

27th Annual National Conference on Law and Higher Education
Center for Excellence in Higher Education Law and Policy
Stetson University College of Law
February 18-22, 2006

WHO ARE YOU?
FRAUDULENT CREDENTIALS AND BACKGROUND CHECKS IN ACADEME

Barbara A. Lee
Rutgers University

“Get a genuine college degree in 2 weeks?” says an email advertisement that includes a telephone number that is available 24/7. “No Study Required! 100% Verifiable!” says another advertisement, referencing the same telephone number. Apparently some individuals have taken advantage of this opportunity; an investigation in 2004 by the General Accounting Office found 28 employees of the federal government who had “bogus degrees,” and another 463 federal employees who were enrolled in unaccredited institutions.¹ In Pennsylvania, a cat named Colby was awarded a master’s of business administration from a “diploma mill” called “the University of Berkeley” that was subsequently sued by the Pennsylvania attorney general and shut down.² Colby’s transcript showed that the cat had a 3.5 grade point average and had attended the university for four semesters.³ The Secret Service has also raided homes and offices in three states, shutting down several fraudulent operations that provided diplomas for non-existing institutions such as “St Regis University” and “James Monroe University.”⁴

¹ Stephen Barr, “An Endless Search for Accountability,” *The Washington Post*, May 16, 2004 at C-2.

² David Epstein, “Class Dismissed,” *INSIDE HIGHER EDUCATION*, July 8, 2005 at <http://insidehighered.com/news/2005/07/08/mill>.

³ Debbi Mack, “Circuit Roundup,” *CORPORATE LEGAL TIMES*, March 2005 at 72.

⁴ Thomas Bartlett, “Federal Officials Raid Homes in 3 States in Crackdown on Diploma Mill,” *CHRON. OF HIGHER EDUC.*, August 15, 2005, at <http://chronicle.com/daily/2005/08/2005081505n.htm>.

A related problem involves resume fraud, in which an individual either claims to have a degree or work experience that he or she has not earned, or inflates prior work experience to make it appear that the position was more responsible or at a higher level than it actually was. For example, a professor in California who was named the state's poet laureate claimed to have a college degree, but had not earned one.⁵ A football coach hired by the University of Notre Dame claimed to have a master's degree that he had not earned.⁶ A popular professor who had taught for four years at Pennsylvania State University was found to have committed murder as a teenager and to have earned his college degree in prison.⁷

Staff members may also have misrepresented their academic or work credentials, or may have failed to disclose convictions for crimes that are related to their job responsibilities. One commentator estimates that at least fifteen percent of all job applicants in business organizations fail to report criminal convictions;⁸ another reports that nearly one quarter (23 percent) of all applicants misrepresent their educational or employment credentials.⁹ Thorough background checks would very likely have identified these misrepresentations or omissions at the time these individuals were hired, and would have saved the employer embarrassment or, worse, legal liability if the employee harmed someone.¹⁰

⁵ Robin Wilson, "Fall From Grace: One Lie, Retold over 26 Years, Undoes a Professor's Teaching Career." CHRON. HIGHER EDUC., April 4, 2003 at A-10.

⁶ Welch Suggs, "Lessons Unlearned: Colleges and Athletic Officials Cope with Falsehoods on Resumes and in Biographies." CHRON. HIGHER EDUC., July 5, 2002 at A-37.

⁷ Scott Smallwood, "The Price of Murder," CHRON. HIGHER EDUC., September 12, 2003 at A-8.

⁸ David Kelly, "How Well Do You Know Your Workforce?" HR WIRE, October 8, 2001.

⁹ Merry Mayer, "Background Checks in Focus," 47 HR MAGAZINE, January 2002, <http://www.shrm.org/hrmagazine/articles/0102/0102agn-employment.asp>.

¹⁰ For an overview of the criminal background checks and sex offender background checks, see Paul G. Lannon and Maura J. Gerhart, "Campus Security: Keeping the Bad Ones Out and the Good Ones Safe." NACUA Annual Conference Outline, June 2005, available at www.nacua.org.

Some states have enacted laws requiring background checks for certain employees, such as schoolteachers, day care workers, nurses, or other individuals who work with children, disabled individuals, or others who cannot care for themselves.¹¹ Many nonprofit organizations have implemented background checks for volunteers who work with youth.¹²

Although individuals have challenged employers' use of background checks, including fingerprinting, under Constitutional¹³ and common law¹⁴ theories, courts have upheld the use of background checks, as long as appropriate notice of the background check was given to the individual. A number of colleges and universities, including James Madison University (Virginia), the California State University system, the University of Arizona, the University of Montana, Frostburg State University (Maryland), and Rowan University (New Jersey), conduct criminal background checks on either all employees, or on non-faculty employees. Pennsylvania State University initiated background checks for all new employees, including faculty, after a revelation

¹¹ See, e.g., Arkansas Nurses Practice Act, Ark. Code Ann. §17-87-312, "Criminal Background Checks," which requires background checks for first time applicants for a nursing license, and Cal Ed Code § 44332.6 (2005), which requires a background check prior to issuance of a temporary certificate to work in an elementary or secondary school. See also N.J. Stat. Ann. 15A:31A (West 2005), which requires organizations "serving youth" to conduct background checks of both employees and volunteers.

¹² Stephanie Strom, "Groups Expanding Background Checks," NEW YORK TIMES, August 4, 2005, at A-12.

¹³ *DeVeau v. Braisted*, 363 U.S. 144 (1960), discussed in Catherine L. Donohue, "Review of Selected 1997 California Legislation: School Safety: Brutal Slaying Prompts Creation of Employee Criminal Background Check Prior to Employment." 29 MCGEORGE L. REV. 729 (1998). See also *Henry v. Earhart*, 553 A.2d 124 (R.I. 1989) (court rejected Constitutional challenge to mandatory fingerprinting and background checks of schoolteachers. For a discussion of the constitutionality of fingerprinting, see Christina Buschmann, "Mandatory Fingerprinting of Public School Teachers: Facilitating Background Checks or Infringing on Individuals' Constitutional Rights?" 11 WM. & MARY BILL OF RTS. J. 1273 (2003).

