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A Few Introductory Notes About This Report

Time Period Covered
This Report covers Ombuds Office activities between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006.

Ombuds and Faculty Ombuds Office
This report represents the combined work of both the Ombuds and Faculty Ombuds Offices during the 2005-2006 academic year.

Three Kinds of “Contacts”
We have three kinds of “contacts” with members of the University community. To differentiate between them we use the terms: Initiators, Other Participants, and Information Contacts. Initiators are people who contact us to ask for help in managing or resolving a concern. Other Participants are those we contact with permission of Initiators who are directly involved in a situation with an Initiator.

“Visitors”
Because of the neutral role of the Ombuds Office, we do not use the term “clients” to refer to those we assist, as that term commonly connotes advocacy. Instead, we use the term “visitors.” We recognize this term is not perfectly descriptive since we use it to refer to people with whom we assist via telephone who may never physically “visit” the office but it does seem more appropriate to describe the nature of our contacts, given our role.

How We Classify Issues
Starting in 2005-2006 the UCB Ombuds Office has adopted the classification system recommended by the International Ombudsman Association (IOA) to describe the various reasons for contacts with an organizational Ombuds Office. The IOA system provides eight broad categories and approximately 75 subcategories to classify the issues, questions, and concerns that lead to contact with an organizational ombuds office. Our use of these categories should help us more accurately identify the reasons for contacts than was possible using our previous categories, some of which were quite vague (e.g., “workplace conflict”). One disadvantage of our adopting this typology is that it will prevent comparison of issues, questions, and concerns with those of previous years. However we can still compare the number of individuals with whom we had contact in previous years and that information will be provided in this Report.

In addition to adopting IOA’s new classification system we have also adopted their suggested rationale for making classification decisions. Specifically, although visitors may raise many issues in our discussions, we now count only the issues for which we discuss options to assist them.

One advantage our use of IOA’s classification system will bring over time is the ability to compare the workload and types of cases of the UCB Ombuds Office to those at other universities and to those of ombuds in corporations, government agencies, and international agencies, as well. Until recently, such “apples-to-apples” comparisons were simply not possible because of significant differences in the methodologies used by various offices.
Ombuds Office Staff Changes:

The 2005-2006 year saw several significant staffing changes in the Ombuds and Faculty Ombuds Offices: Notably, Carolyn Noorbakhsh vacated her position as Associate Director in May of 2006 to accept a position establishing a new ombuds office at the National Renewable Energy Labs in her home town of Golden, Colorado. Following a national search, we were very fortunate to hire Donna Louden, formerly an ombudsperson with the University of California at Irvine. Also, anticipating Jack Kelso’s retirement as Faculty Ombudsperson, in January 2006 we hired retired Associate Professor of Theatre and Dance, Lee Potts, for a training period which included mediation training, Ombuds 101 training, numerous opportunities to observe other ombuds staff at work, and opportunities to participate in Ombuds Office staff meetings. Potts assumed Jack Kelso’s position when he retired after nine years of service at the end of the Spring 2006 semester.

Role of the Ombuds Office:

The Ombuds Office at the University of Colorado at Boulder provides informal, impartial, and confidential dispute resolution services for faculty, students, staff, and administrators. We assist people with interpersonal disputes as well as those with concerns about academic or administrative issues. We attempt to help individuals resolve their concerns fairly and, if possible, informally. The Ombuds Office operates independently as a supplement to existing administrative or formal grievance procedures and has no formal decision-making authority. We do not act as advocates for either side in a dispute. Perhaps most importantly, we operate confidentially, which means we do not acknowledge who has--or has not--used the Ombuds Office unless we have made an agreement to do so with an individual who has asked us to contact one or more individuals. If disputants later become involved in formal processes, we do not acknowledge having seen them, even with their permission. We report administratively to the Provost. We follow the Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice of the International Ombudsman Association (IOA).

