



1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the February 5, 2020 Senate Minutes (Action)
3. Report of the Chair (Information)
4. Deactivation of the University of Maryland, College Park Policy and Procedures Concerning Telephone Credit Cards (Senate Document #19-20-43) (Information)
5. Interim University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports (Senate Document #18-19-34) (Action)
6. Interim University of Maryland Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports (Senate Document #18-19-35) (Action)
7. Amendment to the Code of Academic Integrity (Senate Document #19-20-32) (Action)
8. PCC Proposal to Rename the Master of Science in "Veterinary Medical Science" to "Comparative Biomedical Sciences" (Senate Document #19-20-41) (Action)
9. PCC Proposal to Rename the Ph.D. in "Veterinary Medical Sciences" to "Comparative Biomedical Sciences" (Senate Document #19-20-42) (Action)
10. Proposal to Lower the University's GPA Cutoff for Latin Honors Eligibility (Senate Document #19-20-10) (Action)
11. Special Order  
George Hurtt  
Chair, University Research Council  
*Preliminary Directions on the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes*
12. Special Order  
Katharine Abraham  
Chair, Special Committee on University Finance (SCUF)  
*Spring 2020 Update on the Activities of the Special Committee on University Finance*
13. New Business
14. Adjournment



## **CALL TO ORDER**

---

Senate Chair Lanford called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

## **APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2019 SENATE MINUTES (ACTION)**

---

The minutes were approved as distributed.

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

---

- **Senator Elections:** The candidacy period for staff, student, and single-member constituency elections for the 2020-2021 Senate ends this Friday, February 7th. Elections will begin on February 24th. This Friday is also the deadline for the Deans to report the results of their faculty Senator elections.
- **Nominations for Elected Committees & Councils:** The Nominations Committee has started its work identifying potential nominees for the Senate's elected committees and councils including the Senate Executive Committee, the Committee on Committees, the Athletic Council, and the Council of University System Faculty. Senators will receive an email in the coming days soliciting self-nominations and nominations of their colleagues. With the upcoming transition in University leadership, it is important to continue to have strong nominees running in all of these elections.
- **Presidential Search Update:** The Presidential Search Committee is progressing along its expected timeline as published online by the University. The committee is transitioning from Phase 4 (Selecting Finalists and Recommendations to the Board of Regents to Phase 5 - The Final Choice. We do not have information regarding a date for the announcement of the final selection.

## **SPECIAL ORDER - NATE BURKE, UNIVERSITY HEALTH CENTER, CAMPUS ADVOCATES RESPOND & EDUCATE (CARE) TO STOP VIOLENCE; CHAIR, UMD SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION COMMITTEE (SAPC) - *SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND***

---

Burke provided an overview of the implementation of the Joint President/Senate Sexual Assault Task Force's recommendations to date.

Burke noted that the Sexual Assault Prevention Committee (SAPC) was on track with the second year of the implementation timeline. He stated that thus far, they have been able to deliver the StepUp Bystander Intervention training to over 3,500 new first-year students and noted that they had moved to a peer-peer model with paid student educators, which has been well received by students and instructors. They have also provided graduate student orientation programming and a new faculty orientation presentation.

Burke stated that colleges were in the process of developing their College Action Plans, which are due by April 1, 2020.

He noted that they were considering the EverFi training modules for the prevention programming but noted that it needed an assessment strategy and fidelity monitoring.

Burke closed by reviewing next steps in implementation including online training for second-year students, online training for student organization leadership, and graduate assistants.

- A Senator inquired about the resources available to members of the campus community who wish to support a victim of sexual assault and resources available to the victim.
- Burke stated that the University is trying to centralize information in order to prevent misinformation. He noted that the University provides support for both primary and secondary members of the community. He stated that the college action plans will centralize messaging and redirect people within each college to the appropriate resources.

### **PCC PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A MASTER OF SCIENCE IN APPLIED POLITICAL ANALYTICS (SENATE DOCUMENT #19-20-34)**

---

Janna Bianchini, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) Committee presented the proposal and provided background information.

Senators did not discuss the proposal but voted to approve it with **90 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions.**

### **PCC PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A MASTER OF SCIENCE IN BIOCOMPUTATIONAL ENGINEERING (SENATE DOCUMENT #19-20-35)**

---

Janna Bianchini, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) Committee presented the proposal and provided background information.

Senators did not discuss the proposal but voted to approve it with **89 in favor, 9 opposed, and 3 abstentions.**

### **AMENDMENT TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING FACULTY GRIEVANCES (SENATE DOCUMENT #19-20-28)**

---

Daniel Lathrop, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee presented the proposal and provided background information.

- A Senator inquired about the intersection of the non-discrimination policy with this policy.
- Ellin Scholnick, Faculty Ombudsperson & member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, clarified that the University's non-discrimination covers discrimination based on a protected class but noted that other forms of discrimination can be grieved.

The Senate voted to approve the proposal with a vote of **76 in favor, 7 opposed, and 14 abstentions**.

## **REVISION TO THE POLICY ON PAYMENT OF TUITION AND FEES (SENATE DOCUMENT #19-20-09)**

---

William Reed, Chair of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee presented the proposal and provided background information.

- Senator Breslow raised a broad concern on an issue unrelated to the proposal at hand. He stated that there should be an ongoing process for ensuring that policies are being reviewed regularly.
- Senate Chair Lanford assured the Senator that the Senate leadership had been working to develop a structure around oversight, responsibility, and review processes for all official policies. However, she noted that additional resources in the Senate Office would be needed to help facilitate that process.

The Senate voted to approve the proposal with a vote of **90 in favor, 0 opposed, and 5 abstentions**.

## **REVISION TO THE SENATE BYLAWS ON REPRESENTATION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION (SENATE DOCUMENT #19-20-16)**

---

Alan Peel, Chair of the Elections, Representation & Governance (ERG) Committee presented the proposal and provided background information.

- Lanford noted that revisions to the Senate Bylaws require a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote in favor to be approved.

Senators did not discuss the proposal but voted to approve it with **85 in favor, 6 opposed**.

## **UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON THE USE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S NAME AND TRADEMARKS BY EXTERNAL ENTITIES IN RESEARCH-RELATED ENDORSEMENTS AND PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS (SENATE DOCUMENT #19-20-36)**

---

Robert Dooling, Chair of the Endorsement Subcommittee of the University Research Council presented the new policy and provided background information.

Senators did not discuss the proposal but voted to approve it with **84 in favor, 3 opposed, and 6 abstentions**.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

---

There was no New Business

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.



## Deactivation of the University of Maryland, College Park Policy and Procedures Concerning Telephone Credit Cards

**PRESENTED BY** Derek Richardson, Chair, IT Council

**REVIEW DATES** SEC – February 21, 2020 | SENATE – March 3, 2020

**VOTING METHOD** In a single vote

**RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT** [X-3.02\(A\) – University of Maryland, College Park Policy and Procedures Concerning Telephone Credit Cards](#)

**NECESSARY APPROVALS** Senate, President

### ISSUE

---

Telephone credits cards are no longer issued by the University nor are they available from telephone vendors. Therefore, a policy on their use is no longer needed.

### RECOMMENDATION(S)

---

The University of Maryland, College Park Policy and Procedures Concerning Telephone Credit Cards (X-3.02[A]) should be deactivated.

### COMMITTEE WORK

---

As part of a comprehensive review of campus information technology (IT) related polices, the IT Council (ITC) in consultation with the Division of IT (DIT) noted that the University of Maryland, College Park Policy and Procedures Concerning Telephone Credit Cards (X-3.02[A]) may no longer be relevant since the technology covered by the policy (telephone credit cards) is no longer used by the University.

The ITC consulted with DIT staff members to confirm if telephone credit cards are no longer used. DIT reported that the last of the phone credit cards were shredded 8 years ago (after several years of non-use). It was confirmed vendors discontinued them about a decade ago. The Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer was consulted and concurred that deactivation of this policy is appropriate.

Based on the above information, the IT Council voted at its December 18, 2019 meeting to recommend this policy be deactivated.

### ALTERNATIVES

---

The Senate could decline to deactivate the policy. However, the policy could would likely cause confusion.

## **RISKS**

---

There are no known risks to the University in deactivating this policy.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

---

There are no known financial implications in deactivating this policy.



## **X-3.02(A) UMCP POLICY AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING TELEPHONE CREDIT CARDS**

(Approved by the President August 1, 1991)

### **I. Policy**

Whenever possible, official calls should be dialed directly from University telephones. If business requires that calls be made from outside of the University system, or for conference calling arrangements with multiple off-campus parties conducting University business, a credit card may be requested from the Department of Communication Services. Credit Cards issued by the University may not be used to make personal calls.

### **II. Procedures for Obtaining Telephone Credit Cards**

The requesting department should prepare a memorandum containing the following information:

- A. Name of the person to whom the card is assigned.
- B. Accounting Unit and FAS number to which the card will be assigned.
- C. Signature of person with budgetary authority.
- D. Statement of need for a credit card.

The memorandum should be forwarded to the Department of Communication Services, Telecommunication Services, Campus.

### **III. Procedure for Reporting a Missing Credit Card or Suspicion of Misuse**

The card holder should immediately contact Telecommunication Services with the following information:

- A. name of card holder;
- B. department; and
- C. credit card number.

The credit card will be canceled. A new card may be issued if desired.

### **IV. Use of Credit Card**

When using a credit card, the individual placing the call should enter the credit card number electronically rather than requesting operator assistance.

### **V. Conference Calls**

As noted in UMCP Policy X-3.00(A), conference calls with more than three people located off campus need operator assistance. There is a charge for such assistance, and when a telephone operator is used the call must be charged to a credit card. University issued credit cards may be used for this purpose so long as the call is for official University business.



## Interim University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports

<b>PRESENTED BY</b>	Daniel Lathrop, Chair
<b>REVIEW DATES</b>	SEC – February 21, 2020   SENATE – March 3, 2020
<b>VOTING METHOD</b>	In a single vote
<b>RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT</b>	<a href="#">II-2.25(A) UM Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports</a> <a href="#">II-1.00(D) UM Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances</a> <a href="#">II-2.30(D) Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty</a>
<b>NECESSARY APPROVALS</b>	Senate, President

### ISSUE

---

Due to recent changes in state law, the University System of Maryland (USM) revised its Policy on Parental Leave and Other Family Supports for Faculty ([II-2.25](#)) in June 2019. The University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports (II-2.25[A]) was revised to reflect the changes in USM policy and was approved on an interim basis on September 19, 2019, pending University Senate review. In September 2019, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Faculty Affairs Committee with reviewing the interim Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports, consulting with administrators and with faculty who have recently utilized the policy, considering provisions related to age limits and types of leave that faculty can use, consulting with the Staff Affairs Committee (which was charged with reviewing a similar policy covering staff), recommending changes, as appropriate, and considering how any such changes should impact other University policies.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the proposed revision to the University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports (II-2.25[A]), as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the proposed revision to the University of Maryland Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances (II-1.00[D]), as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty (II-2.30[D]) be deactivated.

### COMMITTEE WORK

---

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) consulted with representatives of relevant administrative units, reviewed USM policies and state law, conducted a survey of faculty members who have recently

used the policy, and considered several substantive issues identified in its charge. The committee determined that faculty should not be required to use sick leave when taking Parental Leave, but that they should retain the option of doing so. The FAC considered language in the interim policy indicating that Parental Leave can only be used for adoption, fostering, and the assumption of legal guardianship if a child is under the age of six. The committee determined that there is no compelling reason to impose such a restriction, and recommended revisions that would make the benefit available to support the addition of any child under the age of eighteen. The committee also proposed a series of technical revisions to the policy.

The committee evaluated whether any changes in the Parental Leave Policy should impact other University policies. It determined that the assumption of parenting responsibilities by fostering or assuming legal guardianships should result in an extension of the time for tenure consideration, as is the case with childbirth and adoption; the committee recommended revisions to this effect to the Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances. The FAC also determined that the Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty have been superseded by the Parental Leave Policy, and recommended that Adoption Leave Policy be deactivated.

After due consideration, the Faculty Affairs Committee voted to approve its recommendations and proposed revisions to the University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports at its meeting on February 11, 2020.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

---

The Senate could choose not to approve the revisions to the University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports and the Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances, and the committee's additional recommendation. However, the University would lose the opportunity to support families who welcome children older than six years of age, clarify aspects of the process, ensure consistency in faculty access to extensions of the tenure clock, and eliminate an unnecessary policy.

## **RISKS**

---

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

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

---

The revisions may have limited financial implications depending on the frequency with which faculty assume parenting responsibilities for children over the age of 6.



## Interim University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports

### 2019-2020 Committee Members

**Daniel Lathrop** (Chair)  
**John Bertot** (Ex-Officio Provost’s Rep)  
**Michele Eastman** (Ex-Officio President’s Rep)  
**Marc Pound** (Ex-Officio CUSF Rep)  
**Jacqueline Richmond** (Ex-Officio Director of Human Resources Rep)  
**Ellin Scholnick** (Ex-Officio Ombuds Officer)  
**Caryn Bell** (Faculty Senator)  
**Caroline Boules** (Faculty Senator)  
**Agislaos Iliadis** (Faculty Senator)  
**Nicole LaRonde** (Faculty Senator)  
**Mark Fuge** (Faculty)  
**Shevaun Lewis** (Faculty)

**Jessica O’Hara** (Faculty)  
**Janice Reutt-Robey** (Faculty)  
**Kevin Roy** (Faculty)  
**Don Webster** (Faculty)  
**Lexxie Monahan** (Staff)  
**Deanna Barath** (Graduate Student)  
**Ashley Hixson** (Graduate Student)  
**Benjamin Lin** (Undergraduate Student)

### Date of Submission

February 2020

## BACKGROUND

---

Due to recent changes in state law, the University System of Maryland (USM) revised its Policy on Parental Leave and Other Family Supports for Faculty ([II-2.25](#)) in June 2019. The University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports (II-2.25[A]) was revised to reflect the changes in USM policy and was approved on an interim basis on September 19, 2019, pending University Senate review. In September 2019, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Faculty Affairs Committee with reviewing the interim Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports, consulting with administrators and with faculty who have recently utilized the policy, considering provisions related to age limits and types of leave that faculty can use, consulting with the Staff Affairs Committee (which was charged with reviewing a similar policy covering staff), recommending changes, as appropriate, and considering how any such changes should impact other University policies (Appendix 1).

## KEY CHANGES IN INTERIM POLICY

---

The University’s Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports provides eligible faculty a guaranteed period of paid Parental Leave to support the addition of a child to the family. The benefit requires that faculty use various forms of accrued leave to ensure that the faculty member is paid during Parental Leave. If these forms of leave are exhausted before the faculty member reaches the guaranteed period of paid Parental Leave, the University will provide additional supplemental paid leave to cover the balance.

The interim policy made several substantive changes to the nature of the benefit.

- Faculty are now guaranteed twelve weeks of paid Parental Leave, up from eight weeks.
- Faculty must still exhaust all accrued annual and personal leave, and must now also use any holiday or administrative leave observed or granted during the Parental Leave period.

Faculty no longer have to use sick or collegial leave, which will remain available for use once faculty return to work.

- Before becoming eligible for Parental Leave, nine-month faculty must have been at the University for at least one semester, and twelve-month faculty for at least six months. Previously, the policy determined length of service requirements by faculty type (instructional vs research).
- In addition to birth, adoption, or foster care, faculty may now use Parental Leave when assuming legal guardianship of a child.
- Parental Leave must now be taken continuously, and is no longer available on an interim basis.
- Parental Leave must now be used during a six-month period surrounding the addition of a child to the family; previously, leave could be taken at any point during the six months preceding and twelve months following the arrival of a child.

## COMMITTEE WORK

---

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) began reviewing its charge at its meeting on October 14, 2019. It reviewed the relevant policies and state law. The FAC consulted with representatives of the Office of Faculty Affairs, University Human Resources, and the Office of General Counsel during its review.

The FAC considered how to gather feedback from faculty who have used the Parental Leave benefit. In conjunction with the Staff Affairs Committee, which was charged with assessing staff experiences with Parental Leave, the Senate Office developed a short survey to provide an opportunity for respondents to share both positive and negative experiences with the policy and with Parental Leave. The survey was distributed to thirty-one faculty members who used the benefit in the past eighteen months, and received ten responses. Most of the respondents expressed gratitude for the ability to take twelve weeks with their child. The low number of responses made further generalizations impossible.

In reviewing the state law and leave types associated with Parental Leave, the FAC considered whether accrued sick leave should be relied upon as part of the paid Parental Leave benefit. The committee learned that System policy permits individual institutions to determine which types of leave faculty must use before the institution will provide additional paid leave. Prior to developing the interim UMD policy, the Office of Faculty Affairs conducted a survey on types of leave available for Parental Leave among faculty at the University. The survey revealed that approximately half of faculty at the University would be forced to completely exhaust their sick leave in order to reach the twelve weeks of assured paid leave they were entitled to by law, if sick leave were required to be used under the University's policy. The University's interim policy does not require faculty to use their sick leave, though it does permit faculty to use sick leave if they choose, given some faculty do not earn other forms of leave. After considering the leave types available to faculty, the FAC agreed that faculty should not be required to use sick leave, though they should be able to choose to use it if they have sick leave available to them.

The FAC considered whether to retain the age limits referenced in the policy. The University System of Maryland policy gives institutions the discretion to establish limitations, including age limits. The interim UMD policy indicates that faculty may use Parental Leave to support the adoption of a child

under six years of age. The interim policy also indicates that the benefit can be used for “the assumption of other parenting responsibilities, such as foster parenting or legal guardianship of a child under the age of six (6).” In considering the age limits in the policy, the FAC noted that children older than six years of age who join a family may need care just as much as younger children, particularly if they have experienced trauma or have special needs. The FAC determined that there is no compelling reason to impose an age restriction, or to privilege certain parenting circumstances over others. The FAC agreed to recommend that the age restrictions be removed, and that the benefit be available when adopting, fostering, or assuming legal guardianship of any child under the age of eighteen.

The FAC also considered whether foster parenting and assuming legal guardianship should be grounds for extending the time for tenure review. The University of Maryland Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances (II-1.00[D]) already permits extensions for instances of childbirth or adoption. The FAC determined that assuming any of the parenting responsibilities that entitle one to Parental Leave, including foster parenting and the assuming legal guardianship, should result in an extension of the time for tenure consideration.

The FAC also considered whether the Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty (II-2.30[D]) should be retained (Appendix 2). The policy was last revised in 1991, and is out of alignment with current practices. After reviewing the provisions of the policy, the FAC determined that it has been superseded by the Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports. The committee agreed to recommend that the Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty be deactivated.

During its review, the committee also considered language in the Policy on Faculty Parental Leave that allows faculty to appeal decisions related to Modified Duty Family Support Plans in a process that involves the University of Maryland Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Grievances (II-4.00[A]). Modified Duty Family Support Plans, which allow eligible faculty members to reduce or modify their duties for a period of time, are negotiated between the faculty member and the appropriate unit head. The FAC discussed the most appropriate forum for appeals, noting that the grievance policy requires the Senate to convene a faculty hearing board and follow a detailed process. The FAC had difficulty identifying an appropriate alternative, given that the creation of Modified Duty Family Support Plans already involve other administrators beyond the faculty member’s chair or dean. After considering various options, the FAC determined that the issues that could arise when creating Modified Duty Family Support Plans are most appropriate for mediation with the Faculty Ombuds Officer, and as such are legitimately within the purview of the grievance policy.

After due consideration, the Faculty Affairs Committee voted to approve its recommendations and proposed revisions to the University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports at its meeting on February 11, 2020.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the proposed revision to the University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports (II-2.25[A]), as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the proposed revision to the University of Maryland Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances (II-1.00[D]), as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty (II-2.30[D]) be deactivated.

## **APPENDICES**

---

Appendix 1 — Charge from the Senate Executive Committee

Appendix 2 — Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty (II-2.30[D])



## II-2.25(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON FACULTY PARENTAL LEAVE AND OTHER FAMILY SUPPORTS

(Approved by the President November 1, 2012; Amended October 7, 2016;  
Amended and approved on an interim basis by the President September 19, 2019)

### I. Purpose ~~& Eligibility Period~~

This policy is intended to support faculty in balancing professional and family demands before and after the addition of children to the family (by birth, adoption, foster parenting, and/or legal guardianship) through a combination of measures to promote a family-friendly environment. These measures include:

- a. A minimum assured period of paid Parental Leave of twelve (12) work weeks;
- b. Eligibility for a Modified Duty Family Support Plan;
- c. Extension of Time for Tenure Review for new parents;
- d. Availability of lactation facilities.

The term "Parental Leave" is used in this ~~P~~**p**olicy to refer to the entirety of the paid leave period available to eligible faculty to care for children new to the family. Up to twelve (12) work weeks of Parental Leave is available through a combination of paid leave charged to a faculty member's accrued leave balance and/or Assured Parental Leave provided by the University. Parental Leave is just one component of the family support measures provided under this ~~P~~**p**olicy.

Parental Leave and all other family support measures under this ~~P~~**p**olicy shall be available on a continuous basis during a six (6) month period surrounding the addition of a child (or children) to the family.

### II. Assured Minimum Parental Leave

Each eligible faculty member shall be assured a period of up to twelve (12) work weeks (i.e., sixty (60) **continuous** work days) of paid Parental Leave to care for a new child (or children) **under the age of eighteen (18)**, as follows:

- A. Nature of Leave: During the Parental Leave period, faculty shall use any accrued **and available** annual and personal leave ~~available for use under USM BOR Policy II-2.40 Policy on Annual Leave for Faculty;~~ **observed** holiday leave ~~for holidays observed during Parental Leave; or~~ **and** discretionary administrative leave **that is** granted ~~to an institution's employees by the President for institutional closures that occur during an~~ **the employee's** Parental Leave period, ~~such as in the case of extreme inclement weather or to provide employees with an additional day off prior to a holiday~~ **for institutional closures**. If none of these categories of leave is available to the faculty

member, supplemental paid leave days (referred to as “Assured Parental Leave”) shall be provided by the institution to attain the twelve (12) work weeks of paid Parental Leave. Faculty are not required to use accrued sick leave as part of their paid Parental Leave period, but may elect to do so in combination with other forms of paid leave (i.e., annual, personal, ~~collegial~~, holiday, administrative, or Assured Parental Leave) to which the faculty member is entitled. No institutional work-related duties are required of the faculty member by the University while on Parental Leave.

B. Interaction of Leave with the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)

All leave taken during the Parental Leave period (annual, personal, sick, ~~collegial~~, holiday, administrative, **and/or** Assured Parental Leave) shall run concurrently with any available FMLA leave (“FML”) per ~~Section IV of the~~ USM ~~BOR~~ Policy II-2.31 Policy on Family and Medical Leave for Faculty, if the faculty member is also eligible for FML under USM ~~BOR~~ Policy II-2.31. Both policies shall be administered concurrently.

