UNIVERSITY SENATE

University Senate
Agenda for Tuesday, February 3, 2026
3:15-5:00PM | Zoom

Agenda:

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the December 2, 2025 Minutes (Action)

3. Report of the Chair (Information)

4. Continued Business
   Elections, Representation & Governance Committee Straw Poll for the Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaws Regarding Senate Committee Charges (Senate Document #25-26-10) (Information)

5. A Special Order Presentation (Information)
   Jeffrey Hollingsworth, Vice President, Division of Information Technology
   Megan Masters, Director, Academic Technology Experience
   Overview of the ADA Title II Regulations on Digital Accessibility: Spring 2026 Updates

6. A Special Order Presentation (Information)
   Courtney Brown, Senior Director, Office of Administrative Services
   The Purple Line: Advancing from Construction to Testing & Operations

7. Updates to the 2021 Plan of Organization Review Committee Slate (Senate Document #21-22-27) (Action)

8. PCC Proposal to Modify the Master of Public Health - Add Area of Concentration in Health Literacy and Public Health Communication (Senate Document 25-26-37) (Action)

9. Interim University of Maryland Consulting Policy, II-3.10(E) (Senate Documents #22-23-13 and #25-26-08) (Action)

10. Special Committee on Policy Review Report (Senate Document #24-25-21) (Action)

11. New Business

12. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY SENATE

University Senate Meeting
Minutes for December 2, 2025
3:15PM - 5:00PM
ZOOM
Called to Order: 3:18 p.m. Adjourned: 5:00 p.m.
Members Present: 160

Meeting Minutes:

1. **Call to Order**
   Senate Chair Dammeyer called the meeting to order at 3:18 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes, November 5, 2025 University Senate Meeting**
   Chair Dammeyer asked if there were any corrections to the minutes for the November 5, 2025, University Senate meeting; hearing none, Chair Dammeyer declared the minutes approved as distributed.

3. **Report of the Chair (Information)**
   Updates on University Senate Meeting Format from Straw Poll Results
   Chair Dammeyer reminded Senators that at the October 15, 2025, University Senate meeting, a straw poll was conducted to gather information about senators' preferences regarding the format of both Senate and committee meetings. Chair Dammeyer reported that the results indicated an interest in hybrid meetings across both settings.

   Chair Dammeyer shared that since receiving this feedback, the Senate Executive Committee has begun to discuss the results and is exploring different ideas.

   Chair Dammeyer reminded Senators that the next scheduled hybrid University Senate meeting is on Wednesday, March 4, 2026, in the Colony Ballroom and on Zoom, and will feature the President's State of the Campus Address.

   University Senate Holiday Social
   Chair Dammeyer announced there will be a Holiday Social for University Senators on Friday, December 12th, from 1–3 p.m. in the Maryland Room (Room 0100) in Marie Mount Hall. Chair Dammeyer said that an email invitation would be distributed to Senators in the coming days.

   Chair Dammeyer shared that a Campus Pantry Food Drive is being coordinated along with the University Senate Holiday Social. Chair Dammeyer encouraged Senators to bring donations to the social, but shared that online donations are also being accepted for the Campus Pantry through the giving.umd.edu website.

   Spring 2026 University Senate Meetings

Chair Dammeyer reminded Senators that the first University Senate meeting of the spring semester will be held on Tuesday, February 3, 2026. The complete spring meeting schedule is on the University Senate website at www.senate.umd.edu/senate/meetings.

Senator Elections

Chair Dammeyer explained that elections for Tenured/Tenure-Track (TTK) and Professional Track (PTK) Faculty seats take place at the College level, following each College's plan of organization. Chair Dammeyer said that the University Senate Office sent letters to all Deans with a request to hold elections to replace any outgoing TTK and PTK Faculty Senators. Chair Dammeyer said that the elections for those seats should be underway, and the deadline for Faculty Senate elections is Friday, January 30, 2026.

Chair Dammeyer explained that elections for staff, student, and single-member constituencies take place through the University Senate Office. The candidacy period of these constituencies for Senate Elections for 2026-2027 will run from Monday, January 12, 2026, to Friday, February 6, 2026. Chair Dammeyer said those eligible to volunteer and run in these elections will be contacted with more details via email at the start of the new year.

Chair Dammeyer asked Senators to encourage their colleagues to run for Senate, or to consider running themselves, if eligible. Chair Dammeyer shared details about the timeline and process could be found under the "Take Action" tab on the Senate website.

Senator-Constituency Communication

Chair Dammeyer provided updates on the status of the Senator–Constituency Google Groups. Chair Dammeyer thanked Senators who had reached out with questions and noted that most of the issues that were shared have been resolved. Chair Dammeyer shared that during the testing phase, additional concerns surfaced, and the University Senate Office is working closely with the Division of Information Technology (DIT) to address them, which is why the November Senate Meeting Overview was not shared. The University Senate Office anticipates that these issues will be resolved by the start of the spring semester.

Chair Dammeyer said that the University Senate Office has incorporated the feedback and is developing a "How-To Guide" to support Senators in using their Google Groups effectively. Once completed, it will be shared via email and posted on the University Senate ELMS page.

4. **Updates to the Approval of the 2025-2026 Committee & Council Slates (Senate Document #25-26-02) (Action)**
   Chair Dammeyer invited Wendy Stickle, Chair Elect, and the Chair of the Committee on Committees to present on the next two agenda items.

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Stickle reported the following:

The Committee on Committees solicited nominations for four (4) University Senate Standing Committee non-exempt staff vacancies that were not filled during the volunteer period.

With the assistance of the University Senate Office, the committee collected nominations via a Google form between September 11 and October 17, 2025. The committee received 3 eligible non-exempt staff volunteer applications.

The Committee on Committees met on October 31, 2025, to vote on the non-exempt staff vacancies and additional seats that became vacant since the original Standing Committee and Council slates were shared.

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 committee choices indicated on their applications.

Non-Exempt Seats were filled on the Educational Affairs Committee, the Elections, Representation & Governance Committee, and the Staff Affairs Committee. These seats were unable to be filled during the volunteer period.

The Campus Affairs Committee filled one (1) Faculty seat that became vacant.

The Equity, Diversity & Inclusion Committee filled one (1) Exempt Staff seat that became vacant.

The Committee on Committees was unable to fill one (1) Non-Exempt Staff Contingent II seat on the Staff Affairs Committee that had been vacant.

The Committee on Committees approved the updated University Senate Standing Committee slates on October 31, 2025. The University Senate Office contacted those selected to confirm their acceptance and ability to participate on the committee.

Additionally, the Information Technology (IT) Council slates were updated to correct the following information:
- The end term of the newly elected Chair, Wolfgang Losert, has been updated to reflect the correct end term of 2028.
- The names of the IT Governance groups were updated to match the formal names used:
  - The IT Security Advisory Committee was changed to IT Security Working Group.

- ○ The Infrastructure Working Group was changed to IT Infrastructure Working Group.
- The original slate incorrectly listed Katherine Russell as the "Enterprise Systems Working Group Chair" instead of Susanne Anacker. Susanne served on the IT Council for the 2024-2025 academic year and therefore, should have been listed as a continuing member. Stickle said this was due to an error with the University Senate website.

The Committee on Committees moved that the Updates to the 2025-2026 Committee & Council Slates be approved.

Chair Dammeyer thanked Stickle and the Committee on Committees for their efforts in filling the vacancies.

Chair Dammeyer opened the floor for discussion. Hearing none, Chair Dammeyer called for a vote on the Updates to the Approval of the 2025-2026 Committee & Council Slates (Senate Document #25-26-02).

The vote was 113 in favor, 1 opposed, and 7 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

5. **Nominations Committee Slate (Senate Document #25-26-24) (Action)**
Chair Dammeyer invited Wendy Stickle, Chair Elect, and the Chair of the Committee on Committees to present the Nominations Committee slate.

Stickle said that, according to the University Senate Bylaws, the Committee on Committees must present a membership slate for the Nominations Committee at the December Senate meeting. The committee is to be composed of four faculty members, one exempt staff member, one non-exempt staff member, one graduate student, and one undergraduate student.

Stickle shared that the purpose of the Nominations Committee is to select nominees for the Senate Executive Committee, the Committee on Committees itself, and other university-wide committees, with final voting conducted by the Senate in May.

Stickle reported that the Committee on Committees' goal was to ensure a diverse representation on the Nominations Committee, including members from different colleges, departments, and backgrounds. They aimed to achieve this by inviting self-nominations from outgoing Senators.

Stickle reported that on September 11, 2025, the Committee on Committees sent a request for volunteers to outgoing Senators. The committee followed up with additional reminders at the October 15, 2025, University Senate meeting and via email on October 21, 2025.

Stickle said the final slate represents the diversity of Senate constituencies, including various colleges, schools, departments, disciplines, positions, and backgrounds.

The Committee on Committees moved the Nominations Committee Slates to be approved.

Chair Dammeyer opened the floor for discussion. Hearing none, Chair Dammeyer called for a vote on the Nominations Committee Slate (Senate Document #25-26-24).

The vote was 114 in favor, 1 opposed, and 9 abstentions. **The motion carried**

6. **Technical Amendments Regarding Belonging and Community at UMD (Action)**
   Chair Dammeyer shared that agenda item #6 would present a series of proposals related to the non-substantive changes regarding the Belonging & Community and the Vice President of Belonging name changes. Chair Dammeyer explained that due to the non-substantive nature of the proposals, the Senate Executive Committee voted to package the six proposals under agenda item #6 into one vote.

   Chair Dammeyer invited Felicia Bidgell, Chair of the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee to present on the six proposals.

   Bidgell shared the background and context for all six proposals together.

   Bidgell reported that the series of proposals being presented all reflect small, non-substantive changes in order to bring the current University of Maryland Policies and Procedures up to date with the office name change that occurred on August 7, 2025.

   On August 7, 2025, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) was renamed Belonging & Community at UMD, and the Vice President's title was updated accordingly.

   Given the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Committee's purview of "continually reviewing policies and procedures pertaining to issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion" as stated in the University Senate Bylaws, the committee began efforts to align University Policy with the office's new name. After reviewing all current, published, University of Maryland Policy and Procedures, references to the old name and title were identified by the committee in six (6) UMD Policies.

   Bidgell said that the proposals were included in the meeting materials, and identified technical updates needed in the following policies:

   - University of Maryland Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action Statement of Policy, VI-1.00(A)

- University of Maryland Policy on Access for Individuals with Disabilities, VI-1.00(D)
- University of Maryland Accessible Technology Policy, VI-1.00(E)
- University of Maryland Policy on Threatening and Intimidating Conduct, VI-1.00(F)
- University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment and Other Sexual Misconduct, VI-1.60(A)
- University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on the Naming of Facilities and Programs, VI-4.00(A)

Bidgell reported that each proposal included the red-lined policy change that would update any references to the Office of Diversity and Inclusion to Belonging & Community at UMD, or the Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion to the Vice President for Belonging.

Bidgell reiterated that these title changes are technical updates and represent non-substantive changes that would not affect the operation, procedure, or impact of the policies as otherwise written.

Bidgell reported that the EDI Committee approved these approvals by majority vote on Thursday, October 30, 2025. Due to the EDI Committee's investment in these proposals and the work already done to submit accurate recommendations, the committee moved that the six proposals be approved.

Chair Dammeyer thanked Bidgell and opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Das, PTK, ENGR, asked if the name of the University Senate Standing committee itself would undergo a similar change.

Chair Dammeyer invited Director Marin to answer the question.

Director Marin shared that there is currently a proposal in the Legislation Log that will look into potentially changing the name of the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion committee, and noted that it is still under review.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Dammeyer called for a vote on the six EDI proposals for non-substantive changes regarding Belonging & Community and Vice President of Belonging name changes.

The vote was 113 in favor, 7 opposed, and 10 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

7. **PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence (Senate Document #25-26-20) (Action)**

Chair Dammeyer invited Teri Bickham, TTK Faculty Senator for ARHU, and member of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, to present the next six items on behalf of Chair Meredith Gore and the PCC Committee.

Bickham provided the following report for the PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence (PCC 25000):

The College of Arts and Humanities' Department of Philosophy proposes to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence.

This new interdisciplinary major is designed to make the foundational technical concepts of artificial intelligence (AI) accessible to a wide range of students, particularly those from human-facing disciplines. The program is being developed in coordination with the Artificial Intelligence Interdisciplinary Institute at Maryland (AIM) as part of a larger effort by the university to become a leader in AI education.

The program has two central goals: (1) to provide students with the technical skills needed to engage with contemporary AI, and (2) to offer training in the ethical, cultural, and social dimensions of AI, preparing graduates to assess and shape its development and use in society.

The curriculum includes 9 core courses (6 technical and 3 ethical and social), a capstone seminar or internship, and six elective courses within one of several specializations.

The core technical courses provide a foundation in programming, formal methods, artificial intelligence, and machine learning, while the ethical and social core courses equip students to critically assess the societal impacts of AI, with emphasis on fairness, bias, and ethical design. The specializations include the following:
- Arts
- Design and User Experience
- Ethics
- Language and Cognition
- Logic, Epistemology, and Machine Learning
- Law, Policy, and Governance
- Society, Culture, and Technology

The program is intentionally structured to meet growing workforce demand for professionals who can bridge technical expertise with ethical and societal insight. As part of the university's commitment to advancing artificial intelligence across disciplines, the program will be supported with dedicated instructional, administrative, and infrastructure resources, with the college, department, AIM, and the Office of the Provost coordinating resource allocation as the program develops.

Bickham shared that the proposal was approved by the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee at its meeting on October 3, 2025.

The Program, Curricula, and Courses Committee moved the proposal to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence be approved.

Chair Dammeyer opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Lohff, Graduate Student, PLCY, asked about the courses being offered under the program, noting a lack of courses that talk about the environmental impacts of increased reliance on artificial intelligence, large data centers, and how these impacts on the environment have a high social cost. Lohff said that respect for the environment and reducing emissions is a value of the University of Maryland and inquired why classes that address these topics are not included in the proposal, and if there is a possibility to include them in the future.

Eric Pacuit, TTK from the Department of Philosophy, shared that they are open to those lines being developed as part of a specialization. Pacuit shared that the specializations will be developed over time, but noted that the Law and Policy specialization includes some of the themes discussed by Senator Lohff. Pacuit also explained that although a topic might not have a specific course, it may still be a component of a course.

Senator Hirsch, Graduate Student, ARHU, shared that they have been studying the history of AI as part of their History of Science background. Hirsch expressed concern about building a major around Artificial Intelligence, describing it as a set of tools and the idea of confusing instruments with practices. Hirsch shared support of Senator Lohff's comments on environmental concerns and added concerns of mental health dangers with the use of technology. Hirsch also expressed concerns over the program pulling financial support from other departments or majors, and in summary, noted that they had concerns that they did not feel were properly or adequately addressed in the proposal as it is currently written.

Senator Raianu, TTK, ARHU, asked what other universities are doing, and where the University of Maryland is in relation to the other initiatives. Raianu also asked about the discussions about the name, Human Centered AI, and was interested in learning examples of other programs. Raianu asked for more information about the relationship between the Artificial Intelligence Interdisciplinary Institute at Maryland (AIM), the departments, and the steering committee. They commended the interdisciplinarity and asked for more information about that relationship compared to what is already happening with other such interdisciplinary majors.

Eric Pacuit, TTK from the Department of Philosophy, shared that there are a number of universities that have some type of AI degree and a more humanity-centered AI degree,

explaining that they tend to be majors that are a "grab bag", wherein a variety of courses can be taken in another department, such as computer science. If a number of classes are taken together, then they would be identified as a major or minor. Pacuit shared that the University's model for this major is very well established, and one that has been available at Stanford for decades as a symbolic systems program. Pacuit said that researchers have been studying AI in philosophy since the 1930's, and it is a well-established area. Pacuit continued that the idea of making the major interdisciplinary is to have a core set of classes in the first two years, and specialization courses in the last two. Some of the specializations may have courses more focused within one department, while others may have courses from a variety of departments and colleges across campus.

Addressing the question of the relationship between the program and AIM, Pacuit said that the major is hosted by the Philosophy department, and there is discussion that advising will primarily be done in ARHU, however there will be some advising done in AIM. Pacuit explained that AIM will be part of the advisory committee, along with representatives for each of the specializations in different departments around campus.

Audran Downing, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs for Undergraduate Education in the College of Arts and Humanities, added that the goal of the majors is to provide a space for disciplines across campus to be included and be a part of the research and growth of this particular major. Downing said this is a new area for a Bachelor of Arts (BA), and the college is very excited about the potential for growth and the inclusive opportunities to come together and think about the next steps for thinking about the human aspect, society, and culture. The goal was to think about what the focus of value-centered AI is, and the way in which AI will impact people and culture, and how we do things, and make sure that it is fair and equitable across the board.

Downing and Pacuit said there were many discussions regarding the name, sharing that it was not easy to name the major.

Chair Dammeyer reminded Senators that this was item number seven on the agenda and encouraged them to keep comments brief.

Senator Stillwell, PTK, PLCY, was enthusiastic about the discussion around the ethics and social implications of AI. Stillwell reminded Senators that during the April 24, 2025, University Senate meeting, the Senate voted on a Master of Science in Artificial Intelligence that was based in the College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences (CMNS), and said that at that time they raised the question about ethics and social implications. Stillwell was encouraged by the discussions on this new major. Noting that the Senate would vote on a Bachelor of Science in AI later in the meeting, Stillwell asked for more information about how decisions are made regarding the gaps in university-wide curriculum around AI and where each new degree is housed. Specifically, where are the guardrails for making sure that there are considerations

around social and ethical implications, regardless of where the degree is housed and what function it's supposed to serve.

Will Reed, Associate Provost for Academic Planning, said that the University has a robust shared governance process around the creation of new programs, which starts in departments. Reed shared that when new programs are developed, they happen as close as possible to the student. Reed explained that programs emerge from departments, such as Philosophy and Computer Science, and they work their way up through the shared governance process in that department and college, all the way up to the Senate Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, and then the Senate itself. New programs and degrees are not top-down initiatives; they're coming from faculty and students. Reed said this is something unique to the University of Maryland and something to be proud of. A feature of this process is that members of the committees, in particular the Senate's PCC committee, are all from UMD, and can bring perspectives like those raised in this meeting, and then have a robust conversation at the campus level.

Senator Moradi, PTK, CMNS, said that over the past two years, many of the programs that have been asking for a name change, or new programs, have been focused around one term, and that's artificial intelligence. Moradi shared that, like Senator Hirsch, they are not anti-AI, and that they use it in their work quite often. However, the problem is that these are temporary themes. Moradi recalled a timeline of topics, saying that, in 1995, it was the internet; in 2000, it was website development; in 2008 to 2010, it was app development. Therefore, if you have an undergraduate degree in website development, it would be useless in 2025. Moradi expressed concern that the university is chasing after a term, noting that five years ago, the topic was internal security. Moradi said that the university's job is to educate people, not teach them tools, and expressed additional concern about the focus on terms and tools rather than basic education.

Dean Shonekan, Voting Ex-Officio, ARHU, shared their appreciation for the comments and questions, and said that they are proud of the work that went into getting this degree on track. Shonekan shared that this was not something developed in the last year, but over a number of years. Shonekan echoed Pacuit's statements, explaining that AI is not a new field for philosophers. Shonekan also acknowledged Senator Hirsch's questions and concerns about mental health, bias, etc., as AI is debated. With regards to resources when creating the new major, Shonekan said that the college was clear that they would not be taking away from the work being done in the traditional fields. Shonekan continued that they are grateful for the resources shared with AIM and through strategic prioritization in the college and around campus. Shonekan thanked the team that created the major and, specifically, Audran Downing, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Senator Gleason, Exempt Staff, CMNS, asked if the major is intended to prepare students for specific career paths, or if it is intended to be more of a liberal arts-general education that includes AI.

Audran Downing, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs: Undergraduate Education, College of Arts and Humanities, replied that it is both. Downing explained that the goal is for students to walk away with a very strong liberal arts education, which can connect and provide a foundation for whatever students endeavor to do, whether it's in STEM, arts and humanities, social sciences, etc. The skills from the liberal arts degree will tie nicely into the conversations surrounding AI. Downing said this is a very new area, and the beauty of it is that there is room for growth, as AI continues to develop. There will be new jobs and career paths that haven't been invented yet, and students will be prepared to be nimble and flexible. Downing shared that students will be able to work with Prompt Engineers and other specific job titles fitting within the industry. Students will be able to provide ethical perspectives when discussing policy decisions. Downing said that any of those types of positions will require people with human centered understanding and focus. This program will train students to be leaders in the field.

Senator Colombi, Undergraduate Student, CMNS, said that a concern they've heard is that there is a lack of clarity about what human-centered AI education means, especially with the cuts in funding to the university. They expressed concern about trying to build a program on something that doesn't have many tangible returns yet. Colombi also expressed concerns over stealing material that has already been produced, such as intellectual property and art. Colombi questioned the role of the University in AI, and echoed the sentiments of other Senators who noted the focus on a tool rather than intention.

Senator Cumings, TTK, ENGR, thanked the PCC committee and all who provided discussion. Cumings moved to close the debate.

Chair Dammeyer explained that Senator Cumings moved to end the discussion and go to a vote, which required a two-thirds vote. Chair Dammeyer asked if there was a second.

Senator Coles, TTK, ARHU seconded the motion.

Chair Dammeyer said there would be a vote to suspend discussion and vote on the proposal.

Senator Stillwell, PTK, PLCY, asked for clarification as to what "yes" and "no" mean in this case.

Chair Dammeyer clarified that voting "yes" would end discussion and move to a vote on the proposal, while voting "no" means that the discussion will continue.

The result was 91 yes, and 45 no. **The vote to suspend discussion passed.**

Chair Dammeyer called for a vote on the PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence.

The vote was 81 in favor, 47 opposed, and 12 abstentions. **The motion carried**

8. **PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science in Artificial Intelligence: Computational Structures for AI Systems (Senate Document #25-26-21) (Action)**
Chair Dammeyer invited Teri Bickham to present.

Bickham provided the following report for the PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science in Artificial Intelligence: Computational Structures for AI Systems (PCC 25001).

The College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences' Department of Computer Science proposes to establish a Bachelor of Science in Artificial Intelligence: Computational Structures for AI Systems. This program is being developed in coordination with the Artificial Intelligence Interdisciplinary Institute at Maryland (AIM) as part of a larger effort by the university to become a leader in artificial intelligence (AI) education. This Bachelor of Science program prepares students to design and implement AI systems responsibly across disciplines by providing technical training to build new algorithms and models from the ground up, understand their data and systems foundations, and apply them ethically and effectively in real-world contexts.

Bickham explained that the program combines a 50-credit core and an 18-credit specialization track, guiding students from a strong foundation in programming, statistical learning, symbolic reasoning, and optimization to the interdisciplinary, ethical application of advanced AI systems. Students can choose either a general specialization, which offers a broad, flexible exploration of AI, or specialize in one of four areas:
- Generative AI
- AI Algorithms
- Accessibility
- AI, Society, and Decision Making

The program addresses state and national workforce needs by preparing graduates for careers in AI development, data science, and related fields, as well as for advanced study in artificial intelligence, computer science, and other graduate disciplines.

As part of the university's commitment to advancing artificial intelligence across disciplines, the program will be supported with dedicated instructional, administrative, and infrastructure resources, with the college, department, AIM, and theOffice of the Provost coordinating resource allocation as the program develops.

The proposal was approved by the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee at its meeting on October 3, 2025.

The Program, Curricula, and Courses Committee moved to establish a Bachelor of Science in Artificial Intelligence: Computational Structures for AI Systems.

Chair Dammeyer opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Das, PTK, ENGR, noted that the list of courses is exhaustive, and asked how many of the courses are new, had to be developed or are being developed. Senator Das asked if the program was coming up with new instructional materials or repackaging existing materials, noting that both are equally valid methods, and they were interested in the numbers from developers.

Bickham invited Jordan Lee Boyd-Graber Ying, Faculty, CMNS or Dean Robert Infantino CMNS, to answer Senator Das's questions. Boyd-Graber Ying said that the major is being developed in conjunction with the BA in AI that was just discussed. There are nine new courses in the BS program, 9 courses that are being developed as shared with the BA, and others are repurposed courses or refocused courses. Boyd-Graber Ying shared that many of the initial courses are new and will provide focus on AI very early in the curriculum, while some of the advanced courses already exist in Computer Science or Information Science, and will be used as part of the major.

Senator Lohff, Graduate Student, PLCY, asked why a new program was created rather than a concentration in computational structures for AI systems in an existing computer science program, noting that many of the classes seem to already exist.

Boyd-Graber Ying said that the existing Computer Science program allows for the study of AI, but by the time students get to AI; after completing all of the prerequisites of computer science, they are in their senior year. The goal of AIM is to have interdisciplinary collaborations between all of the different places on campus that can use AI. By refactoring the program to put more AI at the beginning allows for interdisciplinary connections. This is not feasible with the current structure of how AI in Computer Science is being taught. Boyd-Graber Ying also said that it is difficult to change existing programs, and in some ways can be easier to start with a blank slate.

Senator Jones, PTK, CMNS, cited the learning outcomes from the proposal as, "*Apply insights from ethics and social sciences to interdisciplinary applications of AI to address societal challenges and risks of AI such as bias, transparency, fairness and accountability*". Jones said that, looking at the degree requirements, it is not clear that the learning outcome would be fully mastered by students, particularly in general and algorithm specializations, as the courses and those specializations primarily come from Computer Science, CSAI, and INST, apart from one PSYC course. Additionally, there is only one course on ethics and one course on fairness in the core requirements across all

specializations. Jones expressed concern that students will primarily be focused on producing AI systems and not addressing the full import of the potential societal impact of the systems they're creating, which could potentially entrench existing inequities.

Boyd-Graber Ying confirmed Jones' statement, adding that only a handful of courses, based on title, specifically talk about ethics and fairness. Boyd-Graber Ying continued, sharing that these courses are early in the curriculum, and the goal is for these ideas to be integrated throughout the curriculum. Boyd-Graber Ying gave the example that the Generative AI specialization has several courses in Computer Science, but ethics and fairness are still discussed in those courses. For example, in CMSC470, they discuss how the training data used to build large language models recapitulates cultural bias. Boyd-Graber Ying said that in the Computer Vision course, they discuss some of the seminal work that showed algorithmic bias in face recognition. The technical courses use the philosophy discussed in the earlier courses.

