

Consulting Management Committee
November 1, 2018
2:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Present: A. De Blas, L. Gilson, B. Mayer, T. Van Hoof

Staff: E. Morrison, J. Shoulson, A. Vrabely, S. Wetstone

Actions:

- Management Response to FY17 Audit
 - a. The Consulting Management Committee (CMC) began discussion of the responses to the FY17 audit at the September 18, 2018 CMC meeting. S. Wetstone circulated a draft summary from that discussion prior to the November 1, 2018 meeting.
 - b. J. Shoulson provided an update from Provost C. Kennedy regarding the audit findings.
 - i. Provost C. Kennedy would like to hold off on making a decision on audit finding 1, regarding changing our current rules on a cap on consulting, until the hire of the new Vice Provost for Health and Sciences. The position has been posted and a search committee formed. The search will conclude in early spring, potentially February or early March. The committee discussed if this response would be sufficient for the Joint Audit and Compliance Committee (JACC) meeting in December. It was decided that S. Wetstone would discuss this with C. Chiaputti, Chief Audit Executive.
 - ii. J. Shoulson asked for the history of the faculty consulting policy for management exempt (discussed in audit finding 2). S. Wetstone outlined that the policy came from a previous provost but did not know the full history of the policy, but the concept of the need for managers to have “boots on the ground” had been shared in the past.. It was decided that J. Shoulson would reach out to former Academic Affairs and Policy Specialist in the Office of the Provost, B. Murray to gather additional information on this policy to present to Provost C. Kennedy.
 - iii. Provost C. Kennedy agreed with the committee’s recommendation on finding 3 regarding private practice.
- UConn Health Center (UCHC) Request for Action #13
 - a. S. Wetstone outlined a draft of UCHC’s Request for Action #13 on Legal Activities Supporting Cases Against a State of Connecticut Agency. S. Wetstone presented a scenario that occurred at UCHC that raised this concern and prompted the drafting of this action. The following items were discussed by the committee:
 - i. Perceived ‘disloyalty’ of testifying against your employer.
 - ii. Obtaining personal financial gain due to one’s state position: A motive for recruiting a faculty member to serve as an expert witness against their own state agency could be strategic and done to enhance trust and credibility.

- iii. Potential ill-will generated within the State agency that any such testimony is against and/or retaliation toward the University for approving such consulting work.
- iv. Is it the mission of the University to provide objective expertise to the citizens or institutions in the state regardless of the findings? This would be in the spirit of the Dodd Center and our training programs in social advocacy.
- v. It is possible that a faculty member has a unique professional expertise that cannot reasonably be obtained by another expert witness?
- vi. A faculty member may not be initially aware that the case is against a state agency and the list of defendants can change over time.

The committee charged S. Wetstone to make revisions to this draft action for further consideration by the committee. This will be distributed prior to the next meeting.

- Future Meetings
 - a. It was decided that the committee will continue to meet the third Tuesday of each month. A. Vrabely will place calendar holds for future meetings.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley Vrabely