

Iowa State University

Ombuds Office

Annual Report

For FY 2019

(July 1 2018 to June 30, 2019)

Deanna Clingan-Fischer, JD

Ombuds Officer

***37 Physics Hall
2323 Osborn Drive
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011
(515) 294-0268***

***ombuds@iastate.edu
www.ombuds.iastate.edu***

Message from the Ombuds

It is a pleasure to share this annual report from the Iowa State University Ombuds Office. The FY 2019 report is intended to serve as a summary of the activities and accomplishments of the Ombuds Office this fiscal year, as well as track visitor concerns and identify possible recommendations for addressing some of the issues brought to the attention of the Ombuds Officer.

The Iowa State University Ombuds Office is a confidential, neutral and informal resource to help members of the University community manage conflicts that interfere with their day-to-day academic or professional activities. The Ombuds Officer is not a personal advocate and does not conduct formal investigations but can facilitate difficult or uncomfortable conversations, point to relevant policies, listen to concerns, and identify viable options or referral sources.

This fiscal year saw a dramatic increase in visitors with many visitors being referred by a colleague or having had previous experiences with the Office.

I am honored to serve as the Iowa State University Ombuds Officer and to serve as a confidential and neutral resource available for faculty, professional and scientific staff, merit staff, graduate and professional students as well as for post-doctoral scholars.

I am thankful to those individuals who place their trust in this office and for the support provided by the President and administrators.

Deanna Clingan-Fischer, JD
Ombuds Officer

Brief History:

The Ombuds Office opened on August 15, 2006 as a pilot program which offered impartial and confidential help to faculty, staff and graduate and professional students who had work-related problems. The pilot Ombuds Office proved to be successful and was made permanent in 2008 with a year round appointment of a three-fifths time (24 hours per week) Ombuds Officer. In 2014, the appointment changed to a four-fifths time (32 hours a week) year round appointment. In 2017, the Ombuds Officer position evolved into a full-time year-round appointment.

Report Content:

This annual Report of the Ombuds Office provides data on the volume and characteristics of the visitors who have utilized the office, as well as detailed information on the types of issues raised by those visitors.

The report also describes systemic issues and patterns which were shared by multiple visitors to the Ombuds Office during fiscal year 2019 as well as recommendations for addressing these issues.

Standards of Practice and Code of Ethics:

The Ombuds Officer follows the standards of practice and code of ethics established by the International Ombudsman Association and as outlined in the Iowa State University charter. The core principles are:

- Confidentiality
- Independence
- Informality
- Neutrality and Impartiality

The Ombuds Officer listens to concerns, helps clarify the relevant issues, develops communication strategies, provides resources, policies, referrals, and options, as well as facilitates difficult or uncomfortable conversations with another individual.

The Ombuds Officer is not a personal advocate and cannot provide legal advice, waive university policies, conduct formal investigations, or issue formal decisions.

Executive Summary
Ombuds Office Annual Report for FY 2019
(July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019)

- There were **528 distinct visitors** who contacted the Ombuds Office for assistance during FY 2019
- Those 528 visitors reached out to the Ombuds Office **3,956 times**—with follow up questions, appointments and/or updates
- To address issues raised by those **528** visitors, the Ombuds Officer reached out to an additional **824 individuals or offices** to obtain further information for the visitor
- **188** of the visitors were Faculty members
- **239** of the visitors were Professional & Scientific (P&S) staff
- **31** of the visitors were Merit staff
- **58** of the visitors were Graduate and/or Professional students
- **9** of the visitors were Post Doctorate scholars
- **3** other individuals not eligible for the Ombuds Office services contacted the office and were referred to other resources
- A total of **324** female and **204** male visitors contacted the Ombuds Office
- The Ombuds Office conducted outreach efforts to educate and provide training to members of the university community in a minimum of **151** instances
- The primary three referral sources of visitors to the Ombuds Office are: colleagues, previous visitors, and human resources staff and liaisons
- The **primary issues** that bring most visitors to the Ombuds Office continue to be some sort of interpersonal conflict with a supervisor or academic advisor or colleague and many visitors also express concerns regarding “lack of respect”