Senator Delwiche, TTK, CMNS, stated that this is the second of four PCC proposals that have the term Artificial Intelligence in them, and that they were trying to determine whether these represent different elements of a coherent campus plan for this emerging technology, or whether they are bubbling up across campus. Senator Delwiche asked for clarification as to how it fits in with the broader campus plan.

Will Reed, Associate Provost for Academic Planning, said that this relates to a previous question on how shared governance works on campus. Reed said that faculty own these new programs, and they're developed as closely to the student experiences as they possibly can be. The programs come out of the departments. It can be unpredictable to anticipate how this is going to emerge over time. Reed shared that an example to consider is the emergence of data science, which came on the scene several years ago, and initially showed up as new programs in data science. Departments gradually began embedding data science within their existing curriculum. Reed said that is one possible pathway, and another would be an "AI and 'this'" model, such as "AI and Anthropology" or "AI and Economics". Reed said this is a question to be decided collectively, as this field unfolds. Reed continued that we are very fortunate to be working in a system where we can dynamically respond to these changes through shared governance and adapt programs to better match opportunities for students to get jobs and their learning goals and objectives.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Dammeyer called for a vote on the PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science in Artificial Intelligence: Computational Structures for AI Systems.

The vote was 97 in favor, 26 opposed, and 17 abstentions. **The motion carried**

9. **PCC Proposal to Modify the Master of Public Health - Add Area of Concentration in Global, Environmental, and Occupational Health (Senate Document #25-26-22) (Action)**
Chair Dammeyer invited Teri Bickham to present.

Bickham provided the following report for the PCC Proposal to Modify the Master of Public Health - Add Area of Concentration in Global, Environmental, and Occupational Health (PCC 25036):

The School of Public Health's Department of Global, Environmental, and Occupational Health proposes to modify the Master of Public Health (MPH) by adding a new Area of Concentration in Global, Environmental, and Occupational Health. Bickham said that areas of Concentration are formal course sequences focused on specific topics within an existing degree program. They require external approval from the Maryland Higher Education Commission and the University System of Maryland.

The 45-credit Master of Public Health model consists of a core set of courses of 14-15 credits and remaining coursework focused on the concentration's subject area. The School of Public Health has nine existing MPH Areas of Concentration in areas such as community health, environmental health, epidemiology, biostatistics, health policy, health care management, and physical activity.

Bickham said this fully online Area of Concentration is designed to develop practitioners and researchers who are equipped to assess and engage in the science, theory, and practice related to interconnected global, environmental, and occupational health needs. As with other MPH concentrations, students will take a 14-credit core sequence that includes courses in public health, epidemiology and biostatistics, data science, program and policy development, ethics, and leadership. Students must also complete an experiential requirement.

The specific coursework for this concentration includes courses in environmental health, occupational health, infectious diseases, digital approaches to public health, and global health foundations and policy. All of the core courses and multiple concentration courses are already offered to students in existing MPH concentrations. As a result, many of the instructional and administrative resources to launch and operate the concentration are already in place. Tuition revenue will be used to cover new costs associated with the program.

Bickham said that the proposal was approved by the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee at its meeting on October 3, 2025.

The Program, Curricula, and Courses Committee moves that the Senate approve the proposal to modify the Master of Public Health - Add Area of Concentration in Global, Environmental, and Occupational Health.

Chair Dammeyer opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Raianu, TTK, ARHU, commended the School of Public Health for adding a concentration in this particular area. Raianu asked for the rationale behind making it a fully online program, adding that some programs are fully online while others have an online option. Raianu said that in reading the proposal, they understand that it might have something to do with the targeted student population, as well as the discussion about a shortage of professionals. Raianu asked how that factored into the decision to both create this concentration and then to make it online.

Amy Sapkota, Chair of the Department of Global Environmental and Occupational Health, confirmed that the reason for offering the program fully online is to be able to reach diverse learners who may not be able to be physically here at the University of Maryland. Sapkota said this speaks to the broad, very global-oriented program of study that has been prepared. Sapkota said that there are five core areas of public health, and a Master's degree in Public Health is being offered across all five areas, in-person, in the School of Public Health. Offering online programs allows for competition against other Schools of Public Health across the country. Sapkota also shared that there is a desire to grow the school's online programs and that other online programs are being developed. Sapkota invited Jen Bachner, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs for the School of Public Health, to add to the response.

Bachner added that the programs were not all created at once, and that initially, when the school started, they were in person and followed a model for how master's programs were run at that time. As the school has grown, in an effort to build its reputation and outreach, they wanted to create online programs to allow students across the globe to be a part of this student community.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Dammeyer called for a vote on the PCC Proposal to Modify the Master of Public Health - Add Area of Concentration in Global, Environmental, and Occupational Health.

The vote was 115 in favor, 0 opposed, and 6 abstentions. **The motion carried**

10. **PCC Proposal to Rename the Master of Science in "Business Analytics" to "Business Analytics and Artificial Intelligence" (Senate Document #25-26-26)**

Chair Dammeyer invited Teri Bickham to present.

Bickham provided the following report for the PCC Proposal to Rename the Master of Science in "Business Analytics" to "Business Analytics and Artificial Intelligence" (PCC 25029):

The Robert H. Smith School of Business proposes to rename the Master of Science in "Business Analytics" to "Business Analytics and Artificial Intelligence". The new program title more accurately reflects the program's academic content and its growing emphasis on advanced analytics using artificial intelligence (AI).

Bickham said that this change highlights the integration of AI with traditional business analytics, a core strength of the curriculum, as students gain hands-on experience in AI coding, machine learning, and applying AI to real-world business challenges. The program's 30-credit curriculum includes four core courses and 18 credits of electives that are carefully designed to reflect the expanded focus on AI and its integration with business analytics. The new program name reflects the curriculum's full scope and aligns with student expectations and employer demand, positioning graduates for success in a changing marketplace.

Bickham reported that the proposal was approved by the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee at its meeting on November 7, 2025.

The Program, Curricula, and Courses Committee moves that the Senate approve the proposal to rename the Master of Science in "Business Analytics" to "Business Analytics and Artificial Intelligence".

Chair Dammeyer opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Stillwell, PTK, PLCY, asked for confirmation as to whether any of the content of the program was changing, or if this was only a name change.

Bickham confirmed that it is only a name change.

Senator Hirsch, Graduate Student, ARHU, asked why the choice was to change the name of the program instead of offering AI as a focus within the major.

Sujin Kim, Academic Director of Master's in Business Analytics, responded that the Smith School of Business has two programs particularly focused on the AI area: one in Business Analytics and the other in Information Systems. The name change is being submitted for both programs to include AI at the end. Kim shared that while the two areas have some overlap, their focus will be different. In Business Analytics, the focus is more on a mathematical model to solve business problems, while in Information Systems focuses on the business process, including information technology. Kim said it is important to have a difference between the two programs, and invited Prabhudev Konana, Dean of the Robert H. Smith School of Business, to add to the response.

Dean Konana said the programs have been doing AI for a long time, but it is called Business Analytics to differentiate from the Computer Science area. Konana added that machine learning has been taught for a long time in these programs, with one focusing

on building applications for solving business problems, and the other using AI to solve business problems. One is developing applications while the other is addressing marketing problems, supply chain problems, and finance problems. Konana said that there are more tools now, and the market is reacting to the names. Students are looking for AI in the name of programs. Konana reported that Carnegie Mellon, ASU, and NYU changed their names. AI is being used to reflect the changes in the market, but the program has always had AI, machine learning, and advanced tools.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Dammeyer called for a vote on the PCC Proposal to Rename the Master of Science in "Business Analytics" to "Business Analytics and Artificial Intelligence".

The vote was 87 in favor, 25 opposed, and 11 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

11. PCC Proposal to Rename the Department of "Geology" to "Geological, Environmental, and Planetary Sciences" (Senate Document #25-26-27)
Chair Dammeyer invited Teri Bickham to present.

Bickham provided the following report for the PCC Proposal to Rename the Department of "Geology" to "Geological, Environmental, and Planetary Sciences" (PCC 25031):

The College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences' Department of Geology proposes to change its name to the Department of "Geological, Environmental, and Planetary Sciences".

Bickham said that the proposed name more accurately reflects the interdisciplinary nature of the department's current faculty expertise and academic programming, which spans solid earth science, planetary science, and environmental science. The term "Geology" no longer captures the range of the department's research and teaching.

Bickham reported that no faculty hired since 2007 identify as geologists, and most focus on environmental or planetary sciences. Internal surveys indicate that the current name places faculty and students at a competitive disadvantage when applying for jobs, grants, and graduate programs.

Bickham said that the proposed name aligns with national trends, as peer institutions in the Big Ten and beyond have already adopted broader names to reflect the evolving nature of geosciences. The name change follows a two-year process of consultation with internal and external stakeholders and is supported by faculty and students across the department, as well as by colleagues in allied units across campus.

Bickham said that the proposal was approved by the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee at its meeting on November 7, 2025.

The Program, Curricula, and Courses Committee moves that the Senate approve the Proposal to Rename the Department of "Geology" to "Geological, Environmental, and Planetary Sciences".

Chair Dammeyer opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Espindola, TTK, CMNS, said that there is already a Department of Environmental Sciences, and asked if this is creating some overlap with that department, and how it would be teased apart.

James Farquhar, Distinguished University Professor and Chair of the Department of Geology, said that there is considerable overlap in terms of the use of environmental and also planetary, with respect to expertise and work that other units do. However, in this case, the focus on "environmental" and "planetary" is clearly geological. Farquhar said there was no real conflict, and that it is advantageous, because it helps the Department of Geology in the process of building connections across campus.

Senator Lathrop, TTK, CMNS, shared that James Farquhar, as Chair, reached out to departments around campus, and this was the title that everyone agreed was simple, and that the overlap was meant to be collegial. Lathrop expressed support for the new title and said it will bring students to the program.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Dammeyer called for a vote on the PCC Proposal to Rename the Department of "Geology" to "Geological, Environmental, and Planetary Sciences".

The vote was 108 in favor, 8 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

12. **PCC Proposal to Rename the Master of Science in "Information Systems" to "Information Systems and Artificial Intelligence" (Senate Document #25-26-28)**
Chair Dammeyer invited Teri Bickham to present.

Bickham provided the following report for the PCC Proposal to Rename the Master of Science in "Information Systems" to "Information Systems and Artificial Intelligence" (PCC 25032):

Bickham said that the Robert H. Smith School of Business proposed to rename the Master of Science in "Information Systems" to "Information Systems and Artificial Intelligence". This program title change reflects the evolution of courses in the program toward artificial intelligence (AI) applications in business and technology-enabled digital business models.

Bickham shared that the program builds foundational skills in systems analysis, database management, AI, and business analytics, while incorporating the application of AI to each of these areas. The name change is intended to respond to market demand, align the program with industry trends, and improve visibility and appeal to prospective students. However, the new program title more accurately reflects the program's academic content and learning outcomes.

Bickham said that the courses required for this 30-credit program are not changing, although some course titles and descriptions will be updated to highlight the inclusion of AI topics.

Bickham reported that the proposal was approved by the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee at its meeting on November 7, 2025.

The Program, Curricula, and Courses Committee moves that the Senate approve the Proposal to Rename the Master of Science in "Information Systems" to "Information Systems and Artificial Intelligence".

Chair Dammeyer opened the floor for discussion.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Dammeyer called for a vote on the PCC Proposal to Rename the Master of Science in "Information Systems" to "Information Systems and Artificial Intelligence".

The vote was 88 in favor, 22 opposed, and 9 abstentions. **The motion carried.**

13. Elections, Representation & Governance Committee Straw Poll for the Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaws Regarding Senate Committee Charges (Senate Document #25- 26-10) (Action)

Chair Dammeyer invited Kim Gonzalez, Chair of the Elections, Representation & Governance (ERG) Committee to present.

Gonzalez said that typically their report would have begun with a brief history, but given the time constraints, noted that the history was in the meeting materials.

Gonzalez shared that the ERG committee has been charged with the review of the Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaws Regarding Senate Committee Charges, which requests that a recommendation would need to have a written objection forty-eight (48) hours before the meeting where it's presented.

Gonzalez said the ERG committee was specifically charged with consulting a sample of representatives from the University Senate. To accomplish this goal with as much efficiency as possible, the ERG Committee discussed specific bylaw amendments that

would be possible, based on Big Ten research and consulting with other stakeholders. The ERG committee presented this information as a non-binding straw poll.

Gonzalez said that the list of potential changes discussed by the committee, including "no change to the current Bylaws", are on page 425 of the meeting materials. Gonzalez reported that the committee discussed gathering information via an email or asynchronous vote, but had concerns over logistical and operational feasibility, and ultimately chose the straw poll.

Gonzalez said that due to the time, this idea may need to be revisited. Gonzalez explained that the committee would use the results of the non-binding straw poll as part of its ongoing considerations, but would not be compelled by any response or results.

Gonzalez thanked Senators for helping the committee by providing their insights on how the amendments should be handled by the body as a whole.

Chair Dammeyer said that in order to proceed with the vote, there would need to be a motion to extend the meeting.

Senator Aute, PTK, ENGR, motioned to extend the meeting by ten (10) minutes; it was seconded by Senator Zimmerman, PTK, SPHL.

Chair Dammeyer said there would need to be a two-thirds vote to extend the meeting by ten (10) minutes.

The vote was 52 yes, and 61 no. **The vote to extend the meeting failed.**

14. New Business

The meeting ended before Chair Dammeyer was able to call for New Business.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaws Regarding Senate Committee Charges (Senate Document #25-26-10)
Informational Presentation at the University Senate Meeting

BACKGROUND

On August 11, 2025 a proposal entitled "Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaws Regarding Senate Committee Charges" was submitted to the University Senate Office. This proposal (attached) came in response to a topic that was discussed in the new business portion of the May SEC meeting and was inspired by an issue that arose during the April 24, 2025 University Senate Meeting regarding the review of the APAS Committee's report regarding the Proposal for Bereavement Policies and Practices Toward an Inclusive Community of Care (Senate Document #23-24-27).

Based on the experience of the Senate Meeting discussion, the proposal is recommending that any recommendation brought forward by a University Senate committee may not be amended on the Senate floor unless a detailed written objection outlining the specific concerns is submitted to the Office of the University Senate at least forty-eight (48) hours in advance of the meeting which the recommendation is scheduled to be presented.

This proposal would require a bylaw change; thus it was charged to the Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee for consideration under their purview as stated in University Senate Bylaws.

The ERG Committee was charged with the following;
1. Review the proposal entitled Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaws Regarding
Senate Committee Charges and similar policies and procedures at Big 10 and other peer institutions.
2. Consult with a sample of representatives of the University Senate and of committee members across the University Senate standing committees and councils, with the University Senate Committee on Committees in relation to their charge as stated in the Bylaws, and with Senate Leadership.
3. Consider the impact, if any, on the Senate and campus constituencies if the Bylaws are revised, the proposed placement (University Senate Bylaws (Section 5.1.2)), and,
4. If appropriate, recommend whether the University Senate Bylaws should be revised and if so, provide suggested revisions.

The highlighted portion above recommends consulting with a "sample of representatives of the University Senate". To accomplish this goal with efficiency, the Senate ERG Committee has discussed specific Bylaw amendments that are possible (based on Big10 peer research and consultations with stakeholders) that are being presented at the University Senate Meeting as an informational/non-binding straw poll. This fulfills the consultation on representative of University Senate members.

PRESENTATION AND RATIONALE

The following options were submitted by the ERG Committee members to help guide the feedback of the Senate, committees, and leadership.

Option A: No Change to the Current Bylaw Language

The ERG Committee discussed the option that no change be made to the current Bylaws. This would allow Senators to continue offering amendments on the floor. Discussion on this option focused on the benefits of shared governance, of not constraining voices of Senators, and balancing the volume of amendments with timing.

Bylaws Language would stay:

5.2 Standing Committees - Basic Charge: In its area of responsibility, as defined in its specifications, each

committee shall be an arm of the Senate with the following powers:

(1) To formulate and review policies to be established by the Senate according to the Plan

(Article 1);

(2) To review established policies and their administration and to recommend any changes in

policies or their administration that may be desirable;

(3) To serve in an advisory capacity, upon request, regarding the administration of policies;

(4) To function on request of the President or of the Executive Committee as a board of appeal

with reference to actions and/or decisions made in the application of policies; and

(5) To recommend the creation of special subcommittees (Article 5.7-5.9) when deemed necessary.

Option B: Adopt the Language in the Proposal as Submitted

The proposal recommended that the Senate Bylaws be amended to align all Senate committee charges with that of the PCC Committee, with the suggestion reading as follows:

5.2 Standing Committees - Basic Charge: In its area of responsibility, as defined in its specifications, each

committee shall be an arm of the Senate with the following powers:

(1) To formulate and review policies to be established by the Senate according to the Plan

Senate Memo for Senate Document #25-26-10 Error! Reference source not found.

2 of 5

(Article 1);

(2) To review established policies and their administration and to recommend any changes in

policies or their administration that may be desirable. **Recommendations in these areas are not subject to amendment on the Senate floor unless a detailed objection describing the area of concern has been filed with the Office of the University Senate at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting at which the recommendations will be introduced. The committee will announce proposed recommendations to the campus community sufficiently in advance of the meeting at which they are to be considered so as to allow time for concerned parties to file their objections**;

(3) To serve in an advisory capacity, upon request, regarding the administration of policies;

(4) To function on request of the President or of the Executive Committee as a board of appeal

with reference to actions and/or decisions made in the application of policies; and

(5) To recommend the creation of special subcommittees (Article 5.7-5.9) when deemed necessary.

Option C: Adopt Language in Proposal, with a 2/3 Vote Exception and definition of "detailed objection"

The ERG Committee shared this option which adopts the Bylaw language (providing for a 48-hour notice of additional recommendation) but would include a definition of "detailed objection" and an exception when a 2/3 majority of the Senators present vote to allow an amendment on the floor. The Committee noted this allows the Chair to have guidance on what a detailed objection is and allows the Senate to act when a proposal is time-sensitive or requires an urgent amendment. Discussion on this option focused on preserving the Senate's ultimate authority while introducing a deliberative threshold that encourages members to carefully assess whether the matter is truly urgent before overriding the limitation. It is also in line with what is done in some other Big10 peer institutions.

5.2 Standing Committees - Basic Charge: In its area of responsibility, as defined in its specifications, each

committee shall be an arm of the Senate with the following powers:

(1) To formulate and review policies to be established by the Senate according to the Plan

(Article 1);

(2) To review established policies and their administration and to recommend any changes in

policies or their administration that may be desirable. **Recommendations in these areas are not subject to amendment on the Senate floor unless a detailed objection (_insert definition_) describing the area of concern has been filed with the Office of the University Senate at least**

forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting at which the recommendations will be introduced. *A supermajority vote of 2/3 in favor would allow an exception to this forty-hour (48) time window*. **The committee will announce proposed recommendations to the campus community sufficiently in advance of the meeting at which they are to be considered so as to allow time for concerned parties to file their objections**;

(3) To serve in an advisory capacity, upon request, regarding the administration of policies;

(4) To function on request of the President or of the Executive Committee as a board of appeal

with reference to actions and/or decisions made in the application of policies; and

(5) To recommend the creation of special subcommittees (Article 5.7-5.9) when deemed necessary.

Option D: Any amendment brought to the floor to be automatically sent back to committee for expedited review

The ERG Committee also shared an option that any amendments presented on the floor would automatically trigger the proposal be sent back to committee for expedited review (ideally one month or closest logistically plausible time frame). Discussion on this option focused on the allowance for more thoughtful reflection and action on items presented during Senate discussion.

5.2 Standing Committees - Basic Charge: In its area of responsibility, as defined in its specifications, each

committee shall be an arm of the Senate with the following powers:

(1) To formulate and review policies to be established by the Senate according to the Plan

(Article 1);

(2) To review established policies and their administration and to recommend any changes in

policies or their administration that may be desirable**. Recommendations in these areas are subject to amendment on the Senate floor but will signify immediate referral back to committee for expedited review. The committee will review the amendment and bring recommendation back to the body at the next available Senate Meeting**;

(3) To serve in an advisory capacity, upon request, regarding the administration of policies;

(4) To function on request of the President or of the Executive Committee as a board of appeal

with reference to actions and/or decisions made in the application of policies; and

(5) To recommend the creation of special subcommittees (Article 5.7-5.9) when deemed necessary.

Senate Memo for Senate Document #25-26-10Error! Reference source not found.

4 of 5

Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaws Regarding
Senate Committee Charges (Senate Document #25-26-10)

Elections, Representation & Governance | Chair: Kim Gonzalez

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Sarah Dammeyer request that the Elections, Representation & Governance (ERG) Committee review the proposal entitled Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaws Regarding Senate Committee Charges.

Specifically, the ERG Committee should:

1. Review:
    a. The proposal entitled *Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaws Regarding Senate Committee Charges*.
    b. Similar policies and procedures at Big 10 and other peer institutions.
2. Consult:
    a. A sample of representatives of the University Senate and of committee members across the University Senate standing committees and councils.
    b. With the University Senate Committee on Committees in relation to their charge as stated in the Bylaws.
    c. With Senate Leadership.
3. Consider:
    a. The impact, if any, on the Senate and campus constituencies if the Bylaws are revised.
    b. The proposed placement (University Senate Bylaws (Section 5.1.2)).
4. If appropriate, recommend whether the University Senate Bylaws should be revised and if so, provide suggested revisions.

We ask that you submit a report to the University Senate Office no later than **April 24, 2025**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact the University Senate Office, senate-admin@umd.edu.

Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaws Regarding Senate Committee Charges

NAME/TITLE	Shannon Buenaflor, Program Director		
EMAIL	shayes@umd.edu	PHONE	301-405-6201
UNIT	Engineering Academic Services	CONSTITUENCY	Exempt Staff

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE

The purpose of this proposal is to amend the Senate Bylaws regarding Senate Committee charges. Specifically, I propose that any recommendation brought forward by a Senate Committee may not be amended on the Senate floor unless a detailed written objection outlining the specific concerns is submitted to the Office of the University Senate at least forty-eight (48) hours in advance of the meeting at which the recommendation is scheduled to be presented.

This proposal was inspired based on an issue that arose during the April 24, 2025, Senate meeting. During the review of the APAS Committee's report regarding the Proposal for Bereavement Policies and Practices Toward an Inclusive Community of Care (Senate Document #23-24-27), one of the original proposers introduced an amendment to increase the number of allowable self-signed absence notes from one to two. The Senate voted to approve the committee's recommended policy changes along with this amendment. While proper Senate procedures were followed during the consideration of its report, the amendment represents a significant departure from the committee's original policy recommendations. Further, the amendment was not germane to the original proposal, as the self-signed absence provision applies to any absence—not just bereavement—and only when no major assessments or assignments are due. The amendment was proposed only just before the Senate meeting and so there was no opportunity for the committee to consider it and make a recommendation on the amendment. Further, the amendment was not vetted by faculty to fully assess potential consequences in course learning.

Based on this experience and follow-up discussions with campus leaders, this proposal recommends that the Senate Bylaws be amended to align all Senate committee charges with that of the PCC Committee.

The bylaws for PCC currently read as follows:

The committee shall review and make recommendations to the Senate in at least the areas designated by (1) through (3) below. **Recommendations in these areas are not subject to amendment on the Senate floor unless a detailed objection describing the area of concern has been filed with the Office of the University Senate at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting at which the recommendations will be introduced.** *The committee will announce proposed recommendations to the campus community sufficiently in advance of the meeting at which they are to be considered so as to allow time for concerned parties to file their objections.*

For the Senate PCC, this provision is in place because of possible conflicts between academic units. However, this is a good practice for all committees to ensure that proposed amendments are germane to the topic at hand and not subject to a new proposal, which should be routed through the Senate Executive Committee. A change in bylaws may have avoided the issue we have with the current APAS proposal and the consequences of an amendment being brought to the floor of the Senate without the APAS committee having time to consider and respond as a committee.

DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE

Within the Senate Bylaws, I suggest that the language be added to *Section 5.1.2 Standing Committees – Basic Charge*. Please see suggestion below:

> 5.2 **Standing Committees - Basic Charge:** In its area of responsibility, as defined in its specifications, each committee shall be an arm of the Senate with the following powers:
>
> (1) To formulate and review policies to be established by the Senate according to the *Plan* (Article 1);
>
> (2) To review established policies and their administration and to recommend any changes in policies or their administration that may be desirable. Recommendations in these areas are not subject to amendment on the Senate floor unless a detailed objection describing the area of concern has been filed with the Office of the University Senate at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting at which the recommendations will be introduced. The committee will announce proposed recommendations to the campus community sufficiently in advance of the meeting at which they are to be considered so as to allow time for concerned parties to file their objections;
>
> (3) To serve in an advisory capacity, upon request, regarding the administration of policies;
>
> (4) To function on request of the President or of the Executive Committee as a board of appeal with reference to actions and/or decisions made in the application of policies; and
>
> (5) To recommend the creation of special subcommittees (Article 5.7-5.9) when deemed necessary.

SUGGESTION FOR HOW YOUR PROPOSAL WOULD BE PUT INTO PRACTICE

Should this revision be adopted, all committee reports will continue to be shared with the Senate and campus community one week prior to a Senate Meeting as part of the process of sharing materials. Campus constituents who wish to propose an amendment must submit a written objection and/or proposal to the Senate Office at least four-eight (48) business hours prior to the Senate Meeting where the agenda item will be discussed. The Senate leadership team will then share this information with the Senate Committee Chair to be reviewed with the committee in preparation for discussion at the meeting.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

This idea was initially brought forward to the Senate Executive Committee at the March 15, 2025, meeting.