¹⁴ See, e.g., *Barr v. Great Falls International Airport Authority*, 107 P.3d 471 (Mont. 2005).

that a probationary faculty member, who was a popular teacher, had committed murder over 20 years earlier.¹⁵

This article addresses fraudulent credentials and the use of background checks for faculty and staff positions at colleges and universities. After reviewing the relatively sparse litigation related to fraudulent credentials, the article discusses the various sources of legal liability for colleges and universities when either applicants or employees challenge the use or results of background checks, or when some third party alleges that the lack of a background check (or a defective background check) caused that individual some harm. The article also reviews employer defenses to legal challenges to discipline or discharge of employees, or for failure to hire, based upon the results of background checks. Finally, the article discusses legal and policy considerations in developing a policy for the use of background checks for employment decisions.¹⁶

Fraudulent Credentials

The problem of misrepresentation of academic degrees occurs in two ways. The individual may claim to have a degree that he or she did not earn, an action called “resume fraud.” Or the individual may have obtained a fraudulent degree from a “diploma mill,” an entity that sells diplomas and transcripts to individuals. Often these diploma mills have names that sound similar to actual colleges and universities, such as

¹⁵ Smallwood, *supra*, note 7.

¹⁶ Colleges and universities may also conduct background checks on applicants or students, particularly those who will be placed in clinical settings such as hospitals or public schools. Conducting background checks on students may raise issues under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, 20 U.S.C. §1232g (FERPA). Legal issues related to background checks on students are beyond the scope of this article.

“Columbia State University”¹⁷ or “the University of Berkeley.”¹⁸ Attempting to use a fake degree is apparently not a crime in most states,¹⁹ which means that applicants may risk job loss but not jail time if they lie on applications or use diploma mill degrees to obtain a job or a promotion.

The scope of the problem is substantial. Since 1999, a variety of college administrators, athletics coaches, and faculty have been found to have falsified or exaggerated their academic credentials. The former president of Albright College (Pennsylvania) resigned after it was discovered that fellowships and board memberships that he had listed on his resume were fabrications,²⁰ and the president of Quincy University (Illinois) resigned after the trustees discovered that he had not earned two master’s degrees that he had listed on his resume.²¹ Quincy Troupe, a professor at the University of California at San Diego, retired after it was discovered that he did not have the bachelor’s degree that he claimed.²² The inaccuracy was discovered when Troupe was named as California’s poet laureate.²³ The former associate director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory resigned when it was discovered that he had not earned a

¹⁷ “UCLA Soccer Coach Concedes that Degree Came from Diploma Mill.” CHRON. HIGHER EDUC. February 8, 2002 at A-39.

¹⁸ *Supra*, note 2.

¹⁹ Both North Dakota and Oregon have enacted laws that make the use of a fake degree to attempt to obtain a job a misdemeanor. Individuals found guilty may be fined up to \$1,000 and spend one year in jail. Will Potter. “States Try to Crack Down on Diploma Mills.” CHRON. HIGHER EDUC., December 19, 2003 at A-26. And federal employees who misrepresent their educational credentials may be prosecuted under 18 U.S.C. §1001, which provides for a fine of up to \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than five years, or both, for making a “false, fictitious or fraudulent misrepresentation” to a federal agency.

²⁰ Julianne Basinger, “4 Years After a Scandal, a President Steps Down.” CHRON. HIGHER EDUC., March 5, 2004 at A-23.

²¹ Lindsay Bosslett, “President Quits after Resume is Questioned.” CHRON. HIGHER EDUC., November 8, 2002 at A-29.

²² *Id.*

²³ Elizabeth F. Farrell. “California’s Poet Laureate Admits to Lie on Resume.” CHRON. HIGHER EDUC., November 15, 2002 at A-15.

Ph.D. in applied physics from Princeton, as his superiors believed that he had.²⁴ And several athletics officials were either dismissed or withdrew from new positions after it was discovered that they had not earned graduate degrees that they claimed on their resumes,²⁵ or their degrees were from diploma mills rather than accredited institutions.²⁶

Litigation involving resume fraud typically arises when an employer discharges an employee for falsifying his or her educational background on an employment application. And although one court asserted that misrepresenting one's educational attainment is not illegal,²⁷ judges have been unsympathetic to employees who have challenged discharges linked to resume fraud.

Many such challenges involve claims that the discharge was motivated by discrimination rather than by the employee's misrepresentation. For example, in *Williams v. Boorstin*,²⁸ the former employee had claimed several educational credentials, including a law degree from Georgetown University, which he had not earned, in order to secure a position as a copyright examiner at the Library of Congress. The court rejected the plaintiff's claim of race discrimination and retaliation, ruling that the plaintiff's "formidable record of lying" to the employer clearly justified his discharge. In other cases, plaintiffs have challenged their discharges on the grounds of retaliation for claims of sexual harassment. In *Fishel v. Farley*,²⁹ a woman who misrepresented her educational credentials on her employment application was discharged for the falsification after she made a sexual harassment complaint. She sued the employer for

²⁴ Robin Wilson, "Lab Official Resigns Over Lack of a Ph.D." CHRON. HIGHER EDUC., September 17, 1999 at A-18.

²⁵ Welch Suggs, "Athletic Director Caught in 2002 Resume Scandal Gets a Second Chance," CHRON. HIGHER EDUC. May 7, 2004 at A-41.

²⁶ *Supra*, note 17.

²⁷ *Greenhouse v. MCG Capital Corp.*, 392 F.3d 650 (4th Cir. 2004).

²⁸ 663 F.2d 109 (D.C. Cir. 1980).

²⁹ 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1315 (E.D. La., February 8, 1994).

harassment, but lost both that claim and the claim that her termination was retaliatory. The court found that the employer had responded promptly and appropriately to her harassment claim, and that the falsification was ample grounds for discharge. Similarly, in *Rizzo v. Sheahan*,³⁰ a police officer who falsely claimed that she had earned a General Equivalency Diploma, and who submitted fraudulent documentation of such credential, was discharged after filing a sexual harassment complaint. The investigation of her fraudulent documentation had occurred prior to her filing the harassment complaint, and the court ruled that the employer had discharged her for just cause.

Employees may bring constitutional claims when challenging a discharge based upon resume fraud. In *Barszcz v. Board of Trustees of Community College District No. 504*,³¹ a professor at Triton College stated on his application that he would receive his master's degree in economics a few months later. He did not receive the degree, and did not inform college officials. He was tenured three years later. According to the court, he "wore a masters gown at several graduation ceremonies and accepted a salary consistent with that earned by Triton College teachers possessing master's degrees."³² Furthermore, the college catalog listed him as holding a master's degree. The college decided to terminate him without a hearing, but allowed him to continue to teach until the end of the semester, and then provided a full evidentiary hearing. The professor claimed that his termination violated the fourteenth amendment's Due Process Clause, but the court disagreed, saying that the post-termination hearing satisfied constitutional dictates.

Misrepresenting one's educational credentials may not only lead to termination, but may make the individual ineligible for any severance benefits to which he or she

³⁰ 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7159 (N.D. Ill., May 22, 2000).

