

Undergraduate Admission Process for Applicants with Criminal Records Survey

The following portion of the Executive Summary and the more detailed survey findings that follow were written by the Center for Community Alternatives (CCA) on a survey of AACRAO admissions professionals conducted by CCA in collaboration with AACRAO. While this survey report deals with undergraduate admissions and criminal records, another report about the admissions use of disciplinary (behavioral and academic) records from other schools will be forthcoming. In addition, the report on a smaller survey of graduate admissions professionals will be posted in July.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report reviews findings from a first-of-its-kind survey conducted by the Center for Community Alternatives in collaboration with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) that explores the use of criminal history screening in college admissions procedures. A 59-question survey was administered electronically between September 30 and October 29, 2009 through AACRAO's network of 3248 member institutions in the United States. In all, 273 institutions responded to the survey.

KEY FINDINGS

- A majority (66%) of the responding colleges collect criminal justice information, although not all of them consider it in their admissions process. Private schools and four-year schools are more likely to collect and use such information than their public and two-year counterparts.
- A sizable minority (38%) of the responding schools does not collect or use criminal justice information.
- Self-disclosure through the college application or in some cases the Common Application is the most common way that colleges and universities collect the information. A small minority of schools conduct criminal background checks on some applicants, usually through contracting with a private company.
- Most schools that collect and use criminal justice information have adopted additional steps in their admissions decision process, the most common of which is consulting with academic deans and campus security personnel. Special requirements such as submitting a letter of explanation or a letter from a corrections official and completing probation or parole are common.
- Less than half of the schools that collect and use criminal justice information have written policies in place, and only 40 percent train staff on how to interpret such information.
- A broad array of convictions are viewed as negative factors in the context of admissions decision-making, including drug and alcohol convictions, misdemeanor convictions, and youthful offender adjudications.
- If it is discovered that an applicant has failed to disclose a criminal record there is an increased likelihood that they will be denied admission or have their admission offer rescinded.
- A bare majority of schools that collect information provides support for admitted students who have criminal records, usually in the form of counseling or ongoing supervision.

The most common restriction placed on students with criminal records is exclusion from campus housing.

**FULFILLING THE DREAM PROJECT
SURVEY CONDUCTED IN PARTNERSHIP WITH AACRAO¹**

FINDINGS

Collecting Criminal Justice Data

Table 1: Having a Mechanism for the Collection of Criminal Justice Information From All Applicants Through the Application, by Sector and Level*

	Sector		Level		Total
	Public	Private	2-Year	4-Year	
% Having a mechanism for applicants to self-disclose a criminal record in the application	54.5	80.6*	40.0	74.0*	64.4
% Not having a mechanism for applicants to self-disclose in the application	45.5	19.4	60.0	26.0	35.6
N	154	93	70	177	247

* Source: Qs 1 and 2

Through a series of two questions, respondents were given the choice of responding that the application process either requires the disclosure of a criminal record (either by the use of the Common Application or by their own application) or makes such disclosure optional. Our definition of having a “mechanism” for the collection of criminal justice information consists of positive responses to both of these options. We have counted as having no mechanism (a) those schools that respond that they neither accept the Common Application nor ask the applicant about a criminal record in their own application or (b) those who respond that they require such disclosure only from students who are applying for a particular program.

Statistical tests of significance show that the existence of an application process that includes the possibility of self-disclosure for all applicants is significantly (denoted with an asterisk) associated with institutional sector and level.

Table 2: Having a Mechanism for the Collection of Criminal Justice Information by Any Means, by Sector and Level

Collection Practice*	Sector		Level		Total
	Public	Private	2-Year	4-Year	
% Having any mechanism (through self-disclosure or otherwise) to collect criminal justice information about all applicants	57.1	81.7*	45.7	74.6*	66.4
% Having a mechanism to collect this information					

¹ American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

only about some applicants	6.5	2.2	10.0	2.8*	4.9
% Having no mechanism to collect this information about any applicant	36.4	16.1*	44.3	22.6*	28.7
N	154	93	70	177	247

* Source: Qs 1, 2, 8

In Table 2, a mechanism for the collection of criminal justice information from all applicants is defined as either being the requirement of self-disclosure on the application or the institution's reporting that it conducts criminal background checks on all applicants. The collection of criminal justice information routinely for "some applicants only" mostly consists of cases in which the responding institution reported that they conduct a background check for qualifying or accepted applicants only or for applicants who apply to specific programs.