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Transmittal | #21-22-27
Senate Executive Committee

Updates to the 2021 Plan of Organization Review Committee Slate
(Senate Document #21-22-27)

Presented By: Sarah Dammeyer, Chair

Review Date: SEC - January, 21, 2026 | Senate - February 3, 2026

Voting Method: In a single vote

Relevant Policy/Document: Plan of Organization for Shared Governance at the University of Maryland, College Park

Necessary Approvals: Senate, President

Proposal:
Article 6.3 of the Plan of Organization for Shared Governance at the University of Maryland, College Park ("the Plan"), states that a "Review of the current Plan shall be undertaken at least every ten years by a committee composed of members elected by the Senate. The Executive Committee may institute a review of the Plan by such a committee in the fifth or subsequent year following a review if, in its judgment, there have been changes in the University significant enough to justify a review."

Article 6.3b of the Plan requires "the Executive Committee to develop a slate of nominees to be approved by the Senate."

The current slate was approved by the University Senate on December 9, 2021, and approved by President Pines on December 22, 2021.

In Fall 2022, the Senate Executive Committee agreed that the Plan or Organization Review Committee (PORC) should suspend its work due to staff transitions in the University Senate Office. Due to inactivity for three years, committee membership needs to be updated to ensure that all members are still active at the university and available to participate, which is necessary for PORC to formally resume its work.

Recommendations:
The Senate Executive Committee recommends that the Senate approve the updated slate as presented.

Committee Work:
The SEC contacted all members of the slate approved in 2021 to determine whether they were still eligible and available to serve on the committee. Seven of the 21 members from the 2021 committee slate were both eligible and agreed to continue serving on PORC.

To fill the remaining committee vacancies in accordance with the provisions outlined in Article 6.3(c) of the Plan, the SEC solicited nominations from the Deans of the Colleges, Schools, and Library; the Senate Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committees; the Presidents of the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Government; the Senior Vice President and Provost; and the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Alternatives:
The Senate can decide not to approve the slate.

Risks:
Continued delay in reconstituting PORC prolongs the absence of a formal review of the Plan of Organization, which has not been reviewed since 2013–2015, increasing the risk that governance structures no longer align with current institutional needs.

Financial Implications:
There are no known financial implications.

Slate | #21-22-27
Senate Executive Committee

Updates to the 2021 Plan of Organization Review Committee Slate
(Senate Document #21-22-27)

Faculty Representatatives:
13 Representatives - 1 from every College/School/Library

Name	Title	College/Unit
Rohan Tikekar	Professor	College of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Chengri Ding	Professor	School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation
Colleen Woods	Associate Professor	College of Arts and Humanities
Patrick Wohlfarth	Professor	College of Behavioral and Social Sciences
Louiqa Raschid	Professor	The Robert H. Smith School of Business
Anne Catherine Raugh	Principal Faculty Specialist	College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences
Jean Louise Snell	Senior Faculty Specialist	College of Education
Christopher Cadou	Professor	A. James Clark School of Engineering
Polly O'Rourke	Senior Faculty Specialist	College of Information
DeNeen Brown	Professor	The Philip Merrill College of Journalism
Jo Zimmerman	Senior Lecturer	School of Public Health
Patricia Bory	Associate Clinical Professor	School of Public Policy
Rachel Gammons	Librarian IV	Libraries

Staff Representatives:
2 Representatives - 1 Exempt & 1 Non-Exempt

Name	Constituency	Division/Unit
Kalia Patricio	Exempt Staff	VPSA
Erica Simpkins	Non-Exempt Staff	VPSA

Graduate Student Representatives:
2 Representatives

Name	Constituency	College(s)
Ivy Lyons	Graduate Student	The Philip Merrill College of Journalism
M Pease	Graduate Student	College of Behavioral and Social Sciences

Undergraduate Student Representatives:
2 Representatives

Name	Constituency	College(s)
Galen Richardson	Undergraduate Student	College of Behavioral and Social Sciences
Taryn Reinhart	Undergraduate Student	School of Public Policy

Administrator Representatives:
2 Representatives

Name	Title	College/Division/Unit
John Bertot	Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs	SVPAAP
Stephanie Chang	Assistant Vice President for Belonging	Belonging & Community

Modify the Master of Public Health - Add Area of Concentration in Health Literacy and Public Health Communication (Senate Document #25-26-37)

PRESENTED BY	**Meredith Gore, Chair, Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee**
REVIEW DATES	**SEC – January 21, 2026	SENATE – February 3, 2026**
VOTING METHOD	**In a single vote**
RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT	
NECESSARY APPROVALS	**Senate, President, USM Chancellor, and the Maryland Higher Education Commission**

ISSUE

The School of Public Health's Department of Behavioral and Community Health proposes to modify the Master of Public Health (MPH) by adding a new Area of Concentration in Health Literacy and Public Health Communication. Areas of Concentration are formal course sequences focused on specific topics within an existing degree program. They require external approval by the Maryland Higher Education Commission and the University System of Maryland. The 45-credit MPH model includes 14-15 credits of core coursework and remaining coursework that focuses on the concentration's subject area. The School of Public Health has nine existing MPH Areas of Concentration in areas such as community health, environmental health, epidemiology, biostatistics, health policy, health care management, and physical activity. Because of the large number of credits dedicated to the concentration topic and because individual concentrations are typically offered by individual departments within the School of Public Health, MPH concentrations function as individual programs leading to the same degree award. The Master of Public Health program has several existing Areas of Concentration that are offered in both in-person and online modalities. The proposed concentration will also be offered in both formats.

Recent national and state workforce assessments have identified health communication, health literacy, and informatics as critical skill gaps in the public health workforce. The proposed concentration in Health Literacy and Public Health Communication will train students in the theory, methods, and application of health literacy and health communication for public health information, messages, materials, and campaigns. The program will prepare public health practitioners to create, select, share, and promote health information that supports personal and organizational health literacy and informed decisions about health. Graduates will be equipped with the knowledge and skills to be effective designers and communicators of audience-focused, clear, useful, and culturally relevant health information distributed in a range of formats and channels.

As with other MPH concentrations, students will take a 14-credit core sequence that includes courses in public health, epidemiology and biostatistics, data science, program and policy development, ethics, and leadership. Students must also complete an experiential requirement. The specific coursework for this concentration includes courses in public health communication, health literacy, health behavior, public health research, and public health informatics.

All of the core courses and multiple concentration courses are already offered to students in other MPH concentrations. As a result, many of the instructional and administrative resources to launch and operate the concentration are already in place. Tuition revenue will be able to cover new costs associated with the program.

The proposal was approved by the Graduate School PCC committee on October 24, 2025, and the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses committee on November 7, 2025.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Senate Committee on Programs, Curricula, and Courses recommends that the Senate approve this new academic program.

COMMITTEE WORK

The committee considered this proposal at its meeting on November 7, 2025. Jennifer Bachner, from the School of Public Health, presented the proposal and answered questions from the committee. The committee approved the proposal.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could decline to approve this new Area of Concentration.

RISKS

If the Senate declines to approve this new Area of Concentration, the university will miss an opportunity to meet growing workforce demand for training in health literacy and public health communication.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no significant financial implications with this proposal. This concentration will be self-supported through tuition revenue, and the department will be able to leverage existing faculty, administrative capacity, facilities, and online instructional infrastructure.

1031: MASTER OF PUBLIC HEALTH IN HEALTH LITERACY AND PUBLIC HEALTH COMMUNICATION

In Workflow

1. D-HLTH PCC Chair (tzeeger@umd.edu)
2. D-HLTH Chair (greenkm@umd.edu)
3. SPHL Curriculum Manager (cgossett@umd.edu; jbachner@umd.edu; bdc1@umd.edu)
4. SPHL PCC Chair (cgossett@umd.edu)
5. SPHL Dean (lushniak@umd.edu; cgossett@umd.edu; jbachner@umd.edu)
6. Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager (mcolson@umd.edu)
7. Graduate School Curriculum Manager (jfarman@umd.edu; rlong12@umd.edu)
8. Graduate PCC Chair (jfarman@umd.edu; rlong12@umd.edu)
9. Dean of the Graduate School (jfarman@umd.edu; sroth1@umd.edu)
10. Senate PCC Chair (mcolson@umd.edu; gorem@umd.edu)
11. University Senate Chair (mcolson@umd.edu)
12. President (mcolson@umd.edu)
13. Board of Regents (mcolson@umd.edu)
14. MHEC (mcolson@umd.edu)
15. Provost Office (mcolson@umd.edu)
16. Graduate Catalog Manager (bhernand@umd.edu; fantsao@umd.edu)

Approval Path

1. Wed, 10 Sep 2025 20:39:25 GMT
   Tracy Zeeger (tzeeger): Approved for D-HLTH PCC Chair
2. Wed, 10 Sep 2025 21:02:33 GMT
   Kerry Green (greenkm): Approved for D-HLTH Chair
3. Thu, 11 Sep 2025 17:21:09 GMT
   Jennifer Bachner (jbachner): Approved for SPHL Curriculum Manager
4. Thu, 11 Sep 2025 21:11:06 GMT
   Jennifer Bachner (jbachner): Rollback to Initiator
5. Mon, 15 Sep 2025 12:30:49 GMT
   Tracy Zeeger (tzeeger): Approved for D-HLTH PCC Chair
6. Mon, 15 Sep 2025 23:04:08 GMT
   Kerry Green (greenkm): Approved for D-HLTH Chair
7. Tue, 16 Sep 2025 16:55:20 GMT
   Jennifer Bachner (jbachner): Approved for SPHL Curriculum Manager
8. Thu, 18 Sep 2025 16:12:38 GMT
   Jennifer Bachner (jbachner): Approved for SPHL PCC Chair
9. Thu, 18 Sep 2025 16:48:17 GMT
   Jennifer Bachner (jbachner): Approved for SPHL Dean
10. Tue, 14 Oct 2025 13:37:10 GMT
    Michael Colson (mcolson): Rollback to SPHL Dean for Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager
11. Wed, 15 Oct 2025 21:14:30 GMT
    Jennifer Bachner (jbachner): Approved for SPHL Dean
12. Thu, 16 Oct 2025 17:35:09 GMT
    Michael Colson (mcolson): Approved for Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager
13. Fri, 31 Oct 2025 18:50:10 GMT
    Jason Farman (jfarman): Approved for Graduate School Curriculum Manager
14. Fri, 31 Oct 2025 18:52:32 GMT
    Jason Farman (jfarman): Approved for Graduate PCC Chair
15. Fri, 31 Oct 2025 19:10:28 GMT
    Stephen Roth (sroth1): Approved for Dean of the Graduate School

16. Sat, 08 Nov 2025 13:31:45 GMT
     Meredith Gore (gorem): Approved for Senate PCC Chair

New Program Proposal

Date Submitted: Fri, 12 Sep 2025 19:03:02 GMT

Viewing: 1031 : Master of Public Health in Health Literacy and Public Health Communication
Last edit: Thu, 16 Oct 2025 17:06:39 GMT

Changes proposed by: Katherine Sharp (ksharp1)

Program Name

Master of Public Health in Health Literacy and Public Health Communication

Program Status

Proposed

Effective Term

Spring 2026

Catalog Year

2025-2026

Program Level

Graduate Program

Program Type

Master's

Delivery Method

On Campus

Departments

Department
Behavioral & Community Health

Colleges

College
School of Public Health

Degree(s) Awarded

Degree Awarded
Master of Public Health

Proposal Contact

Katherine Sharp

Proposal Summary

To establish a new MPH degree with a focus on health literacy and public health communication

(PCC Log Number 25041)

Program and Catalog Information

Provide the catalog description of the proposed program. As part of the description, please indicate any areas of concentration or specializations that will be offered.

The Master in Public Health (MPH) degree in Health Literacy and Public Health Communication trains students in the theory, methods, and application of health literacy and health communication for public health information, messages, materials, and campaigns. Designed for public health practitioners, the degree integrates academic study with hands-on training through an internship and a capstone project.

Graduates are equipped with the knowledge and skills to be effective designers and communicators of audience-focused, clear, useful, and culturally relevant health information distributed in a range of formats and channels. The degree includes public health informatics, which involves the use of technology to improve public health. The MPH degree in Health Literacy and Public Health Communication in the Department of Behavioral and Community Health is designed as a practice-oriented degree to prepare social and behavioral science professionals to create, select, share, and promote health information that supports personal and organizational health literacy and informed decisions about health.

The 45 credit degree requires: 14 credits of foundational SPHL courses; 15 credits of HLTH courses; a 4-credit Practical Experience (Internship, HLTH 778), a 3-credit Capstone Project (HLTH 784 & HLTH 786) and three 3-credit electives.

Catalog Program Requirements. Please click on the help bubble for more specific information about formatting requirements.

Course	Title	Credits
SPHL601	Core Concepts in Public Health	1
SPHL602	Foundations of Epidemiology and Biostatistics	4
SPHL603	Public Health Data Laboratory	1
SPHL610	Program and Policy Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation	5
SPHL611	Public Health Ethics	1
SPHL620	Leadership, Teams, and Coalitions: Policy to Advocacy	2
HLTH671	Public Health Communication	3
HLTH672	Public Health Informatics	3
HLTH674	Health Literacy	3
HLTH665	Health Behavior I: Theoretical Foundations of Health Behavior	3
HLTH710	Methods and Techniques of Research	3
HLTH778	Practical Experience in Public Health	4
HLTH784	Guided Capstone Preparation Seminar	1
HLTH786	Capstone Project in Public Health	2
Electives		9
Total Credits		**45**

Sample plan. Provide a term by term sample plan that shows how a hypothetical student would progress through the program to completion. It should be clear the length of time it will take for a typical student to graduate. For undergraduate programs, this should be the four-year plan.

The 45 credit degree requires: 14 credits of foundational SPHL courses; 15 credits of HLTH courses; a 4-credit Practical Experience (Internship, HLTH 778), a 3-credit Capstone Project (HLTH 784 & HLTH 786) and three 3-credit electives.

Fall Year 1: SPHL 601, SPHL 602, SPHL 603, HLTH 674, One 3-credit elective (12 credits)

Spring Year 1: SPHL 610, SPHL 611, HLTH 665, HLTH 672 (12 credits)

Fall Year 2: SPHL 620, HLTH 671, HLTH 710, HLTH 784 (9 credits)

Spring Year: HLTH 786, HLTH 778, Two 3-credit electives (12 credits)

List the intended student learning outcomes. In an attachment, provide the plan for assessing these outcomes.

Learning Outcomes
Select and apply health literacy and health communication strategies to design public health communication practice or research activities that improve health.
Plan implementation and evaluation activities that apply health literacy and health communication strategies.
Select, apply, and critique health behavior and health communication theories to analyze public health problems and inform health promotion activities.
Translate empirical findings to inform community health promotion and practice.
Use a critical lens to analyze and address the systemic inequities that impact the health of socially and structurally marginalized groups.

New Program Information

Mission and Purpose

Describe the program and explain how it fits the institutional mission statement and planning priorities.

The proposed MPH in Health Literacy and Public Health Communication will train students in the theory, methods, and application of health literacy and health communication for public health information, messages, materials, and campaigns. Designed for public health practitioners, the degree will integrate academic study with hands-on training through an internship and a capstone project. The program will prepare social and behavioral

science professionals to create, select, share, and promote health information that supports personal and organizational health literacy and informed decisions about health.

Graduates will be equipped with the knowledge and skills to be effective designers and communicators of audience-focused, clear, useful, and culturally relevant health information distributed in a range of formats and channels. The degree will include public health informatics, which involves the use of technology to improve public health.

The proposed new MPH program will be offered in-person and online and support UMD's mission to achieve "excellence in teaching, research, and public service within a supportive, respectful and inclusive environment."

Program Characteristics

What are the educational objectives of the program?

(1) Enhancing students' ability to create, select, share, and promote health information that supports personal and organizational health literacy and informed health decision making

(2) Equipping students with the knowledge, theoretical foundation, and skills to be effective designers and communicators of audience-focused, clear, useful, and culturally relevant health information and programs

(3) Improve students ability to harness technology to improve public health and implement public health interventions

Describe any selective admissions policy or special criteria for students interested in this program.

Admission is for the fall semester only. Applicants must meet the following minimum admission criteria as established by the Graduate School:
- four-year baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited U.S. institution, or an equivalent degree from a non-U.S. institution.
- 3.0 GPA (on a 4.0 scale) in all prior undergraduate and graduate coursework.
- official copy of a transcript for all of their post-secondary work.
- International applicants are eligible to apply and must follow the UMD Graduate School International Admissions instructions. Since this program is 100% online, the University would not issue an I-20 or DC-2019.

In addition, all School of Public Health applicants must submit an application through the SOPHAS (Schools of Public Health Application Service) portal (www.sophas.org). Include the following information with the completed SOPHAS application:
- Official transcripts for all post-secondary work
- Three letters of recommendations
- Statement of Purpose and Objectives
- CV/Resume

Summarize the factors that were considered in developing the proposed curriculum (such as recommendations of advisory or other groups, articulated workforce needs, standards set by disciplinary associations or specialized-accrediting groups, etc.).

In Spring 2025 during our masters program curriculum review, we held a series of focus groups with current students, alumni, and employers of alumni. From our current students and alumni, we repeatedly heard that courses such as Health Literacy and Health Communication were the most useful and directly related to their jobs. Employers cited communication skills and data presentation/visualization skills as being very important in today's workplace.

In addition to our department data collection, the School of Public Health's Office of Strategic Initiatives conducts regular surveys with internship preceptors and found there is a need to build a workforce to address the continued decline in health literacy among the US population and challenges with addressing misinformation and disinformation as it relates to health. A trained public health workforce will be critical to stem the decline and ensure consumers of health information have the necessary skills.

Moreover, the 2024 results of the Public Health Workforce Interest and Needs Survey (PH WINS) of health department employees revealed that when asked about skill-building interests, the top responses were "Communicate in a way that different audiences understand" and "Communicate in a way that persuades others to act."

Finally, the Job Task Analysis from the National Board of Public Health Examiners asks survey respondents to rate each job task based on how important it is to their job and how often they perform that task. In the most recent survey in 2023, 69.5% of respondents rated "Incorporate culturally appropriate approaches into communications" as either "substantially important" (27.17%) or "critically important" (42.37%) to their work. Overall, communication was the second most important domain of tasks, after data and informatics. (Informatics is another key component of this new proposed degree.) Skills under the communication umbrella deemed very important were: Communicate in a responsive, responsible, and professional manner; Identify communication needs and gaps; Assess health literacy of populations served and apply health literacy concepts; Develop and implement communication plans; Incorporate culturally appropriate approaches into communications; Use risk communication models/ principles to address public health issues, emergencies, crises, and disasters; Identify and utilize social, digital, and traditional media in public health communication; Assess communications for effectiveness; Apply ethical principles and analysis in developing communication plans and promotional initiatives.

This new degree is designed to teach these specific skills.

Select the academic calendar type for this program (calendar types with dates can be found on the Academic Calendar). Please click on the help bubble for more specific information.

Traditional Semester

For Master's degree programs, describe the thesis requirement and/or the non-thesis requirement.

A 3 credit health literacy or health communication capstone project is the non-thesis culminating experience for this proposed program. Students enroll in HLTH 784 (1 credit capstone proposal development seminar) the semester before they intend to graduate and in HLTH 786 (2 credits of independent study, where they execute the project and create a project deliverable) the semester they intend to graduate. Students work with a community partner as they apply the knowledge and skills learned in the MPH program to a specific public health issue or problem. The capstone project demonstrates the student's understanding of health literacy and communication theory, principles, and processes, as well as their ability to actively apply this knowledge and demonstrate the acquisition of the necessary skills and competencies of behavioral and community health professionals.

Identify specific actions and strategies that will be utilized to recruit and retain a diverse student body.

(1) DGS Virtual Info sessions - Once a month from October-May
(2) DGS Virtual Office hours - Three appointments every three weeks from October-May
(3) SPH Virtual Open House - Three day event held mid October
(4) BCH In-person MPH Accepted Applicants Day - Early April
(5) DGS to send individual emails in late September and again in mid January to UMD UG directors in COMM, JOUR, PLCY, NUTR, PSYC, SOCY, ANTH, WGSS, BIOL, etc. The email will ask the UG directors to help promote our MPH program to their majors and invite their students to our SPH Open House, DGS Information Sessions and Office Hours.
(6) Department and SPH social media postings of alumni, current students, faculty and project/center profiles, DGS Information Sessions, SPH Open House and other department happenings, etc.
(7) The UMD Center for Health Literacy will promote the program through their newsletter, website, presentations, meetings, and via flyers.

Relationship to Other Units or Institutions

If a required or recommended course is o#ered by another department, discuss how the additional students will not unduly burden that department's faculty and resources. Discuss any other potential impacts on another department, such as academic content that may significantly overlap with existing programs. Use space below for any comments. Otherwise, attach supporting correspondence.

The School of Public Health's Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs, Dr. Jennifer Bachner, has been informed that (1) we are submitting this proposal, and (2) we will need additional seats in the SPHL core courses to accommodate any increase in MPH enrollment due to a new degree program. As the program is not expected to be large (5-10 students per year), it is not anticipated to have any major impact on SPHL courses.

There are no other required courses from other departments. The program requires two electives that can be taken in BCH or other departments, depending on space and availability. We will collaborate with the Graduate Directors in other departments to continually update elective options that meet program requirements, taking into account space and availability. We will plan to track student elective enrollment to determine its impact on other units and work to ensure that no burden is placed on other departments.

Accreditation and Licensure. Will the program need to be accredited? If so, indicate the accrediting agency. Also, indicate if students will expect to be licensed or certified in order to engage in or be successful in the program's target occupation.

Yes, the program requires accreditation by the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH). Student learning outcomes will be evaluated with specific assessments mapped to specific courses as mandated by the CEPH accreditation requirements.

Students will not expect to be licensed or certified in order to engage in or be successful in most of the program's target occupations.

Describe any cooperative arrangements with other institutions or organizations that will be important for the success of this program.

NA

Faculty and Organization

Who will provide academic direction and oversight for the program? In an attachment, please indicate the faculty involved in the program. Include their titles, credentials, and courses they may teach for the program. Please click on the help bubble for a template to use for adding faculty information.

The Director of Graduate Studies will provide oversight for the in-person program. The Director of Online Master of Public Health Programs will oversee the online program. See attached for faculty list.

Indicate who will provide the administrative coordination for the program

The School of Public Health's Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs, Dr. Jennifer Bachner
The School of Public Health's Director of Graduate Student Services, Dr. Brit Saksvig
The Department of Behavioral and Community Health's Director of Graduate Studies, Dr. Katherine Sharp
The Department of Behavioral and Community Health's Director of Online Master of Public Health Programs, Dr. Jennifer Hodgson

Resource Needs and Sources

Each new program is required to have a library assessment prepared by the University Libraries in order to determine any new library resources that may be required. This assessment must be done by the University Libraries. Add as an attachment.

See attached library assessment.

Discuss the adequacy of physical facilities, infrastructure and instructional equipment.

This proposed program will not have any impact on existing facilities and equipment. We have adequate classroom and seminar space with acceptable technology and furniture.

Discuss the instructional resources (faculty, staff, and teaching assistants) that will be needed to cover new courses or needed additional sections of existing courses to be taught. Indicate the source of resources for covering these costs.

No additional sections are required, but more seats in SPHL primary (0101) sections and HLTH primary (0101 sections). As the anticipated impact is small (e.g., 4 students per year), there is no additional cost as all required courses can accommodate up to 15 new students per year with no additional teaching or facility resources.

Discuss the administrative and advising resources that will be needed for the program. Indicate the source of resources for covering these costs.

The dedicated departmental MPH advisor will advise each student on course sequence and elective options until they reach their capstone project. Once they move into their capstone phase (1st semester of 2nd year for full time students), each student will be assigned a capstone advisor aligned with their interests.

Use the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) commission financial tables to describe the program's financial plan for the next five years. See help bubble for financial table template. Use space below for any additional comments on program funding. Please click on the help bubble for financial table templates.

As this new degree is an alternative configuration of existing required and elective classes, there is no concern about the program's viability. The new degree is an effort to respond to student interest in health literacy and health communication, increase visibility of course offerings with more students, and connect students who may not know that health literacy and health communication are viable paths for their interests/career trajectories. The new degree efficiently uses resources to increase enrollment in existing courses that have room to expand. For example, our health literacy elective typically has 6-9 students per session (one fall and one summer session), when each session could accommodate double the students. By creating a new degree, the department anticipates that more students will gain essential knowledge in health literacy and health communication.

See attached financial tables.

Implications for the State (Additional Information Required by MHEC and the Board of Regents)

Explain how there is a compelling regional or statewide need for the program. Argument for need may be based on the need for the advancement of knowledge and/or societal needs, including the need for "expanding educational opportunities and choices for minority and educationally disadvantaged students at institutions of higher education." Also, explain how need is consistent with the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education. Please click on the help bubble for more specific information.

The proposed program aligns with Maryland's goals to educate and serve a diverse population and enhance lifelong learning. As noted in the section on factors that informed this proposal, practicing health professionals recognize that solid communication skills are necessary to perform their jobs and meet the public's needs for information and services. The surveys and task analysis cited above indicate that training students to communicate both clearly and in linguistically and culturally relevant ways will enhance the public's health. Individual, family, and community health and wellness are lifelong, ongoing topics that students need to be prepared to manage, even if they are not employed in a position that is specifically designed as a health information or health communication job. Public health and clinical health professionals must be trained so they are prepared to communicate clearly with patients, families, caregivers, other health professionals, media, politicians and policymakers, and other stakeholders. The global COVID-19 pandemic illustrated the undesirable effects for individual and community health when professionals and experts did not clearly explain recommended protective actions.

The legislatively mandated Maryland Commission on Public Health (2023-2025) identified communication and community engagement as a priority area for Maryland's public health infrastructure. During the infrastructure assessment phase, surveys and interviews with local public health professionals identified having trained communicators and outreach specialists as critical for Maryland's public health workforce.

Present data and analysis projecting market demand and the availability of openings in a job market to be served by the new program. Possible sources of information include industry or disciplinary studies on job market, the USBLS Occupational Outlook Handbook, or Maryland state Occupational and Industry Projections over the next five years. Also, provide information on the existing supply of graduates in similar programs in the state (use MHEC's Office of Research and Policy Analysis webpage for Annual Reports on Enrollment by Program) and discuss how future demand for graduates will exceed the existing supply. As part of this analysis, indicate the anticipated number of students your program will graduate per year at steady state.) Please click on the help bubble for specific resources for finding this information.