Summary of Key Accomplishments:

- Development of partnerships and collaboration with stakeholders in an effort to provide responses to visitors
- Development of information and outreach to the university community through presentations, meetings and discussions to increase awareness of the Ombuds Office, including messaging on its role and limitations
- Completion of continuing education to further meet the needs of visitors, such as tools for managing workplace conflict and mediation
- Provision of facilitation for college, department, and work units retreats, strategic planning and team building exercises
- Development of and implementation of a mediation/facilitation process to discuss conflicts between the parties
- Refinement of an electronic satisfaction survey and revision from a paper survey model
- Continuation of review and revisions to data formats and collection procedures
- Continuation of outreach through dissemination of an Ombuds Office introduction letter to all new employees
- An increase in the visibility of the office through meetings, presentations and general education sessions
- An increase in the number of visitors from a total of 310 in FY 2018 to 528 in FY 2019

Visitor Information:

The following table indicates the number of visitors who sought assistance from the Ombuds Office each month during FY 2019, the service group to which they belonged, and their gender.

<i>MONTH</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>FACULTY</i>	<i>P&S</i>	<i>Merit</i>	<i>GRAD/ PROFL</i>	<i>POST DOC</i>	<i>OTHER</i>
July	42	17(9F 8M)	15(8F 7M)	4(3F 1M)	5(2F 3M)	0	1(M)
August	43	19(12F 7M)	16(10F 6M)	4(2F 2M)	4(3F 1M)	0	0
September	54	19(10F 9M)	23(17F 6M)	4(2F 2M)	7(4F 3M)	0	1 (M)
October	46	19(8F 11M)	22(19F 3M)	1(F)	4(2F 2M)	0	0
November	37	17(8F 9M)	16(13F 3M)	0	4(2F 2M)	0	0
December	36	11(3F 8M)	24(21F 3M)	0	1(F)	0	0
Sub Total	258	102	116	13	25	0	2
January	36	10(5F 5M)	22(18F 4M)	1(F)	1(F)	2(M)	0
February	43	16(8F 8M)	17(15F 2M)	0	8(M)	2(M)	0
March	49	17(8F 9M)	23(16F 7M)	4(3F 1M)	4(2F 2M)	1(M)	0
April	53	18(8F 10M)	24(20F 4M)	4(3F 1M)	6(3F 3M)	1(M)	0
May	50	17(7F 10M)	20(15F 5M)	4(1F 3M)	5(2F 3M)	3(M)	1(M)
June	39	8(4F 4M)	17(15F 2M)	5(4F 1M)	9(4F 5M)	0	0
Sub Total	270	86	123	18	33	9	1
TOTALS	528	188	239	31	58	9	3
% of Total	100%	36%	45%	6%	11%	1%	1%

KEY:

"TOTAL" -- the total number of distinct visitors for the month, midyear, or entire year

"F" or "M" -- female or male

"2 (1F, 1M)" means there were 2 visitors that month: 1 female and 1 male

"P&S" -- Professional and Scientific employees

"Grad. /Profl." -- Graduate or Professional students

"Post Doc" -- Post-doctoral scholars

"*Other" -- visitors outside the scope of the Ombuds Office's service
(e.g., undergraduates, former employees, etc.)

During FY 2019 there were 188 Faculty, 239 P&S staff, 31 Merit staff, 58 Grad/Profl students, 9 Post Doc and 3 Other visitors to the Ombuds Office. Note: Visitors were allowed to self-select their service group.

