checks (Senate Document #21-22-21), which the University Senate approved at its meeting on April 26, 2022. Please inform the Senate of your decision and any administrative action related to your conclusion.

Approved: _____ **Date:** 05-11-2022

Darryll J. Pines
President

Copies of this approval and the accompanying legislation will be forwarded to:

Jennifer King Rice, Senior Vice President and Provost
Reka Montfort, Executive Secretary and Director, University Senate
Michael Poterala, Vice President and General Counsel
Dylan Baker, Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel
John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
Elizabeth Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs
Rhonda Smith, Director, Division of Academic Affairs
Rythee Lambert-Jones, Assistant Vice President, University Human Resources
Michele Eastman, Assistant President and Chief of Staff, Office of the President
Carlo Colella, Vice President for Administration
Anne Martens, Assistant Vice President and Chief of Staff, Division of Administration
Kimberly Watson, Assistant Vice President Procurement & Business Services, Division of Administration
William Reed, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
Lisa Klein, Chair, Staff Affairs Committee

Enclosure – Memo: Senate Document #21-22-21, Review of the Interim University Policy on Criminal Background Checks

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

May 11, 2022

MEMORANDUM

TO: Professor Rochelle Newman
                Chair, University Senate

FROM: Darryll J. Pines
                President

SUBJECT: Senate Document #21-22-21, Review of the Interim University Policy on
                Criminal Background Checks

I approve the above-referenced Senate Document on Criminal Background Checks subject to the two clarifications below.

1) The "Recommendations for Implementation" will be excluded from the policy—currently they appear to be one document—and only the policy will be posted on the university's website. On the advice of the university's Vice President and General Counsel, we need to avoid any confusion whereby applicants or others see the recommendations and rely on them as if they were policy.

2) With respect to the set of implementation recommendations, I believe these are very detailed in directing how University Human Resources (UHR) should implement, down to details on the data to be collected and that UHR should use expertise outside of UHR to analyze the data. Administrators with fiduciary responsibilities need the maximum flexibility to implement policies. Some of the recommendations may require significant resources, both financial and personnel. I accept the Administrative Recommendations with the following edits **in bolded red**. Please note that there are no changes to the Administrative Recommendations numbered six through nine and are included for reference only.

    1. The committees recommend that the University should **consider** develop**ing** guidance for applicants and finalists on what to expect in the background check process, including clarifying information on the specific time period covered by a criminal background check, the steps in the University's review process, how criminal history will be assessed relative to the position, and that a criminal history does not automatically disqualify a Finalist from employment.

    2. The University should **consider** provid**ing** information to applicants who receive a pre-adverse action letter on the process for disputing the accuracy or completeness of the records or otherwise providing additional information to contextualize an adverse finding. The University should also **consider** provid**ing** information on assistance that

can be provided or may be available to resolve issues related to language and access barriers.

3. The University should **consider** tak**ing** steps to protect the privacy rights of Finalists by ensuring that the direct hiring official for the position or search cannot request a Finalist's birth name or legal name for purposes of conducting a background check.

4. The University should **consider** collect**ing** data on applicant pools, finalists, and the background check process in order to inform reviews of the efficacy and impact of the policy. Data to **consider** collect**ing might** include, but not be limited to, the following:
   - Statistics and demographic data on applicant pools and finalists broadly by job title, both from prior to and after the implementation of the policy;
   - Statistics and demographic data on those for whom a pre-adverse action letter is issued;
   - Statistics and demographic data on those for whom the adverse finding results in an offer of employment being rescinded;
   - Demographics as noted above should include race, gender, ethnicity, veteran status and/or disability status, to the extent provided by the applicant; and
   - Eligibility to hire success and failure rates in cases where there was an adverse finding by type of position and salary range.

5. The University should **consider** review**ing** the data collected on the background check process every three years to consider whether the policy is having an impact on hiring generally, as well as whether the policy has a disproportionate impact on applicants from marginalized backgrounds. The University should **consider** leverag**ing** existing expertise on campus in collecting and interpreting these types of data and assessing the impact of background checks on the University's diversity, equity, and inclusion goals. University Human Resources should **consider** repor**ting** to the Senate Executive Committee on the results of the review.

6. The University should consider developing a plan for communicating information on the background check process clearly and consistently to applicants in plain language, both on the application and through other information available to applicants online.

7. The University should consider whether the process for reviewing the results of a background check received from the vendor could take a double-blind approach, or whether the University can take other steps to remove personally identifiable information from documentation prior to the review by the Hiring Eligibility Review Group (HERG).

8. The University should consider how background checks should be implemented in instances where a student employee needs to transition to a staff position for a period of up to six weeks in order to complete their employment following their graduation.

9. The University should consider assessing its agreements with third-party contractors and vendors whose employees work in University facilities to determine whether those employees are or should be subject to a background check with their employers.

Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks

PRESENTED BY	**William Reed and Lisa Klein, Chairs**
REVIEW DATES	**SEC – April 12, 2022	SENATE – April 26, 2022**
VOTING METHOD	**In a single vote**
RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT	**VII-1.15(A) – University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks**
NECESSARY APPROVALS	**Senate, President**

ISSUE

The University Senate's Faculty Affairs and Staff Affairs Committees have been reviewing issues associated with criminal background checks since 2019. In April 2019, the committees were charged with considering a proposal on whether to institute a policy requiring criminal background checks for all new hires of faculty and staff employees. A joint subcommittee was created, and thought its work was delayed by the pandemic, it developed its final recommendations in June 2021. In September 2021, President Pines informed the Senate Leadership and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) that after consulting with the Office of General Counsel, he decided that it was important for the University to have a criminal background policy in place as soon as possible. He stated that he would be approving a new University policy on criminal background checks on an interim basis, pending Senate review. Following the President's action, the SEC voted to jointly charge the Faculty Affairs & Staff Affairs Committees with a review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks, and to close the committee's pre-existing charge on criminal background checks, at its meeting on September 20, 2021. On September 22, 2021, the President formally announced his approval of the new University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks (VII-1.15[A]), effective October 1, 2021.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Faculty Affairs Committee and Staff Affairs Committee jointly recommend that the proposed revisions to the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks (VII-1.15[A]), as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

In addition, the committees present nine additional administrative recommendations to guide the implementation of the policy and the criminal background checks process. All recommendations can be found in the report.

COMMITTEE WORK

The Faculty and Staff Affairs Committees began their review of the interim policy in October 2021. Each committee reviewed the charge; the USM Policy on Criminal Background Checks for Faculty

and Staff Employees (VII-1.15); the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks (VII-1.15[A]); the report from the Joint Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee Criminal Background Check Subcommittee; and policies at other USM institutions on criminal background checks in the course of their review.

The committees met with the Chief Human Resources Officer, the Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer, and the Deputy General Counsel from the Office of General Counsel to learn more about the need for the interim policy and the legal framework surrounding criminal background checks. The committees also consulted with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion, and received information from the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJS) on scholarly research related to criminal background checks.

In the course of their reviews, the Faculty Affairs and Staff Affairs Committees raised concerns about the need for criminal background checks, as well as the potential impact of criminal background checks on underrepresented minority applicants for faculty and staff positions. However, the committees recognized that the President and the administration felt strongly that this was a necessary step for the University as a major employer. The committees felt that the rationale put forth by the institution, related to minimizing liability and institutional risk, were likely strong motivators for the President. The committees decided to focus their discussions on whether there are ways to improve the policy and process, in order to better align with the institution and the President's stated goals for recruiting a diverse faculty and staff. The committees each identified specific issues that impact faculty and staff, and considered ways to address them within the policy and the recommendations.

In spring 2022, the committees focused their reviews on the specific decision-making aspects of the charge and on the policy language. They developed recommendations that were supported by both committees. After due consideration, the Faculty Affairs and Staff Affairs Committees voted to approve proposed revisions to the interim policy and associated administrative recommendations via an email vote concluding on April 11, 2022.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could decline to approve the recommendations. However, the interim policy would stand as the permanent policy, and the University would lose an opportunity to improve the policy and process for future finalists and other affected individuals.

RISKS

There are no risks to the University in adopting these recommendations.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There may be financial implications involved in implementing the recommendations, in addition to the financial implications of background checks, which are currently being addressed centrally.

REVIEW OF THE INTERIM UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS

Faculty Affairs Committee

William Reed (Chair)
John Bertot (Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep)
Michele Eastman (Ex-Officio - President's Rep)
Alex Franklin (Graduate Student)
Mark Fuge (Faculty)
Saverio Giovacchini (Faculty Senator)
Tracy Huard (Faculty Senator)
Gideon Mark (Faculty Senator)
Rythee Lambert-Jones (Ex-Officio - Director of Human Resources Rep)
Shawn Nijjar (Undergraduate Student)
Karen O'Brien (Ex-Officio - Ombuds Officer)
Jessica O'Hara (Faculty)
Colleen O'Neal (Faculty)
Terry Owen (Faculty)
Autumn Perkey (Graduate Student)
Mary Shelley (Staff)
Beth St Jean (Faculty)
Wendy Stickle (Faculty)
Jennifer Wallace (Faculty Senator)

Staff Affairs Committee

Lisa Klein (Chair)
Alex Aiosa (Non-Exempt Staff Division)
Joseph Azzarello (Exempt Staff Division)
Amelia Barabak (Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep)

Meredith Carpenter (Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep Non-Voting)
Shirlene Chase (Ex-Officio - VP Student Affairs Rep)
Marie-Justine Curney (Non-Exempt Staff Academic)
Joni Floyd (Faculty)
Anthony Harmon (Non-Exempt Staff Division)
Elizabeth Hinson (Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep)
Dolores Jackson (Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep Non-Voting)
Shafali Jalota (Non-Exempt Staff Contingent II)
Jerry Lewis (Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep Non-Voting)
Anne Martens (Ex-Officio - VP Administration Rep)
Raymond Nardella (Exempt Staff Division)
Louisa Nkrumah (Exempt Staff Contingent II)
Shivani Paleti (Student)
Kalia Patricio (Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep)
Jacqueline Richmond (Ex-Officio - Director of Human Resources Rep)
Manuel Rodriguez (Exempt Staff Academic)
Maureen Schrimpe (Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep)
Kristin Stenson (Exempt Staff Academic)
Amy Yaich (Non-Exempt Staff Academic)

Date of Submission

April 2022

BACKGROUND

In April 2019, the University Senate's Faculty and Staff Affairs Committees were charged with reviewing a proposal (Senate Document #18-19-36) from key administrators that cited potential risk to the University from the lack of a policy requiring criminal background checks for all new hires for faculty and staff positions. The proposal suggested that the University should develop a new criminal background check policy that would expand the scope of criminal background checks beyond the existing mandatory pre-employment background reviews that were already a condition of employment for certain positions, as required by law and noted in the University System of Maryland (USM) Policy on Criminal Background Checks for Faculty and Staff Employees (VII-1.15). The committees formed a joint subcommittee that was tasked with tackling this complex issue by conducting the background research and consultations defined in the charge in order to make a recommendation to the full committees. While the subcommittee was in the depth of its work, it was significantly derailed by the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic in March 2020, which not only affected its ability to operate but also made it challenging for the subcommittee to engage with relevant

administrators on its work. Despite these issues and the ongoing pandemic, the subcommittee finalized its recommendations in June 2021.

In September 2021, President Pines informed the Senate Leadership and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) that after consulting with the Office of General Counsel, he decided that it was important for the University to have a criminal background policy in place as soon as possible. He stated that he would be approving a new University policy on criminal background checks on an interim basis, pending Senate review. Following the President's action, the SEC voted to jointly charge the Faculty Affairs & Staff Affairs Committees with a review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks, and to close the committee's pre-existing charge on criminal background checks, at its meeting on September 20, 2021 (Appendix 1). On September 22, 2021, the President formally announced his approval of the new Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks (VII-1.15[A]), effective October 1, 2021.

