

### **Policy for faculty searches in the Physics Department**

All steps of the search are to be carried out following the recommendations and best practices of the Search Advocate Program.

Per college procedures, the dean of the College of Science is the hiring manager in tenure-line hires. Hiring manager authority may be delegated to the department head for fixed-term hires.

The hiring manager forms a committee which includes:

- A committee chair that is trained as Search Advocate.
- A Search Advocate from outside the College of Science.
- An adequate number of other faculty members, including tenure line and fixed term faculty. This may include individuals from outside the department, if relevant to the position.
- A representative of the graduate students in the department.

The search committee formulates the position description and the search criteria which need to be approved by the hiring manager. The committee also formulates an evaluation matrix. The committee may seek faculty input on these documents, but the hiring manager maintains final authority on the position description and required and preferred qualifications.

The committee reviews applications and selects a long-list of applicants to be interviewed remotely. The long-list needs to be approved by the hiring manager.

The committee selects a short-list of candidates to be invited for onsite interviews (either in person or remote). The short list may have backup candidates that would be invited if any of the candidates in the original short list declines before the interviews have started. The short-list needs to be approved by the hiring manager.

The search committee solicits and receives feedback from all stakeholders during and/or immediately following the on-site interview process. This may include organizing focus sessions with stakeholder groups, online feedback forms, etc., at the discretion of the search committee.

The search committee formulates a narrative of strengths and weaknesses that conveys the committee member's opinion and captures the opinions expressed by other stakeholders (faculty, postdocs, students, support staff, etc.)

The committee's decisions and narrative are presented at a faculty meeting with the search advocate present and discussed among all present. The committee may edit the recommendations in response to the discussion but retains the final authority on what is sent to the dean.

### **Conflict of Interest Policy for Physics Department faculty hires**

It is acknowledged that this policy cannot encompass every possible case and that some cases will need to be discussed ad hoc. This policy considers the most likely scenarios and sets guidelines and principles.

This policy applies to the discussions within the department. While significant discrepancies are not anticipated, search committees can make different determinations on the CoIs in their proceedings.

1. Anonymous feedback will not be considered in any case since it can give the appearance that CoIs are ignored.
2. Individuals with strong CoIs should not participate to the discussions of any candidate. However, they are allowed to provide feedback about the candidates they are not conflicted with to the search committee. These include:
  - Having been the PhD supervisor of the candidate.
  - Having written a recommendation letter for the candidate's application to this position
  - Having a significant scientific collaboration (many papers together in the last five years, not from within a large collaboration).
  - Having been the postdoctoral supervisor of a candidate in the previous 5 years.
  - Being in a personal relationship with the candidate (close friendship, family relation, romantic relationship, etc.).
  - Having a financial relationship with the candidate.
3. Individuals with weak CoIs should declare them at the beginning of the meeting but are otherwise allowed to be part of the conversations. These include:
  - Being part of the same large collaboration or having been part of the same collaboration in the previous 5 years.
  - Having been in the co-authorship on a limited number of publications in the previous five years.
  - Having been in the PhD committee of the candidate.
  - Having worked in the same institution as the candidate in the previous 5 years.

It is acknowledged that some of these have gray areas (e.g., what is a "large collaboration"). CoIs that can be argued about should be disclosed at the beginning of the meeting and the decision of whether they are strong or weak should be by majority vote. This same procedure applies to cases not explicitly considered in this policy.