The Office of the Ombuds is one of many parts of the dynamic system that is the UCSF community. The elements are dependent on each other in various ways and we recognize our dependence. The achievements and success of the Office of the Ombuds could not be achieved without the support the UCSF community and those visitors who have placed trust in the Office, allowing us to hear sensitive, personal, and important concerns and have allowed us to assist them within the guidelines (and sometimes constraints) of Ombuds ethical principles. We are grateful to all the UCSF university community who have participated in the resolution of concerns and complaints and have given sincere and considerable efforts towards achieving a fair outcome for all concerned. The Office would also like to recognize the support of faculty and staff leadership who have been willing to listen to various matters brought to their attention and their assistance in working with us in addressing matters without violating the confidentiality, neutrality, informality, or independence of the Ombuds process. We thank those who have allowed us to provide training and professional development in the areas of conflict resolution, constructive communication, and effective skills for collaboration.
UCSF is committed to fair policies and procedures and recognizes the value of providing alternative resources to raise concerns and informally address conflicts and disputes within our community. The UCSF Office of the Ombuds is an integral part of this commitment.

The Office of the Ombuds is a resource offering confidential, informal, impartial and independent problem-solving services to UCSF faculty, staff, students, post-docs, and clinical trainees. Providing a safe place to discuss campus related problems and concerns, the office helps visitors identify and evaluate options, provides information and makes referrals when necessary. The ombuds also provide two-party or group services such as mediation, facilitated discussions and team trainings and workshops for improved skills communication, team-building and conflict management.

Fiscal year 2013-2014 marks the third year since the creation of the UCSF Office of the Ombuds. The Office of the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs serves as the “administrative home” for Office of the Ombuds; however, maintains the autonomy necessary to support its neutrality.

Early 2014, UC President Janet Napolitano asked each of the Chancellors to ensure designation of an official serving as an ombuds as one of five measures resulting from a system-wide review of policies and practices regarding bias and discrimination. The Office of General Counsel subsequently confirmed Ombuds roles in facilitating informal resolutions in response to complaints. Nine UC campuses currently have Ombuds Offices all of whom adhere to UC and International Ombudsman Association standards of practice.

By providing confidential, impartial, independent, and informal services to the University community, the Office of the Ombuds supports the University in its pursuit to advance health worldwide.
Mission

The Mission of the Office of the Ombuds is to humanize the experience of working and learning at UCSF by providing confidential, neutral, informal and independent problem-solving, dispute resolution and mediation and team development services to members of the diverse UCSF community predicated on the principles of fairness, equity and respect.

Ethical Principles

In accordance with the key elements of the International Ombudsman Association (IOA) Ethics and Standards, the UCSF Office of the Ombuds is:

Confidential

The identities of visitors and their communications with the Office remain private. Only with permission will the Ombuds contact other persons as necessary to address a concern. The only exceptions to confidentiality are disclosures of an imminent risk of serious harm.

Informal

The Office does not investigate, arbitrate adjudicate or in any other way participate in any internal or external formal process or action. With the exception of statistical data and the Agreement to Mediate forms the Office of the Ombuds does not maintain documents or record conversations/meetings. The use of our informal dispute resolution and mediation services are an alternative to formal processes and procedures and is strictly voluntary.

Neutral/Impartial

The Office of the Ombuds remains neutral in any conflict, dispute or issue and maintains no personal stake in the outcome of any dispute. The Office considers the legitimate concerns and interests of all parties involved in the matter under consideration and assists individuals in developing a range of possible options to resolve problems and facilitate discussion. The Office does not advocate for individual parties.

Independent

The Office exercises autonomy and freedom from interference in the performance of its duties and responsibilities. This autonomy is accomplished primarily through organizational recognition and support. UCSF respects and supports the independent role of the Office of the Ombuds. The Director of the Office reports to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs for administrative purposes only.
These service options are offered to visitors based on their presenting complaint(s). All requests for service are addressed through an initial individual ombuds appointment where the visitor can identify his or her concern, understand the conflict situations and discuss effective ways to respond, including services or a sequence of services delivered through our office. Initial interviews are primarily conducted in person, although interviews are conducted by phone if this is not possible.

**Individual Services**

All visitors begin with an intake to discuss their concern(s). The appointment focus varies, depending on needs of the visitor. The Office of the Ombuds provides a myriad of services for individuals. An ombuds may provide coaching or strategy development for productive conflict resolution at the individual and institutional level. For those considering more formal channels of grievance (e.g., filing a complaint, litigation) the ombuds can work with a visitor to explore these options to resolve matters. With permission from the visitor, the Ombuds might contact another UCSF resource for information about policies or procedures relevant to the situation. Finally, the ombuds can direct visitors to additional resources and available supports including: a referral to Human Resources, the Office of Academic Affairs, the appropriate Vice-Dean, the Office of Diversity and Outreach, Faculty and Staff Assistance Program or Student Health and Counseling Services.

The Ombuds appointments are structured in the following manner:
- **We listen and clarify interests and issues**
- **Explore options and resources with the visitor**
- **Provide consultation or coaching on conflict situations**
- **Facilitate resolution of concerns through contact with others**
- **Make referrals**

**Mediation**

Mediation between two or more parties is also offered on a voluntary basis. This service allows parties to address conflicts with the facilitation support of a neutral mediator. Mediation begins with confidential, individual intake interviews of each participant, followed by one or more confidential three-hour joint sessions. While the Office of the Ombuds previously engaged volunteer mediators drawn from the campus community, we now rely primarily on professional mediators from our office.

**Group facilitation**

When a visitor comes to the Office of the Ombuds reporting concerns regarding workplace climate, we often use a systems and/or organizational development approach to assess the unit’s dynamics and recommend support strategies. In these cases, we typically interview as many involved parties as volunteer to engage with our services, synthesize and share themes to the leadership of the unit, as expressly permitted by those interviewed, and recommend strategies to address the key issues. Responses might include training, a facilitated conversation, individual or group mediations, or coaching of one or more individuals. These options are sequenced to meet the needs of the unit and the individuals within the unit. Increasingly, the work of the Office of the Ombuds responds to requests that include full departments or teams where we work in-depth over time.
Workshops and Trainings

In order to support learning in conflict management skills, address existing complaints, or promote team-building to manage conflict in a pro-active, skill-building fashion, the Office also provides trainings to work teams or units, students and other trainees, and groups of diverse UCSF community members. Our cadre of volunteer mediators and trained conflict managers support local problem-solving and increase the capacity of units to address conflict early and effectively. As with the other services, workshops and trainings can be sequenced to meet the evolving needs of a group as they become better able to address group dynamics.