Visitor Contacts and Outreach

Some of the 528 visitors had multiple contacts with the Ombuds Office. These contacts included additional visits, calls and/or emails. For some of those visitors additional outreach to third parties was necessary in an effort to obtain information or develop resolutions on behalf of the visitor. The chart below indicates the totals of these efforts

Month	Total Distinct Visitors	Total Contacts	Outreach Conducted
July	42	303	44
August	43	262	51
September	54	278	40
October	46	432	57
November	37	168	32
December	36	219	63
January	36	218	77
February	43	366	76
March	49	519	78
April	53	460	104
May	50	454	93
June	39	277	109
Total	528	3956	824

Visitor Trends

Of the 528 distinct visitors, for FY 2019, 324 identified as female and 204 as male. The following chart shows the breakdown of self-identified genders for the past five years.

	<i>Total # Visitors</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Anonymous</i>
<i>FY 2019</i>	528	324	204	
<i>FY 2018</i>	310	195	115	
<i>FY 2017</i>	94	58	36	
<i>FY 2016</i>	128	85	42	1
<i>FY 2015</i>	153	116	37	

Visitors Five-Year Comparison

The following multi-year summary of Ombuds Office visitor data illustrates the total number of faculty, P&S and Graduate/Professional student annual visitors to the office.*

For FY 2018, Merit staff have been added as a visitor group now eligible for Ombuds Office services. In addition, S&C staff numbers increased due to individuals identifying themselves as that category of visitor. This number did change for next fiscal year with a refinement of the definition within the Ombuds Office.

Five-Year Comparison of Visitors to the Ombuds Office

	Total Visitors	Total Faculty Visitors	Total P&S Visitors	Total Grad. /Prof. student visitors	Merit	S&C
FY 2019	528	188 (90F 98M) 36%	239 (187F 52M) 45%	58 (26F 32M) 11%	31 (21F 10M) 6%	0
FY 2018	310	106 (56F, 50M) 34%	102 (73F, 29M) 33%	31 (15F 16M) 10%	20 (18F 2M) 6%	41 (24F 17M) 13%
FY 2017	94	27 (20F, 7M) 29%	38 (26F, 12M) 41%	20 (9F, 11M) 21%		
FY 2016	128	40 (29F, 11M) 31%	49 (34F, 15M) 38%	23 (11F, 11M) 17%		
FY 2015	153	33 (26F, 7M) 21.5%	76 (60F, 16M) 49.7%	24 (17F, 7M) 15.7%		

*not included are post-doctoral scholars and other categories.

Visitors Compared to the University Population

	<i>ISU Headcount*</i>		<i>Ombuds Visitors</i>	
	<i>% of females</i>	<i>% of males</i>	<i>% of females</i>	<i>% of males</i>
<i>Faculty</i>	39%	61%	48%	52%
<i>P&S</i>	57%	43%	78%	22%
<i>Merit</i>	56%	44%	68%	32%
<i>Grad/Profl</i>	45%	55%	45%	55%
<i>Post Doc</i>	34%	66%	0%	100%

* Data from the 2017-2018 ISU Fact Book
Not included are the S&C and Other visitor categories

Systemic Issues and Concerns Identified by Visitors

Overall:

The most common concerns visitors presented to the Ombuds Office were related to their “evaluative relationships”—relationships with either supervisors, supervisees/subordinate or major professors where a power dynamic exists. For example, in FY 2019, if all forms of this type of conflict (with supervisor, major professor, and/or subordinate) are totaled, the overall figure is **270** individual complaints of the **925** total complaints. This is **29%** of all complaints reported to the Ombuds Office. If all forms of conflict complaints are reviewed, (including the above categories as well as conflict with colleagues), the total becomes **423** of **925** complaints or **46%** of all complaints.

The **highest overall individual category of complaint** received related to conflict with a supervisor and/or major professor at **203** of 925 total. The **second-most common category of complaint** related to conflict with a colleague at **153** of 925 total complaints.

Most visitors often raise more than one concern when they visit the Ombuds Office.

(See the Appendix of this report for the FY 2019 Issues Comparison Chart which outlines all complaint categories and actual number of complaints received per category as well as by type of visitor.)

