



**SB767 - Higher Education - Admissions Process - Criminal History – Opposed  
February 26, 2020  
Senate Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs Committee**

SB 767 will likely have an adverse fiscal impact on the University of Maryland College Park, the amount of which is difficult to quantify. The University of Maryland supplement to the Coalition Application currently includes a question about criminal history. In terms of the cost cited, simply eliminating the question from the application would incur no cost, however a significant cost would be incurred as a result of the fact that we would be required to collect this information from students after the admission process. The costs are difficult to quantify but they would likely be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Unfortunately, we do not currently have a technological system that would allow us to collect and retain this information, which would mean we would need to develop a mechanism to collect this information. Neither of our current systems currently have this capacity. We would then have to review the collected responses from students and determine which students would need to be cleared through the judicial review process. It would also be necessary to follow up with students who don't provide needed information and ensure completion. We would need to coordinate with the Office of Student Conduct to ensure the timely completion of the judicial review process. All of this would need to occur at a time when it's necessary for our focus to shift from the application review process to the yield process and spring recruitment season. As a result, it would be necessary to have appropriate new staff in place to manage this process. Ultimately, we would need to be prepared to rescind offers of admission for any student who does not provide requested documentation or who is denied clearance through the judicial review process.

It is important to note that the timing of the required process would be detrimental to any student who is not cleared through the judicial review process. If it were the case that it would be necessary to rescind a student's offer of admission, this would happen so late in the process that it would not allow them time to pursue other opportunities.

In addition, the process raises the question about how to treat students who do not provide the requested information subsequent to their admission to the university. Because this process would happen at a time when students and school counselors have shifted their focus away from the college application process, this population of students would undoubtedly be the largest group of students affected by this process. It is important to note that this would likely have a disproportionate impact on students in under-resourced schools where school counselors may not be able to assist students through this process.

As drafted, this bill would force the university to incur substantial additional expenditures, such as legal services, staffing, those related to the alteration of current admissions material, and costs to create and maintain an infrastructure to internally collect/manage the impacted data for enrolled students. We urge an unfavorable report.