C. Applicability: The twelve (12) work weeks of paid Parental Leave is available on a continuous basis during a six (6) month period surrounding either:

1. The birth of a child;
2. The recent placement of a child ~~under the age of six (6)~~ for adoption; or
3. The assumption of other parenting responsibilities, such as foster parenting or legal guardianship of a child ~~under the age of six (6)~~.

D. Eligibility: Parental Leave applies to all full-time and part-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, professional track faculty, and all librarian faculty, with appointments of ~~at least~~ 50% FTE **or greater**.

1. Parental Leave shall be pro-rated for eligible part-time faculty.
- ~~2.—Use of Parental Leave does not require the faculty member to submit medical documentation or proof of the assumption of parenting responsibilities as defined above.~~

- 32.** If a child’s parents are both faculty employed by UMD, each may be eligible for paid Parental Leave up to the twelve (12) work week maximum, as follows:
  - a. Both parents may concurrently use accrued sick, annual, personal, ~~collegial~~, or holiday leave **for to take** Parental Leave **at the same time; and**
  - b. **If both parents are eligible for Assured Parental Leave, only one parent may use** ~~At the time that a faculty member takes~~ Assured Parental Leave **at a time.**, ~~after exhausting their own accrued sick, annual, personal, collegial, or holiday leave, they~~ **The employee using**

**Assured Parental Leave** must be acting as the child's primary caregiver **at the time**. ~~In some cases, there will be two UMD parents eligible for Parental Leave.~~ Both **UMD** parents may **take use** Parental Leave simultaneously by alternating between the use of Assured Parental Leave and their own accrued leave, as long as both parents are not **using Assured Parental Leave on the primary caregiver for** the same day.

43. To be eligible for Parental Leave, a 9-month faculty member must have been employed by the institution for at least one semester, and a 12-month faculty member must have been employed by the institution for at least six (6) months.
54. A faculty member ~~may~~ **shall** be eligible for Parental Leave under this **Ppolicy** on one (1) occasion in a given 12-month period, and up to three (3) separate occasions during the duration of the faculty member's employment with the University System of Maryland. Any additional periods of Parental Leave require the approval of the President, or the President's designee.
65. Parental Leave for faculty must be used continuously; it is not available on an intermittent basis.

### III. Modified Duty Family Support Plan

Each eligible faculty member ~~also shall have the opportunity to~~ **may** request a period of time during which their institutional work duties are reduced or modified without a reduction of salary known as a Modified Duty Family Support Plan ~~(the "Plan")~~. The **Modified Duty Family Support** Plan is intended to provide support for a new parent while assuring that continuity in student instruction and other critical faculty duties are not disrupted. Note: Modified duties are neither required nor expected during the period of up to twelve (12) work weeks of Parental Leave.

- A. **Modified Duty Family Support** Plan Development: A written memorandum of understanding documenting the **Modified Duty Family Support** Plan will be developed jointly by the faculty member and department chair, ~~or the~~ designee. **In non-departmentalized Colleges, the plan will be developed jointly by the faculty member and of the chair or the dean or designee, upon request of the faculty member.**
  1. If the faculty member and department chair are unable to finalize the **Modified Duty Family Support** Plan, or if ~~an agreed-upon Pplan would~~ requires **a request for** additional resources, the ~~appropriate~~ dean ~~or other academic affairs administrator~~ will participate in completing the **Pplan**. **In non-departmentalized Colleges, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will participate in such cases.**

2. Each completed **Modified Duty Family Support** Plan will be shared with the ~~appropriate~~ dean or ~~other academic affairs administrator~~ **the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs**.
- B. Plan Content: The **Modified Duty Family Support** Plan will allow the faculty member to reduce or otherwise modify workload during the period of eligibility; through a combination of:
1. Leave, including:
    - a. ~~Exhaustion of all~~ **available** accrued annual, personal, and holiday leave;
    - b. ~~A~~**additional** Assured Parental Leave, as needed up to the twelve (12) work week total;
    - c. Collegial sick leave, as available;
    - d. ~~U~~**n**paid leave, up to the twelve (12) work week (i.e., sixty (60) work day) limit under the **University UM Procedures Related to Family and Medical Leave for Faculty** ~~Family Medical Leave Act Policy~~, II-2.31(A); **and**
  2. Workload modifications, to the extent authorized by the institution and feasible within the faculty member's department, which may include:
    - a. Part-time employment;
    - b. Redistribution of duties to substitute a teaching assignment with other departmental or academic service; and/or
    - c. Other options identified by the institution or department.
- C. Eligibility: All faculty who meet the eligibility standards of Section II.D.1 ~~through~~ 5 are eligible for the benefits of a Modified Duty Family Support Plan, subject to terms and conditions stated below:
1. Faculty with Instructional Responsibilities are entitled to a release from classroom teaching duties and service responsibilities for one semester in the period in which ~~p~~**P**arental ~~H~~**L**eave is taken. For example, faculty taking ~~p~~**P**arental ~~H~~**L**eave for the initial twelve (12) weeks of an academic semester shall be eligible for a Modified Duty Family Support Plan during the remaining weeks of the semester, i.e., no classroom teaching responsibilities.
    - a. During the period of the Modified Duty Family Support Plan, faculty members with instructional responsibilities are expected to continue to perform other non-classroom instructional duties for which they are ordinarily responsible, such as advising graduate students, as well as to sustain their research/creative activities as applicable.

2. Faculty without Instructional Responsibilities are entitled to a Modified Duty Family Support Plan for a period of up to six (6) weeks in addition to the twelve (12) weeks of paid Parental Leave, subject to any limits established by contract or grant by the funding agency responsible for a research faculty member's salary support. The exact nature and schedule of the Modified Duty Family Support Plan shall be defined and approved by the Chair or Unit head as set forth in Section III.A.
  3. Faculty utilizing a Modified Duty Family Support Plan pursuant to this policy shall not be required to offset the reduced workload during the period of modified duty by making up the workload in another semester.
- C. Plan Timeline: The period of the Modified Duty Family Support Plan will normally extend from six (6) months prior to six (6) months following the birth or placement of a child for adoption, foster care, or legal guardianship.
1. The combined period of Paid Parental Leave and the Modified Duty Family Support Plan must be concluded within six (6) months of the birth or placement of the child for adoption, foster care, or legal guardianship.
  2. **A If both parents are faculty and are eligible for** Modified Duty Family Support Plans ~~is available to both faculty parents, and is they are~~ typically taken on a sequential basis by both faculty parents. A Modified Duty Family Support Plan may be available to both faculty parents on a simultaneous basis when the health or personal situation of one or more family members requires it, provided the faculty members adhere to the eligibility requirements noted above regarding primary caregiver.
  3. Both faculty parents are expected to coordinate leave arrangements so that the combined period of Paid Parental Leave and the Modified Duty Family Support Plan are not exceeded.
  4. To minimize hardship of the department/unit, faculty are expected to notify their chair or unit head, and, if applicable, the Dean, at least two (2) months in advance of the date of expected use. Notice should include the projected date of **the child's** birth ~~of the child~~ or **the** expected date of the child's placement through adoption, foster care, or legal guardianship, as feasible.

#### IV. Extension of Time for Tenure/Permanent Status Review

Faculty are entitled to an extension of time before mandatory tenure review or review for permanent status in accordance with II-1.00(D) University of Maryland Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances ("UM Tenure Extension Policy"). Among other provisions, the UM Tenure Extension Policy provides that any tenure-track faculty member or faculty member eligible for permanent status who becomes the parent of a child by birth ~~or~~, adoption, **foster care, or assuming legal guardianship** will automatically be granted a one-year extension of the deadline for review by the provost, upon

mandatory written notification by the faculty member's department. A second automatic extension for the **addition of another child through birth or, adoption, foster care, or assuming legal guardianship of another child** will be granted as long as the total number of ~~all~~ extensions does not exceed two.

## V. **Supports for Nursing Mothers**

The University shall provide space at reasonable locations on campus where faculty who are nursing mothers may breastfeed or express milk.

- A. The areas must be shielded from view and free from intrusion by others.
- B. A bathroom or restroom may not be designated as a lactation facility.
- C. The space may be a private area in a larger room, or a private room that is reliably made available for nursing mothers whenever needed but may otherwise be used for different functions.
- D. The area shall be equipped with seating, a table or other flat surface, an electrical outlet, and nearby access to a sink.
- E. The requirement for lactation facilities and their availability for the purpose of breastfeeding a child are subject to University policies governing the circumstances when children of employees may be present in the workplace.

## VI. **Protections for Faculty**

- A. No faculty member shall be discriminated against or otherwise experience reprisals in any appointment, evaluation, promotion, tenure or other employment-related process as a result of utilizing the Parental Leave and other supports provided by this ~~P~~policy.
- B. ~~Appeals:~~ Faculty may ~~appeal~~ ~~grieve~~ ~~part time or m~~Modified ~~d~~Duty **Family Support Plan agreement** decisions for both procedural and substantive reasons. ~~The F~~faculty member may ~~bring~~ ~~seek~~ the ~~assistance~~ ~~matter to the attention~~ of the Faculty Ombuds Officer **in mediating the concern**, and seek a review in accordance with the procedures of the University of Maryland ~~Policy~~**ies and Procedures** ~~g~~Governing ~~f~~Faculty ~~g~~Grievances (~~University of Maryland Policy~~ II-4.00[A]).



## **II-1.00(D) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TENURE REVIEW DUE TO PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES**

(Approved by President William E. Kirwan on August 13, 1996; amended June 2, 2006; March 6, 2007)

### **I. POLICY**

Note on Terminology. In the provisions below, the term “Chair” refers to the administrator of the first level of review of a faculty person’s request for an extension. In non-departmentalized colleges and schools, this will be the Dean.

A. 1. Any faculty member may request an extension of time for tenure consideration based on personal or professional circumstances. Personal circumstances are individual or family situations that substantially impede normal professional development of the faculty member. Professional circumstances are individual, departmental, or faculty related situations that are beyond the control of the faculty member and substantially impede normal professional development of the faculty member. The University will normally grant up to two one-year extensions, each tied to a different initiating event. Such a request shall be made no later than the end of the Spring semester prior to the year in which the individual is slated to be reviewed.

2. The following shall be considered a nonexclusive list of personal circumstances that might support such a request:

- **the assumption of parenting responsibilities through** childbirth, ~~or~~ adoption, **foster care, or legal guardianship**
- personal illness or injury
- care of ill or injured dependents, including children, relatives, or any other persons who are dependent on the applicant for care
- death of a spouse, family member, or other closely affiliated person

3. If the extension is granted, an appropriate indication shall be placed in the applicant’s University personnel file and a notification will be sent by the Office of Faculty Affairs to the faculty member, the Chair and the Dean. Appropriate adjustments shall be made to the contract review timetable. All documentation regarding the rationale for the request shall be kept confidential and maintained in a file separate from the faculty member’s official institutional personnel file. This confidential file may be accessed by and must be released to the applicant upon request.

4. No person shall be discriminated against in any promotion and tenure proceedings for seeking or obtaining an extension under this provision.

5. Any faculty member who feels an extension request has been denied inappropriately may bring the case to the attention of the Faculty Ombuds Officer or appeal the decision through the Faculty Grievance Procedure.

B. Procedures for Obtaining a Delay due to ~~Childbirth or Adoption~~ **the Assumption of Parenting Responsibilities**<sup>±</sup>

1. The procedures for obtaining an extension for ~~reasons of childbirth and adoption~~ **the assumption of parenting responsibilities** differ from the procedures for obtaining an extension for other causes. Any tenure-track faculty member who becomes the parent of a child by birth, ~~or adoption, foster care, or legal guardianship~~ will automatically be granted a one-year extension of the deadline for tenure review by the provost, upon mandatory written notification by the faculty member's department. A second automatic extension for the ~~birth or adoption~~ **addition** of another child **to the family** will be granted as long as the total number of all extensions does not exceed two.

2. Normally, the process of securing tenure delay should be initiated within a month of the expected arrival of the child. After having been given notice by the faculty member of the child's expected arrival, it is the Chair's responsibility to initiate the formal process. For purposes of record keeping, the Chair shall inform the Dean, Provost, and the Office of Faculty Affairs of the extension and the reasons for granting the extension. The Office of Faculty Affairs will send a written acknowledgment of receipt of notification to the faculty member, the Chair, and the Dean, and ensure that an appropriate indication is placed in the applicant's University personnel file.

3. Although the extension of the deadline for review is automatic, faculty members have the option at any time to be reviewed earlier and obtaining the delay shall be considered normal progress in the promotion process.

C. Other Personal Circumstances

1. Tenure track faculty may request a one-year extension of time for tenure consideration based on personal or professional circumstances such as those listed in A.2.

2. To do so, the faculty member must make a request for extension in writing to the department Chair. The request for extension and the rationale for the request shall be treated confidentially. Only the granting of an extension shall be made public.

3. The Chair may ask for suitable supporting material from the applicant indicating the personal or professional circumstance and how the professional development is substantially

---

<sup>±</sup> ~~The benefits of this section of the policy are available to a tenure-track faculty member who demonstrates he or she has assumed long-term and substantial parental care-giving responsibilities for a child that are equivalent to those assumed through a legal adoption.~~

impeded, and shall afford the applicant an opportunity for a personal discussion of the extension request. In deciding to recommend the request for a tenure delay, the Chair may take into account the time elapsed since the event under consideration, but the applicant shall not be denied an extension for having attempted to maintain progress towards tenure despite hindering personal or professional circumstances.

4. The Chair shall forward the request with his or her recommendation to the Dean, who shall forward the material with his or her recommendation to the Provost for final approval.



**Interim University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports**  
**(Senate Document #18-19-34)**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee | Chair: Daniel P. Lathrop**

Senate Bill 859 - State Employees - Parental Leave provides up to 60 days of paid parental leave up to one year following the birth or adoption of a child. As a result of the new law, the University System of Maryland (USM) revised its Policy on Parental Leave and Other Family Supports for Faculty (II-2.25) and asked all USM institutions to align their policies accordingly. President Loh approved interim changes to the University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports (II-2.25[A]) on September 19, 2019, pending University Senate review.

Senate Chair Lanford and the Senate Executive Committee request that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the interim faculty policy. Similarly, the Staff Affairs Committee will be asked to review the interim staff policy.

The Faculty Affairs Committee should:

1. Review [Senate Bill 859](#) - State Employees - Parental Leave.
2. Review the USM Policy on Parental Leave and Other Family Supports for Faculty ([II-2.25](#)).
3. Review the interim University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports ([II-2.25\[A\]](#)).
4. Review the University of Maryland, College Park Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty ([II-2.30\[D\]](#)).
5. Consult with a representative of the Office of Faculty Affairs.
6. Consult with faculty members who have recently utilized the Policy on Parental Leave and Other Family Supports for Faculty about their experiences with parental leave.
7. Coordinate the review of the faculty policy with the Staff Affairs Committee's review of the staff policy in order to ensure consistency across both policies, where appropriate.
8. Consider whether there should be an age limit related to foster parenting or legal guardianship of a child and if so, what that limit should be.
9. Consider whether faculty should be allowed to use accrued sick leave as one of the forms of paid leave used towards their paid Parental Leave period, if they choose.
10. Consider whether foster parenting and legal guardianship should be valid grounds for an extension of time for tenure/permanent status review. If appropriate, review the University of Maryland, College Park Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances ([II-1.00\[D\]](#)) and recommend whether revisions are needed.

11. Consider whether the policy should include an appeals process or if appeal rights are appropriately covered under other existing University policies.
12. Consider whether the Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty should remain as a separate policy or if provisions within that policy are already addressed in the Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports.
13. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on any proposed changes to the University's policy.
14. If appropriate, recommend whether the interim policy should be revised.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **February 7, 2020**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



## **II-2.30(D) UMCP POLICY AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING ADOPTION LEAVE FOR FACULTY**

(Approved by the President August 1, 1991)

### **I. Policy**

All University of Maryland System employees who are eligible to earn sick leave may use earned sick leave up to a maximum of thirty (30) days as adoption leave subject to the following provisions:

- A. Adoption leave is available only in cases of formal adoption; it is not available in any other case including but not limited to legal guardianship or foster care.
- B. Approved adoption leave shall commence on the actual date of custody of the child without regard to the date of legal adoption.
- C. Adoption leave may be authorized only for employees with primary responsibility for the care of the adoptee. In the event that both adoptive parents are State employees, adoptive leave shall be available to only one parent.
- D. As adoption is a planned event, employees planning to request adoption leave must advise their department heads in advance to minimize the effect of the absence.
- E. An employee shall be permitted one period of adoption leave for each instance of adoption. The adoption of more than one individual at any given time shall be treated as a single instance of adoption.

### **II. Procedures**

#### **A. Request for Leave**

1. A request for adoption leave must be in writing to the department head and include:
  - anticipated beginning and ending dates;
  - a statement that the employee has primary responsibility for the care of the adoptee;
  - documentation of the adoption.
2. The department head shall recommend approval or disapproval of the request.
3. The request is forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval or disapproval. The decision of the Vice President shall be final.



## Interim Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports

**PRESENTED BY** Jane Hirshberg, Chair

**REVIEW DATES** SEC – February 21, 2020 | SENATE – March 3, 2020

**VOTING METHOD** In a single vote

**RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT** [VII-7.49\(A\) UM Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports](#)

**NECESSARY APPROVALS** Senate, President

### ISSUE

---

Due to recent changes in state law, the University System of Maryland (USM) revised its Policy on Parental Leave and Other Family Supports for Staff ([VII-7.49](#)) in June 2019. The University of Maryland Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports (VII-7.49[A]) was revised to reflect the changes in USM policy and was approved on an interim basis on September 19, 2019, pending University Senate review. In September 2019, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Staff Affairs Committee with reviewing the interim Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports, consulting with administrators and with staff who have recently utilized the policy, considering provisions related to age limits and types of leave that staff can use, consulting with the Faculty Affairs Committee (which was charged with reviewing a similar policy covering faculty), and recommending changes, as appropriate.

### RECOMMENDATION

---

The Staff Affairs Committee recommends that the University of Maryland Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports be revised as indicated in the document immediately following this report.

### COMMITTEE WORK

---

The Staff Affairs Committee met with a representative from University Human Resources to discuss changes in the interim policy, conducted a survey of staff members who have recently used the policy, and considered several substantive issues identified in its charge. The committee determined that there was no need to provide staff the opportunity to use sick leave in place of annual leave, given staff have alternative methods to use sick leave to care for children and partners. It considered language in the interim policy indicating that Parental Leave can only be used for adoption, fostering, and the assumption of legal guardianship if a child is under the age of six. The committee determined that there is no compelling reason to impose such a restriction, and recommended revisions that would make the benefit available to support the addition of any child under the age of eighteen. The committee also proposed a series of technical revisions to the policy.

After due consideration, the Staff Affairs Committee voted to approve the revised Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports at its meeting on January 17, 2020.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

---

The Senate could choose not to approve the revisions to the University of Maryland Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports. However, the University would lose the opportunity to support families who welcome children older than six years of age, and to clarify aspects of the process.

## **RISKS**

---

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

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

---

The revisions may have limited financial implications depending on the frequency with which staff assume parenting responsibilities for children over the age of 6.



## Interim Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports

### 2019-2020 Committee Members

**Jane Hirshberg** (Chair)  
**Max Balagtas-Badoy** (Non-Exempt Staff Contingent II)  
**Amelia Barabak** (Ex-Officio Provost's Rep)  
**Darrell Claiborne** (Ex-Officio NV CUSS Rep)  
**Jaison Cooper** (Exempt Staff Contingent II)  
**Everett Daviage** (Exempt Staff-Division)  
**Robert DuDonis** (Non-Exempt Staff-Division)  
**Cathy Fisanich** (Non-Exempt Staff-Academic)  
**Sarah Goff** (Ex-Officio CUSS Rep)  
**Elizabeth Hinson** (Ex-Officio NV CUSS Rep)  
**Antionietta Jennings** (Non-Exempt Staff-Division)  
**Rythee Lambert-Jones** (Ex-Officio Director of Human Resources Rep)

**Anne Martens** (Ex-Officio VP Administration & Finance Rep)  
**Kalia Patricio** (Ex-Officio CUSS Rep)  
**Jeanne Pekny** (Non-Exempt-Academic)  
**Brianne Rowh** (Exempt Staff-Division)  
**Margaret Saponaro** (Faculty)  
**Maureen Schrimpe** (Ex-Officio CUSS Rep)  
**Kristin Stenson** (Exempt Staff-Academic)  
**Brooke Supple** (Ex-Officio VP Student Affairs Rep)  
**Timea Webster** (Exempt Staff-Academic)

### Date of Submission

February 2020

## BACKGROUND

Due to recent changes in state law, the University System of Maryland (USM) revised its Policy on Parental Leave and Other Family Supports for Staff ([VII-7.49](#)) in June 2019. The University of Maryland Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports (VII-7.49[A]) was revised to reflect the changes in USM policy and was approved on an interim basis on September 19, 2019, pending University Senate review. In September 2019, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Staff Affairs Committee with reviewing the interim Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports, consulting with administrators and with staff who have recently utilized the policy, considering provisions related to age limits and types of leave that staff can use, consulting with the Faculty Affairs Committee (which was charged with reviewing a similar policy covering faculty), and recommending changes, as appropriate (Appendix 1).

## KEY CHANGES IN INTERIM POLICY

The University's Policy on Staff Parental Leave provides eligible staff a guaranteed period of paid Parental Leave to support the addition of a child to the family. The benefit requires that staff use various forms of accrued leave to ensure that the staff member is paid during Parental Leave. If these forms of leave are exhausted before the staff member reaches the guaranteed period of paid Parental Leave, the University will provide additional supplemental paid leave to cover the balance.

The interim policy made several substantive changes to the nature of the benefit.

- Staff are now guaranteed twelve weeks of paid Parental Leave, up from eight weeks.
- Staff must still exhaust all accrued annual, personal, and holiday leave. However, they no longer have to use sick leave, which will remain available for use once staff return to work.

- Staff may use the benefit after six months of employment with the University, down from one year.
- Staff may use the benefit three times, up from two.
- In addition to birth or adoption, staff may now use Parental Leave for foster care or assuming legal guardianship of a child.
- Parental Leave must now be taken continuously, and is no longer available on an interim basis.
- Parental Leave may now be used within the six months preceding the arrival of a child or within the six months following the addition of a child to the family; previously, leave could only be taken in the six months following the arrival of a child.