What the Ombuds Office Does

- consult with members of the University of Colorado at Boulder (UCB) community who voluntarily seek information and/or informal assistance in the management or resolution of University-related conflicts, disputes, or complaints;
- At the discretion of the Ombuds Office, pertinent groups associated with the UCB community (i.e., parents, former students, etc.) may also be assisted;
- inform visitors about informal, formal, and/or administrative options for managing and resolving conflicts, complaints, and disputes;
- provide information about relevant policies and procedures;
- provide mediation and/or facilitation services for members of the campus community or information about how to obtain these services elsewhere;
- make appropriate referrals to other offices, services, departments, or procedures;
- provide conflict management and related workshops and training for departments and members of the campus community when, in our professional judgment, such requests are appropriate for an ombudsperson;
• explain the impartial, confidential, informal, and independent function of the Ombuds Office to all visitors seeking assistance both orally and in writing; and
• identify and share with administrators (including the Provost and the Chancellor) patterns of issues, concerns, or complaints and any recommendations we may have for addressing them.

What the Ombuds Office Does NOT Do

• make, change, or set aside a law, policy, or administrative decision;
• make binding decisions or determine rights;
• share confidential information with the administration or with members of the Office of University Counsel unless, in our professional judgment, there is an imminent risk of serious harm or we have permission to do so;
• compel anyone to implement our recommendations;
• conduct investigations that substitute for administrative or judicial proceedings;
• give legal advice;
• receive official notice for the University about issues (other than complaints about the behavior of Ombuds Office staff);
• make administrative decisions for University of Colorado administrators (other than those affecting the operation of the Ombuds Office);
• determine “guilt” or “innocence” of anyone accused of wrong-doing;
• sanction individuals outside the Ombuds Office;
• provide testimony in formal grievance or disciplinary procedures or litigation except to explain the role of the office and provide publicly available information (unless ordered to do so by a judge);
• maintain formal written case records identifying users of the office;
• assist individuals with an issue that is currently pending in a formal forum (e.g., grievance) unless all parties and the presiding officer in that action explicitly consent to suspend the formal process;
• assist individuals with no affiliation with the campus community;
• take on additional administrative (non-ombuds) responsibilities within the institution (e.g., investigations); or
• waive the Ombuds Privilege.

Issues Leading to Contact with the Ombuds Office

As the chart below indicates, Ombuds and Faculty Ombuds Office staff had more contacts with members of the University community about issues related to “Performance, Evaluation, and Supervision” than any other in 2005-2006. We also had a significant number of contacts with people because of conflicts and concerns about “Peer and Collegial Relationships,” “Policies, Procedures, and Ethics,” and “Services or Administrative Concerns.” We had a smaller number of contacts with people who had concerns about “Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance” issues, “Employee Compensation and Benefits” issues, “Organizational, Strategic and Mission-Related” issues, and “Safety, Health and Physical Environment.”
Ombuds Office Contacts with Members Different Constituencies

We had contact with 578 members of the campus community in 2005-2006 about a total of 799 different issues. We had contact with some individuals about multiple issues. The Ombuds and Faculty Ombuds Offices had 199 contacts with Faculty (including professors, instructors, lecturers, research assistant/associates, post-docs, and graduate teaching assistants), 159 with Staff (including classified and unclassified staff, supervisors, and administrators), 157 with Students (including undergraduate, graduate, and former students, and student employees), 37 with Parents (or other family members), and 27 with “Others” (including those we were unable to classify, community members, or individuals from other institutions).
The numbers above represent the total “headcount” for those with whom we had significant contact in 2005-2006. The vast majority of those with whom we have contact are Initiators (401) or Other Participants (119). Information Contacts (58) are members of the campus community we contact to gain information about a policy or procedure in situations not requiring disclosure of names of individuals about whose situations we call. Sometimes these individuals make use of our services themselves at a later time or they make referrals to our office. Thus, although they represent only about 10% of our contacts, they are important to our work and we consider them significant enough to count.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the number of contacts in 2005-2006 decreased from the previous two years, in 2003-2005 the Ombuds and Faculty Ombuds Offices had a very large number of contacts. The 2005-2006 numbers are still well within the range reported by ombuds colleagues at other universities. And, given the role of the office it is never as easy to draw solid conclusions about the reasons for increases or decreases in our number of contacts, especially given the overwhelmingly positive feedback we have received from those initiating requests for our help (see “Evaluation of the Ombuds Office” below). A small contributor to this decline is undoubtedly due the fact that, in 2005-2006 we decided to stop counting our contacts with ombuds colleagues at other universities seeking consultations about complex cases and our contacts with other individuals searching for information about how to enter the ombuds profession. Although counting these contacts did allow us to account for some of our time, we decided we wanted our data to better reflect our work with members of the campus community.
Who Had “Issues” With Whom?