The most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) projections for Health Educators (https://www.bls.gov/ooh/community-and-social-service/health-educators.htm) and Community Health Workers (https://www.bls.gov/ooh/community-and-social-service/community-health-workers.htm), the two

most relevant public health categories, were both found to have "faster than average" growth, suggesting the field is growing, creating jobs for new graduates.

Maryland Occupational Projections for 2023-2033 indicate Health Specialists, as top 10 growing occupations with education value, with a 25% increase and 10,206 new jobs.
The most recent reporting from Lightcast for Community Health Workers shows that employment is projected to grow 13% by 2035. In demand and growing skills include: Community outreach (+25%) and health education (+13%).

The most recent reporting from Lightcast for Health Education Specialists reveals that regional employment is projected to grow 15% by 2035 and that regional compensation ($79,765) is 27% higher than the national compensation ($62,854) in 2024 for Public Health Educators.

Identify similar programs in the state. Discuss any di#erences between the proposed program and existing programs. Explain how your program will not result in an unreasonable duplication of an existing program (you can base this argument on program di#erences or market demand for graduates). The MHEC website can be used to find academic programs operating in the state. Please click on the help bubble for specific information on finding similar programs within the state.

The only somewhat similar program is Johns Hopkins University's MSPH in Health Education and Health Communication. This program offers a single online health literacy course as part of a heavy research focused degree. In contrast, the UMD program provides both in-person and online health literacy courses as part of preparation for engaging in applied work in health literacy and health communication through internships and projects with the nationally recognized UMD Center for Health Literacy and its many partner organizations. The UMD program will have an applied practice focus as the MPH is a terminal practitioner degree while the MSPH is a research degree, often a stepping stone to a PhD.

Discuss the possible impact on Historically Black Institutions (HBIs) in the state. Will the program affect any existing programs at Maryland HBIs? Will the program impact the uniqueness or identity of a Maryland HBI?

The proposed program should not have any possible impact on HBIs in the state as none offer an MPH with a focus on health literacy and public health communication.

Supporting Documents

Attachments

HL_HC Faculty List Template.pdf
HL_HC Proposal LO Assessment.pdf
HL_HC Library Assessment.pdf
HL_HC Financial Tables.pdf
Appendix 4B BCH Financial Table Templates.pdf

Reviewer Comments

Jennifer Bachner (jbachner) (Thu, 11 Sep 2025 21:11:06 GMT): Rollback: Comments detailed in email

Michael Colson (mcolson) (Tue, 14 Oct 2025 13:37:10 GMT): Rollback: Returning at request of college to make updates.

Key: 1031

Faculty Information for MPH in Health Literacy and Health Communication Proposal

The following faculty members are projected to teach in the program. All faculty are full-time unless otherwise indicated.

Name	Dept	Highest Degree Earned, Program, and Institution	UMD Title (indicate if part-time)	Courses
Danielle Catona	SPHL	PhD, Health Communication, Rutgers University	Lecturer	SPHL 601, 610, 611, 620
Jamie Trevitt	EPIB	PhD, Public Health, Johns Hopkins University	Assistant Clinical Professor	SPHL 602, 603
Hector Alcala	HLTH	PhD, Public Health, UCLA	Assistant Professor	HLTH 665
Elaine Doherty	HLTH	PhD, Criminology & Criminal Justice, UMD	Research Professor	HLTH 710
Devlon Jackson	HLTH	PhD, Communication & Culture, Howard University	Assistant Research Professor	HLTH 671, 676 (elective)
Sandy Saperstein	HLTH	PhD, Public & Community Health, UMD	Senior Lecturer	HLTH 672
Cynthia Baur	HLTH	PhD, Communication, UCSD	Professor, Endowed Chair & Director, Horowitz Center for Health Literacy	HLTH 674
Evelyn King-Marshall	HLTH	PhD, Public Health, University of Florida	Assistant Clinical Professor	HLTH 778, 784, 786, SPHL 611

Competency	Course/Experience	Course/Experience	Course/Experience	Course/Experience	Course/Experience	Course/Experience	Course/Experience	Course/Experience
1. Select and apply health literacy and health communication strategies to design public health communication practice or research activities that improve health.	HLTH 674: Health Material Creation Assignment; In-Class Discussions	HLTH 671: Culture-Centered Health Communication Challenge-Solution Project	HLTH 672: Journal Article Analyses/Reviews; Health Communication Material Creation Assignment	HLTH 784/786: Capstone Proposal and Project	HLTH 778: Applied Practice Experience			
2. Plan implementation and evaluation activities that apply health literacy and health communication strategies.	HLTH 674: Health Material Creation Assignment; In-Class Discussions	HLTH 671: Culture-Centered Health Communication Challenge-Solution Project	HLTH 672: Journal Article Analyses/Reviews; Health Communication Material Creation Assignment	HLTH 784/786: Capstone Proposal and Project	HLTH 778: Applied Practice Experience			
3. Select, apply, and critique health behavior and health communication theories to analyze public health problems and inform health promotion activities.	HLTH 665: Theoretical Application Paper	HLTH 665: Self Health Behavior Change Assignment; Midterm Exam	SPHL 610: Group Case Study	HLTH 672: Final Project (app creation)	HLTH 674: Brief Written Papers & Final Exam	HLTH 671: Culture-Centered Health Communication Challenge-Solution Project	HLTH 784/786: Capstone Proposal and Project	HLTH 778: Applied Practice Experience
4. Translate empirical findings to inform community health promotion and practice	HLTH 672: Final Project (app creation; usability testing)	SPHL 610: Community Needs Assignment; Qualitative Data Analysis Assignment; Group Case Study	HLTH 674: Brief Written Papers; Final Examination and/or Project	HLTH 671: Culture-Centered Health Communication Challenge-Solution Project	HLTH 710: Research Paper	HLTH 784/786: Capstone Proposal and Project	HLTH 778: Applied Practice Experience	
5. Use a critical lens to analyze and address the systemic inequities that impact the health of socially and structurally marginalized groups.	HLTH 674: In-Class Discussions/Reactions of Readings/Podcasts	HLTH 671: In-Class Discussions of Article & Text Readings	HLTH 672: Accessible Materials Creation Assignment; In-Class Discussions; Follow-Up Homework Assignments	HLTH 665: Midterm Exam & Theoretical Application Paper	SPHL 610: Community Health Assessment Assignment; Group Case Study	HLTH 784/786: Capstone Proposal and Project	HLTH 778 (4 credit): Applied Practice Experience	

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES

DATE: July 21, 2025

TO: *Katherine Sharp*, PhD, MPH
Clinical Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Behavioral & Community Health, School of Public Health, University of Maryland (UMD)

FROM: *Nedelina Tchangalova*, Public Health & Hearing and Speech Sciences Librarian, UMD Libraries

CC: *Daniel Mack*, Associate Dean of Collections, UMD Libraries
Maggie Saponaro, Director, Collection Development Strategies, UMD Libraries
Kapil Vasudev, Collection Development Strategies Librarian, UMD Libraries

RE: Library Resources in Support of the New Master's Program in Public Health in Health Literacy and Health Communication

We are providing this assessment in response to a proposal by the Department of Behavioral & Community Health in the School of Public Health at the University of Maryland, College Park, to create a new graduate program in health literacy and health communication. The Department requested that the University of Maryland Libraries evaluate their collection resources to determine how well they support the curriculum of the proposed program.

The University of Maryland (UMD) Libraries' mission is to "steward and provide access to diverse collections and preserve the knowledge and history of the university," as well as to "offer inclusive services and innovative technologies for learning, study, and collaboration." Currently, they support undergraduate and graduate students across a variety of face-to-face, online, and distance learning programs, as well as faculty engaged in collaborative work with internal and external partners. The UMD Libraries' collections will adequately support the instruction and research needs of the newly proposed Master's Program in Public Health with a focus on Health Literacy and Health Communication.

As a school with strong ties with other departments/schools on and off campus, the UMD School of Public Health is confident that library resources are readily available and accessible. Ease of access and flexible availability of library materials are paramount, and researchers and students expect this flexibility to be coupled with high academic quality and integrity. The current purchasing practices and available collections at the UMD Libraries will ensure that these two goals can be met, both now and for the life of the school.

In addition, the UMD Libraries have developed partnerships and collaborations with state, regional, and national institutions and consortia to enhance access to library collections and provide necessary materials for teaching and research. Membership in the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA)[1] allows patrons to obtain print materials from other participating libraries through interlibrary loan services. For digital content, UMD Libraries offer access through its collaborations with BTAA, HathiTrust,[2] and the University System of Maryland and

---

[1] Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) - https://www.btaa.org/library/libraries
[2] HathiTrust - http://www.hathitrust.org/

Affiliated Institutions (USMAI).[3] Thus, the broader medical and public health journals not held by UMD Libraries are available through these memberships. Moreover, the University of Maryland Libraries' existing collections—particularly in public health, health literacy, and health communication—of monographs, journals, and databases will continue to support the research and teaching needs of the School of Public Health.

Public Health Science Library Collections at UMD

McKeldin Library supports undergraduate and graduate students in SPH and houses most of the monographs and serials on public health in general and health literacy and health communication in particular. A significant portion of these collections is electronically accessible, both on and off campus, and therefore is not location-dependent.

1. **Monographs**

The Libraries' current collection of books related to health literacy and health communication is sufficient to meet the needs of the school. The Libraries regularly acquire scholarly monographs in health literacy, health communication, and related subject disciplines. Monographs not already part of the collection can usually be added upon request.

A search of the UMD Libraries' UMD Discover catalog was conducted using a variety of relevant subject terms. This search produced substantial lists of owned books—for example, "health literacy" returned over 430 titles, and "health communication" yielded 188 titles. An additional search through the Libraries' BTAA (Big Ten Academic Alliance) membership significantly expanded these results, with over 13,500 titles for "health literacy" and 8,900 for "health communication." As with the Libraries' own holdings, students may request scanned copies of chapters from BTAA books when electronic versions are unavailable.

At this time, the UMD Libraries provide access to several multidisciplinary eBook collections relevant to health literacy and health communication—both locally and globally—including *Credo Reference*, the *EBSCO eBook collection*, the *Gale Virtual Reference Library*, *ProQuest eBook Central*, *Springer eBooks*, *World Scientific eBooks*, and more.

2. **Serial Publications**

The UMD Libraries currently subscribe to a substantial number of scholarly journals—most of which are available online—that directly support research and teaching in health literacy and health communication.

The Libraries provide access to many of the top-ranked journals indexed in the *Journal Citation Reports* (JCR),[4] particularly within public health–related subject categories found in the following editions:

- Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE), including:

  - *Communication*
  - *Public, Environmental & Occupational Health*
  - *Health Care Sciences & Services*

[3] University System of Maryland and Affiliated Institutions (USMAI) - https://usmai.org/
[4] *Journal Citation Reports* is a tool for evaluating scholarly journals. It computes these evaluations from the relative number of citations compiled in the *Science Citation Index* and *Social Sciences Citation Index* database tools.

- Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI), which includes newer and interdisciplinary journals relevant to evolving areas of health communication and health literacy that may not yet be ranked but are considered academically significant and peer-reviewed.

While some facets of health literacy and health communication do not fit neatly into a single JCR category, the UMD Libraries provide extensive access to highly regarded journals spanning multiple disciplines. These include cross-cutting categories such as:

- *Behavioral Sciences*
- *Environmental Sciences*
- *Family Studies*
- *Infectious Diseases*

In addition, the Libraries offer access to the majority of the top ten-ranked journals across all science and engineering disciplines, further reinforcing their capacity to support interdisciplinary graduate research in the proposed program.

Relevant health literacy and health communication-related titles, available online, include leading peer-reviewed journals that are widely cited and recognized in the fields of public health, communication, and health services. Examples are shown in the table below:

Journal Title (in alphabetical order)	ISSN	JCR Category (Rank by Journal Impact Factor)
BMC Public Health	1471-2458	Public, Environmental & Occupational Health (73/419)
Health Communication	1041-0236 (Print); 1532-7027 (Online)	Communication (36/227); Health Policy & Services (35/124)
Health Education & Behavior	1090-1981 (Print); 1552-6127 (Online)	Public, Environmental & Occupational Health (200/419)
Health Literacy Research and Practice	2474-8307 (Online)	Not yet ranked in JCR, but peer-reviewed and highly focused on health literacy
Health Promotion International	0957-4824 (Print); 1460-2245 (Online)	Public, Environmental & Occupational Health (157/419); Health Policy & Services (59/124)
Journal of Communication in Healthcare	1753-8068 (Print); 1753-8076 (Online)	Communication (86/227); Health Policy & Services (86/124)
Journal of Health Communication	1081-0730 (Print); 1087-0415 (Online)	Communication (55/229); Information Science & Library Science (31/166)
Journal of Medical Internet Research	1438-8871	Medical Informatics (9/48); Health Care Sciences & Services (12/185)
Patient Education and Counseling	0738-3991	Public, Environmental & Occupational Health (68/419); Social Sciences, Interdisciplinary (52/271)

Articles in journals not held by the UMD Libraries are likely to be available through Interlibrary Loan[5] and Document Delivery services[6] (see p. 4 below).

3. Databases

The Libraries' *Database Finder*[7] offers online access to databases that provide indexing and access to scholarly journal articles and other information sources. Many of these databases cover subject areas that would be relevant to this proposed program, including the following:

---

[5] Interlibrary Loan - https://www.lib.umd.edu/find/ill
[6] Document Delivery Service - https://www.lib.umd.edu/find/request/deptdelivery
[7] Database Finder - https://lib.guides.umd.edu/az.php

- *Academic Search Ultimate* (EBSCOhost)
- *CINAHL* (EBSCOhost)
- *PsycINFO* (EBSCOhost)
- *Public Health* (ProQuest)

- *PubMed* (National Library of Medicine)
- *ScienceDirect* (Elsevier)
- *Scopus* (Elsevier)
- *Web of Science* (Clarivate)

In many cases—and likely in most—these databases provide full-text access to relevant journal articles. When articles are available only in print, the University of Maryland Libraries can provide copies to students through Interlibrary Loan services (see p. 4 below).

Additional Materials and Resources

In addition to serials, monographs, and databases available through the University Libraries, students in the proposed program will have access to a broad range of media, datasets, software, and technology resources:

- **Media in various formats**—suitable for both on-site use and integration into ELMS course materials—are available at McKeldin Library, as well as through several electronic video collections (e.g., *Counseling and Therapy in Video, Kanopy, Sage Video*, and others accessible via the Database Finder).

- **Geographic Information Systems (GIS)** Datasets are available through the GIS and Data Service Center.[8]

- **Statistical consulting** and additional research support (e.g., conducting **systematic review**, using **citation tools**) are available through the Research and Learning Services.[9]

- **Technology support and services** are available through the TLC Tech Desk.[10]

The subject specialist librarian for the discipline, **Nedelina Tchangalova**, nedelina@umd.edu, also serves as an important resource for programs such as the one proposed. Through departmental partnerships, subject specialists actively develop innovative services and materials that support the University's evolving academic programs and changing research interests. Subject specialists offer one-on-one research assistance online, in person, or by phone. They also provide information literacy instruction and can answer questions regarding publishing, copyright, and preserving digital works.

Other Research Collections

Due to the University's unique physical location near Washington, D.C., Baltimore, and Annapolis, University of Maryland students and faculty have access to some of the country's finest libraries, archives, and research centers, which are vital for researchers in behavioral health, health literacy, and health communication. These include major national institutions such as the Library of Congress, the National Archives, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library, among others.

---

[8] GIS and Data Service Center - https://www.lib.umd.edu/research/services/gis
[9] Research and Learning Services - https://www.lib.umd.edu/research
[10] TLC Tech Desk - https://www.lib.umd.edu/visit/libraries/mckeldin/techdesk

Interlibrary Loan Services

Through the UMD Libraries' membership in BTAA, faculty and students have access to the **UBorrow**[11] program, which enables expedited borrowing from the collections of other BTAA member institutions.

In addition, when materials are not available within the holdings of the USMAI libraries—a consortium of 17 academic libraries—resources can be requested through the **Interlibrary Loan** service at no cost to students or faculty. Most recent journal articles can be delivered electronically, providing convenient and timely access to needed materials

The Libraries also offer an **article/chapter request service** that scans and delivers journal articles or book chapters within three business days, as long as the requested items are available in print or microform on the University of Maryland Libraries' shelves. If not available locally, the request is automatically routed to the Interlibrary Loan service, which will obtain the material from another library—again, at no charge to the requester.

Conclusion

With extensive journal holdings, index databases, and a range of support services and research tools, the University of Maryland Libraries are well equipped to support teaching and learning in health literacy and health communication. These resources are further strengthened by a robust monograph collection.
To ensure access for remote learners, the Libraries offer Scan & Deliver and Interlibrary Loan services, which provide electronic access to materials not otherwise available online. These services are particularly valuable for students enrolled in online or hybrid courses.

Based on this review, it is our assessment that the University of Maryland Libraries are well positioned to meet the curricular and research needs of the proposed Master's Program in Public Health in Health Literacy and Health Communication.

---

[11] Uborrow service - http://www.btaa.org/library/reciprocal-borrowing/uborrow

TABLE 1: RESOURCES

Resources Categories	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
1.Reallocated Funds	$ 100,000 [1]	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
2. Tuition/Fee Revenue (c+g below)	$ 72,683	$ 149,727	$ 173,267	$ 267,384	$ 346,783
a. #FT Students	3	6	6	8	10
b. Annual Tuition/Fee Rate	$ 18,243	$ 18,790	$ 19,354	$ 19,934	$ 20,532
c. Annual FT Revenue (a x b)	$ 54,728	$ 112,739	$ 116,121	$ 159,473	$ 205,322
d. # PT Students	2	4	6	11	14
e. Credit Hour Rate	$ 561.10	$ 577.93	$ 595.27	$ 613.13	$ 631.52
f. Annual Credit Hours	16 [2]	16	16	16	16
g. Total Part Time Revenue (d x e x f)	$ 17,955	$ 36,988	$ 57,146	$ 107,911	$ 141,461
3. Grants, Contracts, & Other External Sources	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
4. Other Sources	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL (Add 1 - 4)	$172,683	$149,727	$173,267	$267,384	$346,783

The university is not anticipating overall enrollment growth as a result of this major (moreso a shift in major selection by matriculating students), so no new tuition revenue is assumed in identifying resources. The tuition revenue should be set to 0 for all state-supported programs. Resources will come from redirection of tuition revenue at the campus level, redirection of instructional resources from the collaborating departments, from enhancement funding, and from other reallocated resources within the university.

Undergraduate	Full time	Part Time		Full time	Part time
(FY2026)	annual	per credit hour	inflation	% in-state	
resident tuition	$ 12,290	$ 437	1.03	0.80	0.90
non-resident tuition	$ 42,053	$ 1,678		0.20	0.10
diff'l addition (BMGT, ENGR, CS)	$1,607	$116			

Graduate	annual	per credit hour
(FY2026)		
resident	$ 19,014	$ 878
non-resident	$ 39,014	$ 1,878

Tuition and Fees can be found at https://billpay.umd.edu/

If the program is using something other than the standard rates, it must be approved by the Finance Committee prior to program delivery. Please contact the Office of Academic Planning and Programs.

Mandatory fees should not be included, because they support specified campus activities that are not part of an academic program.

Specific program fees should be included as a resource to operate the program.

Change 2b and 2e, depending on whether this is a graduate or undergraduate program.

[1] beise:
Resources should match expenditures since we are not asking the state for additional funding, so use the "reallocated" line to match them. Indentify the source, if any, of the reallocated resources.

[2] beise:
For undergraduates, anything over 12 credits per semester is considered full time.

For graduate students, anything over 9 credits per semester is considered full-time.

TABLE 2: EXPENDITURES

Expenditure Categories	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
1. Faculty (b+c below)	$33,250	$34,248	$35,275	$58,133	$59,877
a. #FTE	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4
b. Total Salary	$25,000	$25,750	$26,523	$43,709	$45,020
c. Total Benefits	$8,250	$8,498	$8,752	$14,424	$14,857
2. Admin. Staff (b+c below)	$23,275	$23,973	$24,692	$25,433	$26,196
a. #FTE	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
b. Total Salary	$17,500	$18,025	$18,566	$19,123	$19,696
c. Total Benefits	$5,775	$5,948	$6,127	$6,310	$6,500
3. Total Support Staff (b+c below)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
a. #FTE	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
b. Total Salary	$25,000	$15,450	$15,914	$17,484	$18,008
c. Total Benefits	$8,250	$5,099	$5,251	$5,770	$5,943
4. Graduate Assistants (b+c)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
a. #FTE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
b. Stipend	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
c. Tuition Remission	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
d. Benefits	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
5. Equipment	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
5. Library	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
6. New or Renovated Space	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
7. Other Expenses: Operational Expenses	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000	$1,000
TOTAL (Add 1 - 8)	$58,525	$60,221	$61,967	$85,566	$87,073	revenue made by the year
resources - expenditures	$114,158	$89,506	$111,300	$181,818	$259,710

These budget estimates are resources and expenditures to the University overall, and not to the program or unit. Do not include revenue-sharing agreements between units, between unit and college, or with the university (e.g., for entrepreneurial programs) as an expenditure.

Other expenses might include Space rental (if offsite), advertising/recruitment, course development, travel. Please specify in a footnote.

If new or renovated space is required beyond what is currently allocated to the College, this should be negotiated with the Office of the Provost prior to proposal submission.

Review of the Interim University of Maryland Consulting Policy (II-3.10[E]) (Senate Document #22-23-13 and #25-26-08)

PRESENTED BY	**Gerald Wilkinson, Chair**
REVIEW DATES	**SEC – January 21, 2026	SENATE – February 3, 2026**
VOTING METHOD	**In a single vote**
RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT	**Example: II-3.10(E) – University of Maryland Policy on Consulting**
NECESSARY APPROVALS	**Senate, President**

ISSUE

In October 2022, the University of Maryland established the University of Maryland Policy on Consulting (II-3.10[E]). The Consulting Policy was developed by a working group of subject-matter experts in the Division of Research and key campus stakeholders as well as the Office of General Counsel, with the goal of addressing new federal requirements and state laws. Since the policy was adopted in 2022, the landscape of federal regulations, funding agency requirements, and policies has continued to shift. As a result, the President approved amendments to the Consulting Policy on March 7, 2025. The Research Council was charged with reviewing both versions of the policy.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Research Council unanimously recommends that no further changes be made to the second interim University of Maryland Consulting Policy, and it be finalized as approved. As a result, the Senate Documents for #22-23-13 and #25-26-08 should be closed.

COMMITTEE WORK

The Research Council began reviewing the charge and the Consulting Policy in November 2022. Its review spanned three academic years. In the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 academic years, the Research Council focused on the October 2022 Consulting Policy, and in the 2024-2025 academic year, it focused on the March 2025 Consulting Policy. The Research Council reviewed background information including:

- National Security Presidential Memorandum 33;
- Guidance for Implementing NSPM-33;
- University System of Maryland Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10);
- University of Maryland Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10[A] – II-3.10[C]);
- Maryland General Code, Title 5, Public Ethics Law § 5-525 (2021); and
- Similar policies on consulting at Big Ten and other peer institutions.

The Council gathered feedback on the interim Consulting Policy from a wide range of faculty and staff from a variety of positions and employment classifications in various disciplines. It partnered

with the Division of Research which hosted more than 20 presentations campus-wide to inform the campus community about the new requirements and the interim policy. These presentations were held from 2022 through 2024, and all feedback gathered was summarized and shared with the Research Council. The Council also consulted with the Senate Staff Affairs and Faculty Affairs Committees, as well as the Research Development Council.

The Council met multiple times with representatives of the Division of Research and other administrative units during its review. The Council focused much of its review in 2023-2024 on discussion of the elements and questions in the charge and made many principle decisions about aspects of the policy related to the charge, on issues including but not limited to: how federal disclosure requirements and Maryland State Ethics Law are reflected in the policy; applicability of the policy to part-time employees, non-exempt staff, and graduate students; determining whether an activity is professional service or consulting; and banking of consulting days.

In summer 2024, the Division of Research, the President's Office, and the Office of General Counsel determined that the Consulting Policy needed to be updated on an interim basis again, in order to comply with new guidance from funding agencies on how institutions and researchers need to disclose activities and in order to reflect new processes. The principle decisions made by the Research Council in 2023-2024 were incorporated into the second interim version of the policy, so the Council's work was acknowledged and reflected. The Research Council reviewed the second interim Consulting Policy in Spring 2025 and considered issues including but not limited to: how the policy was affected by the implementation of the new inTERP disclosure system and new federal regulations; the connection between the Consulting Policy and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, and implementation of the new policy.

On May 5, 2025, the Research Council voted unanimously in agreement that the charge elements for the reviews of the Consulting Policy had been met by the Council's work, and that the Council should report to the Senate that no changes are needed and the charge should be closed.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could choose not to accept the recommendation.

RISKS

There are no known risks to the University in accepting the recommendation.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no known financial implications in accepting the recommendation.

Review of the Interim University of Maryland Consulting Policy (II-3.10[E]) (Senate Document #22-23-13 and #25-26-08)

2024-2025 Council Members

Gerald Wilkinson (Chair)
John Bertot (Ex-Officio Provost's Rep)
Eric Chapman (Ex-Officio VP Research Rep)
Blessing Enekwe (Ex-Officio Grad School Rep)
Wendy Montgomery (Ex-Officio Director of ORA)
Kanitta Tonggarwee (Ex-Officio President's Rep)
Douglas Roberts (Ex-Officio UGST Rep)
Typhanye Dyer (Faculty)
Anwar Huq (Faculty)
Bianca Bersani (Faculty)
Thomas Hedberg (Faculty)
Melanie Killen (Faculty)

Polly O'Rourke (Faculty)
Robin Puett (Faculty)
Michael Pack (Faculty)
Rebecca Hunsaker (Staff)
Akanksha Singh (Graduate Student)
Jessica Garbarczyk (Undergraduate Student)

Date of Submission

January 2026

BACKGROUND

In October 2022, the University of Maryland established the University of Maryland Policy on Consulting (II-3.10[E]) in response to federal and state requirements, including the directives in the January 2021 National Security Presidential Memorandum on United States Government-Supported Research and Development National Security Policy, known as NSPM-33, and the NSPM-33 Implementation Guidance issued in January 2022. The Consulting Policy was developed by a working group of subject-matter experts in the Division of Research and key campus stakeholders as well as the Office of General Counsel, with the goal of addressing new federal requirements and state laws. The draft policy was reviewed by the University Senate leadership before it was approved by the President on October 14, 2022. The Research Council was charged with reviewing the interim policy in October 2022 (Appendix 1).