³¹ 400 F. Supp. 675 (N.D. Ill. 1975).

³² *Id.* at 677.

otherwise would have been entitled. In *Moos v. Square D Co.*,³³ the plaintiff had given an altered college transcript to the employer at the time he was hired, stating that he had earned a college degree (which he had not), and raising the grades he had received in seven classes. When a change of management occurred and the plaintiff was selected to be laid off, he again submitted the altered transcript in order to claim certain severance benefits. When the employer discovered the misrepresentation, the plaintiff was discharged. The plaintiff filed a lawsuit under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act,³⁴ claiming that the benefit plan administrator's refusal to award him benefits violated the Act. The trial court awarded summary judgment to the employer, and the appellate court affirmed, saying that the plan administrator had the discretion to determine that the plaintiff's multiple misrepresentations concerning his credentials disqualified him from receiving the benefits.

Similarly, misrepresenting one's educational credentials may make one ineligible for unemployment compensation once a job is lost. In *Denberg v. Loretto Heights College*,³⁵ the plaintiff, who had worked as a part-time instructor at the college, applied for a full-time position. In order to be hired for the position, he was required to provide transcripts for the degrees he claimed to have earned. The plaintiff submitted forged transcripts which stated that he had earned a Ph.D. from New York University, an M.A. from the University of New Mexico, and a B.A. from Hunter College. In truth, the plaintiff had earned no college degrees at all. Although the plaintiff informed his supervisor approximately four weeks after he had begun teaching of his misrepresentations, the supervisor did not inform the assistant dean of the problem until

³³ 72 F.3d 39 (6th Cir. 1995).

³⁴ 29 U.S.C. §1001 et seq.

³⁵ 694 P.2d 375 (Colo. Ct. App. 1984).

four months later. When the assistant dean verified the misrepresentation, the plaintiff was fired.

The plaintiff applied for unemployment benefits, arguing that the discharge was without merit. Because the plaintiff's teaching had been rated as satisfactory, he claimed that the degrees he claimed were immaterial to the job requirements. He also claimed that the college's four month tolerance of his misrepresentation waived its right to terminate him. The court rejected both claims, ruling that possessing earned graduate degrees is an appropriate requirement for a faculty position, and that the college's accreditation status could have been threatened had it retained a full-time professor who had never earned a college degree. The court upheld the denial of unemployment benefits.³⁶

When an employee deceives the employer about his or her educational credentials, the employer may face legal liability from third parties. For example, in *The University of North Carolina v. Shoemate and Staton*,³⁷ a resident at the university's hospital was hired after he presented forged documents supporting misrepresentations about his educational credentials. The resident treated patients at the hospital for over a year before the misrepresentation was discovered. A patient whom the resident had treated filed a malpractice action against the resident and the hospital, but the hospital refused to provide malpractice coverage for the resident, stating that his employment contract was obtained by fraud and thus was void. Although the trial court ruled for the hospital, the appellate court reversed, stating that the resident was the hospital's agent

³⁶ For a case brought by a security guard who was terminated when it was discovered that he had claimed a college degree that he had not earned, see *Miller v. Delaware State University and Unemployment Insurance Appeal Board*, 1994 Del. Super. LEXIS 312 (Super. Ct. Del., Sussex, May 18, 1994).

³⁷ 437 S.E.2d 892 (N.C. Ct. App. 1994).

and thus the hospital was obligated to provide malpractice coverage for him, despite his fraud, and irrespective of whether a valid employment contract existed.

Similarly, a construction consulting firm lost its motion for summary judgment when one of its clients sued the firm for losses it sustained, which it blamed on the defendant firm's employee. That employee had claimed credentials that he did not possess; he had testified at an arbitration hearing on behalf of the client, and his misrepresentations had been discovered at that time. The client argued that this revelation caused it to lose the arbitration and a large sum of money. The plaintiff client sued the individual's employer for negligence, fraud, and breach of contract. The court refused to award summary judgment to the defendant employer, stating that there was evidence that the client had relied upon the employer's representations concerning the employee's credentials, and thus a trial was necessary.³⁸

A case involving an employee protected by civil service regulations demonstrates the importance of prompt verification of an employee's educational credentials. In *Bond v. Dept. of Rehab. & Corrections*,³⁹ the plaintiff applied for a position as business administrator at the Mansfield Correctional Institution. He claimed to have an MBA from Ashland College, which he had not earned. The plaintiff was hired and worked for four years before the misrepresentation was discovered. When the prison warden discovered the fraud, he discharged the plaintiff. The State Personnel Board of Review upheld the discharge, and the trial court to which the plaintiff appealed affirmed the board's decision. The appellate court reversed, citing the provisions of the state's administrative code requiring any discipline to be initiated no later than two years after its

³⁸ *Wartsila NSD North America, Inc. v. Hill International, Inc.*, 342 F. Supp. 2d 267 (D.N.J. 2004).

³⁹ 1999 Ohio App. LEXIS 6288 (Ohio Ct. App. 1999).

occurrence.⁴⁰ Since the falsification occurred four years before the plaintiff's discharge, said the court, the prison was barred by the regulation, which acted as a statute of limitations, from disciplining the plaintiff for his fraud. Furthermore, said the court, had the prison followed the state's rules concerning the verification of educational credentials for employees, the fraud would have been discovered in time to discharge the plaintiff properly.

As the cases discussed above demonstrate, employees usually (but not always) lose challenges to discharges that occur when resume fraud or a fraudulent credential is discovered. The cases also demonstrate that the employee's fraud may involve the employer in legal claims of third parties in addition to litigation over the discharge. Therefore, the cases provide substantial justification for the wisdom of checking employees' credentials before hiring them.

Legal Considerations in Using Background Checks⁴¹

Statutory requirements. Federal law⁴² and the laws of several states⁴³ regulate how background checks are conducted and the type of information to which the subject of the background check is entitled. The federal Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) regulates the use of "consumer reports," defined as a report about an individual's

⁴⁰ O.A.C. 124-3-04.

⁴¹ For a discussion of the legal constraints on various types of background checks, *see* Matthew W. Finkin, *Privacy in Employment Law*, 2d ed. (Bureau of National Affairs, 2003), 173-192.

⁴² Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), 15 U.S.C. §1681 *et seq.* The FCRA is enforced by the Federal Trade Commission.

⁴³ States with laws regulating background check reports for employment include Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and Washington. *See, e.g.*, The California Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act (CCRA), California Civil Code §§1875.1 *et seq.* and the California Investigative Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act (ICRA), California Civil Code §§1786 *et seq.*

personal and credit characteristics, character, general reputation, and lifestyle.⁴⁴ If the employer conducts its own background check without the use of an external agent, then the FCRA does not apply. If, however, the employer uses an outside credit reporting or investigative service to perform the background check,⁴⁵ the FCRA requires that certain steps be taken.