By far, the largest focus of concern for visitors to the Ombuds Office in 2005-2006 was not any individual constituent group but rather Policies and Procedures (167). These contacts were for a variety of reasons. Sometimes people simply wanted to know which policies or procedures applied to their situations. In 42 cases, individuals questioned whether procedures were followed appropriately. Or if they knew which policy was involved, they wanted to know how the procedures were supposed to work. Sometimes people had conflict over differing interpretations of the applicability of those policies to their circumstances. And some people had questions about why they were accused of violating a policy (e.g., Student Code of Conduct, Honor Code) or about their appeals options. In a small number of instances (8), people perceived a policy itself was unfair.

The constituent groups about whom the largest number of concerns were raised was faculty (107), staff (56), and both faculty administrators and undergraduate students (46 each). Concerns about faculty were raised most often by other faculty (33), undergraduate students (32), and faculty administrators (17). Concerns about staff were raised mostly by other staff (19) and staff supervisors (17).

Most Common Reasons for Contacts with Faculty, Students, and Staff

Faculty

1. Performance Evaluation and Supervision (72)

Description: Questions, concerns, or issues arising between people in evaluative relationships (e.g., faculty-chair, faculty-student). Examples include:

- Annual performance evaluation
- Grading
- Perceived Favoritism

2. Peer and Colleague Relationships (56)

Description: Questions, concerns, or issues involving peers or colleagues who do not have a formal evaluative relationship (e.g., two faculty members within the same department or student-professor). Examples include:

- Priorities, values, and beliefs
- Respect/Treatment
- Communication

3. Policies, Procedures, and Ethics (56)

Description: Questions, concerns, or issues about the fairness or need for revision of policies, values, or standards of conduct. Examples include:

- Application of policy/procedures
• Policy itself perceived as unfair

Students

1. Performance Evaluation and Academic Environment (60)

   **Description:** Questions, concerns, or issues pertaining to academic assessment or the academic environment. Examples include:

   • Grading disputes
   • Teaching effectiveness
   • Respect/Treatment

2. Policies, Procedures, and Ethics (60)

   **Description:** Questions, concerns, or issues about the fairness or need for revision of policies, values, and standards of conduct. Examples include:

   • Application of policies/procedures
   • Student Code of Conduct
   • Honor Code

3. Services and Administrative Concerns (46)

   **Description:** Questions, concerns, or issues about services or offices. Examples include:

   • Academic or administrative decisions
   • Responsiveness/Timeliness
   • Quality of Services

Staff

1. Performance Evaluation and Supervision (123)

   **Description:** Questions, concerns, or issues arising between people in evaluative relationships (e.g., supervisor-supervisee). Examples include:

   • Performance appraisal
   • Respect/Treatment
   • Feedback (giving or receiving)

2. Peer and Colleague Relationships (49)

   **Description:** Questions, concerns, or issues involving peers or colleagues who do not have a formal evaluative relationship (e.g., supervisor-supervisee). Examples include:
- Communication
- Respect/Treatment
- Priorities, values, and beliefs

**Most Common Forms of Assistance Provided by the Ombuds Office**

Note: Often the assistance we provide consists of only one or two hours of discussion with an individual. However, in some cases, many more people are involved (sometimes half a dozen or more) and much more time is involved, as well.

1. **Individual Consultations** (provided for 520 people)

   This category is used to indicate that we listened to people’s concerns, answered their questions, identified their interests, considered their goals, and/or helped them recognize and choose among various options to address their concerns. We offer this form of assistance to everyone. Our assistance in this category often includes conflict coaching regarding how visitors might raise difficult issues or approach others to gain their cooperation, etc. and feedback about letters or petitions visitors are writing. Although we do not participate in formal procedures, we also provide information about applicable UCB campus policies or procedures and assist visitors in making decisions about how they want to proceed.

   Note: When any of the categories below are selected, an “Individual Consultation” is assumed to have also occurred.

2. **Contacted Others** (provided for 177 people)

   This category of assistance is used when, with permission of a visitor, we contact someone else. These contacts occur: a) to discuss her/his perceptions or concerns about the matter a visitor presented and to determine how or if we might assist her/him as well as the original visitor and/or b) to gather information about policy requirements, etc. to assist a visitor in deciding whether or how to do something s/he is considering doing (e.g., write a petition, participate in a formal process, etc.).

