



Office of the Ombuds
University of California, Santa Barbara

**2007-2008
Annual Report**

**Priscilla Mori,
Campus Ombuds**

I. ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF THE OMBUDS

A. Mission Statement

The Office of the Ombuds is a *confidential, impartial, informal, and independent* resource for conflict prevention, management, and resolution that serves all members of the UCSB community, including faculty, staff, and students. The Office assists those who seek guidance with the resolution of academic or administrative issues and disputes that are not being adequately addressed through other University procedures. It is a safe, confidential, and impartial place to express concerns.

The Office advocates for fairness and works to ensure that all members of the University community receive equitable treatment. The Office serves the campus community by helping to resolve complaints, by providing information and referrals, and by making recommendations for constructive change when University policies or procedures generate conflicts or concerns. The Office adheres to professional standards of practice to create an environment where members of the UCSB community can obtain information, review options, and resolve problems. The Office is also committed to facilitating campus-wide conflict management with an emphasis on conflict prevention.

B. Standards of Practice

The Office seeks to accomplish its mission by applying four core tenets: independence, impartiality, informality and confidentiality. These are standards of practice established by the International Ombudsman Association (IOA).

Independence: The Office is independent. To ensure objectivity, it operates independently of usual administrative authorities. The Office reports to the Executive Vice Chancellor for administrative and budgetary purposes only, but not regarding the substance of matters discussed in the office.

Impartiality: The Office is impartial. The staff will not take sides in any conflict, dispute, or issue, but will consider the interests and concerns of all parties involved with the aim of achieving a fair and equitable outcome. If the Ombuds believes a university policy or procedure is unfair, the Office will advocate for fairness.

Informality: The Office is informal. The staff facilitates communication when conflict arises and provides the opportunity for informal dispute resolution. The Office does not arbitrate, adjudicate, or participate in any internal or external formal process.

Confidentiality: The Office will maintain strict confidentiality to the extent permitted by the law; the only exception to this confidentiality is when the Office determines that an imminent threat of serious harm exists. It is not an office of official university notice about the existence of a problem.

II. 2007-2008 OVERVIEW

During this academic/fiscal year, we have moved forward in a number of areas to achieve a level of stability as we have grown in our visibility and impact on the campus. We have taken conscious steps to advertise our services and remind campus members of our role, the range of our services, and our availability. We have partnered with other campus offices and served on campus committees. We have also undergone staffing changes and invested in staff training. We have provided training sessions to various groups. We have received support and feedback from an active Ombuds Advisory Committee. The Executive Vice Chancellor has also continued to provide support for our ongoing efforts.

A. Staffing

After a successful recruitment process during the summer of 2007, Kirsi Aulin was hired in September 2007 as the Associate Ombuds. Kirsi's previous appointment was in the Student Health Service on campus. Kirsi is a licensed marriage and family therapist, and brings to our office a rich background in dealing with a wide variety of people. Kirsi has taken cases herself during this year, and has collaborated with others in the office as she is in the process of learning the Ombuds profession and the campus culture, policies, and procedures. She is also developing training modules for implementation during the 2008-2009 academic year. She also provided artistic and design support for our outreach materials.

Bill Forgie was again appointed as Faculty Ombuds at 25% time from October 2007 through June 2008 and was the primary Ombuds for 25 cases during the year. Bill's expertise as a faculty member who is very familiar with campus academic issues has been invaluable both to users of the office and to the staff of the office. Bill also pursued additional Ombuds-related training this year, which will be reflected in the "Training Attended" section below.

Priscilla Mori completed her first full year as Campus Ombuds, having been appointed to that position in May of 2007. She oversaw the further development of office resources and services and was the primary Ombuds for 173 cases during the year.

Lainie Pascall continued to serve as Intake Coordinator and Office Manager, and provided additional service dealing with student cases, particularly during the summer before Kirsi Aulin was hired. Lainie also participated in the Professional Development Group, a program sponsored by the Division of Student Affairs on campus.