The primary complaint codes for each type of visitor category are listed below:

Faculty:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Conflict with colleague | 20% |
| 2. Conflict with a supervisor | 18% |
| 3. Conflict with subordinate | 15% |
| 4. Employment duties | 11% |
| 5. Policy interpretation | 09% |

Professional and Scientific Staff:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| 1. Conflict with supervisor | 20% |
| 2. Conflict with colleague | 15% |
| 3. Lack of respect | 14% |
| 4. Employment duties | 12% |
| 5. Physical environment | 08% |

Merit Staff:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Conflict with colleague | 31% |
| 2. Conflict with a supervisor | 20% |
| 3. Lack of respect | 18% |
| 4. Employment duties | 11% |
| 5. Lack of communication | 05% |

Graduate and Professional Students:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Conflict with major professor | 42% |
| 2. Policy interpretation | 20% |
| 3. Physical environment | 13% |
| 4. Lack of respect-tied | 09% |
| 4. Lack of communication-tied | 09% |

Post-Doctoral Scholar:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Policy Interpretation | 29% |
| 2. Physical environment-tied | 21% |
| 2. Conflict with supervisor-tied | 21% |

The primary complaint codes for each type of visitor gender are listed below:

Female: all categories

1. Conflict with supervisor/major professor	21%
2. Conflict with colleague	17%
3. Lack of respect	14%
4. Employment duties	11%
5. Physical environment-tied	08%
5. Conflict with subordinate-tied	08%

Male: all categories

1. Conflict with a supervisor/major professor	23%
2. Conflict with a colleague	15%
3. Policy interpretation	13%
4. Employment duties	11%
5. Lack of respect	08%

Other Useful Services: Shuttle Diplomacy & Meeting Facilitation

While most Ombuds Office visitors usually want to discuss communication strategies to address their issues or discover relevant policies and other resources, quite a few visitors this year wanted help with a more active approach to managing their conflict. These visitors requested the Ombuds to do ***shuttle diplomacy***, i.e., the Ombuds contacted someone else involved in the conflict, in the interest of trying to share information or obtain information in a non-threatening fashion. The Ombuds also provided ***meeting facilitation*** at the request of several visitors. In facilitated meetings, the Ombuds meets with the parties in a neutral space and uses mediation type techniques to help them discuss their conflict in a respectful, productive conversation.

Outreach, Education & Training

Efforts were invested in developing partnerships as well as providing outreach and education about the Ombuds Office. The Ombuds Officer provided training on such topics as conflict management, civility, and communication skills. University employees who were either new or transferring to a new position received an email from the Ombuds Office, informing them about the services offered. In addition, the Ombuds Officer gave presentations or trainings at various events, including, but not limited to:

- ✓ Department Chairs
- ✓ Professional and Scientific Council Conference
- ✓ The P&S Council Committees
- ✓ Graduate and Professional Student Senate
- ✓ Graduate Student Club
- ✓ Chairs Cabinet
- ✓ Provost's Office New Administrator training
- ✓ College of Engineering leadership meeting
- ✓ Emerging Leaders trainings
- ✓ 12+ Leadership training classes
- ✓ Various department and unit meetings
- ✓ Wellness events displays
- ✓ Lunch and Learn events
- ✓ 'Meet & greet' meetings with leadership at ISU
- ✓ How to work with your Supervisor presentation
- ✓ Conducting strategic planning brainstorming
- ✓ Civility and Bullying presentations
- ✓ Effective Communication presentations