Since the policy was adopted in 2022, the landscape of federal regulations, funding agency requirements, and policies has continued to shift. Individual funding agencies released additional requirements to implement NSPM-33. In addition, the Creating Helpful Incentives to Produce Semiconductors (CHIPS) and Science Act was approved and began to be implemented at the federal level, which required compliance from higher education institutions by 2024. The University also took action and created new processes to implement these requirements to ensure the University is taking all necessary steps to be in compliance. As a result, the President approved amendments to the Consulting Policy on March 7, 2025. The Research Council was again charged with reviewing the interim policy (Appendix 1).

COUNCIL WORK

The Research Council began reviewing the charge and the Consulting Policy in November 2022. Its review spanned three academic years. In the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 academic years, the

Research Council focused on the October 2022 Consulting Policy (Appendix 4), and in the 2024-2025 academic year, it focused on the March 2025 Consulting Policy (Appendix 2 & 3).

2022-2023 Research Council Work

The Research Council began reviewing the charge in November 2022, shortly after the interim policy was approved. The Council began its review by gathering and reviewing background information on the landscape of state and federal laws, regulations, and funding agency requirements surrounding the Consulting Policy. It reviewed and discussed the following:
- National Security Presidential Memorandum 33;
- Guidance for Implementing NSPM-33;
- University System of Maryland Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10);
- University of Maryland Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10[A] – II-3.10[C]);
- Maryland General Code, Title 5, Public Ethics Law § 5-525 (2021); and
- Similar policies on consulting at Big Ten and other peer institutions.

The Research Council also received context on the connection between the Consulting Policy and the University of Maryland Policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment (II-3.10[A]) ("the COI/COC Policy"), which was also recently significantly revised to address NSPM-33 and associated guidance. The COI/COC Policy addresses all forms of outside activities, relationships, and financial interests, and the Consulting Policy addresses specific activities that fall under the definition of Consulting. The two policies are connected, and the Research Council was informed of the efforts by the Division of Research to ensure the policies are in alignment.

The Council met multiple times with representatives of the Division of Research and other administrative units during its review. In 2022-2023, it began its review by meeting with representatives of the Division of Research and of the 2021 Working Group that developed the interim policy, including:
- Denise Clark, Associate Vice President for Research Administration
- Jen Gartner, then-Interim Vice President for Legal Affairs
- Pam Lanford, Director, Animal Research Compliance and Administrator, IACUC
- Mary Santonastasso Hagerty, Consultant, Sponsored Programs Accounting and Compliance Office
- Beth Brittan Powell, Director, then-Conflict of Interest Office
- Reka Montfort, then-Director of Research Transparency & Outreach

The Council began gathering feedback on the interim Consulting Policy from a wide range of campus stakeholders and the campus community. At the same time, the Division of Research was engaging in efforts to inform the campus community about the new requirements and the interim policy, so the Research Council and the Division partnered in these efforts. The Division of Research held more than 20 presentations campus-wide to inform and gather feedback; included in this effort were presentations to the Council of Deans, University Senate, Associate Deans for Research, and the Intercollegiate Research Working Group as well as presentations to College Assemblies, administrative councils, and departmental faculty meetings across campus in order to consult with a wide range of faculty and staff from a variety of positions and employment classifications in various disciplines. These presentations were held from 2022 through 2024, and all feedback gathered was summarized and shared with the Research Council.

2023-2024 Research Council Work

Representatives of the Research Council met with the Senate Staff Affairs and Faculty Affairs Committees, as well as the Research Development Council in Fall 2023 and reported their findings and the feedback gathered to the Council at its meeting in November 2023. The Council continued to meet with key stakeholders and gather feedback throughout the year. The Council focused much of its review in 2023-2024 on discussion of the elements and questions in the charge and made many principle decisions about aspects of the policy related to the charge.

2025 Interim Consulting Policy

In summer 2024, the Division of Research, the President's Office, and the Office of General Counsel determined that the Consulting Policy needed to be updated on an interim basis again, in order to comply with new guidance from funding agencies on how institutions and researchers need to disclose activities and in order to reflect new processes with the University's move to the new Integrated External Relationships Portal (inTERP) system. As Division staff worked to develop the second interim version of the Consulting Policy, they incorporated the principle decisions made by the Research Council into the Policy, so the Council's work was reflected in the second interim policy. The second interim Consulting Policy was shared with the Research Council in early March, 2025.

2024-2025 Research Council Work

In February 2025, the Research Council met with Sarah Hughes, Assistant Director for Research Policy Compliance in the Division of Research. Hughes gave an overview of the federal landscape, the second interim Consulting Policy, the revisions that were made to address state and federal laws, regulations, and funding agency requirements, and the revisions made to address principles decided upon by the 2024-2025 Research Council. The Research Council reviewed the second interim Consulting Policy to understand how the principles were incorporated into the policy and determine whether additional issues still needed to be addressed. On April 7, 2025, the Research Council met with Patrick O'Shea (then-Deputy Vice President for Research and Chair of the COI Committee), Beth Brittan-Powell (Director of the Disclosure Office), and Maura Trimble (Assistant Director of the Disclosure Office) to discuss the new process for reporting and reviewing disclosures in the inTERP system.

On May 5, 2025, the Council reviewed the original charge on the Consulting Policy and continued discussing the second interim policy. After reviewing the elements of the original charge, the Research Council voted unanimously that the elements of the original charge had been met by the second interim Consulting Policy and that the Council should report to the Senate and request that the charge be closed with no further revisions to the Consulting Policy. The Research Council discussed suggestions of steps that could be taken to assist with implementation of the policy, including the development of clear guidance for department chairs and unit heads on how to evaluate consulting activities; the collection of data by the Disclosure Office on the distribution of disclosures across campus and any problem areas that might benefit from training or other mitigation measures; and the development of training for those submitting grant proposals to be aware of the need to disclose prior to submitting a proposal.

Upon receipt of the charge on the second interim Consulting Policy (Senate Document #25-26-08), the Chair of the Research Council and the Division of Research reviewed the charge and determined that all elements had already been met by the Research Council in Spring 2025 and had been addressed by the Council's vote on May 5, 2025, and no further action was needed.

Policy Elements Considered by the Research Council

Federal Disclosure Requirements

Since the Consulting Policy was instituted in October 2022, requirements and policies at federal funding agencies have continued to evolve. While NSPM-33, the underlying directive of federal requirements related to conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment, and foreign influence, was issued in 2021, the implementation of the memorandum is still ongoing. The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy and individual federal agencies have been releasing new requirements, policies, and regulations since 2021. As a recipient of federal funding, the University must be in compliance with all federal laws, regulations, and funding agency requirements in order to maintain current funding for sponsored projects and procure new funding.

In March 2025, the second interim Consulting Policy was approved, and it addressed multiple issues that had recently been changed by the federal government and federal funding agencies. Changes include the following:
- All consulting activities must be disclosed as a part of current & pending (other) support in all proposals for federal funding, at the time of proposal submission;
- Consulting activities must be fully reviewed and dispositioned by the University before any sponsored project funding can be released, and approved before the activity occurs; and
- Full-time employees whose effort is 100% allocated to a federally funded Sponsored Project can only consult if the Sponsored Project allows it, and may not be able to consult at all if their effort is fully assigned.

One of the major changes in the Consulting Policy was the institution of the "disclose to propose" rule. Increasingly, federal funding agencies have changed their policies to require disclosure before a proposal for new funding can be submitted. In order to submit a proposal for federal funding, researchers must disclose all outside professional activities and financial interests, including paid or unpaid consulting, to the University and to the federal funding agency. The Consulting Policy applies this requirement to all researchers seeking federal funding; it states that all activities, including consulting activities, must be disclosed before the activity begins and in all proposals for federal funding at the time of proposal. The policy also notes that all requirements of the COI/COC Policy must also be followed; the COI/COC Policy requires that disclosures be submitted to the University and to the funding agency in order to submit a proposal for a sponsored project.

The Research Council considered these changes and discussed them with representatives of the Division of Research, including the Director and Assistant Director of the Disclosure Office and the Assistant Director for Research Policy Compliance. The Council agreed that the policy revisions comply with federal laws and regulations and funding agency requirements.

UMD inTERP Disclosure System

In October 2024, the Division of Research and the Disclosure Office launched the new inTERP system, which was developed to provide a single site and system of record for disclosure and review of outside professional activities and to better comply with state and federal laws, regulations, and funding agency disclosure requirements. It combined the functionalities of existing systems, including the annual Outside Professional Activities (OPA) reporting system, the Kuali COI Disclosure System (KCOI), and the Office of Faculty Affairs Consulting MOU system to improve the accuracy and accessibility of disclosure processes at the University. The development of this system heavily impacted the processes reflected in the second interim Consulting Policy, as it

changed many of the University's practices and principles related to Consulting and outside activities.

In Spring 2025, the Research Council met with representatives of the Disclosure Office to discuss the implementation of inTERP and its impact on the Consulting Policy and process. The Research Council learned about the development of inTERP and the differences between inTERP and the old KCOI and OPA reporting systems, as well as about the process for reviewing disclosures after they are submitted. Research Council members asked questions about various aspects of the policy and inTERP system, including how to manage consulting situations when on sabbatical or leave without pay; how the Consulting Policy applies to work taken on over the summer months; and what constitutes professional service. The Council also provided suggestions on areas that may need further explanation for faculty and staff as the system is implemented.

Because of the move to inTERP, many changes were made in the second interim Consulting Policy to reflect the new process. Procedural information about submitting a disclosure was revised to reflect new processes. The policy removed all distinctions between research-related and non-research-related Consulting, since all types of activities are now being disclosed and reviewed through inTERP. The Consulting MOU process was revised as well; the 2022 policy outlined a process for entering into an internal Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the individual and providing that information to the external entity. That process is now being managed in inTERP.

Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines

In the development of the second interim Consulting Policy and the May 2025 COI/COC Policy, the Division of Research also developed the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, which were approved in May 2025. The Guidelines were developed and implemented by the Disclosure Office, and are overseen by the COI Committee. They were developed to provide comprehensive instructions to users, explain important nuances of the new disclosure process and consulting requirements, and provide examples and links to more information from the University and federal agencies. In addition, the Guidelines centralize information about implementation procedures; because of this new resource, all procedural elements were removed from the COI/COC and Consulting Policies and moved into the Guidelines so that the policies could focus on high-level principles while the Guidelines served as a more thorough resource with a level of detail that policy language does not provide.

In reviewing the second interim Consulting Policy, the Research Council reviewed the Guidelines to better understand how procedural information that was removed from the Policy was addressed within the Guidelines. The Council agreed that a guidelines document that could be updated more efficiently and could explain key points more clearly is beneficial, and it discussed with the Disclosure Office various points that could be included in the Guidelines to enhance clarity.

Maryland State Ethics Law

As a state institution, the University of Maryland and its employees are bound by Maryland State Ethics Law (Md. Code Ann., General Provisions §§5-101 through 5-1001), which describes requirements and standards of conduct related to conflicts of interest, financial disclosure, and ethics programs of governmental entities. Through its discussions with the Office of General Counsel and the Division of Research, the Research Council learned that the University's Consulting Policy must align with Maryland State Ethics Law, since the potential for conflicts of

interest increases when employees engage in outside professional activities or have financial interests that may conflict with their institutional responsibilities. The State Ethics Commission oversees issues related to conflicts of interest and financial interests for state employees, but the Maryland State Ethics Law has a carve-out for higher education institutions, which allows the University to develop and use its own processes to address these issues instead of referring all matters to the State Ethics Commission. As issues at the federal level have continued to evolve, so have interpretations of State Ethics Law at the state level. The University received updated guidance from the State Ethics Commission, which clarified instances where consulting activities could be addressed by the University through its COI Committee, versus issues that would need permission from the State Ethics Commission.

The Research Council raised concerns about various items in the policy that were related to the interpretation and implementation of Maryland State Ethics Law. The Research Council discussed the distinction between research-related consulting and non-research-related consulting in the first interim policy of 2022. It noted uncertainty about what types of consulting should be reported and assessed under the University's process, rather than those that should be taken to the State Ethics Commission. After receiving updated guidance from the State Ethics Commission, the policy was able to clearly state that all types of consulting should be treated the same and reviewed under the University's processes, which addressed the Council's concerns. For a small minority of cases, an outcome of the review process could be that the item needs to be referred to the State Ethics Commission, but that conclusion would come at the end of the University's review process. The policy was updated to remove the distinction between types of consulting.

The Research Council also discussed how the policy addresses situations that may cause a conflict of commitment for faculty and staff, including instances where faculty and staff engage in secondary employment in their area of expertise or discipline by taking on additional teaching or research positions at other institutions. While the Maryland State Ethics Law has a carve-out for higher education related to research, the provisions related to conflict of commitment still apply to all University employees, and the State of Maryland considers full-time employees to be fully committed to their duties at the University at all times. Employees are prohibited from secondary employment that violates this principle. The Research Council reviewed the policy with this in mind, and determined that its provisions were in alignment with Maryland State Ethics Law.

Applicability of the Policy

The Research Council discussed at length the applicability of the policy. The first interim policy of October 2022 applied to all University employees, but only specifically addressed full-time faculty and staff. It did not allow part-time faculty or staff to engage in consulting, and it clearly stated that adjunct faculty and faculty whose appointment is below 50% FTE were excluded from the Policy. The policy allowed full-time faculty and staff to consult for up to 1 day per week, with a maximum of 52 days for full-time employees on a 12-month appointment and 39 days for those on a 9-month appointment.

The Research Council agreed that the number of days for full-time employees was appropriate. The Council also determined that the policy needed to be extended to allow part-time faculty and staff to consult as well, and it considered different approaches for applying the policy to part-time faculty and staff. It determined that part-time faculty and staff with appointments that total between 50% and 99% FTE should be allowed to engage in consulting, and the number of days should be prorated to their percentage of appointment. It also decided that faculty should only be subject to the policy while being compensated by the University, so faculty on 9-month contracts should be

unlimited in their consulting activities during the summer period if they are not being compensated through grants or other University-paid activities. These decisions were made by the Research Council in spring 2024, and were incorporated into the second interim Consulting Policy in March 2025.

The Council raised serious concerns about including non-exempt staff in the Consulting Policy; prior to 2022, non-exempt staff were not required to submit disclosures under the OPA reporting system, and extending the policy to non-exempt staff would create a new burden of reporting and training for non-exempt staff. The Council noted that non-exempt staff often have secondary employment that would fall into the definition of consulting, but the type of secondary employment they engage in does not pose the same risks for conflicts of commitment. The Council was concerned that the policy might prohibit or restrain some of the legitimate activities of non-exempt staff with very little benefit to the University. After consulting with the Division and the Office of General Counsel, the Research Council decided to exclude non-exempt staff from the policy, thus allowing them to engage in activities that may be defined as consulting under the policy with no limitations. This decision was made by the Research Council in spring 2024, and was incorporated into the second interim Consulting Policy in March 2025.

The Research Council also discussed whether to include graduate students in the Consulting Policy. Guidance from the State Ethics Commission confirmed that graduate students are not subject to Maryland State Ethics Law and do not need to be incorporated into the policy, so the Research Council considered whether they should be included in the policy as a matter of principle. Through its discussions, it learned that since they are not subject to State Ethics Law, graduate students are free to engage in consulting, and since they are not employees, outside activities by graduate students will not constitute a conflict of commitment. However, in instances where graduate students work on sponsored projects or with faculty start-ups, their consulting activities could present a conflict of interest, which would need to be addressed through the University's COI processes. After discussion of potential conflicts of interest that graduate students could have and learning the perspectives of the Dean of the Graduate School related to the COI/COC Policy, the Research Council decided that the ability of graduate students to engage in consulting should not be limited by the policy, and any potential conflicts of interest in outside activities should instead be addressed by the COI/COC Policy. As a result, the second interim Consulting Policy was revised to clearly exclude graduate students.

Professional Service and Consulting

A great deal of the feedback received by the Research Council from presentations and consultations indicated concerns about the distinctions between professional service and consulting and how they relate to institutional responsibilities. Consulting and professional service vary widely across fields, so it was clear to the Research Council that it would be impossible to create one standard that could be applied throughout the University. The Council considered different approaches and ultimately determined that the individual best suited to make the decision on what constitutes professional service would be the Unit Head, who would be able to apply norms and standards relevant to the discipline in their decision-making. In order to prevent biased decision-making by Unit Heads, the Council also agreed that there should be some level of oversight of these decisions as well. The principles agreed to by the Council were incorporated into the second interim Consulting Policy, which indicates that the Unit Head is responsible for making a decision on whether an activity should be considered professional service or consulting, and that the Disclosure Office will advise Unit Heads to enhance consistency with the implementation of the policy.

Banking of Consulting Days

The Consulting Policy allows consulting for up to 1 day per week, with a maximum of 52 days for full-time employees on a 12-month appointment and 39 days for those on a 9-month appointment. Through presentations and consultations, the Research Council learned that the limitation of 1 day per week was a significant concern to many faculty, as there are instances where faculty take multiple days off in a row for consulting activities. The Council considered whether faculty should be allowed to save up their consulting days through banking, in order to allow multi-day consulting activities as needed. The Council raised concerns that banking of consulting days could be detrimental to departments and unit heads, if faculty were to use multiple days in a way that interfered with their instructional obligations or other commitments to the University. However, the Council also heard many examples of instances where banking might be necessary. The Research Council decided to allow banking of consulting days with approval from the unit head, so that there is oversight to ensure that banking does not lead to negative consequences for the unit. The second interim policy incorporated this principle and also indicates that the next-level administrator is generally responsible for ensuring that banking is used equitably.

Implementation of the Consulting Policy

On May 5, 2025, the Research Council voted unanimously in agreement that the charge elements for the reviews of the Consulting Policy had been met by the Council's work, and that the Council should report to the Senate that no changes are needed and the charge should be closed. The Council also discussed suggestions for the Division of Research to consider as it continues to implement the policy. These suggestions included:
- Providing guidance for department chairs and unit heads on disclosures and evaluating consulting activities, including information on the review process and how to ensure an equitable process at the unit level;
- Gathering information as the policy is implemented on the distribution of disclosures across campus and monitoring for problem areas that may benefit from further education and communication efforts; and
- Considering training or other support for faculty who are submitting grant proposals to ensure awareness of the need to disclose activities before submitting a proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

The Research Council unanimously recommends that no further changes be made to the second interim University of Maryland Consulting Policy, and it be finalized as approved. As a result, the Senate Documents for #22-23-13 and #25-26-08 should be closed.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 — Charges from the Senate Executive Committee

Appendix 2 — March 2025 Consulting Policy

Appendix 3 — March 2025 Tracked Changes Consulting Policy

Appendix 4 — October 2022 Consulting Policy

Review of the University of Maryland Policy on Consulting (II-3.10[E])
(Senate Document #22-23-13)
Research Council | Chair: Andrew Harris

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Newman request that the Research Council review the University of Maryland Policy on Consulting (II-3.10[E]), approved by the President on October 14, 2022, on an interim basis pending University Senate review.

The Research Council should:

1. Review the *University of Maryland Policy on Consulting (II-3.10[E])*.

2. Review the *Proposal for Review of the Interim University of Maryland Consulting Policy (II-3.10[E])*.

3. Review the *Presidential Memorandum on United States Government-Supported Research and Development National Security Policy (National Security Presidential Memorandum – 33)* and *Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 (NSPM-33)*.

4. Review *University System of Maryland Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10)*.

5. Review *University of Maryland Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10[A] – II-3.10[C])*.

6. Review the *Maryland General Code, Title 5, Public Ethics Law § 5-525* (2021).

7. Review University System of Maryland member institutions' and Big 10 peer institutions' policies on professional commitment and consulting to identify best practices and principles.

8. Consult with the Vice President for Research or a designated representative.

9. Consult with the Office of Research Administration.

10. Consult with the Office of Faculty Affairs.

11. Consult with representatives of the Working Group that developed the Interim Consulting Policy, which included Division of Research staff, faculty and research staff subject-matter experts, Chair of the Conflict of Interest Committee, Provost Office and Office of General Counsel representatives.

12. Consult with a representative group of faculty and staff, including BIPOC representatives, in a variety of positions and employment classifications who provide Consulting Services and Professional Services in various disciplines and subject-matter expertise.

13. Consult with a representative group of Deans and other affected administrative, research, and teaching units on the impact of the Policy on Consulting on their workload, including assessing the impact based on the size of units.

14. Consult with an Office of General Counsel representative to assess legal implications and exposure for Unit Heads imposed by the Policy on Consulting.

15. Consult with the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee.

16. Consult with the Senate Staff Affairs Committee.

17. Consider whether the Policy on Consulting complies with federal and state regulations and laws and University policies in the least restrictive and bureaucratic means without compromising employees' professional development and benefits to the University.

18. Consider whether the definition of Consulting specifically and the Policy on Consulting generally adequately consider that the nature of consulting relationships differs significantly across fields and provides sufficient flexibility to address those considerations.

19. Consider whether the Policy on Consulting affects the current terms and conditions of employment for faculty and staff and its potential effect on recruiting and retaining faculty and staff.

20. Consider whether the Policy on Consulting affects the University's ability to meet its strategic goals of partnering with outside organizations to advance the common good and taking on humanity's grand challenges.

21. Consider whether the public institutions listed as examples of entities that may receive Professional Services should include approved international organizations of which the United States is a member and approved non-governmental organizations that are chartered to provide service to the state or federal government.

22. Consider whether Banking of Consulting Days should be defined differently to provide more flexibility for clustering consulting days before prior approval from the Unit Head and the next-level administrator is required.

23. Consider whether the paid and unpaid Consulting days limitation of up to one (1) day per calendar week for a maximum number of days based on the length of a faculty member's and staff member's appointment provided in the interim policy is appropriate.

24. Consider whether University employees performing non-research Consulting activities should be precluded from performing activities or holding titles that include Fiduciary Role(s) or Management Role(s), unless otherwise approved under a Conflict of Interest management plan.

25. Consider best practices for reviewing research-related conflicts of interest, including whether there should be a procedure similar to the Conflict of Commitment Review Board approval processes for outside activities unrelated to research endeavors.

26. Consider whether the Policy on Consulting should indicate whether there are restrictions on faculty or staff (full-time or part-time) who have additional career-related jobs.

27. Consider whether the Policy on Consulting should address part-time faculty with multiple appointments that accumulate to more than 50% of full-time, graduate students, and post-doctoral associates.

28. Consider the impact of excluding from the policy adjunct faculty and faculty below 50% of full-time and whether those faculty should have a pro-rated limit on their Consulting time commitment.

29. Consider whether the [interim Policy on Consulting](#) webpage should include additional information and implementation guidance.

30. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on proposed revisions to the University Policy on Consulting.

31. If appropriate, recommend revisions to the University of Maryland Policy on Consulting (II-3.10[E]).

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **May 3, 2024**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact the Senate Office at senate-admin@umd.edu.

Review of the Interim University of Maryland Consulting Policy, II-3.10(E)
(Senate Document #25-26-08)

University Research Council | Chair: Gerald Wilkinson

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Sarah Dammeyer request that the University Research Council review the *Interim Policy Changes to the University of Maryland Consulting Policy, II-3.10(E),* amended and approved on an interim basis by the President, pending University Senate Action, March 7, 2025.

Specifically, the University Research Council should:

1. Review the following:
    a. The proposal entitled, *Review of the Interim University of Maryland Consulting Policy, II-3.10(E)* (Senate Document #25-26-08).
    b. The University of Maryland Policy on Consulting, II-3.10(E).
    c. The proposal and charge documents for the Review of the University of Maryland Policy on Consulting, II-3.10(E) (Senate Document #22-23-13).
    d. The inTERP disclosure system process.
    e. The Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, developed and implemented by the Disclosure Office and overseen by the Conflict of Interest Committee.
    f. Similar consulting policies and procedures at Big 10 and other peer institutions.

2. Consult:
    a. The Vice President for Research or a designated representative.
    b. The Office of Research Administration.
    c. The Office of Faculty Affairs.

3. Consider:
    a. Closing Senate Document #22-23-13.
    b. If the interim policy complies with federal requirements aimed at mitigating technology misappropriation and undue influence in U.S. research enterprises.

4. Consult with a representative from the Office of General Counsel on any proposed changes to the University's policy.

5. If appropriate, recommend whether the policy should be revised, and if so, provide suggested revisions.

We ask that you submit a report to the University Senate Office no later than **April 3, 2026**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact the University Senate Office, senate-admin@umd.edu.

II-3.10(E) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON CONSULTING

(Approved by the President on an interim basis October 14, 2022; Amended and approved by the President on an interim basis, pending University Senate review, March 7, 2025)

I.   **Purpose**

Participation in Consulting can provide an important means for professional development and allows individuals to maintain currency and experience in aspects of their professional fields outside the University of Maryland ("the University"). These activities can also provide a mechanism for the transfer of knowledge from the University to the public arena and contribute to the overall public good. However, the nature of the Consulting process has the potential to create Conflicts of Commitment (COCs) by diverting an employee's efforts from their primary activities and responsibilities to the University, and/or create Conflicts of Interest (COIs) related to those Institutional Responsibilities. As indicated in the University of Maryland Policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment (II-3.10[A]) ("the COI/COC Policy"), University Employees have a primary obligation to their Institutional Responsibilities. University Employees are also State of Maryland employees and as such are obligated to comply with Maryland Public Ethics Law,[1] which limits the Outside Professional Activities they may engage in for personal benefit.

The University of Maryland Policy on Consulting ("this Policy") seeks to establish a balance between Consulting activities and a University Employee's Institutional Responsibilities, thereby safeguarding the interests of all parties. This Policy is designed to ensure compliance with federal and state laws and regulations and University System of Maryland (USM) and University policies and associated requirements, as well as to protect University Employees and the University from potential violations of the same.

Though comprehensive, this Policy cannot address every specific instance of Consulting. The University will implement this Policy with the understanding that Consulting must comply with internal and external requirements and all other applicable USM and University policies.

