

Senate Chairs Meeting
University System of Maryland (USM)
at Adelphi, Maryland

Minutes

Thursday, December 9, 2011

Attendance:	
Bowie	
Coppin	Virletta Bryant (ExecCom)
Frostburg	Robert B. Kauffman (ExecCom)
Salisbury	Theodore Gilkey (SC)
Towson	Timothy Sullivan (SC), Jay Zimmerman (ExecCom)
UB	Odeana Neal (SC)
UMB	Richard Zhao (SC)
UMBC	Tim Nohe (SC)
UMCP	Eric Kasischke (SC)
UMES	Mark Williams (SC), Bill Chapin (FAC)
UMUC	Betty Jo Mayeske (CUSF), Joyce Shirazi (ExecCom)
Guests:	Irwin Goldstein (guest), Brit Kirwan (guest, speaker)

CONVENING THE MEETING - 10:00 AM

Jay Zimmerman, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM in meeting room at the University System of Maryland at Adelphi, Maryland. Jay noted that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the general issues facing CUSF and the universities within the System.

INTRODUCTIONS - 10:02 AM

Those in attendance introduced themselves and their institutions (*see attendance sheet above*).

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES - 10:13 AM

Access to “All Faculty” email lists: Jay introduced the discussion item. Should faculty have to clear their email messages with the administration? What are the implications for shared governance. The discussion started with a brief review of the practices on each of the campuses.

Regarding the email policy at the *University of Baltimore* their representative indicated that faculty used to be able to contact everyone else, but this was now restricted by their president. It stemmed from his concern of keeping valuable information in house and from getting out of the institution. She noted that she has a problem emailing other faculty. She indicated that the one exception was that the faculty senate which has an email account that can be sent to all of the faculty. Regardless, they do not think that the “cross faculty” communication is not sufficient and the President has been reluctant to change.

The policy at *College Park* is similar to the one at UB. Individual members don’t have universal access. Given the large volume of emails, he is not sure that unrestricted access to emails is necessarily a good thing. However, messaging can be cleared through the chair of the faculty senate which does have access.

At *Towson* they have access to the all faculty list. However, they need to go through the Provost to use it. As far as he knows, there is no editing of the content or the list. In addition, he maintains his own list. Also, he noted that they have the Daily Digest which is a newsletter. They use the newsletter for their elections. He jokingly labeled the Daily Digest as the Daily Delete.

At the *University of Maryland, Baltimore County* they have their own list for the Senate. If there is a need to notify the entire faculty, they would need to go through the Provost or the President. They have not had a need to do this to date. Elections are run through the Senate and the Senators are responsible for bringing the information back to their departments.

At *Salisbury* all faculty have access to the all faculty email list. On occasion, there will be a topical debate where any faculty member can participate in the discussion.

Frostburg has similar access to Salisbury. Any faculty member has access to the faculty email list. This is used for Senate elections including the self-nomination process, and the eventual elections. It is used for disseminating Senate reports and minutes as well as the CUSF notes from these meetings. It is a valuable tool for communicating with other faculty.

At the *University of Maryland Eastern Shore* they have a similar system to Frostburg and Salisbury. Regarding potential issues of misuse, the faculty self-police the system.

Regarding the *University of Maryland at Baltimore*, if the faculty want to email everyone, they need to go through the central office.

At *Coppin*, the email system is fairly informal. There is an all-faculty button and then there is a family button also.

At the *University of Maryland University College*, they have a faculty advisory committee. Unfortunately, they have no real mechanism to reach all of the faculty. Since they are located on every continent, their means of communication among faculty is through teleconferencing. For example, they opened up three different courses and received over 2,000 comments. Regarding email communications, they need to go through the Provost. Whether it is or isn’t censoring, it is editing or the power to edit. To provide an example of faculty involvement or lack of involvement in the curriculum, UMUC recently went to a structure of eight week courses. The faculty was involved minimally in the decision to go to eight week courses. They wanted to find out what the faculty thought of the administrative decision, so they opened up three different teleconferencing courses and received over 700 comments in each of the courses. The conclusion is that there is a faculty that wants to communicate and discuss their curriculum with each other, but because they are not located in a traditional brick and mortar campus, they are unable to do so using traditional methods. The use of the teleconferencing is an example of modifying existing resources

to meet this need.