## COMMITTEE WORK

---

At its meeting on October 23, 2019, the Staff Affairs Committee met with a representative from University Human Resources (UHR) to discuss the changes in the interim policy. The committee learned that the state law mandating twelve weeks of parental leave went into effect in October 2018. While the USM and University policies were not updated until later the following year, UHR worked with employees who had taken Parental Leave after October 2018 to retroactively apply the benefit, which involved refunding leave that staff members would not have been required to use under the terms of the interim policy.

The committee considered whether staff should be allowed to use accrued sick leave in place of annual leave so as to preserve their annual leave. The Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Other Family Supports permits faculty the discretion to use sick leave. The committee learned that staff can already use sick leave to care for a child within six months of the child's birth or adoption under the provisions of the USM Policy on Sick and Safe Leave for Nonexempt and Exempt Staff Employees ([VII-7.45](#)). Given this, there would be few circumstances where using sick leave under the terms of the Parental Leave benefit would be necessary or prudent. The committee determined not to recommend that staff be allowed to use sick leave in place of annual leave.

The committee considered how to gather feedback from staff who have used the benefit. In conjunction with UHR and the Faculty Affairs Committee, which was charged with assessing faculty experiences with Parental Leave, the Senate Office developed a short survey to provide an opportunity for respondents to share both positive and negative experiences with the policy and with Parental Leave. UHR distributed the survey to forty-six staff members, and received twenty-three responses. Nearly all of the respondents expressed gratitude for the ability to take twelve weeks with their child, and for the ability to retain their sick leave. A few respondents noted how valuable it would be if they could also retain some annual leave on their return, and several indicated that twelve weeks was inadequate.

Over the course of meetings in November and December, the Staff Affairs Committee discussed age limits referenced in the policy. The interim policy indicates that staff may use Parental Leave to support the adoption of a child under six years of age. The interim policy also indicates that the benefit can be used for "the assumption of other parenting responsibilities, such as foster parenting or legal guardianship of a child under the age of six (6)." While this language is included in the USM policy, that policy also gives each institution the discretion to establish limitations, including those associated with age limits. The committee noted that children older than six years of age who join a family may

need care just as much as younger children, particularly if they have experienced trauma or have special needs. The committee learned from UHR that no staff member has attempted to use the policy to adopt a child older than six years of age, though staff who were aware of the restriction may not have contacted UHR in such circumstances. The committee determined that while there might not be widespread interest in using the Parental Leave benefit to care for children older than six, there is no compelling reason to impose such a restriction, or to privilege certain parenting circumstances over others. The committee agreed to recommend that the age restrictions be removed, and that the benefit be available when adopting, fostering, or assuming legal guardianship of any child under the age of eighteen.

On January 17, 2020, the Staff Affairs Committee reviewed the survey responses. During its review, the committee discussed at length whether to recommend elimination of the provision that the benefit may only be used three times over an employee's service with the USM. Some felt that such a restriction implies a limit on the number of children that the University feels is appropriate. The committee learned from UHR that no staff member has attempted to use the benefit a fourth time or had attempted a third time under the previous policy. The committee considered whether this indicates that an increase is unnecessary, but noted that it is difficult to know whether staff who would have benefited from an additional use of the policy would have reported that need to UHR, given the limitations of the policy. The committee discussed the balance between the financial impact to the institution were the cap to be removed and the tremendous perceived value to those few staff members who would choose to utilize the benefit again. In considering that balance, the committee could not find evidence that an additional use of the benefit would have a significant positive impact on staff, and decided not to recommend a change. The committee also approved a series of additional revisions that were technical in nature.

After due consideration, the Staff Affairs Committee voted to approve the revised Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports at its January 17, 2020, meeting.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

The Staff Affairs Committee recommends that the University of Maryland Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports be revised as indicated in the document immediately following this report.

## **APPENDICES**

---

Appendix 1 — Charge from the Senate Executive Committee



## VII-7.49(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON STAFF PARENTAL LEAVE AND OTHER FAMILY SUPPORTS

(Approved by the President January 1, 2013; Amended and approved on an interim basis by the President September 19, 2019)

### I. Purpose & Eligibility Period

This policy is intended to support eligible staff in balancing professional and family demands during and after the addition of children to the family (by birth, adoption, foster parenting, and/or legal guardianship) through a combination of measures to promote a family-friendly environment. These measures include:

- a. a period of paid Parental Leave of twelve (12) work weeks;
- b. availability of lactation facilities.

The term “Parental Leave” is used in this Policy to refer to the entirety of the paid leave period available to eligible staff to care for children new to the family. Up to twelve (12) work weeks of Parental Leave is available through a combination of paid leave charged to a staff member’s accrued leave balance and/or Assured Parental Leave provided by the University.

Parental Leave shall be available on a continuous basis during a six (6) month period surrounding the addition of a child (or children) **under the age of eighteen (18)** to the family.

### II. Assured Parental Leave

Regular staff employees shall be assured a period of up to twelve (12) work weeks (i.e., sixty (60) continuous workdays, or 480 hours) of paid Parental Leave to care for a new child (or children), as follows:

- A. **Nature of Leave:** During the Parental Leave period, staff shall use any accrued and available annual leave ~~pursuant to USM BOR Policy VII 7.00 Policy on Annual Leave for Regular Nonexempt and Exempt Staff Employees~~; personal leave ~~pursuant to USM BOR Policy VII 7.10 Policy on Personal Leave for Regular Nonexempt and Exempt Staff Employees~~; observed holiday leave ~~pursuant to USM BOR Policy VII 7.30 Policy on Holiday Leave for Regular Nonexempt and Exempt Staff Employees~~; and/or discretionary paid administrative leave that is granted during the Parental Leave period for institutional closures. If none of these categories of leave is available to the employee, supplemental leave days (referred to as “Assured Parental Leave”)

shall be provided to the employee by the institution to attain the twelve (12) work weeks of paid Parental Leave. No institutional work-related duties are required of the staff member by the University while on Parental Leave.

**B. Interaction of Leave with the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)**

All leave taken during the Parental Leave period (annual, personal, holiday, administrative, and/or Assured Parental Leave) shall run concurrently with any available FMLA leave (“FML”) per ~~Section IV of~~ USM ~~BOR~~ Policy VII-7.50 Policy on Family Medical Leave for Nonexempt and Exempt Staff Employees, if the staff member is also eligible for FML under USM ~~BOR~~ Policy VII-7.50. Both policies shall be administered concurrently.

C. **Applicability:** The twelve (12) work weeks of paid Parental Leave is available on a continuous basis during a six (6) month period surrounding either:

1. ~~the~~ birth of a child;
2. ~~the~~ recent placement of a child ~~under the age of six (6)~~ for adoption; or
3. ~~the~~ assumption of other parenting responsibilities, such as foster parenting or legal guardianship of a child ~~under the age of six (6)~~.

D. **Eligibility:** Parental Leave applies to regular staff employees with appointments of ~~at least~~ 50% FTE or greater. Assured Parental Leave is available upon written affirmation that the staff member will be the child’s primary caregiver during the period in which Assured Parental Leave will be used.

1. Parental Leave shall be pro-rated for eligible part-time staff.
2. If a child’s parents are both employees of UMD, each may be eligible for paid Parental Leave up to the twelve (12) work week maximum, as follows:
  - a. ~~Both~~ parents may ~~concurrently~~ use accrued annual, personal, and holiday leave ~~for to take~~ Parental Leave ~~at the same time~~; and
  - b. ~~if both parents are eligible for Assured Parental Leave, only one parent may use~~ ~~At the time that a staff member takes~~ Assured Parental Leave ~~at a time,~~ ~~after exhausting their own accrued annual, personal, or holiday leave,~~ ~~they~~ ~~The employee using Assured Parental Leave~~ must be acting as the child’s primary caregiver ~~at the time.~~ ~~In some cases, there will be two UMD parents eligible for Parental Leave.~~ Both UMD parents may ~~take use~~ Parental Leave simultaneously by alternating between the use of Assured Parental Leave and their own accrued leave, as long as both parents are not ~~using Assured Parental Leave on the primary caregiver for~~ the same day.
3. A regular staff member shall be eligible for Parental Leave after six (6) months of continuous employment with the institution.

4. A staff member shall be eligible for Parental Leave under this policy on one (1) occasion in a 12-month period, and up to three (3) separate occasions during the duration of their employment with the University System of Maryland (irrespective of job category). Any additional periods of Parental Leave require the approval of the President, or the President's designee.
5. The employee must have a satisfactory record of sick and safe leave usage and satisfactory work performance.
6. Parental Leave for staff must be used continuously; it is not available on an intermittent basis.

### **III. Supports for Nursing Mothers**

The University shall provide space at reasonable locations on campus where staff who are nursing mothers may breastfeed or express milk.

- A. The areas must be shielded from view and free from intrusion by others.
- B. A bathroom or restroom may not be designated as a lactation area.
- C. The space may be a private area in a larger room, or a private room that is reliably made available for nursing mothers whenever needed but may otherwise be used for different functions.
- D. The area shall be equipped with seating, a table or other flat surface, an electrical outlet, and nearby access to a sink.
- E. Staff who are not assigned an office or other private space should give advance notice to their supervisor or department head to request access to an area suitable for breastfeeding or expression of milk.
- F. The requirement for lactation facilities and their availability for the purpose of breastfeeding a child are subject to University policies governing the circumstances when children of employees may be present in the workplace.
- G. Staff may use current break and/or lunch periods for this purpose. Supervisors are encouraged to work with their staff who need support.

### **IV. Protections for Staff**

No staff member shall be discriminated against or otherwise experience reprisals in any appointment, evaluation, promotion, or other employment-related process as a result of utilizing the Parental Leave benefit and other supports provided under this policy.

### **V. Implementation**

- A. Staff must apply for Parental Leave by making a request to their supervisor or

department head using the institution's application form available from University Human Resources (~~[www.uhr.umd.edu](http://www.uhr.umd.edu)~~). To minimize hardship of the department/unit, staff should notify their supervisor or department head at least two (2) months in advance of expected use, including the anticipated date of birth or placement of a child for adoption, foster care, or legal guardianship.

- B. The supervisor or department head will review and forward the form to University Human Resources Office of Staff Relations for verification of eligibility and computation of available paid leave and Assured Parental Leave that may be granted to meet the twelve (12) work week paid Parental Leave period.

~~For assistance with this or any staff policy, please contact University Human Resources Office of Staff Relations at 301.405.0001.~~



**Interim Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports  
(Senate Document #18-19-35)  
Staff Affairs Committee | Chair: Jane Hirshberg**

Senate Bill 859 - State Employees - Parental Leave provides up to 60 days of paid parental leave up to one year following the birth or adoption of a child. As a result of the new law, the University System of Maryland (USM) revised its Policy on Parental Leave and Other Family Supports for Staff (VII-7.49) and asked all USM institutions to align their policies accordingly. President Loh approved interim changes to the University of Maryland Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports (VII-7.49[A]) on September 19, 2019, pending University Senate review.

Senate Chair Lanford and the Senate Executive Committee request that the Staff Affairs Committee review the interim staff policy. Similarly, the Faculty Affairs Committee will be asked to review the interim faculty policy.

The Staff Affairs Committee should:

1. Review [Senate Bill 859](#) - State Employees - Parental Leave.
2. Review the USM Policy on Parental Leave and Other Family Supports for Staff ([VII-7.49](#)).
3. Review the interim University of Maryland Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports ([VII-7.49\[A\]](#)).
4. Consult with a representative of the Office of Staff Relations.
5. Consult with staff members who have recently utilized the Policy on Staff Parental Leave and Other Family Supports about their experiences with parental leave.
6. Coordinate the review of the staff policy with the Faculty Affairs Committee's review of the faculty policy in order to ensure consistency across both policies, where appropriate.
7. Consider whether there should be an age limit related to foster parenting or legal guardianship of a child, and if so, what that limit should be.
8. Consider whether staff should be allowed to use accrued sick leave as one of the forms of paid leave used towards their paid Parental Leave period, if they choose.
9. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on any proposed changes to the University's policy.
10. If appropriate, recommend whether the interim policy should be revised.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **February 7, 2020**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



### Amendment to the *Code of Academic Integrity*

PRESENTED BY	Andrea Dragan, Chair, Student Conduct Committee
REVIEW DATES	SEC – February 21, 2020   SENATE – March 3, 2020
VOTING METHOD	In a single vote
RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT	<a href="#">III-1.00(A)</a> – University of Maryland Code of Academic Integrity
NECESSARY APPROVALS	Senate, President

#### ISSUE

---

In November 2019, a proposal was submitted to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) suggesting minor revisions to the *Code of Academic Integrity* (III-1.00[A]) to add degree revocation as a possible sanction. The proposal noted that while degree revocation is included in the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures Concerning Scholarly Misconduct (III-1.10[A]) as a potential sanction for former students found responsible for violating the policy, that sanction is not discussed in the *Code of Academic Integrity*. In November 2019, the SEC charged the Student Conduct Committee (SCC) with review of the proposal.

#### RECOMMENDATION(S)

---

The Student Conduct Committee recommends that the proposed revisions to the *Code of Academic Integrity* (III-1.00[A]), as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

#### COMMITTEE WORK

---

The Student Conduct Committee (SCC) began its review at its meeting on December 3, 2019. It reviewed the proposal and related language on degree revocation in the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures Concerning Scholarly Misconduct (III-1.10[A]). During its review, the SCC consulted with the Director of Student Conduct, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and the Dean of the Graduate School, who jointly submitted the proposal, and with the Office of General Counsel.

The SCC learned about the scholarly misconduct process, and reviewed the process used to address violations of the *Code of Academic Integrity* involving former students. The SCC was in agreement that the *Code* should include a direct statement on degree revocation as a possible sanction. The committee felt that the University community and current and former students should understand that such a sanction is a possible consequence for egregious cases of misconduct in academic work or research conducted at the University. The SCC also felt that the *Code* should indicate that this would be the normal sanction in cases where a former student is found responsible for scholarly misconduct, in order to convey the severity of the consequences involved in scholarly misconduct. In order to ensure that such a sanction is accompanied by an appropriate level of due

process, the committee felt it would be important for former students to have the right to appeal the determination; the SCC developed revisions to the appeals section of the *Code* to incorporate cases involving degree revocation into existing procedures.

The SCC developed language for the *Code* in consultation with the proposers and the Office of General Counsel. The SCC voted to approve the proposed revisions to the *Code* in an email vote concluding on February 12, 2020.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

---

The Senate could choose not to approve the recommendation and revisions to the Code of Academic Integrity. However, the University would lose an opportunity to ensure clarity in the process for enacting disciplinary action against former students found responsible of violating the scholarly misconduct policy.

## **RISKS**

---

There are no risks to the University in adopting this recommendation.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

---

There are no known financial implications in adopting this recommendation.

**AMENDMENT TO THE *CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY*****2019-2020 Committee Members**

**Andrea Dragan** (Chair)  
**Kiara Anthony** (Undergraduate Student)  
**Neijma Celestine-Donnor** (Staff)  
**Raul Cruz-Cano** (Faculty)  
**Andrea Goodwin** (Ex-Officio Director of Student Conduct)  
**Ursula Gorham-Oscilowski** (Faculty)  
**Angela Lambert** (Undergraduate Student)  
**Charles Manekin** (Faculty)

**Michael Robidoux** (Undergraduate Student)  
**Megan Stump** (Graduate Student)  
**Hilary Thompson** (Faculty)

**Date of Submission****February 2020****BACKGROUND**

---

In November 2019, a proposal was submitted to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) suggesting minor revisions to the *Code of Academic Integrity* (III-1.00[A]). The proposal noted that while degree revocation is included in the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures Concerning Scholarly Misconduct (III-1.10[A]) as a potential sanction for former students found responsible for violating the policy, that sanction is not discussed in the *Code of Academic Integrity*. In order to impose a sanction of degree revocation against a former student, the case would need to be reviewed through the academic misconduct process and a sanction would be determined based on the sanctions available in the *Code*. In November 2019, the SEC charged the Student Conduct Committee (SCC) with review of the proposal (Appendix 1).

**CURRENT PRACTICE**

---

While all work submitted for assessment is held to the standards of the *Code of Academic Integrity*, suspected misconduct may also be a violation of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures Concerning Scholarly Misconduct (III-1.10[A]). When allegations that relate to both policies arise, the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) and the Director of Student Conduct together review the allegation and determine which policy should apply.

The scholarly misconduct process is structured to provide an extensive, thorough review of an allegation of misconduct against a faculty member, staff member, and/or student. The process seeks to determine whether misconduct such as fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other types of misconduct that seriously deviate from the practices commonly accepted in the field have occurred. The process incorporates a Preliminary Assessment phase, where the RIO will determine whether the alleged conduct could constitute scholarly misconduct and whether there is evidence that supports a review of the allegation. In cases that move forward, there is an Inquiry phase where a committee gathers evidence and assesses whether an allegation warrants an investigation, and an Investigation phase where a separate committee investigates to determine whether the misconduct occurred and whether the Respondent was responsible for the misconduct. The process incorporates due process rights for the Respondent at every stage, and seeks to produce a finding based on the preponderance of the evidence standard.

If the scholarly misconduct process ends in a finding of responsibility, after all appeal rights are exhausted by the parties, the responsible administrator will determine what disciplinary action is appropriate. In the case of a former student, degree revocation may be the appropriate sanction, but the responsible administrator does not have the authority to revoke a degree. In order to pursue the sanction, the case would be referred to the Office of Student Conduct for review under the process established in the *Code of Academic Integrity*. The OSC would follow its normal process to determine whether there is a violation of the *Code* and, if appropriate, determine a sanction.

The *Code of Academic Integrity* currently includes a range of possible sanctions for any violation, from educational sanctions through expulsion. The *Code* does not explicitly include degree revocation as a possible sanction. However, Part 56 of the *Code* allows for other sanctions that are appropriate to the specific case to be imposed. The Office of Student Conduct has relied on this flexibility within the *Code* when degree revocation may be an appropriate sanction. Degree revocation is very rarely considered as a sanction, and is only used in the most egregious cases.

## COMMITTEE WORK

---

The Student Conduct Committee (SCC) began its review at its meeting on December 3, 2019. It reviewed the proposal and related language on degree revocation in the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures Concerning Scholarly Misconduct (III-1.10[A]). During its review, the SCC consulted with the Director of Student Conduct, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and the Dean of the Graduate School, who jointly submitted the proposal, and with the Office of General Counsel.

The SCC learned about the scholarly misconduct process, and reviewed the process used to address violations of the *Code of Academic Integrity* involving former students. The proposers shared examples of cases where students could be implicated in a scholarly misconduct allegation, and discussed how cases are reviewed through both the scholarly misconduct and academic misconduct processes.

When faculty are found responsible for violating the scholarly misconduct policy, they face sanctions up to and including termination, and may face sanctions beyond the University when federal funding is involved. The SCC noted that any such cases involving current students would likely result in a sanction of expulsion, given that the offense would likely be egregious in nature if it were to be pursued under the scholarly misconduct policy. Since expulsion is no longer available for students who have already graduated, the SCC determined that degree revocation is likely the most appropriate analog.

After reviewing the process, the SCC was in agreement that the *Code* should include a direct statement on degree revocation as a possible sanction. The committee felt that the University community and current and former students should understand that such a sanction is a possible consequence for egregious cases of misconduct in academic work or research conducted at the University. The SCC also felt that the *Code* should indicate that this would be the normal sanction in cases where a former student is found responsible for scholarly misconduct, in order to convey the severity of the consequences involved in scholarly misconduct. In order to ensure that such a sanction is accompanied by an appropriate level of due process, the committee felt it would be important for former students to have the right to appeal the determination; the SCC developed revisions to the appeals section of the *Code* to incorporate cases involving degree revocation into existing procedures.

The SCC developed language for the *Code* in consultation with the proposers and the Office of General Counsel. The SCC voted to approve the proposed revisions to the *Code* in an email vote concluding on February 12, 2020.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

The Student Conduct Committee recommends that the proposed revisions to the *Code of Academic Integrity* (III-1.00[A]), as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

## **APPENDICES**

---

Appendix 1 — Charge from the Senate Executive Committee

Appendix 2 — Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on Degree Revocation



**III-1.00(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**  
(Approved by President August 1, 1991; Amended May 10, 2001; Amended May 5, 2005; Technical Amendments June 2012; Amended November 7, 2014; Amended effective January 1, 2019)

**INTRODUCTION**

The University is an academic community. Its fundamental purpose is the pursuit of knowledge. Like all other communities, the University can function properly only if its members adhere to clearly established goals and values. Essential to the fundamental purpose of the University is the commitment to the principles of truth and academic honesty. Accordingly, the *Code of Academic Integrity* is designed to ensure that the principle of academic honesty is upheld. While all members of the University share this responsibility, the *Code of Academic Integrity* is designed so that special responsibility for upholding the principle of academic honesty lies with the students.

All work submitted for assessment is held to the standards in this *Code*. In cases where an allegation of academic dishonesty could also be a violation of the University's policy on scholarly misconduct, the Director of Student Conduct and the University's Research Integrity Officer (**RIO**) will determine whether this *Code* or the relevant University policy will apply. **When a scholarly misconduct process results in a finding of responsibility for a current or former student, the RIO will refer the case to the Office of Student Conduct for review under this *Code* in order to determine responsibility and an appropriate sanction.**

The *Code of Academic Integrity* is administered by the Office of Student Conduct and its Director. References in this *Code* to the Director of Student Conduct include the Director and designees.

**PROHIBITED CONDUCT**

1. **ACADEMIC DISHONESTY:** any of the following acts, when committed by a student, constitute academic dishonesty:
  - (a) **CHEATING:** fraud, deceit, or dishonesty in any academic course or exercise in an attempt to gain an unfair advantage, and/or using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic course or exercise.
  - (b) **FABRICATION:** unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in any academic course or exercise.

- (c) FACILITATING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY: knowingly helping or attempting to help another to violate any provision of this *Code*.
- (d) PLAGIARISM: representing the words or ideas of another as one's own in any academic course or exercise.
- (e) SELF-PLAGIARISM: the reuse of substantial identical or nearly identical portions of one's own work in multiple courses without prior permission from the current instructor or from each of the instructors if the work is being submitted for multiple courses in the same semester.