1. The employer must notify the job candidate in writing, “in a document that consists solely of the disclosure,” that a consumer report may be used to make a hiring decision;⁴⁶
2. The employer must obtain the candidate’s written authorization to obtain a consumer report from an external agent;⁴⁷
3. If the employer relies on the consumer report to make a negative hiring or other employment decision, the employer must, prior to making the decision, give the candidate a “pre-adverse action disclosure,” a copy of the consumer report, and a copy of “A Summary of Your Rights Under the Fair Credit Reporting Act,” which the consumer reporting agency is required to provide along with the consumer report.⁴⁸
4. After the employer has made a negative employment decision, the employer must give the candidate notice of the negative action in oral, written or electronic form. The notice must include the name, address, and telephone

⁴⁴ 15 U.S.C. §1681a(d)(1).

⁴⁵ According to a report published by the Bureau of National Affairs, “most employers that want to conduct criminal history checks on their workers and job applicants use third-party consumer reporting agencies.” Eric Lekus, “Privacy Rights: Using FBI Databases for Hiring Purposes Raises Many Issues, Commentators Tell DOJ.” WORKPLACE LAW REPORT, Vol. 3, No. 40 (October 14, 2005), p. 1364, available at <http://pubs.bna.com/ip/BNA/whl.nsf/is/a0b1p5k6d3>.

⁴⁶ 15 U.S.C. §1681b(b)(2)(A)(i).

⁴⁷ 15 U.S.C. §1681(b)(b)(2)(A)(ii).

⁴⁸ 15 U.S.C. §1681(b)(b)(3)(A).

number of the consumer reporting agency that supplied the consumer report, a statement that the consumer reporting agency did not make the negative employment decision, and a notice of the candidate's right to dispute the accuracy or completeness of the information provided by the consumer reporting agency, as well as notice of the candidate's right to obtain a free consumer report from the agency within 60 days.⁴⁹

The employer will also be required to certify to the consumer reporting agency that the employer will not misuse any information in the report in a manner that would violate federal or state equal employment opportunity laws or regulations.⁵⁰

International background checks may require compliance with the laws of other countries or aggregations of countries. For example, the European Union's Directive on Data Protection regulates the transfer of personally-identifiable data to countries whose laws regarding data privacy do not meet the standards of the EU's Directive.⁵¹ The U.S. Department of Commerce, in collaboration with the European Commission, has developed a "Safe Harbor" framework.⁵² Employers certifying that they comply with this framework will be added to a "Safe Harbor List" and will be permitted to receive personal data from countries that are members of the European Union.

Lawsuits by applicants or current employees. As noted above, individuals who have been rejected for employment as a result of background checks, or whose

⁴⁹ 15 U.S.C. §1681(b)(3)(B)(i).

⁵⁰ 15 U.S.C. §1681(b)(1)(A).

⁵¹ "On the Protection of Individuals With Regard to the Processing of Personal Data and on the Free Movement of Such Data," Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, October 24, 1995.

⁵² "Export Portal," U.S. Department of Commerce, <http://www.export.gov/safeharbor/> (visited October 4, 2005). For a series of recommendations concerning international background checks, see Jason Morris, Nick Fishman, and Robert Thompson, "Tips for Conducting International Background Checks," SHRM Global Forum, June 2005, http://www.shrm.org/global/library_published/subject/nonIC/CMS_012943.asp (visited 10/4/05).

employment has been terminated after a background check was done, have challenged their use under tort and discrimination theories. Tort claims include defamation, negligence in obtaining or using the report, and invasion of privacy. Discrimination claims typically involve allegations of race discrimination. Although there have been few legal challenges to the use of background checks, litigation against nonacademic employers is instructive in analyzing how courts respond to plaintiffs' claims with respect to the use of background checks.

Employers should use care in communicating the results of a background check to co-workers or others who do not have a business need to know the information, particularly if it indicates prior criminal convictions. In *McClesky v. The Home Depot, Inc.*,⁵³ an employee sued his former employer for defamation and negligence. McClesky was terminated from his position at a Home Depot store for falsification of his employment application. Although the employee had claimed on his employment application that he had not been convicted of a criminal offense in the past five years, a background check revealed that he had used an alias and had, indeed, been convicted of a variety of felonies during the five year period. McClesky took exception to the fact that three individuals were present at a meeting at which he was told that he was dismissed for falsification of his employment application; he also claimed that the information in the background check was false. The court noted that the three employees present at the meeting were the store manager, an assistant manager, and a loss prevention specialist, all of whom had a business reason to be present and to know the reason for McClesky's discharge. The court determined that a fourth individual, who was told later that

⁵³ 612 S.E. 2d 617 (Ga. Ct. App. 2005), *cert. denied*, 2005 Ga. LEXIS 464 (Ga, June 30, 2005).

McClesky had been convicted of child molestation, also had a business need to know because he was a co-worker and McClesky's sudden departure had a significant impact on his workload. This communication was made in a private room, and the co-worker was told that the information was confidential. Despite the fact that this court shielded the employer from liability, a more prudent employer would have simply told the co-worker that McClesky had been terminated for cause, without elaborating on the reasons.

McClesky had signed a waiver at the time he applied for employment that "release[d] Home Depot and/or its agents and any person or entity, which provides information pursuant to this authorization, from any and all liabilities, claims or lawsuits in regard to the information obtained from any and all of the above referenced sources used".⁵⁴ McClesky argued that the court should not enforce the release because the employer was grossly negligent and acted with malice. The trial court awarded summary judgment to the employer, and the state court of appeals affirmed, ruling that the employer's behavior did not meet the standard for gross negligence or malice, and that the communication with the co-worker was privileged.⁵⁵

Similarly, a part-time security officer at the Great Falls International Airport who was dismissed when a background check revealed an arrest for criminal non support was unable to get his case before a jury. In *Barr v. Great Falls International Airport*

⁵⁴*Id.* at 618.

⁵⁵ Communications subject to a privilege will not create liability on the part of the communicator. In this case, the court, although not specifying the type of privilege, appeared to refer to the "common interest" privilege, as described in Section 596 of the Restatement (Second) of Torts. The court cited *Jones v. J.C. Penney Co.*, 297 S.E. 2d 339 (Ga. App. 1982), noting that "a qualified privilege also exists in those cases involving an employer's disclosure of the reasons concerning an employee discharge to fellow employees 'where the disclosure is limited to those employees who have a need to know by virtue of the nature of their duties (such as supervisors, management officials, ... etc.) and those employees who are otherwise directly affected ... by the discharged employee's termination.'" (quoting *Jones* at 340).

