

# Best Practices and Guidelines Regarding Conflict of Interest on Recruitment Committees

## Guiding Principles and Policies

The quality of the faculty of the University of California is maintained primarily through “objective and thorough appraisal, by competent faculty members, of each candidate for appointment or promotion.” (APM 210-1.a.). Although the instructions for review committees given in [APM 210](#) do not explicitly address conflicts of interest for committee members, policy does clearly indicate that it is the right of every faculty member “to be judged by one’s colleagues, in accordance with fair procedures and due process... solely on the basis of the faculty members’ professional qualifications and professional conduct.” ([APM 015](#) Part I.6.)

## Standards

In searching for qualified candidates for a new or vacant position in a department, faculty serving on the recruitment committee, or otherwise engaged in the recruitment, selection and review of candidates, shall make every effort to ensure that any significant personal, academic or professional relationships they may have with a candidate do not interfere with the objective evaluation of all potential candidates or create a perception that evaluation was not objective.

Examples of situations that might create either a real or perceived conflict of interest for a member of a recruitment committee include, but are not limited to, the review of candidates who are current or former students, postdocs, mentees, co-authors, close collaborators or partners in a business or professional practice. Other situations may involve review of a candidate who has or has had in the past, a significant personal relationship with the faculty member, either positive or negative, that might impact the ability of the faculty member to participate objectively in the comparison of the qualifications of that candidate with those of other candidates.

These guidelines are focused on significant relationships. Routine interactions such as knowing candidates from attending the same conferences, serving as associate editors for the same journal, or having overlapped in graduate school are encouraged to be disclosed but do not require any changes to participation in the recruitment,

When there is a significant relationship, it is the obligation of the faculty member to disclose the nature and extent of the personal or professional relationship, and engage in a discussion as appropriate with the recruitment committee, the chair of the recruitment committee, or the chair of the department regarding the nature of the potential conflict of interest and their continued participation in the recruitment. The attached form should be used for documentation.

Depending on the nature of the relationship, and based on discussion with the recruitment committee chair, the faculty member may:

1. *Best practice for significant conflict of interest*- Voluntarily recuse from participation on the recruitment committee or in the review and selection process;
2. *Minimum recommendation for real or perceived conflict of interest*- Voluntarily recuse from discussion and/or voting on the particular candidate with whom there is a potential real or perceived conflict of interest; or

3. *In rare circumstances (with justification)*- Continue to serve on the committee and in the review/selection process, but with full disclosure of the relationship to the committee and, if the candidate is on the short list, to the department.

**Faculty Recruitment Committee— Potential Conflict of Interest Disclosure.**

**To be completed by the Recruitment Committee Chair and provided to the department for inclusion in UCSC Recruit.**

Recruitment#:		Committee Chair Name:	
Department:		Committee Chair Signature:	
Position Rank:		Date:	
Position Title:		Department Chair Name:	

**Please answer the following questions:**

**A.** To your knowledge, were there any potential conflicts of interest (PCOIs) between the members of the recruitment committee (RC) and any applicants who were evaluated by the committee members?

No, I know of no such conflicts. (If this is the case, the Potential Conflict of Interest Disclosure form is complete.)

Yes, some conflicts were disclosed during recruitment deliberations, and were addressed in the following ways. (Check all that apply below and provide explanation of the selection(s) in the Part C text box.)

The RC member disclosed the PCOI to me before review of applications began or early in the application review process. *Best practice for any potential or perceived conflict of interest.*

The RC member recused themselves from participation on the search committee or in the review and selection process. *Best practice for significant conflict of interest.*

The RC member recused themselves from discussion and/or voting on the particular candidate with whom there is a potential conflict of interest. *Minimum recommendation for real or perceived conflict of interest.*

The RC member continued to serve on the committee and in the review/selection process, but with full disclosure of the relationship to the committee. ***Include justification in section C.***

**B.** To your knowledge, were there any potential conflicts of interest (PCOI) between the members of the recruitment committee (RC) and any applicants who were selected to be interviewed for the position?

No, I know of no such conflicts. (If this is the case, the Potential Conflict of Interest Disclosure form is complete.)

Yes, there were some PCOIs between search committee members and applicants advanced to the interview process. The potential impacts of these relationships were addressed in the following ways. (Check all that apply below, and provide explanation of the selection(s) in the Part C text box.)

The PCOIs were fully disclosed to the department before the proposed interview list was finalized. *Best practice for any potential or perceived conflict of interest.*

The RC member recused themselves from discussion and/or voting on the interview list. *Best practice for significant conflict of interest.*

The RC member recused themselves from discussion and/or voting on the particular candidate with whom there is a potential real or perceived conflict of interest. *Minimum recommendation for real or perceived conflict of interest. **Include justification in section C***

**C.** Please provide the information about the faculty member(s) and candidate(s) below. If the identified best practices or minimum recommendations are not adhered to, then include justification for the chosen level of Recruitment Committee participation.