Statistical tests of significance show that institutional practices differ significantly by sector and by level. Private and four-year schools are significantly more likely to have a mechanism to collect information about applicants, either by virtue of the type of application used or the institution's policy regarding criminal background checks.

Table 3: Collection of Criminal Justice Information Through the Application or Through a Criminal Background Check, by Sector and Level

	Sector		Level		Total
	Public	Private	2-Year	4-Year	
% Reporting that they collect criminal justice information about all applicants*	51.3	69.9*	38.6	66.1*	58.3
% Reporting that they do not collect criminal justice information in any way	36.4	16.1*	44.3	22.6*	28.7
N	154	93	70	177	247

* Source: Qs 1, 2, 8

The first row of Table 3 shows the distribution of responding institutions that report that they actually obtain criminal history information about all applicants, either through the application itself (the Common Application or their own application) or by conducting a criminal background check on all applicants. Tests of significance show that there is a statistically significant difference in practices between levels and sectors and that private four-year schools are significantly more likely to collect criminal justice information about all applicants than are all other schools (83.1% v. 57.0).² Similarly, two-year public schools are significantly more likely to report that they do not collect criminal justice information in any way (43.9% v. 23.2%).

² Of the 144 schools that reported that they collect criminal justice information on each applicant, only ten (7%) reported that they gather that information through a criminal background check. The remaining schools all acquire this information through self-disclosure on the application form.

Table 4: Criminal Background Checks, by Sector and Level

	Sector		Level		Total
	Public	Private	2-Year	4-Year	
% That conduct criminal background checks on any applicants (source: Q.7)	19.3	14.1	20.9	16.0	17.4
% That conduct criminal background checks on any applicants (source: Q.8)	16.9	12.9	17.1	14.7	15.4
N	154	93	70	177	247

Table 4 shows the percentage of schools that conduct criminal background checks on any applicants—i.e., all applicants; applicants to particular programs; applicants who indicate a criminal record on the application; and applicants whose application “raises a red flag” for any reason such as “time gaps or multiple schools.” Question 7 is a general question that asks simply whether the school conducts a criminal background check on any applicants whereas Question 8 asks the respondent to identify the categories of applicants for whom a background check is conducted: all; all qualifying applicants; all who qualify and disclose a minor conviction; all who qualify and disclose a misdemeanor conviction; all who qualify and disclose a felony conviction; and other categories that were identified in an open-ended way by the respondents. The “other” responses generally fell into six meaningful categories: all (3 cases); those who apply to certain programs (11); those who raise concerns of one sort or another and are considered on a case-by-case basis (5); those who have any criminal record (1); and those who have a history of school suspension (1). The differences between public/private and 2-year/4-year schools, regardless of the question used to measure this policy, are statistically insignificant.

Table 5: The Collection and Utilization of Criminal Justice Information, by Sector and Level

	Sector		Level		Total
	Public	Private	2-Year	4-Year	
% That have a mechanism to collect from all applicants and make use of that information in the admissions decision	43.4	74.4*	29.0	65.3*	55.0
% That have a mechanism to collect but do not use that information	20.4	10.0*	26.1	12.7*	16.5
% That do not collect from any applicants and do not use	28.3	10.0*	37.7	15.0*	21.5
% That do not collect from any applicants but make use of any criminal justice information that becomes known to them	7.9	5.6	7.2	6.9	7.0
N	152	90	69	173	242

* Indicates a significant difference between the different sectors, levels.

** Source: Qs 1, 2, 8, 16.

Survey respondents were asked to report on whether their institution makes use of criminal justice information, regardless of the way that it is revealed to them, in the admissions decision-making process. Of the 247 respondents, 242 answered this question. Overall, 62 percent report that they make use of this information. Table 5 shows again that the responses differ significantly by sector and level, with private schools and four-year schools being much more likely to consider criminal history in the admissions decision than their public and two-year counterparts. Private four-year schools are significantly more likely to “collect and use” than other schools. It is noteworthy that 17 schools reported that they do not collect this information from any applicants but that they nevertheless make use of any information that does come before them.

