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Message from the Director

The UC Davis Office of the Ombuds began operations on June 3, 2013. The inaugural year has been both challenging and deeply gratifying. We have gone in a year from providing ombuds services to an average of 11 visitors a month out of a room in shared space (with a separate back entrance for confidentiality), to serving an average of 30 new visitors a month out of a suite of offices in Davis and an office in the Medical Center. We have gone from providing services to faculty, staff, and postdocs to providing services to the entire UC Davis community. The Ombuds Office is open for business.

UC Davis is a large and complex system, and coming up to speed with the policies, processes, practices and cultural byways, as well as the institution’s ambitions for the future, has been no small task. And as I have been learning this year how the institution functions and about the different resources available to constituents, the various offices at the institution have been asking questions back about the Ombuds Office. I have appreciated the chance to engage with other service providers on campus about our respective roles; it has shown me how much people at this institution are deeply committed to their work at UC Davis.

The leadership of the institution has opened their doors to the Ombuds Office and – always of supreme importance to an ombuds office – has been consistently supportive of the ombuds unique standards of practice. The ombuds principle of functional independence from all other offices on campus, including administration, can be a challenging concept for an institution, and the Ombuds Office has felt able freely to assert this independence and, hence, to assure users of our services impartiality and confidentiality, without institutional qualification.

It has been a good start. The Ombuds Office looks forward to continuing to serve UC Davis with commitment and integrity, and earning the trust of the community as a safe place to talk.

Sincerely,

Susan Kee-Young Park
Director & Ombudsperson
UC Davis Office of the Ombuds
University of California, Davis
Introduction

The purpose of the Ombuds Office Annual Report is to:

1. Provide statistics concerning the number and nature of the issues brought to the Ombuds Office, as well as basic demographics concerning users of Ombuds Office services, in a manner that protects the confidentiality of individual users of Ombuds Office services; and

2. Provide feedback regarding systemic issues observed by the Ombuds Office in carrying out its duties, and recommendations to address such issues. The Ombuds Office is not an advocate for any individual, but has the programmatic function of serving as an advocate for equitable treatment and fair process.

This report covers the work of the Ombuds Office from its opening in June 3, 2013 through the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014. Although this means that the reporting period contains 13 months of data instead of 12, because the report covers the inaugural year of the Ombuds Office, it would not appear that including the first month of operations (in which I saw a total of 11 visitors) to the 2013-2014 fiscal year, would diminish the usefulness of the data when it is compared with subsequent annual reports. From this point forward, the Ombuds Office will report by fiscal year.

The Ombuds Office presents this report to all members of the UC Davis community (without prior review by any office at the institution) consistent with its principles of independence and impartiality.

Overview of Ombuds Office Services and Operations

Any type of UC Davis-related issue or conflict can be brought to the Ombuds Office for discussion. The Ombuds Office helps visitors develop options, strategies and skills to deal productively with their issues. The goal of the Ombuds Office is to help people help themselves to the greatest extent possible.

In the process of working with a visitor, the Ombuds Office may coach, conciliate, informally mediate or engage in shuttle diplomacy or any other methods of informal conflict management that may be appropriate under the circumstances. If another office or resource is better suited to handle a particular issue, the Ombuds Office will inform the individual initiating contact of such resource. The Ombuds Office will

1 It is common in ombuds practice to use the term “visitor” for any person using the services of an ombuds office.
provide information about applicable institutional policies and procedures, but will not provide legal advice or get involved with a matter if the matter is already in a formal proceeding or is subject to a term of a collective bargaining agreement. The Ombuds Office supplements, but does not replace, existing channels for dispute resolution.

The Ombuds Office provides upward feedback and reports case trends and systemic issues that may cause undesirable conflict or result in unfair treatment. The Ombuds Office may elevate issues as authorized by visitors and will provide feedback on systemic issues as appropriate to administrators who have the authority to address the issues and, for transparency, to the entire UC Davis community through the Annual Report of the Ombuds Office.

The Ombuds Office operates out of two locations and is currently staffed with one full-time ombudsperson and one full-time administrative specialist. Operational accomplishments for the 2013-2014 fiscal period are reported in Appendix A.

**Standards of Practice**

The Ombuds Office adheres to the International Ombudsman Association’s Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, available for review online at [www.ombudsassociation.org/about-us/code-ethics](http://www.ombudsassociation.org/about-us/code-ethics). In brief, the four IOA guiding principles are:

*Confidentiality*

The Ombuds Office will not reveal the identity of any person contacting the Ombuds Office or disclose any confidential information without the person’s express permission and even then at the sole discretion of the Ombuds Office. The only exception to this confidentiality is where there is an imminent risk of serious physical harm. The Ombuds Office does not maintain case records; any case-related notes taken by the Ombuds Office are shredded on a regular basis. Information concerning visitor demographics and issues are aggregated in a manner to protect the identity of users of Ombuds Office services.

*Independence*

The Ombuds Office is unaligned and is functionally independent from other university offices, including administration. The Ombuds Office reports to the Office of the Chancellor for administrative and budgetary purposes, but does not report to any office with respect to its case management. The Ombuds Office exercises sole
discretion over whether and how to act regarding individual matters or systemic concerns.

Because of its strict confidentiality and independence, communication of any matter to the Ombuds Office does not place the university on notice of such matter.

**Impartiality**

The Ombuds Office strives for impartiality, fairness and objectivity in the treatment of people and the consideration of issues. The Ombuds Office is not an advocate for any person or outcome in a conflict, but is an advocate for fair and equitably administered processes.

**Informality**

The Ombuds Office does not investigate, arbitrate, adjudicate or in any other way participate in any internal or external formal process or action. Use of the Ombuds Office is voluntary and not a required step in any grievance or UC Davis policy.

The Ombuds Office subscribes to the IOA “Best Practices” and to the 2006 Draft “Declaration of Best Practices for University of California Ombuds Offices.” Links to these documents are available at the Ombuds Office website, ombuds.ucdavis.edu.

**Caseload**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Visitor Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ombuds Office provided services for 267 visitors (individuals and groups); 172 visitors on the Davis campus and 95 visitors in the Health System. The Ombuds Office began providing services for the Health System in Sacramento late September 2013, but did not establish a significant presence until mid-October 2013. In view of current usage, it is anticipated that the percentage of ombuds services for the new fiscal year will reflect a more even distribution between Davis and Sacramento.
Demographics

Staff (supervisors, managers and non-supervisory staff) accessed the services of the Ombuds Office in greatest number, followed by faculty and other academics,\(^2\) administrators\(^3\) and residents.

