



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The April 2009 meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Tuesday, April 7 and, if needed, on Tuesday, April 21 in the Langone Center Forum beginning at 12:00 p.m. and running until 12:52 p.m. or the conclusion of business, whichever comes first. Professor Tony Massoud, Chair of the Faculty, will preside. Any amendments to the March 2009 minutes should be sent to Faculty Secretary Tom Cassidy prior to the April meeting.

**AGENDA**

**A. Amendments to and approval of March 2009 minutes**

**B. Announcements and remarks by the Chair of the Faculty**

Nominations for Faculty Committees and for Faculty Representatives to Board of Trustees Committees appear in the Appendix pp. 4-5. The floor will be open for additional nominations.

**C. Announcements and remarks by the President**

**D. Committee Reports:**

**1. Committee on Athletics**

Marty Ligare will make a verbal report.

**2. Committee on Planning and Budget**

Karl Voss will make a verbal report.

**3. Middle States Periodic Review Report Committee**

Update on the progress drafting this report and on mechanisms for feedback, including an open forum scheduled for Tuesday April 14.

**3. Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee**

FAPC Motion 1: Revise the Faculty Handbook regarding the timeline for reviews (Appendix pp. 6-12). This motion was introduced at the March meeting and is to be voted on at the April meeting.

**4. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure**

CAFT Motion 1: If the motion from FAPC to change review timelines is passed, the date sheet in Appendix pp. 13-18 shall be appended to all DRC documents until those documents have completed their next periodic review. Recall that the FAPC motion charges departments to construct internal deadlines that, substantially, do not disadvantage candidates in comparison to

the deadlines in current practice.

Rationale: Candidates need and should receive a single, reliable source of deadlines and dates. Note that the date sheet provides suggested dates, as well as giving those University dates that are required.

### **5. Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee**

FAPC Motion 2: Amend the Faculty Handbook Regarding Administrative Searches (Appendix p. 19). This motion was introduced at the March meeting and is to be voted on at the April meeting.

FAPC Motion 3: Change the Role of the Provost and the President in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3rd Year Reviews (Appendix p. 20). This motion was introduced at the March meeting and is to be voted on at the April meeting.

FAPC Motion 4: FAPC and CAFT believe that we need to clarify two issues in the hiring with tenure plan. Thus we propose adding the following items to the Hiring With Tenure Implementation Plan:

1. The decision to hire with tenure is ultimately a hiring decision; as such, candidates do not have the right of appeal to the URC or to CAFT.
2. Finalists receiving an invitation to supply materials for a tenure evaluation shall receive a brief summary of the procedures to be employed in the decision.

FAPC Motion 5: Change the name of the division of Humanities to the division of Arts and Humanities (Appendix p. 21)

FAPC Motion 6: Implement limited background checks on new faculty (Appendix pp. 22-26.)

FAPC Motion 7: Addition of criminal background checks on new faculty (Appendix pp. 27-31.)

### **6. Committee on Instruction**

The new Assessment Plan has completed its transit through the Faculty committee structure (Assessment Committee and COI) with appropriate edits and modifications along the way. Both committees have approved the document, and the current version will be submitted with the Middle States Report. At this time COI is not asking for formal approval of this document by the Faculty as a whole, but those interested in seeing the document may find it in COI's public network space.

### **7. Committee on Complementary Activities**

Bill Flack will make a verbal report.

### **8. Committee on Faculty Development**

### **9. Committee on Honorary Degrees**

**10. University Review Committee**

**11. Committee on Staff Planning**

- E. Announcements and remarks by members of the President's staff**
- F. New business**
- G. Adjournment**

## APPENDIX

### Nominations for Faculty Committees and Faculty Representatives to Board of Trustees Committees as of April 2, 2009.

#### **Faculty Council**

- Humanities
  - John Rickard
  - Gary Steiner
- Social Sciences
  - Kim Daubman
  - Amy Wolaver
- Secretary of the Faculty (1 year term)
  - Phillippe Dubois

#### **Committee on Athletics**

- At-large
  - Paul McGuire
  - Martha Verbrugge

#### **Committee on Planning and Budget**

- Engineering
  - Keith Buffinton
  - Tom DiStefano

#### **Committee on Instruction**

- Natural Sciences and Mathematics
  - Mark Spiro
  - Molly McGuire
- At-large
  - Chris Boyatzis
  - Michael James

#### **Committee on Complementary Activities**

- At-large (4 positions)
  - Beth Capaldi Evans
  - David Del Testa
  - Mike Gross
  - Eric Jablonski
  - Kathleen McQuiston
  - David Mitchell
  - Linda Smolka

#### **Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel**

- Tenured at-large
  - Steve Guattery
  - Carl Milofsky
- Untenured at-large
  - Kevin Daly
  - Atiya Stokes-Brown

### **Committee on Staff Planning**

- Social Sciences
  - Jan Knoedler
  - Michael Johnson-Cramer

### **Committee on Faculty Development**

- Natural Sciences and Mathematics
  - Greg Adams
  - Rob Stockland
- Social Sciences
  - Matt Bailey
  - Zhiqun Zhu
- At-large
  - Sue Reed
  - Jan Traflet

### **Committee on Honorary Degrees**

- Humanities
  - Kelly Knox
  - Rivka Ulmer
- Engineering
  - Rich Kozick
  - Jim Baish
- At-large
  - Andrea Stevenson-Sanjian
  - Hilbourne Watson

### **Faculty Hearing Committee**

- Natural Sciences and Mathematics
  - Marj Kastner
  - Jeff Trop

### **Faculty Reps to the Board**

- Board Committee on Complementary Activities
  - Beth Capaldi Evans
  - Tom Solomon
- Board Committee on University Relations
  - Sue Ellen Henry
  - Marie Pizzorno

**Motion 1: FAPC Motion to revise the Faculty Handbook regarding the timeline for reviews.**

Crafted by FAPC based on the CRTP report and with feedback from the URC, CAFT, Faculty Council, and the Office of the President.

