

University Senate Research Committee Meeting
7 March, 2018
1:00 PM
156 CL

In Attendance: J. Cooper, K. Fike, T. Hitting, G. Huber, P. Morel, D. Salcido, S. Sant, P. Smolinski, M. Spring, T. Songer, D. Turner, C. Wilcox

The minutes were of the February meeting were approved.

P. Morel mentioned that at the meeting of the Board of Trustee Research and Innovation Committee the LifeX small company business accelerator was discussed. She suggested that in the future the Committee invite Dietrich Stephan to a meeting to discuss the project.

P. Smolinski mentioned that in the future a draft of the University's drone policy will be coming before the Committee for review. J. Cooper mentioned that a policy is needed in light of the fact that the University is in close proximity to heliports and there are special regulations for drone use in such cases. The drone policy will fall under the Office of Export Control. P Morel noted that Allen DiPalma is scheduled to come and talk to the committee about this issue at the April meeting.

COI Policy

Prior to the meeting the revised COI policy draft and a summary of the response to comments was circulated to the committee.

P. Smolinski asked if conflict of commitment (COC) can occur when faculty are outside of their appointment period.

J. Cooper said that benefits extend year round for those on less 12 month appointments, so aspects of COC may also apply non-appointment time.

The committee discussed various details of the policy at some length.

M. Spring had circulated some suggested wording changes to the policy, attached here, and these will be examined by the SVC-R and committee to see if these changes are acceptable.

Specific issues raised:

- 1) Concerning Section IV item D Licensed Startup Companies there is no description of how long COIC approval should take and it was suggested that the wording "within a reasonable time frame" be added to one of the clauses – maybe to a. This could read:
“An Option or License agreement for University Intellectual Property with a non-publicly traded company must be prospectively approved by the

COIC within a reasonable time frame, if the University, a University Member, or Members of their Immediate Families have or will be taking an equity interest in the company. “

J. Cooper agreed this was a good change and they will look into adding this language

- 2) Section VI item A: M Spring asked what the relationship was between the COIC and the COIO since it appears that the COIO reports to the COIC but that it also has the ability to conduct random audits on its own, and he was concerned that might appear too.

C. Wilcox explained that the COIO does conduct random audits and this is an important part of its function. The results of these audits are reported to the COIC. J Cooper suggested that the words “and reports them to the COIC” could be added to the section that would then read as follows:

“The COI Office may conduct random or for cause audits assessing compliance with this policy or with CMPs, on its own initiative or as requested by an internal authority (including the COIC) or external party, as appropriate, and reports them to the COIC.”

- 3) Section VI Item A: M Spring asked about the composition of the COIC and suggested that the Committee should include members of the University Senate as decided by the University Senate.

J. Cooper will raise this issue with R. Rutenbar since this change will require his approval

- 4) Clarification was sought concerning the respective roles of the SVC-R and other campus leaders regarding appeals and disciplinary action.

J. Cooper and C. Wilcox clarified that the COIC is responsible for deciding whether a COI exists and coming up with a management plan. This is approved by the SVC-R and can be appealed directly to the SVC-R if the investigator does not agree to the proposed designation and plan. If the researcher fails to follow the agreed upon plan they may be subject to disciplinary procedures as outlined in Section X on Noncompliance. These would involve the relevant supervisors such as the Provost or SVC-HS depending on the researcher’s affiliation.

- 5) D. Salcido pointed out that in Section II item B the wording should be changed to reflect previous changes in the Policy Overview.

Thus, the definition should read

A. Conflict of Interest (COI) exists whenever personal, professional, commercial, or financial interests or activities outside of the University are, or have a reasonable potential of, (1) compromising a University

Member's judgment; (2) biasing the nature or direction of scholarly research; or (3) influencing a faculty or staff member's decision or behavior with respect to teaching and student affairs, appointments and promotions, uses of University resources, interactions with human subjects, or other matters of interest to the University; or (4) resulting in personal or immediate family member's gain or advancement to the detriment of the University or in ways prohibited by University policy.

J. Cooper and C. Wilcox agreed to this change.

G. Huber asked about the process going forward. After some discussion, it was agreed that the committee will attempt to approve the policy in time to be presented at the April 10 Faculty Assembly meeting. This means that a revised policy should be submitted to the Committee by **March 16, 2018**.

When received, the revised version of the COI policy will be circulated to the Committee members electronically for a vote of either a) approved or b) hold for committee discussion.

If additional discussion is required it will be discussed at the April 4 meeting of the SRC. Committee members who were present at the meeting agreed with this course of action.

Action item: The revised version of the COI policy will be circulated to the Committee by email when received for a vote.

The next meeting will be April 4 – 1-3 PM in CL 156

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.

Minutes submitted by Patrick Smolinski and Penny Morel.