The Ombuds Office was opened on June 3, 2013 to serve faculty, staff, administrators and postdoctoral scholars; students became a constituency of the Ombuds Office on March 1, 2014. Many students are yet aware that ombuds services are available to them. It is anticipated that once active outreach to students occurs in the new academic year, student usage of the office will grow significantly.

A detailed breakdown of constituent demographics for the two UC Davis campuses with respect to faculty and staff classifications and union status is provided in Appendix B.

---

\(^2\) Academic administrators (e.g., deans and chairs) have been included for the 2013-2014 reporting period in the “faculty” category, but will be separated out as “faculty administrators” for the next reporting period.

\(^3\) We became aware that a few visitors of the same status had been inconsistently classified. The issue has been resolved, but may have resulted in a small margin of error in the demographics for “administrator” or “manager” (included in “staff”).
The category “Asian” includes people of Indian, Pakistani, and Filipino descent. Visitors had the option of selecting multiple race/ethnicities.
**Recording Visitor Issues**

Preliminarily it must be noted that the visitor issue data compiled by the Ombuds Office include concerns identified by visitors as issues when they walk in the door as well as concerns identified during the course of the discussion between visitor and ombuds. After exploring concerns with the Ombuds, the visitor may see that he or she had framed the facts in a way that may not have been accurate and could very well leave the Ombuds Office with a different or broadened perspective. In other words, this report is not one that asserts facts or presents data on complaints regarding actual incidents; this is a summary of the concerns people in the institution explore with the Ombuds Office.

The UC Davis Ombuds Office used the Uniform Reporting Categories (2007) developed by the International Ombudsman Association as the Office’s framework to record and report issues brought to the Ombuds Office by individuals and groups. The IOA Uniform Reporting Categories (IOARC) schema contains 9 broad categories and over 80 subcategories of questions, concerns, issues or inquiries. The IOARC is attached to this Report as Appendix C.

The Ombuds Office records in its database each concern raised by a visitor (stripped of any identifying information), which may result in multiple issue entries in the database for each visitor; there may be multiple entries for the visitor even within a single category.

As an illustration of how issue information is recorded by the Ombuds using the IOARC categories, say Visitor X reports that her supervisor told Visitor X on several occasions that her work is “pathetic” without explaining what she could do better; that Visitor X’s supervisor pounds on the table and raises her voice and if Visitor X asks for more specific feedback, the supervisor makes statements like “if you can’t figure out what you’re doing wrong, you shouldn’t even be in this job”; and that Visitor X has seen the supervisor say similar things to others and says that office morale is low and that staff are leaving for other jobs. Visitor X says she doesn’t understand why the supervisor feels that the supervisor doesn’t have to follow the UC Davis Principles of Community although when Visitor X was frustrated by this kind of treatment recently and yelled “I can’t listen to you anymore!” and left the office, Visitor X was issued a letter of warning for insubordination and not following the Principles of Community. Visitor X says that she thinks her supervisor is trying to get her to quit; Visitor X fears for her job. When later entering these concerns in its database, the Ombuds Office would enter “Respect/Treatment.”

---

4 In this Report the nine main IOARC categories are presented in boldface type, and the subcategories are presented in quotation marks or italics.
“Communication,” “Trust/Integrity,” “Feedback,” “Discipline” and “Department Climate” issues under the IOARC Evaluative Relationships category; “Standards of Conduct” under the Values, Ethics, and Standards category; “Use of Positional Power/Authority,” and “Organizational Climate” under the Organizational, Strategic, and Mission Related category; and “Tenure/Position Security/Ambiguity” under the Career Progression and Development category.

Data of the concerns entered in each IOARC category for the 2013-14 reporting period are reported in Appendix D. In light of the differences in activities, functions and culture between the Davis Campus and the Health System, the data for each campus have been charted separately.

Data Analysis

The data gathered through use of the IOARC in addition to the specific detail provided the Ombuds Office in discussions with visitors, disclose the following:

1. The most frequent concern of visitors to the Ombuds Office were issues involving poor communication, disrespect (including bullying behaviors) and distrust with a person of higher institutional status.

The IOARC data shows that a large percentage of visitors on both campuses raised issues involving Evaluative Relationships, in which poor communication (Davis, 62%; Health System, 75%) with a supervisor, manager, director, chair or other person of higher “institutional status” than the visitor was the core issue. Often visitors said that the person with whom they had a reporting (or otherwise administratively subordinate or dependent) relationship showed a lack of respect for them or otherwise treated them poorly (Davis, 53%; Health System, 76%) as evidenced by, for example, repeated unkind or thoughtless statements, or with the superior’s failure to communicate information for which the visitor is later held accountable. This pattern of behaviors led visitors to lack trust (Davis, 48%; Health System, 73%) in the person who evaluated their performance, had power with respect to the visitor’s career, or held the departmental purse-strings. Poor communication, respect and trust clustered as the highest concerns of visitors on both campuses.

In approximately 26% of the cases at UC Davis and 34% of the cases in the Health System involving evaluative relationships in which respect or mistreatment was
raised as an issue, the abrasiveness of the communication rose to the level where the visitor felt intimidated or threatened and identified the behavior as bullying.\(^5\)

2. Underrepresented minorities, other people of color, people with disabilities, and women, raised the possibility of discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex and disability as possible reasons they were mistreated by management, and believed they might be experiencing barriers to career progression or position insecurity as a result of this discrimination.

It should be noted that 13% of the visitors in Davis and 15% of the visitors in the Health System perceived that their difficult evaluative relationship was at least in part due to diversity-related issues. On the Davis campus, diversity and discrimination (Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance) concerns were raised predominantly on the basis of race; on the Health System, diversity and discrimination concerns were raised primarily on the basis of sex or work-stress disability issues (Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance). On the Davis campus, concerns were raised that job classification and career progression issues (Career Progression and Development) might be a result of discrimination (Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance).

3. In many cases, visitors related that others in their workgroup or department were also treated disrespectfully, and that the person in charge was unilateral and a poor communicator. Visitors often related that the person in charge appeared favored by leadership because of the person’s willingness to prioritize the bottom line over the concerns of the workgroup.