3. **Referral** (provided for 57 people)

   This category is used to indicate that we referred an individual or individuals to another on-campus or off-campus resource for primary or additional assistance. When this category is checked, an Individual Consultation (see above) is assumed to have occurred, as well. Two offices to which we nearly always refer those seeking a formal remedy to their concerns are the Office of Discrimination and Harassment and the Office of Labor Relations.

   When those we encounter are experiencing emotional difficulties or even personality disorders, when we can, we make referrals to Counseling and Psychological Services: A Multicultural Center, Victim Assistance, the Faculty and Staff Assistance Program, or the Wardenburg Psychiatry Clinic. However, it is important to note that in most of these cases, the referral is in addition to other services we provide. We have observed that
people with apparent personality disorders or those experiencing emotional difficulties may, in fact, have legitimate concerns. In fact, in some cases, because their behavior is so off-putting to others, this appears to affect how they are treated.

4. Mediation or Group Facilitation (provided for 36 people)

This can be selected to indicate that we did a structured mediation between two parties. This requires separate meetings with the disputing parties prior to mediation session(s). Typically, it takes two or three mediation sessions to reach resolution on issues. This form of assistance can also be selected to indicate facilitation of group discussions, retreats, and general meetings to assist groups in identifying issues and making decisions.

5. Department/Unit Consultation (provided for 28 people)

This category of assistance indicates that we assisted multiple people inside a department or unit at the request of and/or with the consent of the head of the department/unit. It generally includes both individual interviews and group facilitations. It differs from “Mediation/Facilitation” in that the issues have to do with group or system dynamics rather than specified individual conflicts.

System Change Assistance

Some problems that come to our attention are systemic in nature. In addition to assisting those directly involved, we often try to assist the University by providing feedback to appropriate individuals or departments about these issues. For example, if our discussions lead us to recognize that two policies appear to conflict with one another or if a policy does not address an issue clearly, without identifying individuals, we typically follow up with University officials to encourage appropriate change and communication to avoid the problem in the future.

Discussion

The Ombuds Office serves as a centralized campus resource for individuals with a myriad of issues, questions, and concerns about where to go, to whom to speak, formal and/or informal procedures, what is required, etc. in order to resolve a problem, achieve a goal or address a concern. Some visitors come to the office before they have attempted any other method of addressing their concerns because they want to learn about all their options before trying anything. However, many come when they have been unable to resolve their concerns through other channels they have tried. Frequently these individuals remark that staff members in the Ombuds Office were “the first to really listen” to them. Our ability to provide this service is often sincerely appreciated. But while listening is essential, and some visitors just need a “sounding board,” it is usually not sufficient to assist most visitors to our office.

We are usually able to help individuals with academic, administrative, or interpersonal concerns to navigate the system more effectively or determine how they might best approach someone with whom they are in conflict. Often our familiarity with the campus culture, policies, and people allow us to readily assist visitors. But sometimes we need to contact other individuals or offices (only with permission if we are identifying the visitor) to gather
information they can use to resolve their concerns. In other instances, we assist them in recognizing more effective ways to approach others about their concerns. Several examples of this led to documents on the “Self-Help Resources” section of our website (http://www.colorado.edu/Ombuds), including:

- a guide for students through the potentially challenging conversation with a professor about a grading dispute;
- a guide on how to write a letter as a conflict resolution tool;
- a guide to preparing for your mediation; and
- a guide on how to make an effective apology.

Evaluation of the Ombuds Office

Our role and the Standards of Practice we follow (see: http://www.ombudsassociation.org/standards.html) sometimes makes it difficult to assess our contributions to those we assist and to the university community. Often it is clear that those who initiated a request for our help (or those we contact with permission) have benefited from the assistance we have provided and frequently we hear this directly from them as they are leaving our offices. People often tell us they are very glad a service like ours exists at the University.

Often people who initiate a request for our help are fearful of letting others know they contacted us. This is especially true for some of the most vulnerable groups on campus (e.g., graduate students experiencing conflict with their advisors, untenured faculty members experiencing conflict with department chairs or senior colleagues, and staff members experiencing conflict with supervisors or administrators). When people do not give us permission to speak with others, we do not disclose that they used the office to anyone. In these cases, we have only one individual’s perspective on the matter about which they sought our help. And that limits what we can do to help them.