Workshops & Trainings
Topics Include:

- Communication protocols
- Difficult conversations
- Managing conflict
- Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument
- True Colors Temperament assessment
- Organizational development issues

Outreach and Education

Office of the Ombuds services are publicized through focused outreach meetings with leadership in Deans’ Offices, Human Resources, and other organizational units; participation at campus events such as student orientations, new student fairs, and Faculty Development Day; and during trainings and workshops to faculty, staff, and learners. Our regularly updated website and office literature also market the Office as a resource. Office of the Ombuds materials are distributed at various events, trainings and workshops, and in new student and employee packets. Members of the Office provide consultation on replicating Ombuds services to outside organizations, collaborate on developing conflict management competency within UCSF, and serve on committees where issues directly relevant to the mission of the Office are addressed.
Delivery of Services

During fiscal year 2013-2014, the Office of the Ombuds delivered the following services:

- 547 intakes for Ombuds services (individual and group services and workshops/trainings) representing an increase of 11% over last year.
- 361 separate conflicts/concerns were brought by one or more individuals
- 460 visitors received consultation, coaching, referral, and/or mediation (in many cases visitors received multiple services)
  - 294 visitors received coaching
  - 49 visitors received referrals
  - 48 visitors participated in 28 two-party mediations
  - 12 visitors participated in 5 group mediations
- 291 people in 25 teams received group facilitation services
- 23 groups received tailored sequenced services, with services provided to 182 people.
- 1,375 people were trained in 57 workshops/trainings
- 30 requests for Office of the Ombuds members to serve in leadership/campus service functions were met
- 698 people were reached through 16 outreach sessions

High Satisfaction with Services Provided

It is a considerable challenge to gather outcome data in a manner consistent with the ethics and standards of Ombuds principles. Due to the confidentiality concerns and standards outlined in our Charter, e-mails are not sent to visitors after they’ve completed their work with us. Methods for distributing surveys include evaluation forms that can be provided in-person or accessed on the Office website for printing and returning to the office via fax or campus mail.

Some notable comments received this past year:

"I felt safe in the mediation and felt there was a very good constructive outcome, more than I had hoped for”

"The facilitation opened up amazing, supported work in our unit - really was crucial to moving us out of a bad place.”

"Having an impartial person listen in a supportive, professional way is very helpful!”

“The Office of the Ombuds provided one-on-one conflict coaching to help me to develop positive and constructive interaction strategies and skills. Ombuds provided a confidential, impartial, non-adversarial environment that enabled me to work through issues I was facing in a calm, constructive, and positive manner. This allowed me to continue to be effective in my work and to stay focused on finding solutions. I have recommended the services of the Office of the Ombuds to my colleagues and feel fortunate that UCSF provides these services to UCSF employees.”

-visitor feedback
Collaboration and Curriculum Development

The Office of the Ombuds participated in the development and delivery of conflict-related curricula, as follows:

Interprofessional Education (IPE) Program Curriculum Development

This work group, under the direction of an inter-school Executive Board, has been charged with expanding the IPE curriculum to five modules that will be launched to a world-wide audience in September 2014 utilizing a Coursera platform. Content expertise and service as a faculty co-lead was provided on Module 4: “Tackling Challenges: Conflict Management and Negotiation.”

Professionalism Learning Community

The Office of the Ombuds is represented on the Professionalism Learning Community (PLC), a new, initiative in the School of Medicine. The PLC’s mission is to create a community that embraces and promotes the view of professionalism as a complex competency with acquirable skills that can be applied toward anticipated challenges at the individual, interpersonal and system level. The community is composed of UCSF experts from a wide variety of disciplines and meets monthly to discuss and develop presentations or workshops on a range of topics and in a variety of formats for faculty, trainees and students.

Arthur Vining Davis Grant

The Office of the Ombuds is represented on a multi-institutional collaboration funded by the Arthur Vining Davis Foundation to develop a conflict management curriculum for health sciences education. The goal is to create an easily accessible, media-rich, customizable curriculum for training interprofessional teams of nurses, social workers/psychologists, physician assistants, physicians and other healthcare professionals that focuses on evidence-based approaches to productively managing common conflicts to improve patient-centered healthcare. The project PI is Dr. Michael Wilkes, in the School of Medicine at UC Davis.

Conflict Management Training Course

The Office of the Ombuds delivered our 9-hour course on providing Conflict Management services to faculty members and staff representing units across the University. The goal of this three-session course is to train members of diverse teams to serve as local Conflict Managers who could provide skilled, site-specific support and intervention when conflicts are contained and more easily managed. Previously, the Office of the Ombuds trained Volunteer Mediators to partner with us on mediation cases. Now, our focus has shifted to training more people to address conflicts within their own teams and units, either as third-party supports to those experiencing conflict or as a manager or supervisor responsible for effectively addressing team conflict. Forty-eight individuals representing 23 units attended the course. By “seeding” the University with conflict-competent individuals who could serve as resources, we hope to increase the number of conflicts that are addressed early, when solutions are more likely to be successful. Evaluations of our Conflict Management Training Course are very positive.
Leadership Quarterly Review

The Office of the Ombuds met with control point leadership to review non-identifying data regarding utilization and concerns particular to their specific constituency. Preserving confidentiality of the visitors to the Office of the Ombuds is the highest priority and the utmost sensitivity is given to this. The approach of regular and scheduled meetings is strategic in that it avoids implied associations. Leadership agreed to regular meetings to receive feedback and exchange ideas on relevant issues and concerns.

Institutional Support

Standing Committees
- Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Childcare
- Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Status of Women
- Council on Campus Climate, Culture, and Inclusion Staff Subcommittee
- University Community Partnerships
- Wellness Workgroup

Association Membership
- International Ombudsman Association (IOA)
- Association for Conflict Resolution (ACR)

Board Membership
- College and University Work-Life-Family Association
Services Provided Overall

Ombuds cases are defined as individual consultation, coaching, two-party or multiple-party mediation, and group facilitation. Ombuds cases respond to an identified issue and request for assistance in addressing or resolving an issue. The bar graph here shows that the office had 460 designated Ombuds cases in the fiscal year.

A case must have at least one individual involved and as the number served amount of 933 shows, more than one individual is often involved in an Ombuds case. In the example of a group facilitation, only one Ombuds case is counted, however, multiple individuals would be involved in that single case. When a case begins initially as an Ombuds case and results in a training as part of the case work, those individuals involved are also counted in the “numbers served” for the Ombuds category. These are distinctly different and not counted as numbers served in the “Trainings” category. Trainings and workshops refer to the delivery of tailored curricula designed for skill-building. In fiscal 2013-14 the Office of the Ombuds conducted 57 trainings serving 1,375 individuals.

Campus service refers to Ombuds participation and contribution to UCSF and outside organizations such as providing consultation on developing conflict management competency programs and curricula and providing appropriate consultation on search committees.

Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Case</th>
<th>Number Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ombuds</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Service</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Services Provided: Ombuds Cases Only

N = 460 Cases
July 2013 - June 2014

Table B

Intake/consultation – Initial (and on-going) discussion with user to identify and clarify concern. (There is at least one intake for every case, so 100% of the 460 cases received an intake.)