PRIOR COMMITTEE WORK

The Joint Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee Criminal Background Check Subcommittee considered how the proposed criminal background checks would work in practice, reviewed policies and practices at Big 10 and other peer institutions, and considered the impact of criminal background checks on potential applicants who have criminal or arrest records. The subcommittee consulted extensively with representatives of University Human Resources (UHR); the Division of Administration; the University of Maryland Police Department; the Office of Diversity and Inclusion; the Office of General Counsel; and the Office of Faculty Affairs. It also reached out to units that it felt may be most affected by such a policy due to their need for high numbers of seasonal and temporary staff, in order to gather feedback on and assess the impact of a policy of this nature.

The Joint Subcommittee thoroughly considered a number of complex issues, related to the impact of a potential policy on underrepresented minorities; the potential cost and logistical concerns related to such a policy; and how to ensure appropriate consideration of criminal background checks in alignment with the University's diversity, equity, and inclusion principles.

After a thorough review, the Subcommittee finalized its recommendations in June 2021. It recommended that the University adopt a limited policy that expands criminal background checks to certain positions, rather than to all positions. The Subcommittee determined that it was unclear whether criminal background checks would increase safety, because many violent crimes do not result in convictions, and since many incidents are first offenses and crimes of opportunity. The Subcommittee felt that the limited benefits to the safety of the campus community were outweighed by the potential negative implications of criminal background checks, particularly for those from underrepresented minority backgrounds who may face unequal treatment by the criminal justice system. The Subcommittee developed its recommendations with the objective of enhancing safety while upholding the University's values related to equity and equal employment opportunity.

INTERIM POLICY

On September 22, 2021, the University community was informed that the President had approved a new University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks (VII-1.15[A]), effective October 1, 2021. In a message to the campus community, the Vice President & Chief Administrative Officer and the Assistant Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer noted that the University of Maryland has a responsibility as a major employer in the County and as the State's flagship institution "to provide as safe a learning and working environment for the UMD community as

possible" and indicated that conducting pre-employment criminal background checks is an important step to "reduce the risk of negligent hiring liability" (Appendix 2).

The interim policy indicates that the University is in compliance with the University System of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks for Faculty and Staff Employees (VII-1.15), which requires mandatory criminal background checks through the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) for specific types of positions. Beyond the mandatory checks, the interim policy explains that the University of Maryland also requires a criminal background check for all new hires of faculty and staff employees, as well as any hires of returning employees with a break in service of one year or more. The policy notes that volunteers may also be subject to a criminal background check. These provisions affect all full-time and part-time employees; they do not affect student employees or graduate assistants, until and unless they move into a faculty or staff position.

The interim policy notes that University Human Resources and the Office of Faculty Affairs will develop procedures and standards for implementing the policy. The policy clearly states that the University reserves the right to decline employment due to the results of a criminal background check review, and that finalists will not be denied employment due to an arrest record alone without additional convictions or criminal penalties. The policy also allows finalists to dispute the accuracy or completeness of the Criminal Background Check.

A phased implementation of the policy began in October 2021. UHR, working with various partners in the administration, developed a process for running and reviewing criminal background checks, and began deploying the process in October.

IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES

In order to implement the interim policy, the University has developed a contract with HireRight, a criminal background check screening services vendor that is already used by the University of Maryland - Baltimore (UMB), as well as a majority of other Big 10 institutions. When hires are initiated as the result of a search process, a finalist is given an offer letter that indicates that the offer is conditional on the successful completion of a criminal background check. The letter provides a link for the finalist to begin the criminal background check process with HireRight. When new hires do not require a formal search process, the individual must be given the link to begin the process prior to being added to the Payroll and Human Resources (PHR) database.

After HireRight receives the necessary information from the finalist, it will run a criminal background check that includes a criminal felony and misdemeanor check for the past seven years, as well as a check against the National Sex Offender Registry. Criminal background check results will typically be returned to the University within 72 hours or less. The results will note any criminal convictions or other notable flags on an individual's record as "adverse findings;" the results are reviewed by the UHR Employment Compliance Team. In the case of an adverse finding, the UHR Team will conduct an individualized assessment of the offense and the job duties, and may reach out to the unit Equity Administrator for more information about the position, if needed. At the conclusion of the review by the UHR Employment Compliance Team, if the individualized assessment indicates that the individual is eligible to be hired, UHR will inform the Hiring Official.

If the criminal background check cannot be resolved by the UHR Employment Compliance Team and needs further consideration, UHR will initiate the process to send the finalist a "Pre-Adverse Action Letter," which details the results of the criminal background check and informs the finalist of their right to provide additional context to the University or correct information in the report. The finalist has seven days to respond.

Further consideration of the criminal background check is undertaken by the Hiring Eligibility Review Group (HERG), which is made up of the Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO), the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, a representative of the Office of General Counsel, a representative of the University of Maryland Police Department (UMPD), and the appropriate Equity Administrator. HERG is responsible for reviewing the criminal background check results as well as any additional information or context provided by the finalist in response to the pre-adverse action letter. HERG then conducts an individualized assessment to make a determination on eligibility to hire. If HERG determines the finalist is eligible to hire and the CHRO agrees, UHR informs the Hiring Official that the finalist is cleared to be hired. If the HERG recommends that the finalist not be hired, it will consult with the appropriate Dean or Vice President (VP). The CHRO, in consultation with the Dean or VP, makes the final decision. If the hire is not approved, UHR will notify the Hiring Official, but no details about the criminal background check are given. UHR will also send a final adverse action determination letter to the finalist, and will either rescind the conditional offer of employment or terminate employment, in the rare case that a finalist has been approved to begin working while the criminal background check results are pending.

COMMITTEE WORK

The Faculty and Staff Affairs Committees began their review of the interim policy in October 2021. Each committee reviewed the charge elements; the USM Policy on Criminal Background Checks for Faculty and Staff Employees (VII-1.15); the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks (VII-1.15[A]); and the report from the Joint Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee Criminal Background Check Subcommittee. The committees also reviewed policies at other USM institutions on criminal background checks in the course of their review.

Early in the review, the committees each met with the Chief Human Resources Officer, the Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer, and the Deputy General Counsel from the Office of General Counsel to learn more about the need for the interim policy and the legal framework surrounding criminal background checks. Both committees had opportunities in their meeting and in subsequent follow-ups to ask questions of administrators. The committees also consulted with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion during the review, and received information from the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJS) on scholarly research related to criminal background checks.

In spring 2022, the committees focused their reviews on the specific decision-making aspects of the charge and on the policy language, using a decision matrix and Google form surveys of the committees to guide their discussions. The chairs of the two committees collaborated to align the work between the two committees, and each committee met at the end of March to develop recommendations that were supported by both committees. After due consideration, the Faculty Affairs and Staff Affairs Committees voted to approve proposed revisions to the interim policy and associated administrative recommendations via an email vote concluding on April 11, 2022.

Major considerations of the review process are summarized below.

Peer Institution Research

As requested in the charge, the committees conducted peer institution research on other USM institutions in order to better understand how institutions operating under the same USM policy and state laws address criminal background checks. The committees found criminal background check policies at nearly all USM institutions (Appendix 3). Findings from the research include the following:

- Most institutions in the USM focus on pre-employment criminal background checks and limit the policy focus to finalists; a few institutions have provisions that focus on current employees or go beyond finalists to any group of candidates or finalists.
  - Bowie State and Towson focus their policies on current employees.
  - Coppin State includes language extending the policy to current employees that take on new roles or change status, especially if the new position involves managing sensitive materials. These provisions apply to employees working in an interim or acting capacity.
  - Salisbury also includes "current employees who change jobs and whose new duties may be subject to a background check."
  - Students are not included in criminal background checks at most USM peers; student employees are only addressed at Salisbury, Bowie State (if they are working with minors), and Towson (certain student employees who are engaged in highly sensitive activities).
  - Many peers explicitly include volunteers, and Salisbury addresses contractors as well.
- Most peers have provisions on false or misleading information, suggesting that it may lead to termination; most also have provisions noting that the focus is on convictions, not arrests.
- Where institutions address gaps in service, the time period ranges from three months (Coppin State) to three years (Salisbury); a time period is not specified in the policy for Frostburg, and gaps in service are not addressed in policies at UMGC, UMES, and Bowie State.
- Where appeals are discussed, they are typically in the form of correcting information or challenging information in the criminal background check. Towson University is the only USM peer to explicitly allow a finalist to challenge why the results of the criminal background check disqualified them from employment.

The committees also considered whether peer institution information outside of the State of Maryland would be instructive. The Joint Subcommittee had conducted research on Big 10 institutions in September of 2019 (Appendix 4), which both committees reviewed. However, the committees found that it is difficult to compare UMD's situation with that of other Big 10 institutions on this particular policy, as other institutions are bound by state laws or system regulations that differ from those that affect UMD. The committees decided to rely on the USM peers in their consideration instead.

Legal Framework

In their consultations, the committees learned that the University has a duty under the law to act reasonably as an employer, and courts expect that the University and all major employers exercise basic due diligence to learn about experiences or behaviors that could result in harm. Criminal background checks are widely accepted as a measure of due-diligence for employers to avoid liability for negligent hiring practices.

There are a few major laws and guidelines that provide a framework for pre-employment criminal background checks. The federal Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) enforced by the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) sets guidelines and standards for using criminal background checks. It requires consent from finalists to conduct a criminal background check, and that finalists receive notice that a criminal background check may be used in employment decisions, as well as notice in the case of an adverse finding or action (15 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1681x). Prince George's County has a "ban the box" law that prohibits inquiring about criminal records until after an initial interview, and requires

that employers limit their consideration to offenses that specifically relate to the duties of the position for which the finalist is applying (CB-078-2014). This law also requires that if an offer is to be rescinded, the finalist must be notified; the notice must include the specific disqualifying information, a copy of the criminal background check, and details on how the finalist can submit additional information for consideration.

The University is also responsible to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which has established guidelines and best practices for the use of criminal background checks in employment to avoid claims of disparate treatment and disparate impact (EEOC Enforcement Guidance Number 915.002). The EEOC best practices include:

- Ensuring there is separation between the review of an individual's qualifications for the position and a review of the criminal background check report;

- Maintaining confidentiality of records;

- Conducting an individualized assessment of the finalist's criminal background, which take into account factors such as the nature and gravity of the offense and the length of time since the offense;

- Using non-discriminatory assessment criteria;

- Giving finalists an opportunity to correct inaccurate information in the report; and

- Limiting criminal background checks to the past 7 years.

The interim policy was developed with a focus on these best practices, as well as the parameters of the FCRA and the Prince George's County law.

Scholarly Research

In the course of its review, the Faculty Affairs Committee consulted with representatives of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJS) to better understand scholarly research related to criminal background checks. The committee met with the chair of the department, Sally Simpson, and received additional information from faculty within and affiliated with the department. The Faculty Affairs Committee shared the research with the Staff Affairs Committee.

The scholarly research on criminal background checks is extensive, and includes research on the way criminal background checks are utilized, the consequences of criminal background checks, and the disparity that is associated with criminal records and the use of criminal records. An overview of the literature shows evidence of inequities in the distribution of criminal records across the population. Communities of color are disproportionately policed in American society, and therefore have a disproportionate likelihood of generating a record. This is related to where policing is targeted; the resources available or unavailable to the offenders; how likely offenders are to have their cases dismissed; and how likely offenders are to have additional information that is brought to bear on their case. In addition, research shows that having a criminal record increases the risk of subsequent charges and a more extensive criminal record.

The committees learned that the use of criminal background checks in employment decisions does not take into account the redemption effect noted by scholars in the field. Research suggests that as time goes on, a person with a criminal record is no more likely than anyone else to engage in criminal behavior. CCJS faculty noted that this raises concerns that criminal background checks introduce bias and stigma without clear empirical benefit. They also noted that there is evidence of significant issues with the accuracy of publicly available criminal history data, as sources of this

information often lack data quality standards or accountability and studies have confirmed errors in information gathered from public and third-party data sources that are used by most companies that conduct criminal background checks.