In slightly over half of the cases in which the visitor claimed mistreatment or disrespect in an evaluative relationship on the Davis campus and in a substantially greater percentage in the Health System, the visitor claimed that beyond the visitor’s own situation, the climate of the department was affected by ineffective supervision and inappropriate or inadequate feedback. Morale was said to be very low in those work areas. In Davis these claims were often raised in situations involving change management. Many visitors, particularly in the Health System,

\(^5\) The term “bullying” is used by many people to describe any form of aggressive, abrasive behavior. Unfortunately, this has led to definitional issues that make it difficult to assess whether the same behavior is being described by respondents in results of surveys. The lack of a shared vocabulary has led to widespread confusion in the field. In the current research literature on the topic of bullying, certain characteristics of the behavior such as repetition and persistency are ordinarily considered requirements for designating behavior as “bullying.” The Ombuds only recorded that the visitor raised an issue of bullying if the visitor indicated the behavior had reoccurred over time.
also reported that supervisors were inflexible and uncaring with respect to staff needs around scheduling. In the Health System visitors frequently indicated that the institution’s profit motive was prioritized over employee well-being concerns, and that such priorities allowed bullying and other mistreatment of staff and faculty where bullies were able in some fashion to improve the bottom line (Organizational, Strategic and Mission-Related). It is notable that 39% of Health System visitors reported concern with area leadership or management abilities and the use of positional power to achieve objectives. Health System visitors also raised concerns over the failure of the UC Davis Principles of Community and other standards of conduct in 19% of the cases brought to the Ombuds Office, in comparison to 9% of the cases on the Davis campus (Values, Ethics, and Standards).

4. Visitors’ fear of retaliation by persons in power is profound.

Visitors often raise retaliation as an issue when dealing with a person who is understood to be in a position to affect the visitor’s career or job security. In the Health System, 40% of visitors reported a fear of retaliation if any effort were to be made to hold a person in charge accountable for their mistreatment of the visitor. Several visitors in the Health System informed the Ombuds that they had used sick leave and FMLA to deal with mental health issues arising as a result of the evaluative relationship. There were several reports that taking FMLA leave seemed to have resulted in greater retaliatory behavior and threatened job loss. Work-related stress was reported in 16% of Davis cases and 20% of Health System cases (Safety, Health, and Physical Environment).

5. Visitors in conflict with peers also raised issues of poor communication, disrespect and distrust. Bullying behavior was a substantial concern in these cases.

Issues involving Peer and Colleague Relationships, as in cases involving evaluative relationships, appeared to cluster in the areas of poor communication, respect/treatment, and trust/integrity. It should be noted that bullying behavior was reported in a greater percentage of peer and colleague cases than in evaluative cases. For matters in which respect or treatment was raised as an issue, approximately 47% of Davis visitors and 57% of Health System visitors claimed that their colleague’s mistreatment involved bullying behavior.

The observations above, as well as discussions with administrators and other UC Davis resource offices, has lead the Ombuds Office to identify the systemic issues discussed below.
Systemic Issues

The UC Davis Campus Climate Assessment results (UCDCCA), issued as a part of the UC Campus Climate Project, were made public on March 19, 2014. The UCDCCA gathered responses from UC Davis community members on a wide variety of questions related to institutional climate, inclusion, and work-life issues. The UCDCCA noted that respondents reported high levels of “comfort” (80%) with the climate at UC Davis, but raised some “opportunities for improvement” with respect to reports of exclusionary conduct, the higher discomfort of certain constituent groups, and unwanted sexual contact.

Because the Ombuds Office hears almost exclusively from those who are having conflicts or problems at UC Davis, Ombuds Office visitors do not for the most part belong to the group UCDCCA reports having high levels of “comfort” with the climate at UC Davis, positive attitudes about work-life issues, or comfort with the climate of diversity at UC Davis. The people who come to the Ombuds Office are often those who believe they are being treated in an objectionable way or that something is off-track at the institution. They may be part of the UCDCCA 24% who experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile behavior at UC Davis within the year before the survey was taken (UCDCCA p. 69), or the 23.2% of staff who are not comfortable taking leave to which they are entitled because of fear that it may affect their job or career (UCDCCA Table 31), or perhaps the 37% of underrepresented minorities who believe they have to work harder than co-workers do in order to achieve the same recognition (UCDCCA Table 31). These are many of the people the Ombuds Office sees, and many of the systemic issues raised in this report come out of listening to these voices.

It is difficult to compare UCDCCA data, derived from responses to standardized questions, with IOARC uniform data categories and other visitor information collected by the Ombuds Office. As an obvious limitation to comparison, the Ombuds Office can only speak to those issues that are brought to the Office and visitors did not raise certain issues into which the UCDCCA inquired.

IOARC data and perspectives offered by visitors to the Ombuds Office do, however, strongly support the UCDCCA finding that a substantial number of community members believe that they experience intimidating and exclusionary conduct at UC Davis. IOARC data also supports the UCDCCA finding (UCDCCA Figure 34) that many at UC Davis believe that the exclusionary, intimidating or offensive behavior was visited on them based on their status at the institution. And IOARC data supports

UCDCCA respondents’ perceptions of unfair or unjust employment practices or employment practices that inhibit diversifying the community (UCDCCA Table 34).

As shown above, the Ombuds Office collects data on a broad range of issues that visitors bring to the office. Since, as with the UCDCCA, the information collected from visitors is not formally investigated by the Ombuds Office, it represents the perspective of the visitors and not proven fact, but unlike the UCDCCA, the Ombuds Office has the opportunity to hear narrative detail beyond the presentation of issues. Recording data on the basis of the information provided through a visitor’s narrative provides the opportunity to let a visitor tell you precisely how she experiences the concern rather than the visitor having to choose something that approximates her concern off a list of options. The Ombuds Office can also ask questions about what someone means when they use certain words and labels, which often reveals how different people use the same words and labels to mean very different things; thus the Ombuds may bring greater internal consistency to data point choices than is possible by survey.  

The work of the Ombuds Office is to help visitors learn to deal with conflict productively, which may involve opening to the perspectives of others and to the possibility of personal growth and change. The work of the Ombuds Office is also to help the institution identify institutional behavior, practice and culture that may cause patterns of conflict and inequity – patterns that may call for institutional growth and change as well.

This report identifies a number of systemic issues, most arising on some level out of failures in communication. Some are large “wicked” issues that appear endemic to academia, health care or institutional behavior in general. Some are more limited in scope and institutional complexity. Most are interrelated. None are simple.