Coaching – Assisting a visitor to develop interpersonal conflict management approaches and identify other University resources to work towards objectives.

Referral – Appropriate UCSF resources are identified to address a visitor concern.

Contact Others – situations where, at the permission of the party, others involved in an issue are engaged in the effort to address a visitor’s concern(s).

Two-Party Mediation – A process in which two individuals come together with a neutral mediator to address a conflict/dispute and to reach an understanding or agreement.

Group Facilitation – Bringing teams, units, or departments together where there is agreement to work with the team to address conflict or concerns.

Group Mediation – A mediation with more than two parties.

Ombuds Training – A training designated here as an Ombuds case is where it has been delivered as an intervention for conflict within a team provided in the context of sequenced Ombuds involvement. These trainings are distinct from those that are delivered as professional development opportunities counted separately as “Trainings” (see Table A).
Analysis of Ombuds services by control point is another way of representing the reach of the Office of the Ombuds. Utilizing the standard, unique control points at UCSF, the table above shows the organizational control point for the services received. The “Other” category is comprised of cases originating from an external source, unidentifiable visitors, or small units where identification of the unit might risk identifying users. For workshops and trainings, only the requestor’s control point is noted. However, while one control point is recorded, participants can include individuals from many control points. (See Glossary for key to abbreviations.)

Utilization of Ombuds services can be indicative of a variety of factors ranging from proactive assistance with personal development, collaboration, and team-building to consultation with interpersonal conflict, misconduct or policy violations.

(Please see Appendices: Campus Organizational Chart for a reference of units and departments reporting to each control point.)
The Office of the Ombuds assists a diverse constituency of the UCSF community. The “Other” category denotes fellows, graduate students, residents, and non-UCSF members who work in partnership with UCSF faculty and staff on integrated teams. This table includes data on the requestor for workshops and training, using the status of the requestor except where the requestor is a faculty member requesting training for a student or trainee group. In those cases (where the request was directed at a service mainly for students or trainees), we recorded the visitor status as either students or post-docs to better reflect services addressing their needs.

Table D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visit 2013-2014 Fiscal Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Comparison Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Office of the Ombuds serves constituents across the diverse campus sites of UCSF (29 sites total). The largest percentage served is on the Parnassus campus (39%). However, Mission Bay comprised 12% and Laurel Heights 9% of users of Ombuds services. The total percentages and campus locations served can be seen on the chart above. The “Other” category is comprised of 20 other locations where identification of the location might risk identifying users. (See Glossary for key to abbreviations.)
Risk Categories

We objectively code a concern with a risk category based on explicit visitor statements as they present their issues. The risk categories are one measure for capturing the concerns of all stakeholders, either individual visitors or organizational leaders. It has been our experience that many Ombuds cases do not fall into any risk category; however, those that do may have one or more applicable categories and are counted as such. One hundred and sixty-eight of the 460 Ombuds cases were coded with at least one associated risk. Further, risk categories document initial potential actions but do not represent completed actions in regards to the particular risk.

Table F

Seven Categories of Risk

1. Loss of departmental productivity—indication that conflict is affecting matters in a widespread manner, negatively affecting the departmental or unit output.
2. Unwarranted staff attrition/transfer—the visitor (or others) leave the department to distance themselves from a conflict.
3. Negative publicity—indication that the visitor has or intends to discuss the conflict with others who may be stakeholders, recipients, or potential candidates for a particular area of service.
4. Significant violations of policy/Code of Conduct—the visitor communicates actions which appear to be in violation of university policy.
5. Potential for internal/external grievances—the visitor communicates a plan to file a complaint with a formal UCSF or external office of record.
6. Litigation potential—the visitor states that they are seeking (or have obtained) advice of legal counsel.
7. High risk safety issue—the visitor communicates factors which pose a safety threat such as environmental hazard, violence potential or clinical care problem.
Visitor Issues and Concerns

The Office of the Ombuds uses the classification system developed by the International Ombudsman Association in 2001 and revised in 2007 (See Appendix). This system includes nine broad, unique categories and approximately 85 subcategories which we use to classify the issues, questions, and concerns that lead the visitor to contact the Office.

Visitors may raise several issues; however, we have found that the concerns can be captured on a primary, secondary, and tertiary basis. The chart above shows that the category of “Evaluative Relationships” was the leading category reported by all affiliations combined. Concerns within this category are focused on others whom the visitor either reports to or otherwise maintains some evaluative capacity over the visitor or the concern may be in regards to someone who reports to the visitor. The second leading concern “Organizational, Strategic, and Mission related” was that concerns were regarded as relating to the whole or some major part of the institution, such as concerns regarding “climate” or leadership that can affect many individuals. The third leading category was “Peer and Colleague Relationships.” This category corresponds to concerns with peers or others who have a similar rank, position, or status as the visitor.
Top Three Issues for Faculty, Staff, Managers/Supervisors

Faculty, managers/supervisors, and staff all had the highest levels of concern over matters involved in the administrative relationship between themselves and someone they reported to who reported to them. Concerns surrounding a job or position were also important to staff and managers/supervisors. Faculty showed relatively higher concern over issues thought to relate to whole or some larger part of the organization. Managers communicated a relatively higher number of concerns regarding peers or colleagues.

For faculty, the leading reasons seeking help through the Office of Ombuds within the category of Evaluative Relationships were for consultation in dealing with individuals they supervise or teach, concerns about respect and treatment, effectiveness of a supervisor or leader. Faculty sought consultation with the Office equally in regards to Peer Relationships, Career Progression, and Organizational, Strategic and Mission-related matters. They had concerns regarding respect, treatment, communication and values in the context of a peer or colleague. Concerns surrounding ambiguity or uncertainty, career development and mentoring, or promotion or reappointment were leading issues within the career progression and development category. Concerns with communication, change management, and leadership decisions were top issues for faculty concerns within Organizational, Strategic, and Mission-related category.

Managers and supervisors and staff both communicated similar high levels of concerns within relationships across a hierarchy and were evaluative in some way. Managers and supervisors tended to express challenges in the areas of respect, treatment, trust and quality of communication. They also called on the Office of the Ombuds for consultation with 2 or more individuals they supervise. Staff had concerns with respect, treatment, trust, and quality of communication. In some cases they also attributed issues to the departmental climate (of which a supervisor has some responsibility for).

The category of career progression and development was communicated with similar frequency for both managers and supervisors and staff. Within this category, managers and supervisors concerns had to do with progression, assignment change, position security, and career development. Staff had concerns about application or recruitment processes, career progression change of assignments, job description, and security.

The third highest-reported issue for managers/supervisors and staff was involving peer and colleague relationships. This concern was significantly higher for manager/supervisors. Both groups identified the areas of respect, treatment, trust, reputation, and quality of communication as the major areas of concern.
Issues and Concerns for Fellows, Residents, Postdocs, Students, Other

Fellows, residents, postdocs, and students were most concerned with matters that arose within the relationship they had with a faculty member, administrator, attending, or other person who had evaluative or administrative duties affecting the visitor. Those matters were attributed to issues relating to respect, treatment, trust, and quality of communication. There were also concerns surrounding appraisals or grading. Many saw their issues as relating to whole or some part of the organization. Some had concerns about the effectiveness of leadership, quality of communication, and use or abuse of power. There were also questions surrounding change or restructuring. This cohort also brought many concerns in regards to their progression or continuance within their respective programs.