In higher education contexts, there is limited information on the efficacy of criminal background checks, and the few studies that exist related to higher education specifically do not show evidence that criminal background checks are an effective mechanism for reducing campus crime. However, surveys of the industry show that the vast majority of institutions do conduct criminal background checks on prospective faculty members. The research indicates that there are measures that can be taken to reduce negative effects of criminal background checks, including ensuring adherence to the EEOC guidelines and crafting explicit policies and procedures.

COMMITTEE FINDINGS

In the course of their reviews, the Faculty Affairs and Staff Affairs Committees raised concerns about the need for criminal background checks, as well as the potential impact of criminal background checks on underrepresented minority applicants for faculty and staff positions. The committees had early discussions that called into question whether they were allowed to explore recommendations to remove the policy entirely because of their strong concerns about diversity, equity, and inclusion. However, the committees recognized that the President and administration felt strongly that this was a necessary step for the University as a major employer. The committees felt that the rationale put forth by the institution, related to minimizing liability and institutional risk, were likely strong motivators for the President, and it would be very challenging to put forward a recommendation to remove the policy, even if the committee were to determine that the diversity, equity, and inclusion concerns should be weighed more heavily than issues of safety and institutional risk. Instead of pursuing further discussions down that path, the committees decided to focus their discussions on whether there are ways to improve the policy and process, in order to better align with the institution and the President's stated goals for recruiting a diverse faculty and staff.

The committees each identified specific issues that impact faculty and staff, and considered ways to address them within the policy and the recommendations. An overview of the key issues reflected in the recommendations is included below.

Impact on Marginalized Groups

The overriding concern for both committees during the review was whether conducting criminal background checks would have a chilling effect that would adversely impact the diversity of applicant pools and eventually the diversity of the faculty and staff at the University. Both committees raised concerns that excellent candidates may choose not to apply, and also noted that criminal background checks may be perceived as undermining the University's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Both committees focused much of their deliberations on ways to mitigate any harmful effects of criminal background checks. In considering any potential impacts on the LGBTQ+ community, the committees felt it important to ensure that applicants maintain control over how they present themselves to Hiring Officials, so they developed an administrative recommendation to ensure that finalists are not required to report their legal or birth name to the Hiring Official. In considering this recommendation, the committees noted that the vendor that runs the criminal background checks may still ask for the legal name; in that case, the finalist would be providing it to a third-party, rather than the individual who would become their supervisor if they were to be employed. The committees

also noted that the vendor will ask for other identifying information like Social Security numbers, which are more reliable and verifiable data points for conducting the criminal background check than the legal name.

In considering the potential impact of criminal background checks on underrepresented minority candidates, the committees were encouraged to learn that the University has incorporated the EEOC guidelines into its processes for considering the results of criminal background checks. A few key steps included in the University's process include:

- reviewing the results of criminal background checks centrally within UHR, rather than at the unit level, which ensures consistency in decision-making and also allows for more safeguards to ensure that Hiring Officials or other unit employees are not aware of the results of a criminal background check;

- conducting an individualized assessment of any adverse findings on criminal background checks to take into account various factors including the time since the offense, the nature and severity of the offense, and other factors that may mitigate or aggravate the offense;

- reviewing the adverse findings on the criminal background check against the specific responsibilities of the position and examining whether there is a business necessity for denying employment in each specific case;

- allowing finalists who have an adverse finding on a criminal background check to provide additional information and/or correct inaccurate information in the criminal background check; and

- considering the totality of the circumstances as the adverse findings are reviewed.

The committees noted that while the University may be implementing best practices and doing its due diligence to eliminate bias from the process, applicants and finalists currently do not have any information about the process that would lead them to believe their information will be handled sensitively. The committees felt that explaining and demystifying the process for reviewing criminal background checks is an important step the University should take to reduce any chilling effect on applicants and finalists. The committees developed recommendations related to communication of the policy, both on the job posting and on the UHR website, to help applicants understand the process and know what to expect.

Returning Employees

The interim policy indicates that it applies to "all returning employees with a break in service of one (1) year or more" (see I.B. of the policy). The committees raised concerns over how long a criminal background check is valid for an intermittent employee, and whether the provision may have an outsized impact on seasonal workers and adjunct faculty.

The committees considered whether there may be faculty or staff who would be subject to repeated criminal background checks that may be unreasonable; for instance, the Faculty Affairs Committee explored issues related to adjunct faculty who consistently teach one semester each year but are not employed for the rest of the year, or who consistently teach a specific program requirement on an inconsistent timeline depending on the unit's needs. Likewise, the Staff Affairs Committee considered whether there may be seasonal workers who are employed around the same timeframe each year but are not employed consistently throughout the year. UHR reported that it has received feedback from Dining Services in particular that a 12-month gap in service may cause difficulties for some of its seasonal employees.

After consideration, both committees agreed that extending the gap in service provision to 18 months rather than 12 months would help to avoid any issues faced by returning seasonal workers or adjunct faculty, and they developed revisions to the policy to that effect.

Role of the Hiring Official

In its prior review, the Joint Subcommittee identified concerns with the proposed criminal background check process due to the inclusion of the Hiring Official, given that Hiring Officials may have biases that could become a factor in the decision-making process or could bias their later decisions about work assignments or performance issues after a candidate becomes an employee. After the development of the interim policy, UHR clarified that it was implementing the policy in a way that removed Hiring Officials from the process; the results of the criminal background check are instead reviewed centrally by UHR and other administrative offices that have been trained on how to conduct criminal background checks in a neutral and unbiased manner.

Both committees were relieved to learn that the Hiring Official would not be a part of the process, as they agreed that allowing a Hiring Official to know that there was an adverse finding on a criminal background check, or to know what the adverse finding was, may bias them if the finalist later becomes their employee. The committees acknowledged that this may make it more difficult to assess the job-related responsibilities against the adverse finding, but UHR clarified that the relevant equity administrator would be included in the review process in order to provide a local perspective.

While the implementation of the interim policy does not currently include Hiring Officials, the committees felt strongly that the principle of excluding Hiring Officials should be codified in the policy, to ensure that the principle continues to be upheld regardless of any future changes in policy implementation. The committees developed policy revisions to clarify that the Hiring Official does not have a role in the review process, and will not have access to the results of a criminal background check.

Data and Review

While the committees understood and acknowledged the institution's interest in conducting criminal background checks, they remained concerned that there is no evidence that supports the argument that criminal background checks reduce harm, and that there could be very real impacts on the University's ability to recruit diverse faculty and staff. As a result, both committees felt strongly that the University must collect data to be able to better understand whether the policy has an impact on the recruitment and hiring of underrepresented minorities.

The committees developed administrative recommendations on data collection and policy review to ensure that the University can make more informed decisions in the future. They outlined components that would be important data points in future reviews, and recommended that UHR review the data every three years to assess whether there has been an impact on hiring and whether the criminal background checks have had a disproportionate impact on applicants from underrepresented minority backgrounds. The committees recognize that data-collection will be limited in part by the information that applicants choose to provide on an application, but noted that having the information to the extent that it is available will be very helpful in future assessments.

Addressing Outlier Situations

As the Staff Affairs Committee reviewed the interim policy and discussed the process for conducting criminal background checks, it identified a few situations that it felt are not adequately addressed by the policy and implementation procedures. The committee explored options for resolving those issues administratively, and developed administrative recommendations to ensure further consideration.

One such scenario impacts student employees who graduate but plan to continue their employment until the end of the fiscal year. Upon graduation, these employees are no longer eligible to be student employees because they are no longer students, so they are typically moved to a Contingent I contract to finish their employment. This short-term transition moves them from a student role to a staff role, which requires that they go through a criminal background check before the transition could be completed in the Payroll and Human Resources (PHR) system. The committee noted that it seems inefficient to require criminal background checks in these situations, since those affected only intend to work for a period of weeks, and since their work responsibilities and scope do not change in the transition. They are also impacted by different rules and regulations in the transition from student to staff, as well, and the committee's administrative representatives indicated that there are broader issues in the transition that merit consideration. As a result, the Staff Affairs Committee decided to develop an administrative recommendation to ensure further consideration of these issues.

The Staff Affairs Committee also raised concerns about the lack of consistency in requiring criminal background checks for UMD employees but not for employees of third-party contractors who work on campus in the same types of roles. There are cases where these employees are doing the same work as UMD employees and have the same level of access to students, and therefore the same capacity to present a risk to the institution. From a safety perspective, the Staff Affairs Committee felt that it may be beneficial to consider extending criminal background checks to employees of third-party contractors, but it also acknowledged that there are additional complexities to be considered with the Office of Procurement, including issues related to contract terms and potential impacts on contracts with small businesses. The committee agreed that an administrative recommendation focused on considering this further might be beneficial.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy Recommendation

The Faculty Affairs Committee and the Staff Affairs Committee jointly recommend that the proposed revisions to the University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks (VII-1.15[A]), as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

Administrative Recommendations

1. The committees recommend that the University should develop guidance for applicants and finalists on what to expect in the background check process, including clarifying information on the specific time period covered by a criminal background check, the steps in the University's review process, how criminal history will be assessed relative to the position, and that a criminal history does not automatically disqualify a Finalist from employment.

2. The University should provide information to applicants who receive a pre-adverse action letter on the process for disputing the accuracy or completeness of the records or otherwise

providing additional information to contextualize an adverse finding. The University should also provide information on assistance that can be provided or may be available to resolve issues related to language and access barriers.

3.   The University should take steps to protect the privacy rights of Finalists by ensuring that the direct hiring official for the position or search cannot request a Finalist's birth name or legal name for purposes of conducting a background check.

4.   The University should collect data on applicant pools, finalists, and the background check process in order to inform reviews of the efficacy and impact of the policy. Data collected should include, but not be limited to, the following:

  • Statistics and demographic data on applicant pools and finalists broadly by job title, both from prior to and after the implementation of the policy;

  • Statistics and demographic data on those for whom a pre-adverse action letter is issued;

  • Statistics and demographic data on those for whom the adverse finding results in an offer of employment being rescinded;

  • Demographics as noted above should include race, gender, ethnicity, veteran status and/or disability status, to the extent provided by the applicant; and

  • Eligibility to hire success and failure rates in cases where there was an adverse finding by type of position and salary range.

5.   The University should review the data collected on the background check process every three years to consider whether the policy is having an impact on hiring generally, as well as whether the policy has a disproportionate impact on applicants from marginalized backgrounds. The University should leverage existing expertise on campus in collecting and interpreting these types of data and assessing the impact of background checks on the University's diversity, equity, and inclusion goals. University Human Resources should report to the Senate Executive Committee on the results of the review.

6.   The University should consider developing a plan for communicating information on the background check process clearly and consistently to applicants in plain language, both on the application and through other information available to applicants online.

7.   The University should consider whether the process for reviewing the results of a background check received from the vendor could take a double-blind approach, or whether the University can take other steps to remove personally identifiable information from documentation prior to the review by the Hiring Eligibility Review Group (HERG).

8.   The University should consider how background checks should be implemented in instances where a student employee needs to transition to a staff position for a period of up to six weeks in order to complete their employment following their graduation.

9.   The University should consider assessing its agreements with third-party contractors and vendors whose employees work in University facilities to determine whether those employees are or should be subject to a background check with their employers.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 — Charge from the Senate Executive Committee
Appendix 2 — Message to Campus Community
Appendix 3 — USM Peer Institution Research
Appendix 4 — Big 10 Peer Institution Research (Conducted September 2019)

VII-1.15(A)   UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS

(Approved by the President on an interim basis effective October 1, 2021, pending University Senate review)

I.   PURPOSE ~~AND SCOPE~~

~~Purpose:~~ This **P**~~p~~olicy outlines the University **of Maryland**'s **("the University")** use of criminal background checks to support a safe and secure campus environment in order to protect students, employees, property, information, and the public, as well as to enable prudent employment decisions based on comprehensive information. This **P**~~p~~olicy establishes the University's use of criminal background checks in compliance with the University System of Maryland (USM) Policy on Criminal Background Checks for Faculty and Staff Employees (VII-1.15).

