

## Faculty Forum

December 3, 2008

### Minutes

Dr. Bona welcomed everyone to the Faculty Forum. Approximately 30 people attended the meeting.

1. The Policy and Guidelines for Interactions between the University of Connecticut School of Medicine and the Biomedical Industry

Dr. Jacqueline Nissen, Associate Dean for Graduate Medical Education, presented the Policy and Guidelines for Interactions between the University of Connecticut School of Medicine and the Biomedical Industry. She explained that the Dean's Council appointed a committee charged with developing an institutional policy that addressed the relationships of the School of Medicine and Health Center with pharmaceutical, biotech, medical device, and hospital research equipment and supply companies. In creating the proposed policy, the committee reviewed data and position papers from the AMA, pharmaceutical industry, the Office of Inspector General, and academic medical centers which have already developed and are currently using policies. She also noted that in 2007, the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) mandated a new policy as a requirement for accreditation. That policy also applied to undergraduate medical education and was approved by the Education Council. In addition, the following policies currently exist at UConn: Individual Conflict of Interest in Research, policies on gifts to individuals, Code of Conduct, Policy on Consulting and Honoraria, and a State Code of Ethics.

Dr. Nissen explained that historically, a cultural wall has separated academic activities from the world of commerce. However, in the last 25 years, institutions have been getting increased support from commercial entities. This relationship has been widely criticized, and many professional organizations are working to develop guidelines for the appropriate management of such relationships. While understanding that interactions between industry and academic centers are vital to public health, such interactions must be conducted in a way that upholds the public trust. She then presented the scope of the policy, which covers the following areas: gifts and compensation; site access by sales and marketing representatives; provision of unrestricted educational funds and scholarships to students and trainees; financial support for professional activities of faculty, trainees, and students; disclosure of relationships with industry; the training of students, trainees, staff, and faculty regarding potential conflicts of interest in industry interactions. She then provided examples of what is allowed and not allowed under each category (see attached list of Do's and Do Not's).

Following her presentation, Dr. Koeppen explained that the Dean's Council had approved the policy for the School of Medicine. Dr. Laurencin also supports the concept but asked that the policy be presented to the faculty for input. It is also being reviewed by the School of Dental Medicine, Corporate Compliance, and Human Resources. What is being requested of the faculty today is their opinion on whether it makes sense to have an institutional policy of this nature. If all parties agree, then representatives from each of the stakeholder groups will take the policy presented today and work from it to create an institutional policy. Human Resources will be involved in the process to ensure that any policy developed will not violate union contracts.

A question was raised as to who would monitor the process and whether prior approval would be required as it is with consulting. Both of these details need to be worked out. One suggestion was that the policy should apply to community-based faculty as a condition of their faculty appointment. It was noted that some things in the policy conflict with the policies of the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME), and these will need to be addressed. It was suggested that faculty from the Storrs campus be included on the committee charged with creating an institutional policy since they will likely be affected by it. Some felt the policy was unnecessary and made the educational process onerous. However, it was again noted that a policy is needed to uphold the public trust.

2. Proposed Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Collaborative Investigators

Dr. Bona announced that the revised criteria for promotion and tenure for collaborative investigators has been reviewed by the Dean and each of the Councils. The revision has been approved by the Dean and all of the Councils, with the exception of the Research Council, which approved the prior version but has not yet commented on the latest version. The revision will now be voted on by the faculty.

It was noted that one of the recommendations in the PricewaterhouseCoopers report is that investigators be required to generate two or three times their salary support in grant funds. If this recommendation is implemented, it would make it very difficult for collaborative investigators to succeed. However, Dr. Koeppen explained that the Dean would like faculty to have 50 percent of their time devoted to research supported by grant funds. Also, any future policies related to salary support and finances will need to take into consideration the impact they will have on collaborative investigators.

3. Proposed Bylaws Revision, Appendix B, Section I.H. (Retention of Rank and Tenure)

Dr. Bona explained that the School of Medicine Bylaws allow for retention of tenure when faculty transfer between schools within the UConn system. However, appointment at senior rank must be reviewed and approved by the Senior Appointments and Promotions Committee. At other UConn campuses, the custom has been to allow transfer of both rank and tenure. The Oversight Committee was asked to discuss this issue and propose a Bylaws revision to allow transfer of both. The proposed revision was shared with Dr. Laurencin and each of the Councils for their approval. The revision was approved by the Clinical and Education Councils. Approval by Research Council is pending. Dr. Laurencin does not support the proposal for the following reasons: "It is common for different Schools within one University to establish criteria for promotion that are different. Rank carried by an individual is a reflection on the School in which one currently serves. The School of Medicine should not relinquish the right to grant or deny rank based on its criteria for senior rank." The Public Issues Council also did not approve the proposed revision for reasons similar to Dr. Laurencin's and suggested that differences in promotion criteria among Schools be studied before making any decision on the proposed Bylaws change. The Dean's Council believes there should be a mechanism for rank to be retained but recommended that a committee be appointed to consider the broader issues of faculty categories and rank.

