## Faculty Senate Research Committee February 21, 2013

1.) For the conflict of interest policy, nine-month appointments need to be addressed; unless non-UTSA summer work creates a potential COI, disclosure is not needed. Language connecting summer UTSA appointments and COC is needed in the policy document. More succinctly, it means faculty need not seek approval for their summer commitments that do not create a conflict of interest risk.

The policy did not specifically address the issue of whether approval was required during times outside of the faculty member's contract, for example during summer for a faculty on a nine month contract. The University Conflict of Commitment committee also raised this as a concern and suggested the following wording in Section I.E.1: "During time in which the faculty member does not have an appointment (e.g., in summer for a faculty on a nine month appointment), the faculty member is not required to seek approval for outside activities except as required by HOP XXX *Intellectual Property*." The Senate Research Committee and also recommends inclusion of this language.

2.) The Policy document has a 'pocket veto' loophole. If the supervisor does not act on the approval request, there should be more than the eventual access to an appeals process. I suggest an implied approval clause. That would also help with the paperwork increase. More succinctly, it means the chair cannot just sit on the request indefinitely.

"The policy does not include a timeline for when approval decisions must be made. This could lead to situations in which the approval is not explicitly denied, but not ever approved either. This can be addressed by including a time frame in which a decision must be made. The committee recommends inserting the following wording in Section IV as Item #5.

In section IV: "Disapproval must be in writing. Failure to assert disapproval within twenty business days of the submission of the request for approval shall constitute implicit approval."