~~A.   Scope: A criminal background check is required for all newly hired employees and all~~ **returning employees with a break in service of** ~~one (1) year or more. In certain cases, volunteers may also be subject to a criminal background check. Primarily, these criminal background checks shall be conducted on finalists for the following positions:~~

   ~~1.   All paid full-time and part-time tenured and tenure track faculty, professional track faculty, adjunct faculty, permanent status and permanent status-track faculty, and faculty holding administrative positions.~~

   ~~2.   All Regular and Contingent Exempt and Non-Exempt staff.~~

~~C.   Typically, University Human Resources will coordinate criminal background check activities. In the case of faculty hires, the Office of Faculty Affairs will also be included in the process.~~

II.   DEFINITIONS

   A. "Affected Individual" means those individuals required to undergo a Criminal Background Check in alignment with this Policy. This includes:

      1.   A Finalist;

2. **Current employees at another USM institution who are selected for employment at the University of Maryland; and**

3. **A returning University employee with a break in service of eighteen (18) months or more**.

B. "Criminal Background Check" means a ~~pre-~~employment review of various aspects of an **Affected Individual's** ~~new employee's~~ background including, but not limited to criminal background, educational background, a trace of an individual's social security number, and driving and credit histories**,** ~~(~~based on the **employment** position~~)~~.

C. "Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Record History" means a criminal background check completed by the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services of all criminal history information **related to** ~~regarding~~ an individual **that is** maintained by the CJIS Central Repository, consistent with the requirements of the Maryland Annotated Code ~~(Md. Code Ann.)~~, Criminal Procedure Article, Section 10-201 et seq. A CJIS Record History is based upon national and state criminalhistory records and uses an individual's fingerprints and other identifying information.

D. "Finalist" means a candidate who meets the minimum qualifications for a specific position at the University **and who has been extended a conditional offer of employment.** ~~Candidates become finalists once they have either advanced through the search and selection process or have otherwise qualified to be one of the final individuals being considered for employment at the University.~~

III. SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY ~~CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS~~

A. Mandatory Criminal Background Checks: Under state and federal law, institutions are required to obtain and review CJIS Record History for their employees under **specific** ~~certain~~ circumstances**.**~~,~~ **To meet its obligation under state and federal law, the University conducts CJIS Record History checks in alignment with the circumstances outlined** ~~as described~~ within the USM Policy on Criminal Background Checks for Faculty and Staff Employees (VII-1.15).

B. Permissive Criminal Background Checks: In addition to the circumstances under which the University is required by law to obtain and review CJIS Record History, the University exercises its discretion to require Criminal Background Checks ~~of all Finalists~~ ~~and volunteers~~ **under the conditions below:**~~.~~

1. **A Criminal Background Check is required for every Affected Individual.**

2. **Permissive Criminal Background Checks will not be conducted on current University employees as a condition of continued employment, unless otherwise required by the University.**

3. **Criminal Background Checks will not be conducted on a current**

University employee who has accepted or is appointed to a new position with the University as part of selection, promotion, transfer, reclassification, or reevaluation processes, unless otherwise required by law, position duties, policy, or is otherwise required by the University.

4. Criminal Background Checks will be conducted for the following positions:

   a. All paid full-time and part-time: tenured and tenure-track faculty, professional-track faculty, adjunct faculty, permanent status and permanent status-track faculty, and faculty holding administrative positions.

   b. All Regular and Contingent Exempt and Non-Exempt Staff.

5. Volunteers may also be considered Affected Individuals subject to a Criminal Background Check when circumstances warrant.

If a foreign national has been residing in the United States for twelve (12) months or more prior to their appointment, they will be required to undergo a Criminal Background Check. If the foreign national has been residing in the United States for less than twelve months prior to their appointment, they will have obtained the necessary background clearances through the Department of Homeland Security and do not have to go through a Criminal Background Check, but may have to submit the criminal background information form to the vendor.

IV. RIGHT TO REFUSE OR TERMINATE EMPLOYMENT

A. Offers of employment are conditional on the Affected Individual's completion of a Criminal Background Check.

B. The University reserves the right to rescind an offer of employment or otherwise refuse decline or terminate employment for to any Affected Individual Finalist whose criminal background is deemed incompatible with the position they are Finalist is seeking, regardless of when the Criminal Background Check is completed.

CB. Any Affected Individual Finalist who provides false or misleading information will be eliminated from further consideration of any position within the University for three (3) years. If false or misleading information is discovered after the Affected Individual Finalist has been appointed in a faculty or staff position, this will be considered regarded as grounds for disciplinary action, up to and including termination, pursuant to the appropriate dismissal procedures.

V. UNIVERSITY RESPONSIBILITIES

A. University Human Resources and the Office of Faculty Affairs are responsible for developing standards and procedures for the acquisition and use of Criminal

Background Checks, consistent with this **P**~~p~~olicy.

B. **The University will ensure that** ~~In order to provide the maximum degree of protection for a Finalist's privacy,~~ all records pertaining to Criminal Background Checks **are** ~~will be~~ maintained **securely and kept** ~~in a secure location~~ separate from personnel records. Criminal Background Check records will be maintained on a confidential basis to the maximum extent required by law.

C. In compliance with federal and state law, this **P**~~p~~olicy prohibits the University and its employees from using a CJIS Record History or the information obtained from Criminal Background Checks to make employment decisions that ~~include~~ discriminate**e**~~ion~~ based on race, color, sex, pregnancy, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, marital status, age, national origin, political affiliation, physical or mental disability, religion, protected veteran status, genetic information, personal appearance, or any other legally protected status ~~in all aspects of employment~~.

D. **The University reserves the right to determine an Affected Individual's** ~~a Finalist's~~ **suitability for a position based on the information reported by the Criminal Background Check vendor and other information provided by the Affected Individual to the University.** The University **will** ~~shall~~ not deny employment to a**n Affected Individual** ~~Finalist~~ based solely on a record of arrest in the absence of a conviction, other criminal penalty, or substantiation of facts underlying the arrest which relate to the **Affected Individual's** ~~Finalist's~~ fitness to perform the duties of the job.

E. University Human Resources ~~and the Office of Faculty Affairs~~ will provide training **to the individuals involved in the review of Criminal Background Check information** ~~to hiring officials and hiring coordinators who are responsible for hiring employees~~ on the appropriate methods for acquiring, using, and maintaining Criminal Background Check information.

VI. **GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

A. **The review of Criminal Background Check results shall be guided by principles that are consistent with the University's values and its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and that recognize factors such as systemic oppression and criminalization in the legal system that affect marginalized communities.**

B. **The following should guide the University's implementation of this Policy:**

1. **The scope of Criminal Background Checks should be guided by industry best practices, and the specific time period considered by the University should be conveyed to all candidates on the job posting.**

2. **The review of Criminal Background Check information should be conducted centrally by University Human Resources, and should be kept confidential from the direct Hiring Official for the position in question.**

3. **The Affected Individual may dispute the accuracy or completeness of the information included in their Criminal Background Check, and will be given an opportunity to provide additional information for the University's consideration.**

4. **Consideration of Criminal Background Check information should be guided by an assessment of the duties of the position and the totality of the circumstances.**

VI. APPEALS PROCESS

A Finalist may dispute the accuracy or completeness of the records included in their Criminal Background Check, and may provide additional information for the University's consideration.

Related USM Policies
VI – 1.50 Policy on the Reporting of Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect
VII – 1.01 Policy on Recruitment and Selection
VII – 1.15 Policy on Criminal Background Checks for Faculty and Staff Employees
VII – 1.24 Policy on Termination with Prejudice

UNIVERSITY SENATE	CHARGE
Charged: October 19, 2021 | Deadline: March 4, 2021	

Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks
(Senate Document #21-22-21)
Faculty Affairs Committee | Chair: William Reed
Staff Affairs Committee | Chair: Lisa Klein

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Williams request that the Faculty and Staff Affairs Committees review the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks (VII-1.15[A]).

The Faculty and Staff Affairs Committees should:

1. Review the University System of Maryland (USM) Policy on Criminal Background Checks for Faculty and Staff Employees (VII-1.15).

2. Review the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks (VII-1.15[A]).

3. Review the report from the Joint Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee Criminal Background Check Subcommittee.

4. Review criminal background check policies and any data or best practices associated with implementation at other USM institutions.

5. Consult with a representative of University Human Resources.

6. Consult with a representative of the Office of Faculty Affairs.

7. Consult with a representative of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI).

8. Consult with a representative of the Division of Administration.

9. Consult with the Office of General Counsel on the legal, compliance, and liability issues associated with the criminal background checks.

10. Consult with the Special Committee on University Finance (SCUF) on possible direct or indirect consequences/costs to the hiring units related to criminal background checks and any appeals process.

11. Consider whether the scope and criteria of the interim criminal background check policy are appropriate, including provisions related to affected positions, gaps of employment, and transitions within the University as an employee or when changing status from a student to an employee.

12. Consider the potential impacts of the criminal background checks on underrepresented minorities, the LGBTQ community, and other marginalized groups.

13. Consider the efficacy, fairness, and legal liability issues associated with the process for making a decision on whether a finalist is eligible for employment when their criminal background check shows a criminal record or other adverse finding.

14. Consider whether the University should establish a record-keeping process on various impacts of the Policy, and what metrics could be used.

15. Consider what opportunities finalists should have to explain or contextualize the results from a background check, or to appeal a decision not to hire based on a background check.

16. Consider whether principles associated with the implementation procedures should be incorporated into the criminal background check policy.

17. Consider whether a review of the impact of the Policy on hiring at the University should be required at some specified time after its implementation.

18. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on any proposed revisions to the policy.

19. If appropriate, recommend whether the interim policy and procedures should be revised and submit recommended revisions.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **March 4, 2022**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, reka@umd.edu.

September 22, 2021

Dear colleagues,

As a major employer in Prince George's County and the State's flagship higher education institution, the University has a responsibility to provide as safe a learning and working environment for the UMD community as possible. An important aspect of keeping the community safe is ensuring that those who are employed with the university have been appropriately screened before their first day of work, via a background check.

Conducting pre-employment background checks is common practice among private and public sector employers, including higher education. Following this process for every new hire can improve faculty and staff quality, verify the honesty and integrity of applicants, and reduce the risk of negligent hiring liability.

We take very seriously our commitment to hiring the best faculty and staff. In consultation with campus leaders, we are implementing the **Interim Policy on Criminal Background Checks** authored by University Human Resources (UHR) and the Office of Faculty Affairs. On October 1, 2021, UHR will begin a department-by-department implementation of the interim policy, applying only to new hires. UHR will communicate details of the implementation plan to department leaders in the coming days. UHR and the Office of Faculty Affairs will be available to answer questions about the interim policy to help make this implementation as seamless as possible. The interim policy will also undergo a review by the University Senate.

Consistent with the University's commitment to non-discrimination, results of background checks will be adjudicated by staff trained in EEO best practices and other federal, state and county regulations.

I appreciate your cooperation and engagement in this initiative. If you have questions, please contact Rythee Lambert-Jones, Interim Assistant Vice President of Human Resources at **rljones7@umd.edu** or John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs at **jbertot@umd.edu**.