The CRTP report made the following observations:

“Bucknell does more reviews in a shorter period of time than any of our peer institutions. Indeed, this is the area in which Bucknell is most out of step with our peer and aspirant institutions. Review decisions are too important to rush, so it is essential that the URC be given enough time to do its work.”

To decompress the URC’s schedule, we recommend the following changes:

Second and fourth year reviews should be submitted earlier in the fall. Tenure review documents should be submitted by November 1st. Second and fourth year review decisions would be sent by December 15th. Tenure review decisions would be sent by February 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Motion: Amend the faculty handbook as outlined below.**

Additions are underlined and deletions are denoted with ~~striketrough~~.

**II.C.5. UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Review procedures and deadlines for tenure and retention are outlined in III.K.2.

The Committee shall review recommendations for promotion during the spring semester (See III.K. and III.L.). Recommendations for promotion in conjunction with the conferral of tenure shall be reviewed on the schedule laid out for tenure cases in III.K. before December 15 of each year.

**II.C.6. COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE**

Appeals responses to candidates

In a case where the complaint is in response to a notice of non-renewal of contract, the individual should bring his/her complaint to the Committee according to the timetable in III.K.2. within 45 days of the notice. Note that the timetable described there admits the possibility of extenuating circumstances causing a delay in bringing the complaint, and provides specifically for time to prepare a complaint after receipt of the result of a reconsideration by the University Review Committee, should such an appeal have been made to that body. However, there may be times when extenuating circumstances require a later date.

**III.K.2. Schedule of Review Procedures**

- On or before May 1, the Deans of the Colleges will notify department chairpersons of the names of those department members who are to be evaluated during the following academic year.
- On or before May 15, the Deans of the Colleges meet with department chairpersons for preliminary discussion of procedures and the progress of evaluations.

- On or before May 15, prior to the evaluation of faculty members, the department chairpersons will invite provisional appointees to discuss the procedures to be followed in arriving at recommendations for their reappointment and tenure. Any questions concerning the procedures of a department committee (including the deadline for their submission) should be answered at this time. Agreements regarding procedures should be specified in a letter written to the candidate by the department chairperson dated on or before June 1.
- On or before September 20 for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews, September 30 for 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and October 15 for tenure reviews, the department chairperson, representing the department review committee, will provide to each faculty member under review a written statement describing his/her standing, the statement to include evaluation of scholarship, teaching, and contributions to the University community. The chairperson will give the candidate the opportunity to (a) meet again with the department committee before the final text of the statement is prepared, (b) see the final text of the statement before it is sent to the Dean of the College, and (c) respond in writing, if the candidate elects to do so, to the departmental statement.
- On or before September 30 for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews, October 10 for 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and November 1 for tenure reviews, the final documented department recommendations and candidate statements of response (if any) will be submitted to the University Review Committee through the Dean of the College.
- ~~During October and November,~~ The University Review Committee reviews department recommendations and all relevant documentation. The University Review Committee will formulate its own recommendations to be reported to the President and forwarded to the Board of Trustees. The final authority to grant appointments, promotions, and tenure rests with the Board of Trustees.
- On or ~~before~~ about December 1 for 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and January 20<sup>th</sup> for tenure reviews, the President will apprise him/herself of the documentation which accompanied the department recommendations and will meet with the University Review Committee to discuss the Committee recommendations.
- On or before December 15 for 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and February 1<sup>st</sup> for tenure reviews, the Deans of the Colleges will send letters of notification of the University Review Committee's actions to each faculty member under review. By this date, the University Review Committee shall prepare for the file a separate letter of explanation for each candidate denied retention or tenure.
- A ~~December~~ University Review Committee letter which indicates the University's intention to terminate an appointment is to be understood as the final notice of non-reappointment or denial of tenure, even if the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure is petitioned.
- If the final decision as stated in the ~~December~~ University Review Committee letter of notification is to deny reappointment or tenure, the individual faculty member may appeal negative decisions on two possible grounds and in the following order: substantive issues and procedural issues. Requests for reconsideration based on substantive issues shall be directed to the University Review Committee before any appeal based on procedural issues is made to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. An appeal to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure will foreclose the right of the candidate to appeal to the University Review Committee for reconsideration.

- January 1 for 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and February 10 for tenure reviews, shall be the latest date on which a candidate who has been denied retention or tenure may request a letter of explanation from the University Review Committee. Letters of explanation which have not been requested shall be destroyed on ~~January 31~~March 1.
- January 15 for 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and February 20 for tenure reviews, shall be the latest date on which a candidate may request reconsideration by the University Review Committee.
- January 31 for 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and March 1 for tenure reviews, shall be the latest date on which a candidate may submit materials for reconsideration to the University Review Committee.
- February 15 for 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and March 15 for tenure reviews, shall be the latest date on which the candidate will receive notification of the result of the reconsideration by the University Review Committee.
- January 31 for 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and March 1 for tenure reviews, shall be the latest date on which a candidate may appeal to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure unless the candidate has made a timely appeal to the University Review Committee, in which case the deadline will be fifteen days after the written notification to the candidate of the reconsideration decision. If such a petition is made, it is the faculty member's responsibility to establish a prima facie case before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure takes any investigative action. The Committee shall endeavor to complete its investigation within 45 days of receipt of the petition. If, after its investigation, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure finds grounds to support the claim of the candidate, it may direct the University Review Committee to conduct a new review, or it may direct that Committee to appoint an ad hoc committee for such a purpose. The University Review committee or ad hoc committee shall endeavor to complete its new review within 30 days. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure may also direct a department/program to conduct a new review, the results of which shall be forwarded to the University Review Committee (or ~~an~~ an ad hoc committee, if appropriate) for its new review. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall establish the timetable for the new department/program review after consulting with the University Review Committee and the department/program.
- At the request of the candidate, the University Review Committee may, for extenuating circumstances, extend the deadlines for appeals of January 1, 15, 31, and February 15 listed above. In like manner, at the request of the candidate, the Committee on Academic ~~Freedom Tenure~~ and ~~Tenure Freedom~~ may, for extenuating circumstances, extend the deadlines s of January 31 for appeals and the fifteen-day period following the written notification to the candidate of the reconsideration decision.