Authority,⁵⁶ Barr, the plaintiff, alleged a variety of tort claims, including invasion of privacy, negligence and negligence per se, and civil rights claims. He also alleged that the employer breached the federal Privacy Act,⁵⁷ which protects the privacy of confidential criminal information, as well as violations of state law regarding the treatment of confidential criminal information.

The court ruled that Barr's arrest was public information, and thus federal and state privacy laws regarding confidential criminal information did not apply. With respect to Barr's common law breach of privacy claim, the court ruled that Barr had no expectation of privacy in a public arrest record, even one that was thirty years old. And with respect to his negligence claim, the court ruled that the employer had no duty to limit disclosure of Barr's arrest, since it was public information.

The court in *Barr* did not discuss the lawfulness of using arrest records, in cases in which no conviction ensued, to deny an individual employment or to dismiss an individual. In Barr's case, the fact that he was a security officer could justify the use of arrest records even if no conviction ensued. For most positions, however, both federal and state law generally forbid the use of arrest records alone unless the position is one involving public safety, such as in *Barr*. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has taken the position that the use of arrest records, when there has been no conviction, has a disparate impact on non-whites, who tend to be arrested, but not convicted, at a rate higher than that of white individuals.⁵⁸ The federal courts have

⁵⁶ 107 P.3d 471 (Mont. 2005).

⁵⁷ National Crime Prevention Policy Compact (the Privacy Act), 5 U.S.C. §552(a).

⁵⁸ For a discussion of EEOC cases prohibiting the use of arrest records as potentially discriminatory, see Barbara Lindemann Schlei and Paul Grossman, *Employment Discrimination Law*, 2d ed. (1983 and

agreed.⁵⁹ The laws of some states forbid using arrest records, rather than records of convictions, to deny an individual employment.⁶⁰ For example, Massachusetts law prohibits employers from inquiring into an applicant's arrests or detentions in situations where no conviction resulted, as well as first convictions for drunkenness, simple assault, speeding, minor traffic violations, or disturbing the peace.⁶¹ Furthermore, under Massachusetts law, a sealed record is treated as though the individual had no criminal record.⁶²

Lawsuits by third parties. In addition to lawsuits by applicants or employees challenging the use of background checks, employers face the possibility of lawsuits brought by individuals who claim to have been harmed by an employee, and assert that had the employer conducted a reasonable background check, the harm would not have occurred. The most frequent legal claim is that of negligent hiring, in which a party physically or financially harmed by an employee sues the employer; claims of negligent retention or supervision often accompany negligent hiring claims. Under these tort theories, the employer may be held directly liable for its failure to use reasonable care in hiring an individual that the employer knew, or should have known, was unfit for the

periodic supplements) at 175. *See also* Comment, "Arrest Records as a Racially Discriminatory Employment Criterion," 6 *Harv. C.F.-C.L. Rev.* 165 (1970).

⁵⁹ *See, for example, Gregory v. Litton Systems, Inc.*, 316 F. Supp. 401 (C.D. Cal. 1970), *modified on other grounds*, 472 F.2d 631 (9th Cir. 1971).

⁶⁰ *See, e.g.*, CAL. LAB. CODE §432.7 (2005); R.I. GEN. LAWS §28-5-7 (2005). *See also* Steven C. Bednar, "Employment Law Dilemmas: What to Do When the Law Forbids Compliance," 12 *BYU J. Pub. L.* 175 (1997).

⁶¹ Mass. General Laws, c. 151B, §4(9).

⁶² Mass. General Laws, c. 276, §100A. *See also* COLO. REV. STAT. §24-72-308(f) (2005); VA. CODE ANN. §19.2-392.4 (2005). For a review of state laws limiting the use of prior criminal activity in evaluating an applicant for employment, *see* Wendell V. Courtney and Matathew T. Rogers, "Checking New Hires at the Door: Criminal and Other Background Check Issues," Presentation at Annual Conference of the National Association of College and University Attorneys, June 26-20, 2005.

position.⁶³ The tort of negligent hiring differs from the doctrine of *respondeat superior*⁶⁴ in that the employer may be found liable for the tortious behavior of its employee even if the employee is not acting within the scope of his or her employment, while a plaintiff must demonstrate that the employee was acting within the scope of his or her job in order to prevail under a *respondeat superior* theory.⁶⁵ Because the injuries to individuals in these cases are typically not considered to be within the scope of the injuring party's employment, victims of physical violence or fraud tend to bring negligence claims instead.

Although negligent hiring cases are very fact-sensitive, and thus difficult to characterize in a general way, plaintiffs in such cases typically assert that the employer has breached a duty not to expose one or more third parties to a dangerous or incompetent employee. The plaintiff alleges that the employer breached this duty by not exercising reasonable care in hiring the employee, either because the employer did not conduct a background check or because the background check was incomplete or inadequate. The plaintiff must also prove that the harm incurred was proximately caused by the employer's decision to hire the employee (sometimes referred to as the "nexus").

In *Blair v. Defender Services, Inc.*,⁶⁶ a college student was assaulted by a custodian who was employed by a janitorial service pursuant to a contract between it and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The student sued the janitorial service for negligent hiring, negligent supervision, and negligent retention. The contract

⁶³ For a discussion of the negligent hiring doctrine, see Michael A. Gamboli, "Negligent Hiring—Caveat Employer." 44 RI Bar Jnl. 13 (1995).

⁶⁴ For a discussion of *respondeat superior*, or vicarious liability, see William J. Prosser, LAW OF TORTS, 4TH ed., 458-467.

⁶⁵ Id. at 13, citing *DiCosala v. Kay, et al.*, 450 A.2d 508 (N.J. 1982).

⁶⁶ 386 F.3d 623 (4th Cir. 2004).

required the janitorial service to perform background checks on all of its employees assigned to work at the University. The employer had not performed a background check on the assailant, against whom a protective order had been issued in a nearby county for a similar assault on a woman. Had the janitorial service conducted the required background check, it would have discovered the protective order. The student sued the janitorial service, but not the university. Although the trial court had awarded summary judgment to the janitorial service on the plaintiff's claims of negligent hiring, supervision, and retention, the appellate court reversed the award with respect to the negligent hiring and retention claims. Because the university, not the janitorial service, was contractually responsible for supervising the custodian, summary judgment on the negligent supervision claim was affirmed. Similarly, in *Doe v. Garcia*,⁶⁷ a state supreme court reversed a summary judgment award for a medical center. The court ruled that the medical center, which had not conducted a reference check before hiring a hospital employee who later assaulted a patient, could be held liable for negligent hiring; the assailant had been terminated from his previous job for the same misconduct.