Sincerely,

Carlo Colella
Vice President & Chief Administrative Officer
He/Him/His

Rythee Lambert-Jones
Assistant Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer
She/Her/Hers

Appendix 3 - USM Peer Institution Research

Institution	Policy / Procedures Link	Who is subject to a check?	Is there a gap in service provision?	Who coordinates/ conducts the check?	Finalists or Candidates?	False or Misleading Info Provision?	Records Protection/ Confidentiality Provision?	Arrests or Convictions?	Appeals?	Implementation?	Review of Policy Efficacy?
Bowie State University	VI - 3.00 Policy on Minors on Campus, https://www.bowiestate.edu/files/resources/minor-protection-policy-approved-4-12-17.pdf; https://bowiestate.edu/about/administration-and-governance/legal-and-government-affairs/university-policies/section-vi-general-administra/vi--300--policy-on-minors-on-campus.php	Faculty, staff, students who have direct contact with minors are required to have a current background check on record with the University.	No	University Human Resources	At the time of hire and/or beginning work with the minors	No	Records of background checks will be maintained separately from an individual's personnel or student file.	No discussion of arrests. A prior conviction shall not automatically disqualify a person from participating in a program or activity.	Not discussed	Not discussed. References an Appendix on Background Check Specifics, but appendix is not available online.	Not discussed
Coppin State University	https://www.coppin.edu/sites/default/files/pdf-library/2021-05/coppin_state_university_s_background_check_policy_and_procedures_for_faculty_and_staff_employees_af-hr-002.pdf	All job candidates offered employment and status change employees that take on new roles; applies to all regular and contractual faculty, regular and contingent staff, applicants for employment, volunteers, chaperones of camps and enrichment programs or any position that involves working with minors, adult dependent populations and positions that transport hazardous materials.	More than 3 months of separation from the University	Office of Human Resources	All candidates for new hire, rehire and reinstatement that have more than 3 months of separation from the University, and transfers from other state agencies; Current employees that change positions or acquire new responsibilities that involves managing sensitive materials may be required to have an updated or new credit history or criminal background check. This includes employees working in an interim or acting capacity; Any employee convicted of a crime, beyond a traffic infraction, must inform the CHRO and their supervisor of this conviction within five business days.	Failure to disclose accurate information to avoid obtaining information of criminal conviction(s), is deemed to of have provide falsification of application and may result in termination. An employee who fails to disclose being convicted of a crime within five (5) business days is considered to be in violation of a condition of continued employment and may result in termination.	Chief Human Resources Officer and OHR are responsible for ensuring confidentiality; records stored separate from employment files; confidentially report ineligibility to hiring official; violation of confidentiality may lead to disciplinary action	Arrests not discussed; background check focuses on convictions	Yes; If the candidate is not hired or promoted based on the background check results, the candidate has five (5) business days from the date of notice, to send a written appeal to the University's OHR, CHRO to contest the accuracy of the results. The CHRO will review the appeal to determine if there was an error in the accuracy of the background check results. The CHRO will provide final decision within 15 days of receiving written appeal and send it to the candidate's home address on file.	Procedures are included as part of the policy document	This policy shall be reviewed and revised annually, if necessary, to become effective at the beginning of the University's fiscal year, unless otherwise noted.
Frostburg State University	https://www.frostburg.edu/human-resources/_files/pdfs/background-check-procedure.pdf	all new applicants for employment	No	Office of Human Resources	Seems like it could be any group of candidates/finalists, at the discretion of the hiring manager, but has to include the final candidate to be hired.	No	No	Not discussed	Not discussed	Information included in the procedures.	Not discussed

Institution	Link	Coverage	Re-investigation	Responsible Office	When Conducted	False Information	Confidentiality	Convictions	Challenge	Procedures	Other
Salisbury University	https://www.salisbury.edu/administration/general-counsel/policies/section_VII/SU%20BOR%20VII-1.15.pdf	Newly hired and rehired employees (Faculty, staff, student, contingent employees); Current employees who change jobs AND whose new duties may be subject to a new background check; Rehired contractual employees who have had a break in service of more than three years; those who work with minors; Volunteers; and Contractors, consultants or others if the University determines the background checks conducted by their agencies are not satisfactory (Student employees only required if their job involves specific duties)	Yes - for contractual employees, 3 years.	Human Resources Office	Finalists - conduct a background check only after a candidate for employment has been offered and accepted a conditional offer of employment with the University.	Yes - If the University determines that a candidate has provided false or misleading information regarding criminal convictions, the candidate may be ineligible for the current position or may be subject to disciplinary action up to and including termination	Yes - Review of background check results will be held in strict confidence by reviewers.	Convictions - The University will not deny employment to an applicant based solely on a record of arrest in the absence of a conviction, other criminal penalty, or substantiation of facts underlying the arrest that relate to the individual's fitness to perform the duties of the job.	May challenge the information in the background check, but not the decision on whether they are eligible for employment based on that information.	Some procedures included in the document.	Not discussed
Towson University	https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/policies/07-01-04-background-investigations.html	All staff and faculty, certain Volunteers and certain student employees who are engaged in highly sensitive activities (e.g., those conducting financial transactions, working with vulnerable populations, or otherwise specified in this policy). In the relatively rare case in which relevant facts justify an exception, the Office of Human Resources (OHR) may waive the requirement for a criminal history background check on a specific Covered Person.	The University may require re-investigation if there has been a break in service.	Responsible Executive: Associate Vice President of Human Resources Responsible Office: Office of Human Resources	Candidates selected for hire	Not discussed	Yes - The Criminal Background Investigation results shall be maintained in the strictest confidence in a separate and secure file that may include an online vendor database.	Convictions - The University may not deny employment to a Candidate based solely on a record of arrest in the absence of a conviction, other criminal penalty, or substantiation of facts underlying the arrest which relate to the Candidate's fitness to perform the duties of the position.	Challenges addressed, the candidate may challenge why the results of the check should not disqualify them for employment.	Not discussed	Not discussed
University of Baltimore	None found										
University of Maryland Baltimore	https://www.umaryland.edu/policies-and-procedures/library/human-resources/policies/vii-101a.php	UMB requires pre-employment background investigations as a condition of hire for each applicant selected for a covered position. Current Regular and C II employees of UMB will not undergo background investigations as part of promotion, transfer or reevaluation processes unless required by the law, position duties, or policy.	Current employees who separate from employment with UMB and return after one year will be subject to a background investigation	Human Resource Service	As a condition of hire	If it is found that an applicant did not fully disclose or misrepresented information on the application, the applicant will be ineligible for hire and employment of the applicant may be terminated if the applicant is currently employed with UMB.	Information reported on background investigations will be treated as confidential, maintained by HRS, and released by HRS only when deemed necessary to support a decision.	Convictions - Criminal convictions and open criminal cases will be taken into account when reviewing a tentatively selected candidate's background. The Executive Director, HRS will assess the circumstances surrounding the criminal conviction, the time frame and the nature and gravity of the offense, and the relevancy of the criminal conduct to the duties of the announced position.	In accordance with the Fair Credit Reporting Act, HRS will provide a copy of the investigative report to applicants who are denied employment based on the background investigation, and guidelines for appeal.	Not discussed	Not discussed

University of Maryland Baltimore County	None found. Seems that some positions may require it due to USM policy, but did not find UMBC specific policy.									
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	https://www.umes.edu/HR/Pages/Policy-on-Background-Checks/	Background checks for candidates for hire for any position with the university including all regular faculty and staff appointments, any contingent (contractual) new hires, and volunteers	No	Office of Human Resources Management	Finalists - conducted once a tentative offer of employment is extended and accepted by the candidate	Not discussed	All criminal records received by the University will be kept in strict confidence within the Office of Human Resources Management and held on a need to know basis.	Convictions	Yes - candidates will be notified of any adverse information and will be given an opportunity to verify and reply to this information. Any appeal should be directed to the Director of the Office of Human Resources Management.	Not discussed	Not discussed
University of Maryland Global Campus	https://www.umgc.edu/administration/policies-and-reporting/policies/human-resources/criminal-background-checks-staff-faculty-policy.cfm	UMGC may elect to obtain criminal background checks with respect to any position.	No	Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO)	Unclear	Not discussed	Records will be maintained confidentially	May not be based on arrest records alone.	UMGC commits to providing a process for contesting the accuracy of the records upon which a denial was based.	CHRO is responsible for implementing, communicating, and developing procedures.	Not discussed
University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science	None found. Seems that some positions may require it due to USM policy, but did not find UMCES specific policy.									

Appendix 4 - Big 10 Peer Institution Research (Conducted Sept 2019)

Institution	Policy	Last Updated	Covers Faculty	Covers Staff	Other Categories	Appeal/challenge info	Who pays	State law?	Other
University of Iowa	https://opsmanual.uiowa.edu/human-resources/hiring-and-appointments/criminal-background-check-point-hire	9/17/19	Yes	"All regular merit, professional and scientific, and faculty positions"	Flexibility to determine whether temporary, fixed-term, or student positions are "security sensitive"	Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction.	Campus level	Yes*	The expectation is that each individual college/division covers their costs but have the flexibility of how to do so. The vast majority charge back to the individual hiring unit. However, a few do set aside central funds to pay. Several policies explicitly address third-party vendors/staffing
Indiana University	https://policies.iu.edu/policies/hr-02-10-background-checks/index.html	9/2013	All (no precise definition but faculty don't seem to be split out in HR definitions).	All new receive minimum, further for positions involving finances	Required for temporary employees, "including individuals with student status," as well. Additional info on foreign nationals.	May appeal withdrawn offer or separation if based on un reported conviction.	Fees responsibility of hiring department.	No	Checks good for 12 months
University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign	https://humanresources.illinois.edu/assets/docs/University-Background-Check-Policy-4-12-2016.pdf	1/16	Yes	Yes	Also includes employees transitioning into new position that requires checks by law or policy. "background checks will not be conducted with respect to graduate or undergraduate student employees, pre- or post-doctoral fellows, volunteers, individuals appointed to non-paid positions, contractors"	Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction.			
University of Michigan	https://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.95	Reviewed 1/19	Yes	Yes, regular and temporary	Also covers Graduate Student Instructors, Graduate Student Staff Assistants and Graduate Student Research Assistants.	Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction.		No	Katie McCollum is contact
Michigan State University	https://www.hr.msu.edu/policies-procedures/faculty-academic-staff/fas-policies-procedures/CriminalCheck.html	2/18	Yes	Yes	Includes visiting, unpaid appointments.	Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction.	Covered centrally		

Institution	Policy Link	Date	Faculty	Staff	Others Covered	Appeal/Dispute	Fees		Notes
University of Minnesota	https://policy.umn.edu/hr/backgroundverification	1/18	Yes	Yes	Non-employees, students if performing security-sensitive work; additional levels for senior admins.	Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction in associated procedures.	Fees responsibility of hiring department.	No	Checks good for 12 months
University of Nebraska	https://hr.unl.edu/policies/criminal-background-check/	12/6 (staff)	No (just asked general question before final hire)	Full/part-time, regular and temporary	Also includes employees transitioning into new position that requires checks by law or policy.	Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction or challenge.	Fees responsibility of hiring department.	No	Cannot ask about criminal background on application.
Northwestern University	No policy, procedures here: https://www.northwestern.edu/hr/for-managers/hiring/hiring-process/offer.html		Not required for faculty (except when working with minors)	Regular and temporary	Required of interns/volunteers over age 18.		Central	No	Check is good for 12 months https://www.northwestern.edu/hr/for-managers/hiring/hiring-process/offer.html Added approximately in 2011 for all staff (previously just those who work with minors). Re-check for all internal movements that are posted if it's been more than a year since last check.
Ohio State University	https://hr.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/policy415.pdf	12/18	Regular faculty (associated faculty and visiting scholars)	Regular staff (including temporary, term, seasonal, intermittent)	Student employees/GA w/access to restricted data;	Can dispute (Fair Credit Reporting Act related); Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction.		No	For internal candidates, checks good for 12 months; required after break in service unless <12 months AND associated faculty or student/GA. Detail in toolkit: https://hr.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/policy415-standards.pdf Good model.
Penn State University	https://policy.psu.edu/policies/hr99	2/16	Faculty (including adjunct), post-doc scholars/fellows, visiting	Regular and temporary	Volunteers (if sensitive), GAs, student employees, work study students, interns (paid or unpaid)	Required notification pursuant to FCRA.	University covers	No	Break in service of <5 years, no check required (unless new position requires different checks); breaks of longer than 6 months required to complete self-disclosure form. Becky Folk (847.491.8573)
Purdue University	https://www.purdue.edu/policies/human-resources/vif6.html	9/16	Faculty (fulll and part)	Full/part benefits-eligible, temporary	Not required of student/grad student appointments (GA?), non-paid positions, outside staffing agencies.	Required notification pursuant to FCRA.	Basic covered by U, more extensive by department.		
University of Wisconsin - Madison	https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/university-of-wisconsin-system-criminal-background-check-policy/	12/12	Yes	Yes	Required of individuals in a "position of trust." Discretionary: temporary or limited term, hourly student employees, interns. Required of volunteers in position of trust.				