Visitor Issues: Other
(Combined Fellows, Residents, Postdocs, Students, Grad Students, UCSF Affiliates)
N = 37 Cases with 155 Issues Recorded
July 2013 - June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative Relationships</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational, Strategic, and Mission Related</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression and Development</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values, Ethics, and Standards</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer and Colleague Relationships</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, Regulatory, Financial, and Compliance</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Administrative Issues</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Benefits</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Health, and Physical</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I
Observations

In reviewing the data describing the majority of concerns or complaints brought to the Office of the Ombuds in 2013-2014, our team identified the following themes:

**Respect/Treatment**

The majority of visitors spoke unfavorably about behaviors demonstrated by a supervisor, colleague, or faculty member. The visitors perceived these behaviors as disrespectful or inappropriate. Many behaviors were rooted in conflicting communication styles. Both quantity and quality of communication were noted with visitors perceiving that they had not been informed properly, or failed to understand a directive due to the lack of communication skills by someone who had a supervisory role or hierarchically higher designated relationship. Some visitors reported surprise at an adverse event such as a poor performance evaluation or disciplinary action, and were disconcerted by the information or feedback they were unprepared for.

**Leadership Effectiveness and Organizational Climate**

A variety of concerns were perceived to be due to organizational factors and to people who had power to influence the general climate of units or divisions. Decisions made by leadership may have not been well understood or felt to be inadequately planned or executed resulting in a negative effect on morale and or functioning. There were ongoing concerns and practices arising from “Operational Effectiveness” initiatives, which resulted in staff reductions and reorganization of some areas. Visitors expressed a culture of do “more with less” and voiced experiencing unrealistic expectations as a result of the organizational changes. In many cases the perceptions were attributed to the “quality” of communication by the organization or leadership and may be a result of less than optimal, timing or content or issues related to style.

**Administrative Processes and Policies**

A salient concern of many visitors who were engaged in a formal process was a lack of clarity, transparency, or communication in regards to an administrative process, practice or policy that resulted in a formal complaint, grievance or other disciplinary action. Many of these concerns were related to administrative decisions that had an impact on a visitor’s career or position in some way. A variety of factors could have been contributing to visitor’s concerns. Practices or policies may have been unknown, implicit, ambiguous, or difficult to locate. A visitor’s own assumptions about a policy or practice might have been inaccurate. There could have been challenges in identifying or connecting with someone who can assist in clarity. Investigations or procedures might have been protracted or unresponsive and can compound or contribute to confusion and anxiety surrounding an action.
Recommendations

A key role of the Office of the Ombuds is to serve as an information and communication resource, consultant, dispute resolution expert and catalyst for institutional change. The following recommendations are based on our experience providing services to the broad UCSF community since our incorporation under our IOA-based charter.

1. Increase professional development opportunities and resources in the following areas:

   a. Effective communication, employee engagement, and conflict management
   b. Unconscious bias
   c. Leadership and management
   d. Policy and practice surrounding discrimination and harassment
   e. Conflict management in the workplace
   f. Microaggression and bullying behavior
   g. Developing effective teams

Ongoing training and professional development has tremendous value in cultivating an effective and engaged community. Despite the multiple providers who address the key areas, easy access may not be available or always encouraged. UCSF constituents utilize a variety of approaches depending on available resources and requirements. The Office of the Ombuds continues to develop needs based responses for professional development in conflict management and communication. The Office of Diversity and Outreach launched the Unconscious Bias Training Initiative in 2013 and has offered workshops to a variety of campus members to help understand the role unconscious bias plays in various situations, and how to mitigate unconscious bias in the institution. An assortment of robust resources and opportunities for managers and staff are available on the recently renovated UCSF Learning & Organization Development Department website http://learning.ucsf.edu/.

The UCSF Learning & Organization Development Department (LOD), initially a Medical Center enterprise resource, has been expanded to include the UC campus staff community as well. During its first year in this expanded role LOD introduced four comprehensive programs to develop key competencies for all staff levels. Efforts to assure the broad dissemination of consistent practices through training and development could be most efficiently accomplished using a centralized resource such as the LOD and the University should continue to assure that sufficient resources are made available through LOD. Additionally, addressing practices and styles in a proactive manner through development and training will help mitigate utilization of inappropriate or avoidable conflicts and reduce challenges faced by management and staff. Also important are those efforts by individuals who are part of a department charged with responsibilities for training and facilitating support to individuals associated within their specific units. Continued support for these efforts is key to maintaining high levels of expertise within subject matter as well as positive engagement. Although the University should offer online training, the opportunity to engage in the trainings, in person may be a more effective methodology for such topics. Additional supports for tailored trainings, which may be more effective for a unit are recommended.

2. Leadership and management should regularly strive to inform their constituency of relevant initiatives, practices, and policies to demonstrate transparency and increase awareness.

Leaders should make efforts to provide information regarding decision-making processes and make themselves available to address questions or concerns. They should also create a culture of collaboration by encouraging multiple perspectives. Finally, leaders should ensure decisions and information are effectively disseminated and then work to create a process for which honest feedback can be heard. Effort should be made at utilizing a variety of available strategies and formats that can allow for the dissemination of information such as newsletters, list serves, websites, and particularly those forums and meetings which allow for information exchange. The utilization of multiple approaches will also assist in accommodating a diverse audience and constituency which may require unique and varying approaches.

3. Clarify policies and practices.

Provide clear guides and contact personnel where individuals can further understanding about a process or policy. Assure that the information is easily accessible to all including managers and supervisors. New Managers should receive mentors and training around critical supervision and team-building skills including communication, conflict management, and supervision.
Visitors come to the Office of the Ombuds for many reasons: to raise a complaint, discuss a conflict, have better understanding, prepare for a difficult conversation, and others. These various reasons are the result of a complex, diverse, and dynamic system and to some degree are inevitable. The way in which an organization or individual responds can make a vast difference and effect many elements throughout the system. A successful organization will recognize that individuals and systems normally generate various conflicts and will seek to create and foster a culture that promotes appropriate management of conflict and raising of concerns while maintaining a respectful, fair, and equitable environment for all.
Control Points

EVCP - Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
FAS - Financial and Administrative Services
MED CTR - Medical Center
SOD - School of Dentistry
SOM - School of Medicine
SON - School of Nursing
SOP - School of Pharmacy
UDAR - University Development and Alumni Relations

Locations (for those noted with abbreviation)

LHts - Laurel Heights
MCB - Mission Center Building
MtZ - Mount Zion
SFGH - San Francisco General Hospital
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University of California, San Francisco - Office of the Ombuds Charter

I. Introduction

The Office of the Ombuds at the University of California, San Francisco was established in 2011 to provide confidential, neutral, informal, and independent dispute resolution and mediation services to members of the UCSF community, predicated on the principles of fairness, equity, and respect. The structure and practice of the office is built on independence, impartiality and confidentiality. In the spirit of these important functions, this Charter Agreement defines the privileges and responsibilities of the Office of the Ombuds.