A community college that failed to conduct a background check on an instructor was found liable to a student he injured. In *Harrington v. La. State Bd. of Elementary & Secondary Educ.*, a student enrolled in a culinary apprenticeship program at Delgado College sued the instructor (who was the program director) and the college's trustees for vicarious liability and negligent hiring, after the instructor raped her. The instructor had a criminal record for drug violations and theft, and, although the college had checked the validity of his educational credentials, the college had not conducted a background check

⁶⁷ 961 P.2d 1181 (Id. 1998).

⁶⁸ 714 So.2d 845 (La. App. 4 Cir. 1998), *writ denied*, 728 So. 2d 1287 (La. 1998).

before hiring him. The trial court had awarded summary judgment to the school board, asserting that the rape had not occurred in the course of the instructor's employment, as he had taken the student to the home of a friend who owned a restaurant. The appellate court reversed, ruling that the instructor-student relationship was in effect at the time of the rape, and therefore both the instructor and the school board were liable.

Cases involving physical assaults by individuals who have access to homes provide useful examples of the use of the negligent hiring theory. For example, in *Elliott v. Williams*,⁶⁹ a state appellate court reversed an award of summary judgment against a plaintiff who had been assaulted in her apartment by a security guard employed by the defendant landlord. The employer had not performed a background check prior to hiring the guard; had it done so, it would have discovered that the guard had a criminal record. Although the defendant argued that the plaintiff's action of admitting the security guard to her apartment was the proximate cause of her injury, the court ruled that a jury could find that she relied on his position as a security guard to justify admitting him, and that the employer's act of hiring the security guard could be found to be the proximate cause of her injury. In a similar case, *Keibler v. Cramer*,⁷⁰ a trial court found that the employer had a duty to perform a reasonable background check on an employee hired to read gas meters, and that punitive damages could be awarded because the employer's failure to perform a background check could be deemed outrageous.⁷¹ Failure to perform a background check for a position involving access to school-age children has persuaded

⁶⁹ 807 N.E. 2d 506 (Ill. Ct. App. 2004). See also *Ponticas v. K.M.S. Investments*, 331 N.W. 2d 907 (Minn. 1983).

⁷⁰ 36 Pa. D. & C.4th 193 (May 26, 1998).

⁷¹ *Id.* at 200.

judges to allow negligent hiring cases to go to a jury.⁷² Background checks that are “cursory” and incomplete may also expose an employer to liability for negligent hiring.⁷³ The scope of a background check that may be suitable for a simple job that is subject to close supervision is different from the scope of a background check for an individual who is given substantial responsibility, access to vulnerable people or to money, or who has access to individuals’ homes because of his or her job responsibilities.⁷⁴

On the other hand, if the background check reveals no criminal record, or provides information that is not relevant to the job the subject is being considered for, the employer may avoid liability for negligent hiring. For example, in *Reed v. Kelly*,⁷⁵ a woman who was sexually touched by a security guard sued his employer for negligent hiring. Although the employer had not conducted a background check, the court ruled that there was no nexus between the assailant’s prior misconduct (slapping his wife and a fistfight with a coworker) and the harm done to the plaintiff. Even though the employer admitted that it would not have hired the security guard had it known about the prior misconduct, the court affirmed summary judgment for the employer on the negligent hiring claim.

⁷² See, for example, *Mueller v. Community Consolidated School District 54*, 678 N.E. 2d 660 (Ill. App. Ct. 1997). See also *T.W. et al. v. City of New York*, 729 N.Y.S.2d 96 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. App. 2001) and *Harrington v. La. State Bd. Of Elementary & Secondary Education*, 714 So. 2d 845 (Lap. App. 4th Cir. 1998).

⁷³ See, for example, *Welsh Manufacturing v. Pinkerton’s, Inc.*, 474 A.2d 436 (R.I. 1984). See also *Wise and Wise v. Complete Staffing Services*, 56 S.W.3d 900 (Tex. Ct. App. 2001).

⁷⁴ See, for example, *Saine v. Comcast Cablevision of Arkansas, Inc.*, 126 S.W. 3d 339 (Ark. 2003)(cable installer assaulted and attempted to murder homeowner while performing his job in her house; background check performed by employer found no information to suggest he had a predisposition to violence. Summary judgment for employer affirmed). See also *Spencer v. Health Force, Inc.*, 107 P.3d 504 (N.M. 2005)(summary judgment for employer reversed; failure to conduct criminal background check for home health care worker could constitute negligent hiring).

⁷⁵ 37 S.W. 3d 274 (Mo. Ct. A pp. 2000).

Similarly, in *Browne v. SCR Medical Transportation*,⁷⁶ an employer that did a background check that revealed no criminal convictions could not be liable for negligent hiring of a bus driver who assaulted a developmentally disabled individual. Although the driver had a number of arrests for crimes, he had no record of convictions. The plaintiff argued that the criminal record check using the assailant's name was insufficient, and that his fingerprints should have been submitted for a more thorough background check. The appellate court affirmed summary judgment for the defendant employer because, since the individual had not been convicted of any crimes, even a fingerprint background check would not have revealed relevant information. And in *Southeast Apartments Management, Inc. v. Jackman*,⁷⁷ a tenant suing her landlord for negligent hiring did not prevail because the court determined that the landlord had conducted an appropriate reference check on the maintenance supervisor who had attacked the tenant. The employer had collected detailed information on the applicant's background and had spoken with two former supervisors; none of the information gathered by the employer would have put the employer on notice that the employee would attack a tenant.

Courts rejecting negligent hiring claims also have done so on the basis that the information collected in the background check did not make actual harm done to the plaintiff foreseeable. For example, in *Moricle v. Pilkington*,⁷⁸ a homeowner whose diamond bracelet was stolen by an employee of a plumbing service who was working at her home sued the service for negligent hiring, arguing that the employer should have performed a criminal background check on the employee who stole the bracelet. The

⁷⁶ 826 N.E.2d 1030 (Ill. Ct. App. 2005).

⁷⁷ 513 S.E.2d 395 (Va. 1999).

