

UO Senate ad hoc COI-C Committee/UO Chapter of the AAUP Town Hall Meeting Feedback

Wednesday, January 21, 2009 - 166 Lawrence Hall - 3:00 p.m.- 5:00 p.m.

Both COI & COC – Policy and Process (In general)

Why do we need a new policy?

Why do we need a new policy immediately?

Where is the peril? Then fix that.

The University should respond to accusations and not try to manage these problems before they occur.

We need clarification about the new legal requirements that mandate this or clarification about what exactly the disagreements about this issue are. It's all extremely confusing.

You've got to acknowledge the differences between departments.

What about the budget? This is not the right time.

There must be some grave issue that we don't know about that is prompting this.

This process should be minimally intrusive and done with a minimal budget.

If faculty can't engage in their areas of expertise, you will drive them away.

The issue is to handle this locally – in the departments.

We are scholars with professional codes of ethics – why do we need this?

This process should be similar to tenure promotion – a broad policy, but with different approaches at the department level – then have someone at a higher level sign off on the disclosed information.

There must be a cleaner way to get at the abuses.

How can I be an 'external entity'?

The process must be efficient – this is huge.

The policy and process are draconian – Look at policies from institutions that have done this and just adopt theirs.

There must have a process for appeal.

This is an example of an unfunded mandate.

What is the problem you are trying to solve?

The University should establish a broad policy and the schools/departments, centers and institutes should decide how they will respond and what is appropriate for their faculty.

How timely can ORCR respond to disclosures? The process will get clogged.

These should be handled at the school/department or dean level.

There should be a way to opt out of the process for those people who are not affected.

This policy should not address issues around writing and publishing at all – the focus should be on start-ups and commercial enterprises – not on people trying to get published or those who have published textbooks.

I am not comfortable with the definitions of ‘outside activities’ or ‘external entities.’

Royalties are very small – there is no conflict there.

Look at the tenure promotion guidelines – do something similar.

What is the basis of the notion that faculty or the institution is at risk if we don’t do this? This hasn’t been shown.

This should not be a centralized process.

What about the fiscal implications of implementing software that costs 200K?

The policy needs to actually promote publishing, editing, and software design – it should not place a burden on these activities.

The policy should only apply to behaviors that place faculty and the institution at risk – it needs to be tailored only to these areas.

I am concerned that this doesn’t address the needs of individual departments – give us a broad University standard and let the departments develop their own standards

COI Policy

Can we do a ‘COI-Light’ version?

This policy needs to be tied to those individuals with federal funding – focus on that for the period of funding only.

Professional practice, scholarly work is almost never a conflict of interest. Other activities can be [conflicted].

You need to define COI – who is harmed? Students? Departments? The University?

Why is 10K threshold valuable if there are rarely conflicts in the professional schools?

COC Policy

This should be called Balance of Commitment.

If a faculty member's area of expertise is building buildings, then there is an expectation that they will engage in that work – those are professional expectations - They will always be involved with outside entities.

The policy must explicitly state what is supported – such as outside work, authoring books and text books, requiring our book be used in the classroom.

Form

Form can be better.

Form can be better organized.

Form is too broad.

The form should get longer if you need to provide more information.

This is like filling out another tax form.

The form should ask what is it that you don't do – then just answer yes or no. There should be a broad University policy and then have a sense of what your departmental guidelines are. Just one yes or no and then let the department handle it. If people aren't sure, then they can consult with Randy Geller, Rich Linton, Russ Tomlin, or Lynette Schenkel.

There has got to be a way to simplify the form and the process –faculty and administrative staff are all overburdened already.

Form should give examples.

Small amounts should not have to be reported - those should be exempt.

Everyone should have an orientation to the form.

If I forget to write something down, will it be seen as cheating? What are the penalties?

How long are these kept?

The form takes long enough and now you want me to go to an orientation?

There are too many examples.

What is this 1 day in 7? One day in five?

Process can be more efficient.

How are these evaluated – how do I know what is getting looked at and why?

How is privacy protected? This includes the privacy of the individual completing the disclosure and their clients?

People can not disclose who their clients are.

Who has access to the form?

Who retains the form? There are laws governing the number of personnel files.

Language in the form is too broad – such as the words “any” or “benefit”
It’s too hard to fill out – it took me over an hour and I was only ¼ of the way through.

I can’t remember all my activities – I don’t keep track and I don’t want to keep track of these activities.

This list was compiled by Meg Rowles
This list was reviewed and edited by John Bonine