## DEFINITIONS

2. When used in the context of this *Code*, the terms below mean the following:

- (a) "University" means the University of Maryland, College Park.
- (b) "Student" means either a person enrolled in or auditing courses at the University on a full-time or part-time basis at the time the alleged violation occurred, or an individual who may not be enrolled for a particular term at the time the alleged violation occurred but has a continuing relationship with the University.
- (c) "Respondent" refers to a student alleged to have committed a violation of this *Code*.
- (d) "Complainant" includes individual(s) who have referred a student or incident to the Office of Student Conduct based on an alleged violation of the *Code*. A Complainant may be any member of the campus community, including the instructor of the course or a representative from the academic department.
- (e) "Campus Advocate" refers to a registered, degree-seeking student designated by the Office of Student Conduct who is responsible for working with the Complainant in preparation for the Honor Review process. Their responsibilities include preparing a formal charge for alleged violations of the *Code* on behalf of the University community and drafting appeal responses when necessary.
- (f) "Community Advocate" is a registered, degree-seeking student who is trained to assist or represent the Complainant and present disciplinary cases at Honor Reviews. Their responsibilities include providing brief opening and closing statements, presenting evidence, and other duties as requested by the Honor Board. The Community Advocate performs their responsibilities under the oversight of the Campus Advocate designated by the Office of Student Conduct.
- (g) "Mitigating factors" may be considered in determining sanctions. Factors may include, but are not limited to, the conditions under which the incident occurred, the present demeanor of the Respondent, whether the Respondent has acknowledged responsibility for the alleged misconduct, and any steps the Respondent has taken to address their behavior.
- (h) "Aggravating factors" may be considered in determining sanctions. Factors may include, but are not limited to, the present demeanor and past disciplinary record of the Respondent, the extent of dishonest or malicious intent, the degree of premeditation or planning, as well as the nature and importance of the academic exercise.

- (i) “Knowingly” means consciously engaging in specific conduct, regardless of whether the individual understood the conduct was a violation of the *Code*.

### **STANDARD OF EVIDENCE**

3. The focus of disciplinary proceedings is to resolve allegations of academic dishonesty. Students have the right to be notified of the allegations and specific charges against them, to have access to the information underlying the charges, and to have an opportunity to respond. The clear and convincing standard of evidence will be used to determine responsibility for *Code* violations. Clear and convincing evidence gives a reasonable certainty of the truth, and means that based on the totality of the evidence, it is highly and substantially more probable than not that the violation occurred. Sanctions are imposed according to the nature and severity of the violation.

### **RESPONSIBILITY TO REPORT ACADEMIC DISHONESTY**

4. Academic dishonesty is a corrosive force in the academic life of a university. It jeopardizes the quality of education and depreciates the genuine achievements of others. It is, without reservation, a responsibility of all members of the campus community to actively deter it. Apathy or acquiescence in the presence of academic dishonesty is not a neutral act. Histories of institutions demonstrate that indifference will reinforce, perpetuate, and enlarge the scope of such misconduct. Institutional reputations for academic dishonesty are regrettable aspects of modern education. These reputations become self-fulfilling and grow, unless vigorously challenged by students and faculty alike.

All members of the University community - students, faculty, and staff - share the responsibility and authority to challenge and make known acts of apparent academic dishonesty.

### **HONOR STATEMENT**

5. New and incoming graduate and undergraduate students should be informed about the role of the Honor Pledge and the Student Honor Council, as well as the obligation of all members of the University of Maryland, College Park community to promote and practice the highest standards of academic integrity.

### **HONOR PLEDGE**

6. The Honor Pledge is a reminder that at the University of Maryland students carry primary responsibility for academic integrity because the meaningfulness of their degrees depends on it. Instructors are urged to emphasize the importance of academic honesty and of the pledge as its symbol. Instructors are encouraged to reference both the pledge and this *Code* on syllabi, including links to additional materials online.

7. On all work submitted for assessment that is not specifically exempted by the instructor, students are encouraged to write and sign the following pledge:

*I pledge on my honor that I have not given or received any unauthorized assistance on this assessment.*

Failure to sign the pledge is not a violation of the *Code of Academic Integrity*, but neither is it a defense in case of violation of this *Code*. Signing or non-signing of the pledge will not be considered in grading or in student conduct procedures.

8. On examinations, no assistance is authorized unless given by or expressly allowed by the instructor. On other assignments, the pledge means that the assignment has been done without academic dishonesty, as defined above. Instructors should define clearly in writing what type of material or information is authorized. Students are expected to seek clarity if there is confusion as to whether specific materials are authorized.

### **SELF-REFERRAL**

9. Students who commit acts of academic dishonesty may demonstrate their renewed commitment to academic integrity by reporting themselves in writing to the Office of Student Conduct. Students who elect to self-refer for academic integrity violations are encouraged to utilize the Office of Student Conduct electronic referral form on the Office of Student Conduct website to detail the incident. Students may not exercise the self-referral option more than once during their enrollment at the University.
10. If an investigation by the Director of Student Conduct reveals that no member of the University had a suspicion of a self-referring student's act of academic dishonesty, then the student will not be charged with academic dishonesty or left with a disciplinary record. Instead, the Director of Student Conduct will notify the instructor of the course in which the incident occurred to consult on the matter. The Director of Student Conduct will then convene a meeting with the student. The purpose of the meeting will be to ensure that the self-referral provisions of this *Code* are followed, not to levy a sanction or to create a disciplinary record. The Director of Student Conduct will notify the instructor of the course in which the incident occurred of the meeting's outcome.
11. In all cases where a student self-referral is accepted, the student will be required to successfully complete an educational sanction. In addition, at the discretion of the course instructor, the student may have the grade for the academic exercise in question reduced to a zero, by one letter grade, or to an "F."
12. If the Director of Student Conduct determines that academic dishonesty was suspected at the time of the student's self-referral and admission, the matter will be resolved in accordance with the procedures specified in this *Code* for resolving academic dishonesty allegations. The student's self-referral and admission may be considered a mitigating circumstance for purposes of sanctioning.

## REPORTING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

13. Any member of the University community who has witnessed an apparent act of academic dishonesty, or who has information that reasonably leads to the conclusion that such an act has occurred or has been attempted, has the responsibility to promptly inform the Office of Student Conduct.
14. If the Director of Student Conduct determines that a report of academic dishonesty is supported by reasonable cause, the Office of Student Conduct will notify the student. University email is the primary means by which the Office of Student Conduct communicates with students. Students are responsible for reading all official communications delivered to the University email address and are advised to check their email regularly for University communications, including those from the Office of Student Conduct.
15. The Office of Student Conduct will offer the student an opportunity for a preliminary interview to review the allegations and any supporting evidence that was provided to the Office of Student Conduct. The instructor of the course in which the incident occurred may be included in the meeting. The Office of Student Conduct will also provide the Respondent with a copy of this *Code* and a statement of procedural rights, which will include information about the right to be assisted by an Advocate, in alignment with Part 21 of this *Code*.

## THE STUDENT HONOR COUNCIL

16. The Student Honor Council is a branch of the University Student Judiciary composed of qualified graduate and undergraduate students in good academic standing.
17. The Student Honor Council has the following responsibilities and authority:
  - (a) To increase awareness throughout the campus of the importance of academic integrity.
  - (b) To designate from its members students to serve as members of Honor Boards, as specified in this *Code*.
  - (c) To advise and consult with faculty and administrative officers on matters pertaining to academic integrity at the University.
18. All Student Honor Council members will participate in orientation and training-sessions held by the Office of Student Conduct.
19. Members of the Student Honor Council who are charged with any violation of this *Code*, the *Code of Student Conduct*, another University policy, or with a criminal offense may be suspended from their positions by the Director of Student Conduct while the charges against them are pending. Students found responsible for any such violation or offense may be disqualified from any further participation in the University Student Judiciary by

the Director of Student Conduct. Additional grounds and procedures for removal may also be set forth in the bylaws of the University Student Judiciary.

20. The administration will provide an appropriate facility for the primary use of the Honor Council suitable for conducting Honor Reviews. Clerical and secretarial assistance will also be provided.

### **ROLE OF ADVOCATE, ADVISOR, AND SUPPORT PERSON**

21. The Respondent may be assisted by an Advocate, who must be a registered, degree-seeking student at the University. The role of an Advocate is limited to:
  - (a) Making brief opening and closing statements.
  - (b) Suggesting relevant questions, which may be directed to witnesses.
  - (c) Providing confidential advice to the Respondent.
  - (d) Following a determination of responsibility, the Advocate may make recommendations regarding sanctions, if appropriate.
22. The Respondent may also choose to be assisted by an Advisor of their choice, who may be an attorney, at their own initiation and expense. The Advisor is present to provide advice and consultation to the Respondent. If necessary, the Respondent may request a recess in order to speak privately with an Advisor. The Advisor shall not be an active participant in the hearing. The Advisor may not speak for the Respondent, advise the Advocate, serve as a witness, provide evidence in the case, delay, or otherwise interfere with the University's disciplinary process.
23. Respondents may choose to be supported by a Support Person of their choice to provide emotional and logistical support. A Support Person shall not be an active participant in the process.
24. As a general practice, disciplinary proceedings will not be delayed due to the unavailability of an Advocate, Advisor, or Support Person.

### **ROLE OF WITNESSES IN ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS**

25. It is the responsibility of the party requesting the presence of a witness to ensure that the witness appears. Because experience has demonstrated that the appearance of a witness is of greater value than a written statement, the latter is discouraged and should not be used unless the witness cannot or reasonably should not be expected to appear. Any written statement must be dated and signed, and witnessed by a staff member in the Office of Student Conduct or a person designated by the Director of Student Conduct. The resolution process will not generally be delayed due to the unavailability of a witness.
26. University students and employees are expected to comply with requests to serve as a witness, unless compliance would result in significant and unavoidable personal hardship

or substantial interference with normal University activities. Notifications of a witness' inability to appear must be submitted in writing to the Director of Student Conduct.

27. During an Honor Review, the Presiding Officer may direct witnesses to appear upon the motion of any Honor Board member, or at the request of either party. If the Director of Student Conduct determines that a fair Honor Review cannot be held without the testimony of a particular witness, and if after good faith attempts are made to notify the witness, the witness either fails to or refuses to appear, the Honor Review will be postponed until the witness agrees to appear or the charges will be dismissed.

#### **PROCEDURES: RESOLUTION BY INFORMAL AGREEMENT**

28. If the Respondent acknowledges responsibility for academic dishonesty, they may choose to resolve the matter informally without participating in a formal disciplinary process.
29. In consultation with the instructor of the course in which the incident occurred, the Director of Student Conduct and the Respondent may reach an agreement concerning how a case should be resolved. With informal agreement, the Respondent waives the right to an appeal of the agreement and the sanction.

#### **PROCEDURES: RESOLUTION BY A DISCIPLINARY CONFERENCE**

30. Respondents may choose to resolve the matter in a Disciplinary Conference if the alleged act of academic dishonesty would not normally result in suspension or expulsion, as defined by the *Code of Academic Integrity*. The Director of Student Conduct reserves the right to refer complex or contested cases to an Honor Review for adjudication.
31. Disciplinary Conferences will be conducted by the Director of Student Conduct. The Respondent will be notified in writing of the conference outcome and sanctioning determination. Respondents who choose to resolve the matter in a Disciplinary Conference waive the right to an appeal of any decision made in a Disciplinary Conference.
32. Respondents participating in a Disciplinary Conference in the Office of Student Conduct are accorded the following procedural protections:
  - (a) Written notice of charges at least three (3) days prior to the scheduled conference.
  - (b) Reasonable access to the case file prior to and during the conference.
  - (c) An opportunity to respond to the evidence against them and to call appropriate witnesses on their behalf.
  - (d) The option to be accompanied and assisted by an Advisor, who may be an attorney, as well as an Advocate or Support Person. All Advisors, Advocates, and Support Persons are subject to the restrictions of Parts 21 through 24 of this *Code*.
33. A plea of not responsible will be entered for Respondents who fail to attend their scheduled Disciplinary Conference; the conference will proceed in their absence and the

Respondent will be notified of the Disciplinary Conference outcome and sanctioning determination.

34. The Director of Student Conduct will determine that a student is responsible for academic dishonesty or an attempt thereof only after considering all of the information before them, and only if the Director believes that such a conclusion is supported by clear and convincing evidence. If the Director of Student Conduct finds that the Respondent is not responsible, the Director will dismiss the charge of academic dishonesty.
35. If the Director finds that the Respondent is responsible for academic dishonesty, the Director of Student Conduct may receive sanctioning recommendations from the Complainant, instructor, academic program, and the Respondent before determining an appropriate sanction.

### **PROCEDURES: RESOLUTION BY A DISCIPLINARY CONFERENCE BOARD**

36. Respondents may request that the matter be resolved using a Disciplinary Conference Board if the alleged act of academic dishonesty would not normally result in suspension or expulsion, as defined by this *Code*. Disciplinary Conference Boards may be used to ensure the Respondent receives a review by their peers while also ensuring that the case can be resolved in an expedited or timely fashion. The discretion on whether to use a Disciplinary Conference Board to resolve the matter rests with the Director of Student Conduct. The Director of Student Conduct reserves the right to refer complex or contested cases to an Honor Review for adjudication.
37. Respondents who agree to resolve the matter through a Disciplinary Conference Board waive the right to an appeal of any decision made by the Board.
38. A Disciplinary Conference Board consists of two students from the University Student Judiciary and a staff member from the Office of Student Conduct.
39. Respondents who agree to a resolution by a Disciplinary Conference Board are accorded the same procedural protections as those who choose resolution by a Disciplinary Conference, as outlined in Part 32 above.
40. If the Disciplinary Conference Board finds that an attempt or act of academic dishonesty occurred, it will determine an appropriate sanction.

### **PROCEDURES: RESOLUTION BY AN HONOR REVIEW**

41. Cases that are not appropriate for resolution through an Informal Agreement, a Disciplinary Conference, or a Disciplinary Conference Board will be resolved through an Honor Review. The Director of Student Conduct will select the date, time, and place for the Honor Review, and will notify all parties in writing a minimum of five (5) business days in advance.

42. Honor Reviews are conducted by an Honor Board convened by the Student Honor Council. Normally, an Honor Board consists of six members: five voting members and one non-voting Presiding Officer. Determinations of the Honor Board will be by a majority vote. In cases of a tie, the Presiding Officer will vote to break the tie. Honor Boards are selected as follows:
- (a) Three (3) students will be selected by the Student Honor Council from among its members. If the Respondent is a graduate student, then at least two (2) of the student members will be graduate students.
  - (b) Two (2) faculty or staff members will be selected by the Office of Student Conduct. If the Respondent is a graduate student, then at least one (1) member will be a regular member of the graduate faculty.
  - (c) The Presiding Officer may be a University student, faculty, or staff member and will be selected by the Director of Student Conduct.
43. If the full Honor Board is unable to convene on the date of the scheduled Honor Review, a replacement Board member may be identified. The modified Board can convene if the Respondent signs a waiver agreeing to the modified makeup of the board.
44. Ad hoc Honor Boards may be convened if the Director of Student Conduct determines that the Student Honor Council or an Honor Board cannot be convened within a reasonable period of time after the allegation is reported. The Director of Student Conduct will convene an ad hoc Honor Board by selecting and appointing at minimum two students and one faculty or staff member. Whenever possible, student members of ad hoc Honor Boards will be members of the Student Honor Council. A Presiding Officer will be appointed by the Director of Student Conduct and will only vote in cases of a tie.
45. Honor Boards may be advised by a University staff member as designated by the Director of Student Conduct. A Board Advisor is a non-voting member of the Board and has all the privileges of Board members, including the ability to comment on questions of procedure and on the relevance of evidence, and will otherwise assist in the administration of the hearing.
46. The Campus Advocate will prepare a formal charge of academic dishonesty, and send it to the Respondent and the Honor Board with appropriate written notice. The Community Advocate will present the case at an Honor Review. The principal responsibilities of the Community Advocate are:
- (a) To present the evidence and analysis upon which the charge is based to the Honor Board during the Honor Review; and
  - (b) To perform such other duties as may be requested by the Student Honor Council or the Honor Board.
47. The charge of academic dishonesty serves to give the Respondent a reasonable understanding of the act and circumstances to be considered by the Honor Board, in order to allow the Respondent to contribute in a meaningful way to the inquiry. It also serves to

provide initial focus to that inquiry. The charge may be modified as the discussion in the Honor Review proceeds, as long as the Respondent is provided notice and accorded a reasonable opportunity to prepare a response. Recesses or postponements may be granted by the Presiding Officer as needed to allow the Respondent a chance to review a modified charge and prepare a response.

48. The purpose of an Honor Review is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the allegation of academic dishonesty, and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. It is the responsibility of all persons at an Honor Review to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts.

An Honor Review is not a criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems, nor does it serve the same social functions. It is not a court or tribunal. Rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a university.

49. The role of the Presiding Officer is to exercise impartial control over the Honor Review in order to achieve an equitable, orderly, timely, and efficient process. The Presiding Officer is authorized to make all decisions and rulings as are necessary and proper to achieve that end, including decisions and rulings pertaining to scheduling and to the inclusion of information in the record. If in the judgment of the Presiding Officer there is reasonable cause to question the impartiality of a board member, the Presiding Officer will inform the Honor Council, which will reconstitute the Honor Board.
50. The Presiding Officer may modify procedural guidelines when necessary. Normally, the following procedures apply during an Honor Review:
  - (a) Both parties will be given an opportunity to share any relevant information or arguments. The Community Advocate will summarize the matter before the Honor Board first, followed by a summary presented by the Respondent.
  - (b) The Community Advocate will present and question witnesses, and offer documents or other materials relevant to the case. The Respondent will then present and question witnesses, and offer documents or other materials relevant to the case. The Community Advocate, the Respondent, and all members of the Honor Board may question any witness appearing before the Board.
  - (c) The members of the Honor Board may ask the Complainant, the Community Advocate, or the Respondent any relevant questions. The members may also request any additional material or the appearance of other witnesses, as appropriate.
  - (d) The Community Advocate may make a brief closing statement, followed by a brief closing statement by the Respondent.
  - (e) The Honor Board will meet privately to discuss the case, and must reach a finding by a majority vote.
  - (f) The Honor Board will not conclude that the Respondent has attempted or engaged in an act of academic dishonesty unless, after considering all the information before it, a majority of members believe that such a conclusion is supported by

clear and convincing evidence. If this is not the case, the Honor Board will dismiss the charge of academic dishonesty.

- (g) If the Honor Board finds the student has engaged in an act of academic dishonesty, both the Community Advocate and the Respondent or their Advocate may recommend an appropriate sanction. Pertinent documents or other material may be submitted for consideration. The Honor Board will then meet privately to reach a decision regarding the sanction by a majority vote.
  - (h) The Presiding Officer will provide the Community Advocate and the Respondent with a written report of the Honor Board's determination.
51. An Honor Review is a confidential investigation. It requires a deliberative and candid atmosphere, free from distraction. As such, Honor Reviews are not open to the public or others interested in the case. The Presiding Officer has discretion to remove any person who disrupts or impedes the investigation, or who fails to adhere to the rulings of the Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer may exclude witnesses from the Honor Review except during the time they are providing information to the Board. The Honor Board may conduct its private deliberations at such times and places as it deems appropriate.
52. The University's academic integrity process differs from any legal proceedings. Formal rules of evidence are not applicable to Honor Review proceedings. The Presiding Officer will admit all matters into evidence which reasonable persons would accept as relevant, significant, and important to the issues being decided in the case. Unnecessarily repetitious, irrelevant, or prejudicial evidence may be excluded at the discretion of the Presiding Officer.
53. If the Honor Board finds that an attempt or act of academic dishonesty did occur, it will impose an appropriate sanction.

## SANCTIONS

54. The normal sanction for undergraduate students found responsible for violating the *Code of Academic Integrity* is the grade of "XF." The normal sanction for a graduate student is the grade of "XF" and dismissal (suspension or expulsion) from the University. **The sanctions available for former students will need to be determined on a case by case basis, but in cases where a former student has been found responsible under the University's scholarly misconduct policy, the normal sanction is degree revocation.** The Director of Student Conduct and/or the Honor Board or Disciplinary Conference Board will consider sanction recommendations from the Complainant and Respondent in determining an appropriate sanction.
55. Attempts to commit acts prohibited by this *Code* may be sanctioned to the same extent as completed violations.
56. The Director of Student Conduct reserves the right to impose a lesser or more severe sanction depending on mitigating or aggravating factors as defined in Parts 2(g) and 2(h) above. The following sanctions for violations of this *Code* may be imposed:

- (a) **Degree revocation: rescinding a degree previously awarded by the University. A permanent notation will appear on the student's transcript.**
- (ba) **Expulsion:** permanent separation of the student from the University. A permanent notation will appear on the student's transcript. The student will also be barred from University premises. (Expulsion requires administrative review and approval by the Vice President for Student Affairs and may be altered, deferred, or withheld.)
- (cb) **Suspension:** separation of the student from the University for a specified period of time. A permanent notation will appear on the student's transcript. The student shall not participate in any University-sponsored activity and may be barred from University premises during the period of suspension. Suspended time will not count against any time limits required by the Graduate School for completion of a degree. (Suspension requires administrative review and approval by the Vice President for Student Affairs and may be altered, deferred, or withheld.)
- (de) **The grade of "XF":** the grade "XF" recorded on the student's transcript includes the notation "failure due to academic dishonesty." The grade of "XF" is treated in the same way as an "F" for the purposes of determining grade point average, course repeatability, and academic standing.
- (i) No student with an "XF" on their transcript will be permitted to represent the University in any extracurricular activity (for example, intercollegiate athletics, sports clubs, traveling performance groups, etc.), or run for or hold office in any student or University organization which is allowed to use University facilities or which receives University funds.
- (ii) The normal duration of the placement of the "XF" is twelve months. If serious mitigating circumstances are presented, an abbreviated "XF" for six months may be considered. If serious aggravating circumstances are presented, the "XF" may be given as a permanent notation on the student's transcript for the course in question.
- (ed) **The grade of "F":** the grade "F" recorded on the student's transcript for the course in which the academic misconduct occurred. The grade of "F" factors into the determination of the student's grade point average, eligibility for course repeatability, and academic standing.
- (fe) **Letter grade reduction:** the student will be given no credit for any assignment(s) in which academic misconduct occurred, and the student's final course grade will be reduced as determined by the course instructor.
- (gf) **Zero on the assignment(s):** the student will be given no credit for the assignment(s) in which academic misconduct occurred. The instructor will factor the zero into the student's final grade in the course.
- (hg) **Other sanctions:** other sanctions may be imposed in addition to those specified in sections (a) through (f) above. Other sanctions may include educational or reflective experiences that encourage the student to prevent repeated acts of academic dishonesty, or help the student better understand how their academic

dishonesty affects the academic and professional communities of which the student is a part.