⁷⁸ 462 S.E.2d 531 (N.C. Ct. App. 1995).

court disagreed, noting that the employer had conducted a reference check with the employee's previous employer, and that no information related to the employee's dishonesty had been communicated. Similarly, when a patient who was assaulted by a health care worker sued the employer for negligent hiring, an appellate court affirmed the trial court's award of summary judgment to the employer, noting that the employer had conducted a background check on the employee, and that the check had revealed no prior criminal activity.⁷⁹

In addition to negligent hiring claims, individuals injured by the actions of an employee have filed claims of negligent retention and/or negligent supervision. In *Saine v. Comcast Cablevision of Arkansas, Inc.*,⁸⁰ a plaintiff who was able to demonstrate that the employer was on notice that the employee had behaved in a sexually suggestive way to another customer was able to win reversal of a summary judgment ruling for the employer. The court noted that the possibility that the employer was on notice of this behavior suggested that the subsequent attack on the plaintiff was foreseeable, and ruled that her claims of negligent supervision and retention would need to be resolved by a jury. Similarly, in *T.W. v. City of New York*,⁸¹ the court reversed summary judgment for the employer on the issues of negligent retention and supervision. The court ruled that the employer knew that an employee who sexually assaulted a child had a criminal conviction, and that his position as a custodian at the Police Athletic League community center would involve interaction with numerous children. Given the employer's actual knowledge that the employee had a criminal conviction, said the court, it should have conducted a background check, which would have demonstrated that the employee had

⁷⁹ *Munroe v. Universal Health Services, Inc.*, 596 S.E.2d 604 (Ga. 2004).

⁸⁰ *Supra*, note 42.

⁸¹ *Supra*, note 40.

an extensive criminal record. But in *Reed v. Kelly*,⁸² the court affirmed summary judgment for the employer on the plaintiff's negligent retention and supervision claims on the grounds that the employee's prior misconduct did not put the employer on notice that the employee would engage in sexual touching and indecent exposure.

In a few cases, courts have refused to find employers liable for off-work conduct of employees. In *Guidry v. National Freight*,⁸³ a long-haul truck driver assaulted a woman while he was off duty. The court ruled that the employer had no duty to the victim, that its duty was to hire safe drivers, and that the assault was not foreseeable. Similarly, a court awarded summary judgment to the employer in a negligent hiring lawsuit against a security service whose employee took a car without permission and injured a passing motorist.⁸⁴ The employer had verified the employee's prior employment, also as a security guard, and a criminal background check had been completed. Neither inquiry indicated that the employee was likely to take a car without permission and to use it to harm another.

The litigation demonstrates that employers who conduct background checks on employees who have access to vulnerable individuals may very likely avoid liability when sued by individuals they refused to hire, or by individuals harmed by their employees. Courts are sensitive to the relationship between prior criminal conduct and the requirements of the particular job, and appear to be requiring that the type of injury was foreseeable before employers will be found liable for the crimes of their employees.

⁸² *Supra*, note 43.

⁸³ 944 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Ct. App. 1997).

⁸⁴ *Burnett v. C.B.A. Security Service, Inc.*, 820 P.2d 750 (Nev. 1991).

The after-acquired evidence doctrine. Although challenges by individuals either denied employment or dismissed from employment because of a negative background check are infrequent, such individuals may challenge the negative employment decision using discrimination theories rather than challenging the use of the background check itself. In such cases, if an employer discovers negative information about a job candidate or employee after the negative decision is made, the employer may be able to use the “after acquired evidence” doctrine to defend against a discrimination claim.

This doctrine was established by a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *McKennon v. Nashville Banner Publishing Co.*,⁸⁵ in which a woman who was laid off from her position during a reduction in force sued the employer for age discrimination. Prior to her separation from the company, she had photocopied confidential employer documents. When the employer learned that she had copied the confidential documents, it changed the layoff to a termination for cause, and argued that the misconduct precluded the plaintiff’s recovery for the alleged age discrimination. Although the trial court awarded summary judgment to the employer on that theory and the appellate court affirmed, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed, ruling that if the plaintiff could demonstrate that age was, in fact, the motive for her layoff, the plaintiff could prevail and could be awarded back pay damages up until the date on which the employer learned of the misconduct.

McKennon will not help an employer obtain a summary judgment ruling if an individual is able to marshal some evidence of discrimination. The case does, however, suggest that an employer who refused to hire a candidate, or who dismissed an employee, for subjective reasons that could suggest discrimination, but who later discovered resume

⁸⁵ 513 U.S. 352 (1995).

fraud or found criminal behavior as a result of a background check, could limit backpay liability.

The conflict between the privacy rights of job applicants and employees, on the one hand, and the potential for harm that may be borne by innocent third parties on the other, creates a dilemma for employers. It appears, however, that applicants or employees seldom challenge the results of background checks or an employer's decision based on a negative background check. And even though not all negligent hiring cases result in a victory for plaintiffs, the negative publicity and expense of litigating these claims is substantial. For these reasons, some colleges and universities have implemented background check policies for staff, and in some cases, for faculty as well.

Policy Considerations in Conducting Background Checks

Although risk management and public relations considerations, among others, suggest that conducting background checks on employees is a wise idea, the subject is controversial on campuses. Institutions considering adopting a background check policy will need to consider a variety of issues. Several of these issues are discussed below.

Which jobs will be included? Some colleges and universities conduct background check on candidates for all positions, including faculty positions. The scope of the background check may differ, depending on whether the position involves access to vulnerable populations, money, or institutional vehicles. For example, the University of Arizona policy includes “all temporary and regular appointed and classified new hires,” and requires the verification of “academic credentials, relevant licenses or

certifications, work history and job performance.”⁸⁶ James Madison University (Virginia) also conducts background checks on all employees, including criminal records checks for all full-time and part-time employees.⁸⁷ At other institutions, only applicants for selected positions that are safety- or security-sensitive are required to undergo background checks.⁸⁸ At still other institutions, all staff must undergo a background check before being hired, but faculty do not.⁸⁹ In addition to determining which applicants for employment should be subject to background checks, institutions should consider whether certain volunteers, such as unpaid athletics coaches, or individuals who volunteer at university hospitals, day care centers, or other units with vulnerable populations, should undergo background checks as well.

What kind of information should be collected? Another important issue to be resolved is the type of information to be collected about an applicant. It would seem to be important to verify any educational credential that the individual claims, but seeking other types of information may appear to raise larger privacy issues. Is a review of the individual’s criminal record necessary for all positions? Is a credit check necessary for those positions where the employee will not have access to institutional funds or personally-identifiable information? Should prior work history be verified, and an

⁸⁶ “Overview of University of Arizona Pre-Employment Screening and Background Checking Procedures,” available at http://www.hr.arizona.edu/02_sel/preEmpScreenOverview.php.

⁸⁷ “Policy 1321, Criminal History Investigation,” available at <http://www.jmu.edu/JMUpolicy/1321.shtml>.