The table below delineates how the calendar would work for each review.

	<u>2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> year</u>	<u>4<sup>th</sup> &amp; 5<sup>th</sup> year</u>	<u>Tenure</u>
<u>9/20</u>	<u>DRC reports to candidates</u>		



<u>9/30</u>	<u>Materials sent to Dean, URC</u>	<u>DRC reports to candidates</u>	
<u>10/10</u>		<u>Materials sent to Dean, URC</u>	
<u>10/15</u>			<u>DRC reports to candidates</u>
<u>11/1</u>			<u>Materials sent to Dean, URC</u>
<u>12/1</u>	<u>URC discussion with President</u>	<u>URC discussion with President</u>	
<u>12/15</u>	<u>URC letters to candidates</u>	<u>URC letters to candidates</u>	
<u>1/15</u>	<u>Appeals to URC</u>	<u>Appeals to URC</u>	
<u>1/20</u>			<u>URC discussion with President</u>
<u>2/1</u>			<u>URC letters to candidates</u>
<u>2/15</u>	<u>Appeals responses to candidates</u>	<u>Appeals responses to candidates</u>	
<u>2/20</u>			<u>Appeals to URC</u>
<u>3/15</u>			<u>Appeals responses to candidates</u>
<u>4/1</u>			
<u>4/15</u>			
<u>9/1</u>			
<u>9/30</u>			

### 3. Notification of Non-reappointment

Written notification of non-reappointment of a full-time member of the Faculty in a provisional status, following one year or more of contracted service, is given by the University as follows:

- On or before March 1 of the first academic year of service if the appointment expires at the end of that academic year; or if a one-year appointment terminates during the academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
- On or before December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that academic year; or if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.

- At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of full-time service in the institution.
- It is understood that expiration of appointment at the end of a year will be interpreted to mean the end of the academic year.

An appointment may be terminated by a faculty member effective at the end of an academic year, provided that notice is given in writing at the earliest possible opportunity, but not later than May 1, or thirty days after receiving notification of the terms of the appointment for the coming year, whichever date occurs later. The faculty member may properly request a waiver of this requirement of notice in case of hardship or in a situation where he/she would otherwise be denied substantial professional advancement or other opportunity.

---

*Should the motion pass, the URC and CAFT will write a cover sheet to be attached to all DRC documents giving the new UNIVERSITY dates and deadlines and making it clear that these dates supersede any of the deadlines in the rest of the DRC document.*

*The cover sheet will also contain blank spots for the dates and deadlines internal to the DEPARTMENT to be filled in by the department. This cover sheet, with the DRC and URC deadlines, will thus provide candidates with a single reliable source.*

*Should a department keep its current dates, there does not need to be a review by CAFT, but should a department decide to CHANGE deadlines (because of earlier submissions to the URC) it should submit to CAFT a version of the cover sheet with both the old, and the new, departmental dates, for a quick review to see that there have not been changes disadvantageous to the candidate from the current DRC deadlines. As well, a department that keeps its old dates might, for second or fourth year reviews, have a compressed timeline, and this should not be at the expense of the candidate.*

*Departments are expected to construct internal deadlines so that the opportunities for, and time periods available to, the candidate for responses (such as a meeting with the DRC to request full or partial reconsideration, and/or the writing of a response to the DRC report to be included in the file sent to the URC) are substantially the same as those under current departmental practice. Departments seeking to change their internal deadlines, or departments seeking guidance from CAFT as to the suitability of the timeline resulting from earlier URC deadlines combined with unchanged departmental deadlines, should submit a cover sheet to CAFT by April 13, 2009.*

### **Issues the committee considered in crafting this motion**

#### **1. Which review (4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup>) should be moved into the spring semester.**

As noted above, in order to decompress the URC schedule, one review must be moved into the spring semester. Provisional candidates who do not get an additional year after notification of non-renewal must be reviewed in the fall to allow time for them to find another job. Thus, 2<sup>nd</sup>

year reviews must occur in the fall. The question then becomes, should we move 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> or the 6<sup>th</sup> year reviews into the spring semester.

**Arguments for moving the 6<sup>th</sup> year (tenure) review to the spring semester:**

1. Tenure files are larger and take more time to prepare and review. Thus, it is more important to give extra time to those candidates and departments undertaking tenure reviews.
2. Tenure files naturally succeed 2nd and fourth-year reviews. Newer DRC and URC members benefit from going through 2nd and 4th year reviews before undertaking tenure reviews.
3. 4<sup>th</sup>- and especially 5<sup>th</sup>-year candidates need timely feedback that they can act on in the spring semester, so they should be reviewed in the fall and given feedback by December 15th. Timely feedback is much less important in tenure cases.

**Arguments for moving 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews to the spring semester:**

1. It may be more difficult for a failed candidate 6 years out to obtain a job than a failed fourth year candidate, so earlier access to the job market may be more important for one than the other.
2. The university has invested more time and resources in candidates at their 6<sup>th</sup> year, so we should work the hardest to keep this group from leaving.
3. All reviews have their waiting period stresses, but the tenure decision may come with the greatest level of stress.
4. Candidates who are concerned about the tenure decision and who are inclined to hedge their bets and go on the market may receive a job offer before they receive a tenure decision. Although this would also apply to candidates at other review levels, it may be more likely to apply to candidates undergoing a tenure review.
5. Planning for sabbaticals is slightly more difficult if 6<sup>th</sup> year review recommendations are not announced until Feb. 1, but the final schedule for the fall semester is not completed until after Feb. 1, so this is a minor concern.