## APPEALS

57. The Respondent may appeal both the determination of responsibility and the sanction. The Complainant may only appeal the sanction. A party must provide notice to the Director of Student Conduct of their intent to file an appeal in writing within three (3) business days after the Presiding Officer's report is sent.
58. A written argument supporting the appeal must be submitted in writing to the Director of Student Conduct within seven (7) business days of the notice of the intent to file an appeal. The opposing party will be provided seven (7) business days to submit a written response.
59. If the parties do not submit notice of their intent to file an appeal, the decision and sanction are final after three (3) business days from the date of the Presiding Officer's report. Appeals submitted after three (3) business days will be denied.
60. Appeals of decisions resulting in suspension, ~~or~~ expulsion, **or degree revocation** will be decided by the University Senate Student Conduct Committee Appellate Body, which is comprised of three members from the Student Conduct Committee including at least one student. Appeals of decisions resulting in sanctions other than suspension or expulsion will be decided by the Appellate Board, which is a branch of the University Student Judiciary and is comprised of students.
61. Grounds for an appeal will be limited to:
  - (a) Substantial Procedural Error: Procedural errors or errors in interpretation of University policy that were so substantial as to effectively deny a Respondent notice or a fair opportunity to be heard. Deviations from procedures that were not so substantial as to deny a Respondent notice or a fair opportunity to be heard will not be a basis for granting an appeal.
  - (b) Disproportionate Sanctioning: The sanction is substantially disproportionate to the offense, which means it is far in excess of what is reasonable given the facts or circumstances of the violation.
  - (c) Arbitrary and Capricious Decision: An arbitrary and capricious decision is a decision without a rational basis or unsupported by any evidence in the record.
  - (d) New Evidence: New and significant relevant information has become available which a reasonably diligent person could not have discovered before or during the original hearing.

When the basis of the appeal is new evidence, the appellate body will determine whether the information is new and was unavailable at the time of the Honor Review. If the appellate body determines that the information is not new and was available at the time, the appeal will be denied. If the information is determined to

be new and unavailable at the time of the Honor Review, the appellate body will consider whether the new information could have changed the outcome of the original Honor Review. If it is determined that the outcome could have been impacted by the new evidence, the case will be sent back to the original Honor Board for further review.

62. Appeals are not intended to allow for a second review of the facts of the case and determination of whether there was a violation. A review of the matter will be prompt and narrowly tailored to the stated grounds for appeal. In most cases, appeals are confined to a review of the written record and the statements of the parties in support of or against the appeal. In all cases, deference shall be given to the determinations of the lower board.
63. The appellate body will consider the appeal and may:
  - (a) Affirm the Decision and the sanction imposed;
  - (b) Affirm the Decision and reduce, but not eliminate, the sanction;
  - (c) Remand the case to a new Honor Board, if there were procedural or interpretation errors;
  - (d) Remand the case to the original Honor Board in accordance with the procedures outlined under “New Evidence;” or
  - (e) Dismiss the case if the decision is determined to be arbitrary and capricious.
64. Decisions of the appellate bodies are not subject to further appeal. Decisions altering the determinations of Honor Boards will be accompanied by a brief report explaining the appellate body’s decision. Sanctions of suspension or expulsion require review and approval by the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Vice President for Student Affairs may alter, defer, or withhold a sanction of dismissal.

#### **“XF” REMOVAL PROCESS**

65. The Respondent may file a written petition to the Appellate Board to have the grade of “XF” removed and permanently replaced with the grade of “F.” The Appellate Board has the sole discretion in the decision to remove the grade of “XF” and replace it with an “F” provided that:
  - (a) At the time the petition is received, at least twelve (12) months should have elapsed since the grade of “XF” was imposed, unless a different time period was specified at the time the “XF” was imposed;
  - (b) At the time the petition is received, the student has successfully completed a non-credit seminar on academic integrity, as administered by the Office of Student Conduct; or, for those no longer enrolled at the University, an equivalent activity as determined by the Office of Student Conduct; and,
  - (c) The Office of Student Conduct certifies that to the best of its knowledge the student has not been found responsible for any other act of academic dishonesty

or similar disciplinary offense at the University of Maryland or another institution.

66. Prior to deciding a petition, the Appellate Board will review the record of the case and consult with the Director of Student Conduct. Generally, the grade of “XF” will not be removed if it was imposed for an act of academic dishonesty requiring significant premeditation.
67. If the “XF” grade is removed, records of the incident may be voided. If the Appellate Board denies the petition to remove the “XF” grade, the petition cannot be reconsidered for one year, unless the Appellate Board specifies an earlier date on which the petition may be reconsidered.
68. Decisions of the Appellate Board pertaining to the removal of the “XF” may be appealed to the Senate Student Conduct Committee Appellate Body. If the Senate Student Conduct Committee Appellate Body removes the grade of “XF” from the student’s transcript, the Senate Student Conduct Committee Appellate Body will provide a written rationale to the Student Honor Council.

## **DISCIPLINARY RECORDS**

69. Students found responsible for violations of the *Code of Academic Integrity* will have a disciplinary record. Disciplinary records are maintained by the Office of Student Conduct for a period of three (3) years from the date of the letter providing notice of final disciplinary action. Disciplinary records may be retained for longer periods of time or permanently, if specified in the sanction. Disciplinary records of students with a sanction of suspension or expulsion will be retained permanently unless otherwise specified.
70. Students may petition the Office of Student Conduct to void their disciplinary record early, for good cause. Factors to be considered in review of such petitions include:
  - (a) The present demeanor of the Respondent;
  - (b) The conduct of the Respondent subsequent to the violation; and
  - (c) The nature of the violation and the severity of any damage, injury, or harm resulting from it.
71. Disciplinary records retained for less than 90 days or designated as “permanent” should not be voided without unusual and compelling justification.
72. Denials of petitions to void disciplinary records can be appealed to the Senate Student Conduct Committee, which will consider the appeal using the grounds for appeal outlined in Part 61 above. Such an appeal must be submitted in writing within five (5) business days from the letter providing notice of the original decision.



## Amendment to the Code of Academic Integrity (Senate Document #19-20-32) Student Conduct Committee | Chair: Andrea Dragan

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Lanford request that the Student Conduct Committee review the proposal entitled, *Amendment to the Code of Academic Integrity*.

Specifically, it asks that you:

1. Review the University of Maryland Code of Academic Integrity ([III-1.00\[A\]](#)).
2. Review language related to degree revocation within the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures Concerning Scholarly Misconduct ([III-1.10\[A\]](#)).
3. Consult with the proposers, the Director of the Office of Student Conduct, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and the Dean of the Graduate School.
4. Consider whether the *Code of Academic Integrity* should be amended to define degree revocation and identify it as a potential sanction.
5. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on any proposed changes to the University's policy.
6. If appropriate based on the committee's consideration of the above items, recommend whether the existing policy should be revised.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **February 7, 2020**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



Amendment to the Code of Academic Integrity

Table with 4 rows: NAME/TITLE (Andrea Goodwin, John Bertot and Steve Fetter), EMAIL (Agoodwin@umd.edu), PHONE (3013148204), UNIT (Office of Student Conduct), CONSTITUENCY (Staff)

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE

Students may commit violations of the Code of Academic Integrity that go undetected until after the student has graduated from the University and receives their degree. It is the current and longstanding practice of the Office of Student Conduct to hold former students accountable for violations of the Code of Academic Integrity that occurred at the time they were a student.

However, the Code of Academic Integrity does not currently define "Degree Revocation" as a sanction and does not state that this is the standard penalty for a former student found responsible for academic dishonesty who has since earned their degree.

Degree Revocation is referenced in the University's Policy on Scholarly Misconduct, part X (B) 2:

Disciplinary Action. The University views Scholarly Misconduct as grounds for disciplinary action pursuant to applicable University policies, procedures, and contracts. Disciplinary action may include suspension and/or termination of employment of a faculty or staff member found responsible for Scholarly Misconduct.

The Code of Academic Integrity references the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures Concerning Scholarly Misconduct (III-1.10(A) in the following way: In cases where an allegation of academic dishonesty could also be a violation of the University's Policy in scholarly misconduct, the Director of Student Conduct and the University's Research Integrity Office will determine whether this Code or the relevant University policy will apply.

However, the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures Concerning Scholarly Misconduct does not specifically define Degree Revocation. This applies to scholarly work, which includes research and other creative activity, research training, applications and proposals, and related activity containing a research component, performed at the University by any person, including students.

DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE

Amend the Code of Academic Integrity to clearly define degree revocation as a sanction and outline circumstances in which a degree may be revoked. For example:

"Degree Revocation" means rescinding a degree previously awarded by the University. In cases where a degree revocation sanction has been issued, it will be permanently noted on the student's academic transcript.

## **SUGGESTION FOR HOW YOUR PROPOSAL WOULD BE PUT INTO PRACTICE**

Charge the appropriate Senate Committee with revising the *Code of Academic Integrity* to incorporate the suggested changes. After approval by the Senate and the President, the changes could then be implemented by the appropriate offices.

## **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

## Appendix 2

### Amendment to the *Code of Academic Integrity* Senate Document #19-20-32 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on Degree Revocation

Does the University currently have the ability to revoke a degree?

- Degree revocation can currently be used as a sanction in the academic misconduct process.
- The *Code of Academic Integrity* has a provision that allows for “Other sanctions,” in order to allow for sanctions that are not explicitly listed in the *Code* if they are appropriate for the specific case.
- However, since degree revocation is not explicitly listed in the *Code* as a potential sanction, current and former students are not aware that it is a possible consequence of egregious misconduct, or that it would be the normal sanction in cases involving the scholarly misconduct policy.

How many cases have resulted in degree revocation? How many of those were related to scholarly misconduct, versus those associated with *Code of Academic Integrity* violations?

- The Office of Student Conduct has revoked at most 4 degrees over the past 19 years.
- At least 2 of those were related to scholarly misconduct.

Do peer institutions allow degree revocation as a sanction for former students? Do peer institutions incorporate any sort of statute of limitations for degree revocations?

- Peers generally do allow for degree revocation as a potential sanction.
- Some institutions have the authority to revoke a degree but have not used that authority.
- Degree revocation is used very rarely and only in egregious cases. Peer institutions cite scholarly misconduct cases as potential valid reasons or the only reasons for degree revocation as a sanction.
- At peer institutions, former students have all of the due process rights current students would have in the academic misconduct process.

What is the process a case would go through in order to end in revocation of a degree?

- When an allegation is received, the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) and the Director of Student Conduct together review it to determine which policy should apply.
- For potential scholarly misconduct, the RIO would initiate a review under the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures Concerning Scholarly Misconduct (III-1.10[A]).
- If a former student is found responsible for violating the scholarly misconduct policy, the responsible administrator would determine what disciplinary action is appropriate.
- If degree revocation is recommended, the case would be referred to the Office of Student Conduct for review under the *Code of Academic Integrity*.
- The process in the *Code* would be followed. If an Honor Board finds the former student responsible, it would determine an appropriate sanction.
- Former students retain all rights to due process and appeals through both the scholarly misconduct and academic misconduct processes.

What stages are involved in the scholarly misconduct process? What due process rights do Respondents have through that process?

- The scholarly misconduct policy begins with a Preliminary Assessment phase, where the RIO determines whether the alleged conduct would constitute scholarly misconduct if it were true, and whether there is evidence to support reviewing the allegation.

- In the Inquiry Phase, a committee gathers evidence and assesses whether an allegation warrants an investigation.
- In the Investigation Phase, a separate committee investigates and comes to a finding as to whether the misconduct occurred and whether the Respondent is responsible.
- The scholarly misconduct process incorporates due process for the Respondent at every stage, through opportunities to respond to the allegation at each stage and opportunities to comment on draft reports and challenge determinations by each committee.
- The Respondent has the right to appeal the finding of the Investigation Committee.

Why is there no statute of limitations for cases that might result in degree revocation?

- The scholarly misconduct policy has no statute of limitations, due to the severity of the misconduct and the potential harm to the University, its reputation, and the scholarly community.
  - The scholarly misconduct policy states that “Misconduct in carrying out academic activities undermines the integrity of the educational system and the scholarly enterprise, and erodes the public trust in the university community.”
- Likewise, the *Code of Academic Integrity* has no statute of limitations, and specifically indicates that it applies to individuals who were students at the time of the violation.
- If a former student goes into academia, and their career path and the work that builds their professional reputation is based on misconduct like fabricated data, the University should review it and consider whether degree revocation is the correct response. We recognize that the consequence of revoking a degree would be serious damage to the individual’s career, but depending on the facts of the case, it might still be the appropriate sanction regardless of when it is found.
- There could be cases that show up in the news where the University would be pressured to act regardless of how far back the misconduct occurred, so it’s important to have this tool available to us.

Is degree revocation too severe a sanction for some *Code of Academic Integrity* violations?

- The degree revocation sanction, while available, would need to be appropriate depending on the facts of the case.
- In cases where an undergraduate student cheated on one exam and it wasn’t discovered until after graduation, degree revocation may not be a reasonable sanction.
- Other sanctions could be considered that may be more appropriate for the case.
- Former students would have the ability to appeal the sanction based on the grounds that it is grossly disproportionate to the offense.

What would an Honor Board do in a case where degree revocation would be unreasonable given the violation?

- Other sanctions would be considered instead of degree revocation.
- Possible sanctions could include putting a hold on the former student’s account (so they cannot get transcripts), either for a defined period of time or until the person completes an educational sanction such as a reflection paper or academic integrity seminar/tutorial.

If a former UMD student was also a former student of another institution and they committed misconduct while at that institution, but there is no evidence of misconduct while at UMD, would their UMD degree be revoked?

- No. A degree could only be revoked if the former student had been found responsible of misconduct while a student at the University of Maryland.

Standards of appropriate research conduct may change over time. How would this review take that into account for cases where an allegation focuses on misconduct well in the past?

- The scholarly misconduct policy focuses on whether the conduct seriously deviates from practices commonly accepted in the field. In cases that span years or decades, the RIO and the committees involved in the review would consider how practices have changed over time.
- Committees in the scholarly misconduct process include members with expertise in the relevant field, so that practices and standards in the discipline may be considered.
- In the academic misconduct process, faculty and staff are included on Honor Boards, so they can give perspectives on whether accepted practices could have changed in the time since the alleged conduct.



## PCC Proposal to Rename the Master of Science Program in “Veterinary Medical Sciences” to “Comparative Biomedical Sciences” (PCC 19033)

**PRESENTED BY** Janna Bianchini, Chair, Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee

**REVIEW DATES** SEC – February 21, 2020 | SENATE – March 3, 2020

**VOTING METHOD** In a single vote

**RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT** NA

**NECESSARY APPROVALS** Senate, President, Chancellor, and Maryland Higher Education Commission

### ISSUE

---

The Department of Veterinary Medicine proposes to rename its M.S. and Ph.D. programs in Veterinary Medical Sciences to Comparative Biomedical Sciences. This research-based curriculum is distinct from the department’s professional Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (D.V.M.). The latter is offered on the Virginia Tech campus, is jointly administered by the University of Maryland and Virginia Tech through the Virginia-Maryland College of Veterinary Medicine, and is the practitioner program designed for those students who wish to pursue a career as a veterinarian. In contrast, the Veterinary Medical Sciences programs (offered on the College Park campus) are focused on educating the next generation of scientists in the techniques for and approaches to analyzing infectious diseases and therapeutic development. The name change to Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC) is intended to help students better distinguish the goals of the research-based program from the professional doctorate. CBSC covers both basic and applied veterinary and biomedical sciences for improving animal, human, and environmental health. The integration of the animal, human, and environmental health is a relatively new thrust in the field, known as “One Health.” Several graduate programs, at the colleges of veterinary medicine in comparable universities, have already adopted the CBSC title.

A minimum of 24 semester with hours of graduate coursework and six hours of thesis research credit (VMSC799) is required for the M.S. degree.

The proposed name change was endorsed by the Graduate School Programs, Curricula, and Courses committee on January 30, 2020, and by the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses committee on February 7, 2020.

### RECOMMENDATION(S)

---

The Senate Committee on Programs, Curricula, and Courses recommends that the Senate approve this name change.

## **COMMITTEE WORK**

---

The committee considered this proposal at its meeting on February 7, 2020. The committee met with the graduate program director, Dr. Yanjin Zhang, who made a brief presentation and responded to questions. The committee voted to endorse the name change.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

---

The Senate could decline to approve the name change.

## **RISKS**

---

If the Senate declines to approve this degree program, the University will lose an opportunity to better market and recruit this degree program to prospective graduate students.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

---

There are no significant financial implications.

# 473: COMPARATIVE BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES (CBSC)

---

## In Workflow

1. D-VMSC Chair (xzhu1@umd.edu)
2. AGNR Curriculum Manager (ecooper@umd.edu;%20tgallman@umd.edu)
3. AGNR PCC Chair (jsull@umd.edu;%20mcarroll@umd.edu)
4. AGNR Dean (jsull@umd.edu)
5. Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager (mcolson@umd.edu)
6. Graduate School Curriculum Manager (aambrosi@umd.edu)
7. Graduate PCC Chair (aambrosi@umd.edu)
8. Dean of the Graduate School (sfetter@umd.edu;%20aambrosi@umd.edu)
9. Senate PCC Chair (jcw@umd.edu;%20mcolson@umd.edu)
10. University Senate Chair (mcolson@umd.edu)
11. President (mcolson@umd.edu)
12. Chancellor (mcolson@umd.edu)
13. MHEC (mcolson@umd.edu)
14. Provost Office (mcolson@umd.edu)
15. Graduate Catalog Manager (aambrosi@umd.edu)

## Approval Path

1. Tue, 19 Nov 2019 14:53:35 GMT  
Xiaoping Zhu (xzhu1): Approved for D-VMSC Chair
2. Mon, 25 Nov 2019 17:30:07 GMT  
Tyra Monnity (tgallman): Approved for AGNR Curriculum Manager
3. Thu, 05 Dec 2019 16:10:21 GMT  
Mark Carroll (mcarroll): Rollback to Initiator
4. Fri, 06 Dec 2019 16:32:22 GMT  
Xiaoping Zhu (xzhu1): Approved for D-VMSC Chair
5. Thu, 12 Dec 2019 18:30:29 GMT  
Tyra Monnity (tgallman): Approved for AGNR Curriculum Manager
6. Thu, 12 Dec 2019 20:02:01 GMT  
Mark Carroll (mcarroll): Approved for AGNR PCC Chair
7. Thu, 12 Dec 2019 21:07:20 GMT  
Joseph Sullivan (jsull): Approved for AGNR Dean
8. Wed, 22 Jan 2020 22:27:05 GMT  
Michael Colson (mcolson): Approved for Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager
9. Fri, 07 Feb 2020 15:19:55 GMT  
Angela Ambrosi (aambrosi): Approved for Graduate School Curriculum Manager

## History

1. Sep 16, 2019 by Angela Ambrosi (aambrosi)
2. Oct 18, 2019 by William Bryan (wbryan)

Date Submitted: Thu, 05 Dec 2019 17:29:54 GMT

**Viewing: 473 : Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC)**

**Last approved: Fri, 18 Oct 2019 20:23:28 GMT**

**Last edit: Thu, 05 Dec 2019 17:29:52 GMT**

Changes proposed by: Yanjin Zhang (zhangyj)

## Proposed Action

Rename Program

## Program Name

Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC)

**Program Status**

Active

**Effective Term**

Fall 2020

**Catalog Year**

2020-2021

**Program Level**

Graduate Program

**Program Type**

Master's

**Delivery Method**

On Campus

**Departments****Department**

Veterinary Medicine Program

**Colleges****College**

Agriculture and Natural Resources

**Program/Major Code**

VMSC

**MHEC Inventory Program**

Veterinary Medical Sciences

**CIP Code**

512504 - Veterinary Microbiology and Immunobiology.

**HEGIS**

129958

**Degree(s) Awarded****Degree Awarded**

Master of Science

**Proposal Contact**

Yanjin Zhang: zhangyj@umd.edu, 301-314-6596

**Proposal Summary**

Change the program name from Veterinary Medical Science (VMSC) to Comparative Biomedical Science (CBSC).

**Program and Catalog Information****Catalog Program Requirements:****Thesis only:** 30 credits

Students with adequate undergraduate training usually complete the master's degree within two years.

Course	Title	Credits
VMSC698	Seminar in Veterinary Medical Science	1
VMSC799	Thesis Research	6

Select one graduate level biometrics or biochemistry course	3
Select at least 12 credits of VMSC courses	12
Select eight additional credits	8
Total Credits	30

During the first semester the student selects an advisor, and with the help of the advisor forms an Advisory Committee with the approval by the program's Graduate Education Committee. By the end of the second semester with the advice of the Advisory Committee, the student files a proposed schedule of course work including at least one credit of seminar (VMSC698). A minimum of 24 semester with hours of graduate courses and six hours of thesis research credit (VMSC799) is required for the degree. No less than 12 credits should be from courses 600 level or higher; at least 12 credits must be earned in the major subject. Three credits of graduate biometrics or biochemistry and one seminar credit (VMSC698) are required. No more than two credits of Special Problems (VMSC699) are acceptable as part of the 24 required course credits.

Students must maintain an overall GPA of 3.0 or better in courses taken for graduate credit. The committee may require remedial courses if the student enters with inadequate prerequisites or deficiencies in the undergraduate program. By the end of the second semester, a thesis research proposal must be approved and filed. The student must present the thesis in a public seminar and pass a final oral examination given by the Advisory Committee.

Details on the Graduate School policy on the Master's Thesis Examination may be found in the Graduate School Catalog at [http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/masters\\_degree\\_policies.htm](http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/masters_degree_policies.htm). The thesis must be submitted to the Graduate School in electronic format after final approval of the document by the Thesis Examining Committee. See the University of Maryland Thesis and Dissertation Style Guide (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/etd>) (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/etd/>) for the details of this process.

## Program Modification Information

**Impact on current students. It should be specifically acknowledged that students enrolled in the program prior to the effective date of any curriculum change may complete their program under the old requirements if they wish. The courses required must remain available, or suitable substitutions specifically designated.**

Just the program name change. There is no impact on current students.

## Linked Programs

### Renaming Program

**Provide a rationale for renaming the program.**

The Department of Veterinary Medicine operates the Veterinary Medical Sciences (VMSC) graduate program, which concentrates on zoonotic infectious disease research. The VMSC graduate program offers Master of Science (MS) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees in the academic fields of veterinary medical, biomedical, and comparative medical sciences.

The current name, VMSC, is often misinterpreted as a professional track for those desiring to become practicing veterinarians. However, the VMSC program focuses on a much broader spectrum with educating the next generation of scientists in the techniques and approaches to analyze infectious diseases and therapeutic development. We sincerely believe that this misinterpretation is based solely on the program name and is actively discouraging applicants. The change is necessary for the development and success of the graduate education program in the Department of Veterinary Medicine.

Changing the graduate program name to Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC) more closely aligns with the academic and training of the degree program and conforms with the department's research areas of virology, bacteriology, immunology, epidemiology, and vaccinology. Currently, several other research-based Veterinary schools across the country, including Louisiana State University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Georgia, Iowa State University, North Carolina State University, and Cornell University, successfully uses the name of Comparative Biomedical Sciences as a graduate program title.

