

Consulting Management Committee
Minutes: January 17, 2008

Attendees

Members: M. Aindow, H. Frank, A. Pappanikou, R. Rubin, and S. Wikel
Staff: S. Wetstone
Guests: None

The meeting was convened at 1:15 pm.

1) Minutes

The Committee agreed that the minutes will include the list of attendees, topics discussed, and a record of any votes taken, but not a transcript of the discussion. Instead, considerable attention will be spent in developing a library of 'case law' as it is developed. Staff will prepare drafts of meeting minutes to be reviewed by the co-chairs of the committee before they are distributed for the review of the whole committee.

2) Training

- a.) The committee expressed its concern that all training documents be consistent and complete. If more than one web site is used (ex/ one at Storrs and one at UCHC), they should be identical and include the same items including the University policies & procedures, relevant state statutes, forms and FAQs. These contents should be determined by mutual agreement of the two Faculty Consulting Offices. It was noted that the version of the BoT approved policy on consulting is not word for word identical to the Storrs policy database and this should be reviewed and corrected.
- b.) The FAQ's posted need clearer answers.
- c.) The faculty are confused about the difference between consulting (work performed while not acting a State employee) and academically related activities (work performed as a State employee). There is also confusion about where compensation earned from ARA's must/may be deposited and the role, if any, for accounts held by the Research Foundation. The Committee hoped that the ARA policies could be aligned for Storrs and UCHC and asked Dr. Wetstone to distribute UCHC's policies on ARA and travel. The Committee may then make recommendations to the Provost and EVP in developing a standard policy across units.

3) Jurisdictional Issues

- a.) The committee doesn't believe it is appropriate for it to make recommendations on sanctions when the consulting policies and procedures are not complied with.
- b.) The committee doesn't believe it should serve as an adjudicating body for grievances. Its role is to make recommendations to the Provost or EVP who make the actual decisions and any grievances in response to these decisions should be made at that level.

4) Process issues

- a.) Submission of requests for interpretations by the CMC – At least for the immediate future, all requests for CMC action should come through the Faculty Consulting Offices. This restriction can be revisited later.
- b.) Accelerated review by the committee – There may be times in which a quick response is needed from the CMC in order to ensure an activity is approved before the work actually starts. Initially, the committee would like the whole membership involved in every decision but might entertain a more nimble process once some of the more significant ‘case law’ is established. It asked Dr. Wetstone to develop a draft model of such a mechanism.
- c.) Meeting schedule

The committee agreed to schedule weekly meetings over the next 4-6 weeks in order to catch up on the backlog of work it needs to consider. These will be held on Thursdays from 2:00 – 3:30 pm. These will continue to be videoconferences and the staff will announce the locations shortly.

Note: Dr. Pappanikou’s email should be pappanikou@ATT.net

The committee adjourned at 2:35 pm.