I. Abrasive Behaviors and Hierarchical Relationships

That 23% of Health System and 17% of Davis visitors to the Ombuds Office reported issues of mistreatment or disrespect by peers certainly raises an issue that requires examination. That 76% of Health System and 53% of Davis visitors to the Ombuds Office report mistreatment or disrespect by people holding positions of higher authority or status, raises issues that go even beyond the issue of mistreatment to

7 See, e.g., discussion at n. 5 above.

8 The behaviors reported include issues of incivility, rudeness, ridicule or public embarrassment, interrupting, harsh or demeaning language or tone of voice, yelling, swearing, passive aggressive behavior, ignoring personal boundaries.
the issue of an institutional culture that may allow mistreatment to those less powerful. In the Ombuds' many discussions with visitors, it has become apparent that the perception people of higher status are allowed and able to treat others disrespectfully at UC Davis without consequence is not uncommon, particularly in the Health System. And the fact that a significant number of visitors to the Ombuds Office raising an evaluative relationship issue also report a departmental climate issue (Davis, 34%; Health System, 43%) suggests that the disrespect extends beyond the personal experience of the visitor into department culture. The possibility of such workgroup dysfunction was validated in several cases in which a second or third visitor from the same workgroup brought a concern to the Ombuds Office about the same authority figure.

Mistreatment by higher-ups is not an issue raised solely by nonsupervisory staff. Supervisors, managers, administrators and faculty on both campuses, as well as Health System residents and Davis students (no medical students were seen by the Ombuds Office in this reporting period), reported mistreatment by persons of higher institutional status. It must be noted, however, that the number of claims of such mistreatment are in every instance higher in the Health System. For example, out of the 36 Davis faculty and other academics visiting the Ombuds Office, 13 (36%) reported mistreatment by someone of higher institutional ranking; out of the 18 Health System faculty and other academics, 16 (89%) reported such mistreatment.

What stands in the way of addressing the perceived mistreatment?

Visitors sometimes reported confusion about what policies applied and how objectionable behavior could be reported; they sometimes reported having no hope

---

9 Although “kick-down” mistreatment is the most commonly raised scenario, abrasive behavior by no means always flows downstream. The Ombuds Office also saw instances in which supervisors felt bullied by front-line staff. Even in these situations, however, it was often perceived by the targets that someone on a higher level than the supervisor allowed the behavior to continue. And even where visitors reported peer mistreatment, it was often the case that they asserted that management allowed such behavior to continue and on occasion condoned the behavior.

10 Residents present a particular issue of positional disadvantage. They consistently report an inability to voice issues without harsh treatment by clinic management and/or fear that raising issues will negatively affect their careers. Program directors are generally junior faculty who are not in the most comfortable position to assert the needs of residents, and residents are not afforded the opportunity to have direct representation in department faculty meetings. Accepting such unilateral treatment appears to be a cultural expectation.
that the issue would be addressed because of the power structure; and sometimes reported a lack of confidence/skill in raising communication and respect issues with the person with whom they were having difficulty. It was a very common fear that any attempt to deal directly with the authority figure would result in retaliation. That threat was a risk most staff and faculty were not willing to take either because of job and career concerns or because of fear that it might lead to even greater mistreatment. In light of retaliation concerns, many visitors had a difficult time seeing any way out of their predicament. Staff and faculty reported some early retirements and resignations in their work area, reliance on FMLA and sick leave, and stress-induced workplace injuries, as indicative of the toxicity of their workplace.

In attempting to address these visitor concerns, the Ombuds Office became aware that: (1) the policies dealing with abrasive behavior were confusing and ineffective, (2) the options for registering an issue of mistreatment were confusing as to process and effect, (3) problematic behavior often goes unaddressed for long periods of time, (4) leadership is considered complicit in the mistreatment in view of the unaddressed persistency of such behaviors, and (5) the UC Davis community, including supervisors, managers, faculty, and administrators, are largely untrained in dealing productively with conflict.

**Current Policies**

There are two separate policies currently in place that address abrasive behavior in the Health System and on the Davis campus. UCDHS Policy 1616 (Violence and Hate Incidents in the Workplace) is the Health System’s “policy for preventing and responding to disruptive, intimidating, threatening, violent, or hate incidents ... and identifies resources for preventing, reporting, and responding to workplace violence and hate incidents.” UC Davis PPM 390-30 (Disruptive Behavior in the Workplace) states that the “policy describes the resources and processes available to address disruptive, threatening or violent behavior in the workplace, including definitions and procedures for reporting and responding to reports.” Although both policies provide resources external to a department and a clear route to address behaviors that involve physical violence, responsibility for correcting other “non-threatening” or “non-violent” mistreatment is placed for the most part in the hands of the

---

11 In some instances, information had been communicated about visitors’ concerns, but it was perceived that nothing was being done.

12 UC Davis Policy 390-30 does not apply to the Health System. The Ombuds Office has been informed UCDHS Human Resources that Health System intends to bring UCDHS Policy 1616 in line with UC Davis Policy 390-30.
department in which the behavior occurred, which provides little comfort to people who believe that the behavior is a result of leadership in the department. Even if an anonymous report of inappropriate behavior is investigated by someone external to the department, the lack of specificity of the report (because the reporter wants to avoid identification) and the vagueness of the policy may provide little in the way of guidance for the investigation. And if the issues raised are not substantiated by the investigation, there is ordinarily nothing more that is done to deal with the conflict. The investigation may upset management, and the reporter (and those experiencing the same behavior) may see that displeasure and feel even more vulnerable and subject to retaliation. In other words, the situation may end feeling worse for the reporter than if the report had not been filed.

Confusing and ineffective policies lead the community to believe that the institution does not consider dealing with disruptive and intimidating behavior to be an issue of high priority. Although UC Davis PPM 390-30 states that “the University is committed to providing and maintaining a safe and secure environment free from all forms of violence or disruptive behavior” and UCDHS Policy 1616 states that “UCDHS will not ignore, condone or tolerate disruptive, threatening, intimidating, violent, or hate incidents,” the words ring hollow for many at UC Davis who feel intimidated and disempowered, and see no safe way forward. In fact, it is not uncommon to hear in public venues as well as from visitors to the Ombuds Office that even the UC Davis Principles of Community ring hollow in light of the disrespectful behaviors of many in positions of power.