The proposed name change from VMSC to CBSC has been fully endorsed by all faculty members in the graduate program. This change will clearly define the goals of the graduate program and ultimately attract students who are interested in our research.

### Reviewer Comments

**Mark Carroll (mcarroll) (Thu, 05 Dec 2019 16:10:21 GMT):** Rollback: Please remove the attachment and all wording pertaining to changes in the program curriculum from the proposal, and then resubmit. Curriculum changes are a separate item from a program name change and need to be submitted as a separate proposal.

Key: 473

# Program Change Request

Date Submitted: 12/05/19 12:29 pm

Viewing: **473 : Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC) ~~Veterinary Medical Sciences (VMSC)~~**

Last approved: 10/18/19 4:23 pm

Last edit: 12/05/19 12:29 pm

Changes proposed by: Yanjin Zhang (zhangyj)

Catalog Pages Using this Program

[Veterinary Medical Sciences, Master of Science \(M.S.\)](#)

Proposed Action **Rename Program**

Program Name

## In Workflow

1. D-VMSC Chair
2. AGNR Curriculum Manager
3. AGNR PCC Chair
4. AGNR Dean
5. Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager
6. Graduate School Curriculum Manager
7. Graduate PCC Chair
8. Dean of the Graduate School
9. Senate PCC Chair
10. University Senate Chair
11. President
12. Chancellor
13. MHEC
14. Provost Office
15. Graduate Catalog Manager

## Approval Path

1. 11/19/19 9:53 am  
Xiaoping Zhu  
(xzhu1): Approved for D-VMSC Chair
2. 11/25/19 12:30 pm  
Tyra Monnity  
(tgallman): Approved for AGNR Curriculum Manager

3. 12/05/19 11:10 am  
Mark Carroll  
(mcarroll): Rollback  
to Initiator
4. 12/06/19 11:32 am  
Xiaoping Zhu  
(xzhu1): Approved  
for D-VMSC Chair
5. 12/12/19 1:30 pm  
Tyra Monnity  
(tgallman):  
Approved for AGNR  
Curriculum  
Manager
6. 12/12/19 3:02 pm  
Mark Carroll  
(mcarroll):  
Approved for AGNR  
PCC Chair
7. 12/12/19 4:07 pm  
Joseph Sullivan  
(jsull): Approved for  
AGNR Dean
8. 01/22/20 5:27 pm  
Michael Colson  
(mcolson):  
Approved for  
Academic Affairs  
Curriculum  
Manager
9. 02/07/20 10:19 am  
Angela Ambrosi  
(aambrosi):  
Approved for  
Graduate School  
Curriculum  
Manager

---

## History

1. Sep 16, 2019 by

Angela Ambrosi  
(aambrosi)  
2. Oct 18, 2019 by  
William Bryan  
(wbryan)

**Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC) ~~Veterinary Medical Sciences (VMSC)~~**

Program Status Active

Effective Term Fall 2020

Catalog Year **2020-2021**

Program Level Graduate Program

Program Type Master's

Delivery Method On Campus

Departments

Department
Veterinary Medicine Program

Colleges

College
Agriculture and Natural Resources

Program/Major Code VMSC

MHEC Inventory Program Veterinary Medical Sciences

CIP Code 512504 - Veterinary Microbiology and Immunobiology.

HEGIS 129958

MHEC Recognized Area(s) of Concentration

Degree(s) Awarded

Degree Awarded
Master of Science

If other, new degree award:

## Proposal Contact

**Yanjin Zhang: [zhangyj@umd.edu](mailto:zhangyj@umd.edu), 301-314-6596**

## Proposal Summary

**Change the program name from Veterinary Medical Science (VMSC) to Comparative Biomedical Science (CBSC).**

## 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.

### Catalog Program Requirements:

#### Thesis only: 30 credits

Students with adequate undergraduate training usually complete the master's degree within two years.

#### Course List

Course	Title	Credits
<a href="#">VMSC698</a>	Seminar in Veterinary Medical Science	1
<a href="#">VMSC799</a>	Thesis Research	6
	Select one graduate level biometrics or biochemistry course	3
	Select at least 12 credits of VMSC courses	12
	Select eight additional credits	8
	<b>Total Credits</b>	<b>30</b>

During the first semester the student selects an advisor, and with the help of the advisor forms an Advisory Committee with the approval by the program's Graduate Education Committee. By the end of the second semester with the advice of the Advisory Committee, the student files a proposed schedule of course work including at least one credit of seminar ([VMSC698](#)). A minimum of 24 semester with hours of graduate courses and six hours of thesis research credit ([VMSC799](#)) is required for the degree. No less than 12 credits should be from courses 600 level or higher; at least 12 credits must be earned in the major subject. Three credits of graduate biometrics or biochemistry and one seminar credit ([VMSC698](#)) are required. No more than two credits of Special Problems ([VMSC699](#)) are acceptable as part of the 24 required course credits.

Students must maintain an overall GPA of 3.0 or better in courses taken for graduate credit. The committee may require remedial courses if the student enters with inadequate prerequisites or deficiencies in the undergraduate program. By the end of the second semester, a thesis research proposal must be approved and filed. The student must present the thesis in a public seminar and pass a final oral examination given by the Advisory Committee.

Details on the Graduate School policy on the Master's Thesis Examination may be found in the Graduate School Catalog at [http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/masters\\_degree\\_policies.htm](http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/masters_degree_policies.htm). The thesis must be submitted

to the Graduate School in electronic format after final approval of the document by the Thesis Examining Committee. See the University of Maryland Thesis and Dissertation Style Guide (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/etd>) for the details of this process.

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.

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

## Program Modification Information

---

Impact on current students. It should be specifically acknowledged that students enrolled in the program prior to the effective date of any curriculum change may complete their program under the old requirements if they wish. The courses required must remain available, or suitable substitutions specifically designated.

**Just the program name change. There is no impact on current students.**

### Linked Programs

---

Indicate in the space below all programs to which this program is formally linked (e.g., approved combined bachelor's/master's programs, dual master's programs, or joint-programs with other universities). If the proposed modification will affect the linked program, provide as an attachment the new curriculum for each arrangement and provide supporting correspondence from the director of the linked program.

### Renaming Program

---

Provide a rationale for renaming the program.

The Department of Veterinary Medicine operates the Veterinary Medical Sciences (VMSC) graduate program, which concentrates on zoonotic infectious disease research. The VMSC graduate program offers Master of Science (MS) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees in the academic fields of veterinary medical, biomedical, and comparative medical sciences.

The current name, VMSC, is often misinterpreted as a professional track for those desiring to become practicing veterinarians. However, the VMSC program focuses on a much broader spectrum with educating the next generation of scientists in the techniques and approaches to analyze infectious diseases and therapeutic development. We sincerely believe that this misinterpretation is based solely on the program name and is actively discouraging applicants. The change is necessary for the development and success of the graduate education program in the Department of Veterinary Medicine.

Changing the graduate program name to Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC) more closely aligns with the academic and training of the degree program and conforms with the department's research areas of virology, bacteriology, immunology, epidemiology, and vaccinology. Currently, several other research-based Veterinary schools across the country, including Louisiana State University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Georgia, Iowa State University, North Carolina State University, and Cornell University, successfully uses the name of Comparative Biomedical Sciences as a graduate program title.

The proposed name change from VMSC to CBSC has been fully endorsed by all faculty members in the graduate program. This change will clearly define the goals of the graduate program and ultimately attract students who are interested in our research.

### Supporting Documents

---

Attachments

Administrative  
Documents

Reviewer

Comments

**Mark Carroll (mcarroll) (12/05/19 11:10 am):** Rollback: Please remove the attachment and all wording pertaining to changes in the program curriculum from the proposal, and then

resubmit. Curriculum changes are a separate item from a program name change and need to be submitted as a separate proposal.

Key: 473



## PCC Proposal to Rename the Ph.D. Program in “Veterinary Medical Sciences” to “Comparative Biomedical Sciences” (PCC 19034)

**PRESENTED BY** Janna Bianchini, Chair, Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee

**REVIEW DATES** SEC – February 21, 2020 | SENATE – March 3, 2020

**VOTING METHOD** In a single vote

**RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT** NA

**NECESSARY APPROVALS** Senate, President, Chancellor, and Maryland Higher Education Commission

### ISSUE

---

The Department of Veterinary Medicine proposes to rename its M.S. and Ph.D. programs in Veterinary Medical Sciences to Comparative Biomedical Sciences. This research-based curriculum is distinct from the department’s professional Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (D.V.M.). The latter is offered on the Virginia Tech campus, is jointly administered by the University of Maryland and Virginia Tech through the Virginia-Maryland College of Veterinary Medicine, and is the practitioner program designed for those students who wish to pursue a career as a veterinarian. In contrast, the Veterinary Medical Sciences programs (offered on the College Park campus) are focused on educating the next generation of scientists in the techniques for and approaches to analyzing infectious diseases and therapeutic development. The name change to Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC) is intended to help students better distinguish the goals of the research-based program from the professional doctorate. CBSC covers both basic and applied veterinary and biomedical sciences for improving animal, human, and environmental health. The integration of the animal, human, and environmental health is a relatively new thrust in the field, known as “One Health.” Several graduate programs, at the colleges of veterinary medicine in comparable universities, have already adopted the CBSC title.

Applicants with a D.V.M., M.D., or equivalent or related degree in biological sciences plus a master’s degree, may be admitted to the Ph.D. program. In exceptional cases, admission to the Ph.D. program without the M.S. degree may be considered but these candidates must complete a minimum of 24 hours of course work.

The proposed name change was endorsed by the Graduate School Programs, Curricula, and Courses committee on January 30, 2020, and by the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses committee on February 7, 2020.

### RECOMMENDATION(S)

---

The Senate Committee on Programs, Curricula, and Courses recommends that the Senate approve this name change.

## **COMMITTEE WORK**

---

The committee considered this proposal at its meeting on February 7, 2020. The committee met with the graduate program director, Dr. Yanjin Zhang, who made a brief presentation and responded to questions. The committee voted to endorse the name change.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

---

The Senate could decline to approve the name change.

## **RISKS**

---

If the Senate declines to approve this degree program, the University will lose an opportunity to better market and recruit this degree program to prospective graduate students.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

---

There are no significant financial implications.

# 474: COMPARATIVE BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES (CBSC)

---

## In Workflow

1. D-VMSC Chair (xzhu1@umd.edu)
2. AGNR Curriculum Manager (ecooper@umd.edu;%20tgallman@umd.edu)
3. AGNR PCC Chair (jsull@umd.edu;%20mcarroll@umd.edu)
4. AGNR Dean (jsull@umd.edu)
5. Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager (mcolson@umd.edu)
6. Graduate School Curriculum Manager (aambrosi@umd.edu)
7. Graduate PCC Chair (aambrosi@umd.edu)
8. Dean of the Graduate School (sfetter@umd.edu;%20aambrosi@umd.edu)
9. Senate PCC Chair (jcw@umd.edu;%20mcolson@umd.edu)
10. University Senate Chair (mcolson@umd.edu)
11. President (mcolson@umd.edu)
12. Chancellor (mcolson@umd.edu)
13. MHEC (mcolson@umd.edu)
14. Provost Office (mcolson@umd.edu)
15. Graduate Catalog Manager (aambrosi@umd.edu)

## Approval Path

1. Wed, 13 Nov 2019 21:10:54 GMT  
Xiaoping Zhu (xzhu1): Approved for D-VMSC Chair
2. Mon, 25 Nov 2019 17:32:22 GMT  
Tyra Monnity (tgallman): Approved for AGNR Curriculum Manager
3. Thu, 05 Dec 2019 16:10:56 GMT  
Mark Carroll (mcarroll): Rollback to Initiator
4. Fri, 06 Dec 2019 16:33:34 GMT  
Xiaoping Zhu (xzhu1): Approved for D-VMSC Chair
5. Thu, 12 Dec 2019 18:31:57 GMT  
Tyra Monnity (tgallman): Approved for AGNR Curriculum Manager
6. Thu, 12 Dec 2019 20:03:08 GMT  
Mark Carroll (mcarroll): Approved for AGNR PCC Chair
7. Thu, 12 Dec 2019 21:07:29 GMT  
Joseph Sullivan (jsull): Approved for AGNR Dean
8. Wed, 22 Jan 2020 22:27:10 GMT  
Michael Colson (mcolson): Approved for Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager
9. Fri, 07 Feb 2020 15:19:59 GMT  
Angela Ambrosi (aambrosi): Approved for Graduate School Curriculum Manager

## History

1. Sep 16, 2019 by Angela Ambrosi (aambrosi)
2. Oct 18, 2019 by William Bryan (wbryan)

Date Submitted: Thu, 05 Dec 2019 17:31:09 GMT

**Viewing: 474 : Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC)**

**Last approved: Fri, 18 Oct 2019 20:23:59 GMT**

**Last edit: Thu, 05 Dec 2019 17:31:08 GMT**

Changes proposed by: Yanjin Zhang (zhangyj)

## Proposed Action

Rename Program

## Program Name

Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC)

**Program Status**

Active

**Effective Term**

Fall 2020

**Catalog Year**

2020-2021

**Program Level**

Graduate Program

**Program Type**

Doctoral

**Delivery Method**

On Campus

**Departments**

**Department**

Veterinary Medicine Program

**Colleges**

**College**

Agriculture and Natural Resources

**Program/Major Code**

VMSC

**MHEC Inventory Program**

Veterinary Medical Sciences

**CIP Code**

512504 - Veterinary Microbiology and Immunobiology.

**HEGIS**

129958

**Degree(s) Awarded**

**Degree Awarded**

Doctor of Philosophy

**Proposal Contact**

Yanjin Zhang: zhangyj@umd.edu, 301-314-6596

**Proposal Summary**

Change the program name from Veterinary Medical Science (VMSC) to Comparative Biomedical Science (CBSC).

**Program and Catalog Information**

**Catalog Program Requirements:**

Applicants with a D.V.M., M.D., or equivalent or related degree in biological sciences plus a M.S. degree may be admitted to the Ph.D. program. In exceptional cases, admission to the Ph.D. program without a M.S. degree may be considered but these candidates must complete a minimum of 24 hours of course work. Ph.D. candidates who have previously completed the D.V.M. and/or M.S. degree must meet the minimum course requirements of 12 credits, and a minimum of twelve dissertation research credits (VMSC899). No more than two credits of Special Problems (VMSC699) are acceptable as part of the 12 required course credits. Two additional seminar credits (VMSC698) are required.

Students are required to register for one seminar credit (VMSC698) each academic year. Two seminar credits will be counted toward degree requirements. All students are expected to attend seminars regularly. Students are required to take a written and oral comprehensive examination and submit and defend their Ph.D. dissertation in partial fulfillment of the doctoral degree (see below).

## DOCTORAL REQUIREMENTS

During the first semester, the student selects an advisor and with the help of the advisor forms an Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee and the student must meet by the end of the second semester to approve the student's plan of study. By the end of the second semester the student will submit to the Advisory Committee a dissertation research proposal. An oral and written comprehensive examination is required for advancement to candidacy. Prior to the final dissertation, an oral examination is required for advancement to candidacy. A student must be admitted to candidacy for the doctorate within five years after admission to the doctoral program and at least six months before the date on which the degree will be conferred. It is the responsibility of the student to submit an application for admission to candidacy when all the requirements for candidacy have been fulfilled. Applications for admission to candidacy are made in duplicate by the student and submitted to the graduate program for further action and transmission to the Graduate School. Application forms may be obtained at the Graduate School, Room 2123, Lee Building, or on the web. Paperwork must be received by the Graduate School prior to the 25th of the month in order for the advancement to become effective the first day of the following month. Doctoral candidates are automatically registered for six (6) credits of Doctoral Dissertation Research (899), for which they pay the flat candidacy tuition. Prior to the final dissertation oral examination, the candidate must present a public seminar. Details on the Graduate School policy on the Doctoral Dissertation and Examination may be found in the Graduate School Catalog at: [http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/doctoral\\_degree\\_policies.htm](http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/doctoral_degree_policies.htm)

Dissertations are to be submitted to the Graduate School in electronic format after final approval of the dissertation by the Dissertation Examining Committee. See the University of Maryland Electronic Thesis and Dissertation (ETD) website at <http://dissertations.umi.com/umd> or the University of Maryland Thesis and Dissertation Style Guide (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/styleguide> (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/styleguide/>)) for the details of this process.

## Curriculum requirements

Course	Title	Credits
<b>Core Requirements</b>		
VMSC698	Seminar in Veterinary Medical Science	2
Select 10 credits of coursework		10
<b>Dissertation Research Requirements</b>		
VMSC899	Dissertation Research	12
Total Credits		24

## Program Modification Information

**Impact on current students. It should be specifically acknowledged that students enrolled in the program prior to the effective date of any curriculum change may complete their program under the old requirements if they wish. The courses required must remain available, or suitable substitutions specifically designated.**

Just the program name change. There is no impact on current students.

## Linked Programs

### Renaming Program

**Provide a rationale for renaming the program.**

The Department of Veterinary Medicine operates the Veterinary Medical Sciences (VMSC) graduate program, which concentrates on zoonotic infectious disease research. The VMSC graduate program offers Master of Science (MS) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees in the academic fields of veterinary medical, biomedical, and comparative medical sciences.

The current name, VMSC, is often misinterpreted as a professional track for those desiring to become practicing veterinarians. However, the VMSC program focuses on a much broader spectrum with educating the next generation of scientists in the techniques and approaches to analyze infectious diseases and therapeutic development. We sincerely believe that this misinterpretation is based solely on the program name and is actively discouraging applicants. The change is necessary for the development and success of the graduate education program in the Department of Veterinary Medicine.

Changing the graduate program name to Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC) more closely aligns with the academic and training of the degree program and conforms with the department's research areas of virology, bacteriology, immunology, epidemiology, and vaccinology. Currently, several other research-based Veterinary schools across the country, including Louisiana State University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Georgia, Iowa State University, North Carolina State University, and Cornell University, successfully uses the name of Comparative Biomedical Sciences as a graduate program title.

The proposed name change from VMSC to CBSC has been fully endorsed by all faculty members in the graduate program. This change will clearly define the goals of the graduate program and ultimately attract students who are interested in our research.

**Reviewer Comments**

**Mark Carroll (mcarroll) (Thu, 05 Dec 2019 16:10:56 GMT):** Rollback: Please remove the attachment and all wording pertaining to changes in the program curriculum from the proposal, and then resubmit. Curriculum changes are a separate item from a program name change and need to be submitted as a separate proposal.

Key: 474

# Program Change Request

Date Submitted: 12/05/19 12:31 pm

Viewing: **474 : Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC) ~~Veterinary Medical Sciences (VMSC)~~**

Last approved: 10/18/19 4:23 pm

Last edit: 12/05/19 12:31 pm

Changes proposed by: Yanjin Zhang (zhangyj)

Catalog Pages Using this Program

[Veterinary Medical Sciences, Doctor of Philosophy \(Ph.D.\)](#)

Proposed Action **Rename Program**

Program Name

## In Workflow

1. D-VMSC Chair
2. AGNR Curriculum Manager
3. AGNR PCC Chair
4. AGNR Dean
5. Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager
6. Graduate School Curriculum Manager
7. Graduate PCC Chair
8. Dean of the Graduate School
9. Senate PCC Chair
10. University Senate Chair
11. President
12. Chancellor
13. MHEC
14. Provost Office
15. Graduate Catalog Manager

## Approval Path

1. 11/13/19 4:10 pm  
Xiaoping Zhu (xzhu1): Approved for D-VMSC Chair
2. 11/25/19 12:32 pm  
Tyra Monnity (tgallman): Approved for AGNR Curriculum Manager

3. 12/05/19 11:10 am  
Mark Carroll  
(mcarroll): Rollback  
to Initiator
4. 12/06/19 11:33 am  
Xiaoping Zhu  
(xzhu1): Approved  
for D-VMSC Chair
5. 12/12/19 1:31 pm  
Tyra Monnity  
(tgallman):  
Approved for AGNR  
Curriculum  
Manager
6. 12/12/19 3:03 pm  
Mark Carroll  
(mcarroll):  
Approved for AGNR  
PCC Chair
7. 12/12/19 4:07 pm  
Joseph Sullivan  
(jsull): Approved for  
AGNR Dean
8. 01/22/20 5:27 pm  
Michael Colson  
(mcolson):  
Approved for  
Academic Affairs  
Curriculum  
Manager
9. 02/07/20 10:19 am  
Angela Ambrosi  
(aambrosi):  
Approved for  
Graduate School  
Curriculum  
Manager

---

## History

1. Sep 16, 2019 by

Angela Ambrosi  
(aambrosi)  
2. Oct 18, 2019 by  
William Bryan  
(wbryan)

**Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC) ~~Veterinary Medical Sciences (VMSC)~~**

Program Status Active

Effective Term Fall 2020

Catalog Year **2020-2021**

Program Level Graduate Program

Program Type Doctoral

Delivery Method On Campus

Departments

Department
Veterinary Medicine Program

Colleges

College
Agriculture and Natural Resources

Program/Major Code VMSC

MHEC Inventory Program Veterinary Medical Sciences

CIP Code 512504 - Veterinary Microbiology and Immunobiology.

HEGIS 129958

MHEC Recognized Area(s) of Concentration

Degree(s) Awarded

Degree Awarded
Doctor of Philosophy

If other, new degree award:

**Proposal Contact****Yanjin Zhang: [zhangyj@umd.edu](mailto:zhangyj@umd.edu), 301-314-6596****Proposal Summary****Change the program name from Veterinary Medical Science (VMSC) to Comparative Biomedical Science (CBSC).**

## 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.

**Catalog Program Requirements:**

Applicants with a D.V.M., M.D., or equivalent or related degree in biological sciences plus a M.S. degree may be admitted to the Ph.D. program. In exceptional cases, admission to the Ph.D. program without a M.S. degree may be considered but these candidates must complete a minimum of 24 hours of course work. Ph.D. candidates who have previously completed the D.V.M. and/or M.S. degree must meet the minimum course requirements of 12 credits, and a minimum of twelve dissertation research credits ([VMSC899](#)). No more than two credits of Special Problems ([VMSC699](#)) are acceptable as part of the 12 required course credits. Two additional seminar credits ([VMSC698](#)) are required.

Students are required to register for one seminar credit ([VMSC698](#)) each academic year. Two seminar credits will be counted toward degree requirements. All students are expected to attend seminars regularly. Students are required to take a written and oral comprehensive examination and submit and defend their Ph.D. dissertation in partial fulfillment of the doctoral degree (see below).

