Implementation Procedures

1. The conflicts of interest policy is to be widely publicized and readily accessible to AERA members. The Code of Ethics (to be reviewed for possible revision subsequent to Council’s adoption of the conflicts of interest policy) may include general ethical guidance on conflicts of interest beyond just serving the Association.
2. Those elected or appointed to positions in the Association will be informed of the conflict rules and acknowledge their acceptance of the policy as part of their acceptance of the position or appointment.
3. All AERA bodies that allocate benefits or make decisions that can have positive consequences for some and not for others are expected to observe recusal rules and seek clarification from the AERA Ethics Committee or the Executive Director in cases of ambiguity. With bodies that require fuller procedures than can be accounted for by the general policy, the Executive Director or the President should be so informed.
4. Individuals in elective, appointed, or staff positions who may be faced with a potential conflict of interest or appearance of conflict of interest should take appropriate steps to recuse themselves from the activity or action and should either ask an alternate to serve in that role (a chair asking a chair-elect, an editor asking an associate editor) or inform those who otherwise would be responsible for making an alternate appointment (a staff program director informing the executive director or an associate editor informing an editor).

APPENDIX A
Conflicts of Interest Policy for Awards Selection
American Educational Research Association
Adopted by Council, June 30, 2006

Introduction

The following policy was adopted by the American Educational Research Association (AERA) to guide the handling of conflicts of interest for award committees and other entities in the selection of awards. This policy applies to all AERA award selection committees, Division award selection committees, SIG award selection committees, and certain AERA committees that confer awards. The Association has similar policies governing other deliberating bodies that provide opportunities, benefits, or awards to others, including procedures that guide the Publications Committee, the Books Editorial Board, and advisory committees for fellowships and grants (e.g., the Governing Board for the AERA Grants Program). The purpose of these policies is to avert to the extent possible biasing circumstances, or the appearance of biasing circumstances, in the selection of AERA awardees.

Ethical Standards

1. Award Eligibility. Members of award selection committees are not eligible to be candidates for that award during their terms of service.
2. Required Circumstances. Certain biasing or potentially biasing relationships to an award nominee require committee members to withdraw from service on award selection committees. They include:
   a. current or former chair or current or former student of a chair;
   b. family member, spouse, or partner;
   c. anyone with whom one has a current business or financial relationship (e.g., business partner, employer, employee);
   d. research collaborator or co-author who is currently in that relationship or has been within the last five years; or
   e. anyone working at the same institution or having accepted a position at the same institution.
3. Elective Circumstances. Members of award selection committees may for other reasons determine that they have conflicts or potential conflicts that require elimination from service and then act on that determination if they believe that service could affect the fairness of the selection process.

Implementation Procedures

1. The conflict of interest standards and implementation procedures for award committee service should be widely publicized and readily accessible to AERA members.
2. AERA presidents, presidents-elect, division vice presidents, chairs of SIGs, and others appointing members of award selection committees should make potential committee members aware of these ethical standards and the implementation procedures.
3. Alternates should be appointed by or readily accessible to those appointing members of selection committees so that substitute appointments can be readily made if any committee member or members need to step down from service.
   a. In the case of AERA-wide awards, the President-Elect should appoint award selection committee members in advance of the selection process during the ongoing year and advise incoming committee members that they are alternates for accelerated service for an additional year if a vacancy arises due to a conflict of interest in the year before the commencement of service.
   b. In the case of AERA committee awards, selection should be made by a subcommittee so that the chair of the committee can select other members of the committee as alternates if a vacancy arises due to a conflict.
   c. Division vice presidents and SIG chairs should be prepared to appoint alternates expeditiously if a vacancy arises due to a conflict.
4. Upon completion of the nomination process, committee members need to make known whether they can continue service on the award selection committee or whether they are in a circumstance that mandates withdrawal from service.
5. If vacancies occur on award selection committees due to withdrawal of members from service, those vacancies should be filled promptly by those in a position to fill such vacancies on committees.
6. Any award selection chair or committee member with questions or ambiguous circumstances or who finds the full implementation disruptive should seek the advice of the Executive Director, who will, where necessary, consult with the President on this policy and its implementation.

APPENDIX B
Conflicts of Interest Policy for Publications Committee
All Policies in Manual Previously Adopted by Council

Conflicts of Interest
Committee Deliberations
The Publications Committee observes conflict of interest rules in its deliberations. In the consideration of editor candidates, members of the Committee recuse themselves if a familial or personal relationship or institutional affiliation creates a biasing conflict. The conflict of interest guidelines are as follows (Publications Committee, August 2004):

Committee members will not participate in evaluation of applications from their own institutions. Members will also not evaluate applications in cases where they have co-published articles or volumes with applicants, or in cases where they are currently collaborating with applicants in directing projects jointly or have done so within the past five years. A member will also not evaluate an application if he or she chaired the doctoral committee of that candidate. Any committee member may additionally declare a conflict based on any positive or negative judgments that the committee member determines are sufficiently strong to be biasing. Committee members with conflict of interest will not be included in Committee discussions of applications where these conflicts arise. Committee members may be present during stages of decision making when ranking of applications occurs but may not participate in ranking those applications or comment on the ranking of those applicants.

Benefiting From Position
Members of the Publications Committee may not be seen as being in a position to profit from the use of confidential information to which they have had access because of their service on the Committee. Thus, should privileged information regarding a particular article or publication (e.g., the discussion of a grievance, or the review of a controversial editorial decision) come before the Committee, members of the Committee shall not speak or write directly in an independent capacity (e.g., by publishing a critique) about the article or publication in question. (Publications Committee, April 1995)

APPENDIX C
Conflicts of Interest Policy for AERA Books Program and Books Editorial Board
Adopted by Board May 2005 and Council January 27, 2008

Members of the Books Editorial Board are precluded from submitting book projects for consideration by the Books Editorial Board and also from being an author on a book project submitted to or accepted by the Board for publication by AERA. This policy ensures that the AERA Book Publications Program operates without Board members’ benefiting from their roles on the Board or appearing to do so.

This policy extends to all books under consideration by or in production for AERA publication. These conflict rules govern Board members’ involvement in any AERA book, and they also preclude the resignation of a Board member in order to submit a proposal for consideration of a possible project during which would have otherwise been her or his term as a Board member. The reason for precluding resignation in order to allow the submission of a proposal flows from the basic rule that no member of a Board or deliberative body should benefit from service or from an attenuation of service and that the possibilities of real or perceived undue influence of the remaining Board members would constitute a conflict.

One exception to the conflict rule presents itself: The AERA has in place a right of first refusal for potential book projects emanating from AERA projects, activities, or initiatives undertaken on behalf of the Association. It is understood that members of the Books Editorial Board may be in that situation with respect to prior or ongoing work. In most instances such projects may be known in advance as intending to produce books, and AERA presidents making appointments to the Board are asked to avert such appointments and the conflict between competing principles under which the Books Program operates (i.e., conflict rules and the right of first refusal).

In the rare event that such a conflict of principles might present itself without prior knowledge by any of the parties, the spirit and intent of the conflicts of interest policy is to mitigate the appearance or reality of a conflict. Accordingly, in considering such volumes, the Books Editorial Board would not be involved in the review of proposals and subsequent review of volumes. Instead, the Chair of the Books Editorial Board and the Executive Director would handle the review of book proposals and of subsequent manuscripts through the use of ad hoc expert reviewers. In the event that both of these individuals have such a conflict, the Chair of the Publications Committee would be asked to preside over the ad hoc review. The Books Editorial Board would be kept informed about the status of the project, but the Board would not participate in the review or recommendation of such volumes or in any other deliberation.