Jay provided a brief summary of this section. His points included the following:

1. In general, there is too much email.
2. It seems as if the small schools tend to have free access to email than the larger schools.
3. It seems as if the larger schools tend to restrict access.
4. Also, there is the issue of elections and run off campaigns where faculty have need to communicate through email and other methods.

In addition to Jay's summary, the point was made that this issue is not just one of determining email usage by faculty. It was suggested that communication and the ability to assemble are an underlying foundation in the concept of shared governance. What faculty assume as part of their culture in a traditional brick and mortar institution may not be present in a system such as UMUC.

It was suggested that it may be desirable to create minimum standards or perhaps best practices regarding this communications issue. After a brief discussion, the consensus of the group was to support the following two propositions.

1. There needs to be a mechanism to communicate with all faculty.
2. This communication needs to be uncensored by the administration.
3. There should be funding for administrative help allocated to assist.

USM Policy for Maternity and Family Leave for Faculty: A summary of the discussion at the CUSF meeting the previous day was provided to attendees. In general, the following points were made.

1. There is a need to include the "stop the tenure clock" for child birth in the policy.
2. *Child care facilities* need to be provided on campus including nursing rooms.
3. There maybe a need to prioritize issues in order of their importance to obtain something with the policy rather than attempting to ask for everything and obtaining nothing.

LUNCH - 11:40 AM

CHANCELLOR AND SENIOR VICE CHANCELLOR - Brit Kirwin and Irv Goldstein - 11:55 AM

Irv's Retirement: The Chancellor informed the group that Irv Goldstein will be retiring from System and returning to College Park. There will be a national search for his successor. His contribution will be missed by all concerned.

UMCP/UMB Merger:

Today, December 9th is the day that the BOR will meet and formally make their recommendation on the proposed UMCP/UMB merger. The study has come to a conclusion. The System has worked closely with the BOR regarding the finally proposal, so the Chancellor indicated that hopefully there should be few surprises regarding the recommendations. The BOR meets this afternoon and will formally make its decision. Its recommendation will be forwarded to the Legislature for their consideration. Also, Brit noted the enormity of the task completed. The study took seven months of work to complete. It was an enormous undertaking by the staff. There were numerous sessions including public meetings. The research and information collected was extensive. [Secretary's Note: *On December 9th the BOR*

recommended the Strategic Alliance option where the two institutions remained independent but would seek ways to increase collaborations.]

Budget Status: Brit discussed the FY13 budget. At this time there is no real news and there probably won't be too much difference between next year and this year' budgets. Although the process has begun, it won't formally begin until after the Governor submits his budget in January. Some of the proposed highlights include: 1) there is a 1 billion dollar structural deficit with an uncertain economy, 2) furlough are currently not an issue in the discussion, 3) although it is not definite, there is discussion of and a potential for a 2% COLA effective in January 2013, and 4) Merit is unlikely unless the economy really improves. He noted that the effective date of the COLA is negotiable and in flux. In addition, he addressed the issue of COLAs for adjunct faculty. COLAs are determined by the Legislature for State employees. In contrast, the amount paid to adjunct faculty which includes any increases in that pay is determined on the individual campuses.

Child Abuse Policy: (*see attachments*) With the incidents at Penn State and Syracuse, the BOR will be acting upon a child abuse policy at their meeting today. Brit indicated that it isn't perfect and that it can be refined and improved in the future. In addition, he noted that it merely reiterated and reinforces the current law on child abuse. Also, he noted that it will involve training responsibilities.

A brief summary of the discussion of this topic which occurred at the December 8th CUSF meeting was conveyed to Brit. A summary of these issues and concerns with the policy include:

1. There were issues regarding the term "suspect" and effective implementation of the policy.
2. Suspect tends to focus on the abused and may not include a focus on the perpetrator.
3. They need to consider the "*unintentional consequences*" of the policy. For example, instructors may eliminate reflective oriented assignments or journals where students might describe an abusive incident. Faculty may need to place disclaimers in their syllabi.

Family Leave Policy: Brit indicated that neither he nor System has had much opportunity to focus on the Family Leave Policy due the demands to finish the UMCP/UMB merger study for the BOR and the Legislature. Also, he indicated that the issue has become much more complicated than originally envisioned (e.g. fair labor practices, issue of faculty versus staff, etc.), and for these reasons, they are not prepared to move the policy forward to conclusion at this time. It will be high on the priority list for next year's business.