In evaluating these arguments, the committee felt that the arguments for moving the 6<sup>th</sup> year (tenure) review to the spring were much stronger than the arguments for moving the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews to the spring. In particular, timely feedback for 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year candidates was deemed the single most important factor in convincing the committee that tenure reviews should be moved to the spring. A candidate undergoing a 5<sup>th</sup> year review has only one semester and 8 months in which to address any concerns that emerge from the URC's review of that candidate's file. Delaying notification from Dec. 15<sup>th</sup> until Feb. 1<sup>st</sup> for these candidates would mean they would not have the between-semester break to restructure classes to address concerns about teaching or to make a push in an area of scholarship.

**2. Establishing a calendar for promotion reviews.**

In the future, we intend to construct a similar, written timetable for promotion reviews. The table below indicates how that calendar might look.

	2 <sup>nd</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> year	4 <sup>th</sup> & 5 <sup>th</sup> year	Tenure	Promotion
9/20	DRC reports to candidates			

9/30	Materials sent to Dean, URC	DRC reports to candidates		
10/10		Materials sent to Dean, URC		
10/15			DRC reports to candidates	
11/1			Materials sent to Dean, URC	
12/1	URC discussion with President	URC discussion with President		
12/15	URC letters to candidates	URC letters to candidates		
1/15	Appeals to URC	Appeals to URC		
1/20			URC discussion with President	
2/1	Appeals responses to candidates	Appeals responses to candidates	URC letters to candidates	DRC reports to candidates
2/15				Materials sent to Dean, URC
2/20			Appeals to URC	
3/15			Appeals responses to candidates	
4/1				URC discussion with President
4/15				URC letters to candidates
9/1				Appeals to URC
9/30				Appeal responses to candidates

## CAFT MOTION on the Provisional and Tenure Review Timeline

The following dates supersede any of the deadlines in the rest of the DRC document.

Key: [All], [2,3], [4,5], [T] refer, respectively, to dates relevant to all provisional reviews, second and third year reviews, fourth and fifth year reviews, and tenure reviews. Dates in **boldface blue** in the electronic version (**dark bold** in the printed version) are University deadlines and not subject to change. Underlines in **boldface green** in the electronic version (**light bold** in the printed version) are slots for departmental deadlines. Next to the underlines is to be found (**Boldface green**) in the electronic version, which is (**light boldface**) in the printed version, and these are a suggestion for the departmental date. In what follows, "chair" may mean either department chair or DRC chair, in accordance with the DRC procedures.

- [All] **On or before May 1**, the Deans of the Colleges will notify department chairpersons of the names of those department members who are to be evaluated during the following academic year
- [All] **On or before May 15**, the Deans of the Colleges meet with department chairpersons for preliminary discussion of procedures and the progress of evaluations
- [All] **On or before May 15**, prior to the evaluation of faculty members, the department chairperson will invite provisional appointees to discuss the procedures to be followed in arriving at recommendations for their reappointment and tenure. Any questions concerning the procedures of a department committee (including the deadline for their submission) should be answered at this time. Agreements regarding procedures should be specified in a letter written to the candidate by the department chairperson dated on or before June 1
- [All] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (May 15)**, the DRC or Chair will select undergraduates for letters on teaching (if applicable)
- [All] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (May 15)**, candidate may submit the names of undergraduates for letters on teaching (if applicable)
- [T] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (May 15)**, candidate provides list of potential external reviewers

- [T] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (May 15)**, the DRC or Chair provides list of potential external reviewers
  
- [T] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (May 18)**, the DRC or Chair in consultation with the candidate creates a list of **at least 8** acceptable external reviewers
  
- [T] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (May 22)**, the DRC or Chair forwards the list of acceptable external reviewers to the Dean of the College
  
- [T] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (June 1)**, after approval of the Dean of the College, the Chair solicits the participation of external reviewers
  
- [All] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (June 1)**, department solicits student letters (if applicable)
  
- [All] **On or before June 1**, Chair sends a letter to the candidate specifying procedures
  
- [T] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (June 18)**, additional external reviewers may be solicited if fewer than 3 have agreed to write for the candidate
  
- [All] \_\_\_\_\_ **(July 15)**, initial due date for receipt of student letters (if applicable)
  
- [All] \_\_\_\_\_ **(July 15)**, Chair writes to remind students solicited for letters who have not yet responded (if applicable)
  
- [All] \_\_\_\_\_ **(August 1)**, students solicited for letters who have still not responded are reminded by email from the department (if applicable)
  
- [T] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (August 15)**, all external reviewer letters are due to the DRC
  
- [All] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (August 15)**, all student letters are due to the DRC (if applicable)
  
- [All] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (August 26)**, candidate submits required and optional materials for the relevant review
  
- [2,3] **On or before September 20**, the department chairperson, representing the department review committee, will provide to each faculty member under review a written statement [**DRC Report**] describing his/her standing, the statement to include evaluation of scholarship, teaching, and contributions to the University community. The chairperson will give

the candidate the opportunity to (a) meet again with the department committee before the final text of the statement is prepared, (b) see the final text of the statement before it is sent to the Dean of the College, and (c) respond in writing, if the candidate elects to do so, to the departmental statement. At this time the chair will also provide the candidate with redacted copies of outside reviewers' reports (if any), and redacted copies of the student letters (if any)

- [2,3] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (strongly suggest September 23)**, candidate may suggest clarification, revision, or partial or complete reconsideration of the DRC Report, and may have, for this purpose, a meeting with the DRC
- [2,3] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (strongly suggest September 27)**, final DRC Report presented to candidate
- [2,3] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (strongly suggest September 29)**, candidate may submit to the DRC a written response to the DRC Report, to letters from outside reviewers, or student letters
- [2,3] **On or before September 30**, the final version of the DRC Report with supporting materials, and the candidate's written response (if any), will be submitted to the Dean of the College for consideration by the URC
- [4,5] **On or before September 30**, the department chairperson, representing the department review committee, will provide to each faculty member under review a written statement [**DRC Report**] describing his/her standing, the statement to include evaluation of scholarship, teaching, and contributions to the University community. The chairperson will give the candidate the opportunity to (a) meet again with the department committee before the final text of the statement is prepared, (b) see the final text of the statement before it is sent to the Dean of the College, and (c) respond in writing, if the candidate elects to do so, to the departmental statement. At this time the chair will also provide the candidate with redacted copies of outside reviewers' reports (if any), and redacted copies of the student letters (if any)
- [4,5] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (strongly suggest October 3)**, candidate may suggest clarification, revision, or partial or complete reconsideration of the DRC Report, and may have, for this purpose, a meeting with the DRC
- [4,5] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (strongly suggest October 7)**, final DRC Report presented to candidate
- [4,5] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (strongly suggest October 9)**, candidate may submit to the DRC a written response to the DRC Report, to letters from outside reviewers, or student letters