B. Administrative Support

Lainie Pascall proactively provides administrative support of consistently high quality. Not only is she the person who most users of the office encounter first, but she also handles an administrative workload that, this year, included the following:

- Updated intake forms
- Updated statistics forms to conform with new IOA categories
- Updated user data sheet
- Redesigned and updated outreach materials, including brochure, bookmarks, and cards
- Updated our website and PowerPoint presentations
- Developed initial plan for Threat Management Team website and coordinated with web designer

- Coordinated visits of Ombuds staff to various campus locations
- Updated database
- Prepared statistical reports as needed
- Handled case intake for most of the 318 cases
- Served as primary Ombuds for 72 cases
- Provided travel arrangements for Ombuds training sessions and conference
- Coordinated arrangements for the Ombuds Advisory Committee and prepared meeting notes
- Completed financial transactions and maintained appropriate departmental documentation

C. Training/Professional Activities/Outreach

The level of training and related professional activities is essential in order for us to be informed and engaged, both in the Ombuds profession as well as in the campus community. It behooves us to be informed, both for the sake of the integrity of our own organization, but also to be aware of the broader issues that are of concern to visitors to our office.

1. Training Attended - Off Campus

Priscilla, Bill, and Kirsi

- IOA Annual Conference in Boston, April 2008
Professional conference of the International Ombudsman Association, with opportunities to attend sessions on topics relevant to the profession and connect with professional colleagues from around the world, Bill facilitated a topical session on the way we “get the word out” about our services.

Bill and Kirsi

- Southern California Ombuds Caucus, October 2007 and May 2008
Professional meeting with Ombuds from the Southern California region representing a variety of institutions, both inside and outside academia

Bill

- Ombuds 101 in Philadelphia, October 2007
Basic Ombuds training offered by the International Ombudsman Association

Kirsi

- Ombuds 101 in Las Vegas, March 2008
Basic Ombuds training offered by the International Ombudsman Association
- Cottage Hospital Psychiatric Grand Rounds, Quarterly
Information on current issues in mental health and community resources
- Law & Ethics Training, June 2008
Online continuing education requirement administered by Professional Psychology Seminars

Priscilla

- UC Ombuds Meeting in Berkeley, March 2008
Meeting of UC Ombuds to collaborate and share ideas and resources

Lainie

- NASPA Western Regional Conference in Las Vegas, November 2007
Meeting of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

2. Training Attended - On Campus

Priscilla, Bill, Kirsi, Lainie

- Active Shooter, April 2008

Priscilla, Kirsi, and Lainie

- Learn at Lunch re: Social Networking Sites, February 2008

Priscilla and Lainie

- Threat Management Team Training, August 2007

Kirsi and Lainie

- Distressed Students Training, January 2008
- Administrative Services Business Officers Meeting, March 2008

Kirsi and Bill

- First Amendment on the College Campus, November 2007

Kirsi and Priscilla

- Letters and Science Chair and Business Officer Meeting, March 2008

Priscilla

- Ethics Workshop, August 2007
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Training, November, 2007

Kirsi

- Critical Incident Response, February 2008
- Issues Facing Women Junior Faculty, March 2008
- Non-Academic Jobs for Ph.Ds, April 2008
- Staff Town Hall, May 2008

Lainie

- UCSB Extension Course: Reframing Communication, September 2007
- UCSB Extension Course: Difficult People, September 2007
- Human Resources: Open Enrollment and Benefits, October 2007
- Sexual Harassment Training, December 2007
- Purchasing 101, January 2008
- UCSB Extension Course: Mediation, January 2008
- BELI Training, March 2008
- Time Reporting Workshop, March 2008
- Department Safety Representative Training, May 2008

3. Training Provided

The staff provided training sessions on ten different occasions this year; preparation and presentation time for these combined was over 100 hours. Although many of these sessions were confidential in nature, the scope of topics included team building, communication and conflict, and threat management; members of the audience included faculty, staff, students, and community members. The threat management training involved collaboration with other professionals on campus, and was part of a broader effort to inform the campus about strategies and a new draft policy to deal with intimidation, threats of violence, and acts of violence. Often as a result of these group sessions, individuals learned of the Ombuds' services and utilized them on an individual basis.