When we have permission to contact others involved in situations brought to our attention by visitors we usually find it helpful. Visitors often do not understand the perspective of others with whom they are in conflict. Our neutral role allows us to make contact with individuals without threatening them. Although responses to our contacts vary, most of those we contact are eventually cooperative and even seem to appreciate our help.

Users of the Ombuds Office who make appointments are given a packet of information when they arrive for their appointments. In addition to information about how the Ombuds Office functions and what it does and does not do, the packet includes an evaluation form and a return mailing envelope which they may return after their appointments. Those who provided feedback overwhelmingly indicated that they appreciate how they were treated by Ombuds Office staff and that they had a positive experience with the office. On a 1 - 5 rating scale, with 5 representing “strongly agree,” the average overall satisfaction rating in 2005-2006 was 4.73.
Based on verbal and written feedback, the number of referrals and requests for Ombuds Office assistance (about 500 per year), and responsiveness we experience from members of the University community we contact with permission, we believe our services are beneficial for a large number of individuals and for the University itself.

Sometimes matters are resolved for reasons having little or nothing to do with the Ombuds Office. And occasionally matters are not resolved to the satisfaction of a visitor requesting our help because:

- they are asking for something that would violate a policy or be unfair to others;
- a request does not fit the criteria established for exceptions to a policy;
- there is a perceived need to be consistent in the application of a policy;
- in the judgment of an individual who have the authority to grant what has been requested s/he simply does not believe it is appropriate; and/or
- in some interpersonal disputes, one or more parties are so entrenched in their positions, they are simply unwilling to make agreements or find new ways to work together.

The above points illustrate why evaluating the effectiveness of the Ombuds Office is so challenging. There is danger that some visitors who do not achieve the results they want, might conclude the office is “ineffective.” This, of course, is not simply a matter of concern for the UCB Ombuds Office. It is a challenge to all organizational ombuds offices across the country and around the world. Significant work is being done by an IOA Task Force on how to measure the effectiveness of an ombuds office. We expect to take advantage of this work and make use of their ideas in the years ahead.

**Observations and Recommendations**

1. **Observation:** Some faculty members seemed to lack skill and tact in confronting students about perceived violations of academic integrity, resulting in unnecessary escalation of conflict with students. Most experienced faculty members recognize the difference in intent between a student who knowingly tries to pass off someone else’s work as her/his own and one who simply needs more instruction on how to properly cite sources. Some, especially less-experienced faculty members appear to be personally insulted by this behavior – regardless of the intent. While both students are guilty of plagiarism, treating both students as though they knowingly, intentionally cheated, results in unnecessary conflict, minimizes the value of a “teachable moment,” and causes unnecessary harm to the student who lacked accurate information about how to appropriately cite sources.

   **Recommendation:** Offer professional development opportunities to assist faculty (especially Assistant Professors, Lecturers, and Instructors) in learning how to effectively
and appropriately speak with students they believe may be guilty of plagiarism and help
them recognize the importance of considering intent when having this conversation.

2. **Observation:** A common dynamic between conflicting supervisors and staff members
has been the supervisor’s perception that the employee has a “performance problem”
while the employee has the perception that the supervisor is “harassing” her/him.

**Recommendation:** Continue to provide funding for supervisory training to assist
supervisors in: a) learning how to give feedback effectively and engage employees in
meaningful dialogue about performance issues while b) avoiding behaviors which
employees can view as “harassing.”

3. **Observation:** Following then President Betsy Hoffman’s commitment to the Colorado
Legislature, the campus grade appeals processes were identified, clarified, and publicized
in the Spring of 2004.

**Recommendation:** Since anecdotal reports from ombuds colleagues at other institutions
suggest that when grade appeals processes are implemented up to half result in changes in
students’ grades, it might be expected that at least some percentage of these processes
would have a similar outcome on our campus. While a majority of grades challenged are
likely to be upheld by faculty committees reviewing them, effective and fair processes
should not simply serve as a “rubber stamp” of every grade assigned. Assess how
frequently these processes are being used and how well they appear to be working.
Include everyone involved in evaluating these processes - especially students - in this
assessment.

4. **Observation:** The Chancellor has identified the need for a new strategic planning process
for the Boulder campus. As the possibility exists that organizational restructuring
(whether small or large) may occur as a result, a predictable reaction inside of any
organization to the prospect of such change is often uncertainty and fear. Much of this is
probably unnecessary.