## DOCTORAL REQUIREMENTS

During the first semester, the student selects an advisor and with the help of the advisor forms an Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee and the student must meet by the end of the second semester to approve the student's plan of study. By the end of the second semester the student will submit to the Advisory Committee a dissertation research proposal. An oral and written comprehensive examination is required for advancement to candidacy. Prior to the final dissertation, an oral examination is required for advancement to candidacy. A student must be admitted to candidacy for the doctorate within five years after admission to the doctoral program and at least six months before the date on which the degree will be conferred. It is the responsibility of the student to submit an application for admission to candidacy when all the requirements for candidacy have been fulfilled. Applications for admission to candidacy are made in duplicate by the student and submitted to the graduate program for further action and transmission to the Graduate School. Application forms may be obtained at the Graduate School, Room 2123, Lee Building, or on the web. Paperwork must be received by the Graduate School

prior to the 25th of the month in order for the advancement to become effective the first day of the following month. Doctoral candidates are automatically registered for six (6) credits of Doctoral Dissertation Research (899), for which they pay the flat candidacy tuition. Prior to the final dissertation oral examination, the candidate must present a public seminar. Details on the Graduate School policy on the Doctoral Dissertation and Examination may be found in the Graduate School Catalog at: [http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/doctoral\\_degree\\_policies.htm](http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/doctoral_degree_policies.htm)

Dissertations are to be submitted to the Graduate School in electronic format after final approval of the dissertation by the Dissertation Examining Committee. See the University of Maryland Electronic Thesis and Dissertation (ETD) website at <http://dissertations.umi.com/umd> or the University of Maryland Thesis and Dissertation Style Guide (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/styleguide>) for the details of this process.

## Curriculum requirements

### Course List

Course	Title	Credits
Core Requirements		
<a href="#">VMSC698</a>	Seminar in Veterinary Medical Science	2
Select 10 credits of coursework		10
Dissertation Research Requirements		
<a href="#">VMSC899</a>	Dissertation Research	12
Total Credits		24

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.

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

## Program Modification Information

Impact on current students. It should be specifically acknowledged that students enrolled in the program prior to the effective date of any curriculum change may complete their program under the old requirements if they wish. The courses required must remain available, or suitable substitutions specifically designated.

**Just the program name change. There is no impact on current students.**

### Linked Programs

Indicate in the space below all programs to which this program is formally linked (e.g., approved combined bachelor's/master's programs, dual master's programs, or joint-programs with other universities). If the proposed modification will affect the linked program, provide as an attachment the new curriculum for each arrangement and provide supporting correspondence from the director of the linked program.

### Renaming Program

---

Provide a rationale for renaming the program.

**The Department of Veterinary Medicine operates the Veterinary Medical Sciences (VMSC) graduate program, which concentrates on zoonotic infectious disease research. The VMSC graduate program offers Master of Science (MS) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees in the academic fields of veterinary medical, biomedical, and comparative medical sciences.**

**The current name, VMSC, is often misinterpreted as a professional track for those desiring to become practicing veterinarians. However, the VMSC program focuses on a much broader spectrum with educating the next generation of scientists in the techniques and approaches to analyze infectious diseases and therapeutic development. We sincerely believe that this misinterpretation is based solely on the program name and is actively discouraging applicants. The change is necessary for the development and success of the graduate education program in the Department of Veterinary Medicine.**

**Changing the graduate program name to Comparative Biomedical Sciences (CBSC) more closely aligns with the academic and training of the degree program and conforms with the department's research areas of virology, bacteriology, immunology, epidemiology, and vaccinology. Currently, several other research-based Veterinary schools across the country, including Louisiana State University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Georgia, Iowa State University, North Carolina State University, and Cornell University, successfully uses the name of Comparative Biomedical Sciences as a graduate program title.**

**The proposed name change from VMSC to CBSC has been fully endorsed by all faculty members in the graduate program. This change will clearly define the goals of the graduate program and ultimately attract students who are interested in our research.**

### Supporting Documents

---

Attachments

Administrative  
Documents

Reviewer

Comments

**Mark Carroll (mcarroll) (12/05/19 11:10 am):** Rollback: Please remove the attachment and all wording pertaining to changes in the program curriculum from the proposal, and then resubmit. Curriculum changes are a separate item from a program name change and need to be submitted as a separate proposal.

Key: 474



## Proposal to Lower the University's GPA Cutoff for Latin Honors Eligibility

**PRESENTED BY** William Reed, Chair, Senate Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee

**REVIEW DATES** SEC – February 21, 2020 | SENATE – March 3, 2020

**VOTING METHOD** In a single vote

**RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT** NA

**NECESSARY APPROVALS** Senate, President

### ISSUE

---

In summer 2019, a proposal was submitted to the Senate Executive Committee related to the University's procedures for calculating Latin Honors. The proposal suggested that the University should do more to recognize its high-achieving students, and noted that the University's threshold for Latin Honors is much higher than the thresholds at some peer institutions. In August 2019, the SEC voted to charge the Academic Procedures and Standards (APAS) Committee with review of the proposal.

### RECOMMENDATION(S)

---

The APAS Committee recommends that all eligible students who earn a cumulative GPA of 3.900 or above should earn a Latin Honor.

The APAS Committee recommends that the proposed University of Maryland Policy on the Awarding of Latin Honors, as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

### COMMITTEE WORK

---

The APAS Committee began its review of the charge at its meeting on September 19, 2019. It reviewed the provisions on Latin Honors in the Undergraduate Catalog, as well as the current GPA level specifications for Latin Honors in each College. The committee consulted with the proposer, and with representatives of the Office of Undergraduate Studies, the Office of the Registrar, and the Senior Vice President & Provost throughout its review. The committee also reviewed peer institution practices and consulted with the Office of General Counsel (OGC).

During its review, the APAS Committee carefully considered whether Latin Honors should be calculated based on a percentage or a set GPA threshold. APAS felt that disciplinary differences must be honored, and therefore a GPA threshold applied University-wide would not be appropriate. However, APAS also acknowledged the importance of communicating the Latin Honors levels clearly to students, to encourage them to strive for excellence and allow them to plan their coursework accordingly. APAS developed a hybrid solution that retains the current percentage model, to ensure that the honors are reserved for the top percentages of the graduating class while

accounting for disciplinary differences, and incorporates a provision to ensure that all students who earn a 3.900 cumulative GPA will earn at least the honor of cum laude. In Colleges and Schools where the percentage model would set the cum laude threshold above 3.900, the Office of the Registrar will lower the threshold as it sets the cutoffs for the coming year.

APAS determined that there would be value in establishing the Latin Honors provisions as a University policy, since Latin Honors affect the transcript. The committee developed its proposed policy based on the existing language in the Undergraduate Catalog, and incorporated details on the process for calculating Latin Honors in consultation with the Office of Undergraduate Studies and the Office of the Registrar. After due consideration, the APAS Committee voted to approve the change to the University's process for Latin Honors and the proposed policy at its meeting on February 7, 2020.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

---

The Senate could choose not to approve these recommendations. However, the provisions on Latin Honors would remain in the Undergraduate Catalog rather than policy and the University would lose an opportunity to enhance clarity about the thresholds for earning Latin Honors.

## **RISKS**

---

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

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

---

There are no known financial implications in adopting these recommendations.



## PROPOSAL TO LOWER THE UNIVERSITY'S GPA CUTOFF FOR LATIN HONORS ELIGIBILITY

### 2019-2020 Committee Members

**William Reed** (Chair)  
**William Cohen** (Ex-Officio Provost's Rep)  
**Adrian Cornelius** (Ex-Officio Registrar Rep)  
**Shannon Gundy** (Ex-Officio Director of Admissions Rep)  
**Lisa Kiely** (Ex-Officio Undergraduate Studies Rep)  
**Ryan Long** (Ex-Officio Graduate School Rep)  
**Progyan Basu** (Faculty)  
**Nicole Coomber** (Faculty)  
**Lee Friedman** (Faculty)  
**Patricio Korzeniewicz** (Faculty)  
**Marilee Lindemann** (Faculty)  
**Tianzhou Ma** (Faculty)  
**Kellie Rolstad** (Faculty)  
**Dylan Selterman** (Faculty)

**David Straney** (Faculty)  
**Monica VanKlompberg** (Faculty)  
**Alice Donlan** (Staff)  
**Paula Nasta** (Graduate Student)  
**Jason Tan** (Undergraduate Student)  
**Kaylee Towey** (Undergraduate Student)  
**Eleanor VanVraken** (Undergraduate Student)

### Date of Submission

February 2020

## BACKGROUND

---

In summer 2019, a proposal was submitted to the Senate Executive Committee related to the University's procedures for calculating Latin Honors. The proposal suggested that the University should do more to recognize its high-achieving students, and noted that the University's threshold for Latin Honors is much higher than the thresholds at some peer institutions. In August 2019, the SEC voted to charge the Academic Procedures and Standards (APAS) Committee with review of the proposal (Appendix 1).

## CURRENT PRACTICE

---

At the University of Maryland, the Latin Honors of summa cum laude, magna cum laude, and cum laude are bestowed to recognize academic excellence among graduating seniors. The University of Maryland Undergraduate Catalog explains the current practice for calculating and awarding Latin Honors. Latin Honors are awarded to the top 10% of the class in each College, with students who earn a cumulative GPA in the top 2% of the graduating class earning summa cum laude, the next highest 3% earning magna cum laude, and the following 5% earning cum laude. These thresholds were established by the University Senate, effective in the 1975-1976 academic year (Senate Document #72-73-8).

While the thresholds for Latin Honors are set to award the honors to the top 10% of the class, the University calculates minimum required GPAs for each Latin Honor level by individual College or School (Appendix 2). The Office of the Registrar determines the Latin Honors GPA levels for summa cum laude, magna cum laude, and cum laude annually before the start of the fall semester to make students aware of the minimum GPA level required to earn a Latin Honor. The Latin Honors levels are based on the cumulative GPA averages of the previous academic year's three graduating terms in each College or School. While the minimum GPA cutoffs for Latin Honors may

change from year to year, once they are calculated for a given year, they will remain static for all graduating terms during that academic year.

In order to be eligible for Latin Honors, a student must have a final cumulative GPA that meets or exceeds the minimum required GPAs for that year. The student must also have:

- at least 60 credits earned at the University or through a program where credit is counted as University of Maryland resident credit;
- no more than 6 credits within the 60 credit minimum that were taken pass/fail or satisfactory/fail; and
- a final, cumulative GPA of 3.300 or higher.

Latin Honors are calculated after graduation, so as to incorporate grades from a student's final semester, and they are noted as pending in the Commencement program (Senate Document #12-13-03). Once calculated, Latin Honors are officially annotated on the transcripts and diplomas of the students who have graduated.

## **COMMITTEE WORK**

---

The APAS Committee began its review of the charge at its meeting on September 19, 2019. It reviewed the provisions on Latin Honors in the Undergraduate Catalog, as well as the current GPA level specifications for Latin Honors in each College. The committee consulted with the proposer, and with representatives of the Office of Undergraduate Studies, the Office of the Registrar, and the Senior Vice President & Provost throughout its review. The committee also reviewed peer institution practices and consulted with the Office of General Counsel (OGC).

The committee worked with the Office of the Registrar to understand the effect of the current Latin Honors procedures on the number and percentage of students earning Latin Honors, as well as to consider various alternate scenarios. Data from 2013 to present on Latin Honors show that there has been no significant increases or decreases in the GPA cutoffs and that the number of students receiving the honors are relatively stable. Throughout its consideration of the charge, APAS received data simulations from the Office of the Registrar showing what the impact of a change in the calculation method would be under various scenarios, including scenarios where the percentages were retained but changed to the top 5%, the next 5%, and the following 5% of the graduating class, or where GPA thresholds were used instead, at various levels.

The APAS Committee reviewed information on Latin Honors at Big 10 and other peer institutions (Appendix 3). The committee found that there is a wide range of variability on whether the honor is awarded based on a percentage or absolute threshold; applied uniformly across the institution or varied by college; and if the calculation of cutoffs are associated with the prior year's cohort or based on a percentage of the current class. The majority of peer institutions apply Latin Honors uniformly across the university, but six peers apply Maryland's approach of differentiating by college. The majority of peers reserve the distinction for the top percentage of the graduating class each year. Some institutions define a lower bound where a Latin Honor cannot be received, or indicate that students who are within a small buffer range for each level could still earn that honor.

In discussions with the committee, the proposer raised concerns that the Latin Honors levels are too high and may prevent students from advancing professionally or academically when compared with their peers at institutions with more generous Latin Honors thresholds. APAS searched for scholarly literature on this point, and found one study indicating a slight advantage in the job market for students with a Latin Honor in the first five years out of college. After the five-year mark, employers

tend to value skills and experience over accolades. APAS also consulted with the University Career Center, which reported that a student's GPA is a stronger indicator that they will be a competitive applicant in the job market than a Latin Honor, as the GPA is a more concrete comparison tool for employers.

The proposer also raised concerns that using percentages to determine the GPA levels for each Latin Honor creates confusion for students, in that the GPA they need to earn is not clear to them until the fall of their senior year. During its review, the APAS Committee carefully considered this concern as it discussed whether Latin Honors should be calculated based on a percentage or a set GPA threshold. The current method of using percentages allows students to be compared to their peers within their field, and accounts for variations by College and disciplinary differences. It also increases the distinction of receiving a Latin Honor, as the honor is clearly limited to a small number of students. However, when the percentages are based on a prior cohort of students and calculated on an annual basis, the thresholds can be difficult to predict and thus difficult for students to plan for. If the University were to move to a set GPA threshold for each honor level, students would be better able to plan to meet a certain honor level, and students and employers would both have a better understanding of what a Latin Honor from the University of Maryland means. However, GPA thresholds cannot account for disciplinary differences, and are less able to accommodate shifts in GPAs over time while ensuring the honor is reserved for the top students.

APAS felt that disciplinary differences must be honored, and therefore a GPA threshold applied University-wide would not be appropriate. However, APAS also acknowledged the importance of communicating the Latin Honors levels clearly to students, to encourage them to strive for excellence and allow them to plan their coursework accordingly. APAS developed a hybrid solution that retains the current percentage model, to ensure that the honors are reserved for the top percentages of the graduating class while accounting for disciplinary differences, and incorporates a provision to ensure that all students who earn a specific cumulative GPA will earn at least the honor of cum laude. In Colleges and Schools where the percentage model would set the cum laude threshold above the chosen GPA, the Office of the Registrar will lower the threshold as it sets the cutoffs for the coming year.

In considering where to set the specific GPA threshold for this hybrid solution, the committee considered whether there is an objective line amongst GPAs that can be drawn to clearly delineate academic excellence. While APAS acknowledges that there is room for disagreement on what constitutes excellence, the committee feels strongly that a cumulative GPA of 3.900 indicates a sustained pattern of excellence in academic work and is deserving of a Latin Honor. While points below 3.900 may also be deserving of recognition when contextualized among a student's peer group, a 3.900 would be represented on the transcript by a clear pattern of high marks in the majority of a student's coursework. The APAS Committee developed language to set 3.900 as the chosen GPA threshold at which all eligible students would earn a Latin Honor.

In the course of the committee's review, APAS considered whether Latin Honors information should remain in the Undergraduate Catalog or if it should be codified into a University policy. Over the past few years, the University has been converting items outlined in the Catalog into policy in order to maintain consistency and codify expectations. APAS noted that information in the Catalog may be interpreted more as guidelines, whereas information set forth in policy tends to have a more binding and consistent understanding across campus. After considering examples of similar items that were converted from Catalog items to policy, the APAS Committee determined that there would be value in establishing a University policy, since Latin Honors affect the transcript.

The committee developed its proposed policy based on the existing language in the Undergraduate Catalog, and incorporated details on the process for calculating Latin Honors in consultation with the Office of Undergraduate Studies and the Office of the Registrar. After due consideration, the APAS Committee voted to approve the change to the University's process for Latin Honors and the proposed policy at its meeting on February 7, 2020.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

The APAS Committee recommends that all eligible students who earn a cumulative GPA of 3.900 or above should earn a Latin Honor.

The APAS Committee recommends that the proposed University of Maryland Policy on the Awarding of Latin Honors, as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

## **APPENDICES**

---

- Appendix 1 — Charge from the Senate Executive Committee
- Appendix 2 — Latin Honors GPA Cutoffs 2019-2020 Academic Year
- Appendix 3 — Latin Honors Peer Institution Comparison

XX-X.XX(X) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON THE AWARDING OF LATIN HONORS

I. Purpose

The University of Maryland awards Latin Honors to recognize high-achieving undergraduate students for academic excellence over the course of the student's undergraduate career. Summa cum laude, magna cum laude, and cum laude are the highest honors the University bestows to signify sustained excellence in scholarship.

II. Policy

- A. The University bestows the Latin Honors of summa cum laude, magna cum laude, and cum laude.
- B. Latin Honors are awarded to the top ten (10) percent of all students graduating in each College or School, and are calculated based on the average cumulative GPAs of the previous academic year's graduating classes from the specific College or School.
  - 1. Summa cum laude is awarded to students with a cumulative GPA equal to or greater than the highest two (2) percent of the GPAs;
  - 2. Magna cum laude is awarded to students with a cumulative GPA equal to or greater than the next highest three (3) percent; and
  - 3. Cum laude is awarded to students with a cumulative GPA equal to or greater than the next highest five (5) percent, as well as to all students with a cumulative GPA of 3.900 or greater who would not otherwise be eligible for a Latin Honor.

III. Eligibility for Latin Honors

- A. To be eligible for Latin Honors, students must have earned at least 60 semester hours either at the University or through a program in which credit earned is counted as University of Maryland resident credit, as defined by the Office of the Registrar.
- B. No more than six (6) credits with pass/fail or satisfactory/fail grades will be counted towards the 60 semester hours minimum.
- C. Coursework completed in a student's final semester will be included in the calculation of Latin Honors.
- D. No student with a GPA of less than 3.300 will be considered for Latin Honors.

IV. Implementation of Latin Honors

- A. The Office of the Registrar will calculate and publicize the minimum GPA cutoffs required in the current academic year for each Latin Honors level for each

College or School.

- B. While the minimum GPA cutoffs for Latin Honors will change from year to year, once calculated, they will remain static for the entire upcoming academic year and will not be recalculated during that academic year.
- C. Since Latin Honors calculations include grades earned in a student's final semester, Latin Honors will be annotated in the commencement program as tentative and unofficial pending the submission and calculation of all final grades for the semester of commencement.
- D. Latin Honors will be recorded on the transcripts and diplomas of students who have earned the honors and who have graduated from the University.



## Proposal to Lower the University's GPA Cutoff for Latin Honors Eligibility (Senate Document #19-20-10)

Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee | Chair: William Reed

Senate Chair Lanford and the Senate Executive Committee request that the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee review the attached proposal entitled, *Proposal to Lower the University's GPA Cutoff for Latin Honors Eligibility*.

The APAS Committee should:

1. Review the provisions for Latin Honors in the [University of Maryland Undergraduate Catalog](#).
2. Review the Latin Honors [GPA level specifications](#) for each college.
3. Review similar provisions and GPA level specifications at Big 10 and other peer institutions.
4. Review data on the impact of potential changes to existing procedures.
5. Consult with the proposer.
6. Consult with a representative of the Office of Undergraduate Studies.
7. Consult with a representative of the Registrar's Office.
8. Consult with a representative of the Office of the Senior Vice President & Provost.
9. Consider whether the provisions for Latin Honors appropriately recognize top-tier graduates of the University.
10. Consider whether the University's rationale for assessing Latin Honors as percentages instead of absolute GPA thresholds is appropriate.
11. Consider whether the percentage or GPA level thresholds should be revised.
12. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on any proposed changes to the University's policies or procedures.
13. If appropriate, recommend whether the University's procedures should be revised.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **February 7, 2020**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



Proposal to Lower the University’s Latin Honor Eligibility GPA Cutoff

NAME/TITLE	Jordan N. Brown		
EMAIL	Jordan.n.brown@duke.edu	PHONE	(301) 728-7595
UNIT	N/A	CONSTITUENCY	N/A

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE

At the University of Maryland – College Park, hereinafter UMD, the lowest qualifying GPA for graduating seniors to achieve cum laude is 3.5 on a 4.0 scale (College of Information Studies). Currently, 10 out of the 13 (76%) of the colleges at the University have requirements between 3.85 to 3.91 to simply qualify for cum laude, the lowest Latin honor distinction. In addition, UMD only considers the GPAs of the top 10% of graduates when determining the GPA cutoffs for the following academic year.

After researching a myriad of universities including; Ivy Leagues, similarly academic ranked institutions, and peer colleges within the BIG 10 Conference, I found a stark disconnect between the high GPA threshold to achieve Latin honors at UMD in comparison to other comparable institutions. For brevity, I will discuss the schools with the same rank as UMD according to the 2020 U.S. News and World Report (<https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/rankings/national-universities>).

Currently, the University of Maryland – College Park is ranked #63 under the National Universities category along with George Washington University and the University of Connecticut (U-Conn). According to their respective Offices of the Registrar, achieving Latin honors requires a GPA of the following:

- The George Washington University: 3.4–3.59 (**cum laude**), 3.6–3.79 (**magna cum laude**), 3.8–4.0 (**summa cum laude**).
- U-Conn: at least a 3.0 total GPA (**cum laude**), 3.4 – 3.69 (**magna cum laude**), 3.7 – 4.7 GPA (**summa cum laude**).

Latin honors distinctions are important to high achieving students, of which the UMD prides itself on. If UMD wants to recruit, retain, and graduate students who excel academically, the University must acknowledge and reward students of high academic performance to a proportionate degree of their peer institutions.

UMD graduates are competing against students from other universities for admission into the nation’s most prestigious graduate programs and job opportunities. However, UMD graduates fall short when graduates from other institutions are achieving the prestigious Latin honor titles and UMD graduates are not, simply because of the high GPA threshold. The limited honors

acknowledgement for UMD students creates a disadvantage for them amidst these already difficult and competitive processes.

Due to the GPA cutoff to qualify for Latin honors at UMD, I believe the University is neglecting high achieving students by depriving them of the honored distinction. In its current form, UMD's Latin honors policy is dismissive towards students of high academic excellence and ultimately does an incredible disservice to UMD graduates. Thousands of families and students have paid great sacrifices to attend the University of Maryland - College Park, and as it stands, this high threshold sends a nonverbal message that their academic achievements are not enough to be acknowledged or rewarded.

I believe the University should consider adjusting the University's Latin honors system and GPA threshold to align more closely with other peer institutions.

### **DESCRIPTION OF ACTION**

The University's current Latin honor's system needs to be changed to align with universities of a similar rank and/or other universities in the BIG 10 Conference. See the Office of the Registrar's website <https://registrar.umd.edu/current/Policies/latinhonors.html> for a comprehensive outline on UMD's Latin honors eligibility.

After speaking with Dr. Ann Smith, Assistant Dean in the Office of Undergraduate Studies, it was made clear that the University currently determines its GPA cutoff for Latin Honors by referring to the GPAs of graduating seniors from the previous academic year.

