Meeting called to order at 1:30 p.m.

1. Agenda approved with amendments and reordering of items.


3. Discussion of two draft Conflict of Interest Policy documents was led by their authors. The first draft (#1) was authored by the ad hoc subcommittee (Balasubramanian, Crimp, Ross, Voice) and was distributed prior to the meeting by email. The second (#2), distributed at the meeting, was authored by T. Voice to reflect his experience with the COI issue in his role as Associate Dean.

   - Draft #1 adopts a philosophy of reducing redundancy in various university policy statements and presenting a (presumably web-based) concise set of annotated links to relevant policy documents.
   - Draft #2 reflects a view that the document is “guidance, not policy,” and is therefore appropriately published in the Faculty Handbook.
   - No consensus was reached on the approach, but there were certain points of agreement in the discussion:
     - Current university regulations on COI are (i) difficult to find, (ii) difficult to read and understand once located, (iii) not consistently enforced.
     - University enforcement of COI policy focuses on issues with clear salary / time of effort implications: (i) co-employment, (ii) conflict of commitment, (iii) outside work for pay.
     - There is general agreement on the need for COI training for faculty and their supervisors.
     - There is general agreement that, whatever the form of the COI document, it should strongly urge a policy of “when in doubt (about a potential COI issue), report it.”
     - There is general agreement on the need to protect students from exploitation in a faculty member’s external-employment activities.
     - The Dean’s Office strongly favors an advisory committee on issues related to COI, outside work for pay, etc. Dean Kempel expressed the need for any bylaws changes to give the Dean discretion in deciding which cases to refer to such a committee. The reason is to protect committee members from exposure to legal action in particularly sensitive cases, or cases of egregious violations.
4. Dean’s comments:
   
   • In the recent poll to elect Engineering College representatives to various University Governance positions, a candidate for office was not informed of the nomination and the intention to place that person’s name on the ballot.
   • The application period for the new Associate Dean position has been extended.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

The next meeting will be held at 8:30 a.m. on 04/25/2018.

Respectfully submitted

John R. Deller, Jr.
ECAC Secretary