II.   **Definitions**

A. **"Banking"** means accumulating multiple Consulting Days over time to use at once for a larger consecutive period of time.

---

[1] The Maryland Public Ethics Law, Maryland Code Annotated, General Provisions Article, Title 5. To find this provision online, go to http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/mdcode/.

B. **"Conflict(s) of Commitment (COC)"** means situations where a University Employee's Outside Professional Activities, external Relationships, or Significant Financial Interests interfere or compete with the University's educational, research, or service missions or impede the University Employee's ability to perform or fulfill the full range of their Institutional Responsibilities, as stipulated under Maryland Public Ethics Law. This applies regardless of whether the activity holds value to the University or contributes to the employee's professional development.

C. **"Conflict of Interest (COI)"** means situations in which University Employees or their Family Member(s) are in a position to gain, or appear to gain, financial advantages or personal benefits stemming from their roles within the University. Such benefits can occur due to Outside Professional Activities, external Relationships, or Significant Financial Interests, or as a result of their research, administrative, or educational actions or decisions made while working at the University.

D. **"COI Committee"** means the advisory committee appointed by the President of the University in accordance with the University's COI/COC Policy and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines and based on the authority granted by the Maryland State Ethics Commission (SEC) regarding conflicts associated with research or development.

E. **"Consulting"** means any additional activity beyond a University Employee's Institutional Responsibilities that is professional in nature and based on their discipline or area of expertise. The activity may be paid or unpaid, and such activities primarily benefit the University Employee and not the University.

F. **"Current and Pending (Other) Support"** means information submitted to Funding Agencies in proposals for Sponsored Projects on all the resources made available or expected to be made available to an individual in support of their research and development efforts. This includes but is not limited to resources from both foreign and domestic sources; those given through an award and those given directly to the individual; monetary resources, in-kind resources, and support with no monetary value; and travel support.

G. **"Day"** means a regular "duty day" for University Employees, which is equivalent to a maximum of eight (8) hours on a given work day and is typically understood to be during regular business hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. University Employees cannot interpret the definition of a Day to be any period longer than 8 hours, regardless of the number of hours it may actually take them to complete their Institutional Responsibilities on a given Day.

H. **"Disclosure(s)"** means information that is required to be provided on all Outside Professional Activities, external Relationships, and/or Significant Financial Interests.

I. **"Disposition"** means the final result of the review of a Disclosure. The review may result in a decision that no conflict exists, that the activity must be stopped due to an

unmanageable conflict, or that a Management Plan is necessary to mitigate any possible COIs in accordance with Maryland Public Ethics Law and relevant USM and University policies.

J. **"External Entity(ies)"** means an entity that is external to the University with which University Employees may choose to engage. These may include but are not limited to entities such as domestic governments (U.S. federal, state, or local), foreign entities (governments, institutions, companies), domestic or international institutions or societies (academic, professional, commercial), philanthropic organizations, or companies (sole proprietorships, for-profit companies whether publicly traded or not, non-profits, startups, or any other corporate entity regardless of whether they are registered to do business).

K. **"Family Member(s)"** means a University Employee's spouse or domestic partner, parent, child, sibling, or other close relative as defined in the USM Policy on Employment of Members of the Same Family (Nepotism) (VII-2.10).

L. **"Fiduciary Role(s)"** means a role that requires an individual to make financial decisions on behalf of another individual(s) and/or entity. Titles that include terms such as executive, officer, director, or manager and positions with titles such as CEO, Director, Scientific Officer, or Vice President are examples of designations that may indicate a role with fiduciary responsibilities.

M. "**Funding Agency(ies)**" means any domestic or foreign entity that provides monetary support for a Sponsored Project to a University Employee or to the University on behalf of a University Employee. Funding Agencies may include but are not limited to entities such as the U.S. government and its agencies; U.S. state and local entities; foreign entities including governments and institutions; non-profit organizations; associations; or companies.

N. **"Gift"** means any gratuity, favor, discount, entertainment, hospitality, loan, forbearance, software, license, special access, equipment, equipment time, samples, research data, or other item having monetary value. A Gift also includes services as well as gifts of training, transportation, local or foreign travel, lodging, meals, and research hours, whether provided in-kind, by purchase of a ticket, payment in advance, or reimbursement after the expense has occurred. A Gift by definition is given without expectation of anything in return.

O. **"Graduate Student"** means a registered student who is enrolled in a graduate degree program at the University. For the purposes of this Policy, references to Graduate Students include Graduate Research Assistants (GRAs) and Graduate Fellows.

P. **"Institutional Responsibilities"** means a University Employee's primary duties and responsibilities at the University, as defined in their contract, job duties, offer letter, or other comparable documentation.

Q. **"Management Plan"** means a written plan provided by the University that describes how a conflict or potential conflict will be managed.

R. **"Moonlighting"** means activities for financial profit that occur outside of a University Employee's Institutional Responsibilities and are not directly related to their discipline or area of expertise.

S. **"Next-Level Administrator (NLA)"** means the administrator in the role immediately above a Unit Head. The NLA is typically the Dean of a College or School, or the Vice President of a Division or their designee. For non-departmentalized Colleges, the NLA is the Senior Vice President and Provost or their designee.

T. **"Outside Professional Activities"** means any paid or unpaid activity with an External Entity that is beyond the scope of a University Employee's Institutional Responsibilities but is still related to their discipline, area of expertise, or the practice of their profession. Outside Professional Activities include both Professional Service and Consulting.

U. **"Professional Service"** means a form of Outside Professional Activities that provides a service to governmental agencies and other entities such as peer review panels and advisory bodies to other universities and professional organizations; academic or professional journals; presentations to either professional or public audiences in such forums as professional societies and organizations, libraries, and other universities; and peer review activities undertaken for either for-profit or nonprofit publishers, including grant reviews. Professional Service provides a benefit to the University, academia, the discipline, and/or the public interest, and may or may not be remunerated by a small honorarium.

V. **"Relationship(s)"** means any interest, activity, service, employment, Gift, or other benefit or association with an individual or entity not part of the State government that would be prohibited by Maryland Public Ethics Law if not reported on a Disclosure and approved according to this Policy, the COI/COC Policy, the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, and any other relevant USM and/or University policy.

W. **"Significant Financial Interest"** means anything of monetary value, including, but not limited to, salary or other payments for services (e.g., Consulting fees or honoraria); equity interest (e.g., stocks, stock options or other ownership interests); Intellectual Property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights, and royalties from such rights); and/or positions outside of the University that involve a Fiduciary Role for an External Entity, whether compensated or not.

X. **"Sponsored Project(s)"** means monetary or non-monetary support provided by a domestic or foreign entity to the University to support specific research, instruction,

or other activities of University Employees.

Y. **"Supervisor(s)"** means a University Employee with supervisory authority over other employees. This term is typically used for those with direct authority over one or more employees. The term can be used interchangeably with the term Unit Head throughout this Policy and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines.

Z. **"Unit"** means a department, center, institute, division, or College or School.

AA. **"Unit Head"** means the administrator(s) responsible for a Unit and the individual(s) to whom a University Employee reports. A Unit Head may be a Director, Department Chair, Dean, Vice President, or a similar University Official in a non-academic Unit and also includes Supervisors in all references in this Policy.

AB. **"University Employee(s)"** means all faculty and staff employed by the University, regardless of title, FTE, full- or part-time status, and also includes University Officials.

AC. **"University Official(s)"** means any individual(s) at the University who, because of their respective positions with the University, can affect or can reasonably appear to affect University processes for the design, conduct, reporting, review, or oversight of research and who have the authority to commit significant University resources. They include but are not limited to the President of the University, Assistant President, Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, the Senior Vice President and Provost, Associate Provosts, Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, Center and Institute Directors, and the Athletic Director, including those holding these positions in an interim capacity, as well as others who have discretionary authority to allocate resources related to the University enterprise as identified by any of the officials named previously. University Officials are also included in all references to University Employees.

III. Applicability

A. This Policy applies to exempt staff and faculty members with appointments of 50% full-time equivalent (FTE) or greater whose appointments are funded at least in part by the State of Maryland. These University Employees are eligible to engage in Consulting and their activities must align with this Policy.

1. Full-time University Employees with 100% of their effort allocated to a federally-funded Sponsored Project(s) may only engage in Consulting if it is in accordance with the terms and conditions of their Sponsored Project(s) and any applicable University policies.

B. This Policy does not apply to the following:

1. Graduate Students are not subject to this Policy, and they may engage in Consulting. However, Graduate Students who work on Sponsored Projects are subject to the COI/COC Policy and must submit a Disclosure on their Consulting activities in accordance with the provisions in the COI/COC Policy and/or Funding Agency requirements for Sponsored Projects.

2. Non-exempt staff, regardless of FTE, and University Employees with FTEs of less than 50% are not subject to this Policy.

C. All University Employees, regardless of their FTE or eligibility to engage in Consulting, remain subject to the COI/COC Policy and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, which apply to Outside Professional Activities occurring both during and outside regular University business hours, external Relationships, and all Significant Financial Interests.

D. This Policy, the COI/COC Policy, and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines are applied concurrently, and all University Employees must align their activities with both policies and the guidelines.

E. Applicability of this Policy is subject to change per state and federal laws and regulations, and Funding Agency guidance for Sponsored Projects.

IV. Scope

A. Consulting allows University Employees to engage in activities outside of the University and beyond their Institutional Responsibilities to share their professional expertise with External Entities.

1. Consulting activities are related to a University Employee's discipline, profession, or area of expertise.

2. Consulting activities may include both paid and unpaid activities.

3. Consulting primarily benefits the individual, rather than the University, the discipline, the profession, or the public.

B. Consulting is permitted provided the University Employee has fulfilled their Institutional Responsibilities and has received prior approval through the Disclosure process to engage in the activity.

C. University Employees may engage in Consulting up to one (1) Day per calendar week across all Consulting agreements, subject to the limitations in Section V below.

D. Banking of Consulting Days is allowed for both full-time and part-time University Employees with prior approval of the University Employee's Unit Head.

1. The total number of Consulting Days that are available for Banking for a given fiscal year may not exceed the allowable number of Days based on the University Employee's appointment, as indicated in Section V below.

2. The use of Consulting Days cannot interfere with the University Employee's Institutional Responsibilities and must not constitute a Conflict of Commitment.

3. The NLA is responsible for ensuring the equitable application of Banking by Unit Heads.

E. The following activities are not considered Consulting, for the purposes of this Policy:

1. Scholarly publications produced as a part of a University Employee's Institutional Responsibilities are not considered to be Consulting.

   a. Publications include but are not limited to scholarly communications, books, films, television productions, artworks, or other published works or products.

   b. Publications may or may not result in compensation for a University Employee.

   c. If a University Employee is listed as an author on any publication resulting from the performance of Consulting activities, they may list their University affiliation but must include a broad statement in the acknowledgment section that the work performed by the University Employee on the publication was in their capacity as a consultant and was not a part of their Institutional Responsibilities with the University, nor is the publication endorsed by the University.

2. Professional Service is distinct from Consulting, in that such service is provided for the benefit of the public, the academy, the discipline, or the profession. Professional Service is not undertaken for personal financial gain, though an honorarium or equivalent may be provided.

   a. While it is not considered Consulting, Professional Service must still be disclosed and must receive a Disposition through the University's Disclosure process.

   b. Activities that qualify as Professional Service may vary by discipline, and include service provided to such entities as noted in Section II above. Additional information on the types of services that qualify and how to distinguish between Professional Service and Consulting is detailed in the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines.

     c. Federal regulations and award requirements related to federally-funded Sponsored Projects consider income provided for service to some non-governmental organizations, including foundations and professional societies, to be Consulting. Disclosure of these activities is required, as specified in federal regulations and Funding Agency guidance.

   3. Moonlighting by University Employees is not Consulting and is excluded from this Policy. However, Moonlighting activities performed for foreign entities, such as foreign universities, foreign governments, or foreign companies, must always be disclosed to the University for federal compliance purposes.

V.   Consulting Limitations

   A. University Employees, as State Employees, must comply with Maryland Public Ethics Law and Maryland State Ethics Commission (SEC) guidance, and their Consulting activities must align with the relevant law and guidance as well as with the COI/COC Policy and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines.

   B. Terms and conditions for participating in Consulting activities are outlined in the University's Memorandum of Understanding for Consulting Activity with an External Entity ("Consulting MOU").

    1. The Consulting MOU seeks to remind University Employees of their compliance obligations to the University, USM, and the Maryland SEC.

    2. All University Employees engaging in Consulting must sign the Consulting MOU, abide by its specifications, and share the Consulting MOU with the External Entity with which they are engaged.

   C. University Employees must receive a COI Disposition prior to engaging in any Consulting activities, as required by Maryland Public State Ethics Law, federal law/regulations, Funding Agency requirements, and USM and University policies.

   D. University Employees cannot perform activities or hold titles that include a Fiduciary Role(s) in an External Entity that licenses University-owned Intellectual Property or does business with the University unless otherwise approved under a Management Plan.

   E. University Employees are prohibited from engaging their students in their Consulting activities, unless it is allowed by an approved Management Plan.

   F. The State of Maryland considers all full-time University Employees who are paid entirely or in part with funding from the State to be fully committed to their assigned duties at the University at all times and on all days, including nights and weekends. University Employees must ensure that any Consulting activities are carried out in alignment with the provisions below in G and H of this Section to remain in

alignment with Maryland Public Ethics Law and related guidance.

G. Time Commitment for Faculty

1. Full-time faculty may undertake Consulting up to one (1) Day per calendar week, subject to the limitations defined below.

   a. Faculty members on 12-month appointments may engage in Consulting for a maximum of 52 Days during a given fiscal year.

   b. Faculty members on 9-month appointments may engage in Consulting a maximum of 39 Days each fiscal year during their term of employment with the University.

      i. During the other three (3) months of the year, if the faculty member is not receiving any compensation from the University, there will be no limitation placed on the number of Days in which the faculty member may engage in Consulting.

      ii. If the faculty member receives any compensation through the University during any portion of the other three (3) months, their Consulting activities will be subject to the one (1) Day per calendar week limitation during the period in which the faculty member is receiving compensation. Such compensation may include but is not limited to summer salary from Sponsored Projects or compensation for teaching at the University during the summer.

   c. Consulting activities performed during the evenings, weekends, or holidays count towards the total number of Consulting Days.

2. Faculty members whose appointments with the University are between 50% to 99% FTE may engage in Consulting for the number of Days proportional to the percentage of their appointment spread across the term of their employment with the University during a given fiscal year.

   a. The total number of Consulting Days may not exceed 52 days.

   b. There will be no limitation placed on the number of Days in which the faculty member may engage in Consulting during any period when the University does not compensate them.

3. Faculty members who would like to engage in Consulting while on sabbatical or Leave Without Pay (LWOP) must comply with the University policies on sabbatical and LWOP.

H. Time Commitment for Exempt Staff

1. Full-time exempt staff may undertake Consulting up to one (1) Day per calendar week, subject to the limitations defined below.

   a. Exempt staff must continue to meet all of their Institutional Responsibilities, as determined by their job descriptions and reviewed through the University's Performance Review and Development (PRD) process.

   b. Exempt staff members on 12-month appointments may engage in Consulting for a maximum of 52 Days during a given fiscal year.

   c. Exempt staff may only engage in Consulting during periods outside their regular University work hours or during periods of approved applicable leave.

2. Part-time exempt staff members may engage in Consulting for the number of Days proportional to the percentage of their appointment at the University spread across the term of their employment for a given fiscal year.

   a. The total number of Consulting Days may not exceed 52 days.

   b. There will be no limitation placed on the number of Days in which they may engage in Consulting activities during any period when the University does not compensate the exempt staff member.

VI. Responsibilities of University Employees, Unit Heads, and the Next Level Administrator (NLA)

A. University Employees

1. University Employees are responsible for adhering to the principles set forth in this Policy, the COI/COC Policy, the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, Funding Agency guidance, and applicable state and federal laws.

2. Questions and/or ambiguities on what constitutes Consulting and the requirements of this Policy should be resolved through collaboration with the University Employee's Unit Head, NLA, and/or applicable university administrators.

3. University Employees must:

   a. Submit a Disclosure to the University on all Outside Professional Activities, including Professional Service and Consulting, before engaging in the activity;

   b. Disclose all paid or unpaid Consulting activities as part of their Current and Pending (Other) Support documentation on all proposals for federal funding at

the time of proposal;

c. Clearly indicate when their work, including publications and presentations, is associated with their Consulting activities, and clarify that the work was not performed in their capacity as a University Employee and is not endorsed by the University; and

d. Sign and abide by the University's Consulting MOU and provide a copy of it to each External Entity with which they Consult.

B. Unit Head Responsibilities

1. Unit Heads serve as the Unit-level reviewer for all Disclosures of Outside Professional Activities, including Professional Service and Consulting, in order to assess whether a potential COI or COC exists.

2. Unit Heads are responsible for monitoring the Consulting activities undertaken by University Employees within their Unit.

3. Unit Heads must remain knowledgeable about the types of activities that may lead to real, potential, or apparent COIs and/or COCs, and advise Unit employees on how they may avoid and/or mitigate COIs, COCs, or similar situations that may adversely affect the University.

4. Unit Heads must ensure University Employee compliance with this Policy, the COI/COC Policy, the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, and Maryland Public Ethics Law, as applicable, including:

a. Ensuring that University Employees in their Unit do not exceed the total number of Consulting Days allowed by this Policy in a given fiscal year.

b. Making determinations on whether specific activities are part of a University Employee's Institutional Responsibilities or whether they constitute a COC.

c. Making determinations on whether Outside Professional Activities should be considered Consulting or Professional Service for their discipline, based on established Unit principles and University guidance.

i. If a Unit Head's determination seems inconsistent with this Policy and University guidance, the Disclosure Office will advise the Unit Head on whether the Outside Professional Activities should be considered Consulting or Professional Service.

5. Unit Heads should remind University Employees to provide a copy of the Consulting MOU to each External Entity with which they Consult.

6. Unit Heads should work with relevant University offices to provide guidance on Consulting, COIs, and COCs to their Unit.

7. Unit Heads should escalate any instances of non-compliance to the Next-Level Administrator and Disclosure Office for appropriate action based on the provisions of this Policy and applicable University policies and procedures.

8. Unit Heads should cooperate with all applicable University entities, such as the COI Committee, to eliminate, reduce, and/or Manage any conflicts that may be identified through the review of Consulting activities.

C. Next Level Administrator (NLA)

1. The NLA serves as the next-level reviewer for all Disclosures of Outside Professional Activities, including Professional Service and Consulting.

2. The NLA is responsible for making an independent recommendation on whether a potential COI or COC exists.

3. The NLA is responsible for broad oversight of Consulting within their Units, including of how Banking is being applied.

D. University Responsibilities

1. The University has an obligation to oversee Consulting activities undertaken by University Employees and ensure compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and USM and/or University policies.

2. The University will establish and maintain the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines to provide information on the process of submitting and reviewing Disclosures.

3. The University must work to identify and eliminate COCs by University Employees.

4. The University is responsible for establishing COI Management Plans, and/or taking corrective actions to eliminate, reduce, or manage COIs when they are identified.

VII.   Non-Compliance

A. Failure to comply with this Policy and other Disclosure requirements associated with federal funding may be a violation of federal law.

B. The University has the right and obligation to protect itself from losses due to excess Consulting and to seek restitution for salary and benefits covering time spent on

Consulting activities beyond the limits provided for by this Policy.

C. Individuals found to be in violation of this Policy, USM/University policies and procedures, and/or Funding Agency requirements based on any form of dishonesty or by acting in bad faith, may face disciplinary action, including but not limited to formal letters of reprimand, freezing federally-funded research accounts, suspension and/or termination of employment, or, in accordance with relevant USM and University policies, as applicable.

VIII. Associated Policies

A. Several USM and University policies are closely related but are separate and distinct from this Policy. These policies can be found at https://policies.umd.edu/all.

B. This Policy is designed to ensure compliance with the following USM and University policies and associated requirements.

1. The University of Maryland Policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment ("the COI/COC Policy") (II-3.10[A]) and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, which are required by Maryland Public Ethics Law and apply to all University Employees and Graduate Research Assistants (GRAs) working on Sponsored Projects.

2. The University System of Maryland (USM) Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10), which states that "[e]ach institution of the University System of Maryland shall develop and publish procedures to implement this policy" and that "[s]uch procedures shall include provisions for regular reporting by faculty members to the institution on all outside professional consulting or teaching and substantial external professional service, whether paid or unpaid."

C. This Policy operates in concert with other USM and University policies related to Consulting, including the following.

1. The USM Policy on Intellectual Property (IV-3.20), which prohibits individuals from entering into an agreement to pursue Consulting or Professional Service that conflicts with the policy without the advance written waiver or consent of the Chancellor or their designee.

2. The University of Maryland Policy on Malign Foreign Talent Recruitment Program Policy (IV-7.00[A]), which requires University Employees and GRAs to submit a Disclosure if they are a party to any Foreign Talent Recruitment Programs and prohibits University Employees, GRAs, and/or covered individuals on a Sponsored Project from participating in Malign Foreign Talent Recruitment Programs.

3. The USM Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10), which, among other things, defines requirements for engaging in Consulting, overload teaching, or Professional Service within the institution and for teaching at other institutions within the USM.

D. This Policy is also designed to ensure compliance with federal and state laws and regulations, including the following.

1. Federal requirements, including but not limited to National Security Presidential Memorandum-33[2] (NSPM-33), and the regulatory and contractual requirements of Funding Agencies, which require higher education institutions accepting federal funds to have a formal policy in place to address Consulting and other Outside Professional Activities to ensure that these activities are disclosed appropriately and do not negatively impact the interests of the federal government and/or the University.

2. Federal laws and regulations and Funding Agency requirements that require all senior/key personnel on Sponsored Projects to report all sources of Current and Pending (Other) Support in proposal submissions, including all current awards, pending proposals, paid/unpaid Consulting activities, Gifts (monetary or in-kind), and any additional information required by the specific Funding Agency.

3. Maryland Public Ethics Law, which imposes requirements related to COI and associated provisions on research and development, which apply to all University Employees.

---

[2] Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 (NSPM-33) on National Security Strategy for United States Government-Supported Research and Development. To find this report online, go to: https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/presidential-actions/presidential-memorandum-united-states-government-supported-research-development-national-security-policy/

II-3.10(E)   UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON CONSULTING
(Approved by the President on an interim basis, pending University Senate review, October 14, 2022**, Amended and approved by the President on an interim basis, pending University Senate review March 07, 2025**)

I.   Purpose

Participation in ~~consulting~~**Consulting** can provide an important means for professional development and allows individuals to maintain currency and experience in aspects of their professional fields outside the University of Maryland ("the University"). These activities can also provide a mechanism for the transfer of knowledge from the University to the public arena and contribute to the overall public good. ~~Though such attributes of consulting may make University employees better scholars, teachers, and campus community members~~**However**, the nature of the ~~consulting~~**Consulting** process has ~~in it~~ the potential to create ~~a conflict~~**Conflicts** of ~~commitment (COC~~**Commitment (COCs**) by diverting ~~employees'~~**an employee's** efforts from their primary activities and responsibilities **to the University,** and/or create ~~a conflict~~**Conflicts** of ~~interest (COI~~**Interest (COIs**) related to those ~~institutional responsibilities~~ **Institutional Responsibilities. As indicated in the University of Maryland Policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment (II-3.10[A]) ("the COI/COC Policy"), University Employees have a primary obligation to their Institutional Responsibilities. University Employees are also State of Maryland employees** and~~/or related research activities~~ **as such are obligated to comply with Maryland Public Ethics Law,[1] which limits the Outside Professional Activities they may engage in for personal benefit**.

The ~~purpose of the~~ University of Maryland Policy on Consulting ~~(the "~~**("this** Policy") ~~is~~**seeks** to ~~provide a general definition of "consulting," clarify exclusions to this definition, define the limits on consulting, and~~ establish a balance between ~~those~~**Consulting** activities and a University ~~employee's regular institutional responsibilities~~**Employee's Institutional Responsibilities**, thereby safeguarding the interests of all parties.

This Policy is ~~also~~ designed to ensure compliance with ~~the following internal and external requirements:~~

- ~~The~~ **federal and state laws and regulations and** University System of Maryland (USM) ~~Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10), which states that "[e]ach institution of the University System of Maryland shall develop and publish procedures to implement this policy"~~ and ~~that "[s]uch procedures shall include~~

~~provisions for regular reporting by faculty members to the institution on all outside professional consulting or teaching~~**University policies** and ~~substantial external Professional Services, whether paid or unpaid."~~

- ~~Federal requirements, including but not limited to National Security Presidential Memorandum 33[2] and the regulatory and contractual requirements of federal agencies such~~**associated requirements,** as ~~the Public Health Service, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Energy, which presume that institutions accepting federal funds have a formal policy in place to address consulting and other outside activities and ensure that these activities do not negatively impact the interests of the federal government and/or the~~**well as to protect** University~~.~~ ~~The requirements of Maryland State Ethics Law[3], which are broadly applicable to all~~ **Employees and the** University ~~employees~~**from potential violations of the same**.
- ~~The University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment "COI/COC Policy and Procedures" (II-3.10[A]) and (II-3.10[B]), which are required by Maryland State Ethics Law and apply to all University employees.~~

Though comprehensive, this Policy cannot address every specific instance of ~~consulting. In cases of doubt, consulting must align with and promote the interests of the~~**Consulting. The** University~~, and must be in compliance~~ **will implement this Policy with the understanding that Consulting must comply** with ~~the~~ internal and external requirements ~~listed above,~~ and all **other** applicable **USM and** University policies.

II. Definitions

A. **"Banking"** means accumulating multiple ~~consulting days~~**Consulting Days** over time ~~in order~~ to use ~~them~~ at once for a larger consecutive period of time.