The Ombuds Office has witnessed steps being taken to attempt to resolve this perception. The new Vice Chancellor for Human Health Sciences and Dean of the Medical School, Julie Freischlag, has been consistent in her messaging about the need for civility and adherence to the Principles of Community in her Health System presentations. David Acosta, Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion in the Health System, and Rahim Reed, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for

13 The policies do not have a specified process for reviewing claims, standards of review or penalties for violation of the policies. (Indeed, to file a claim for relief, a complaint must be filed under other policies, such as PPSM 70.) Although Human Resources and Compliance may feel limited in their ability to take action under the policies, the person reporting the behavior simply sees only that nothing is done to address the situation, and often believes that the outcome demonstrates that HR is aligned with management.

14 The Ombuds Office does not label all disrespectful behaviors as malicious, nor would the Office attribute bad intent. It is the experience of the Ombuds Office that many perpetrators of such behaviors are unaware of the impact of their behavior, and may see their behaviors as serving the goals of the institution.
Campus Community Relations, appear committed to opening up paths forward on issues of civility and inclusion. Human Resources has indicated a readiness to revise the policies currently in place. Clearly the will is there in many significant respects and certain efforts are newly underway. The Ombuds Office recommends, however, that UC Davis take concrete steps on many institutional levels concurrently as part of an articulated plan to demonstrate a significant organizational commitment to change.

Moving Forward

Issues between parties arise in a context. To the extent that the institutional culture allows incivility and the advantages of power and status to provide that context, issues between community members take on a degree of inevitability. Pressures to produce are always at play where an institution strives for excellence, but such pressure cannot be given free reign. UC Davis is not alone in having to deal with these issues. They are often present in institutional settings, particularly in health care systems in which various professional cultures and the business model are an overlay. But that they are endemic does not mean that UC Davis cannot take the lead in attempting to root out inequities and unfair processes. It is a complex challenge, but not one beyond the reach of this institution.

Of course, perception is not always reality. Some who are believed to abuse power may be misinterpreted, and there should be a way to open up communication without necessarily jumping to judgment that behavior must be punished. People who believe they are disadvantaged in a power relationship also must be helped to develop a voice, and the system can be proactive in providing resources to deal with workgroup miscommunications before they become workgroup patterns.

In order to show an institutional commitment to addressing the causes of community member mistreatment (particularly with respect to hierarchical issues) as well as its manifestations, the Ombuds Office suggests that UC Davis consider a comprehensive multi-leveled approach:

- Organizational level
- Dyadic level
- Individual level

---

UC Davis Human Resources has informed the Ombuds Office that it understands that policies are forthcoming from the Office of the President that may affect this area, and that it may be premature to work on PPM 390-30. If OP indicates that a policy dealing with this behavior is not imminent, in light of the number of people who feel affected by bullying behavior, it makes sense to attempt to move forward with policy change at UC Davis.
Recommendations: Organizational Level

- Identify and address stressors that contribute to bullying behavior\(^\text{16}\) and determine what changes must be made in light of institutional values, e.g.:
  - Develop cross-professional team building (particularly in clinical workgroups), new professional role model development, and training that develops conflict competence
  - Explicitly reorder value and awards system: is it possible that higher staffing levels could be better for the bottom line?

- Establish and refine policies (rights-based and collaborative)
  - Establish an anti-bullying policy (define processes, standards and consequences) applicable to all community members
  - Consider building in a 360° review process, group communication protocols and coaching support in areas with reported activity
  - Provide alternatives to formal processes

- Enforce policies and engage in proactive monitoring
  - Encourage bystander reporting, by providing clearer reporting paths and ways to activate informal conflict resolution processes
  - Maintain centralized data concerning bullying claims
  - Monitor meaningful data for conflict hotspots (e.g., personnel departures figures, FMLA requests, sick leave, workers compensation claims, and grievances). Provide confidential exit surveys to all departing employees that will go in a database outside of the department.
  - Address retaliation issues (institutional monitoring)

- Provide training and support
  - Encourage proactive use of conflict management group services
  - Provide skills-building training in conflict management and difficult/crucial conversations skills for all community members, with mandatory training in such areas for program directors, administrators, supervisors, managers, and chairs.

\(^{16}\) Institutional causes may include:
- Embedded hierarchies and role expectations (some unique to health care environment)
- High stake/high emotion situations
- Leadership changes/adjustment of power balance
- Pressures from understaffing and inadequate resources
- Bottom-line reward system
- Historical tolerance of bullying behavior
- Difficulty of confidential reporting/fear of retaliation
- Build in assessment timetable to refine initiatives

**Recommendations: Dyadic Level**

- Provide access to mediated discussion services with third-party neutrals and other dialogic processes.
- Provide confidential conflict management services.
- Train directors and managers in mediation skills.
- Provide shuttle diplomacy services.

**Recommendations: Individual Level**

- Provide conflict-coaching support to people exhibiting abrasive behaviors, and integrate the support with departmental feedback.
- Provide confidential conflict management services.

Basics of the comprehensive effort:

(1) Establish an anti-bullying policy, applicable to all UC Davis containing clear processes, standards and consequences. Consider peer representation on complaint review panels. Clarify use, timelines and consequences of on-line filing mechanisms. Hold all members of the community accountable for compliance. Trigger referrals of management to informal conflict resolution services where incident may not rise to the level warranting formal investigation or proceedings.

(2) Establish a protocol for dealing with repeated or group complaints of uncivil or bullying behavior that would contain confidential 360° reviews or other confidential departmental climate surveys.

(3) Provide training in conflict management and interpersonal communication skills. Institute mandatory skills-building training for supervisors, managers, program directors, chairs and administrators in conflict management and difficult/crucial conversations skills. Familiarize these parties with the bullying

---

17 Currently, new supervisors attend mandatory “Developing as a Supervisor Certificate Series” training that may extend over a year, and chairs attend an orientation. The orientation for new chairs provides a section on conflict management, but there is not enough time available in the orientation for chairs to develop or practice such critical skills. The mandatory training for supervisors does not contain any skill-building training in conflict management or difficult/crucial conversations; such training is provided as a later elective option. In view of the pervasiveness of conflict and communication issues between staff and supervisors, the Ombuds Office suggests that some degree of mandatory training in conflict management and difficult/crucial conversation skills should be required of supervisors, as well as for chairs, managers, administrators and program directors.
policy, 360° protocols, and all UC Davis conflict resolution and communication resources.

