In the university, the term “conflict of interest” refers to financial or other personal considerations that may compromise a faculty member’s professional judgment in administration, management, instruction, research, or other professional activities. Conflicts of interest have the potential to bias, directly or indirectly, important aspects of the Council on Academic Personnel’s (CAP) endeavor, including its recommendations about candidates for appointment, merit advance, or promotion and campus policies. CAP members must always keep this potential in mind and recuse themselves where a conflict of interest arises.

There are additional circumstances in which recusal is necessary. The need for recusal may arise from the nature of academic review, the structure of the review process, and the importance to the campus of maintaining the integrity of Academic Senate review of academic personnel matters.

Recusal Policy

(A) CAP members must recuse themselves in the following circumstances:

1. The CAP member has, or has had, a family relationship with the candidate, such as that of a current or former significant other, partner, spouse, child, sibling, or parent.
2. The CAP member has, or has had, a sexual relationship with the candidate.
3. The CAP member has, or has had, a personal financial interest in the outcome of the case.
4. The CAP member has a significant co-authorship with the candidate (published within the last 48 months and/or pending).
5. The CAP member has, or has had, a significant grant collaboration as PI or Co-PI with the candidate (funded within the last 48 months and/or pending).
6. The CAP member has, or has had, a formal, significant mentor/mentee relationship with the candidate:
   a. PhD or Postdoctoral Research Advisor to the candidate (Lifelong recusal)
   b. Formal or significant mentoring/mentee relationship (One full review cycle recusal after ending the relationship)
7. The CAP member has participated, or intends to participate, in deliberations about the questions at issue in the case at another level of review. (CAP members should not knowingly participate at other levels of review.)
8. The CAP member believes that their recusal is necessary to preserve the integrity of the review process.

(B) Upon joining the Council on Academic Personnel, each member is expected to read and sign this document indicating their awareness of this recusal policy and their intention to abide by it.

Comment

In carrying out their work, CAP members are expected to rely on their academic expertise, experience, and judgment, and so professional agreements or differences of opinion are not by themselves a basis for recusal. Indeed, members of CAP, like all members of the academic community, are expected to understand the standards of their disciplines, to judge the work of others in light of these standards, and to express these judgments publicly when that is relevant to their own professional activities.

Service to CAP must be dedicated and it is the member’s responsibility to remove themselves from all personnel consultations, actions or decisions at the department, school or other committee level of review. Exceptions may be made upon consultation with the CAP Chair.

Grey Areas

In “grey areas” where a CAP member is uncertain regarding recusal, they are expected to disclose the potential grounds for recusal to the CAP Chair. Such grounds may include collaborative work with the candidate during the review period, recognizing that the type and level of collaboration can vary enormously from field to field. The Chair may then advise whether the member should recuse, or the Chair may seek the advice of other Council members in making this determination. The Chair should consult the CAP Vice Chair regarding potential grounds for their own recusal, who may then need to seek the advice of other Council members. In making its determination regarding recusal in grey areas, the Council will take into account the fact that, by design, each member brings valuable and unique expertise to the Council as a whole.