Table 6: Method of Conducting a Criminal Background Check (N=50)*

Method	Percent of Responding Institutions that Use this Method
Background check by a private company	28.0
Check of an official state repository	22.0
Single-state requested from a law enforcement agency	20.0
Check of a state-operated database that is accessible to the public	14.0
Public information search	10.0
Multi-state requested from a law enforcement agency	10.0
Don't know	24.0

* Source: Q.9 (includes only those who indicated in Q.7 that they use some other method of obtaining information about applicants' criminal records, besides self-disclosure).

Table 6 contains information about the methods used for conducting a criminal background check, listed in order of prevalence of use.

Background Checks

Table 7: Percent of Applicants Subject to a Background Check, by Type (N=50)*

All applicants	14.0
All qualifying applicants	14.0
Qualifying applicants who disclose a minor conviction	10.0
Qualifying applicants who disclose a misdemeanor conviction	14.0
Qualifying applicants who disclose a felony conviction	32.0
Other applicants	
to certain programs only	20.0
identified on a case-by-case basis	10.0

who disclose any conviction	2.0
with a history of behavioral suspension	2.0

*Source: Q.8 (includes only those who indicated in Q.7 that they use some other method of obtaining information about applicants' criminal records, besides self-disclosure).

Table 7 shows that, of the schools eligible to answer the survey's question regarding the types of applicants for whom a background check is done, 14 percent report that they conduct a background check on all applicants. The most common criteria for conducting a background check are the disclosure of a felony or misdemeanor conviction in the application and applying to a particular program, such as those that award degrees in caregiving professions.

Use of Criminal Justice Data

Table 8: Admissions-Related Uses to Which Schools Put Criminal Justice Information

% of schools that consider criminal justice information in the admissions decision (N=273)*	60.8
% of schools having any criminal justice-related automatic bars to admission (N=138)**	18.2
% of schools that regard specific types of criminal records as an automatic denial of admission (N=138)**	
Felony conviction	12.4
Misdemeanor conviction	0.0
Violent conviction	15.3
Sex offense conviction	16.8
% of schools reporting that campus security office's recommendation of denial results in an automatic denial of admission (N=138)**	10.9
% of schools collecting criminal justice information from <i>any</i> applicants and do not use it as a basis to deny admission (N=191)***	24.5

* Source: Q.16

** Source: Q. 37 (only those that did not answer “We do not ask the applicant about such records or findings” in Q.2)

*** Source: Q. 43 (only those that indicated that they collect criminal justice information from at least some applicants in Qs 1, 2, and 8)

Table 8 contains information about practices regarding the uses to which admissions practitioners put criminal justice information. Sixty-one percent report that they consider it, but only about a fifth of the responding schools report that they have any criminal justice-related automatic bars to admission. Convictions for a violent or sex offense are the most likely to trigger an automatic denial. It is noteworthy that a quarter of the schools that collect criminal justice information from any applicants report that they do not use that information as a basis for denying admission.

Process for Considering Criminal Justice Information

Table 9: Personnel Involved in Admissions Decision Making for Applicants with a Criminal Record

How is the Decision Made? (Q.17; N=166)*		
	% Make decision by same process as any other application	6.1
	% Make decision by some other process	
	% Make decision only after ordering a background check	19.3
	% Make decision only after ordering a special review by the chief admissions officer or his/her designee	46.1
or	% Make a decision only after ordering a review by a special panel committee	60.4
	% Make a decision only after undertaking some other process	10.8
How is the Decision Made? (Q.20; N=273)		
	% Make decision with input from no one other than the usual admissions decision makers	25.1
for at	% Obtain input from others besides the usual admissions decision makers least <i>some</i> applicants with criminal records (N=273)**	74.9
Identity of Other Decision Makers (Q.24; N=161)**		
	% Campus security	40.0
	% Housing director	26.7
	% Counseling or mental health staff	19.9
	% Academic officer (e.g., provost, dean)	53.4
	% Legal counsel	25.5
	% Risk assessment personnel	11.8
	% Special committee	42.9
	% Other	14.9

* Only those that answered “yes” to Q.16

** Only those that answered “yes” or “sometimes” to Q.20

Responses to two survey questions inform our estimate of the extent to which admissions committees rely on outsiders to advise them on the acceptance of applicants with criminal records. Q.17 is designed to capture this information from respondents who reported that their institution makes use of criminal justice information in its deliberation process, while Q.20 did not screen on the basis of any previous question.