(4) Develop data to monitor conflict hotspots: Provide exit surveys to all departing personnel with specific questions about personal experiences with supervision and management and department climate; the survey should be submitted to Central Human Resources. Monitor statistics that might be helpful in detecting areas in which to offer conflict management support, such as personnel exit figures, FMLA requests, sick leave, workers compensation claims, and grievances.

Obviously, the Ombuds Office is not in a position to decide who should take the lead roles in moving the above initiatives forward. The Ombuds Office recommends that leadership open a collaborative process to determine which institutional office or offices would be best suited to achieve results on the various fronts. The Ombuds Office further recommends that leadership establish a committee to coordinate efforts in this area, to hold offices accountable for performance, and to communicate with the UC Davis community about initiatives and progress. It is a good time to move forward – this initiative dovetails nicely with UC Davis’ current efforts to reaffirm and revitalize the Principles of Community.

II. Hiring and Reclassification Issues

Many staff raised issues concerning the fairness of hiring and reclassification practices at UC Davis. Visitors believe that management manipulates the hiring and reclassification processes because management does not feel it necessary to live by the rules. Staff felt powerless to say anything to correct the situation in light of their status, and saw such manipulative and unfair behavior as indicative of what they would be subject to if they raised any concern of their own. When trust in the integrity of management is undermined in one area, it is easily generalized to others.

Matters raised by visitors:

--- Many employees have informed the Ombuds Office that it is difficult to have their positions reclassified to a higher level although they believe they have been required unfairly to work above their pay grade. In some situations this has resulted in staff moving to different departments in order to obtain a higher pay grade even though they liked their previous job – they were hired for higher level positions, they argue, because they were working at the higher level at their old

--- The Ombuds Office does not provide services to union members in areas that are the subject of terms to collective bargaining agreements. The issues raised in this section were matters brought to the Ombuds Office by non-union staff.
jobs, which should have justified the requested upgrade. Sometimes the source of the perceived unfairness is seen to be Human Resources; sometimes area management is perceived to be insufficiently or completely unsupportive of a reclassification that would correct the inequity.

--Several visitors recounted situations in which they believed that someone had already been preselected for a position by management, and that the department or office went through the formal recruitment process as a subterfuge. Staff perceives that position descriptions are often written to favor these preselected candidates, and that it would be futile for them to apply for such jobs.

--If a department does not support a visitor’s request for reclassification and the visitor sees staff being hired at higher levels under position postings tailored for pre-identified people, the visitor often reports feeling unappreciated for the visitor’s loyalty and length of service, and feels singled out for mistreatment. Several people in underrepresented minority groups or other people of color believe that they are treated differently because of their race or color. The visitors do not report that they believe their managers are purposefully discriminating against them; rather visitors have raised the issue of implicit (racial) bias. They see managers favoring people they are more “comfortable” with, and not looking for or recognizing value from people with whom they have limited experience.

--Several visitors have also reported being on search committees where inappropriate comments were made (e.g., concerning a candidate’s age) or they were instructed to evaluate candidates in a way that the hiring authority wanted them to, and feeling unable to say anything in view of their status in the department and possible retaliation.

If leadership is not scrupulously fair in its conduct with respect to hiring and reclassification requests, when leadership takes action that appears unsupportive of an employee, the employee will often refer to the prior unfairness as evidence that unfairness is again at play. Although management may believe their actions in hiring or failing to reclassify are justified in light of the service and fiscal needs of their department, staff will draw their own conclusions and that may affect office morale in significant ways, unless the reasons in support of management’s actions are well-considered and the process is transparent. And if leadership does not model fair behavior at all times, it is unrealistic to expect that it should expect the same from its employees.

19 Implicit bias refers to certain attitudes or stereotypes that may affect our actions and decisions in an unconscious, subtle and pervasive way. They do not necessarily align with our declared beliefs.
Recommendations:

(1) Management should be proactive in reviewing staff classifications when additional responsibilities are added to the employee’s portfolio to determine whether to request reclassification.

(2) Management should institute a procedure to review requests for reclassification with the employee and not assume that management has complete information from supervisory staff about the requestor’s responsibilities. Employees should be informed of their ability to request reclassification directly with Human Resources if management decides not to move forward.

(3) Management should be required to provide greater transparency to employees concerning the reclassification process, including the date a reclassification request is submitted and responses they obtain from Human Resources.

(4) Management should consider periodic review of salary differentials of entering staff with long-term staff to determine whether to initiate requests for raises for long-term staff.

(5) All persons who make hiring decisions or serve on selection committees should be required to complete implicit bias training. Implicit bias training should be mandatory for supervisors and managers.

(6) Supervisors should actively promote the accomplishments of their front-line staff to area management. Consider programs that would demonstrate to all staff that they are given fair opportunities for development by, for example, instituting a staff mentorship program, and allowing compensatory time for service on institutional committees.

(8) Better assure fair deliberations of search committees by opening up the process to scrutiny. Possible methods for opening up the process could include requiring that a central Human Resource representative is present during search committee deliberations, or having HR select a person from outside of the department (with no personal relationship with area leadership) to serve on the search committee with the specific duty to monitor for diversity-related concerns.

---

20 The Inclusive Campus Climate Initiative of the UC Davis ADVANCE program has formed a faculty-led committee that will begin offering workshops in Fall 2014 designed to decrease the effects of implicit bias in faculty hiring and promotion practices. Some training for staff in the area of implicit bias is currently available through the UC Davis Office of Campus Community Relations.
(9) If management feels that hiring a particular person is necessary for their department, management should request a waiver of the posting process so that the preference is transparent.

III. Institutional Change Issues

UC Davis is a dynamic system. A readiness and ability to respond to issues of import to the institution’s mission and constituents is necessary for the continuing viability and success of the system – of any system. On some occasions administration may be required to move quickly in order to respond to an emergency situation, to execute a mandate, or to take advantage of a limited opportunity. Other situations may allow for a more studied response.

The Ombuds Office has been made aware that there is a perception on different levels of the institution’s hierarchy that decisions by leadership to create, realign or expand program areas may be made without adequate preparation and consultation. Programmatic change may occur without assuring budgetary or infrastructure support for the change, and may subsequently be reconsidered as part of the annual budget review process. Although changes or expansion may be mandated by leadership, if program funding is uncertain, program administrators may feel unable to communicate downstream about space and manpower relief, and a delay or failure of communication can cause staff distrust because it is concluded that management is not proactively working to support the interests of their staff and constituencies. Thus, although change may be well-reasoned and fit in with the higher objectives of the campus, front-line staff often report feeling disempowered and victimized by the change process.

