

Professionalism Reports:

Reporting on instances of mistreatment or professionalism lapses enables the Faculty of Medicine to respond to these incidents in a timely manner. Reports of mistreatment or professionalism lapses can be reported by a witness, or by a person who was directly involved in the situation.

You are encouraged to discuss such incidents directly with the individual. If you are uncomfortable approaching the individual, the Faculty of Medicine encourages individuals to submit an incident report where a professionalism concern arises via the Faculty of Medicine's Professionalism [reporting tool](#).

The Vice-Dean and the delegates of the corresponding academic unit automatically receive a copy of the report. These reports are reviewed with appropriate follow-up.

Individuals who opt not to remain anonymous will be contacted by the Vice-Dean of the respective academic unit (Undergraduate, Graduate, Postgraduate, Faculty Affairs) and/or their delegate to further discuss the incident. It is preferable that the reporting individual identifies themselves so that appropriate action and follow up can be arranged. Anonymous complaints will be tracked. All information shared with the Vice-Dean and or their delegate will remain confidential.

Examples of professionalism concerns include harassment or discrimination, confidentiality breach, retaliation, uncooperative behaviours, academic fraud, or other unethical practices.

Incidents of Professionalism are categorized based on the severity of the allegations. The stages or levels as referred to in the Vanderbilt Model are described as follows:

- Coffee cup conversation – this is reserved for minor allegations and involves an informal conversation for single incidents,
- **Level 1:** Interventions are warranted for an incident of low severity. The perceived unprofessional or disruptive behaviour is brought to the attention of the individual concerned. It is explained why the observed behaviour is considered unprofessional or disruptive and the format of a response and methods of redress to stop the behaviour.
- **Level 1 remediation:** Depicts a documented confidential discussion on a professionalism issue between the individual and one with supervisory responsibilities. This is a non-punitive awareness intervention. Such documentation is not shared outside of the unit or department as applicable.
- **Level 2:** Interventions are warranted for behaviour that is of moderate severity or where stage one intervention has been ineffective, i.e. repetitive or when a pattern of behaviour has emerged. The methods of redress established at Level 1 are formalized, there may be more monitoring, a timeframe within which change or progress must be demonstrable and notification to the individual that another incident could result in more severe consequences.

Level 2 remediation: Depicts a documented confidential discussion between the individual and one with supervisory roles at a higher level such as the Chair of Department, the Chief of Staff, the Vice Dean of Faculty Affairs, the Vice Dean of PGME, the Vice Dean of UGME, as applicable based on the individual reporting lines. Level 2 or below tends to be more informal in nature and aims to provide formative feedback.

- **Level 3:** Interventions are required for behaviour that has continued despite previous interventions or where there is concern about the Quality of Care and of Clinical Services. At this level, discipline or sanctions are considered where appropriate.

Level 3 remediation: Depicts a formal investigation process as stipulated in the [Policy](#). Level 3 is a formal process and may have legal implications

Vanderbilt Model



For more information please refer to: <https://med.uottawa.ca/professional-affairs/policies/professionalism-policy>