The following concerns were noted. Not allowing transfer of rank and tenure may result in an individual, who has been a full Professor at another UConn school for several decades, having to transfer to the School of Medicine as an Assistant Professor. In the past, the Senior Appointments and Promotions Committee (SAPC) occasionally awarded tenure but not senior rank to promising faculty, which resulted in tenured Assistant Professors. The SAPC agreed with Dr. Deckers, who was Dean at the time, that this would no longer occur, and this agreement was one of the reasons why the tenure probationary period was extended. If senior rank does not transfer, you again run the risk of having tenured Assistant Professors. It was also noted that the School of Medicine Bylaws state, "In general, the qualifications for tenure will be equivalent to those for promotion or appointment at senior rank." This statement is taken from the University Bylaws, and indicates that schools within the UConn system have criteria for both promotion and tenure that differ from the School of Medicine's, and it is therefore inconsistent to allow transfer of one but not the other. A question was raised regarding how this rule would apply to those who change their field of expertise.

Faculty Forum - Minutes  
December 3, 2008  
Page 4

Following discussion, it was decided to take the Dean's Council's suggestion to broaden this discussion to include other issues pertaining to faculty categories and rank.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Donatelli

## 1. Gifts and Compensation

### Do's:

- Unrestricted educational grants.
- Educational material to programs/departments.
- Travel/lodging for speech appearance or if being asked to participate at an event in one's official capacity.

### Do Not's:

- Personal gifts such as pens, meals, mugs, products with logos ...
- Travel/lodging for attending a conference.

## 2. Site access by sales & marketing representatives

### Do's

- Sales and marketing reps are permitted in non-patient care areas by appointment only for the purpose of in-service training for research and clinical equipment/devices already purchased or about to be purchased, and to provide free drug samples.

### Do Not's:

- Sales and marketing reps are not permitted in patient care areas except when providing in-service training on devices and other equipment and, in these instances, must go through University policy on vendor training; i.e. HIPAA/informed consent by patients.

## 3. Provision of unrestricted educational funds and scholarships to students and trainees

### Do's

- Unrestricted educational grants to fund educational meetings, scholarships for training, individually sponsored merit awards.
- Must go to School of Medicine department chairs, program directors.
- UConn determines educational programs, recruits the candidates for scholarship positions, and determines if award has merit.

### Do Not's

- Direct financing of any student or resident for educational meetings or for employment as a resident in training.
- There will not be a quid pro quo obligation to the industry sponsoring the trainee/student.

4. Financial support for professional activities of faculty, trainees, and students.

Do's

- Read the ACCME standards for industry support.
- Know that all educational and professional CME and non-CME activities sponsored by the School of Medicine must be in compliance with these standards.
- Know that all faculty, staff, trainees, or students who participate, organize, or deliver lectures or educational conferences sponsored by industry must comply with ACCME standards.
- Know the University policies that apply to consulting and honoraria.
- Can receive funding for travel expenses and speaker honorarium if participating in CME activity to defray costs, or if required to attend an educational meeting to learn how to use a new or existing device.

Do Not's

- Receipt of direct funding or meals from vendors for UConn sponsored events.
- If non-UConn sponsored educational activity is sponsored by industry and no CME credit is offered, think about the following:
  - Is the expert speaker presenting an important topic or a product?
  - Is CME provided? Why not? (Implies that standards are being met.)
  - Is the event hosted by a clinical institution or educational institution and just sponsored by pharma? Or is it just sponsored by industry??
  - Use your discretion!!!

5. Disclosure of relationships with industry

Do's:

- UConn faculty with actual or potential conflicts of interest related to institutional decisions must disclose and/or recuse themselves from deliberations, e.g. equipment or drug procurement.
- Must be in compliance with ACCME standards for commercial support for disclosure requirements related to educational activities.
- Must abide by Code of Conduct and disclose financial interests and potential conflicts of interest; this includes properly acknowledging sponsorship of research in publications and presentations.

6. The educational training of students, trainees, staff, and faculty regarding potential conflicts of interest in industry interactions.