II. Purpose & Scope of Services

The Office of the Ombuds provides confidential, impartial, independent and informal dispute resolution and mediation services. The office is available to all members of the UCSF community, including faculty, staff, students, post-doctoral fellows and other trainees who seek assistance with matters brought to the attention of the Ombuds. Participation for any party is on a voluntary basis.

The Office of the Ombuds receives complaints, concerns or inquiries about alleged acts, omissions, improprieties, and/or broader systemic problems within the Office’s defined jurisdiction. These are received in confidence as defined in section IV. B of this document. In response, the Office of the Ombuds will listen, review matters received, make informal inquiries, offer options, make referrals, and facilitate resolutions independently and impartially. In addition, the Office of the Ombuds shall serve as an information and communication resource, consultant, dispute resolution expert and catalyst for institutional change.

The Office of the Ombuds supplements but does not replace or substitute for formal, investigative or appeals processes made available by the University. Use of the services of the Ombuds office does not delay filing requirements associated with the University’s complaint and/or grievance procedures.

The Office of the Ombuds functions to assist parties in reaching mutually acceptable agreements in order to find fair and equitable resolutions to concerns that arise at the university. Use of the office is voluntary. The Office of the Ombuds also reports general trends of issues and provides feedback throughout the organization, and recommends systems change when appropriate, without disclosing confidential communications.

III. Reporting

The Office of the Ombuds functions independently with respect to case handling and issue management. For administrative and budgetary purposes only, it reports to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs. To fulfill its functions, the Office of the Ombuds shall have a specific allocated budget, adequate space, and sufficient resources to meet operating needs and pursue continuing professional development.
IV. Standards & Ethics

The Office of the Ombuds staff shall adhere to The International Ombuds Association (IOA) Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice which may be found on its website at ombuds.ucsf.edu. This Charter adopts and incorporates by reference the IOA Standards of Practice, IOA Code of Ethics, and IOA Best Practices. These tenets require the Office of the Ombuds to function independently of the organization, to be confidential and neutral, and to limit the scope of its services to informal means of dispute resolution. The IOA Standards, Code, and Best Practices delineate minimum standards, and the Office of the Ombuds shall always strive to operate to “best practices”\(^1\) and to serve the best interests of all concerned. The Office of the Ombuds also adheres to best practices within the University of California system, as delineated in the “Declaration of Best Practices for University of California Ombuds Offices”.

A. Independence

Independence is essential to the effective functioning of the Office of the Ombuds. The Office of the Ombuds shall be, and shall appear to be, free from interference in the legitimate performance of its duties. This independence is achieved primarily through reporting structure, neutrality and organizational recognition and respect for the independent role of the Office of the Ombuds. To ensure objectivity, the Office of the Ombuds shall function independently from administrative authorities. This includes not disclosing confidential information about matters discussed in the Office of the Ombuds with anyone in the organization, including the person to whom the Office of the Ombuds reports, except as clearly delineated in Section IV. B. In addition, the Office of the Ombuds will have the authority to manage the budget and operations of the office.

\(^1\) “Best practices” are defined as operating in accordance with the guidelines and definitions contained within this document, IOA Standards of Practice, IOA Code of Ethics, IOA Best Practices: A Supplement to IOA’s Standards of Practice – Version 2, IOA Guidance for Best Practices and Commentary on the American Bar Association Standards for the Establishment and Operation of Ombuds Offices, and Declaration of Best Practices for University of California Ombuds Offices.
B. Confidentiality

The Office of the Ombuds shall not disclose any information provided in confidence, unless in the course of discussions with an inquirer, the Ombuds asks for and receives permission to make a disclosure or unless the Ombuds determines that there is an imminent risk of serious harm. The Office of the Ombuds asserts that there is a privilege of confidentiality with respect to the identity of visitors and their issues, and therefore cannot be required to disclose confidential communications. The Office of the Ombuds shall not confirm communicating with any party or parties. The Office of the Ombuds shall neither willingly participate as witnesses with respect to any confidential communication, nor participate in any formal process inside or outside the University.

C. Impartiality

The Office of the Ombuds shall not take sides in any conflict, dispute or issue. The Office of the Ombuds shall consider the interests and concerns of all parties involved in a situation impartially with the aim of facilitating communication and assisting the parties in reaching mutually acceptable agreements that are fair and equitable, and consistent with the policies of the University.

D. Informality

The Office of the Ombuds shall be a resource for informal dispute resolution and mediation services. The Office of the Ombuds shall not investigate, arbitrate, adjudicate or in any other way participate in any internal or external formal process or action. The Office of the Ombuds does not keep records for the University, and shall not create or maintain documents or records for the University about individual cases. Use of the Office of the Ombuds will be voluntary and not a required step in any grievance, formal complaint process or University policy.

---

2 As stated in the Declaration of Best Practices of University of California Ombuds Offices, “In accordance with the California Mediation Act (California Evidence Code Section 1115-1128), UC Ombuds are neutrals who meet the definition of mediators and whose communications with visitors are for the purpose of initiating, considering, or reconvening a mediation or retaining the ombuds, and thus assert the mediator’s privilege for all communications with visitors. Additionally, UC Ombuds assert that all communications with their offices are made with the expectation of confidentiality and are therefore entitled to a protection under the California State Constitution. By providing visitors with a confidential reporting mechanism, Ombuds Offices also assist the University in meeting the important public objectives set forth in the Federal Sentencing Guidelines and the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.” The UCSF Office of the Ombuds will assert any and all legal privileges related to confidential communications made with the office.
V. Authority and Limits of the Office of the Ombuds

A. Authority of the Office of the Ombuds

The Office of the Ombuds shall be entitled to inquire about any issue concerning the University which affects any member of the University community, and shall respect the confidentiality of that information. The Office of the Ombuds may informally address issues which fall under federal, state, local labor and employment laws, rules and regulations. The Office of the Ombuds shall have appropriate access to records and personnel at UCSF for the purpose of facilitating informal resolutions. The Office of the Ombuds has the authority to break confidence if the Ombuds believes there is an imminent risk of serious harm.

The Office of the Ombuds may, without having received a specific complaint from a member of the University community, act on its own discretion, and initiate inquiries concerning matters the Office of the Ombuds believe warrant such treatment. The Office of the Ombuds may decline to inquire into a matter or may withdraw from a case if the Ombuds believes involvement is inappropriate for any reason, including matters not brought in good faith, or which appear to be misuses of the Ombuds function. In situations such as this, the Ombuds will directly communicate their intent to the visitor and refer them to other options which may be available.