All-Faculty email Lists: Jay summarized the findings of the group from the morning session for the Chancellor. He noted the summary points regarding email communications, and the best practices statement regarding faculty email lists, etc. In addition, the linkage between shared governance, and the need for free communications among faculty, and the ability of faculty to assemble in the electronic age with a dispersed faculty was made. These two issues which are often taken for granted in the brick and mortar institutions may be important underpinnings to the future success of shared governance.

The Chancellor indicated that he was not opposed to the findings of providing faculty communications in terms of the shared governance discussion. Two suggestions included:

- 1) He would bring this issue up with the Council of Presidents.
- 2) It was suggested to Brit that it may be necessary to amend the USM policy on Shared Governance.

Workload Issue: The Chancellor was asked about the high workload status at Coppin. There was a brief discussion. Irv indicated that there was merit in the issue and that they would need to look into it more.

Tuition Increases: The Chancellor was asked about a tuition increases as an approach to increase the revenue stream. Brit noted that the BOR won't set any tuition increases until April. Also, he noted that "mandatory costs" from the State have increased and a 5% increase in tuition is needed to cover these costs. The question becomes how much of these mandatory costs will the Governor "buy down" in his budget which will eventually determine the amount of any tuition increases.

COLAs: There are no guarantees at this point until the Governor submits his budget. There has been a lot of discussion regarding the 2% COLA and this is often a good sign that they will eventually be included in the budget. Conversely, merit has not received the same level of discussion and this may be a sign that merit may not be included in the budget.

UMUC Workload: The Chancellor was asked to keep data on adjunct workload documentation at the UMUC.

CAMPUS ISSUES - 12:57 PM

With the pending BOR meeting, the Chancellor and Irv took leave of the group at 12:57 PM. With the Chancellor and Irv no longer present, Jay opened the floor to a discussion of issues facing the campuses.

Development of Incentive Models: Particularly at College Park, there are few if any incentives for faculty once they are hired and obtain tenure. It was suggested that the State needs to look at different models to encourage productivity. For example, it was noted that faculty apply for internal positions advertised at higher salaries. In addition, this issues dovetails with the issue that University System of Maryland is an independent organization and should have more autonomy from State control.

Joyce suggested that they develop a panel discussion on this topic. She asked Eric Kasischke and Richard Zhao to assist in putting together this panel discussion.

Salary Compression: Next, the chairs discussed the issue of salary compression. The discussion involved the differences between what is an administrative and what is an instructional cost, a comparison between campuses regarding salaries and salary compression, and the access of salary information by faculty. It was noted that salary information is public information, that at Frostburg, the salary information for faculty and administrators is normally published with the September senate agenda, and there is NUCBO website that has all the state employee's salaries.

ADJOURNMENT - 1:30 PM

Since several of the members needed to attend the BOR meeting, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Kauffman

Robert B. Kauffman
Secretary

Attachments: Joint Meeting Summary
Memo: Proposed Policy on the Reporting of Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect
Proposed Policy on the Reporting of Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect

Approved



Second Annual Joint USM Councils Meeting

University System of Maryland Student Council

Council of System Faculty

Council of System Staff

November 13, 2011

During the Second Annual Joint USM Councils Meeting at the University of Maryland, College Park, students, faculty, and staff discussed three topics: the proposed UMB-UMCP merger, the USM budget, and family leave policies.

Summary of Discussions

UMCP-UMB Proposed Merger

Members favored joint faculty appointments and joint programs not only with UMB and UMCP, but also among other institutions. It was pointed out that the merger that eventually created the University System of Maryland in 1988 has not fully merged; with many of the institutions' procedures (i.e. payroll system) has not been unified in the USM. Members also discussed the fact that the National Science Foundation has indicated that they would not recognize a merged institution with two campus presidents, as Senate President Miller has recently proposed. There are other ways to obtain greater research funding and higher rankings, including submitting joint reports between UMB and UMCP. It was also submitted that if all of the system institutions would submit one report as a University system, the USM would be placed third in research rankings. The length and the projected costs of a merger also posed concerns for many members, along with the programs at the new institution and how those programs will affect smaller system institutions. Members agreed that the priority of a merged institution would be to enhance access to Maryland residents to pursue their undergraduate and graduate studies within the USM. Members expressed support for an alliance or a "strategic realignment," a term coined by Senate President Miller. Members expressed strong support for more collaboration between the two institutions and other system institutions. One of the positive results that members projected would be the prestige that this new institution would command. Students indicated that the value of a degree from the University of Maryland would be greater given its projected prestige. Furthermore, more joint programs between UMB and UMCP could expand access to the Baltimore-region for UMCP and for UMB, expanded access to the Washington, D.C.-region. Some members argued that a merged institution would make University of Maryland and other system institutions more competitive and would garner national and global attention. However, members did recognize the vast cultural differences that exist in UMB and UMCP and expressed concerns about how that would play out if the two institutions were to merge. Members expressed concerns about the fact that this merger is politically motivated (mandate from legislative leaders instead of discussions between institutions), how this could impact the