- [4,5] **On or before October 10**, the final version of the DRC Report with supporting materials, and the candidate's written response (if any), will be submitted to the Dean of the College for consideration by the URC
- [T] **On or before October 15**, the department chairperson, representing the department review committee, will provide to each faculty member under review a written statement [**DRC Report**] describing his/her standing, the statement to include evaluation of scholarship, teaching, and contributions to the University community. The chairperson will give the candidate the opportunity to (a) meet again with the department committee before the final text of the statement is prepared, (b) see the final text of the statement before it is sent to the Dean of the College, and (c) respond in writing, if the candidate elects to do so, to the departmental statement. At this time the chair will also provide the candidate with redacted copies of outside reviewers' reports (if any), and redacted copies of the student letters (if any)
- [T] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (strongly suggest October 18)**, candidate may suggest clarification, revision, or partial or complete reconsideration of the DRC Report, and may have, for this purpose, a meeting with the DRC
- [T] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (strongly suggest October 23)**, final DRC Report presented to candidate
- [T] **On or before \_\_\_\_\_ (strongly suggest October 29)**, candidate may submit to the DRC a written response to the DRC Report, to letters from outside reviewers, or student letters
- [T] **On or before November 1**, the final version of the DRC Report with supporting materials, and the candidate's written response (if any), will be submitted to the Dean of the College for consideration by the URC
- [2-5] **On or about December 1**, the President will apprise him/herself of the documentation which accompanied the department recommendations and will meet with the University Review Committee to discuss the Committee recommendations
- [2-5] **On or before December 15**, the Deans of the Colleges will send letters of notification of the University Review Committee's actions to each faculty member under review. By this date, the University Review Committee shall prepared for the file a separate letter of explanation for each candidate denied retention or tenure
- [2-5] **January 1** shall be the latest date on which a candidate who has been denied retention may request a letter of explanation from the University Review Committee. Letters of explanation which have not been requested shall be destroyed on **March 1**.



- [2-5] **January 15** shall be the latest date on which a candidate may request reconsideration by the University Review Committee
- [T] **On or about January 20**, the President will apprise him/herself of the documentation which accompanied the department recommendations and will meet with the University Review Committee to discuss the Committee recommendations
- [2-5] **January 31** shall be the latest date on which a candidate may submit materials for reconsideration by the University Review Committee
- [2-5] **January 31** shall be the latest date on which a candidate for retention may appeal to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure unless the candidate has made a timely appeal to the University Review Committee, in which case the deadline will be fifteen days after the written notification to the candidate of the reconsideration decision. If such a petition is made, it is the faculty member's responsibility to establish a prima facie case before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure takes any investigative action. The Committee shall endeavor to complete its investigation within 45 days of receipt of the petition. If, after its investigation, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure finds grounds to support the claim of the candidate, it may direct the University Review Committee to conduct a new review, or it may direct that Committee to appoint an ad hoc committee for such a purpose. The University Review committee or ad hoc committee shall endeavor to complete its new review within 30 days. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure may also direct a department/program to conduct a new review, the results of which shall be forwarded to the University Review Committee (or an *ad hoc* committee, if appropriate) for its new review. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall establish the timetable for the new department/program review after consulting with the University Review Committee and the department/program
- [T] **On or before February 1**, the Deans of the Colleges will send letters of notification of the University Review Committee's actions to each faculty member under review for tenure. By this date, the University Review Committee shall prepared for the file a separate letter of explanation for each candidate denied retention or tenure
- [T] **February 10** shall be the latest date on which a candidate who has been denied tenure may request a letter of explanation from the University Review Committee. Letters of explanation which have not been requested shall be destroyed on **March 1**.
- [2-5] **February 15** shall be the latest date on which the candidate will receive notification of the result of the reconsideration by the University Review Committee
- [T] **February 20** shall be the latest date on which a candidate for tenure may request

reconsideration by the University Review Committee

- [T] **March 1** shall be the latest date on which a candidate may submit materials for reconsideration by the University Review Committee
  
- [T] **March 1** shall be the latest date on which a candidate for tenure may appeal to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure unless the candidate has made a timely appeal to the University Review Committee, in which case the deadline will be fifteen days after the written notification to the candidate of the reconsideration decision. If such a petition is made, it is the faculty member's responsibility to establish a prima facie case before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure takes any investigative action. The Committee shall endeavor to complete its investigation within 45 days of receipt of the petition. If, after its investigation, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure finds grounds to support the claim of the candidate, it may direct the University Review Committee to conduct a new review, or it may direct that Committee to appoint an ad hoc committee for such a purpose. The University Review committee or ad hoc committee shall endeavor to complete its new review within 30 days. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure may also direct a department/program to conduct a new review, the results of which shall be forwarded to the University Review Committee (or an *ad hoc* committee, if appropriate) for its new review. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall establish the timetable for the new department/program review after consulting with the University Review Committee and the department/program
  
- [T] **March 15** shall be the latest date on which the candidate for tenure will receive notification of the result of the reconsideration by the University Review Committee
  
- [All] At the request of the candidate, the University Review Committee may, for extenuating circumstances, extend the deadlines for appeals listed above. In like manner, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure may, for extenuating circumstances, extend the deadlines for appeals and the fifteen-day period following the written notification to the candidate of the reconsideration decision.

