Evaluation policies and procedures used in the accreditation process provide a system of checks and balances regarding the fairness and impartiality in all aspects of the accreditation process. Central to the fairness of the procedural aspects of the Commission’s operations and the impartiality of its decision making process is an organizational and personal duty to avoid real or perceived conflicts of interest. The potential for a conflict of interest arises when one’s duty to make decisions in the public’s interest is compromised by competing interests of a personal or private nature, including but not limited to pecuniary interests.

Conflict of interest is considered to be: 1) any relationship with an institution or program, or 2) a partiality or bias, either of which might interfere with objectivity in the accreditation review process. Procedures for selection of representatives of the Commission who participate in the evaluation process reinforce impartiality. These representatives include: Commissioners, Review Committee members, consultants/site visitors, and Commission staff.

In addition, procedures for institutional due process, as well as strict guidelines for all written documents and accreditation decisions, further reinforce adherence to fair accreditation practices. Every effort is made to avoid conflict of interest, either from the point of view of an institution/program being reviewed or from the point of view of any person representing the Commission.

1. Visiting Committee Members: Conflicts of interest may be identified by either an institution/program, Commissioner, consultant/site visitor or Commission staff. An institution/program has the right to reject the assignment of any Commissioner, consultant/site visitor or Commission staff because of a possible or perceived conflict of interest. The Commission expects all programs, Commissioners and/or consultants/site visitors to notify the Commission office immediately if, for any reason, there may be a conflict of interest or the appearance of such a conflict. Because of the nature of their positions, a state board representative will be a resident of the state in which a program is located and may be a graduate of the institution/program being visited. These components of the policy do not apply for state board representatives, although the program retains the right to reject an individual’s assignment for other reasons.

Possible conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to, a consultant/site visitor who:
- is a graduate of a program at the institution;
- has served as a consultant/site visitor, consultant, employee or appointee of the institution;
- has a family member who is employed or affiliated with the institution;
- has a close professional or personal relationship with the institution/program or key personnel in the institution/program which would, from the standpoint of a reasonable person, create the appearance of a conflict;
- manifests a partiality that prevents objective consideration of a program for accreditation;
- is affiliated with an institution/program in the same state; and/or
- is a resident of the state.

If an institutional administrator, faculty member or consultant/site visitor has doubt as to whether or not a conflict of interest could exist, Commission staff should be consulted prior to the site visit. The Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and a public member of the Commission, in consultation with Commission staff and legal counsel, may make a final determination about such conflicts.

2. Commissioners, Review Committee Members And Members Of The Appeal Board: The Commission firmly believes that conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest must be avoided in all situations in which accreditation recommendations or decisions are being made by Commissioners, Review Committee members, or members of the Appeal Board.
No Commissioner, Review Committee member, or member of the Appeal Board should participate in any way in accrediting decisions in which he or she has a financial or personal interest or, because of an institutional or program association, has divided loyalties and/or has a conflict of interest on the outcome of the decision. Areas of conflict of interest for Commissioners, Review Committee members and/or members of the Appeal Board include, but are not limited to:

- close professional or personal relationships or affiliation with the institution/program or key personnel in the institution/program which may create the appearance of a conflict;
- serving as a consultant to the institution/program;
- being a graduate of the institution/program;
- being a current employee or appointee of the institution/program;
- being a current student at the institution/program;
- having a family member who is employed by or affiliated with the institution;
- manifesting a professional or personal interest at odds with the institution or program;
- key personnel of the institution/program having graduated from the program of the Commissioner, Review Committee member, or member of the Appeal Board;
- having served on the program’s visiting committee; and/or
- no longer a current employee of the institution or program but having been employed there within the past five (5) years.

To safeguard the objectivity of the Commission and Review Committees, conflict of interest determinations shall be made by the Chairperson of the Commission. If the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson, in consultation with a public member, staff and legal counsel, determine that a Commissioner or Review Committee member has a conflict of interest in connection with a particular program, the report for that program will not be provided to that individual, either in an advance mailing or at the time of the meeting. Further, the individual must leave the room when they have any of the above conflicts. In cases in which the existence of a conflict of interest is less obvious, it is the responsibility of any committee member who feels that a potential direct conflict of interest exists to absent himself/herself from the room during the discussion of the particular accreditation report.

To safeguard the objectivity of the Appeal Board, any member who has a conflict of interest in connection with a program filing an appeal must inform the Director of the Commission. The report for that program will not be provided to that individual, either in an advance mailing or at the time of the meeting, and the individual must leave the room when the program is being discussed.

Conflicts of interest for Commissioners, Review Committee members and members of the Appeal Board may also include being from the same state, but not the same program. The Commission is aware that being from the same state may not itself be a conflict; however, when residence within the same state is in addition to any of the items listed above, a conflict would exist. This provision refers to the concept of conflict of interest in the context of accreditation decisions. The prohibitions and limitations are not intended to exclude participation and decision-making in other areas, such as policy development and standard setting.

Commissioners are expected to evaluate each accreditation action, policy decision or standard adoption for the overall good of the public. The American Dental Association (ADA) Constitution and Bylaws limits the involvement of the members of the ADA, the American Dental Education Association and the American Association of Dental Boards in areas beyond the organization that appointed them. Although Commissioners are appointed by designated communities of interest, their duty of loyalty is first and foremost to the Commission. A conflict of interest exists when a Commissioner holds appointment as an officer in another organization within the Commission’s communities of interest. Therefore, a conflict of interest exists when a Commissioner or a Commissioner-designee provides simultaneous service to the Commission and an organization within the communities of interest. (Refer to Policy on Simultaneous Service)
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3. **Commission Staff Members**: Although Commission on Dental Accreditation staff does not participate directly in decisions by volunteers regarding accreditation, they are in a position to influence the outcomes of the process. On the other hand, staff provides equity and consistency among site visits and guidance interpreting the Commission’s policies and procedures.

For these reasons, Commission staff adheres to the guidelines for consultants/site visitors, within the time limitations listed and with the exception of the state residency, including:

- graduation from a program at the institution within the last five years;
- service as a consultant/site visitor, employee or appointee of the institution within the last five years; and/or
- close personal or familial relationships with key personnel in the institution/program.
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