economy, and the fact that resources are already scarce given today's economic situation. Furthermore, there were some concerns about the potential negative impacts on smaller institutions and the loss of resources and support from Annapolis. Given a larger and more prominent merged institution with greater research standings in Baltimore, members questioned how this merger might impact institutions like Johns Hopkins, renowned for its research capabilities. With a \$1 billion deficit, members also questioned where the cost of this proposed merger will come from.

Dr. Neerchal of University of Maryland, Baltimore County, a member of the Council of System Faculty, requested that an opinion piece submitted by David Salkever, a professor at University of Maryland, Baltimore County be included in the summary:

“Flawed thinking in push for UM merger.” David Salkever. *Baltimore Sun*, Nov 8, 2011.

link: http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2011-11-08/news/bs-ed-um-merger-20111108_1_rankings-research-funding-campus

This article suggests that even if College Park and UMB merged, their research funding data might still be treated separately in the Center for Measuring University Performance's national rankings. The center's research director, Craig Abbey, told me that factors such as geographic distance between units, a tradition of separate reporting, separate faculty groupings, and governance arrangements are all considered. He illustrated this with examples of "flagship campus-medical institutions" combinations that are each treated in the rankings as two distinct universities. These were the University of Oklahoma (22 miles between the Norman campus and the Oklahoma City medical campus), the University of Kansas (40 miles between the Lawrence campus and the Kansas City medical campus), and the University of Nebraska (56 miles between the Lincoln campus and the Omaha medical campus). In all three examples, a single president was CEO for both campuses combined, but each of the two constituent campuses also had its own CEO serving under the single president.

USM Budget

Members were asked to make recommendations of areas to cut in the budget and came up with the following items to cut: remedial education, legal fees, and finances in budgets for institution administration. Members also indicated that they would prefer cuts be made outside academic areas, financial aid, and capital projects. Members also indicated that they would prefer that cuts not be made to human resources, given the fact that faculty and staff have been affected negatively by furloughs and budget cuts in recent years. Members also discussed furloughs and presented the following opinions on this issue: with more furloughs, faculty members would be less willing to sit on university committees; students recommend that furloughs occur during academic breaks to lessen impact on students' academic experience; given the increase mobility of faculty members, there are many alternatives to furloughs; faculty and staff also graciously weathered through furloughs in years past and faculty continued to provide superior academic experience in the classroom and staff continued to provide great services and support for our students; and lastly, furloughs hurt the morale of faculty and staff. Members also discussed the

possibility of consolidating the academic week to 4 days instead of 5 and streamline programs to save money. In regards to tuition and fees, members indicated that raising tuition and fees would make attending a system institution, especially a merged institution, less attractive. Due to the fact that many students face significant student debt and budget cuts to financial aid, the access to quality and affordable education might be compromised. Members also pointed out the fact that faculty and staff members' compensations have not seen an increase in a number of years. Newly hired faculty and staff are being promised salaries and benefits that are unrealistic. Members strongly support a cost of living increase.

Family Leave

Members indicated that the Towson Family Leave Policy should be implemented systemwide. The USM should have a unified family leave policy instead of varying family leave policies in individual system institutions. The USM should also set aside funds specifically for family leave and paternity leave should be compensated. Family Leave policies should also cover same-sex couples and families and students who are employed by an institution (i.e. graduate assistants) should receive partial or full coverage under such policy. Given the fact that we live in a technological world and faculty, staff, and students can perform work at home during Family Leave days, there should be more flexibility in the number of days permitted and individuals should be able to save up leave days. Members indicated that having a strong and unified Family Leave Policy for the USM could boost morale for faculty and staff. Members also support alternative work options and systemwide definitions for varying circumstances that are different in individual institutional policy. Members strongly oppose leave without pay.