⁸⁸ *See, for example*, “Employment Checking Procedures,” Oklahoma State University, available at http://www.nacua.org/documents/oklahomasu_bckgrndchk.htm. *See also* “Background Checks,” HR2005-10, Office of the Chancellor, California State University (March 1, 2005), available from the author. The California State University policy lists examples of positions for which a background check is required, including individuals who are responsible for the care, safety and security of people or property; individuals with access to financial information or cash, credit cards, or checks; individuals who can commit institutional funds; individuals who exercise control over the institution’s business processes (as well as those with access to business systems); individuals with access to personally identifiable information about students, faculty, staff or alumni; individuals with access to controlled substances; and individuals who possess master or sub-master keys to the institution’s buildings.

⁸⁹ *See, e.g.*, “Important Information for Final Candidates,” Rowan University (New Jersey) , available from the author.

evaluation of the individual's performance in prior jobs be made?⁹⁰ The answer to these questions may differ depending on the position, or the institution may decide to perform a criminal background and credit check on all applicants.

Who should conduct the background check? As noted above,⁹¹ employers who use an external "consumer reporting agency" to conduct background checks must comply with the Fair Credit Reporting Act. Although verification of degrees, checking employment references, and verifying prior work history can be done in-house, most states do not allow employers direct access to criminal records, and an external organization is frequently used to conduct these checks. Consumer credit agencies may be used to conduct credit checks of applicants or employees. In addition to the dictates of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, some states, such as California, require that an individual be notified that a background check is being performed, and given a copy of the ensuing report.⁹²

How should negative information be evaluated, and who should do the evaluation? Institutions conducting background checks need to develop criteria for evaluating any negative information that they receive about an applicant or current employee. How relevant is the information to the job that the individual is or will be doing? How long ago did any criminal or other misconduct occur? What was the nature of the offense? How old was the individual when the crime or other misconduct occurred? Can the individual be viewed as rehabilitated, or has subsequent misconduct

⁹⁰ Reference checking by a prospective employer may be difficult if the former employer refuses to divulge information beyond verifying the individual's length of service and job title. For a discussion of the legal issues in seeking and providing employment references, see Janet Swerdlow, Note: "Negligent Referral: A Potential Theory for Employer Liability." 64 S. CAL. L. REV. 1645 (1991).

⁹¹ See discussion of the Fair Credit Reporting Act in text accompanying notes 44-50.

⁹² See, for example, the laws discussed in note 43, *supra*.

occurred? If there have been arrests but no convictions, should these arrests be taken into consideration at all?

In addition to developing criteria for evaluating the results of a background check, institutions need to decide who will be authorized to review the information. For example, at James Madison University, the Human Resources Department receives the information and contacts the recruiting department if negative information is obtained. A decision to hire an applicant with a job-related conviction requires the approval of the vice president.⁹³ Given the confidential nature of much of the information that may be elicited by a background check, institutions should limit the number of individuals who have access to the information, and should develop policies to protect applicants from inappropriate or unnecessary disclosure of this information.

Special issues relating to faculty. Although faculty are among those individuals whose false credentials or prior criminal conduct have resulted in their discharge, and in embarrassment and, in some cases, legal liability for their institutions, many faculty are deeply suspicious of the use of background checks for applicants for faculty positions. Although the verification of an applicant's college degrees and prior work experience, as well as conversations with a candidate's current and former colleagues concerning the quality of that individual's teaching, service, and collegiality, are not an issue for most faculty,⁹⁴ many oppose the use of criminal background checks for faculty positions.⁹⁵

⁹³ *Supra*, note 87.

⁹⁴ The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has issued a report on background checks: "Verification and Trust: Background Investigations Preceding Faculty Appointment," available at <http://www.aaup.org/statements/REPORTS/background.htm>. The report approves of search committees making "thorough checks of a candidate's references and of interviewing a candidate's present and former colleagues . . . search committees also check educational credentials, prior employment, professional experience, and the like. No doubt such reference checks entail some compromise of the privacy of candidates, but it is justified in light of reasonable institutional needs." *Id.* at 2.

The AAUP report, although opposing criminal background checks for faculty positions, recommends that, if such policies are implemented, the provisions of the Fair Credit Reporting Act⁹⁶ be followed, whether the institution conducts its own background check or uses a third party. The report also recommends discarding all background check information except that relevant to the candidate who was hired. It also recommends that any inaccuracies in the report be corrected before the report is placed in the faculty member's personnel file, or segregated in a confidential file with limited access.

Other issues related to the use of background check information regarding faculty are the same as those discussed with respect to the use of such information for any employee.⁹⁷ In addition, institutions developing background check policies for faculty should consider the fact that, for most faculty hires, search committees are used to recruit, screen, and recommend candidates for faculty positions. Should the search committee verify candidates' degrees and former employment? Should a criminal background check be done? If so, how much and what kind of information should the search committee be given about the contents of the background check? And if search committee members are given background check information, what guidelines should the search committee be given to evaluate the relevance of certain criminal or civil legal records (such as a prior bankruptcy, previous drug offenses, etc.)?

⁹⁵ AAUP, *id.* Academic administrators may also oppose the use of criminal background checks for faculty on the grounds that such investigations might offend a sought-after candidate for an important faculty position. *See, e.g.,* Scott Smallwood, "Should Colleges Check up on Professors?" CHRON. HIGHER EDUC., September 12, 2003 at A-12 (President of Emory University quoted as saying "I believe they [the faculty] feel it would be an incursion on their privacy, and that they would argue convincingly that the checking done in the faculty-hiring process is so thorough that the risk is minimal" (*id.*). The University of Texas implemented a policy of background checks for new faculty hires, but rescinded it. On the other hand, the University of Montana conducts criminal background checks on all individuals offered a position, including faculty. *Id.*

⁹⁶ Fair Credit Reporting Act, *supra*, note 44.

⁹⁷ See text accompanying note 93.

With respect to candidates for faculty positions, the institution should consider the rights of the candidate as well as its own concerns. Will the candidate be given a copy of the information elicited during the background check? Will that individual be given an opportunity to challenge allegedly incorrect or misleading information, or to explain certain items in the report? Answers to all of these questions will differ depending upon state law limitations on the use of criminal background checks, institutional culture, and the institution's own history of problems with employees who had undisclosed criminal convictions or fraudulent credentials.

Conclusion

Faculty and administrators should consider the issue of using background checks carefully, in order to ascertain that individuals who claim to have earned degrees, to have a particular kind of work experience, and to be crime free are, in fact, who they say they are. Verifying this information is an important risk management strategy; it is also an important indicator of institutional accountability. Academic communities function, in many respects, on the basis of trust; verifying the veracity of applicants' background information helps ensure that that trust is earned.