**Motion 2: FAPC Motion to Amend the Faculty Handbook Regarding Administrative Searches**

Crafted by FAPC with feedback from the Faculty Council

Rationale: Existing Faculty Handbook language does not accurately reflect current practices with respect to administrative searches.

Additions to handbook language are underlined, deletions are marked by ~~strikethrough~~.

**FAPC Motion: Amend the faculty handbook as outlined below.**

I.E

Subject to the regulations which the Board of Trustees may provide, and in a manner consistent with general University policies, the Faculty...

- Advises the President in the appointment of the Provost, the Vice Presidents and the Deans of the Colleges. The ~~officers of the~~ Faculty Council, in consultation with ~~the University Council~~ the Provost and the President, will appoint and/or elect committees members for this purpose. In the appointment of the College Deans, committees shall be populated with faculty broadly representing the college in which the Dean will be hired, including at least one representative from the administration appointed by the Provost.

### **FAPC Motion 3: Motions to Change the Role of the Provost and the President in Second and Third Year Reviews**

Crafted by FAPC with feedback from the URC, Faculty Council, and Office of the President.

In recent years, one of the problems that has hampered the URC in the completion of its work is the difficulty of finding times to meet with the Provost and the President. To address this problem, the CRTTP Report recommended the following:

To reduce the burden on the Provost and the President, we recommend the following changes in second and third year reviews. The Provost should only participate in problematic second and third year reviews. Problematic cases would be defined as those in which the URC, excluding the Provost, reaches a negative decision, experiences a tie vote, or otherwise decides that it is necessary to involve the Provost. The President would not be involved in second and third year reviews other than to report the outcomes of these reviews to the board at the appropriate time.

In order to make it easier for the URC to do its work, FAPC proposes the following amendments to the faculty handbook that reduces the roles of the Provost and the President in second and third year reviews: Additions to the handbook are underlined. Deletions are indicated in ~~strike through~~.

#### **Motion 3a: Amend the faculty handbook as outlined below to change the role of the Provost in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews:**

##### III.K.2.

- ~~During October and November, t~~The University Review Committee reviews department recommendations and all relevant documentation.
- Normally, in the case of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews, the Provost need not participate in URC reviews. However, the Provost shall participate in URC reviews in which the preliminary recommendation is negative, the vote is tied, or the URC requests the Provost's involvement.
  - In the case of 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, or 6<sup>th</sup> year reviews, the entire URC shall participate.
  - In all cases, ¶the University Review Committee will formulate its own recommendations to be reported to the President. The President shall exercise the authority set forth under Section II.c.5 and in the case of tenure and promotion reviews will forward~~ed~~ the URC's recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

The final authority to grant appointments, promotions, and tenure rests with the Board of Trustees.

---

#### **Motion 3b: Amend the faculty handbook as outlined below to change the role of the President in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews:**

##### III.K.2.

- On or ~~before~~ about December 1 for ~~2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>~~, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and January 20<sup>th</sup> for tenure reviews, the President will apprise him/herself of the documentation which accompanied the department recommendations and will meet with the University Review Committee to discuss the Committee recommendations. The President is not typically involved in second and third year reviews.

**FAPC Motion 5: Change the name of the Division of Humanities to the Division of Arts and Humanities**

On behalf of the department chairs in the Division of Humanities, FAPC makes a motion that the humanities division be renamed *Arts and Humanities*. The name change would affect the Faculty Handbook and other university documents referring to the Humanities division.

This request grows from the curricular discussions the chairs held last fall. The newly-adopted College Core Curriculum includes specific learning outcomes in Textual Analysis and Interpretation and in Arts Literacy and Practice; consequently, renaming the division as requested would make the connection between the division and its learning outcomes more clear. Although this connection is the primary reason for this request, the name change would more clearly show that study of the arts can be central to a Bucknell liberal education.

This name change would be in line with widespread practice in education and in other areas as well. In education, the divisional designation of *Arts and Humanities* is used by many universities (e.g. Berkeley, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee). Outside of education, it is used widely in the press (see, for example, a February 24, 2009 New York Times headline, "Bill Would Aid Arts and Humanities") and in politics (see The President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities). It should also be noted that the national endowments for the arts and for the humanities are distinct entities.

The chairs in the Bucknell's Humanities Division unanimously endorse this change.

## **FAPC Motion 6: Implement Limited Background Checks for New Faculty**

Rationale for multi-level history verification.

Bucknell has historically enjoyed a culture of common trust and an institutional character of integrity and shared respect, among and between constituencies of students, staff and faculty. In order to maintain the confidence of present and future students, their parents, and fellow staff and faculty, it is necessary to assure those constituencies of prudent verification of accomplishments and integrity.

As a result, Bucknell has instituted a practice of verification of sexual and violent offender registries, and criminal background for all new non-faculty employees, including all levels of administrators, since April 2007. To their credit, no prospective employees have been denied employment based upon those verifications.

The Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee received the administration request to institute similar verifications for faculty hires, including the addition of verifications for educational credentials and employment histories. Although previous hires had undergone rigorous reference checks to verify similar data, the process had not been uniform or formalized. With approval of the motion before the Faculty, any proposed new hires would first have their educational and employment history verified and be free of any registration as a Sexual or Violent Offender.

**The motion is:**

**Resolved, that the Faculty does hereby approve the process of verifying the educational credentials, employment history and the absence of registration as a Sexual or Violent Offender of faculty candidates who have been offered a position. The process for verification is outlined below.**

Note: the background check policy below was designed by Human Resources and the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee in consultation with the University Counsel, CAFT and the Faculty Council.

## **Post-offer Background Screening Policy For Faculty Candidates Who Have Been Offered a Position**

### **A. Application of Policy**

This policy applies to all final candidates who are offered faculty positions at Bucknell University after September 1, 2009.