Respectfully submitted:

Emmanuel Welsh
Chair, Student Council

Willie Brown
Chair, Staff Council

Joyce Shirazi, PhD
Chair, Faculty Council



TOPIC: Proposed Policy on the Reporting of Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect

COMMITTEE: Committee of the Whole

DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING: December 9, 2011

SUMMARY: The University System of Maryland's current policies encourage the voluntary reporting by its employees and students of all forms of misconduct and provide whistleblower protections for members of the USM community who come forward with such reports. However, Maryland family law makes the reporting of suspected child abuse and neglect mandatory for all persons, with heightened reporting requirements for health, police and education professionals. These mandatory provisions are not reflected currently in USM policy.

The attached proposed policy affirms the USM's commitment to protecting children from abuse and neglect, sets out the reporting requirements and process applicable to USM employees and others, and identifies a core set of measures to be taken by each institution to support full reporting. These include provisions to:

- Communicate to employees and students their obligations under the law;
- Affirm statutory and USM protections for those who make reports under the policy;
- Ensure that those who violate their reporting requirements are disciplined appropriately; and
- Establish mechanisms for promptly informing appropriate institution officials of suspected child abuse or neglect on the part of members of the USM community.

This policy proposal is a critical first step in a thorough USM review of its policies and procedures that address issues of abuse and assault on its campuses.

ALTERNATIVES(S): The Committee could elect to recommend modifications to the proposed policy, or recommend that a policy not be adopted.

FISCAL IMPACT: The policy is not expected to have a fiscal impact.

CHANCELLOR'S RECOMMENDATION: That the Board of Regents approve the policy.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

DATE: December 9, 2011

BOARD ACTION:

DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: William E. Kirwan, Chancellor (301) 445-1901

Proposed USM Policy on the Reporting of Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect

(Dec. 9, 2011)

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance to staff, faculty, and students of the University System of Maryland (USM) community regarding the mandatory requirements in Maryland law that govern the reporting of suspected cases of child abuse and child neglect; and to affirm the commitment of the USM to the protection of the safety and welfare of children who come into contact with the USM community.

II. AUTHORITY

The reporting requirements addressed in this policy implement the mandatory child abuse and neglect reporting provisions of the Family Law Article of the Maryland Annotated Code, Sections 5-701 through 5-708, as they apply to the USM.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. "Abuse" means:

1. The physical or mental injury of a child by a parent or other person who has permanent or temporary care or custody of the child, or by any household or family member, under circumstances indicating that the child's health or welfare is harmed or at substantial risk of being harmed; or
2. Sexual abuse of a child, whether physical injuries are sustained or not, defined as any act that involves sexual molestation or exploitation of a child by a parent or other person who has permanent or temporary care or custody or responsibility for supervision of a child, or by any household or family member.

B. "Child" means any individual under the age of 18 years.

C. "Local department of social services" means the department of social services for the jurisdiction in which:

1. The child resides; or
2. The abuse or neglect occurred, or,
3. If neither location is known, the jurisdiction in which the institution is located.

D. "Mental injury" means the observable, identifiable, and substantial impairment of a child's mental or psychological ability to function.

E. "Neglect" means the failure to give proper care and attention to a child, including leaving the child unattended, by a parent or other person who has permanent or temporary care or custody or responsibility for supervision of the child under circumstances indicating:

1. That the child's health or welfare is harmed or placed at substantial risk of harm; or
2. Mental injury to the child or a substantial risk of mental injury.

F. "Professional employee" means a person employed by the USM as a:

1. Faculty member;
2. Administrator;
3. Coach; or
4. Other employee who provides academic support, student service, or institutional support activities, whose duties require either a college degree or comparable experience.

IV. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. Reporting Requirements for USM Professional Employees. A USM health practitioner, police officer, or other professional employee ("the professional employee") of a USM institution, when acting in a professional capacity, who has reason to believe that a child has been abused or neglected, shall report this suspicion as follows:

1. An oral report shall be made as immediately as is practicable, within 48 hours of the event that caused the employee to believe that a child has been subject to abuse or neglect:
 - a. To the local police department or the local department of social services; and
 - b. When acting as a staff member of a USM institution, to the President of the institution, or the person or persons designated by the President to receive such reports ("the President's Designee").
2. A written report shall also be provided to the local department of social services within 48 hours of the event that caused the employee to believe that a child has been subject to abuse or neglect.
 - a. The employee shall provide a copy of the written report to the institution President, or the President's Designee.
 - b. The report shall include the following information, to the extent that it is known by the employee:
 - i. The name, age, and home address of the child;
 - ii. The name and home address of the parent or other person responsible for the care of the child;
 - iii. The child's whereabouts;
 - iv. The nature and extent of the suspected abuse or neglect, including any information regarding possible previous instances of abuse or neglect; and
 - v. Any other information that may help to identify the person responsible for the abuse or neglect or determine the cause.
3. A copy of the written report also shall be sent to the local State's Attorney, if abuse is suspected.