Table 9 shows that only six percent of the survey respondents reported in Q.17 that their school exclusively uses the “same process as any other application.” The remaining schools reported that they use some other process in addition to, or other than the “usual.” About half of the schools that use some other method of decision making use only one of the four methods identified in Table 9. The other half indicated that they use two or more of those methods. “Other” responses included a referral to the Dean of Students, a referral to several designated

officials (academic deans, Human Resources, “the administration”), or the gathering of more information.

Q.20 asked the survey respondents to indicate whether, for applicants determined to have a criminal record, the admissions decision is made with input from anyone other than the usual decision makers. The choices offered to the respondents were “yes,” “no,” “sometimes,” and “does not apply.” Of the 215 who answered the question (i.e., neither skipped the question [6 respondents] nor checked “does not apply” [52 respondents]), 54 (25.1%) reported that they do not solicit anyone’s input other than the usual decision-makers. Those schools that reported that they routinely or sometimes seek input from anyone other than the usual decision makers were most likely to report that an academic officer or a special committee participates in the review or decision process. A representative from the campus security office participates in decision making in 40 percent of the schools that solicit other input. Most of the 25 schools that reported obtaining input from an “other” entity indicated that the input is received from the office of student affairs or Dean of Students.³

Table 10: Percent of Schools that View Various Kinds of Criminal Records Negatively

Type of Record	Schools That Collect CJ data (N=138)	Schools that Collect and Use CJ Data (N=121)
Violent crime conviction	85.4	93.4
Sex offense conviction	85.4	92.6
Felony conviction	81.8	90.1
Drug or alcohol-related conviction	68.6	75.2
Violent crime pending	67.2	74.4
Sex offense pending	64.5	71.9
Felony pending	62.0	68.6
Violent crime arrest	60.6	66.9
Sex offense arrest	58.0	64.5
Felony arrest	54.7	60.3
Sex offense youthful offender adjudication	51.4	57.9
Violent crime youthful offender adjudication	51.1	57.0
Drug or alcohol-related pending	50.4	55.8
Drug or alcohol-related arrest	46.4	51.2
Felony youthful offender adjudication	43.1	47.9
Misdemeanor conviction	39.1	43.8
Drug or alcohol-related youthful offender adjudication	30.7	34.2

³ Although Q.20 did not screen out any respondents on the basis of his or her answer to a previous question, we ran a separate set of frequencies that included only schools that reported in Q.16 that they make use of criminal justice information in their admissions decision making. Within this subset of 161 respondents 11% reported that they make their decision with no input from any other decision makers. Of the 143 that do seek input from someone other than the usual decision makers, responses to Q.24 indicate that 58 (41%) obtain input from the campus safety department; 41 (29%) obtain input from the housing office; 31 (22%) obtain input from the counseling office; 79 (55%) obtain input from an academic officer (e.g., provost, dean); 36 (25%) obtain input from the school’s legal staff; 18 (13%) obtain input from risk assessment personnel; 65 (46%) obtain input from a special committee; and 22 (15%) obtain input from some other source (e.g., Dean of Students, student affairs, judicial affairs).

Misdemeanor pending	29.9	33.3
Misdemeanor arrest	26.1	28.9
Misdemeanor youthful offender adjudication	19.7	22.5
Lesser offense conviction	16.1	18.3
Lesser offense pending	13.2	15.1
Lesser offense arrest	12.5	14.3
Lesser offense youthful offender adjudication	9.6	10.9

*Source: Q.27

Table 10 shows the kinds of criminal records that are viewed negatively by schools that (a) have some mechanism for collecting criminal justice information on their application form(s) and (b) have such a mechanism and report that they *use* criminal justice-related information in admissions decision making. They are listed in order of the percentage of schools reporting that a given type of record is viewed negatively. Except for a very few types of information the rank order of the percentages is the same. Twenty respondents provided comments regarding the kinds of offenses that are looked upon negatively in the admissions decision-making process. Twelve mentioned that these decisions are made on a case-by-case basis, five of whom specifically referring to the length of time since the incident occurred as a critical factor to consider.