The Office of the Ombuds has the authority to discuss a range of options available to the visitor, including both informal and formal processes. However, the Office of the Ombuds will have no actual authority to impose sanctions, remedies or to enforce or change any policy, rule or procedure. The Office of the Ombuds may require legal or other professional advice, from time to time, in order to fulfill their required functions. The Office of the Ombuds may be provided separate legal counsel in the event it is asked for documents or testimony related to any litigation or other formal process, or when a conflict of interest arises between the Office of the Ombuds and the administration or the University.

B. Limitations on the Authority of the Office of the Ombuds

1. Receiving Notice for the University

Communication to the Office of the Ombuds shall not constitute notice to the University. The Office of the Ombuds shall publicize its non-notice role to the University. This includes allegations that may be perceived to be violations of laws, regulations or policies, such as sexual harassment, issues covered by the Whistleblower policy, or incidents subject to reporting under the Clery Act. Because the Ombuds does not function as part of the administration of the University nor as a “Campus security authority” as defined in the Cleary Act, even if the Ombuds becomes aware of such allegations, the Ombuds is not required to report it to the University or to law enforcement.

If a user of the Office of the Ombuds would like to put the University on notice regarding a specific situation, or wishes for information to be provided to the University, the Ombuds will provide that person with information so that the person may put the University on notice.
2. Collective Bargaining Agreements

The Office of the Ombuds shall not address any issues arising under any collective bargaining agreement (“CBA”), unless allowed by specific language in the CBA. This means that while the Office of the Ombuds may provide services to exclusively represented (i.e. unionized) employees, those services may not include addressing issues that are covered in the CBA, including, but not limited to, issues such disciplinary or non-disciplinary performance management, dismissal or any other alleged violation of a CBA or University policy. In those cases, the Ombuds shall refer the employee to his or her union representative. The Office of the Ombuds may work with exclusively represented (i.e. unionized) employees regarding all other issues not covered by the contracts, such as communication issues, facilitating discussions, and improving teamwork with various other employees.

3. Formal Processes and Investigations

The Office of the Ombuds shall not conduct formal investigations of any kind. The Office of the Ombuds staff shall not willingly participate in formal dispute processes or outside agency complaints or lawsuits, either on behalf of a user of the Office of the Ombuds or on behalf of the University. The Office of the Ombuds provides an alternative to formal processes for dispute resolution. All use of Ombuds services shall be voluntary and shall not impact filing requirements within the University or outside agencies. Because confidentiality, neutrality and informality are critically important to the Office of the Ombuds, all communications with the office are made with the understanding that they are confidential, off-the-record, and that no one from the office will be called to testify as a witness in any formal or legal proceeding to reveal confidential communications.

4. Record Keeping

The Office of the Ombuds does not keep records for the University, and shall not create or maintain documents or records for the University about individual cases. Notes, if any, taken during the course of working on a case are routinely destroyed at regular intervals and at the conclusion of a matter. All materials related to a case will be maintained in a secure location and manner, and will be destroyed once the case is concluded. The Ombuds may maintain non-confidential statistical data to assist the Ombuds in reporting trends and giving feedback to the University community.

5. Advocacy & Psychological Counseling

The Office of the Ombuds shall not act as an advocate for any party in a dispute, nor shall they represent management or visitors to their office. In addition, the Office of the Ombuds does not provide legal or psychological assistance, but can provide referral to the appropriate resources if necessary.

6. Adjudication of Issues

The Office of the Ombuds shall not have authority to adjudicate, impose remedies or sanctions, or to enforce or change policies or rules.
7. **Conflict of Interest**

Individual Ombuds shall avoid involvement in cases where there may be a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest occurs when the Ombuds’ private interests, real or perceived, supersede or compete with his or her dedication to the impartial and independent nature of the role of the Ombuds. When a real or perceived conflict exists, the Ombuds should take all steps necessary to disclose and/or avoid the conflict.

VI. **Retaliation for Using the Office of the Ombuds**

All members of the constituencies served by the Office of the Ombuds shall have the right to consult the Office of the Ombuds without fear of retaliation or reprisal.

VII. **Office of the Ombuds Structure**

The Office of the Ombuds also includes two units--Mediation Services and Work-Life Services. Mediation Services offers workplace mediation, group facilitations, conflict coaching, and workshops to UCSF community members. Work-Life Services offers assistance and expertise in topics and initiatives aimed at interpersonal and organizational communications, individual and team development, and creating and maintaining a supportive work environment. It accomplishes this through workshops, facilitations, and committee participation. All involvement and functions operate within the parameters and guidelines set forth in this charter and IOA principles. The Office of the Ombuds reports to the Office of the Vice Provost, Academic Affairs for administrative and budgetary purposes only.
References:


Declaration of Best Practices for University of California Ombuds Offices Ombuds DeclarationBestPractices - 11-16-06.docx
PREAMBLE

The IOA is dedicated to excellence in the practice of Ombudsman work. The IOA Code of Ethics provides a common set of professional ethical principles to which members adhere in their organizational Ombudsman practice.

Based on the traditions and values of Ombudsman practice, the Code of Ethics reflects a commitment to promote ethical conduct in the performance of the Ombudsman role and to maintain the integrity of the Ombudsman profession.

The Ombudsman shall be truthful and act with integrity, shall foster respect for all members of the organization he or she serves, and shall promote procedural fairness in the content and administration of those organizations’ practices, processes, and policies.

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

INDEPENDENCE
The Ombudsman is independent in structure, function, and appearance to the highest degree possible within the organization.

NEUTRALITY AND IMPARTIALITY
The Ombudsman, as a designated neutral, remains unaligned and impartial. The Ombudsman does not engage in any situation which could create a conflict of interest.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The Ombudsman holds all communications with those seeking assistance in strict confidence, and does not disclose confidential communications unless given permission to do so. The only exception to this privilege of confidentiality is where there appears to be imminent risk of serious harm.

INFORMALITY
The Ombudsman, as an informal resource, does not participate in any formal adjudicative or administrative procedure related to concerns brought to his/her attention.
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The IOA Standards of Practice are based upon and derived from the ethical principles stated in the IOA Code of Ethics.

Each Ombudsman office should have an organizational Charter or Terms of Reference, approved by senior management, articulating the principles of the Ombudsman function in that organization and their consistency with the IOA Standards of Practice.

**STANDARDS OF PRACTICE**

**INDEPENDENCE**

1.1 The Ombudsman Office and the Ombudsman are independent from other organizational entities.

1.2 The Ombudsman holds no other position within the organization which might compromise independence.

1.3 The Ombudsman exercises sole discretion over whether or how to act regarding an individual's concern, a trend or concerns of multiple individuals over time. The Ombudsman may also initiate action on a concern identified through the Ombudsman direct observation.