4. Outreach

We have taken a multi-pronged approach to outreach, using a combination of methods to describe our services and invite individuals to use them and refer others to use them. In addition to the various training sessions described above, we have:

- sent personal letters to those on campus who typically refer faculty, staff, and students to other services
- met personally with campus administrators, with particular efforts to reach out to those new to their roles
- provided material in new staff orientation packets
- provided material in new student orientation packets
- made presentations to new student orientation staff, resident assistants, and resident directors
- published an article in Diversity Forum (Spring 2007)
- made presentations to new chairs and new faculty
- provided contact information in General Catalog and quarterly Schedule of Classes
- maintained and updated our website with an array of information and resources

D. University Service/Committees

Priscilla Mori

- Sustaining Community and Preventing Violence Policy Workgroup
- Faculty Club Board
- Financial Aid Advisory Committee
- Threat Management Team
- Consultation Support Group
- Student Resource Group
- Campus Emergency Planning Committee

Kirsi Aulin

- HIV Working Group

Lainie Pascall

- Professional Women's Association
- Professional Development Group (Student Affairs)

E. Office Location

The Office has been located in 1205-K Girvetz Hall since May 2005. This location is a four-room suite of offices, including a conference room that has also served as an office for Bill Forgie. This central campus location is ideal; it is accessible for most campus members, yet fairly private.

We have continued to use the “white noise” system to deal with acoustic issues related to confidentiality. It provides the necessary privacy enhancement that allows us to maintain our standard of confidentiality in a limited amount of space.

Space continues to be a challenge when we are dealing with groups of multiple users. Two of our offices are fine for one-on-one meetings, but often we have groups meeting with us. A more ideal situation would be one in which we have a separate space for the Faculty Ombuds, and a separate space for intake sessions that are often long and involved and need to be conducted in private space. We hope to augment our space in the future.

F. Professional Affiliation

The International Ombudsman Association (IOA) is the professional organization of which we are members as Ombuds on our campus. This organization provides professional affiliation and training opportunities as well as ongoing discussions on challenging topics relevant to the profession. Our office operates consistent with the IOA standards of practice, including the tenets of confidentiality, informality, independence, and impartiality. Our credibility as an office and as members of the profession is tied directly to adhering to these tenets tenaciously. In April 2008, Priscilla, Bill, and Kirsi attended the annual meeting of the IOA in Boston.

The UC system-wide Ombuds group has been active during this year in ongoing conversations, emails, and meetings. The group met together physically once during the year (in Berkeley) and Priscilla attended that meeting. The members have provided ongoing advice and support to one another, and have used one another as resources for multiple issues, sometimes one-on-one, and sometimes in the larger group setting. In a previous year, the group drafted a UC Ombuds Best Practices document which was presented to each of our campuses as a document which represents appropriate practices that tie our UC Ombuds practices to IOA standards of practice, thus solidifying the credibility of our operations across the UC system. In addition, the document, which is also on our website, provides guidelines for UC campuses that may create Ombuds offices in the future. This year the UC Ombuds group met with representatives from two campuses that are contemplating the creation of an Ombuds office.

Our office also participated this year in two meetings of the Southern California Ombuds Caucus, a group composed of educational, governmental, and private sector Ombuds who meet together to share best practices, resources, and issues relevant to the profession. (UCSB seems to be the northern-most participant in this southern California organization.)

In addition, Kirsi is continuing to maintain her status as a Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist by fulfilling the standards and requirements of the California Board of Behavioral Sciences.

G. Ombuds Advisory Committee

The Ombuds Advisory Committee met three times in the course of the academic year. It is a campus committee and the Executive Vice Chancellor appoints the members. Committee members' terms of service are established with the possibility of individuals serving two consecutive terms and are staggered to ensure continuity. The undergraduate student representative each year is the Goodspeed intern, an internship coordinated by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

The committee has two main functions:

- To act as a sounding board and advisor to the Office in regard to such matters as the Annual Report and its distribution, promotion and marketing of the office, hiring of staff, additional duties, professional development plans, and the annual budget;
- To receive and respond to comments or complaints about the Office and to convene the committee should such concerns arise.