~~A.~~ **"Conflict(s) of Commitment**[2] **(COC)"** means ~~a circumstance that arises when otherwise acceptable outside activities may compromise or appear to compromise the fulfillment of~~ **situations where** a University ~~employee's institutional responsibilities~~**Employee's Outside Professional Activities, external Relationships, or Significant Financial Interests interfere or compete with the University's educational, research, or service missions or impede the University Employee's ability to perform or fulfill the full range of their Institutional Responsibilities**, as stipulated under Maryland ~~State~~**Public** Ethics Law ~~and/or otherwise determined by the unit head.~~

B. ~~"Conflict of Commitment (COC) Review Board" is the advisory board, appointed by~~**.** **This applies regardless of whether** the ~~Senior Vice President and Provost or~~

---

designee,**activity holds value** to ~~review unit head approvals of outside activities that are unrelated to research endeavors and may or may not constitute a Conflict of Commitment. The COC Review Board has~~ the ~~authority to issue requirements and/or guidance regarding~~ **University or contributes to** the ~~implementation of local approval processes~~**employee's professional development**.

C. **"Conflict of Interest**~~"~~ **(COI)"** means situations in which ~~members of the~~ University ~~community~~**Employees or their Family Member(s)** are in a position to gain, or appear to gain, financial ~~advantage~~**advantages** or personal ~~benefit (broadly construed) arising~~**benefits stemming** from their ~~University positions, either through outside professional activities or through~~**roles within the University. Such benefits can occur due to Outside Professional Activities, external Relationships, or Significant Financial Interests, or as a result of** their research, administrative, or educational actions or decisions **made while working** at the University.

D. **"**~~Conflict of Interest (~~**COI**~~)~~ **Committee"** ~~is~~**means** the advisory committee~~,~~ appointed by the President~~,~~ **of the University** in accordance with the University's COI/COC Policy and ~~Procedures related to~~ **the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines and based on the authority granted by the Maryland State Ethics Commission (SEC) regarding conflicts associated with** research ~~endeavors.~~**or development.**

E. **"Consulting"** means any additional activity beyond a University ~~employee's institutional responsibilities,~~ **Employee's Institutional Responsibilities that is** professional in nature~~,~~ and based on ~~the appropriate~~**their** discipline or area of expertise~~, for which the employee may receive additional personal remuneration, and where~~ **. The activity may be paid or unpaid, and** such activities primarily benefit the ~~employee~~**University Employee** and not the University.

F. **"Current & Pending (Other) Support" means information submitted to Funding Agencies in proposals for Sponsored Projects on all the resources made available or expected to be made available to an individual in support of their research and development efforts. This includes but is not limited to resources from both foreign and domestic sources; those given through an award and those given directly to the individual; monetary resources, in-kind resources, and support with no monetary value; and travel support.**

G. **"Day" means a regular "duty day" for University Employees, which is equivalent to a maximum of eight (8) hours on a given work day and is typically understood to be during regular business hours between 8:00am and 5:00pm. University Employees cannot interpret the definition of a Day to be any period longer than 8 hours, regardless of the number of hours it may actually take them to complete their Institutional Responsibilities on a given Day.**

H. **"Disclosure(s)" means information that is required to be provided on all Outside Professional Activities, external Relationships, and/or Significant Financial Interests.**

I. **"Disposition" means the final result of the review of a Disclosure. The review may result in a decision that no conflict exists, that the activity must be stopped due to an unmanageable conflict, or that a Management Plan is necessary to mitigate any possible COIs in accordance with Maryland Public Ethics Law and relevant USM and University policies.**

J. **"External Entity(ies)" means an entity that is external to the University with which University Employees may choose to engage. These may include but are not limited to entities such as domestic governments (U.S. federal, state, or local), foreign entities (governments, institutions, companies), domestic or international institutions or societies (academic, professional, commercial), philanthropic organizations, or companies (sole proprietorships, for-profit companies whether publicly traded or not, non-profits, startups, or any other corporate entity regardless of whether they are registered to do business).**

K. **"Family Member(s)" means a University Employee's spouse or domestic partner, parent, child, sibling, or other close relative as defined in the USM Policy on Employment of Members of the Same Family (Nepotism) (VII-2.10).**

~~F.~~**L.** **"Fiduciary Role(s)"** means a role that ~~imparts an obligation (i.e., a fiduciary duty) upon~~**requires** an individual to ~~act~~**make financial decisions** on behalf of another ~~person(s) or entity and put those interests, which are typically financial, ahead of one's own~~**individual(s) and/or entity**. Titles that include terms such as executive, officer, director, or manager and positions with titles such as CEO, Director, Scientific Officer, or Vice President are **examples of** designations that may indicate a role with fiduciary responsibilities.

~~B. "Institutional Responsibilities" are an employee's professional responsibilities on behalf of the University including, without limitation, research, education, administrative, and/or service responsibilities, and which may include such activities as research, research consultation, teaching, professional practice, committee memberships, and service on University committees, councils, or other institutional bodies.~~

~~C. "Management Role(s)" means any role wherein a University employee's responsibilities include formal supervision and/or oversight of personnel activities, as part of an organizational structure. Titles that include terms such as executive, officer, director, or manager and positions with titles such as CEO, Director, Scientific Officer, or Vice President are designations that may indicate a role with management responsibilities.~~

M. **"Funding Agency(ies)" means any domestic or foreign entity that provides monetary support for a Sponsored Project to a University Employee or to the**

University on behalf of a University Employee. Funding Agencies may include but are not limited to entities such as the U.S. government and its agencies; U.S. state and local entities; foreign entities including governments and institutions; non-profit organizations; associations; or companies.

N. **"Gift" means any gratuity, favor, discount, entertainment, hospitality, loan, forbearance, software, license, special access, equipment, equipment time, samples, research data, or other item having monetary value. A Gift also includes services as well as gifts of training, transportation, local or foreign travel, lodging, meals, and research hours, whether provided in-kind, by purchase of a ticket, payment in advance, or reimbursement after the expense has occurred. A Gift by definition is given without expectation of anything in return.**

O. **"Graduate Student" means a registered student who is enrolled in a graduate degree program at the University. For the purposes of this Policy, references to Graduate Students include Graduate Research Assistants (GRAs) and Graduate Fellows.**

P. **"Institutional Responsibilities" means a University Employee's primary duties and responsibilities at the University, as defined in their contract, job duties, offer letter, or other comparable documentation.**

Q. **"Management Plan" means a written plan provided by the University that describes how a conflict or potential conflict will be managed.**

~~G.~~**R.** **"Moonlighting"** means ~~endeavors~~**activities** for financial profit that occur outside of a University ~~employee's~~**Employee's** Institutional Responsibilities and are not directly related to their ~~professional field or~~ discipline~~.~~ **or area of expertise.**

S. **"Next-Level Administrator (NLA)" means the administrator in the role immediately above a Unit Head. The NLA is typically the Dean of a College or School, or the Vice President of a Division or their designee. For non-departmentalized Colleges, the NLA is the Senior Vice President & Provost or their designee.**

~~D.~~ **"Outside Professional Activities"** means any ~~additional professional activities, that may be~~ paid or unpaid~~, are~~ **activity with an External Entity that is** beyond **the scope of** a University ~~employee's institutional responsibilities, are within~~**Employee's Institutional Responsibilities but is still related to** their discipline ~~or~~**,** area of expertise, ~~and could~~**or the practice of their profession. Outside Professional Activities** include ~~professional service.~~

~~H.~~**T.** **"both** Professional Service~~(s)" means activities that provide a benefit to the University, academia, and/or the public interest, regardless of whether there is~~

II-3.10(E) page 5

~~personal remuneration.~~ **and Consulting.**

E.   ~~"Publications" are scholarly communications or other products such as books, movies, television productions, art works, etc. that may result in compensation.~~

U.   **"Professional Service" means a form of Outside Professional Activities that provides a service to governmental agencies and other entities such as peer review panels and advisory bodies to other universities and professional organizations; academic or professional journals; presentations to either professional or public audiences in such forums as professional societies and organizations, libraries, and other universities; and peer review activities undertaken for either for-profit or nonprofit publishers, including grant reviews. Professional Service provides a benefit to the University, academia, the discipline, and/or the public interest, and may or may not be remunerated by a small honorarium.**

V.   **"Relationship(s)" means any interest, activity, service, employment, Gift, or other benefit or association with an individual or entity not part of the State government that would be prohibited by Maryland Public Ethics Law if not reported on a Disclosure and approved according to this Policy, the COI/COC Policy, the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, and any other relevant USM and/or University policy.**

W.   **"Significant Financial Interest" means anything of monetary value, including, but not limited to, salary or other payments for services (e.g., Consulting fees or honoraria); equity interest (e.g., stocks, stock options or other ownership interests); Intellectual Property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights, and royalties from such rights); and/or positions outside of the University that involve a Fiduciary Role for an External Entity, whether compensated or not.**

X.   **"Sponsored Project(s)" means monetary or non-monetary support provided by a domestic or foreign entity to the University to support specific research, instruction, or other activities of University Employees.**

Y.   **"Supervisor(s)" means a University Employee with supervisory authority over other employees. This term is typically used for those with direct authority over one or more employees. The term can be used interchangeably with the term Unit Head throughout this Policy and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines.**

Z.   **"Unit" means a department, center, institute, division, or College or School.**

~~I.~~**AA.**   **"Unit Head"** means the administrator(s) responsible for a Unit and the individual(s) to ~~which~~**whom** a University ~~employee~~**Employee** reports. A Unit Head may be a Director, Department Chair, Dean, Vice President, or a similar

officialUniversity Official in a non-academic Unit~~, unless a different individual is designated by proper authority.~~ **and also includes Supervisors in all references in this Policy.**

BB. "University Employee(s)" means all faculty and staff employed by the University, regardless of title, FTE, full- or part-time status, and also includes University Officials.

CC. "University Official(s)" means any individual(s) at the University who, because of their respective positions with the University, can affect or can reasonably appear to affect University processes for the design, conduct, reporting, review, or oversight of research and who have the authority to commit significant University resources. They include but are not limited to the President of the University, Assistant President, Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, the Senior Vice President & Provost, Associate Provosts, Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, Center and Institute Directors, and the Athletic Director, including those holding these positions in an interim capacity, as well as others who have discretionary authority to allocate resources related to the University enterprise as identified by any of the officials named previously. University Officials are also included in all references to University Employees.

III.   Applicability

A. This Policy ~~and any associated procedures are applicable~~ **applies** to ~~all University employees, even if Consulting occurs outside~~ **exempt staff and faculty members with appointments** of ~~regular University business hours, such as on evenings and weekends~~**50% full-time equivalent (FTE)** or ~~when an employee is "off the clock."~~

B. ~~This Policy is separate and distinct from the University's COI/COC Policy and Procedures, which also apply to~~ **greater whose appointments are funded at least in part by the State of Maryland. These University Employees are eligible to engage in Consulting and their** activities ~~regardless of whether those activities occur outside of regular University business hours.~~

A. ~~Compliance~~**must align** with this Policy ~~does not relieve University employees of their obligation to:~~**.**

1. ~~Disclose and receive approval for COIs/COCs, as required by University policy and Maryland State Ethics Law;~~

2. ~~Disclose the activity as part of the University's Outside Professional Activities (OPA) Report; and/or~~

3. ~~Disclose activities as part of current and pending support documentation on federal proposals.~~

1. ~~Disclosures made pursuant to~~ **Full-time University Employees with 100% of their effort allocated to a federally-funded Sponsored Project(s) may only engage in Consulting if it is in accordance with the terms and conditions of their Sponsored Project(s) and any applicable University policies.**

B. **This Policy does not apply to the following:**

1. **Graduate Students are not subject to** this Policy, ~~as well as pursuant to~~**and they may engage in Consulting. However, Graduate Students who work on Sponsored Projects are subject to the COI/COC Policy and must submit a Disclosure on their Consulting activities in accordance with** the ~~University's~~**provisions in the COI/COC Policy and/or Funding Agency requirements for Sponsored Projects.**

2. **Non-exempt staff, regardless of FTE, and University Employees with FTEs of less than 50% are not subject to this Policy.**

C. **All University Employees, regardless of their FTE or eligibility to engage in Consulting, remain subject to the** COI/COC Policy and ~~Procedures~~**the Disclosure** and **Conflict Management Guidelines, which apply to** Outside Professional Activities ~~(OPA) reports are not automatically populated into other institutional systems~~**occurring both during** and ~~may need to be separately disclosed.~~**outside regular University business hours, external Relationships, and all Significant Financial Interests.**

~~B.~~**D.** **This Policy, the COI/COC Policy, and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines are applied concurrently, and all University Employees must align their activities with both policies and the guidelines.**

~~C.~~**E.** Applicability of this Policy is subject to change per ~~Maryland State Ethics Commission guidance and/or~~ state and federal laws and regulations**, and Funding Agency guidance for Sponsored Projects**.

IV. **Scope**

A. **Consulting allows University Employees to engage in activities outside of the University and beyond their Institutional Responsibilities to share their professional expertise with External Entities.**

1. **Consulting activities are related to a University Employee's discipline, profession, or area of expertise.**

2. **Consulting activities may include both paid and unpaid activities.**

3. **Consulting primarily benefits the individual, rather than the University, the discipline, the profession, or the public.**

B. Consulting is permitted~~,~~ provided~~:~~ **the University Employee has fulfilled their Institutional Responsibilities and has received prior approval through the Disclosure process to engage in the activity.**

C. **University Employees may engage in Consulting up to one (1) Day per calendar week across all Consulting agreements, subject to the limitations in Section V below.**

~~A.~~**D.** **Banking of Consulting Days is allowed for both full-time and part-time University Employees with prior approval of the University Employee's Unit Head.**

1. The ~~University employee's Institutional Responsibilities have been met;~~**total number of Consulting Days that are available for Banking for a given fiscal year may not exceed the allowable number of Days based on the University Employee's appointment, as indicated in Section V below.**

~~1.~~ The ~~limitations on~~ **use of** Consulting~~, as defined in Section V. below, are not exceeded;~~

~~2. The requirements of Section VI.A below are met; and~~

2. ~~The relationship and/or any related financial interest(s) are disclosed, reviewed, and managed as required by~~ **Days cannot interfere with** the ~~federal government and/or~~University ~~policies~~**Employee's Institutional Responsibilities and must not constitute a Conflict of Commitment**.

~~B. Exclusions~~

3. **The NLA is responsible for ensuring the equitable application of Banking by Unit Heads.**

E. **The following activities are not considered Consulting, for the purposes of this Policy:**

1. **Scholarly publications produced as a part of a University Employee's Institutional Responsibilities are not considered to be Consulting.**

   a. Publications~~, including~~ **include but are not limited to** scholarly communications ~~and/or other Publications in the form of~~ **,** books, ~~movies~~**films**, television productions, ~~art works~~**artworks**, or other **published**

works or products~~, which~~**.**

b. **Publications** may or may not result in compensation for a University ~~employee and/or external entity (e.g., publisher). When produced in the course of a University employee's Institutional Responsibilities, such Publications are not viewed as Consulting. It is not the purpose of this Policy to differentiate between specific types of Publications or the roles of those published works in different disciplines; however, if a University employee~~**Employee.**

~~a.~~**c.** **If a University Employee** is listed as an author on any ~~Publication~~**publication** resulting from **the** performance of Consulting ~~services, the Publication should include a disclosure stating~~**activities, they may list their University affiliation but must include a broad statement in the acknowledgment section** that the work ~~was~~ performed **by the University Employee on the publication was in their capacity** as a consultant and was not **a** part of ~~the employee's~~**their** Institutional Responsibilities ~~to~~**with** the University~~.~~**, nor is the publication endorsed by the University.**

2. Professional Service is distinct from Consulting ~~in that such service is for the benefit of public institutions and/or the University. Examples of Professional Service include but are not limited to service provided to (a) United States (U.S. or federal) national commissions; (b) U.S. federal, state, and local governmental agencies and boards; (c) federal and state granting agency peer review panels; (d) approved foreign governmental agencies, boards, and peer review panels; (e) philanthropic organizations or charities; (f) professional societies; (g) academic and/or professional journals, including editorial board service; (h) visiting committees; or (i) advisory groups to other U.S. or approved foreign universities, and analogous bodies.~~ **, in that such service is provided for the benefit of the public, the academy, the discipline, or the profession. Professional Service is not undertaken for personal financial gain, though an honorarium or equivalent may be provided.**

   a. ~~Although an honorarium or equivalent sometimes is forthcoming~~**While it is not considered Consulting**, Professional Service ~~is not undertaken for personal financial gain; therefore, such service does not fall within~~**must still be disclosed and must receive a Disposition through** the ~~Consulting category~~**University's Disclosure process.**

   b. **Activities that qualify** as ~~defined~~**Professional Service may vary** by ~~this Policy.~~ **discipline, and include service provided to such entities as noted in Section II above.**
   Additional information on the types of services that qualify and how to distinguish between Professional Service and Consulting is detailed in the

Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines.

a.**c.** Federal regulations and award requirements related to federally-funded ~~sponsored activities~~**Sponsored Projects** consider income provided for service to some non-governmental organizations, including foundations and professional societies, to be Consulting ~~and reporting~~. **Disclosure of these activities** is required**,** as ~~set forth~~**specified** in **federal** regulations and ~~agency~~**Funding Agency** guidance.

3. Moonlighting by University ~~employees~~**Employees** is ~~considered part of the employee's private life~~ **not Consulting** and is excluded from this Policy. However, Moonlighting activities performed for foreign entities**,** such as foreign ~~institutions of higher education~~**universities**, foreign governments, or foreign companies, must **always** be disclosed to the University for federal compliance purposes.

V. **Consulting** Limitations

A. **University Employees, as State Employees, must comply with Maryland Public Ethics Law and Maryland State Ethics Commission (SEC) guidance, and their Consulting activities must align with the relevant law and guidance as well as with the COI/COC Policy and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines.**

B. **Terms and conditions for participating in Consulting activities are outlined in the University's Memorandum of Understanding for Consulting Activity with an External Entity ("Consulting MOU").**

   1. **The Consulting MOU seeks to remind University Employees of their compliance obligations to the University, USM, and the Maryland SEC.**

   2. **All University Employees engaging in Consulting must sign the Consulting MOU, abide by its specifications, and share the Consulting MOU with the External Entity with which they are engaged.**

C. **University Employees must receive a COI Disposition prior to engaging in any Consulting activities, as required by Maryland Public State Ethics Law, federal law/regulations, Funding Agency requirements, and USM and University policies.**

D. **University Employees cannot perform activities or hold titles that include a Fiduciary Role(s) in an External Entity that licenses University-owned Intellectual Property or does business with the University unless otherwise approved under a Management Plan.**

E. **University Employees are prohibited from engaging their students in their Consulting activities, unless it is allowed by an approved Management Plan.**

F. **The State of Maryland considers all full-time University Employees who are paid entirely or in part with funding from the State to be fully committed to their assigned duties at the University at all times and on all days, including nights and weekends. University Employees must ensure that any Consulting activities are carried out in alignment with the provisions below in G and H of this Section to remain in alignment with Maryland Public Ethics Law and related guidance.**

~~A.~~**G.** Time Commitment for Faculty

1. ~~Faculty~~ **Full-time faculty** may undertake Consulting up to one (1) ~~day~~**Day** per calendar week, ~~across all consultancy agreements,~~**subject to the limitations defined below.**

   a. **Faculty members on 12-month appointments may engage in Consulting for a maximum of 52 Days during a given fiscal year.**

   b. **Faculty members on 9-month appointments may engage in Consulting a maximum of 39 Days each fiscal year during their term of employment with the University.**

      i. **During the other three (3) months of the year, if the faculty member is not receiving any compensation from the University, there will be no limitation placed on the number of Days in which the faculty member may engage in Consulting.**

      ii. **If the faculty member receives any compensation through the University during any portion of the other three (3) months, their Consulting activities will be subject to the one (1) Day per calendar week limitation** during the period ~~for~~**in** which ~~they provide the service, so long as the~~ **the** faculty member is ~~appropriately meeting all~~ **receiving compensation. Such compensation may include but is not limited to summer salary from Sponsored Projects or compensation for teaching at the** University ~~obligations as determined through unit-level reviews, and with~~**during** the ~~approval of their Unit Head. It does not matter if faculty Consult on~~**summer.**

   ~~a.~~**c.** **Consulting activities performed during the** evenings, weekends, or holidays~~; if faculty perform activities that are defined by this Policy as Consulting, it counts~~ **count** towards ~~their~~**the** total number of Consulting ~~days.~~ **Days.**

2. Faculty members ~~on 9-month~~**whose** appointments **with the University are between 50% - 99% FTE** may ~~Consult a maximum~~**engage in Consulting for the number** of ~~39 days,~~**Days proportional to the percentage of their appointment spread** across ~~all Consulting agreements, during an academic year. This does not include the summer period. During the summer period, if~~**the term of their employment with the University during a given fiscal year.**

   a. **The total number of Consulting Days may not exceed 52 days.**

   ~~a.~~**b.** **There will be no limitation placed on the number of Days in which** the faculty member ~~is not engaged~~**may engage** in ~~other compensated~~ **Consulting during any period when the** University ~~work, such as working on grants through summer salary, the one (1) day per calendar week limit~~ does not ~~apply.~~ **compensate them.**

~~1.~~ Faculty members ~~on 12-month appointments may Consult a maximum of 52 days, across all Consulting agreements, during a given fiscal year.~~

4. ~~This Policy does not currently apply to a) adjunct faculty;~~**who would like to engage in Consulting while on sabbatical** or ~~b) faculty whose appointment is below 50% of full-time, unless otherwise determined by the Unit Head~~**Leave Without Pay (LWOP) must comply with the University policies on sabbatical** and ~~next level administrator~~**LWOP**.

~~B.~~**H.** Time Commitment for **Exempt** Staff

1. ~~Staff are permitted~~**Full-time exempt staff may undertake Consulting up** to **one (1) Day per calendar week, subject to the limitations defined below.**

   a. **Exempt staff must continue to meet all of their Institutional Responsibilities, as determined by their job descriptions and reviewed through the University's Performance Review and Development (PRD) process.**

   b. **Exempt staff members on 12-month appointments may** engage in Consulting~~, in compliance with this Policy,~~ **for a maximum of 52 Days during a given fiscal year.**

   ~~a.~~**c.** **Exempt staff may** only **engage in Consulting during periods** outside ~~of~~ their regular University work hours or during periods of approved applicable leave.

~~1. Staff must continue to meet all University obligations as determined by job descriptions and unit reviews and comply with Maryland State Ethics Law and Maryland State Ethics Commission guidance.~~

2. ~~With the approval of their Supervisors,~~**Part-time exempt** staff members ~~on 12-month appointments~~ may ~~Consult a maximum of 52 days, across all~~**engage in** Consulting ~~agreements, during~~ **for the number of Days proportional to the percentage of their appointment at the University spread across the term of their employment for** a given fiscal year.

   a. ~~Banking~~**The total number** of Consulting ~~days is~~**Days may** not ~~permissible without prior approval from the Unit Head and the next-level administrator~~**exceed 52 days**.

   b. ~~Limitations and Exclusions to Consulting~~ **There will be no limitation placed on the number of Days in which they may engage in Consulting activities during any period when the University does not compensate the exempt staff member.**

VI. Responsibilities of University Employees, Unit Heads, and the NLA

A. University Employees

1. University Employees are responsible for adhering to the principles set forth in this Policy, the COI/COC Policy, the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, Funding Agency guidance, and applicable state and federal laws.

2. Questions and/or ambiguities on what constitutes Consulting and the requirements of this Policy should be resolved through collaboration with the University Employee's Unit Head, NLA, and/or applicable university administrators.

3. University Employees must:

~~C.~~ **Submit a Disclosure to the University on all Outside Professional** Activities ~~Related to Research~~

~~1. For Consulting activities related to research, University employees cannot perform activities or hold titles that include Fiduciary or Management Role(s), unless otherwise approved under a COI management plan.~~

~~2. University employees who are chosen to serve on a company's advisory council or scientific advisory board may use titles associated with these appointments, as they are research-related and different from Fiduciary or Management roles and titles. For example, roles with the title, "Scientific Advisor," or "Technical Consultant," are permitted and must be disclosed.~~

~~VI. Responsibilities of University Employees and Unit Heads~~

A. University Employees

1. The responsibility for adhering to the limit on Consulting days, and other aspects of this Policy and related procedures, lies first with the individual employee.

2. University employees must disclose fully and accurately any professional activities that they intend to undertake outside their Institutional Responsibilities.

   a. ~~Disclosure must be made~~**, including Professional Service and Consulting,** before engaging in the activity~~, so as to ensure that the University employee is adhering to the principles set forth in this Policy, and that the University community is not injured by the employee's activity. Questions and/or ambiguities should be resolved through collaboration with the Unit Head, Dean, and/or applicable University officials.~~ **;**

3. University employees entering into a Consulting or related agreement with an external entity must sign an internal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University related to working with external entities and provide a copy of the signed internal MOU, along with any required documentation pertaining to the terms and conditions of the agreement, to the external entity for which the employee is Consulting.

   b. **Disclose all paid or unpaid Consulting activities as part of their Current and Pending (Other) Support documentation on all proposals for federal funding at the time of proposal;**

   c. **Clearly indicate when their work, including publications and presentations, is associated with their Consulting activities, and clarify that the work was not performed in their capacity as a University Employee and is not endorsed by the University; and**

   d. **Sign and abide by the University's Consulting MOU and provide a copy of it to each External Entity with which they Consult.**

B. **Unit Head Responsibilities**

   ~~2.~~**1.**Unit Heads **serve as the Unit-level reviewer for all Disclosures of Outside Professional Activities, including Professional Service and Consulting, in order to assess whether a potential COI or COC exists.**

   ~~3.~~**2.**Unit Heads are responsible for~~:~~ **monitoring the Consulting activities undertaken by University Employees within their Unit.**

   3. ~~Ensuring~~ **Unit Heads must remain knowledgeable about the types of activities that may lead to real, potential, or apparent COIs and/or COCs, and advise**

Unit employees on how they may avoid and/or mitigate COIs, COCs, or similar situations that may adversely affect the University.