1.4 The Ombudsman has access to all information and all individuals in the organization, as permitted by law.

1.5 The Ombudsman has authority to select Ombudsman Office staff and manage Ombudsman Office budget and operations.

**NEUTRALITY AND IMPARTIALITY**

2.1 The Ombudsman is neutral, impartial, and unaligned.

2.2 The Ombudsman strives for impartiality, fairness and objectivity in the treatment of people and the consideration of issues. The Ombudsman advocates for fair and equitably administered processes and does not advocate on behalf of any individual within the organization.

2.3 The Ombudsman is a designated neutral reporting to the highest possible level of the organization and operating independent of ordinary line and staff structures.

2.4 The Ombudsman serves in no additional role within the organization which would compromise the Ombudsman's neutrality. The Ombudsman should not be aligned with any formal or informal associations within the organization in a way that might create actual or perceived conflicts of interest for the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman should have no personal interest or stake in, and incur no gain or loss from, the outcome of an issue.

2.5 The Ombudsman has a responsibility to consider the legitimate concerns and interests of all individuals affected by the matter under consideration.

2.6 The Ombudsman helps develop a range of responsible options to resolve problems and facilitate discussion to identify the best options.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

3.1 The Ombudsman holds all communications with those seeking assistance in strict confidence and takes all reasonable steps to safeguard confidentiality, including the following:

- The Ombudsman does not reveal, and must not be revealed, the identity of any individual contacting the Ombudsman Office, nor does the Ombudsman reveal information provided in confidence that could lead to the identification of any individual contacting the Ombudsman Office, without that individual's express permission, given in the course of informal discussions with the Ombudsman; the Ombudsman takes specific action related to an individual's issue only with the individual's express permission and only to the extent permitted, and even then at the sole discretion of the Ombudsman, unless such action can be taken in a way that safeguards the identity of the individual contacting the Ombudsman Office. The only exception to this privilege of confidentiality is where there appears to be imminent risk of serious harm, and where there is no other reasonable option. Whether this risk exists is a determination to be made by the Ombudsman.

3.2 Communications between the Ombudsman and others (made while the Ombudsman is serving in that capacity) are considered privileged. The privilege belongs to the Ombudsman and the Ombudsman Office, rather than to any party to an issue. Others cannot waive this privilege.

3.3 The Ombudsman does not testify in any formal process inside the organization and resists testifying in any formal process outside of the organization regarding a visitor's contract with the Ombudsman or confidential information communicated to the Ombudsman, even if given permission or requested to do so. The Ombudsman may, however, provide general, non-confidential information about the Ombudsman Office or the Ombudsman profession.

3.4 If the Ombudsman pursues an issue systemically (e.g., provides feedback on trends, issues, policies and practices) the Ombudsman does so in a way that safeguards the identity of individuals.

3.5 The Ombudsman keeps no records containing identifying information on behalf of the organization.

3.6 The Ombudsman maintains information (e.g., notes, phone messages, appointment calendars) in a secure location and manner, protected from inspection by others (including management), and has a consistent and standard practice for the destruction of such information.

3.7 The Ombudsman prepares any data and/or reports in a manner that protects confidentiality.

3.8 Communications made to the ombudsman are not notice to the organization. The ombudsman neither acts as agent for, nor accepts notice on behalf of, the organization and shall not serve in a position or role that is designated by the organization as a place to receive notice on behalf of the organization. However, the ombudsman may refer individuals to the appropriate place where formal notice can be made.

**INFORMALITY AND OTHER STANDARDS**

4.1 The Ombudsman functions on an informal basis by such means as: listening, providing and receiving information, identifying and reframing issues, developing a range of responsible options, and – with permission and at Ombudsman discretion – engaging in informal third-party intervention. When possible, the Ombudsman helps people develop new ways to solve problems themselves.

4.2 The Ombudsman as an informal and off-the-record resource pursues resolution of concerns and looks into procedural irregularities and/or broader systemic problems when appropriate.

4.3 The Ombudsman does not make binding decisions, mandate policies, or formally adjudicate issues for the organization.

4.4 The Ombudsman supplements, but does not replace, any formal channels. Use of the Ombudsman Office is voluntary, and is not a required step in any grievance process or organizational policy.

4.5 The Ombudsman does not participate in any formal investigative or adjudicative procedures. Formal investigations should be conducted by others. When a formal investigation is requested, the Ombudsman refers individuals to the appropriate offices or individual.

4.6 The Ombudsman identifies trends, issues and concerns about policies and procedures, including potential future issues and concerns, without breaches confidentiality or anonymity, and provides recommendations for responsibly addressing them.

4.7 The Ombudsman acts in accordance with the IOA Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, keeps professionally current by pursuing continuing education, and provides opportunities for staff to pursue professional training.

4.8 The Ombudsman endeavors to be worthy of the trust placed in the Ombudsman Office.
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INTERNATIONAL OMBUDSMAN ASSOCIATION

Uniform Reporting Categories

1. Compensation & Benefits
   Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about the equity, appropriateness and competitiveness of employee compensation, benefits and other benefit programs.
   1.a Compensation (rate of pay, salary amount, job salary classification/level)
   1.b Payroll (administration of pay, check wrong or delayed)
   1.c Benefits (decisions related to medical, dental, life, vacation/sick leave, education, worker’s compensation insurance, etc.)
   1.d Retirement, Pension (eligibility, calculation of amount, retirement pension benefits)
   1.e Other (any other employee compensation or benefit not described by the above sub-categories)

2. Evaluative Relationships
   Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries arising between people in evaluative relationships (i.e. supervisor-employee, faculty-student).
   2.a Priorities, Values, Beliefs (differences about what should be considered important – or most important – often rooted in ethical or moral beliefs)
   2.b Respect/Treatment (demonstrations of inappropriate regard for people, not listening, rudeness, crudeness, etc.)
   2.c Trust/Integrity (suspicion that others are not being honest, whether or to what extent one wishes to be honest, etc.)
   2.d Reputation (possible impact of rumors and/or gossip about professional or personal matters)
   2.e Communication (quality and/or quantity of communication)
   2.f Bullying, Mobbing (abusive, threatening, and/or coercive behaviors)
   2.g 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)
   2.h Retaliation (punitive behaviors for previous actions or comments, whistleblower)
   2.i Physical Violence (actual or threats of bodily harm to another)
   2.j Assignments/Schedules (appropriateness or fairness of tasks, expected volume of work)
   2.k Feedback (feedback or recognition given, or responses to feedback received)
   2.l Consultation (requests for help in dealing with issues between two or more individuals they supervise/teach or with other unusual situations in evaluative relationships)

2.m Performance Appraisal/Grading
   (job/academic performance in formal or informal evaluation)

2.n Departmental Climate
   (prevailing behaviors, norms, or attitudes within a department for which supervisors or faculty have responsibility.)

