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Objective / Charter

- The committee shall review the Col Policy and provide a recommendation to the executive board for revisions.
- This committee was formed on the recommendation of both the IP policy review committee and distance learning committee.
Conflict of Interest

- Potential COI may arise from
  - external corporate ventures and/or consulting relating to areas such as
    - sponsored research
    - licensing university technology
    - clinical studies involving human subjects
    - mentoring students
    - use of university facilities
- Purpose of policy is to provide process and guidelines to avoid potential or real COI
Approach

- Review policies by
  - State
    - Substantial interest (GA Law) is defined as direct or indirect ownership of more than 25% of assets or stock of any business → no Employee may Transact Business with the state with more than 24.9% ownership
  - BoR
    - Principles regarding COI: Recognize IP and the desire or necessity of an employee to participate as a consultant or advisor that could lead to financial gain and will adopt policies to “eliminate, reduce and/or manage any real or apparent conflicts of interest”
  - Federal (NIH, NSF)
    - NSF places a cap on significant financial interest as receiving an amount greater than $10k or 5% ownership in a single entity
General topics reviewed

- Entrepreneurial activity
  - Encouraged, however, must have review by Col committee. Certain conditions trigger this review and in some cases are prohibited, e.g. cannot have substantial interest [>25%] in a company and conduct business with the state [applies to full and part-time employees]

- Students
  - Must follow Col guidelines – verbiage has been changed in many sections by either including staff and students in addition to faculty or referring to employees.
  - Students are represented on committees by an appropriate administration representative

- Use of GT facilities
  - May be used only after ‘approval and with appropriate charges’
General topics reviewed

- SBIR language
  - Removed reference to SBIR since GT cannot submit proposals for SBIR

- Consulting hours
  - Consulting hours have been clarified for both full and part time employees and those on hourly and non-hourly timekeeping.
    - Full time General Faculty – allowed, on average, 1 day consulting per week = 39 days for 9 mth appointment and 52 days for a 12 mth appt.
    - Hourly Timekeeping General Faculty – allowed outside normal work hours
    - Part-time faculty – allowed a fraction of their allocated 39 days \[39 \times \text{Fraction}\], e.g. 75% time employee during the academic year is allowed \(39 \times 0.75 = 29\) days of consulting.
    - Summer term and leave not subject to policy
Topics added

- Categories of conflict of interest
  - Individual
  - Conflict of commitment
  - Institutional conflicts
- COI Committee added
  - Include representation by major units and a representation for students
  - Advisory role to the Provost
- Disclosure to the IRB
Topics added

- Disclosure to students
  - Faculty, research, and company involvement disclosure to student and responsible member of the institute

- Conflict of commitment

- Distance learning and education
  - Reporting of outside continuing education for approval by the Vice Provost for Distance Learning and Professional Education

- Institutional COI
  - Commercialization and equity in start-ups
Conclusion

- Recommend revised policy to Provost for inclusion into the faculty handbook