4. **Unit Heads must ensure University Employee** compliance with this Policy, the ~~University's~~ COI/COC Policy**, the Disclosure** and ~~Procedures~~**Conflict Management Guidelines**, and Maryland ~~State~~**Public** Ethics Law, as applicable, including:

   a. ~~Reminding~~**Ensuring that** University ~~employees~~**Employees in their Unit do not exceed the total number of Consulting Days allowed by this Policy in a given fiscal year.**

   b. **Making determinations on whether specific activities are part of a University Employee's Institutional Responsibilities or whether they constitute a COC.**

   c. **Making determinations on whether Outside Professional Activities should be considered Consulting or Professional Service for their discipline, based on established Unit principles and University guidance.**

      i. **If a Unit Head's determination seems inconsistent with this Policy and University guidance, the Disclosure Office will advise the Unit Head on whether the Outside Professional Activities should be considered Consulting or Professional Service.**

5. **Unit Heads should remind University Employees** to provide a copy of the ~~signed internal~~**Consulting** MOU to ~~the external entity and attach any required documentation pertaining to the terms and conditions of their Consulting agreement, if applicable;~~
   each External Entity with which they Consult.
~~Working~~
6. **Unit Heads should work** with ~~applicable~~**relevant** University ~~units~~**offices** to provide guidance on Consulting, COIs, and COCs~~; and~~
   to their Unit.
~~Escalating~~
7. **Unit Heads should escalate** any instances of non-compliance to the ~~next-level administrator~~**Next-Level Administrator and Disclosure Office for appropriate action based on the provisions of this Policy and applicable University policies and procedures**.

1. ~~Remaining informed about any Consulting undertaken by University employees within their unit.~~

2. ~~Monitoring the level of outside activities for appropriateness relative to the mission of the unit and for compliance with this Policy and the COI/COC Policy~~

~~and Procedures, Maryland State Ethics Law, and related procedures, as applicable.~~

3. ~~Remaining knowledgeable about the types of activities that may lead to actual or apparent conflicts and, in consultation with the next-level administrator and~~ **Unit Heads should cooperate with all applicable University entities, such as** the COI Committee, ~~advising unit personnel so that they may avoid and/or manage COIs, COCs, or similar situations that may adversely affect the University.~~

4. ~~Reporting approvals of non-research-related Consulting that may constitute a Conflict of Commitment to the COC Review Board, on a rolling basis.~~

5. ~~Cooperating with all applicable University entities such as the COI Committee to resolve and/or manage~~**to eliminate, reduce, and/or Manage** any conflicts that may be identified through the ~~disclosure process.~~

8. ~~Responsibilities~~**review** of **Consulting activities.**

C. Next Level Administrator (NLA)

1. **The NLA serves as** the **next-level reviewer for all Disclosures of Outside Professional Activities, including Professional Service and Consulting.**

2. **The NLA is responsible for making an independent recommendation on whether a potential COI or COC exists.**

3. **The NLA is responsible for broad oversight of Consulting within their Units, including of how Banking is being applied.**

~~B.~~**D.** University **Responsibilities**

1. ~~Oversight:~~The University has ~~obligations~~**an obligation** to oversee Consulting **activities** undertaken by University ~~employees~~**Employees** and ensure compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and **USM and/or** University policies. ~~To that end, the~~

2. **The** University ~~shall~~**will** establish ~~procedures through which disclosures are made, reviewed, mitigation plans established, and/or~~ **and maintain the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines to provide information on the process of submitting and reviewing Disclosures.**

3. **The University must work to identify and eliminate COCs by University Employees.**

~~1.~~**4.**The University is responsible for establishing COI Management Plans, and/or taking** corrective actions ~~taken~~**to eliminate, reduce, or manage COIs**

when they are identified.

VII.   ~~Penalties:~~ **Non-Compliance**

A. **Failure to comply with this Policy and other Disclosure requirements associated with federal funding may be a violation of federal law.**

B. The University has the right and obligation to protect itself from losses due to excess Consulting and to seek restitution for salary and benefits covering time spent on Consulting **activities** beyond the limits provided for by this Policy. ~~Depending upon the severity of the~~

C. **Individuals found to be in** violation~~, the University~~ **of this Policy, USM/University policies and procedures, and/or Funding Agency requirements based on any form of dishonesty or by acting in bad faith,** may ~~also take employment actions~~**face disciplinary action**, including but not limited to formal letters of reprimand, ~~suspensions, and/or~~ **freezing federally-funded research accounts, suspension and/or** termination ~~with prejudice~~**of employment, or**, in accordance with relevant **USM and** University policies~~.~~**, as applicable.**

VIII.   **Associated Policies**

A. **Several USM and University policies are closely related but are separate and distinct from this Policy. These policies can be found at https://policies.umd.edu/all.**

B. **This Policy is designed to ensure compliance with the following USM and University policies and associated requirements.**

   1. **The University of Maryland Policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment ("the COI/COC Policy") (II-3.10[A]) and the Disclosure and Conflict Management Guidelines, which are required by Maryland Public Ethics Law and apply to all University Employees and Graduate Research Assistants (GRAs) working on Sponsored Projects.**

   2. **The University System of Maryland (USM) Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10), which states that "[e]ach institution of the University System of Maryland shall develop and publish procedures to implement this policy" and that "[s]uch procedures shall include provisions for regular reporting by faculty members to the institution on all outside professional consulting or teaching and substantial external professional service, whether paid or unpaid."**

B. **This Policy operates in concert with other USM and University policies related to Consulting, including the following.**

1. **The USM Policy on Intellectual Property (IV-3.20), which prohibits individuals from entering into an agreement to pursue Consulting or Professional Service that conflicts with the policy without the advance written waiver or consent of the Chancellor or their designee.**

2. **The University of Maryland Policy on Malign Foreign Talent Recruitment Program Policy (IV-7.00[A]), which requires University Employees and GRAs to submit a Disclosure if they are a party to any Foreign Talent Recruitment Programs and prohibits University Employees, GRAs, and/or covered individuals on a Sponsored Project from participating in Malign Foreign Talent Recruitment Programs.**

3. **The USM Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10), which, among other things, defines requirements for engaging in Consulting, overload teaching, or Professional Service within the institution and for teaching at other institutions within the USM.**

C. **This Policy is also designed to ensure compliance with federal and state laws and regulations, including the following.**

1. **Federal requirements, including but not limited to National Security Presidential Memorandum-33[4] (NSPM-33), and the regulatory and contractual requirements of Funding Agencies, which require higher education institutions accepting federal funds to have a formal policy in place to address Consulting and other Outside Professional Activities to ensure that these activities are disclosed appropriately and do not negatively impact the interests of the federal government and/or the University.**

2. **Federal laws and regulations and Funding Agency requirements that require all senior/key personnel on Sponsored Projects to report all sources of Current & Pending (Other) Support in proposal submissions, including all current awards, pending proposals, paid/unpaid Consulting activities, Gifts (monetary or in-kind), and any additional information required by the specific Funding Agency.**

1.3.**Maryland Public Ethics Law, which imposes requirements related to COI and associated provisions on research and development, which apply to all University Employees.**

---

[4] **Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 (NSPM-33) on National Security Strategy for United States Government-Supported Research and Development. To find this report online, go to: https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/010422-NSPM-33-Implementation-Guidance.pdf.**

II-3.10(E)   UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON CONSULTING
(Approved by the President on an interim basis, pending University Senate review, October 14, 2022)

I.   Purpose

Participation in consulting can provide an important means for professional development and allows individuals to maintain currency and experience in aspects of their professional fields outside the University of Maryland ("the University"). These activities can also provide a mechanism for the transfer of knowledge from the University to the public arena and contribute to the overall public good. Though such attributes of consulting may make University employees better scholars, teachers, and campus community members, the nature of the consulting process has in it the potential to create a conflict of commitment (COC) by diverting employees' efforts from their primary activities and responsibilities and/or create a conflict of interest (COI) related to those institutional responsibilities and/or related research activities.

The purpose of the University of Maryland Policy on Consulting (the "Policy") is to provide a general definition of "consulting," clarify exclusions to this definition, define the limits on consulting, and establish a balance between those activities and a University employee's regular institutional responsibilities, thereby safeguarding the interests of all parties.

This Policy is also designed to ensure compliance with the following internal and external requirements:

- The University System of Maryland (USM) Policy on Professional Commitment of Faculty (II-3.10), which states that "[e]ach institution of the University System of Maryland shall develop and publish procedures to implement this policy" and that "[s]uch procedures shall include provisions for regular reporting by faculty members to the institution on all outside professional consulting or teaching and substantial external Professional Services, whether paid or unpaid."

- Federal requirements, including but not limited to National Security Presidential Memorandum-33[1] and the regulatory and contractual requirements of federal agencies such as the Public Health Service, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Energy, which presume that institutions accepting federal funds have a formal policy in place to address consulting and other outside activities and ensure

---

[1] Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 (NSPM-33) On National Security Strategy For United States Government-Supported Research and Development.

that these activities do not negatively impact the interests of the federal government and/or the University.

- The requirements of Maryland State Ethics Law[2], which are broadly applicable to all University employees.
- The University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment "COI/COC Policy and Procedures" (II-3.10[A]) and (II-3.10[B]), which are required by Maryland State Ethics Law and apply to all University employees.

Though comprehensive, this Policy cannot address every specific instance of consulting. In cases of doubt, consulting must align with and promote the interests of the University, and must be in compliance with the internal and external requirements listed above, and all applicable University policies.

II. Definitions

A. "Banking" means accumulating multiple consulting days over time in order to use them at once for a larger consecutive period of time.

B. "Conflict of Commitment" means a circumstance that arises when otherwise acceptable outside activities may compromise or appear to compromise the fulfillment of a University employee's institutional responsibilities, as stipulated under Maryland State Ethics Law and/or otherwise determined by the unit head.

C. "Conflict of Commitment (COC) Review Board" is the advisory board, appointed by the Senior Vice President and Provost or designee, to review unit head approvals of outside activities that are unrelated to research endeavors and may or may not constitute a Conflict of Commitment. The COC Review Board has the authority to issue requirements and/or guidance regarding the implementation of local approval processes.

D. "Conflict of Interest" means situations in which members of the University community are in a position to gain, or appear to gain, financial advantage or personal benefit (broadly construed) arising from their University positions, either through outside professional activities or through their research, administrative, or educational actions or decisions at the University.

E. "Conflict of Interest (COI) Committee" is the advisory committee, appointed by the President, in accordance with the University's COI/COC Policy and Procedures related to research endeavors.

F. "Consulting" means any additional activity beyond a University employee's institutional responsibilities, professional in nature, and based on the appropriate discipline or area of expertise, for which the employee may receive additional

---

[2] The State Ethics Law, Maryland Code Annotated, General Provisions Article, § 5-525(e).

personal remuneration, and where such activities primarily benefit the employee and not the University.

G. "Fiduciary Role(s)" means a role that imparts an obligation (i.e., a fiduciary duty) upon an individual to act on behalf of another person(s) or entity and put those interests, which are typically financial, ahead of one's own. Titles that include terms such as executive, officer, director, or manager and positions with titles such as CEO, Director, Scientific Officer, or Vice President are designations that may indicate a role with fiduciary responsibilities.

H. "Institutional Responsibilities" are an employee's professional responsibilities on behalf of the University including, without limitation, research, education, administrative, and/or service responsibilities, and which may include such activities as research, research consultation, teaching, professional practice, committee memberships, and service on University committees, councils, or other institutional bodies.

I. "Management Role(s)" means any role wherein a University employee's responsibilities include formal supervision and/or oversight of personnel activities, as part of an organizational structure. Titles that include terms such as executive, officer, director, or manager and positions with titles such as CEO, Director, Scientific Officer, or Vice President are designations that may indicate a role with management responsibilities.

J. "Moonlighting" means endeavors for financial profit that occur outside of a University employee's Institutional Responsibilities and are not directly related to their professional field or discipline.

K. "Outside Professional Activities" means any additional professional activities, that may be paid or unpaid, are beyond a University employee's institutional responsibilities, are within their discipline or area of expertise, and could include professional service.

L. "Professional Service(s)" means activities that provide a benefit to the University, academia, and/or the public interest, regardless of whether there is personal remuneration.

M. "Publications" are scholarly communications or other products such as books, movies, television productions, art works, etc. that may result in compensation.

N. "Unit Head" means the administrator(s) responsible for a Unit and the individual(s) to which a University employee reports. A Unit Head may be a Director, Department Chair, Dean, Vice President, or a similar official in a non-academic Unit, unless a different individual is designated by proper authority.

III. Applicability

A. This Policy and any associated procedures are applicable to all University employees, even if Consulting occurs outside of regular University business hours, such as on evenings and weekends or when an employee is "off the clock."

B. This Policy is separate and distinct from the University's COI/COC Policy and Procedures, which also apply to activities regardless of whether those activities occur outside of regular University business hours.

C. Compliance with this Policy does not relieve University employees of their obligation to:

   1. Disclose and receive approval for COIs/COCs, as required by University policy and Maryland State Ethics Law;

   2. Disclose the activity as part of the University's Outside Professional Activities (OPA) Report; and/or

   3. Disclose activities as part of current and pending support documentation on federal proposals.

D. Disclosures made pursuant to this Policy, as well as pursuant to the University's COI/COC Policy and Procedures and Outside Professional Activities (OPA) reports are not automatically populated into other institutional systems and may need to be separately disclosed.

E. Applicability of this Policy is subject to change per Maryland State Ethics Commission guidance and/or state and federal laws and regulations.

IV. Scope

A. Consulting is permitted, provided:

   1. The University employee's Institutional Responsibilities have been met;

   2. The limitations on Consulting, as defined in Section V. below, are not exceeded;

   3. The requirements of Section VI.A below are met; and

   4. The relationship and/or any related financial interest(s) are disclosed, reviewed, and managed as required by the federal government and/or University policies.

B. Exclusions

1. Publications, including scholarly communications and/or other Publications in the form of books, movies, television productions, art works, or other products, which may or may not result in compensation for a University employee and/or external entity (e.g., publisher). When produced in the course of a University employee's Institutional Responsibilities, such Publications are not viewed as Consulting. It is not the purpose of this Policy to differentiate between specific types of Publications or the roles of those published works in different disciplines; however, if a University employee is listed as an author on any Publication resulting from performance of Consulting services, the Publication should include a disclosure stating that the work was performed as a consultant and was not part of the employee's Institutional Responsibilities to the University.

2. Professional Service is distinct from Consulting in that such service is for the benefit of public institutions and/or the University. Examples of Professional Service include but are not limited to service provided to (a) United States (U.S. or federal) national commissions; (b) U.S. federal, state, and local governmental agencies and boards; (c) federal and state granting agency peer review panels; (d) approved foreign governmental agencies, boards, and peer review panels; (e) philanthropic organizations or charities; (f) professional societies; (g) academic and/or professional journals, including editorial board service; (h) visiting committees; or (i) advisory groups to other U.S. or approved foreign universities, and analogous bodies.

   Although an honorarium or equivalent sometimes is forthcoming, Professional Service is not undertaken for personal financial gain; therefore, such service does not fall within the Consulting category as defined by this Policy. Federal regulations and award requirements related to federally-funded sponsored activities consider income provided for service to some non-governmental organizations, including foundations and professional societies, to be Consulting and reporting is required as set forth in regulations and agency guidance.

3. Moonlighting by University employees is considered part of the employee's private life and is excluded from this Policy. However, Moonlighting activities performed for foreign entities such as foreign institutions of higher education, foreign governments, or foreign companies, must be disclosed to the University for federal compliance purposes.

V.   Limitations

A. Time Commitment for Faculty

Faculty may undertake Consulting up to one (1) day per calendar week, across all consultancy agreements, during the period for which they provide the service, so long as the faculty member is appropriately meeting all University obligations as determined through unit-level reviews, and with the approval of their Unit Head. It does not matter if faculty Consult on evenings, weekends, or holidays; if faculty

perform activities that are defined by this Policy as Consulting, it counts towards their total number of Consulting days.

1. Faculty members on 9-month appointments may Consult a maximum of 39 days, across all Consulting agreements, during an academic year. This does not include the summer period. During the summer period, if the faculty member is not engaged in other compensated University work, such as working on grants through summer salary, the one (1) day per calendar week limit does not apply.

2. Faculty members on 12-month appointments may Consult a maximum of 52 days, across all Consulting agreements, during a given fiscal year.

3. This Policy does not currently apply to a) adjunct faculty; or b) faculty whose appointment is below 50% of full-time, unless otherwise determined by the Unit Head and next level administrator.

B. Time Commitment for Staff

1. Staff are permitted to engage in Consulting, in compliance with this Policy, only outside of their regular University work hours or during periods of approved applicable leave.

2. Staff must continue to meet all University obligations as determined by job descriptions and unit reviews and comply with Maryland State Ethics Law and Maryland State Ethics Commission guidance.

3. With the approval of their Supervisors, staff members on 12-month appointments may Consult a maximum of 52 days, across all Consulting agreements, during a given fiscal year.

C. Banking of Consulting days is not permissible without prior approval from the Unit Head and the next-level administrator.

D. Limitations and Exclusions to Consulting Activities Related to Research

1. For Consulting activities related to research, University employees cannot perform activities or hold titles that include Fiduciary or Management Role(s), unless otherwise approved under a COI management plan.

2. University employees who are chosen to serve on a company's advisory council or scientific advisory board may use titles associated with these appointments, as they are research-related and different from Fiduciary or Management roles and titles. For example, roles with the title, "Scientific Advisor," or "Technical Consultant," are permitted and must be disclosed.

VI. **Responsibilities of University Employees and Unit Heads**

A. University Employees

1. The responsibility for adhering to the limit on Consulting days, and other aspects of this Policy and related procedures, lies first with the individual employee.

2. University employees must disclose fully and accurately any professional activities that they intend to undertake outside their Institutional Responsibilities.

3. Disclosure must be made before engaging in the activity, so as to ensure that the University employee is adhering to the principles set forth in this Policy, and that the University community is not injured by the employee's activity. Questions and/or ambiguities should be resolved through collaboration with the Unit Head, Dean, and/or applicable University officials.

4. University employees entering into a Consulting or related agreement with an external entity must sign an internal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University related to working with external entities and provide a copy of the signed internal MOU, along with any required documentation pertaining to the terms and conditions of the agreement, to the external entity for which the employee is Consulting.

B. Unit Heads

Unit Heads are responsible for:

1. Ensuring compliance with this Policy, the University's COI/COC Policy and Procedures, and Maryland State Ethics Law, as applicable, including:

   a. Reminding University employees to provide a copy of the signed internal MOU to the external entity and attach any required documentation pertaining to the terms and conditions of their Consulting agreement, if applicable;

   b. Working with applicable University units to provide guidance on Consulting, COIs, and COCs; and

   c. Escalating any instances of non-compliance to the next-level administrator.

2. Remaining informed about any Consulting undertaken by University employees within their unit.

3. Monitoring the level of outside activities for appropriateness relative to the mission of the unit and for compliance with this Policy and the COI/COC Policy and Procedures, Maryland State Ethics Law, and related procedures, as applicable.

4. Remaining knowledgeable about the types of activities that may lead to actual or apparent conflicts and, in consultation with the next-level administrator and the COI Committee, advising unit personnel so that they may avoid and/or manage COIs, COCs, or similar situations that may adversely affect the University.

5. Reporting approvals of non-research-related Consulting that may constitute a Conflict of Commitment to the COC Review Board, on a rolling basis.

6. Cooperating with all applicable University entities such as the COI Committee to resolve and/or manage any conflicts that may be identified through the disclosure process.

VII. **Responsibilities of the University**

A. Oversight: The University has obligations to oversee Consulting undertaken by University employees and ensure compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and University policies. To that end, the University shall establish procedures through which disclosures are made, reviewed, mitigation plans established, and/or corrective actions taken.

B. Penalties: The University has the right and obligation to protect itself from losses due to excess Consulting and to seek restitution for salary and benefits covering time spent on Consulting beyond the limits provided for by this Policy. Depending upon the severity of the violation, the University may also take employment actions, including but not limited to formal letters of reprimand, suspensions, and/or termination with prejudice, in accordance with relevant University policies.

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Transmittal | #24-25-21
Special Committee on Policy Review

Preliminary report of the Special Committee on Policy Review
(Senate Document # 24-25-21)

Presented By: Rochelle Newman, Chair

Review Date: SEC - January, 21, 2026 | Senate - February 3, 2026

Voting Method: In a single vote

Relevant Policy/Document: Senate Document # 24-25-21

Necessary Approvals: Senate Executive Committee, Senate

Description:
During the last University of Maryland (UMD) accreditation review, one of the concerns raised was the absence of a formal process for reviewing older policies to ensure their relevance and currency. To address this, the Senate formed a special committee to start the process and assess the need for a permanent committee. The committee was formed in Spring, 2025, and was charged with reviewing UMD policies, identifying those needing updates or elimination, and delivering a final report to the Senate by January, 2026.

Committee Work:
Members of the Special Committee on Policy Review (SCPR, or hereinafter "the committee") examined almost 150 policies; of those, 39 were identified as needing updates. This includes 6 requiring technical changes and 33 requiring more substantive changes and/or further review.

We note that this is a substantial number of policies and indicates the need for a more regular review process. In addition, the committee discovered several policies with broken links, and one, on APT, that had been posted incorrectly, resulting in serious errors, again suggesting that a regular process of reviewing policies is helpful.

The committee's work demonstrates that policy review is an ongoing governance responsibility rather than a one-time corrective effort. The scope and volume of policies requiring attention, coupled with the need for continuity and institutional memory, cannot be effectively managed through periodic special committees. While we initially considered recommending a periodic review process, the scale and pace of change on campus strongly support a permanent, ongoing body instead. Based on this experience, the committee's recommendation is to establish a standing committee on policy review to ensure regular, consistent, and sustainable policy oversight. Among other reasons, the committee noted that:

1. The backlog of policy changes needed as a result of our not having such a process previously was extensive; going forward, a standing committee would result in a more even distribution of work over time.
2. Given the large number of policies that the SCPR needed to look at, it did not have sufficient time to look in depth at any individual policy; as a result, there were a number of policies that it felt it did not do justice to evaluating. A permanent committee that was looking at a smaller number of policies per year would be in a better place to make recommendations.

We also envision this standing committee having responsibilities that go beyond routine policy review, including:

1. **Minor Changes:** Recommending technical or minor changes directly to the SEC for approval, reducing workload on other Senate bodies.
2. **Major Change Tracking:** Identifying policies impacted by major shifts—such as Workday implementation or new USM policies—and recommending updates accordingly.
3. **Oversight and Scheduling:** Maintaining a reasonable re-review schedule, ensuring the online policy repository remains accurate, and proactively managing the policy inventory
4. **Ad-Hoc Support:** Providing recommendations to the Senate Director on policy issues that arise outside of the regular Senate cycle.

Thus, there are a number of other benefits to forming a standing committee.

Finally, the special committee considered the ideal make-up of the proposed standing committee and how it should be formed. Our conclusions are as follows:

1. The committee should be appointed by the Committee on Committees rather than be an elected committee. In order to be successful, this committee requires not only broad representation, but critically requires that its members have experience with how policies are implemented on our campus and familiarity with the campus governance processes. This is easier to ensure with an appointed committee.
2. When appointing members of the committee, the Committee on Committees should primarily focus on the individuals' prior experience with campus policy. In particular, all faculty and staff members should have served on previous senate standing committee(s) with a minimum of 1 year's experience with the Senate or a Senate committee. Student representatives should also have prior experience either with the Senate or with their own representative governance (either RHA, SGA, or GSG).
3. The committee should consist of a Chair, plus 12 members. This allows for subdivision into 3 subcommittees of 4 people each. This year, the Special Committee on Policy Review was subdivided into 4 subcommittees of 3 people each to look at different policies. But our experience suggested both that 4 subcommittees were too many to keep track of, and that 3 people per subcommittee were insufficient in terms of breadth of experience.

4. The 12 members of the committee should include as an *ex-officio* voting member the immediate past chair of the Senate in order to ensure continuity of knowledge with regards to recent University Senate policy considerations.
5. The 11 members of the committee beyond the ex-officio member should include 1 undergraduate student, 1 graduate student, 3 staff, and 6 faculty; that will allow for a minimum of 2 faculty members and 1 staff member on each subcommittee.
6. We recommend that faculty and staff serve 2-year terms, with staggered starting years, to ensure continuity of knowledge. In order to build this staggered system, we recommend that some faculty and staff be appointed for a single year when the committee begins.

Finally, we recommend that this new committee be referred to as the Committee on Policy Review.

Recommendations:
The Special Committee on Policy Review moves that the report be accepted and that a new standing Committee on Policy Review be established.

To move this work forward, the committee recommends that the Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee propose bylaw amendments to formally add the Committee on Policy Review as a standing committee. The committee also recommends that the Committee on Committees begin selecting members as early as Spring 2026 so that the committee may begin its work in Fall 2026.

The committee further recommends that the Senate Executive Committee, in consultation with the University Senate Director, determine an implementation model that aligns the committee's scope of work with available administrative capacity and the regular Senate cycle. This may include phased implementation, defined limits on the number of policies reviewed annually, or the identification of additional staffing or compensation support for the University Senate Office.

Alternatives:
As an alternative to establishing a new standing committee, the Senate Executive Committee could assign responsibility for policy review to an existing standing committee through a revised charge and clearly defined scope, thereby addressing policy review needs without creating a new committee structure.

Risks:
There are existing Senate policies that are no longer current or relevant, which have the potential to cause confusion to campus constituencies and to leave the campus open to complaints of inconsistency. Without a defined, sustainable mechanism for regular policy review, the University risks maintaining outdated or inconsistent policies that may undermine clarity, compliance, and institutional credibility.

Financial Implications:

The creation of a new Standing Committee on Policy Review would constitute a significant and ongoing expansion of the University Senate Office's administrative responsibilities. Unlike most standing committees, the proposed committee would require continuous coordination, longitudinal tracking of policy inventories, management of policy review schedules, maintenance of policy documentation, and campus consultations.

While workload allocation within the University Senate Office falls within the purview of the University Senate Director, the scope of responsibilities envisioned for this committee would significantly expand ongoing administrative obligations. Absent additional staffing, compensation adjustments, or clearly defined limits on the committee's scope, implementation would place an unfunded operational burden on existing staff. For this reason, the establishment of a standing Committee on Policy Review should be undertaken in consultation with the University Senate Director and structured to ensure sustainability and preserve the University Senate Office's ability to meet its existing obligations.

It is worth noting, however, that while appropriate staffing entails additional costs, policy inconsistencies or inaccuracies could also have legal and financial impacts (by leaving the university open to potential lawsuits).