Overall Visitor Impact

The overall process for capturing data to accurately depict the efforts of the Ombuds Officer was revised this past fiscal year. For each distinct visitor that comes to the office each month, a record is logged of not only the complaint(s), referral source, and demographics, but also the number of contacts such as visits, emails, phone calls and/or outreach during that month on behalf of that one visitor. These numbers can vary tremendously. As an example, for one visitor in September of 2018, the visitor came into the Ombuds office two times, sent thirty-five emails as follow up or with additional questions for which the Ombuds Officer reached out to two different entities a total of four times. So, for that one individual, there were 37 contacts and 4 outreach efforts. For a visitor in July of 2018, the office logged 102 contacts, including 1 visit and 101 emails, and 1 outreach effort. In other instances, concerns/questions have been addressed with 1 contact through a visit. Part of the role of the Ombuds Officer also allows for voluntary facilitation between impacted parties. In the case of conducting facilitations, a minimum of 3 to 4 visits generally occur. Through the evaluations, many visitors expressed that they would have looked at other programs to move to, left the university or followed more formal grievance processes if they had not come to the Ombuds Office.

Evaluation

In an effort to determine whether the responses and services provided to visitors and partners met their expectations, the Ombuds Office continued the protocol of sending a survey out throughout the year requesting feedback. The survey was responded to by 67 of 178 visitors and/or partners that were sent the survey. Note: not all visitors received the survey as some were not eligible for services, some had received the survey previously, while others had left the university and/or no longer had a valid email address.

The following questions were asked and responses given were:

1. Did the Ombudsperson respond to your initial inquiry promptly? 100% stated yes; one added that the Ombuds first reached out to them so no inquiry was made.
2. Did you feel welcomed by and listened to by the Ombudsperson? 100% stated yes
3. Did the Ombuds Office feel like a safe and confidential environment for you to discuss your concerns? 99% stated yes; 1% stated that the assistance occurred through email (1 reply)
4. Did the Ombudsperson offer assistance, suggestions, and/or possible options to help address your concerns? 97% stated yes; 3% stated no (2 replies)
5. If you need assistance in the future, would you contact the Ombuds Office? 99% stated yes; 1% stated no (1 reply)
6. Would you refer others to the Ombuds Office for assistance? 99% stated yes; 1% stated no (1 reply)
7. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the Ombuds Office? 89% extremely satisfied; 10% moderately satisfied; 0% neither-satisfied-or-dissatisfied; 1% slightly dissatisfied; and 0% extremely dissatisfied
8. If you had not contacted the Ombuds Office, what would you have done?

The top answers were: 25 would complain to family and friends; 20 were not sure what they would do; 17 would have remained in the situation; 16 would have left the university; 14 would have looked for other programs or positions within the university; and 13 would have brought the issue to a formal channel such as a grievance

9. What could the Ombuds Office have done differently to serve you better? Sample comments include:

- Our Ombuds is perfectly suited for a role like this. An asset in every way
- The Ombuds was helpful in guiding me in how to handle a situation without going through the process of a formal grievance. The office was very helpful
- A good experience, in that it allowed all parties to express their views in a safe environment
- Great resources, quick to respond
- She did a great job in providing information
- The Ombuds is extremely helpful, professional, knowledgeable and personable
- I received good advice about improving my communication with my supervisor
- It was easy to schedule appointments with her. She is conscientious. We are blessed to have her as a resource in this position.
- She made me feel heard and validated
- She helped negotiate issues with my leadership and I'm very thankful for her ongoing assistance in a very unpleasant employment situation
- The office and her personality are welcoming and supportive
- Very helpful with strategies moving forward; compassionate, but not biased; professional yet personable; she was genuinely interested in my concerns
- I could not ask for a better listener. She has helped when I felt I had no other options or anywhere else to turn
- Very helpful and followed up with many of the concerns discussed. It is very important to have a neutral resource on campus to talk to
- None, she has been doing an absolutely outstanding job! Given the problems that exist, we need more staff to help in the Ombuds Office
- The office exceeded my expectations for support and professionalism
- The Ombuds is awesome! She helped lead a subset of my staff through a facilitation so that we can all understand better what the other individuals are doing. It has greatly helped moral and moved our unit forward more positively!
- Having this service makes Iowa State University stand apart from previous employers. This environment provided a safe space to confidentially ask for advice and assistance in a challenging situation