Table 11: Special Requirements for Applicants with Criminal Records

% That have special requirements for applicants with criminal records (N=138)*	69.4
Type of Requirement (N=93)**	
Interview	54.8
Letter of explanation from applicant	90.3
Letter of reference from Probation Officer and/or corrections official	63.0
Completion of community-based supervision	38.7
Period of residency	9.7
Official criminal justice documents (e.g., rap sheet)	18.3

* Source: Q. 32 (only those that did not answer “We do not ask the applicant about such records or findings” in Q.2)

** Source: Qs. 33-34 (only those that did not answer “We do not ask the applicant about such records or findings” in Q.2 *and* who answered “yes” in Q.32)

Table 11 presents information about schools’ requirements for applicants who have a criminal record. Almost 70 percent have some special requirements. Of the 93 surveyed schools that do have special requirements, most require a letter of explanation, an interview, and/or a letter of reference from a corrections official (community-based or otherwise).

Table 12: Response to an Applicant’s Failure to Disclose a Criminal Record

% That handle an applicant’s failure to disclose a criminal record differently from applicants who do self-disclose (N=125)*	65.3
Method of handling applications in which the applicant has not self-disclosed a criminal record (N=68)	
% Automatically deny admission	35.3
% May deny admission	58.8

* Source: Q.31 (only those that did not answer “We do not ask the applicant about such records or findings” in Q.2)

Table 12 shows that most schools do have a process for addressing failures to self-disclose a criminal record. Sixty-eight respondents provided information in an open-ended format about the extent to which such a failure to disclose is likely to result in a denial of admission. Just over one-third indicated that such a failure would unequivocally result in a denial of admission, and almost 60 percent indicated that it might result in a denial (such as “In some cases, we may prevent admission based on the omission” and “Such applicants are required to have a formal interview”).

Opportunity for Applicant to Address School’s Concerns Regarding His/Her Criminal Record

Table 13: Opportunity for Applicant to Address School’s Concerns Regarding His/Her Criminal Record During the Admissions Process

% That offer an opportunity for applicants to address concerns during the admissions process (N=138)*	82.3
Ways in which applicants can address the school’s concerns during the admissions process (N=107)**	
% requiring the submission of written or oral statements	61.7
% requiring the submission of official documentation	8.4
% requiring something else of the applicant	13.1

* Source: Q.40 (only those that did not answer “We do not ask the applicant about such records or findings” in Q.2)

** Source: Q.40 comments (only those that did not answer “We do not ask the applicant about such records or findings” in Q.2 and answered “yes” in Q.40)

Table 13 shows that most schools offer applicants an opportunity to address the school’s concerns about a criminal record during the admissions process. Of those schools that offer such

an opportunity, more than half, in an open-ended context, reported that they require the submission of a written or oral statement. Only about eight percent require the submission of official documents. Responses from the 14 schools that require “something else” of the applicant included releases to speak to correctional personnel; letters of recommendation; and information that indicates improvement such as the completion of a course of counseling or treatment.

Table 14: Extent to Which Schools Notify Applicants of the Reason for Denial Because of a Criminal Record and the Nature of the Appeals Process for Those Applicants

% That inform applicants that the reason for a denial of admission is that they have a criminal record (N=160)*	67.5
% That provide a mechanism for the applicant to appeal a denial based upon his or her criminal record (N=108)**	66.7
% That inform <i>all</i> denied applicants that there is an appeal process (N=72)***	56.3
% That inform <i>some</i> denied applicants that there is an appeal process (N=72)***	14.1
% That do not inform denied applicants of an appeals process (N=72)***	28.2

* Source: Q.43 (consists of those respondents that did not check the box in this question indicating that “an applicant is not denied on this basis”)

** Source: Q.43 (consists of respondents that indicated that they do inform applicants of the reason for their denial of admission if it is on the basis of their having a criminal record)

*** Source: Q.44 (consists of respondents that indicated in Q.43 that the applicant may appeal the decision)

Table 14 presents information relevant to the notification and appeals process. Of the 160 schools that report that applicants can be denied on the basis of having a criminal record, two-thirds report that they inform applicants that their criminal record is the reason for denial. Of those, another two-thirds of the schools report that they have an appeals process. Over half of the schools that have an appeals process provide that information to all applicants denied because of a criminal record, and an additional 16 percent provide that information only to some such denied applicants. Twenty-eight percent report that although they have an appeals process, they do not inform denied applicants of that option.