The appointed members for 2007-08:

- Jon Cruz, Faculty Representative and Chair
- Nancy Collins, Faculty Representative
- Robin Rogers, Staff Representative
- Amy Van Meter, Staff Representative
- Grace Anderson, Graduate Student Representative
- Leila Jelloule, Undergraduate Student Representative

Ex-officio members during 2007-08:

- Priscilla Mori, Campus Ombuds
- Bill Forgie, Faculty Ombuds
- Kirsi Aulin, Associate Ombuds
- Lainie Pascall, Office Manager and Intake Coordinator

H. Other Campus Issues

Over the course of the year, Priscilla contributed a significant amount of time and effort to the development of the Threat Management Team (TMT) on campus. This team is a broadened version of the Civil and Responsible Environment (CARE) team that was in existence on campus for a number of years. Together with other campus staff members including John Berberet, Burt Romotsky, and Carolyn Buford, Priscilla participated in a process to define the scope of the role of TMT and, with the help of Meta Clow, drafted a related policy that was distributed to the UCSB campus for input and review during this year. Priscilla also participated in the initial TMT training sessions for TMT members and other interested campus individuals. Lainie has also been a key contributor in the process of developing a TMT website which will go live sometime in the 2008-09 academic year.


III. CASES, CONTACTS, AND ISSUES

The Office of the Ombuds is a resource for all members of the UCSB campus community including faculty, staff, students, parents, researchers, and visitors.

In the course of the year, we handled 318 cases, which represents an increase of approximately 40% over the previous year. The timing of the cases in terms of time in the quarter and months in the year approximately reflects that of previous years, but the rise in cases during the months of October, January, and June was particularly significant in 2007-08. We attribute the steep rise in visitors in October to the personal letters that we sent to 407 campus contacts at the beginning of the Fall Quarter. The ebb and flow of visitors during most of the academic year is predictable based on the academic calendar.

2007-2008 Case Total By Month:


July	16
August	22
September	20
October	38
November	30
December	23
January	36
February	20
March	24
April	21
May	32
June	36



Staff members comprised 40% of our visitors, virtually unchanged from 37% the previous year, although in raw numbers there were 126 staff cases this year and 86 staff cases last year. Faculty (ladder and non-ladder) comprised 14%, compared to 18% the previous year. But in raw numbers, there were 42 faculty cases this year, and 40 cases last year. So although the faculty case percentage of the total was different, actual case numbers were very similar over the two years. The researcher/post doc numbers were very similar at approximately 2% of our visitors.

Student visitors this year amounted to 34% of our numbers, 24% being undergraduates and 10% graduate students. Last year student visitors were 36%, with 22% undergraduates and 14% graduate students. The mix of graduates and undergraduates varied slightly, but the total student population of visitors remained fairly constant.

There were a significant amount of visitors in what we have called the “other” category, which includes parents, community members, and other users of the office. The percentage of other users was 6% this year (real numbers=18). It is feasible that these “other” users may understand the role of an ombuds in a more generic way, outside the campus environment, and find us as a resource particularly because they do not fit in the traditional categories of those who are part of the campus community. It is sometimes difficult for individuals in this “other” category to determine where to go on campus to bring up concerns or ask questions. Some “other” users are alumni who knew about the office when they were students here.




* “Faculty” includes Administrators and Department Chairs

** “Staff” includes Business Officers, Managers, and Supervisors


*** “Other” includes Parents, Community Members, Alumni, and other users of the Office

We have tracked the self-reports of our visitors to determine how they heard about our office. The numbers reflect the fact that a significant number of individuals (34%) heard about us from other individuals on campus, or they know us as personal acquaintances, or they have been on campus for a long time and have known about the existence of the office. Those who identified themselves as “self-referrals” amounted to 29% of our visitors. Repeat users accounted for 12% of our visitors. Those who learned about us on the website were 4%. Some learned about us through presentations made on campus. We will continue to track this information, and we will also continue our broad-based efforts at publicity.


The complexity of cases is based on a combination of factors including risk level, impact on the organization or impact on others, perceived impact on the individual, and effort by the Ombuds. It is based on a judgment call made by the Ombuds who is primarily responsible for the case. Case complexity is rated on a 1-5 scale, with a "1" indicating a non-complex case and "5" rating an extremely complex case. The number of hours spent on each case is not necessarily comparable to the complexity of the case. We have found that the pattern of case complexity remains fairly constant over the years.



The pattern of the number of hours spent on cases is also fairly consistent over the years, with most cases needing about 1-2 hours of our time. Usually this involves one to two meetings or conversations. The spread, however, with 25% of the cases involving 3 or more hours, illustrates that a significant number of cases are not quickly or easily resolved.