Institution	Link	Date	Col4	Col5	Col6	Notification	Authority	Reciprocity	Notes
Rutgers	https://discover-uhr.rutgers.edu/forms/background-checks-staff-faculty-positions	12/18	Yes (regular and temp)	Yes (regular and temp)		Required notification pursuant to FCRA.			Break in service up to 1 year allowed.
UC - Berkeley	http://policy.ucop.edu/doc/4010394/PPSM-21	11/18	Unclear (critical positions)	Unclear (critical positions)		Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction.	Hiring department	No	Break in service up to 6 months allowed.
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	https://hr.unc.edu/managers/hiring/background/		Yes (paid/unpaid, permanent/temporary), post-doc fellows	Yes (full/part, permanent/temporary)	Not required of students if position is "incidental" - not required for GAs or work study. If working w/minors, yes.	Required notification pursuant to FCRA.	Hiring department	No	Checks good up to 6 months (after review for staff). Students who continue work after graduating must undergo checks.
UCLA	https://www.chr.ucla.edu/news/procedure-21-appointment	1/18	Unclear (critical positions)	Unclear (critical positions)		Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction.			
USM INSTITUTIONS									
Bowie State	No institutional policy								
Coppin State	https://www.coppin.edu/sites/default/files/pdf-library/2021-05/background_check_policy_and_procedures_for_faculty_and_staff_employees.pdf	6/17/2019	All regular and contractual	Regular and contractual, contingent, volunteers, chaperones		Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction or challenge, can appeal decisions.			
Frostburg	Procedures: https://www.frostburg.edu/human-resources/_files/pdfs/background-check-procedure.pdf						Hiring department		
Salisbury	https://www.salisbury.edu/administration/general-counsel/policies/section_VII/SU%20BOR%20VII-1.15.pdf								
Shady Grove	UMCP and USM								

Towson	https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/policies/07-01-04-background-investigations.html	8/16	Yes	All staff and faculty, certain Volunteers and certain student employees who are engaged in highly sensitive activities (e.g., those conducting financial transactions, working with vulnerable populations, or otherwise specified in this policy).			Centrally for fingerprinting and background	
U of Baltimore	No institutional policy							
UMB	https://www.umaryland.edu/policies-and-procedures/library/human-resources/policies/vii-101a.php		Not covered?	Regular and CII	Not required for CI or students. Not required for staff promotions unless new position mandates.		Units pay (fingerprinting done for certain positions)	Break in service up to 1 year allowed.
UMBC	No institutional policy							
UMES	https://www.umes.edu/HR/Pages/Policy-on-Background-Checks/		Yes	Yes, including contingent		Opportunity to provide clarifying info on a conviction.		
UMGC	https://www.umgc.edu/administration/policies-and-reporting/policies/human-resources/criminal-background-checks-staff-faculty-policy	1/17	Not clearly defined (when required by law, procedures)	Not clearly defined (when required by law, procedures)	Can conduct permissive checks when appropriate.	Must ensure a process for contesting accuracy of any record on which a denial is based.		
USM Hagerstown/Southern MD	No institutional policies							

Memorandum

To: Rochelle Newman, Chair, University Senate

From: Lisa Klein, Chair, Senate Staff Affairs Committee

Date: August 12, 2022

Re: Council of University System Staff (CUSS) Election Results

---

During the 2021-2022 academic year, the Staff Affairs Committee was responsible for conducting an election to identify primary and alternate representatives from the University of Maryland to serve on CUSS (Senate Document #21-22-36).

The Senate Office sent announcements to all eligible staff members regarding the elections. All exempt and non-exempt staff employees on regular and contingent II status who are not part of a collective bargaining unit represented by a union were eligible to run for CUSS and vote for CUSS representatives. UMD is entitled to three primary representatives and up to three alternate representatives. The candidacy period ran from April 28–May 11, 2022. The elections took place online via the Senate website from May 16–May 27, 2022. The election results were reported to all eligible staff members on May 31, 2022.

There were fourteen nominees. The following staff members were elected to serve as primary representatives: **Meredith Carpenter**, **Kalia Patricio**, and **Maureen Schrimpe**. The three alternate representatives are **Vandaliah Aderholt**, **Suzanne Ashour-Bailey**, and **Namrata Ram-Andriessens**. All representatives will serve two-year terms starting in August 2022. They will also serve as ex-officio members of the Staff Affairs Committee, as specified in the Senate Bylaws.

The Staff Affairs Committee respectfully requests that these election results be announced to the University Senate at the first meeting of the 2022-2023 academic year.

Thank you.

LK:jb

Senate Legislation Log

PRESENTED BY	Reka S. Montfort, Executive Secretary & Director
REVIEW DATES	SEC – August 22, 2022 | SENATE – September 7, 2022
VOTING METHOD	For information only
RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT	N/A
NECESSARY APPROVALS	N/A

ISSUE

The Senate Legislation Log is an overview of the work brought to the Senate during the 2021-2022 academic year. The log shows all completed legislation as well as dates of subsequent approvals following Senate approval. In addition, there is a table of continuing legislation that was not completed last year but will continue into the 2022-2023 academic year.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Legislation Log is provided for informational purposes.

COMMITTEE WORK

N/A

ALTERNATIVES

N/A

RISKS

N/A

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

N/A

2021-2022 Senate Legislation Log

Completed University Senate Legislation 2021-2022

Senate Document Number	Action	Date of Senate Meeting Action	Disposition	Approval Date(s)	Completion Date
18-19-36	Policy on Criminal Background Checks for Faculty and Staff Employees	09/30/2021	Complete: Further discussion of these issues can be found under Senate Document #21-22-21		09/30/2021
19-20-07	Consideration of a Policy on the Naming of Academic Programs	09/20/2021	Complete: The SEC voted to charge the Ed Affairs Committee with a review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on the Naming of Facilities and Programs but agreed to postpone the charge until after the committee completed its current charge on the Diversity General Education Requirement.		09/20/2021
20-21-10	Revisions to the Diversity General Education Requirement	03/01/2022	Presidential Approval	03/02/2022	03/02/2022
20-21-15	Proposal for the Establishment of a University Privacy Policy	12/09/2021	Presidential Approval	12/22/2021	12/22/2021
20-21-20	PCC Proposal to Modify the Master of Public Health - Add Health Care Management Concentration	12/08/2020	MHEC Approval Chancellor Approval Presidential Approval	09/15/2021 05/24/2021 12/10/2020	09/15/2021
20-21-28	PCC Proposal to Establish a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Latin American and Caribbean Studies	02/09/2021	Presidential Approval Chancellor's Approval MHEC Approval	02/11/2021 06/08/2021 09/15/2021	09/15/2021
20-21-38	Review of the Interim University of Maryland Grading Symbols and Notations Used on Academic Transcripts Policy	09/08/2021	Presidential Approval	09/10/2021	09/10/2021
20-21-39	PCC Proposal to Establish a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Dual Language Education	04/06/2021	Presidential Approval Chancellor's Approval MHEC Approval	04/09/2021 08/13/2021 10/13/2021	10/13/2021
20-21-42	PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Technology and Information Design	04/20/2021	Presidential Approval MHEC Approval BOR Approval	04/27/2021 10/01/2021 11/12/2021	11/12/2021
20-21-43	PCC Proposal to Rename the Upper-Division Certificate Program in "Latin American Studies" to "Latin American and Caribbean Studies	04/20/2021	Presidential Approval Chancellor's Approval MHEC Approval	04/27/2021 06/08/2021 09/15/2021	09/15/2021
21-22-01	2020-2021 Legislation Log	09/08/2021	Complete: The Senate reviewed the legislation log.		09/08/2021

Senate Document Number	Action	Date of Senate Meeting Action	Disposition	Approval Date(s)	Completion Date
21-22-02	Approval of the 2021-2022 Committee & Council Slates	09/08/2021	Presidential Approval	09/10/2021	09/10/2021
21-22-03	Technical Revisions to the University of Maryland Policy on Promoting Responsible Action in Medical Emergencies (V-1.00[J])	09/08/2021	Complete: The technical revisions were presented to the Senate as an information item.		09/08/2021
21-22-05	Revision to the Senate Bylaws to Extend the Term of the Special Committee on University Finance (SCUF)	09/08/2021	Presidential Approval	09/10/2021	09/10/2021
21-22-06	PCC Proposal to Establish a Doctorate of Business Administration	09/08/2021	Presidential Approval BOR Approval MHEC Approval	09/10/2021 12/10/2021 12/16/2021	12/16/2021
21-22-07	PCC Proposal to Establish a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Remote Sensing	09/08/2021	Presidential Approval Chancellor Approval MHEC Approval	09/10/2021 11/17/2021 12/17/2021	12/17/2021
21-22-08	PCC Proposal to Discontinue the Upper-Division Certificate in Science, Technology and Society	10/07/2021	Presidential Approval Chancellor Approval MHEC Approval	10/08/2022 04/27/2022 10/08/2021	05/23/2022
21-22-09	Technical Revisions to the University of Maryland Disability & Accessibility Policy and Procedures VI-1.00(D)	10/07/2021	Complete: The technical revisions were presented to the Senate as an information item.		10/07/2021
21-22-12	Review of the Western Gateway Development of Guilford Woods	09/27/2021	Complete: The proposer received a letter from the SEC explaining its decision not to charge a committee with reviewing the proposal.		09/27/2021
21-22-17	Proposal to Amend the Code of Academic Integrity and the Code of Student Conduct to Incorporate Other Exceptional Circumstances	10/18/2021	Complete: The SEC voted to charge the Student Conduct Committee with a related charge. See Senate Document # 21-22-22.		10/18/2021
21-22-18	Proposal for Changes to the Codes of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity	10/18/2021	Complete: The SEC voted to charge the Student Conduct Committee with a related charge. See Senate Document # 21-22-22.		10/18/2021
21-22-19	Proposal to Request Review of IT Governance and Opportunities for Constituency-Based Feedback into IT Policies & Standards	10/18/2021	Complete: Further discussion of these issues can be found under Senate Document #21-22-30.		10/18/2021
21-22-20	Technical Revisions to the University of Maryland Web Accessibility Policy (VI-1.00[E])	11/10/2021	Complete: The technical revisions were presented to the Senate as an informational item.		11/10/2021
21-22-21	Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Criminal Background Checks	09/07/2022	Presidential Approval	5/11/2022	
21-22-24	PCC Proposal to Rename Ph.D. in "Women's Studies" to "Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies"	12/09/2021	Presidential Approval Chancellor Approval MHEC Approval	12/22/2021 02/07/2022 05/11/2022	05/11/2022