### **B. Background**

The University's academic mission is supported by qualified members of the faculty, working in a safe and secure environment for all University constituents, including students, visitors and other employees. Bucknell University should take meaningful actions to protect its funds, property and other assets, and avoid unreasonable risks to property or the safety and welfare of the members of the University community.

Toward that end, this policy supports the educational verification, employment verification, and sex and violent offender registry checks related to faculty candidates who have been offered a position.

### **C. Statement of General Policy**

It is the policy of Bucknell University that all faculty candidates offered a position have educational credentials, employment history, and sex and violent offender registry information verified as a condition of employment.

### **D. Definitions**

1. "Educational verification" means ensuring the faculty candidate offered a position possesses all educational credentials listed on the application, resume or cover letter or otherwise cited by the candidate that qualify the individual for the position sought.
2. "Employment verification" means ensuring the faculty candidate offered a position actually worked in the positions listed on the application, resume, or cover letter or otherwise cited by the candidate that qualify the individual for the position sought, as well as all employment during a period of at least seven (7)

years immediately preceding application at Bucknell University. This verification should include dates of employment and verification of last position held.

3. "Sex and violent offender registry check" means verifying the faculty candidate offered a position does not have convictions of certain sex and violent crimes in every jurisdiction where the applicant or employee currently resides, or has resided throughout the previous 7 years.

## **E. Policy Provisions**

1. All faculty candidates offered a position shall have the following three checks completed as a condition of employment with Bucknell University:
  - a. an educational verification check;
  - b. an employment verification check;
  - c. a sex and violent offender registry check
2. If the University has performed any of the above verification or background checks on an individual within the past year, a new verification or background check of that specific category will not be required. The results of the previously performed verification and/or background checks will be considered in any pending employment decision.

## **F. Background Screening Process**

1. All written offers of employment shall include the following statement: "*This offer is contingent upon the University's verification of educational credentials and employment history, compliance with state and federal laws regarding employment, and the absence of any registration of the candidate as a Sexual or Violent Offender. The results of these verifications will be considered confidential.*"
2. Verifications and checks should be completed as soon as possible after an offer of employment to an individual has been extended.
  - a. The hiring department will notify Human Resources that the offer has been made to the final candidate.
  - b. Human Resources will notify the background check vendor to contact faculty candidates offered a position to obtain their official names, dates of birth and social security numbers for its use in providing associated background check services.



- c. For all education and employment verifications required, Human Resources shall maintain records indicating the item checked/verified, the name of the person completing the check/verification, the date of the check/verification and the status of the check/verification. These records are considered confidential and will be maintained in confidential files within Human Resources.
- d. Human Resources will be responsible for any fees associated with any of the components of the background check process, and will coordinate the receipt and payment of the background check vendor's fees through the Recruitment Budget.

### **G. Process for handling information from background checks**

The background check vendor will inform Human Resources of the results. Human resources will share the results with the Dean and the Provost. If any of the checks unearth problems, the following steps will take place:

1. Human Resources will provide a copy of the report to the faculty candidate offered the position, who will be invited to respond and/or provide additional information directly to Human Resources. (All related information will be treated as confidential, and protected as such.)
2. Human Resources will construct a report including the information from the background check vendor and any additional information provided by the candidate. Human resources will forward this report to the Provost, the Dean and the Chair of the Faculty.
3. The Provost, Dean and Chair of the Faculty will review the report and may solicit additional information from the candidate, the Search Committee, the University Counsel, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the Affirmative Action Officer, Human Resources, and other bodies, to aid in their deliberations. Upon reviewing the relevant information, the Provost, Dean and Chair of the Faculty will determine if the offer of employment will be confirmed or withdrawn.
4. Typically, consistent with AAUP guidelines, candidates will have two weeks to accept or reject a job offer from Bucknell. The background check process will not interfere with this intent, since either the review will be completed within this time frame or the candidate's decision period will be extended to accommodate the background check process.

The existence of a conviction does not automatically disqualify an individual from employment. Relevant considerations may include, but are not limited to: the individual's age at the time of the offense; the seriousness of the offense; the amount of time that has elapsed since the offense; any information provided by the individual regarding his/her rehabilitation or good conduct; the duties and responsibilities of the

position sought or held by the individual, and the effect the conviction on the individual's ability to perform these duties. Any decision to accept or reject an individual is solely at the discretion of Bucknell University. Since the candidate is not an employee of Bucknell University, the candidate does not have recourse to an appeal of a hiring decision through University procedures.

All results of criminal and sex and violent offenders convictions or issues are considered confidential and will be maintained in confidential files within Human Resources for 3 years, after which they will be destroyed.

## **H. Office Responsible for this Policy**

Human Resources  
Bucknell University

## **I. Review of the Program**

Human Resources and the Affirmative Action Officer will monitor the hiring decisions for consistency. (All related information will be treated as confidential and protected as such.) As the body charged with reviewing faculty personnel policies, FAPC will review the background check program after its first year of operation and report its conclusions to the faculty. In subsequent years, FAPC will receive annual summary reports on the background check policy from the Deans, Provost and Chair of the Faculty. After its first year of operation, FAPC will review the background check program every 5 years and will report its findings to the faculty. Note that due to the confidential nature of the background check process, FAPC will not receive any details with respect to specific cases and will only receive summary information regarding the entire background check program.

FAPC Motion 7 regarding the addition of criminal background checks to the policy outlined above.

FAPC has deliberated the issue of criminal background checks and has no recommendation on their appropriateness for faculty hires. There was disagreement amongst the faculty we consulted with on this issue. In order to bring the matter to the floor for discussion and debate, the committee is proposing a second motion to add criminal background checks to the policy discussed above, in the event that the policy above passes the faculty.

**The motion is:**

**Resolved, that the Faculty does hereby approve the use of post-offer criminal background checks for faculty members being offered a position, using the process for verification outlined below.**

Note: additions to motion 1 are underlined below, and deletions are denoted in strikethrough text.