We encourage users of the office to contact us by phone rather than by email because confidentiality on email cannot be assured. So the vast majority of users contact us by phone or walk-in, but the percentage of our visitors who contact us by email doubled in the last year. This reflects the ease of use of email and the general acceptance of email as a mode of communication. We do not, however, advertise our email addresses on our website. We want to be available to walk-in visitors, but sometimes being available in this way presents challenges to dealing with individuals in a confidential way. Our space constraints do not always allow us to meet with walk-in visitors in a confidential space. Sometimes we can make arrangements for visitors to return at another time, but that is not always feasible. For some, particularly student visitors, the fact that we are accessible for walk-in visits, makes us an option for them as a resource when they need immediate help.




We have tracked the categories of concerns brought to the office in two different ways this year. We have continued the use of UCSB-specific categories that we have used in the past (tweaking those slightly to provide new categories to such concerns as “ethical dilemmas.”) We have also tracked concerns more broadly according to the categories recommended by the IOA. The results, as one might expect, are not in contrast with each other, but the IOA categories allow us to break apart such issues according to the nature of the relationships of those involved. For example, we can track issues between colleagues or peers in different categories than those among supervisor/supervisee or faculty/student.

UCSB Categories



IOA Case Categories



Please see Appendix I for full descriptions of IOA case categories.

IV. OBSERVATIONS AND INTERPRETATION

The use of our office is up about 40% over the previous two years. There is no one “normal path” to our office, but most visitors who come are repeat users, know one of the Ombuds, or have been referred by friends or other offices on campus. The referrals from others indicate to us that there is a campus awareness (at least among the staff) of our existence and our role. I believe the effectiveness of our service is our strongest asset—people come back and refer their colleagues and friends.

Of the broad categories that we have used to define issues of our visitors, the following are the most common:

- Strained relationship
- Unfair treatment
- Management effectiveness
- Civility/Respect
- Policy concern

In parallel, we have tracked issues separately in cases involving evaluative relationships and in cases involving peer relationships.

The most common concerns in evaluative relationships (in order of frequency) are:

- Communication
- Supervisory Effectiveness
- Performance Appraisal/Grading
- Respect/Treatment
- Department Climate
- Trust/Integrity

The most common concerns in peer relationships (in order of frequency) are:

- Respect/Treatment
- Communication
- Trust/Integrity

Another common concern that is not tied to evaluative or peer relationships is the area of Administrative Decisions and Interpretation (IOA category 7C). It is not surprising that these issues are brought to our office because those who come here are often experiencing the feeling of being “up against the wall” in terms of their options in the institution. They can come to the office and talk through options in an atmosphere of confidentiality and safety.

An important aspect of our role on the campus is to be available as a resource for departments or subsets of departments for consultation or training. Such involvement is not reflected in our case statistics, but in many ways is tied directly to the types of issues individuals discuss with us privately. We often train or consult on issues involving communication, trust, building a department climate where open communication can occur and where trust can grow. Some of our cases involve working with two or more individuals who are experiencing difficulty in working or studying together. Sometimes it becomes clear that these relationships will never be workable, and sometimes individuals discover ways to make relationships work in a satisfactory way.

We have made a number of public presentations this year around many of the same topics that are those of highest concern to our visitors. We plan to continue and to increase these presentations as opportunities arise.

This year a significant amount of our time involved working with a campus team on the development of a Threat Management Team (TMT) and drafting a related policy that was sent out for campus review. We have also worked on the website which will “go live” in 2008-09.

In terms of patterns and trends, we have spent a substantial amount of time working with the challenges faced by faculty and graduate students/researchers as they work together. These issues are difficult from the perspective of the faculty members as well as the perspective of the graduate students and researchers. There is often a need for developing clarity of expectations and increasing the quality of the interactions. The power differential, of course, complicates the situations and makes them sensitive.

We are encouraged when we observe campus units work together toward common goals (such as Distressed Student Protocol participants working with the Threat Management Team.) We observe the challenges that ensue when campus units do not work together in ways that would be most productive. We look for opportunities to help coordinate effective communication.