The Ombuds Office has heard from employees in areas undergoing change who believe they are being asked to assume a larger workload without full appreciation of the way in which the additional workload may result in a qualitative change in the nature of the work that they do. They see the change as based solely on a bottom-line analysis that requires front-line staff do more so that the institution can move forward with initiatives at the trade-off of staff’s ability to do good work for their constituent groups. They also raise issues of work-life balance, safety, and morale. Most of all they talk about a lack of respect and trust in management, and point to a lack of meaningful communication from management regarding any concerns they raise about the change, and retaliation if they persist in raising questions. The fear of retaliation comes in tandem with the sense that if they do not appear able or willing to meet the new demands, there is a real chance that they could lose their jobs. With a sense that discussion is not possible, even employees who feel capable of doing the work may feel the workplace is no longer a place in which they feel supported, appreciated and respected, and may begin looking elsewhere for work.
And although the programmatic change may not be idea of area management, in departments in which discussion is shut down, blame for the change is often placed on immediate supervisors and managers. Disgruntled staff often take the view that new area leadership are people brought in simply to improve metrics without considering staff needs and interests and the existing culture of the group, or conclude that the managers are incompetent.

It appears that many supervisors and managers lack strong communication and conflict management training, and may not have skills to productively raise legitimate staff concerns with their superiors or to obtain buy-in from their reports. These managers and supervisors may fear that asking for help would indicate that they are not up to the job. When managers and supervisors feel under siege, communication with staff often worsens, conflicts get more entrenched, morale suffers, and valuable employees head for the door.

Change management is a multileveled issue, complicated by the competing concerns of limited windows of opportunity (or sudden mandated change) and sufficient time to assure adequate preparation and front-line buy-in. There is the further complication that leadership may need to rely on program administrators to provide comprehensive feedback and appropriate pushback necessary for informed decision-making at the top, but administrators might feel hesitant to raise matters that appear contrary to the desires of leadership. Although communication issues between leadership and program administrators have not yet been observed by the Ombuds Office with sufficient frequency to deal with in this Report as systemic, the Ombuds Office is aware that dealing with such a disconnect, if one exists, would be a critical component of dealing productively with change management. The Ombuds Office understands that the Office of the Chancellor has made concrete efforts to open paths to such communication. The recommendations of the Ombuds Office in this Report focuses on the morale issues that affect front-line staff, but of course such issues cannot be dealt with in a vacuum. What happens at the top inevitably affects what happens at the bottom.

Recommendations:

(1) Implement standard practices to trigger up-front budgeting analysis and financial support commitments, identification and engagement of campus resources with expertise in related subject matter areas that will assure project success, and input from affected units (including from area front-line staff), before commitment to program expansion or changes. If concerns are raised that cannot be accommodated, leadership should explicitly explain the reasons why. If exigencies require leadership to act without first engaging the standard practices, program
leadership should be given a timeline for when the standard practices will occur; the timeline should be distributed to area staff.

(2) Design a range of support resources that will be a regular adjunct of the process for areas undergoing substantial growth or programmatic change, which may include:

(a) Training for managers and supervisors on how to get buy-in and motivate teams, and how to deal with conflict in times of change. These trainings can be designed in-house or brought in by contract. It is very important that the trainings build skills, not just supply theory and information.

(b) Providing support to those who can’t meet new expectations. It may be reasonable to expect that some people may not be able to come on board with changes to the system. Consider what could be done to build skills, help the employees to transition to other areas, or otherwise deal with lack of fit in a respectful way.

(c) Forming a team in the work area undergoing change that is empowered to raise issues concerning issues that arise in connection with the change. Front-line staff should be represented on the team.

(d) Providing individual and group conflict management support.

Conclusion

There are many people who have come to the Ombuds Office who in frustration, anger, or pain state that UC Davis is unresponsive to their needs and that the institution allows people in power to abuse those who work under them. The Ombuds Office hears these voices and takes them very seriously, but feels that it is important to note new efforts by the system to address incivility and to understand the needs of the community, including efforts by the Health System’s Office of Diversity and Inclusion and UC Davis’ Office of Campus Community Relations. The Ombuds Office has also observed the institution’s top administrators addressing concerns regarding incivility and inequity at all levels of administration and academic units. And, of course, we note that leadership at UC Davis opened the Office of the Ombuds – an office that is here to help visitors with their issues and that holds itself responsible for surfacing systemic issues that others in the institution may hesitate to say on the record. UC Davis has taken meaningful steps, but there are many more to go to assure fair and equitable processes in the areas of respectful behavior, hiring and reclassification, and change management. The Ombuds Office feels privileged to be part of this effort.
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Ombuds Office 2013-2014 Operations and Accomplishments

Created Ombuds Office Infrastructure and Systems

The Ombuds Office was allotted a suite of offices in Surge IV on the Davis Campus, and fashioned a space that would allow visitors to use the services of the ombuds office without feeling that their confidentiality was at risk. We were able to establish a stand of potted bamboo to shield a rather open entryway, and the office had sufficient space to assure that any person awaiting their appointment could be seated in a private waiting area and not be observed by any person who might drop in unexpectedly.

The Ombuds Office was also allotted office space in the Medical Center that was very conveniently located for hospital personnel who often had limited available time to meet. Because of the central location of the office and the fact that it is a single office without a waiting area, however, it has sometimes been difficult to coordinate visitor confidential ingress and egress, in light of the hallway traffic. The Ombuds Office is attempting to identify ways to resolve the competing access and confidentiality needs of visitors to its Health System location.

In order to monitor office use in a confidential manner, the Ombuds Office installed an offsite database system to capture basic user demographics and issue reporting. The Office also created an on-line and hard-copy SASE user satisfaction survey to help the Office improve ombuds services. Although the categories of data collected require further refinement, the Ombuds Office has been able to collect information to serve as a suitable foundation for this Annual Report and, most importantly, to protect visitor confidentiality in the process.

Conducted Extensive Outreach

Outreach is an extremely important part of the process of opening a service-oriented office. In order to let the UC Davis community know of the services provided by the Ombuds Office, the Office conducted 98 outreach sessions with 128 administrators, deans, chairs, division and section heads, and constituent group leaders, and provided 110 presentations on the Davis and Sacramento campuses (from 15 minute orientations to 30 minute presentations with a training component), reaching over 2,900 people.