4. The above reporting requirements apply regardless of generally accepted confidentiality privileges otherwise applicable to professional-client relationships, except that they may not apply to attorneys or members of the clergy under the specific circumstances described in Family Law Article Section 5-705(a)(2) and (3).
- B. Reporting Requirements for All Other Persons. Members of the USM community other than USM professional employees acting as a staff member of a USM institution, including other staff, students, and contractors on campus, are also required to report suspected child abuse or neglect as follows:
1. Such individuals shall report orally or in writing to:
 - a. The local department of social services or local law enforcement agency; and
 - b. The President of the institution or the President's Designee, if the suspected child abuse or neglect:
 - i. Took place in institution facilities or on institution property;
 - ii. Was committed by a current or former employee or volunteer of the USM;
 - iii. Occurred in connection with an institution sponsored, recognized or approved program, visit, activity, or camp, regardless of location; or
 - iv. Took place while the victim was a registered student at the institution.
 2. The report shall include the information listed in Section IV.A.2 above, to the extent that it is known by the individual making the report.
 3. The requirement to report suspected abuse or neglect to the President or the President's designee under section B.1.b, above, is subject to generally accepted confidentiality privileges applicable to professional-client relationships.
- C. Questions Regarding the Reporting Requirements. Questions regarding the applicability of these requirements to a particular individual or situation may be directed to the local department of social services or the President's Designee for the reporting of suspected abuse or neglect.
- D. Reporting of Past Abuse or Neglect. The obligation to report suspected child abuse or neglect applies, even if the individual who may have been the victim of past child abuse or neglect is no longer a child at the time when the past abuse or neglect is disclosed or otherwise suspected.
- V. POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND CONSEQUENCES
- A. Immunity. Under State law (Family Law Article Section 5-708), any individual who in good faith makes or participates in making a report under the law shall be immune from any civil liability or criminal prosecution. In addition, any person who in good faith makes or participates in making a report under this policy shall be free from any reprisal at the institution that might otherwise result from compliance with the policy.

- B. Failure to Report. Any employee of the USM who fails to report suspected child abuse or neglect in violation of this policy may be subject to discipline for professional misconduct, up to and including termination of the employee's employment with or appointment to the USM.
- C. Confidentiality. The confidentiality of a report of suspected child abuse or neglect, including the identity of an individual who makes a report under this policy, the individual suspected of abuse or neglect, and the child who may have been abused or neglected, will be protected consistent with relevant federal and state laws that safeguard the confidentiality of such information.

VI. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE INSTITUTION

Each institution of the USM shall take the following actions to implement this policy and support compliance with State law requirements:

- A. President's Designee. The President of the institution shall designate the person or persons to receive oral and written reports of suspected child abuse or neglect from employees, students, and others at the institution.
- B. Information Dissemination. Employees, students and other members of the campus community shall be informed through employee or student handbooks, institution websites, and other appropriate means of communication of:
 - 1. The requirements of this policy and relevant state law requirements;
 - 2. Institution policies and procedures for compliance with the policy; and
 - 3. Contact information for the local department of social services, local law enforcement agency, State's Attorney, and the President's Designee for the reporting of suspected child abuse or neglect.
- C. Training. Employees and students who have regular contact with children shall receive periodic training in the requirements of this policy.
- D. Cooperation with Other Agencies. The institution shall cooperate fully and appropriately with any investigation of suspected child abuse or neglect by a local department of social services or law enforcement agency. If the individual suspected of child abuse or neglect is an employee, student, or contractor of the institution, the institution shall coordinate its own investigation or other activities in response to a report with the appropriate local agency.

- E. Disciplinary Action. Each institution shall ensure that its own policies and procedures for addressing alleged employee and contractor misconduct include provisions and measures to respond swiftly and appropriately to reports of suspected child abuse and neglect.

VII. IMPLEMENTATION

A copy of this policy shall be provided to all faculty, staff, and students of each USM institution within one week of the Board's approval of the policy. All other requirements of the policy shall be implemented at each institution no later than January 31, 2012.

Approved