Examples of specific issues of concern brought forward to the Ombuds Office

1. Improved Delivery System—how this would be implemented and how non-human resources and financial staff would be impacted with extra work loads.
2. The policies surrounding Professional and Scientific staff hours of work. Concerns were verbalized regarding the time expectations and lack of flexibility to adjust hours.
3. Evaluations and the review process for employees. Concerns were brought forward relating to lack of uniformity across the university regarding evaluation forms and process. Employees did not always feel that their input was considered, some employees were surprised by the evaluation, and performance improvement plans are seen as a process to separate a staff member from employment rather than to help them be successful in their current position.
4. Position Responsibility Statements—concerns were presented regarding the inability to adequately devote the percentage of time allocated to an activity.
5. Teaching evaluations. In some instances, individual faculty members felt that too much weight was given to teaching evaluations and considerations as to whether the class was required and the size of the sections were not given sufficient consideration in the use of the scores for an evaluation/review.
6. Pay equity concerns based upon merit and gender.

7. Clarity regarding internal standards which are not outlined in policy or governance documents, such as how much notice must be provided before requiring staff to move offices, and different treatment by supervisors.
8. Questions surrounding hiring practices and minimum rather than preferred qualifications for a position as well as accommodation processes.
9. Questions surrounding management plans for couples and their use.
10. Graduate and Professional students needing clarity and guidance on how to proceed when concerns exist with the program or major professor.
11. Age discrimination-concerns with treatment of employees that are older.
12. Bullying and harassment that fall outside of the protected class and faculty handbook policies.
13. Research misconduct.
14. Authorship disputes.
15. Complaint processes, both formal and informal, as well as the relevant policies and handbooks.
16. Retaliation concerns when bring forward concerns that do not relate to misconduct and the potential for lack of confidentiality when those concerns are brought forward to leadership.

Recommendations for Addressing Concerns

In an effort to address some of the prevalent concerns that have been brought to the attention of the Ombuds Officer, it may be worthwhile for university leadership to discuss the following issues or concepts:

1. Develop policies regarding hostile work environments, harassment or bullying exhibited by a supervisor or colleague that is not related to protected class for Professional and Scientific and Merit staff.
2. Create a system which allows new employees, residents, post-doctoral candidates, and graduate/professional students to successfully navigate the Iowa State University system. This can include: an orientation, a mentor, a discussion on the policies and procedures they will need to follow, as well as sufficient support, equipment, and training to equip them to perform the function for which they were brought on board.
3. Review and refine the Professional and Scientific (P&S) Dispute Resolution Guidance and Procedures. The policy limits formal grievances to two categories and the appeal process is unnecessarily adversarial.
4. Provide interactive training for those individuals placed in a supervisory position. In several situations, education on how to address personnel matters, how to communicate effectively with employees so they feel valued, and how to respond to inappropriate employee behavior would have resolved many conflicts that came to the Ombuds Office.
5. Provide more transparency in communications. This includes providing information on appeal rights, rights and possible benefits available upon separation with the university and ensure consistent practices throughout the university

APPENDIX

History of the I.S.U. Ombuds Office

A proposal to establish a faculty Ombuds office was approved by the Iowa State University Faculty Senate in early 2002. Several months later the Professional and Scientific Council passed a motion asking University administrators to include Professional and Scientific staff in discussions regarding development of an Ombuds office. According to reports published in *Inside Iowa State* at that time, the first discussions about the possibility of an Ombuds office at the university actually began as far back as the early 1990s.

In December, 2005, an article in *Inside Iowa State* announced that “I.S.U. faculty, staff and graduate students will soon have a new place to turn for help with problems or disputes – the Ombuds Office.” The following August (2006) the office finally opened as a two-year pilot project, and it was staffed by two part-time Ombuds who shared a single .5 F.T.E. position. At the conclusion of the pilot project, the office began operating on a permanent basis in July, 2008. A single part-time Ombuds officer was hired to provide Ombuds service three days a week to faculty, Professional and Scientific staff, Confidential and Supervisory staff, and graduate and professional students. Soon thereafter service expanded to include post-doctoral scholars.