The Ombuds Office also created a tri-fold brochure, and kept the brochure updated as the Office began work in the Health System location and students were added to the our constituency. The UC Davis Ombuds Office website (ombuds.ucdavis.edu) was created to

“Please have another location for the office at the Med Center - being so open in the hallway entering / exiting feels not safe / assuring confidentiality. Thanks!”

Ombuds Office Satisfaction Survey Comment
explain campus ombuds services and to provide an array of conflict management resources and information on other institutional resources and policies. The website has been accessed by 2,671 unique users to date.

Provided Training in Conflict Management

It is a goal of the Ombuds Office to increase the conflict competence of the institution through constituent training. The Ombuds Office believes that conflict management trainings are an important tool to help the community develop the skills to deal with conflict productively. In line with this goal, the Ombuds Office provided 8 conflict management workshops serving approximately 160 people, through five 3 hour trainings open to the public, two 1½ hour trainings provided to departments on request, and one 1 hour training for the UC Davis ADMAN annual professional development conference for middle managers. It is our hope that an expansion of training and proactive group work in developing communication protocols will be made possible by expansion of Ombuds Office staffing in the new fiscal year.

Rendered Ombuds Services

The stock in trade of the Ombuds Office is to provide individual and groups with conflict management and problem-solving services, and the first year of operations provided many opportunities to render such services. We provided conflict management and problem-solving services to 267 constituents from all levels of the institution’s hierarchy, including 4 mediated discussions. This number is impressive in light of the fact that this is an inaugural year; the expectation was that it might take some time for Ombuds Office outreach to translate into user traffic. Obviously, news travels fast at UC Davis.

An exit survey (on-line or hard-copy) is provided all visitors to the Ombuds Office. According to the 64 responses returned (a 24% return rate), 95% of the visitors to the Ombuds Office saw enough value in their experience to say they would refer others to the Office for services.

I have referred the Ombuds to a few people already. My consultation was extremely helpful and beneficial. I took away valuable tools for problem solving. I highly recommend the Ombuds person! Thank you.

My manager and I have been in conflict for such a long time that it is really affecting me emotionally and having a guide for self-reflection provides the crucial feedback I need for improving communication to help me do my part to resolve the conflict.

My experience with the Ombuds program was excellent. Before meeting with Ombuds I was in a situation where everything I was trying was making the situation worse. The mediator provided with tools to understand the root of the problem and how to cope.... I was also provided with literature to help me cope with my issue. My only regret is not having sought out help before. Thank you.
In addition to providing individual and group conflict management services, it is important that an ombuds office provides upward feedback to help its institution understand ways in which system policies, practices, structures and/or culture create or exacerbate conflict or inequities among constituents, or pose potential risk to the university. The UC Davis Ombuds Office is able to provide feedback about how institutional policies and behaviors affect campus constituents because the office is privy to the unvarnished perspectives of hundreds of people on campus about issues that trouble them. The Ombuds Office is akin to a continuously operating campus climate survey, with the ability to ask follow-up questions to get a clearer sense of the basis on which a concern may arise.

To surface the systemic concerns observed this fiscal year for consideration and action, the Ombuds Office has discussed its observations and suggestions with several administrators, policymakers and constituent group leaders. This Annual Report serves as an additional way for the Ombuds Office to demonstrate transparency and accountability concerning its observations on systemic issues to the UC Davis community.
APPENDIX B

Demographics: Davis Campus

Visitor Position at UC Davis

- Faculty and Other Academics: 23%
- Staff: 58%
- Postdoctoral Scholars: 3%
- Students: 7%
- Non-Faculty Administrators: 9%
- Non-Faculty Staff: 58%
- Visitors: 6%

Davis Campus

- Total Visitor Count: 28
- Non-Supervisory Staff: 54
- Supervisor: 48%
- Manager: 3%
- Not Selected: 7%

Non-Supervisory Staff Union Status

- Represented: 28
- Non-Represented: 54

Davis Campus Faculty and Other Academics

- Academic Senate - Tenured: 13%
- Academic Senate - Non-tenured: 3%
- Academic Federation: 7%
- Not Selected: 0%
Demographics: Health System

**Visitor Position in Health System**

- Staff: 56%
- Faculty and Other Academics: 20%
- Residents: 18%
- Non-Faculty Administrators: 6%
- Non-Faculty: 56%
- Visitors: 8%

**Health System**

- Total Visitor Count: 100
- Non-Supervisory Staff: 44%
- Supervisor: 8%
- Manager: 3%

**Non-Supervisory Staff Union Status**

- Represented: 23
- Non-Represented: 18

**Health System Faculty and Other Academics**

- Total Visitor Count: 100
- Academic Senate - Tenured: 6%
- Academic Senate - Non-tenured: 3%
- Academic Federation: 7%
- Not Selected: 3%
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 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)

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 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 position, 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 (change: or disagreements over requirements of assignment, appropriate tasks)
4.c Involuntary Transfer/Change of Assignments (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 Assignments (non-completion or over-extension of assignments, 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: safety, 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, effect 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)

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 issue not described in the above sub-categories)
### Evaluative Relationships

#### Davis Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Visitor Count</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect/Treatment</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust/Integrity</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Climate</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Effectiveness</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments/Schedules</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal/Grading</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities, Values, Beliefs</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of Treatment</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, Mobbing</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Violence</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Health System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Visitor Count</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect/Treatment</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust/Integrity</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Climate</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Effectiveness</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments/Schedules</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal/Grading</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities, Values, Beliefs</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of Treatment</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, Mobbing</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Violence</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer & Colleague Relationships

**Davis Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Visitor Count</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect/Treatment</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust/Integrity</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, Mobbing</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities, Values, Beliefs</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Violence</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Visitor Count</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect/Treatment</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust/Integrity</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, Mobbing</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities, Values, Beliefs</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Related</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Violence</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Services/Administrative Issues

**Davis Campus**

- Total Visitor Count
- Administrative Decisions and Interpretation/Application of Rules: 3%
- Responsiveness/Timeliness: 1%
- Quality of Services: 1%
- Behavior of Service Provider(s): 0%
- Other: 1%

**Health System**

- Total Visitor Count
- Administrative Decisions and Interpretation/Application of Rules: 3%
- Responsiveness/Timeliness: 1%
- Quality of Services: 0%
- Behavior of Service Provider(s): 2%
- Other: 0%