**Recommendation:** Consider offering of training programs on managing change, dealing
effectively with change, etc. and make this training available for administrators,
supervisors, and staff. At the least, make those considering making organizational
changes aware of resources to help them manage the process (e.g., William Bridges’
*Managing Transitions: Making the Most of Change*).

5. **Observation:** Budget cuts over a period of several years have resulted in staff cutbacks in
various departments around the campus. This has led to the assignment of some former
staff members’ responsibilities to existing staff. It has also led to morale problems when,
for a prolonged period of time, staff are expected to “do more with less” and to increased
stress for some staff.

**Recommendation:** As Ombuds Office data is, by definition, anecdotal, assess the
pervasiveness of this problem on staff morale. Also, those in management roles should
try to assure that workloads are not excessive.
Workshops, Training, and Outreach Activities

Every year Ombuds Office staff members provide workshops and training for members of the campus community (and beyond) on conflict management skills and strategies as well as presentations about the role of the Ombuds Office. Workshops and training are often given as a part an ongoing training series for particular constituencies (e.g., Organizational and Employee Development’s series of trainings for staff supervisors or “Negotiation” for faculty members participating in the LEAP program). In some cases they are free-standing workshops available to all members of the campus community (e.g., “Applying Principled Negotiation to Workplace Conflict”) or they are given by request for specific constituencies (e.g., the Faculty and Staff Assistance Program requested we develop and implement a summer workshop for faculty and staff called “Maintaining Positive Workplace Relationships”).

These outreach activities serve a number of useful functions. They are proactive attempts to assist members of the campus community in learning concepts and/or skills to better manage conflict. And, they increase the visibility of the office. As a result, many workshop participants make use of the office after attending our workshops.

Some Highlights:

- Number of Outreach Activities: 34 (see Appendix B for details)
- Number of Participants: 916
- Average Workshop Evaluations for OED Classes: 5.6 on a 1 - 6 scale (6 is the highest possible rating)

Significant Accomplishments in 2005-2006

All but one of the “Future Initiatives” from the 2003-2005 Bi-Annual Report (see http://www.colorado.edu/Ombuds) have been accomplished.

After a two-year delay, the book Exercising Power with Wisdom: Bridging Legal and Ethical Practice with Intention (James M. Lancaster and Associates, College Administration Publications, Inc.) was published. Tom Sebok authored chapter VI. in this book called “Restorative Justice on Campus: Repairing Harm and Building Community.”

Future Initiatives

One issue that has plagued not only the UCB campus, but US society for centuries is the ability to effectively communicate and understand one another when conflicts arise involving issues of difference (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.). In 2006-2007 we will revive a workshop (formerly called “Conflicting Through Differences”) which will combine information about differences, privilege, oppression, and emotional intelligence with conflict management skills training. This workshop will be available in the Spring of 2007 and open to any member of the campus community.
As allegations of incivility continue to appear in the Ombuds Office we will also explore the possibility of developing a new workshop on “Civility in the Academic and Work Environment.”

The Ombuds and Faculty Ombuds Offices will implement additional outreach and marketing activities in the 2006-2007 year.

Tom Sebok will serve as Associate Editor of the *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association*.

Develop a new skill-based course for the LEAP Program on “Crucial Conversations.”

We will add several documents to the Ombuds Office website (www.Colorado.EDU/Ombuds) including one on “Responding to Critical Supervisory Feedback” and another on “Conflict Management Skills” with examples and suggestions about when and how to use the skills most effectively.

The evaluation form given to visitors of the Ombuds Office will be abbreviated in an effort to elicit a greater rate of response.

In 2006-2007 we hope to receive an “Authorization of Ombuds Services” letter from the UCB Chancellor to demonstrate his support for our following the Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice of the International Ombudsman Association.

In 2006-2007 we hope to continue to utilize the evolving work of the IOA Database Categories Task Force by adopting the categories and subcategories they developed to classify the kinds of issues with which we assist visitors to better identify the issues, questions, and concerns of those seeking our help and allow for the comparison of our work here at UCB with that of our ombuds colleagues in other universities, corporations, government agencies, and international agencies.

Author an article and submit it for publication to an ombuds journal about the history of the UCB Ombuds Office.

Submit a proposal and, if accepted, co-organize a panel presentation at the 2007 IOA Conference in St. Louis, MO on “Variations of Ombuds Practice Around the World.”