Ombuds Office Charter Establishes its Services and Authority

In 2013 President Steven Leath and Ombuds Officer Elaine Newell signed the Charter that officially established the Iowa State University Ombuds Office as an independent unit within the President’s office and defined the authority and responsibilities of the office as a confidential, neutral resource that can help students and employees with conflict management.

As noted in the Charter (which is available on the office’s website):

The primary mission of the Iowa State University Ombuds Office is to provide confidential and impartial assistance that enables individuals to manage their own conflicts early, informally, and at the lowest levels possible without the need to pursue more formal grievance processes or litigation. In addition, the Ombuds Office may alert University officials about systemic problems or general trends that merit further review or consideration for the good of the University community. The Ombuds is neither an advocate for its visitors nor does it represent University management. Rather, the Ombuds is an advocate for respectful dialogue, fair practices, and mutual understanding.

Tracking Visitor Concerns

One of the challenges faced by the Ombuds Office is how to maintain the confidentiality of each visitor while also identifying trends or problematic areas that may be ripe for some administrative review or consideration. For most of the visitors who come to the Ombuds Office, their concern usually encompasses one (or more) of the following:

- Conflict with a supervisor (includes job performance issues and lack of leadership, but not faculty promotion/tenure disputes, which are tracked separately)
- Conflict with a colleague (including research credit, etc.)
- Conflict with a subordinate
- Employment duties (including teaching or committee assignments. etc.)
- Financial issues (including compensation, reimbursement, benefits, etc.)
- Disciplinary action (includes actual or threat/implementation of disciplinary action)
- Interpretation/implementation of policy
- Concern regarding physical environment (i.e., work conditions, not personal violence)
- Promotion & tenure, or non-renewal of a contract related to faculty duties
- Issues related to diversity (includes adverse treatment related to protected class status)
- Lack of respect (visitor perceives that he/she is not being respected)
- Lack of communication
- Failure to manage (i.e., their supervisor is ignoring a problem)
- Failure to produce (i.e., an employee or student isn't meeting expectations)
- Gossip (the workplace is unpleasant due to excessive gossip)
- Email (a conflict has arisen/escalated from unpleasant email exchanges)
- Talking Behind Back
- Other (when the concern is not encompassed by any of the above)

By tracking the number of times each of the above concerns is presented by visitors, the Ombuds Office can determine if or when a particular situation may merit additional review by a supervisor or unit head.

FY 2019 Issues Comparison Chart (July 2018 to June 2019)

Complaint Category	Faculty	P&S	Merit	Graduate/ Professional	Post Doc	Other Total	Total visitors	TOTAL Complaints by Category
<i>Total visitors by category</i>	188	239	31	58	9	3	<u>528</u>	
1: Conflict with Supervisor/ Major Professor	53	93	11	43	3	0		203
2: Conflict with Colleague	59	70	17	5	0	2		153
3: Conflict with Subordinate	43	24	0	0	0	0		67
4: Employment duties	31	57	6	6	0	0		100
5: Financial issues	9	7	0	1	0	0		17
6: Discipline	6	14	1	3	0	0		24
7: Policy interpretation	25	22	1	14	4	0		66
8: Physical environment	11	38	2	11	3	0		65
9: Promotion and Tenure	7							7
00: Other	8	12	1	1	0	1		23
DR: Diversity Related	0	4	1	1	0	0		6
LOR: Lack of Respect	22	64	10	9	2	0		107
FTM: Failure to Manage	1	8	1	0	0	0		10
LOC: Lack of Communication	12	34	3	9	2	0		60
FTP: Failure to Produce	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
EC: Email Conflict	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
TBB: Talking Behind Back	1	13	1	0	0	0		15
GOS: Gossip	0	2	0	0	0	0		2
Totals	288	462	55	103	14	3		925
%	31%	50%	6%	11%	1%	1%	100%	