Post-Enrollment Process

Table 15: Extent to Which Schools Have Any Program of Support or Supervision for Admitted Students Who Have a Criminal Record

% That have such programs, either required or optional (N=138)*	55.1
% That provide counseling (N=70)**	20.0
% That require ongoing supervision (N=70)**	14.3

* Source: Q.45 (only those that did not answer “We do not ask the applicant about such records or findings” in Q.2)

** Source: Q.45-Comment (only those that answered “yes, required” or “yes, optional” in Q.45)

More than half of the schools that have a mechanism for collecting criminal justice information in their application forms report that they have some kind of program(s) of support or supervision for admitted students who have a criminal record. Twenty percent of the schools reporting that they have such programs (either required or optional) indicated in an open-ended

question that they offer a counseling program, and 14 percent indicated that their programming includes ongoing supervision. Forty-three percent of the schools reporting that they have programs, commented that their assignment of a student to such a program is made on a case-by-case basis.

Table 16: Extent to Which Schools Have Special Registration Requirements, Have Restrictions on Services, or Annotate Official Records for Students Who Have a Criminal Record

% That have special registration requirements (N=138)*	15.2
% That have restrictions on services (N=138)**	37.7
% That annotate student transcripts (N=273)***	6.3

* Source: Q.48⁴

** Source: Q.49

*** Source: Q.57

Table 16 contains information about other special procedures for enrolled students who have a criminal record. Special requirements, as identified by respondents in comments, included insuring that the student is in compliance with state laws regarding registration (3 schools), meeting with a school official (3), entry of the student’s name in a special database (2), and restrictions on class enrollment (2). Nine respondents mentioned other requirements. They included “providing court documents and recommendations”; “a letter informing us about the issue”; paying for a criminal background check; and housing restrictions.

Fifty-two schools reported having restrictions on services. Seventeen (12%) noted that such restrictions are handled on a case-by-case basis. Housing was mentioned by 22 respondents (probably due to the question’s wording having included housing as an example of a service), and restrictions on work study assignments were mentioned by two respondents.

Two schools (.7%) reported that they annotate the transcripts of students who have a criminal record. Their comments were “Dean of Students” and “programs will use to advise students of legal prohibitions.”

⁴ The survey contained a complicated skip pattern for Qs.48 and 49, and for this version of the report we are unable to determine which of the non-answers to these questions are legitimate skips and which are legitimate “no” answers. As a temporary measure we have used Q.16 as a screening variable: i.e., we excluded cases that indicated in Q.2 that they “do not ask applicants about criminal justice records or findings.”

Table 17: Training for School Personnel on Interpreting Criminal Records

% Whose admissions staff receive training (N=126)*	40.4
Recipients of the Training (N=51)**	
% Admissions staff	52.9
% “Staff” (unspecified)	15.7
% Dean of Students staff	7.8
% Campus security staff	3.9
% Enrollment/Registrar staff	3.9
% Other staff	5.9
Provider of the Training (N=51)***	
% Campus security staff	33.3
% Admissions staff	23.5
% Dean of Students staff	19.6
% Legal staff	21.6
% Enrollment/Registrar staff	7.8
% Human Resources staff	3.9
% Counseling staff	2.0
% Other staff	23.5

* Source: Q.50 (includes only those who had neither been screened out by an earlier question nor had answered “does not apply” to Q.50)

** Source: Q.52 (includes only those who answered “all or nearly all,” or “some” to Q.50)

*** Source: Q.51 (includes only those who answered “all or nearly all,” or “some” to Q.50)

Table 17 presents the percentage of schools that reported that at least some of the admissions staff receive training or guidance for interpreting criminal records as well as the coded responses to the open-ended questions regarding who receives the training and who provides it. Slightly more than half of the schools responding to the question regarding who receives training indicated Admissions staff. The next most likely specified group is the Dean of Students staff. The most likely groups to provide training are staff from campus security, admissions, the Dean of Students, and the school’s legal office.

Table 18: Extent to Which Schools Have a Formal, Written Policy Regarding Applicants Who Have a Criminal Record

% of schools that have such a policy – overall (N=133)*	44.4
% of schools that have such a policy – schools that utilize criminal justice information in the admissions decision-making process (N=119)**	47.1

* Source: Q.53 (includes only those respondents that had not been screened out by an earlier question)⁵

** Source: Q.53 (includes only those respondents that had not been screened out by an earlier question *and* that reported in Q.16 that they utilize criminal justice information in the admissions decision-making process)

Table 18 shows that less than half of schools overall have a written policy about accepting applicants with a criminal record. That is also true even for schools that indicate that they utilize criminal justice information in the decision-making process.

⁵ The documentation provided to CCA makes the skip/screening process unclear.