

APPENDIX III

GOOD STANDING CRITERIA

A. DEFINITION of Good Standing

Plan Participants should be deemed in good standing until they are otherwise found to be not in good standing.

Plan Participants should meet Department/unit guidelines regarding productivity in research, teaching, patient care, mentoring, and University service as defined by their series, rank and step.

Plan Participants are responsible for actively participating in activities that support the Department/unit objectives.

Plan Participants are expected to demonstrate professional behaviors including collaboration and teamwork, and responsibility and accountability in all areas of work. Additionally, Plan Participants are expected to take responsibility for the overall success and well-being, including financial, of the Department/Unit.

Loss of good standing may occur in the following instances:

- Finding of faculty misconduct
- Finding of research misconduct
- Finding of unsatisfactory performance in a five year review
- Failure to meet expectations related to generation of salary support and/or shared expenses
- Refusal or failure to participate in assigned duties
- Loss of clinical privileges (as required)
- Loss of licensure and/or credentials (as required)
- Refusal or failure to participate in required trainings
- Lack of compliance with University policy and/or reporting requirements¹

B. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCESS

The Chair/ORU Director meets with the Plan Participant to discuss issues, how to remedy the situation and specific consequences as determined by the Plan, including but not limited to initiating the formal process outlined below. The Chair/ORU Director and the Plan Participant look for informal resolution as appropriate to circumstances but a specific timeline for that resolution must be determined. The Chair/ORU Director follows-up in writing with the Plan Participant confirming the details of their discussion.

If informal resolution is unsuccessful, the Department Chair/ORU Director must provide a written statement documenting the reasons for requesting that a Plan Participant be deemed not in Good Standing. The document should include recommendations on how to remedy the situation. Relevant back-up documentation should be attached.

The Plan Participant shall be given a copy of the written statement and an opportunity to provide a written response within 14 days to the Chair/ORU Director. If the issue is remedied within the 14 day response period, the Chair documents that the matter is closed.

If the issue is not remedied within the 14 day response period, the Statement, back-up documentation, and Plan Participant's response (if provided) should be sent to the Dean.

If the Dean's assessment is consistent with the Chair, then the Dean issues a written determination that the Plan Participant is not in Good Standing and identifies any corrective actions that must be taken in order to return to Good Standing.

¹ Other relevant University policies and/or consequences may be pursued as appropriate to the circumstances.

If the Dean's assessment is not consistent with the Chair, then the Dean issues a written determination that the Plan Participant remains in Good Standing.

Appeal process: If there is a determination of loss of Good Standing and the Plan Participant believes that the Good Standing Criteria have been applied unfairly, the Plan Participant may appeal to the Compensation Plan Advisory Committee. The Compensation Plan Advisory Committee provides a written assessment to the Dean for his/her consideration; however, the decision ultimately resides with the Dean. Senate faculty members may pursue their grievance rights before the Privilege and Tenure Committee under Senate Bylaw 335. Non-Senate faculty are entitled to a Step III hearing under APM - 140.

C. CONSEQUENCES

The following consequences may be imposed on Plan participants who have been determined to not be in good standing:

- Prohibition from participating and/or retaining income from outside professional activities
- Decrease in additional compensation (Y; see APM - 670-18-c(1))
- Loss of incentive/bonus compensation (Z; see APM - 670-18-c(2)).
- If a Plan Participant is unable to practice at a specific site due to revocation of clinical privileges, the Plan Participant must be willing to undertake new duties as assigned, or otherwise must forfeit the compensation from that assignment.
- Advance approval is required from the Department Chair to engage in any unassigned professional activities.
- Requests for any academic leaves will not be approved and/or requests previously approved will be revoked.

D. RETURN TO GOOD STANDING

The Plan Participant must submit a request to his/her Department Chair to return to good standing which outlines how the issues have been resolved or rectified. The Chair makes an assessment on any progress made and forwards his/her recommendation to the Dean along with the Plan Participant's request. If the assessment of the Chair is that no progress, or insufficient progress, has been made, the Chair should include in his/her recommendation to the Dean what further actions must be taken.

If the assessment of the Dean is that no progress, or insufficient progress, has been made, the Dean must notify in writing the Plan Participant that he/she has not been returned to Good Standing and outline what further actions must be taken.

If the Dean believes that all issues have been resolved, the Plan Participant will be notified in writing that they are now in Good Standing.

If the Plan Participant does not submit a request, he/she will continue to not be in good standing.

If a Plan Participant continues not to be in good standing for more than 90 days, the Chair may wish to pursue further actions as appropriate to relevant academic policy.

Appeal process: If the Dean determines that the Plan Participant has not returned to Good Standing and the Plan Participant disagrees with this determination based upon unfair assessment or application of the criteria, the Plan Participant may appeal to the Compensation Plan Advisory Committee. The Compensation Plan Advisory Committee provides a written assessment to the Dean for his/her consideration; however, the decision

ultimately resides with the Dean. Senate faculty members may pursue their grievance rights before the Privilege and Tenure Committee under Senate Bylaw 335. Non-Senate faculty are entitled to a Step III hearing under APM - 140.