Investigate non-intrusive options for collecting better demographic data for those we assist.

Coordinate with the Director of Internal Audit to make sure Ombuds Office information is included on the CU “landing page” for the new Ethics Line so people considering using the Ethics Line know that they have the option to speak with someone in the Ombuds Office either as an alternative to using the Ethics Line or to receive assistance in thinking about whether they want to use it.

Co-develop and, if asked, teach new “Bullying in the Workplace” specialized course for the International Ombudsman Association.
Work collaboratively with the new Director of Faculty Relations (if hired) to provide appropriate training for academic administrators on conflict-related topics and to make and receive appropriate referrals.

Conclusion

Conflict is an inevitable part of life. Although some people have questioned how we can stand to do the work we do day-in and day-out, and while the work we do is often challenging, the Ombuds Office staff enjoys assisting members of the campus community in informally managing and resolving conflicts. Yes, we go through our share of Kleenex in the Ombuds Office, but having the opportunity to assist UCB students, faculty, and staff in managing and resolving interpersonal, academic, and administrative difficulties - so they can be successful in their endeavors here - is actually a great privilege. And working in an arena where it is possible to learn so much – and then take what is learned and incorporate it into practical workshops to help others learn about managing and resolving conflict – is quite rewarding.

The collaboration between the Ombuds and Faculty Ombuds Offices is a strong one. The inclusion of a female faculty ombudsperson has been met with great enthusiasm and it’s clear we made an excellent choice.

Finally, we are proud to note that several current and former UCB Ombuds Office staff members have taken leadership roles in the emerging profession of organizational ombudsing through service on the Board of Directors and Chairing several Task Forces of the International Ombudsman Association.
Appendix A:

Ombuds Office Contacts with Members of the Campus Community (detail)

Students:
- Undergraduates: 110
- Graduate Students: 30
- Former Students: 11
- Student Employees: 6
- TOTAL Number of Students: 157

Faculty:
- Teaching Faculty: 199
- Faculty Administrators: 120
- Retired Faculty: 38
- PRA/Post Doc: 30
- Graduate Teaching Assistants/TA’s: 6
- TOTAL Number of Faculty: 199

Staff:
- Non-Supervisory staff: 96
- Staff Supervisors: 16
- Staff Administrators: 46
- TOTAL Number of Staff: 158

Parents: 37
Other: 27

Total: 578
### Appendix B (Detail on Outreach Activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Services, Pt. II Challenging Customer</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair's Training</td>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Advisor Fair, Housing</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGGS Orientation Faire</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Student Welcome</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Intensive Workshop</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC Admin. Presentation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences Staff, Conflict Res. Skills</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of Supervision</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Conflict Management for Students</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Skills for College Students</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principled Negotiation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of Supervision</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Leadership, LEAP Program</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Housing Staff Training</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of Supervision</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar's Employees, Ombuds Infomercial</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBG Employees, Ombuds Infomercial</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Ombuds presentation to Retired Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Staff - Respectful Comm. Skills</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Staff - Respectful Comm. Skills</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Professional Development Activities of Ombuds Office Professional Staff

- Served as Secretary to the Board of Directors of the International Ombudsman Association;
- Served as Chair of the IOA Database Categories Task Force;
- Served on the Editorial Board for the Journal of the California Caucus of College and University Ombuds;
- Chaired the IOA Effectiveness Task Force, and launched the first offering of “Effectiveness” in the IOA Ombuds 101 course;
- served on IOA Certification Committee;
- served on IOA Professional Development Committee;
- taught IOA Ombuds 101 and coordinated and taught the Intermediate and Advanced courses;
- co-chaired the Task Force on “Drawing from Psychology and began developing the IOA "Drawing From Psychology" course;
- Attended the Inaugural IOA Conference in La Jolla, CA; and

1. Participated in a panel on “ombuds certification”
2. Presented at IOA Inaugural Conference about the work of the IOA Database Categories Task Force;
3. Moderated a plenary session called “The Ombuds Crystal Ball;”
4. Participated in a panel discussion presenting the work of the Database Category Task Force; and
5. Coordinated, served as co-MC, and performed in the Inaugural IOA Talent Show;

Lee Potts

Participated in Mediation training (February 2006)
Participated in IOA Ombuds 101 training (March 2006)

Bob Fink

Attended Inaugural IOA Conference in La Jolla, CA.