We appreciate the fact that we have access to individuals at all levels of the institution and that, in general, there is an attitude of openness to hearing about concerns in their areas. We honor our commitment to confidentiality, and when we have permission to do so, can bring concerns to those who can appropriately take action to resolve difficult situations.

V. PLANS FOR 2008-2009

- Explore options to increase our visibility as an office.
- Encourage members of the campus community to build skills in the most common areas that are of concern to our visitors.
- Continue to share our resources (such as books from a small lending library and information about campus and community resources).
- Organize a book club with discussions on topics involving challenges and dilemmas of intrapersonal and interpersonal issues.
- Continue to attend training sessions to increase our knowledge and skills when it is both feasible and fiscally appropriate.
- Continue to explore options to provide training and partner with appropriate offices and individuals on campus to provide such training.
- Continue to meet one-on-one with campus administrators to initiate relationships and provide support and referral services.
- Work within budget constraints as we face the challenges of the upcoming year.

APPENDIX I

INTERNATIONAL OMBUDSMAN ASSOCIATION

VERSION 1, 2006

Reporting Categories

<p>1. Employee Compensation & Benefits Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about the equity, appropriateness and competitiveness of employee compensation, benefits and other benefit programs.</p> <p>1.a Compensation (rate of pay, salary amount, job salary classification/level)</p> <p>1.b Payroll (administration of pay, check wrong or delayed)</p> <p>1.c Benefits (decisions related to medical, dental, life, vacation/sick leave, education, worker's compensation insurance, etc.)</p> <p>1.d Retirement, Pension (eligibility, calculation of amount, retirement pension benefits)</p> <p>1.e Other (any other employee compensation or benefit not described by the above categories). Please specify below: Other 1: Other 2: Other 3: (add additional rows, if necessary) </p> <p>2. Evaluative Relationships Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries arising between people in evaluative relationships (i.e. supervisor-employee, faculty-student.)</p> <p>2.a Assignments/Schedules (appropriateness or fairness of tasks)</p> <p>2.b Feedback (feedback or recognition given, or responses to feedback received)</p> <p>2.c Consultation (requests for help in dealing with issues between two or more individuals they supervise/teach or with other unusual situations in evaluative relationships)</p> <p>2.d Performance Appraisal/Grading (job/academic performance in formal or informal evaluation)</p> <p>2.e Departmental Climate (prevailing behaviors, norms, or attitudes within a department for which supervisors or faculty have responsibility)</p> <p>2.f Supervisory Effectiveness (management of department or classroom, failure to address issues)</p> <p>2.g Insubordination (refusal to do what is asked)</p> <p>2.h Discipline (appropriateness, timeliness, requirements, alternatives, or options for responding)</p> <p>2.i Equity of Treatment (favoritism, one or more individuals receive preferential treatment)</p> <p>2.j Priorities, Values, Beliefs (differences about what should be considered important – or most important – often rooted in ethical or moral beliefs)</p> <p>2.k Respect/Treatment (demonstrations of inappropriate behavior, disregard for people, rudeness, crudeness, etc.</p>	<p>2.l Trust/Integrity (suspicion that others are not being honest, whether or to what extent one wishes to be honest, etc.)