Senate Document Number	Action	Date of Senate Meeting Action	Disposition	Approval Date(s)	Completion Date
21-22-25	PCC Proposal to Rename the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in "Women's Studies" to "Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies"	12/09/2021	Presidential Approval Chancellor Approval MHEC Approval	12/22/2021 02/07/2022 05/11/2022	05/11/2022
21-22-26	Nomination Committee Slate 2021-2022	12/09/2021	Presidential Approval	12/22/2021	12/22/2021
21-22-27	2021 Plan of Organization Review Committee Slate	12/09/2021	Presidential Approval	12/22/2021	12/22/2021
21-22-28	PCC Proposal to Establish a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Science, Technology, and Innovation Policy	12/09/2021	Presidential Approval Chancellor Approval MHEC Approval	02/11/2022 04/27/2022 05/23/2022	05/23/2022
21-22-29	PCC Proposal to Rename the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Public Management to Public Leadership and Management	02/09/2022	Presidential Approval Chancellor Approval MHEC Approval	02/11/2022 04/27/2022 05/23/2022	05/23/2022
21-22-31	Proposal to Create Policy for Equitable Access to Scholarly Articles Authored by University Faculty	04/06/2022	Presidential Approval	04/08/2022	04/08/2022
21-22-32	Revisions to the College of Education Plan of Organization	04/26/2022	Presidential Approval	05/11/2022	05/11/2022
21-22-33	PCC Proposal to Rename the Certificate of Advanced Study in "Curriculum and Instruction" to "Teaching and Learning, Policy and Leadership"	04/26/2022	Presidential Approval MHEC Approval Chancellor Approval	05/11/2022 07/25/2022 08/05/2022	08/05/2022
21-22-34	Slates for the 2022 Transition Elections	05/10/2022	Complete: The Senate conducted the elections		05/10/2022
21-22-37	BOR Staff Awards 2021-2022	N/A	Complete: The BOR approved the final Staff Awards for 2022.		07/01/2022

Pending University Senate Legislation 2021-2022

Senate Document Number	Name	Requester	Reviewing Committee	Date Received	Senate Status
Legislation Reviewed from Prior Years					
13-14-37	Revisions to the School of Public Health (SPHL) Plan of Organization	School of Public Health (SPHL)	Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee	09/02/2013	Under Review.
19-20-15	Campus Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Senate Representation	J. David Allen, Director, Department of Transportation	Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee	09/13/2019	Under Review.
19-20-24	Revisions to the School of Public Policy (PLCY) Plan of Organization	School of Public Policy (PLCY)	Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee	10/29/2019	Under Review.
19-20-33	Review of the University of Maryland Policy on Threatening and Intimidating Conduct	Senate Office	Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion (EDI) Committee	11/25/2019	Under Review.
19-20-39	Revisions to the College of Agriculture & Natural Resources (AGNR) Plan of Organization	College of Agriculture & Natural Resources (AGNR)	Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee	01/27/2020	Under Review.
20-21-14	Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment	Laurie Locascio, Vice President for Research	Research Council	10/12/2020	Under Review.
Senate Document Number	**Name**	**Requester**	**Reviewing Committee**	**Date Received**	**Senate Status**
Legislation Reviewed from 2021-2022					
21-22-04	Proposal to Promote Mental Health and Equity in the Excused Absence Policy	Senator M Pease, Undergraduate Student & Dr. John Cumings, Associate Professor	Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee	08/11/2021	Under Review.
21-22-11	Revision to the Final Exam Provision in the University of Maryland Policy on the Conduct of Undergraduate Courses and Student Grievance Procedure	Doug Roberts, Associate Dean for General Education	Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee	09/08/2021	Under Review.

Senate Document Number	Name	Requester	Reviewing Committee	Date Received	Senate Status
21-22-13	Student Fee Process	Kislay Parashar, Student Body President ;Tamara Allard, Graduate Student Government President; Scott Cronin, Residence Hall Association President	Vice President for Finance & Chief Financial Officer	09/01/2021	Under Review.
21-22-14	Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on the Naming of Facilities and Programs	President's Office	Educational Affairs Committee	09/15/2021	Under Review.
21-22-16	Implementation of a SGA Ex-Officio Representative on the Senate Standing Committee for Academic Procedures and Standards	Madhulika C. Nallani, UMD SGA Director of Academic Affairs	Senate Executive Committee (SEC)	10/07/2021	Under Review.
21-22-22	Review of the Student Codes of Conduct	Senate Executive Committee	Student Conduct Committee	10/18/2021	Under Review.
21-22-30	Review of the University of Maryland Plan of Organization for Shared Governance	Senate Executive Committee	Plan of Organization Review Committee (PORC)	01/24/2022	Under Review.
21-22-35	Plan of Organization Review Committee (PORC) Review of the Relationship Between the Senate and the University's Student Organizations	ERG Committee	Plan of Organization Review Committee (PORC)	05/09/2022	Under Review.
21-22-36	2022 Council of University System Staff Elections	Staff Affairs Committee	Senate Executive Committee (SEC)	03/31/2022	Under Review.

2022-2023 Senate Standing Committee & University Council Slates

PRESENTED BY	Rochelle Newman, Acting Chair
REVIEW DATES	SEC – August 22, 2022	SENATE – September 7, 2022
VOTING METHOD	In a single vote
RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT	N/A
NECESSARY APPROVALS	Senate, President

ISSUE

Presentation of the Senate Standing Committee and University Council Slates, as generated by the Senate Committee on Committees, to be approved by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and the University Senate.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee on Committees recommends that the Senate approve the Standing Committee and University Council slates as submitted.

COMMITTEE WORK

Senate Chair Newman served as Acting Chair of the Committee on Committees because the newly elected Chair-Elect was on sabbatical through summer 2022, including during the period when the Committee on Committees initiates its annual committee volunteer placement process. Chair-Elect Jarzynski will assume his role as Chair of the Committee on Committees starting in the fall 2022 semester.

The Committee on Committees met on May 27, 2022, and June 2, 2022, to review all committee volunteers and their statements. There were 93 membership openings on the ten standing committees of the Senate. The Committee on Committees reviewed 252 volunteer applications from the campus faculty, staff, and graduate and undergraduate student constituencies. The committee endeavored to create balanced standing committee memberships, representing a variety of Colleges/Schools, departments/units, disciplines, positions, and backgrounds. The committee members also considered the volunteers' top three committee choices indicated on their applications. In addition, the committee members and the Senate Office staff engaged in further recruitment efforts as needed for specific committee membership seats.

The Committee on Committees approved the final slates of the committee memberships on June 21, 2022. Following the final placements, the Senate Office informed all the volunteers whether they were placed on a committee for the 2022-2023 academic year. The Senate Office staff worked with

the Acting Chair of the Committee on Committees to fill any vacancies that arose during the summer.

Senate Chair Newman appointed current Senators as chairs for each of the ten standing committees of the Senate, in accordance with the provisions of the Senate Bylaws. They are included on the slates for approval by the Senate. In addition, the committee slates include the continuing committee members and the ex-officio representatives appointed by the appropriate administrative unit head, which are provided for information only.

The Senate Chair, assisted by Senate Office Staff, consulted with the designated administrative officers to create a slate of candidates for each University Council. Individuals nominated by Senators, volunteers for Senate committees who were not placed on a committee, and past Council members were considered.

On May 18, 2022, the Senate Chair met with the Vice President and Chief Information Officer along with the Senate Director and the Information Technology (IT) Council Chair to develop a plan for filling vacant seats on the Council. The Senate Chair met with the Dean of Libraries on August 10, 2022, and consulted with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, the Provost's representative on the Library Council, to develop the membership slate for the Library Council. On August 9, 2022, the Senate Chair met with the Vice President for Research and other representatives of the Division of Research to develop the membership slate for the Research Council.

In accordance with the Senate Bylaws, the slates for the University Councils were reviewed by the Committee on Committees. On August 17, 2022, the Committee on Committees voted to approve the slates.

Any remaining vacancies on committees and councils that arise during the academic year will be filled in accordance with the Senate Bylaws.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could decide not to approve the slates.

RISKS

There are no risks to the University in approving these slates.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications in approving these slates.

Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee

Nominated

John Buchner	Faculty	CMNS	2024
Joseph Eggen	Faculty	CMNS	2024
Alka Gandhi	Faculty	BSOS	2024
Katherine Izsak	Faculty	INFO	2024
Li Ma	Faculty	AGNR	2024
Andrew Lewis	Graduate Student	BMGT	2023
Gabrielle Angeletti	Undergraduate Student	PUAF	2023
Isaiah Hilsenrath	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2023
Prudence Iwundu	Undergraduate Student	SPHL	2023

Ex-Officio

Adrian Cornelius	Ex-Officio - University Registrar Rep	SVPAAP	2023
Shannon Gundy	Ex-Officio - Director of Undergraduate Admissions Rep	SVPAAP	2023
Lisa Kiely	Ex-Officio - Undergraduate Studies Rep	UGST	2023
William Cohen	Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep	UGST	2023
Jason Farman	Ex-Officio - Graduate School Rep	ARHU	2023

Continuing Members

Alice Donlan	Staff	SVPAAP	2023
John Bono	Faculty	BMGT	2023
Caroline Eades	Faculty	ARHU	2023
Kellie Rolstad	Faculty	EDUC	2023
Monica VanKlompenberg	Faculty	AGNR	2023
Zeena Zakharia	Faculty	EDUC	2023

Chair

Amy Karlsson	Chair	ENGR	2023

Campus Affairs Committee

Nominated

Ginny Hutcheson	Staff	SVPAAP	2024
Lester Andrist	Faculty	BSOS	2024
Leigh Ann DePope	Faculty	LIBR	2024
Charles Wellford	Faculty	BSOS	2024
Naomi Atughonu	Graduate Student	PUAF	2023
Jillian Rothschild	Graduate Student	BSOS	2023
Jason Lovo Callejas	Undergraduate Student	BMGT	2023
Elizabeth Paglinauan-Warner	Undergraduate Student	ARHU	2023

Ex-Officio

Courtney Brown	Ex-Officio - VP & Chief Administrative Officer Rep	VPA	2023
Chris Carroll	Ex-Officio - VP Marketing & Communications Rep	PRES	2023
Megan Gebregziabher	Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2023
Christopher Lester	Ex-Officio - Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion Rep	PRES	2023
Allynn Powell	Ex-Officio - VP Student Affairs Rep	VPSA	2023
Mark Sherburne	Ex-Officio - Chair of Coaches Council Rep	PRES	2023
Lawrence Haavik	Ex-Officio - GSG Rep	EDUC	2023
Ayelette Halbfinger	Ex-Officio - SGA Rep	BMGT	2023

Continuing Members

Vandaliah Aderholt	Staff	VPA	2023
Carmen Cantemir-Stone	Faculty	CMNS	2023
Joseph Koivisto	Faculty	LIBR	2023
Lance Yonkos	Faculty	AGNR	2023

Chair

Keira Martone	Chair	VPSA	2023

Educational Affairs Committee

Nominated

Mary Fortier	Staff	SVPAAP	2024
Matthew Sinclair	Staff	ENGR	2023
Caroline Boules	Faculty	AGNR	2024
Robert DiLutis	Faculty	ARHU	2024
Joanne Klossner	Faculty	SPHL	2024
Wendy Stickle	Faculty	BSOS	2024
David Straney	Faculty	CMNS	2024
Sopiko Beriashvili	Graduate Student	EDUC	2023
Kevin He	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2023
Marilyn Yang	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2023

Ex-Officio

Lawrence Clark	Ex-Officio - Undergraduate Studies Rep	UGST	2023
Alice Donlan	Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2023
Linda Macri	Ex-Officio - Graduate School Rep	GRAD	2023
Marcio Oliveira	Ex-Officio - Division of Information Technology Rep	DIT	2023
Douglas Roberts	Ex-Officio - Associate Dean for General Education	UGST	2023
Siddhesh Ranade	Ex-Officio - GSG Rep	ENGR	2023
Ayelette Halbfinger	Ex-Officio - SGA Rep	BMGT	2023

Continuing Members

Joanna Goger	Faculty	AGNR	2023
Donal Heidenblad	Faculty	INFO	2023
Celina McDonald	Faculty	LIBR	2023
Elizabeth Warner	Faculty	CMNS	2023
Kellee White	Faculty	SPHL	2023

Chair

Rohan Tikekar	Chair	AGNR	2023

Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee

Nominated

Crystal Davis	Faculty	ARHU	2024
Richard Klank	Faculty	ARHU	2023
Erin Miller	Faculty	BSOS	2024
David Steele	Faculty	ENGR	2023
Hilary Thompson	Faculty	LIBR	2024
Hammed Ayansola	Graduate Student	AGNR	2023
Rishabh Mukund	Graduate Student	ENGR	2023
Michael Werre	Non-Exempt Staff	VPSA	2024
Sara Alemseged	Undergraduate Student	SPHL	2023
Matthew Salerno	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2023