**Post-offer Background Screening Policy  
For Faculty Candidates Who Have Been Offered a Position  
*INCLUDING CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS***

---

**A. Application of Policy**

This policy applies to all final candidates who are offered faculty positions at Bucknell University after September 1, 2009.

**B. Background**

The University's academic mission is supported by qualified members of the faculty, working in a safe and secure environment for all University constituents, including students, visitors and other employees. Bucknell University should take meaningful actions to protect its funds, property and other assets, and avoid unreasonable risks to property or the safety and welfare of the members of the University community.

Toward that end, this policy supports the educational verification, employment verification, [criminal background checks](#), and sex and violent offender registry checks related to faculty candidates who have been offered a position.

**C. Statement of General Policy**

It is the policy of Bucknell University that all faculty candidates offered a position have educational credentials, employment history, [criminal background](#), and sex and violent offender registry information verified as a condition of employment.

**D. Definitions**

1. "Educational verification" means ensuring the faculty candidate offered a position possesses all educational credentials listed on the application, resume or cover letter or otherwise cited by the candidate that qualify the individual for the position sought.
2. "Employment verification" means ensuring the faculty candidate offered a position actually worked in the positions listed on the application, resume, or cover letter or otherwise cited by the candidate that qualify the individual for the position sought, as well as all employment during a period of at least seven (7) years immediately preceding application at Bucknell University. This verification

should include dates of employment and verification of last position held.

3. "Criminal history check" means verifying the faculty candidate offered a position does not have any criminal history in every jurisdiction where the finalist currently resides, or has resided, throughout the previous 7 years.

The following convictions need not be reported by applicants, and, if discovered, will not be a detriment to consideration for employment:

- a. expunged criminal record;
- b. juvenile records, if maintained in juvenile court;
- c. summary offenses, such as minor traffic violations.

4. "Sex and violent offender registry check" means verifying the faculty candidate offered a position does not have convictions of certain sex and violent crimes in every jurisdiction where the applicant or employee currently resides, or has resided throughout the previous 7 years.

## E. Policy Provisions

1. All faculty candidates offered a position shall have the following three checks completed as a condition of employment with Bucknell University:
  - a. an educational verification check;
  - b. an employment verification check;
  - c. a criminal background check; and
  - d. a sex and violent offender registry check
2. If the University has performed any of the above verification or background checks on an individual within the past year, a new verification or background check of that specific category will not be required. The results of the previously performed verification and/or background checks will be considered in any pending employment decision.

## F. Background Screening Process

1. All written offers of employment shall include the following statement: "*This offer is contingent upon the University's verification of educational credentials and employment history, compliance with state and federal laws regarding employment, successful completion of a criminal background check, and the absence of any registration of the candidate as a Sexual or Violent Offender. The results of these verifications will be considered confidential.*"

2. Verifications and checks should be completed as soon as possible after an offer of employment to an individual has been extended.
  - a. The hiring department will notify Human Resources that the offer has been made to the final candidate.
  - b. Human Resources will notify the background check vendor to contact faculty candidates offered a position to obtain their official names, dates of birth and social security numbers for its use in providing associated background check services.
  - c. For all education and employment verifications required, Human Resources shall maintain records indicating the item checked/verified, the name of the person completing the check/verification, the date of the check/verification and the status of the check/verification. These records are considered confidential and will be maintained in confidential files within Human Resources.
  - d. Human Resources will be responsible for any fees associated with any of the components of the background check process, and will coordinate the receipt and payment of the background check vendor's fees through the Recruitment Budget.

#### **G. Process for handling information from background checks**

The background check vendor will inform Human Resources of the results. Human resources will share the results with the Dean and the Provost. If any of the checks unearth problems, the following steps will take place:

1. Human Resources will provide a copy of the report to the faculty candidate offered the position, who will be invited to respond and/or provide additional information directly to Human Resources. (All related information will be treated as confidential, and protected as such.)
2. Human Resources will construct a report including the information from the background check vendor and any additional information provided by the candidate. Human resources will forward this report to the Provost, the Dean and the Chair of the Faculty.
3. The Provost, Dean and Chair of the Faculty will review the report and may solicit additional information from the candidate, the Search Committee, the University Counsel, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the Affirmative Action Officer, Human Resources, and other bodies, to aid in their deliberations. Upon reviewing the relevant information, the Provost, Dean and Chair of the Faculty will determine if the offer of employment will be confirmed or withdrawn.

4. Typically, consistent with AAUP guidelines, candidates will have two weeks to accept or reject a job offer from Bucknell. The background check process will not interfere with this intent, since either the review will be completed within this time frame or the candidate's decision period will be extended to accommodate the background check process.

The existence of a conviction does not automatically disqualify an individual from employment. Relevant considerations may include, but are not limited to: the individual's age at the time of the offense; the seriousness of the offense; the amount of time that has elapsed since the offense; any information provided by the individual regarding his/her rehabilitation or good conduct; the duties and responsibilities of the position sought or held by the individual, and the effect the conviction on the individual's ability to perform these duties. Any decision to accept or reject an individual is solely at the discretion of Bucknell University. Since the candidate is not an employee of Bucknell University, the candidate does not have recourse to an appeal of a hiring decision through University procedures.

All results of criminal and sex and violent offenders convictions or issues are considered confidential and will be maintained in confidential files within Human Resources for 3 years, after which they will be destroyed.

## **H. Office Responsible for this Policy**

Human Resources  
Bucknell University

## **I. Review of the Program**

Human Resources and the Affirmative Action Officer will monitor the hiring decisions for consistency. (All related information will be treated as confidential and protected as such.) As the body charged with reviewing faculty personnel policies, FAPC will review the background check program after its first year of operation and report its conclusions to the faculty. In subsequent years, FAPC will receive annual summary reports on the background check policy from the Deans, Provost and Chair of the Faculty. After its first year of operation, FAPC will review the background check program every 5 years and will report its findings to the faculty. Note that due to the confidential nature of the background check process, FAPC will not receive any details with respect to specific cases and will only receive summary information regarding the entire background check program.