

Complete Policy Title:  
**Academic Collaborators in  
Appointment, Tenure, Permanence and  
Promotion Proceedings,  
Statement on**

Policy Number (if applicable):  
**SPS B4**

Approved by:  
**Senate  
Board of Governors**

Date of Most Recent Approval:  
**December 14, 2011  
December 15, 2011**

Date of Original Approval(s):  
**February 27, 1990**

Supersedes/Amends Policy dated:  
**December 9, 1998 (SPS 11)**

Responsible Executive:  
**Provost and Vice-President (Academic)**

Enquiries:  
[University Secretariat](#)

***DISCLAIMER:** If there is a Discrepancy between this electronic policy and the written copy held by the policy owner, the written copy prevails*

---

A faculty member who is a significant collaborator with a candidate for appointment, tenure/permanence, promotion, or re-appointment may be - or may be perceived to be - in a conflict of interest. It follows that a faculty member who is a significant collaborator should recuse himself/herself from participation in any committee (Departmental, Faculty or Senate) while the case of the candidate in question is being considered and voted on.

Whether or not an individual is a "significant" collaborator must be judged on a case-by-case basis. The faculty member sitting on the Appointment Committee, Tenure and Promotion Committee or on the Senate Committee on Appointments will in most cases be the one in the best position to know the degree of collaboration and to decide whether or not to exclude himself/herself from judgments in so far as they may be, or be perceived to be, judgments on himself or herself. The Chair of the Committee should raise the issue of potential conflict of interest if, (1) in an appointment process any candidate was supervised in his or her graduate work by a member of the Committee or is currently working or has worked as a post-doctoral fellow with one or more members of the Committee, and (2) a *curriculum vitae* for any candidate shows the name(s) of one or more Committee members as co-author(s) or co-investigator(s). In such circumstances, the Chair will ask the Committee member(s) to outline the nature and extent of the relationship with the candidate. The Committee member(s) will then absent themselves from the meeting while the Committee considers the potential

conflict and votes on the issue. In the event that the chair is a collaborator, another Committee member will be asked to chair the Committee while the issue of potential conflict is resolved. If the chair is deemed to be in a conflict, the Committee will appoint another member to chair that portion of the meeting and the chair will absent himself/herself and record a technical abstention. If the Committee is unable to reach a consensus on whether or not a conflict exists, the matter will be referred to the Senate Committee on Appointments for a final determination. If the Committee believes that the collaboration is indeed significant, the Committee is bound to declare that such a conflict exists. Once a ruling has been made that a conflict of interest exists, the collaborator must absent himself/herself during discussion and voting on the case. When a ruling is made that a conflict does or does not exist, this ruling must be accepted at subsequent levels. In order to ensure that this is done, a statement about the potential conflict must become part of the documentation of the case.