2.o Supervisory Effectiveness
   (management of department or classroom, failure to address issues)

2.p Insubordination
   (refusal to do what is asked)

2.q Discipline
   (appropriateness, timeliness, requirements, alternatives, or options for responding)

2.r Equity of Treatment
   (favoritism, one or more individuals receive preferential treatment)

2.s Other (any other evaluative relationship not described by the above sub-categories)

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.)
   3.a Priorities, Values, Beliefs (differences about what should be considered important – or most important – often rooted in ethical or moral beliefs)
   3.b Respect/Treatment (demonstrations of inappropriate regard for people, not listening, rudeness, crudeness, etc.)
   3.c Trust/Integrity (suspicion that others are not being honest, whether or to what extent one wishes to be honest, etc.)
   3.d Reputation (possible impact of rumors and/or gossip about professional or personal matters)
   3.e Communication (quality and/or quantity of communication)
   3.f Bullying, Mobbing (abusive, threatening, and/or coercive behaviors)
   3.g 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)
   3.h Retaliation (punitive behaviors for previous actions or comments, whistleblower)
   3.i Physical Violence (actual or threats of bodily harm to another)
   3.j Other (any other peer or colleague relationship not described by the above sub-categories)

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.)
   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)
   4.b Job Classification and Description
   (changes or disagreements over requirements of assignment, appropriate tasks)
   4.c Involuntary Transfer/Change of Assignment
   (notice, selection and special dislocation) rights/benefits, removal from prior duties, unrequested change of work tasks)
   4.d Tenure/Position Security/Ambiguity
   (security of position or contract, provision of secure contractual categories)
   4.e Career Progression
   (promotion, reappointment, or tenure)
   4.f 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)
   4.g Resignation
   (concerns about whether or how to voluntarily terminate employment or how such a decision might be communicated appropriately)
   4.h Termination/Non-Renewal
   (end of contract, non-renewal of contract, disputed permanent separation from organization)
   4.i Re-employment of Former or Retired Staff
   (loss of competitive advantages associated with re-hiring retired staff, favoritism)
   4.j Position Elimination
   (elimination or abolition of an individual’s position)
   4.k Career Development, Coaching, Mentoring
   (classroom, on-the-job, and varied assignments as training and developmental opportunities)
   4.l Other (any other issues linked to recruitment, assignment, job security or separation not described by the above sub-categories)

.................................................................
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, e-mail, audio, video 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 Property Damage (personal property damage, liabilities)

5.j Other (any other legal, financial and compliance issue not described by the above sub-categories)

6. Safety, Health, and Physical Environment

Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about Safety, Health and Infrastructure-related issues.

6.a Safety (physical safety, injury, medical evacuation, meeting federal and state requirements for training and equipment)

6.b Physical Working/Living 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 sub-categories)

7. Services/Administrative Issues

Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about services or administrative offices including from external parties.

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 (impact of non-disciplinary decisions, decisions about requests for administrative and academic services, e.g., exceptions to policy deadlines or limits, refund requests, appeals of library or parking fines, application for financial aid, 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 sub-categories)

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, e.g. downsizing, off shoring, 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 sub-categories)

8.l Other (Other policy, procedure, ethics or standards issues not described in the above sub-categories)

9. Values, Ethics, and Standards

Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about the fairness of organizational values, ethics, and/or standards, the application of related policies and/or procedures, or the need for creation or revision of policies, and/or standards.

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, e.g., appropriate dress, use of internet or cell phones)

9.e Other (Other policy, procedure, ethics or standards issues not described in the above sub-categories)
INTAKE FORM

Case ID #: [EG RD MB KB]

Provider(s) [KB MB RD EG]

First Point of Contact [Phone In-Person Email]

First Point of Contact [In-Person]

Resource(s) Provided (number order of service)

- Intake/Consult
- Contact Others
- Referral
- Coaching
- 1:1 Mediation
- Grp Mediation
- Outreach
- Leadership

Training/Workshop

Group Facilitation

Training/Group Title:

INITIATOR

Name:

Dept:

Ph#:

Title:

Dept:

Status

Faculty Non-Faculty Academic Mgr/Spvr Staff Resident Fellow Student Post-Doc Other:

Campus Site

Parnassus MCB MtZ Mission Bay LHts SFGH Geary Montgomery Exec Park VAMC

Global Health UCOP Fresno Beal China Basin Other: If Other, Note:

Control Point

SON SOD SOM SOP EVCP UDAR Div & Outreach Strat Commun/UR FAS Med Center

Union?

CUE UPTE AFSCME C.N.A. FUPOA AFT Hx

MEDIATION DATA

Mediator: [ ] Co-Mediator: [ ] # Sessions:

OUTCOME Agreement Reached No Agreement Not completed

# Info Contacts # Contact Others Information Contact

Name:

Title:

Ph#:

Email:

Dept:

Status

Faculty Post-Doc Mgr/Spvr Student Staff Fellow Resident Other

Control Point

SON SOD SOM SOP EVCP Dvlpmnt/Alum Rel Div & Outreach Strat Commun/UR Fin & Admin Med Center

Status

Faculty Post-Doc Mgr/Spvr Student Staff Fellow Resident Other

Control Point

SON SOD SOM SOP EVCP Dvlpmnt/Alum Rel Div & Outreach Strat Commun/UR Fin & Admin Med Center

CLOSING SUMMARY (* for group cases, complete this information on the index intake only)

* # Served # Contact Others # Info Contacts

* # Individ. Sessions # Group Sessions

Case Status Withdrawn Cancelled Completed Carry Forward? (year end only)

Closure Date

Associated Risks

1 2 3

5 6 7

4

COMMENTS:

Rev. 2/13/2013
Ombuds Shared/Intake
OMBUDSRY REPORTING

Refer to IOA Uniform Reporting Categories Sheet for this section. For each relevant category, note the primary (1), secondary (2), and tertiary (3) rating in the box to the right. Choose all that apply for each sub-category.

1.  Compensation & Benefits  
Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about the equity, appropriateness and competitiveness of employee compensation, benefits and other benefit programs.

2.  Evaluative Relationships  
Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries arising between people in evaluative relationships (i.e. supervisor-employee, faculty-student.)

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.)

4.  Career Progression & 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.)

5.  Legal, Regulatory, Financial & 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.

6.  Safety, Health, & Physical Environment  
Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about Safety, Health and Infrastructure-related issues.

7.  Services/Administrative Issues  
Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about services or administrative offices including from external parties.

8.  Organizational, Strategic, Mission Related  
Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries that relate to the whole or some part of an organization.

9.  Values, Ethics, and Standards  
Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about the fairness of organizational values, ethics, and/or standards, the application of related policies and/or procedures, or the need for creation or revision of policies, and/or standards.

LEGEND: Areas of Risk 1-7
1. Loss of department productivity due to pervasive conflict
2. Unwarranted staff attrition/transfer
3. Negative publicity
4. Significant violations of policy/Code of Conduct
5. Potential for internal/external grievances
6. Litigation potential
7. High risk safety issue
** Also reports to the General Counsel/Vice President—Legal Affairs, Office of the President