Ex-Officio

Michelle Appel	Ex-Officio - Associate VP IRPA Rep	SVPAAP	2023
Karen McDonald	Ex-Officio - Director of Human Resources Rep	VPA	2023

Continuing Members

Aaron Tobiason	Exempt Staff	BSOS	2023
Marcia Shofner	Faculty	CMNS	2023

Chair

Gene Ferrick	Chair	CMNS	2023

<u>Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion (EDI) Committee</u>

<u>*Nominated*</u>

Tony Randall	Exempt Staff	VPSA	2024
Bailey Bedford	Faculty	CMNS	2024
Deneen Brown	Faculty	JOUR	2023
Thu Nguyen	Faculty	SPHL	2024
Shane Walsh	Faculty	BSOS	2024
Ruth Gomez Quezada	Graduate Student	ENGR	2023
Siena Hurwitz	Graduate Student	CMNS	2023
Lauren Miles	Non-Exempt Staff	CMNS	2024
Katherine Badia	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2023
Rajiv Esua	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2023

<u>*Ex-Officio*</u>

Brandon Dula	Ex-Officio - VP Student Affairs Rep	VPSA	2023
Anne Martens	Ex-Officio - VP & Chief Administrative Officer Rep	VPA	2023
Brian Medina	Ex-Officio - Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion or Rep	PRES	2023
Angela Nastase	Ex-Officio - OCRSM Rep	PRES	2023
Laura Rosenthal	Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep	ARHU	2023

<u>*Continuing Members*</u>

Donna Hammer	Exempt Staff	CMNS	2023
Tunji Sawyer	Exempt Staff	PRES	2023
Sun Young Lee	Faculty	ARHU	2023
Robert DuDonis	Non-Exempt Staff	VPA	2023

<u>*Chair*</u>

Yasmeen Shah	Chair	BSOS	2023

Faculty Affairs Committee

Nominated

Cecily Holland	Staff	VPR	2024
Birthe Kjellerup	Faculty	ENGR	2024
Jennifer Mullinax	Faculty	AGNR	2024
Sean Mussenden	Faculty Senator	JOUR	2024
Andrew Ristvey	Faculty Senator	AGNR	2024
Delores Ziegler	Faculty	ARHU	2024
Autumn Perkey	Graduate Student	BSOS	2023
Pei-Ying Chuang	Graduate Student	INEL	2023
Syed Zaidi	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2023

Ex-Officio

Michele Eastman	Ex-Officio - President's Rep	PRES	2023
Rythee Lambert-Jones	Ex-Officio - Director of Human Resources Rep	VPA	2023
John Bertot	Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2023
Holly Brewer	Ex-Officio - CUSF Rep	ARHU	2023
Karen O'Brien	Ex-Officio - Ombuds Officer	BSOS	2023

Continuing Members

Gideon Mark	Faculty Senator	BMGT	2023
Jessica O'Hara	Faculty	SVPAAP	2023
Colleen O'Neal	Faculty	EDUC	2023
Terry Owen	Faculty	LIBR	2023
Jennifer Wallace	Faculty Senator	BSOS	2023

Chair

Peter Sunderland	Chair	ENGR	2023

<u>Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee</u>

<u>*Nominated*</u>

Patricia Cossard	Faculty	LIBR	2024
David Loshin	Faculty	INFO	2024
Heather McHale	Faculty	AGNR	2024
Ashley Newby	Faculty	BSOS	2024
Diana Obanda	Faculty	AGNR	2024
Beth St Jean	Faculty	INFO	2024
Meredith Meads	Graduate Student	PUAF	2023
Margaret McDermott	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2023
Dillon Walton	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2023

<u>*Ex-Officio*</u>

Lisa Kiely	Ex-Officio - Undergraduate Studies Rep	UGST	2023
Elizabeth Beise	Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2023
Jason Farman	Ex-Officio - Graduate School Rep	ARHU	2023
Daniel Mack	Ex-Officio - Dean of Libraries Rep	LIBR	2023

<u>*Continuing Members*</u>

Mary Warneka	Staff	SVPAAP	2023
Galina Madjaroff	Faculty	INFO	2023
Chandrasekhar Thamire	Faculty	ENGR	2023
Gran Wilson	Faculty	ARHU	2023
Lei Zhou	Faculty	BMGT	2023

<u>*Chair*</u>

Piotr Swistak	Chair	BSOS	2023

Staff Affairs Committee

Nominated

Luis Alfonzo	Exempt Staff (Division)	VPA	2024
Kelsey Diggs	Exempt Staff Contingent II	VPSA	2024
Louisa Nkrumah	Exempt Staff (Academic)	SVPAAP	2023
Dennis Paffrath	Non-Exempt Staff Contingent II	VPR	2024
Maggie Saponaro	Faculty	LIBR	2024
Tara Holmes	Student	BMGT	2023
Rosanne Hoaas	Non-Exempt Staff (Division)	VPA	2024
Ronald Mentzer	Non-Exempt Staff (Academic)	ENGR	2024

Ex-Officio

Vandaliah Aderholt	Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep (Non-Voting)	VPA	2023
Suzanne Ashour-Bailey	Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep (Non-Voting)	ENGR	2023
Meredith Carpenter	Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep	VPSA	2023
Shirlene Chase	Ex-Officio - VP Student Affairs Rep	VPSA	2023
Megan Gebregziabher	Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2023
Anne Martens	Ex-Officio - VP & Chief Administrative Officer Rep	VPA	2023
Kalia Patricio	Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep	VPSA	2023
Namrata Ram-Andriessens	Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep (Non-Voting)	VPA	2023
Jacqueline Richmond	Ex-Officio - Director of Human Resources Rep	VPA	2023
Maureen Schrimpe	Ex-Officio - CUSS Rep	VPSA	2023

Continuing Members

Raymond Nardella	Exempt Staff (Division)	VPSA	2023
Manuel Rodriguez	Exempt Staff (Academic)	ARHU	2023
Alex Aiosa	Non-Exempt Staff (Division)	DIT	2023
Amy Yaich	Non-Exempt Staff (Academic)	CMNS	2023

Chair

Daniel Ostick	Chair	VPSA	2023

Student Affairs Committee

Nominated

Norah Aljunaidi	Faculty	BSOS	2024
Isabella Baxter	Faculty	LIBR	2023
Lynn-Marie Edwards	Graduate Student	PUAF	2023
Margaryta Gomozkova	Graduate Student	CMNS	2023
Adam Hopper	Graduate Student Senator	AGNR	2023
Milen Matthews	Graduate Student Senator	EDUC	2023
Alexa Marcos	Staff	EXST	2024
Reese Artero	Undergraduate Student Senator	BSOS	2023
Zachary Braunstein	Undergraduate Student Senator	ARHU	2023
Saxon Brown	Undergraduate Student Senator	EDUC	2023
Vivian Flanagan	Undergraduate Student Senator	SPHL	2023
Michael German	Undergraduate Student	BMGT	2023
Prajeet Kalakonda	Undergraduate Student	INFO	2023
John Landsiedel	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2023
Favour Madu	Undergraduate Student	ENGR	2023

Ex-Officio

Chetan Joshi	Ex-Officio - VP Student Affairs Rep	VPSA	2023
Linda Macri	Ex-Officio - Graduate School Rep	GRAD	2023
Kevin Pitt	Ex-Officio - Resident Life Rep	VPSA	2023
Brian Watkins	Ex-Officio - VP Student Affairs Rep	VPSA	2023
Elizabeth Irlbacher	Ex-Officio - GSG Rep	BSOS	2023
Ayelette Halbfinger	Ex-Officio - SGA Rep	BMGT	2023

Continuing Members

Nicole Garcia Diaz	Staff	VPSA	2023

Chair

Kassidy Jacobs	Chair	BSOS	2023

Student Conduct Committee

Nominated

Ursula Gorham-Oscilowski	Faculty	INFO	2024
Michael McMillan	Faculty	BMGT	2024
Jordan Sly	Faculty	LIBR	2024
Anjali Garg	Graduate Student	ENGR	2023
Aaron Roth	Student	CMNS	2023
Andrew Dworski	Undergraduate Student	BMGT	2023
Kara Groisser	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2023
Michaela James	Undergraduate Student	INFO	2023

Ex-Officio

James Bond	Ex-Officio - Director of Student Conduct (Non-Voting)	VPSA	2023

Continuing Members

Wendy Loughlin	Staff	CMNS	2023
Jennifer Gershberg	Faculty	BMGT	2023

Chair

Suzanne Ashour-Bailey	Chair	ENGR	2023

IT Council

Nominated

Dawn Roy	Exempt Staff	VPR	2024
Augustus Sam	Infrastructure Working Group Chair	PRES	2024
Mary Shelley	IT Security Advisory Committee Chair	SPHL	2024
Julie Wright	Enterprise Systems Working Group Chair	ARHU	2024
Zhi-Long Chen	Tenured Faculty	BMGT	2024
Pamela Duffy	Professional Track Faculty	INFO	2024
Stephen Roth	Learning Technology Working Group Chair	SPHL	2024
Karolin Buchholz	Graduate Student	BMGT	2023
Sriharsha Kolla	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2023

Ex-Officio

Jack Blanchard	Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2023
David Dahl	Ex-Officio - Dean of Libraries Rep	LIBR	2023
Jeffrey Hollingsworth	Ex-Officio - VP IT/CIO	DIT	2023
Ayelette Halbfinger	Ex-Officio - IT Student Advisory Committee	BMGT	2023

Continuing Members

Yifei Mo	Enabling Research Working Group Chair	ENGR	2023

Chair

Jeffery Klauda	Chair	ENGR	2025

__Library Council__

__Nominated__

Jason Baron	Faculty	INFO	2024
Lindsay Carpenter	Library Faculty	LIBR	2024
Ira Chinoy	Faculty	JOUR	2024
Mark Demorra	Faculty	AGNR	2023
Victor Galitski	Faculty	CMNS	2024
Emma Bailey	Graduate Student	ARHU	2023
Maitri Khera	Undergraduate Student	ARHU	2023

__Ex-Officio__

Marcio Oliveira	Ex-Officio - Division of IT Rep	DIT	2023
John Bertot	Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2023
Christopher Jarzynski	Ex-Officio - Senate Chair-Elect	CMNS	2023
Daniel Mack	Ex-Officio - Libraries Rep	LIBR	2023

__Continuing Members__

Progyan Basu	Faculty	BMGT	2023
Linda Coleman	Faculty	ARHU	2023
James Farquhar	Faculty	CMNS	2023
Michele Lamprakos	Faculty	ARCH	2023
David Tomblin	Faculty	ENGR	2023

__Chair__

Holly Brewer	Chair	ARHU	2025

Research Council

Nominated

Stanley Smith	Staff	VPR	2024
Ashok Agrawala	Faculty	CMNS	2024
Adriane Fang	Faculty	ARHU	2024
Jing Lin	Faculty	EDUC	2024
Isaac Moradi	Faculty	CMNS	2024
Neil Sehgal	Faculty	SPHL	2024
Twesh Upadhyaya	Graduate Student	CMNS	2023
Meghana Kotraiah	Undergraduate Student	AGNR	2023
Harrison Lee	Student	CMNS	2023

Ex-Officio

Eric Chapman	Ex-Officio - VP Research Rep	VPR	2023
Michele Eastman	Ex-Officio - President's Rep	PRES	2023
Blessing Enekwe	Ex-Officio - Graduate School Rep	GRAD	2023
Wendy Montgomery	Ex-Officio - Director of ORA Rep	VPR	2023
Melissa Thompson	Ex-Officio - Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2023
Douglas Roberts	Ex-Officio - Undergraduate Studies Rep	UGST	2023

Continuing Members

Rachel Gammons	Faculty	LIBR	2023
Amir Sapkota	Faculty	SPHL	2023
Ji-Cheng Zhao	Faculty	ENGR	2024

Chair

Andrew Harris	Chair	CMNS	2025