For example, the GPAs of the top 1% (summa cum laude) of graduating seniors of the College of Behavioral Sciences in the 2018-2019 academic year will determine the GPA cutoff for the students graduating in the 2019-2020 academic year who receive the summa cum laude distinction.

It is my goal to have the University abandon the aforementioned system and adopt one that expands the GPA/percentage cutoff to align with other peer institutions.

### **SUGGESTIONS FOR HOW TO IMPLEMENT LATIN HONORS POLICY CHANGE**

The majority of universities in the BIG 10 Conference have their Latin honors data published on their Office of the Registrar websites. UMD could use the Latin honor systems of other schools in the Big 10 as a model for an appropriate GPA threshold to receive a Latin Honor title. If the University chooses this approach, UMD's Office of the Registrar can average the GPA cutoffs of other BIG 10 universities to determine a standardized GPA range for each Latin honor title. Information on the GPA ranges for other Big 10 universities can be found under the "Additional Information" section.

However, if UMD wishes to keep the percentage system (i.e. the top X% of students in the class receive a Latin Honor title) and uphold the integrity of the degrees and Latin honors titles awarded, then the University's Registrar should consider expanding the percentage of students who are eligible to receive Latin honors from the top 10% to the top 20-25% (please refer to

Indiana University, Northwestern University, or Purdue University under the “Additional Information” section).

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Below is all the Latin Honors data published by universities in the **BIG 10 Conference**:

Indiana University: <https://commencement.indiana.edu/what-to-wear/students/honors-criteria.html>

University of Michigan (College of Literature, Science, and the Arts):  
<https://lsa.umich.edu/advising/graduation/diplomas-distinction.html>

Michigan State University: <https://reg.msu.edu/ROInfo/GradHonor/GraduationHonors.aspx>

The Ohio State University

- College of Engineering: <https://advising.engineering.osu.edu/current-osu-students/graduation-honors-and-distinction>
- College of Education and Human Ecology: <https://ehe.osu.edu/ugss/advising-basics/honors/graduating/>

Pennsylvania State University: <https://www.registrar.psu.edu/graduation/distinction.cfm>

Rutgers University (See “Graduation with Honors” tab):  
<https://sasundergrad.rutgers.edu/major/additional-academic-programs/honors-opportunities#graduation-with-honors>

University of Illinois – Urbana Champaign

- College of Liberal Art and Sciences: <https://las.illinois.edu/academics/distinctions>

University of Minnesota: <https://policy.umn.edu/education/degreshonors-faq>

University of Nebraska

- College of Education and Human Sciences: <https://cehs.unl.edu/cehs/deans-list-and-degrees-distinction/>

Northwestern University

- School of Communication: <https://advising.soc.northwestern.edu/registration-and-policies/honors/>

- Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences:  
<https://www.weinberg.northwestern.edu/undergraduate/enrichment-opportunities/honors-awards/college-honors.html>
- McCormick School of Engineering:  
<https://www.mccormick.northwestern.edu/students/undergraduate/student-prizes-awards.html>
- School of Education and Social Policy (page 33):  
<https://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/ugrad/files/pdfs/sesp-student-handbook-2018-19.pdf>

Purdue University (See Section C “Graduation with Distinction”):  
<http://catalog.purdue.edu/content.php?catoid=9&navoid=10530>

University of Wisconsin: <https://registrar.wisc.edu/grading-honors/>

Below is all the Latin Honors data published by universities in the **Ivy League Conference**:

Cornell University (for Bachelor’s of Science): 3.50 – 3.74 (**cum laude**), 3.75 – 4.0 (**magna cum laude**), 4.00 or greater (**summa cum laude**).

<https://cals.cornell.edu/academics/registrar/degree-requirements/academic-honors/>

University of Pennsylvania: 3.40 – 3.59 (**cum laude**), 3.60 – 3.79 (**magna cum laude**), 3.80 or higher (**summa cum laude**).

<https://catalog.upenn.edu/pennbook/graduation-honors/>

Columbia University (College of General Studies): 3.50 – 3.66 (**cum laude**), 3.67 – 3.89 (**magna cum laude**), 3.9 or above (**summa cum laude**).

<http://bulletin.columbia.edu/general-studies/undergraduates/academic-policies/academic-honors/>

Appendix 2

LATIN HONORS CUTOFFS

Fall 2019, Spring 2020, and Summer 2020 Graduating Classes

---

---

**College of Agriculture and Natural Resources**

Summa	4.000 - 3.960
Magna	3.959 - 3.905
Cum Laude	3.904 - 3.831

**School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation**

Summa	4.000 - 3.923
Magna	3.922 - 3.771
Cum Laude	3.770 - 3.655

**College of Arts and Humanities**

Summa	4.000 - 3.984
Magna	3.983 - 3.940
Cum Laude	3.939 - 3.868

**College of Behavioral and Social Sciences**

Summa	4.000 - 3.976
Magna	3.975 - 3.932
Cum Laude	3.931 - 3.852

**Robert H. Smith School of Business**

Summa	4.000 - 3.966
Magna	3.965 - 3.912
Cum Laude	3.911 - 3.837

**College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences**

Summa	4.000 - 3.980
Magna	3.979 - 3.941
Cum Laude	3.940 - 3.895

### **College of Education**

Summa	4.000 - 3.993
Magna	3.992 - 3.986
Cum Laude	3.985 - 3.962

### **A. James Clark School of Engineering**

Summa	4.000 - 3.975
Magna	3.974 - 3.931
Cum Laude	3.930 - 3.846

### **College of Information Studies**

Summa	4.000 - 3.808
Magna	3.807 - 3.674
Cum Laude	3.673 - 3.592

### **Philip Merrill College of Journalism**

Summa	4.000 - 3.943
Magna	3.942 - 3.893
Cum Laude	3.892 - 3.830

### **School of Public Health**

Summa	4.000 - 3.938
Magna	3.937 - 3.850
Cum Laude	3.849 - 3.77

### **School of Public Policy**

Summa	4.000 - 3.892
Magna	3.891 - 3.890
Cum Laude	3.889 - 3.816

### **College of Undergraduate Studies**

Summa	4.000 - 3.929
Magna	3.928 - 3.896
Cum Laude	3.895 - 3.827

## Appendix 3

University	Uniformly Distributed	GPA or Percentage	Minimum Threshold	GPA/Percentage for each Latin Honors Level
University of California: Berkeley	Yes, but students may enroll in their major's honors program as well which have varying specifications	GPA	Complete at least 50 units in the University of California -43 of those 50 units must be letter graded. -30 of the 50 units must be completed in residence at Berkeley. Meet the GPA requirement for Distinction in General Scholarship.  *Each major program has an honors policy and program. Students may enroll in their major's honors program provided they have the required GPA in courses in the major and the approval of the major department. Students participating in the honors program in their major may enroll in fewer than 13 units. Honors in the major is noted on the transcript and diploma as Honors, High Honors or Highest Honors. Visit your undergraduate major adviser (UMA) for details.	General Distinction: 3.747 High Distinction: 3.860 Highest Distinction: 3.953
UCLA	No: differs by college	GPA	Eligible students must have completed at least 90 (98 for the School of Nursing) University of California units for a letter grade.	Varies by college
University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign	Yes	Percentage	Summa Cum Laude GPA 3.96 Magna Cum Laude GPA 3.91 Cum Laude GPA 3.84 Must complete one of the following: 25 honors hours, OR 35 advanced hours (300/400 level), OR LAS James Scholar Graduation Honors, OR Departmental Distinction	Top 3% Summa Cum Laude Top 7% Magna Cum Laude Top 12% Cum Laude
Indiana University: Bloomington	No: differs by college	GPA	Varies by college	Varies by college
The University of Iowa	No: differs by college	GPA	Varies by college	Varies by college
University of Michigan	Yes	Percentage	Highest Distinction: 3.957 – 4.000 High Distinction: 3.865 – 3.956 Distinction: 3.722 – 3.864	Top 3% "with Highest Distinction" Next 10% "with High Distinction" Next 25% "with Distinction."
Michigan State University	Yes	Percentage	The specific minimum grade-point averages required are determined by the Office of the Provost following a review of the standards by the University Committee on Undergraduate Studies. the GPA thresholds are adjusted following each Spring semester for the following calendar year.	Top 20% 6% receive the degree With High Honor 14% receive the degree With Honor
University of Minnesota: Twin Cities	Yes	GPA	Must complete an Honors Thesis consistent with the level of Latin Honors they are attempting. Must meet the residency requirement of 60 graded credits on campus. Students whose GPA is 0.100 or less below one of these three bands may be awarded Latin Honors based on exceptional thesis work as determined by the student's campus honors program	cum laude: 3.50 GPA or higher magna cum laude: 3.66 GPA or higher summa cum laude: 3.75 GPA or higher
University of Nebraska: Lincoln	No: differs by college	GPA	Varies by college	Varies by college
UNC Chapel Hill	Yes	GPA	To graduate "with Distinction" or "with Highest Distinction" a student must have completed at least 45 academic hours at UNC-CH and have obtained a cumulative grade point average of at least 3.5 and 3.8 respectively.	Distinction: 3.5 Highest Distinction: 3.8
Northwestern University	Yes	Percentage.	The GPA cutoffs for each level of honors based on the stated percentages are not made public	Top 25% of the students in each school 5% of the school's class are awarded summa cum laude Next 8%, magna cum laude Next 12%, cum laude
Ohio State University	Yes	GPA	No	Cum laude: 3.50 to 3.69 Magna cum laude: 3.70 to 3.89 Summa cum laude: 3.90 GPA
Penn State	No: differs by college	Percentage	Must have at least 3.5 GPA and 60 credits	Top 12% of a college's graduating class, GPA standard varies by college

Purdue University	No: differs by college	GPA, except for Highest distinction honors	No	Three-tenths of the graduates having the highest overall GPA shall be designated as graduating with highest distinction, irrespective of the schools from which they graduate. Regular Honors decided by individual colleges
Rutgers University	Yes	GPA	No	Summa Cum Laude: 3.850 or better Magna Cum Laude: 3.700 to 3.849 Cum Laude: 3.500 to 3.699
University of Wisconsin-Madison	Yes	Percentage	<p>will be noted on the transcript of students who have earned a grade GPA that places them within the top 20 percent of students graduating that term provided the student has earned 60 or more credits at UW-Madison.</p> <p>The award of Distinction in the Major is granted at graduation, upon the recommendation of a department to the Dean of the College of Letters &amp; Science, to any L&amp;S undergraduate student not earning the Honors degree (i.e., Honors in the Liberal Arts, Honors in the Major, Comprehensive Honors) who has done outstanding work in the major and who has passed a comprehensive examination on that work.</p>	Distinction: top 20%

# Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes

February 2020

## **Background**

In 2017, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) voted to charge the Research Council with review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes (IV-1.00[A]). The policy has not been revised since it was approved in 1991, though the University's educational and research mission has evolved since that time. The SEC noted that a comprehensive review of the policy would allow the University to assess how the policy aligns with its mission and strategic initiatives.

The review was delayed to allow the new Vice President for Research to provide input. The Senate leadership and the Provost agreed to further delay the charge to the Research Council until the June 2019 [report of the Research Institute Advisory Committee](#) had been completed. The Research Council received its charge on June 3, 2019 and began planning initial steps to gather information regarding current centers and institutes at the University. [The charge](#) asked that the Research Council, chaired by George Hurtt, review the current policy, peer institution policies, the recommendations of the Research Institute Advisory Committee, data on existing UMD centers & institutes, and any associated best practices; consult with the Provost's Office, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, and faculty and graduate students engaged in centers & institutes; and consider the definitions of centers & institutes, the role of graduate students and the impact of any potential organizational changes, and whether sunset provisions or probationary status should be incorporated into the policy.

## **Work to Date**

As of the writing of this report, the following activities have taken or are taking place:

- The Research Council has reviewed the current 1991 policy.
- Information on centers and institutes has been requested from each UMD college.
- Center and institute directors were invited to a forum to collect input and feedback on their experiences. Other sessions were held with the deans and with graduate students.
- A [survey](#) was sent to center directors and faculty and students engaged in centers & institutes.
- The feedback from the forum, sessions, and survey was carefully reviewed and compiled into a document of major themes for the Council's review.
- Peer data (Big Ten and other peers) has been gathered and best practices were compiled to serve as a resource to the Council as it works to revise the policy.

## **Preliminary Findings**

Overall, initial findings from peer data show that most schools have a more organized process for centers and institutes. The current UMD policy touches on many of the key elements identified in best practices, but the policy is ambiguous and does not give enough structure to the process to ensure that it is consistently followed or enforced.

The Research Council's initial findings are as follows:

- *There is no central repository of centers & institutes at the University.* While efforts have been made to gather and update this material (once in 2018 and again more recently), it is unclear who is responsible for making adjustments and on what schedule. It is also unclear what information should be included (Director? URL? Number of employees? Dollars [internal v. external]? Reporting structure?). Until this point, the process has involved going to the budget officers of different units and asking for them to self-report any changes in information and results have been uneven and difficult to verify.
- *There are no clear, stated definitions or levels at the University* of what constitutes a center versus an institute; different types of centers (departmental, collegiate, inter-collegiate, university-wide); or bureaus, laboratories, research teams. In line with this point, there needs to be a better understanding of how scale, size, purpose, and funding model(s) aligns with the different types of centers, institutes, or other entities.
- *There needs to be more clarity about what aspect of the University mission a center or institute supports.* There is an articulated desire to ensure that it be made clear that the mission extends beyond research to include education and service. Graduate students, in particular, were vocal about a center or institutes role in attracting students and providing training and employment opportunities.
- *There is no formal establishment or approval process for new centers and institutes at the University.* Other institutions have policies that detail the specific information that is required when proposing a center or institute. A number had comprehensive forms that are in use that could be used as models for UMD. Proposals at peers require information on alignment with the University's mission, impact on society or the research community, organizational structure or business plan, assessment of overlap with existing centers at the institution, funding arrangements, proposed benchmarks for success, and other operational details.
- *There are no consistent guidelines on structure/operations at the University.* Other universities tend to have much more robust and clear structures. At peers, the director is named immediately; an advisory committee is established; the director may only be a tenured faculty member unless the chancellor makes an exception, and there are formal governance structures.
- *With regard to funding, clarification is needed on institutional support and DRIF return rates.* There does not seem to be a lot of information publicly available about DRIF return percentages at other institutions. At UMD, the

- dean is responsible for identifying funding sources, and long-term support and/or higher DRIF return rates are negotiated at a higher level.
- *There is no standard review process (internal and/or external).* Most institutions use a five-year term, though there is some deviation. Most institutions have lists of review criteria and most of the metrics by which an entity will be judged are created at the outset. There are formal processes and review committee composition requirements. There are existing templates and forms that could be adjusted for UMD's purposes.
  - *There are no existing sunset provisions at the University* and no sense of what criteria should be used in determining when and how to close, revise, or repurpose a center or institute. Other institutions have criteria and a clear process by which all of these scenarios may play out. One key component of transitioning or sunsetting centers or institutes is ensuring that attention is paid to establishing a carefully thought out plan for the orderly transfer or termination of non-faculty personnel.
  - *There are no probationary periods at the University;* either those created when a new center or institute is being created or those enacted after a less than wholly positive review. These do exist at a number of other institutions.

## **Preliminary Directions**

As a result of the feedback received and research conducted by the Research Council, the Council developed the following preliminary directions to guide its revision of the policy. The Research Council intends to revise the current policy to add clarity and additional key principles identified at peers, while maintaining flexibility in order to encourage and optimize the critical role that centers and institutes play at the University.

- **Database:** The University should create and maintain a central database of all centers and institutes. The database should include a public-facing list of all centers and institutes as well as an internal component with more detailed information such as size, funding, research area(s), administrative structure, outcomes of last reviews, etc. The database should be regularly updated.
- **Levels:** The current levels in the policy (group, center, institute or bureau) should be retained but there should be more granularity to the definition of a center based upon the organizational, administrative, or reporting structure in order to be clearer about the different types of centers at the University. The granularity in center definition can be used to guide the establishment and review procedures. The Research Council has begun to consider offering guidance about how to address evolution of entities and movement between the levels (from center to institute, for example.)
- **Proposal:** The approval process for a new center or institute should be guided by a proposal that requires proponents to address key elements, such as the role of the proposed center, how it fits within the University's mission, whether and how it engages graduate students, and what metrics or benchmarks it will use to assess performance.

- Mission: The proposal/review processes should include a requirement for entities to identify how they contribute to the research, teaching, and/or service aspects of the University’s mission. This should apply to centers and institutes, but not groups.
  - Centers and institutes would be required to address both the educational and research missions in the proposal and review processes. Including graduate students in its work would be one way of addressing the educational mission.
  - The University would encourage graduate student participation in centers and institutes and include information on graduate student engagement in the proposal and review processes.
  - The policy would include information on the potential impact a center or institute has on graduate student programs in the proposal and review processes
- Review process: There should be more specificity in the review process for centers and institutes, perhaps based upon the “type” or “level” of center involved. However, a review process should not be required for groups.
- Sunset provisions: Sunset provisions should not be required to be built in from the outset. However, in the wake of a negative review, procedures for sunsetting a center or institute should be specified.
- Probationary Status: New centers and institutes should be created with a probationary status and the term of this status should align with the term of a typical review cycle so that it may be determined at the first review whether the probationary period should be extended; if it should be lifted; or if the entity should be sunsetted.
- Remaining discussion points: The Research Council intends to discuss further how reorganizations, restructurings, and renamings should be addressed in the policy; and how to transition existing centers and institutes to the new policy and review processes.

### **Timeline and Next Steps**

The Research Council is reviewing all of the feedback that has been gathered and reviewing the peer research and best practices information. It is in the process of discussing and developing key principles that will guide the development of policy language. Once policy revisions have been drafted, feedback must be gathered from stakeholders and from the Office of General Council before the policy revisions can be finalized and brought back to the Senate for a vote.

The Research Council’s deadline for completing this charge is March 30.

## Senate Committee on University Finance Spring 2020 Update

### **Formation**

The Special Committee on University Finance (SCUF) established by the Senate ([Senate Document #17-18-20](#)) and was approved by President Loh in April 2019. The Special Committee will operate until May 2022, at which time the Senate will decide whether it should be codified as a permanent body.

### **Charge to the Special Committee**

The Special Committee on University Finance (SCUF) is charged with advising the administration on institutional priorities and with educating the Senate and the campus community on the University's budget and the budget process. Members of the committee are responsible for developing a deep understanding of the University's budget and budgeting processes. SCUF gives the Senate a role in advising the administration on short- and long-term planning, and in ensuring that academic excellence and the University's educational and research missions are key considerations when budgetary priorities are determined. SCUF also serves as a resource to the campus community to help improve understanding of the budget, and advises the Senate and Senate-related bodies on the fiscal implications of recommendations under consideration. SCUF will be integral to the Senate's ability to make informed decisions and recommendations, and will be central in demystifying the complexities of our current resource tensions.

### **Membership and Election Process**

The committee's membership includes:

- A chair, who is a tenured faculty member;
- five tenured or tenure-track faculty members;
- one professional track faculty member;
- one exempt staff member;
- one non-exempt staff member;
- two undergraduate students;
- one graduate student;
- the immediate Past Chair of the Senate;
- the Associate Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer;
- the Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel, Academic Affairs;
- a representative of the President;
- a representative of the Vice President for Student Affairs; and
- a representative chosen from among current and former unit-level budget officers or former department chairs, selected by the Senior Vice President and Provost.

In spring 2019, the University Senate opened a nomination period for faculty, staff, and student seats on SCUF. Senators representing each constituency submitted nominations and were encouraged to ask for nominations from their colleagues. The elected members of the Senate Executive Committee for each constituency voted to elect representatives to SCUF. The full membership of SCUF was announced in June 2019.

### **Fall 2019 Committee Activities**

SCUF began meeting in September 2019, and decided to focus its efforts in Fall 2019 on developing a deep understanding of University finances. Working in collaboration with its ex-officio representatives from the University administration, SCUF developed a series of educational briefings for committee members. The briefings included the following topics:

- The Macro View of University Finances
- The Basics of the Governor's Budget

- Financial Improvement Initiatives
- Student Enrollments and Tuition
- Allocation of Resources across Colleges and Divisions
- Auxiliaries and Student Support Services
- Capital Budget and Facilities Renewal
- Greater College Park Investment
- Allocation of Resources to Faculty and Staff
- Overview of the Budget Request Process

### **Progress on Charge Elements: Educational Charge**

SCUF is charged to “Develop a deep understanding of the University’s budget and budgeting processes and use that knowledge to educate the campus community on these practices.” In service of this charge element, SCUF spent the fall semester learning about the various facets of the budget. This will allow the committee to educate the campus community and advise the administration from a more informed perspective.

### **Progress on Charge Elements: Advisory Charge**

SCUF is charged to “Consult with and advise the President, the Senior Vice President and Provost, and other University administrators on short- and long-term institutional priorities, particularly as they relate to the University’s mission and Strategic Plan.” SCUF is reviewing the priorities in the University’s Strategic Plan and developing a list of data needed to appropriately assess budget priorities. Data that show trends over time along various dimensions will help the committee better understand how the Strategic Plan is reflected in budget decisions. The committee expects to work collaboratively with the University administration to gather the appropriate data that it needs to make the budget more transparent and so the committee can be effective in its role in providing perspectives and advice on alignment of the budget with the Strategic Plan. This open exchange of information and collaboration is a critical element to ensuring the success of the committee.

As the committee works to collect the data needed to ensure the quality and accuracy of its recommendations, SCUF is also considering how to develop processes and timelines that will ensure its recommendations have an impact on the University’s budgeting process. SCUF is reviewing the budget timeline to determine whether there are specific points in the budget process where recommendations would have the most significant impact.

### **Plans for Future Development**

SCUF plans to develop informational materials about the University's budget and share them publicly on the Senate website. This information will be updated annually so that it remains current, and it will be shared with Senators. As part of this effort, the committee plans to develop a Frequently Asked Questions list, featuring some common questions and myths about the budget process. The committee will work with the University administration to find answers to those questions and will share information about those topics in a user-friendly way.

SCUF will also begin assessing trends over time based on the data it receives from the administration. This will allow the committee to gain a deeper understanding of how the Strategic Plan has been implemented through the budget and provide opportunities for the committee to identify how best to leverage budget opportunities to further the goals identified in the Strategic Plan.

SCUF began its first year with the intention of learning and developing plans. It intended to take the time needed to develop a deep understanding of University finances among members of the

committee, and to thoughtfully develop plans on how to fulfill its charges. While the committee is at the beginning of its work, it has been laying the foundation for impactful work over the next two years. Because of the upcoming transition in leadership, the committee plans to gain additional insight from the incoming President on ways in which the committee can best advise his administration.