</p> <p>2.m Communication (quality and/or quantity of communication)</p> <p>2.n Bullying, Mobbing (abusive, threatening, and/or coercive behaviors)</p> <p>2.o Diversity-Related (comments or behaviors perceived to be insensitive, offensive, or intolerant on the basis of an identity-related difference such as race, gender, nationality, sexual orientation)</p> <p>2.p Retaliation (punitive behaviors for previous actions or comments, whistleblower)</p> <p>2.q Physical Violence (actual or threats of bodily harm to another)</p> <p>2.r Other (any other evaluative relationship not described by the above categories). Please specify below: Other 1: Other 2: Other 3: (add additional rows, if necessary) </p> <p>3. Peer and Colleague Relationships Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries involving peers or colleagues who do not have a supervisory-employee or student-professor relationship (e.g., two staff members within the same department or conflict involving members of a student organization).</p> <p>3.a Priorities, Values, Beliefs (differences about what should be considered important – or most important – often rooted in ethical or moral beliefs)</p> <p>3.b Respect/Treatment (demonstrations of inappropriate regard for people, not listening, rudeness, crudeness, etc.)</p> <p>3.c Trust/Integrity (suspicion that others are not being honest, whether or to what extent one wishes to be honest, etc.)</p> <p>3.d Communication (quality and/or quantity of communication)</p> <p>3.e Bullying, Mobbing (abusive, threatening, and/or coercive behaviors)</p> <p>3.f Diversity-Related (comments or behaviors perceived to be insensitive, offensive, or intolerant on the basis of an identity-related difference such as race, gender, nationality, sexual orientation)</p> <p>3.g Retaliation (punitive behaviors for previous actions or comments, whistleblower)</p> <p>3.h Physical Violence (actual or threats of bodily harm to another)</p> <p>3.i Other (any peer or colleague relationship not described by the above categories). Please specify below: Other 1: Other 2:</p>	<p>Other 3: (add additional rows, if necessary) </p> <p>4. Career Progression and Development Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about administrative processes and decisions regarding entering and leaving a job, what it entails, (i.e., recruitment, nature and place of assignment, job security, and separation.)</p> <p>4.a Job Application/Selection and Recruitment Processes (recruitment and selection processes, facilitation of job applications, short-listing and criteria for selection, disputed decisions linked to recruitment and selection)</p> <p>4.b Job Classification and Description (changes or disagreements over requirements of assignment, appropriate amount of work and/or tasks)</p> <p>4.c Involuntary Transfer/Change of Assignment (notice, selection and special dislocation rights/benefits, removal from prior duties, unrequested change of work tasks)</p> <p>4.d Tenure/Position Security/Ambiguity (security of position or contract, provision of secure contractual categories), Career Progression (Promotion, Reappointment, or Tenure)</p> <p>4.e Rotation and Duration of Assignment (non-completion or over-extension of assignments in specific settings/countries, lack of access or involuntary transfer to specific roles/assignments, requests for transfer to other places/duties/roles)</p> <p>4.f Resignation (concerns about whether or how to voluntarily terminate employment or how such a decision might be communicated appropriately)</p> <p>4.g Termination/Non-Renewal (end of contract, non-renewal of contract, disputed permanent separation from organization)</p> <p>4.h Re-employment of Former or Retired Staff (loss of competitive advantages associated with re-hiring retired staff, favoritism)</p> <p>4.i Position Elimination (elimination or abolition of an individual's position)</p> <p>4.j Career Development/Coaching/Mentoring (classroom, on-the-job, and varied assignments as training and developmental opportunities)</p> <p>4.k Other (any other issues linked to recruitment, assignment, job security or separation not described by the above categories). Please specify below: Other 1: Other 2: Other 3: (add additional rows, if necessary) </p>
---	--	---

5. Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries that may create a legal risk (financial, sanction etc.) for the organization or its members if not addressed, including issues related to waste, fraud or abuse.
- 5.a Criminal Activity (threats or crimes planned, observed, or experienced, fraud)
- 5.b Business and Financial Practices (inappropriate actions that abuse or waste organizational finances, facilities or equipment)
- 5.c Harassment (unwelcome physical, verbal, written, psychological or sexual conduct that creates a hostile or intimidating environment)
- 5.d Discrimination (different treatment compared with others or exclusion from some benefit on the basis of, for example, gender, race, age, national origin, religion, etc.(being part of an Equal Employment Opportunity protected category – applies in the U.S.))
- 5.e Disability, Temporary or Permanent, Reasonable Accommodation (extra time on exams, provision of assistive technology, interpreters, or Braille materials including questions on policies, etc. for people with disabilities)
- 5.f Accessibility (removal of physical barriers, providing ramps, elevators, etc.)
- 5.g Intellectual Property Rights (e.g., copyright and patent infringement)
- 5.h Privacy and Security of Information (release or access to individual or organizational private or confidential information)
- 5.i Other (any other legal, financial and compliance issue not described by the above categories). Please specify below:
Other 1:
Other 2:
Other 3: (add additional rows, if necessary)
.....
.....
6. Safety, Health, and Physical Environment Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about Safety, Health and Infrastructure-related issues.
- 6.a Safety (physical safety, medical evacuation, meeting federal and state requirements for safety training and equipment)
- 6.b Physical Working Conditions (temperature, odors, noise, available space, lighting, etc)
- 6.c Ergonomics (proper set-up of workstation affecting physical functioning)
- 6.d Cleanliness (sanitary conditions and facilities to prevent the spread of disease)
- 6.e Security (adequate lighting in parking lots, metal detectors, guards, limited access to building by outsiders, anti-terrorists measures (not for classifying "compromise of classified or top secret" information)
- 6.f Telework/Flexplace (ability to work from home or other location because of business or personal need, e.g., in case of man-made or natural emergency)
- 6.g Safety Equipment (access to/use of safety equipment as well as access to or use of safety equipment, e.g., fire extinguisher)
- 6.h Environmental Policies (policies not being followed, being unfair ineffective, cumbersome)
- 6.i Work Related Stress and Work-Life Balance (Post-Traumatic Stress, Critical Incident Response, internal/external stress, e.g. divorce, shooting, caring for sick, injured)
- 6.j Other (any safety, health, or physical environment issue not described by the above categories). Please specify below:
Other 1:
Other 2:
Other 3: (add additional rows, if necessary)
.....
.....
7. Services/Administrative Issues Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about services or administrative offices.
- 7.a Quality of Services (how well services were provided, accuracy or thoroughness of information, competence, etc.)
- 7.b Responsiveness/Timeliness (time involved in getting a response or return call or about the time for a complete response to be provided)
- 7.c Administrative Decisions and Interpretation/ Application of Rules (non-disciplinary decisions by those providing administrative or academic services, e.g., financial aid, parking, etc)
- 7.d Behavior of Service Provider(s) (how an administrator or staff member spoke to or dealt with a constituent, customer, or client, e.g., rude, inattentive, or impatient)
- 7.e Other (any services or administrative issue not described by the above categories). Please specify below:
Other 1:
Other 2:
Other 3: (add additional rows, if necessary)
.....
.....
8. Organizational, Strategic, and Mission Related Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries that relate to the whole or some part of an organization.
- 8.a Strategic and Mission Related/ Strategic and Technical Management (principles, decisions and actions related to where and how the organization is moving)
- 8.b Leadership and Management (quality/ capacity of management and/or management/leadership decisions, suggested training, reassignments and reorganizations)
- 8.c Use of Positional Power/Authority (lack or abuse of power provided by individual's position)
- 8.d Communication (content, style, timing, effects and amount of organizational and leader's communication, quality of communication about strategic issues)
- 8.e Restructuring and Relocation (issues related to broad scope planned or actual restructuring and/or relocation affecting the whole or major divisions of an organization, eg. downsizing, offshoring, outsourcing)
- 8.f Organizational Climate (issues related to organizational morale and/or capacity for functioning)
- 8.g Change Management (making, responding or adapting to organizational changes, quality of leadership in facilitating organizational change)
- 8.h Priority Setting and/or Funding (disputes about setting organizational/departmental priorities and/or allocation of funding within programs)
- 8.i Data, Methodology, Interpretation of Results (scientific disputes about the conduct, outcomes and interpretation of studies and resulting data for policy)
- 8.j Interdepartment/Interorganization Work/Territory (disputes about which department/organization should be doing what/taking the lead)
- 8.k Other (any organizational issue not described by the above categories). Please specify below:
Other 1:
Other 2:
Other 3: (add additional rows, if necessary)
.....
.....
9. Values, Ethics, and Standards Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about the fairness or need for revision of policies, values, and standards of conduct.
- 9.a Standards of Conduct (fairness, applicability or lack of behavioral guidelines and/or Codes of Conduct, e.g., Academic Honesty, plagiarism, Code of Conduct, conflict of interest)
- 9.b Values and Culture (questions, concerns or issues about the values or culture of the organization)
- 9.c Scientific Conduct/Integrity (scientific or research misconduct or misdemeanors, e.g., authorship; falsification of results)
- 9.d Policies and Procedures NOT Covered in Broad Categories 1 thru 8 (fairness or lack of policy or the application of the policy, policy not followed, or needs revision, eg., appropriate dress, use of internet or cell phones)
- 9.e Other (Other policy, procedure, ethics or standards issues not described in the above categories). Please specify below:
Other 1:
Other 2:
Other 3: (add additional rows, if necessary)
.....
.....