



Ombuds Office

ANNUAL REPORT

2003-2004

OCT. 2004

IAN DARLING

VOLUME XI

in accordance with the terms of reference pertaining to the Ombuds Office, this annual report is submitted to the President of the College and the Ombuds Advisory Committee. The report covers the period from July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004, and is available to any member of the Fanshawe College Community.

ANNUAL REPORT MESSAGE

Eleven years have passed since the establishment of the Ombuds Office. In preparing this report, I examined the ten previous reports to take stock of the office's evolution. It is clear from reading these reports reflect both consistency and change within the college, and issues with which the office deals.

Several themes are relevant in the reports. In general, they reflect how the college has developed over the past decade, its response to external pressures, and changing college-wide priorities. In the earliest reports, common themes included educating the college community about the role and purpose of the office, and identifying areas where significant change to policy or practice was required. The fifth annual report (1997-98) discussed many of these accomplishments, and the role of the Ombuds Office in identifying gaps in policy. More recently, the reports have focused on improving existing policies, and have attempted to encourage a proactive approach to addressing complaints. In general, it is more difficult to improve existing policy and practice, than it is to create new policies to address gaps. Today, in many cases, problems arise due to ineffective promulgation of new policies, characterized by lack of education, rather than absent or insufficient policy.

An underlying cause of complaints about academic areas appears to be lack of communication between students and teacher creating barriers to communication, thereby inhibiting early resolution to complaints. Of the 179 academic complaints in 2003/4, 37% came from students seeking information about academic appeals. In many cases, students had not approached teachers and were unaware why they did not receive the grade expected. This suggests that there are barriers, both real and perceived, that limit the effectiveness of student-teacher communication.

While it is not appropriate for academic areas to incorporate a customer service focus, the need exists for preventative measures. Individual teachers and academic leaders should make efforts to foster the development of respectful learning environments. This includes educating students of the college's expectation of their role in the learning process, developing a respectful classroom environment, and working to creating an atmosphere where students and faculty can work through their differences in a respectful manner.

This review also demonstrated the importance of incorporating a larger perspective into the statistical analysis of the Ombuds office activities. An important perspective can be gained by reviewing several years at the same time. Therefore, this year's report includes statistical data from several years.

Analysis of the history of the Ombuds office provides useful context for establishing priorities for future development of the service. Over the past several years, the college has grown significantly, and the increase in student population has led to a corresponding jump

(continued on page 2)

Contents

Annual Report Message.....	1
Ombuds Mandate.....	2
Overview.....	2
Advisory Committee Activities.....	2
Promotion and Outreach.....	2
Professional Development.....	3
Discussion of Cases.....	3
Case Studies.....	4
Recommendations.....	7
Thanks.....	8
Statistics.....	9

in caseload for this office. This presents a challenge because I have found that the time required to respond to specific complaints has limited my ability to engage in outreach or preventative work. I hope to identify solutions to these challenges in the coming months.

Ian Darling
September 2004.

OMBUDS MANDATE

The Ombuds Office was established in October 1993 through a joint agreement between the College and the Student Union. In the spring of 2003, the mandate was revised. The mandate of the Ombuds Office is to:

1. Receive, investigate, and seek to resolve, at the request of any member of the college community, or upon the Ombuds' own motion, any problems, or complaints with regard to any aspect of college life.
2. Provide general information about College resources, procedures and rules, and advise visitors of their rights and responsibilities in situations where problems or questions may arise.
3. Make recommendations to those in authority with a view to remedying the situation of individuals, and recommend changes in rules or procedures, which would have the effect of making the College, or Student Union more fair in their operations.

If you would like more information about the mandate for the office, please do not hesitate to contact me. For the full text of the mandate, please refer to the Ombuds Office website (www.fanshawec.ca/ombuds).

2003-2004 OVERVIEW

Ombuds Advisory Committee Activities

The members of the Ombuds Advisory Committee during this report period were: Steve Andrusiak (Dean Communication Arts); Crystal Boyd (Student Union President); Leslie McIntosh (Local 109 Representative); Joy Warkentin (Academic Vice-President); Lois Wey (Manager of Counselling and Student Life Services); Kay Wigle (Local 110 Representative) and John Young (Student Union Building Manager/Programmer). The Committee is co-chaired by the Manager of Counselling and Student Life Services and the Student Union President.

The Committee met once during this reporting period to discuss the 2002-2003 annual report. The committee was unanimous in their acceptance of

the report, and supportive of the work done by the Ombudsperson during this report year. The committee provided their advice on an informal basis throughout the year.

Promotion and Outreach

Visitors to the office learned of, or were referred to the Ombuds Office from a variety of sources, including: Faculty, co-workers, divisional offices, Counselling and Student Life, The President's Office, Student Union, other students, and advertising. If you are unsure if you should refer someone to the Ombuds Office, please do not hesitate to ask. I continue to meet with staff and students to discuss a wide range of issues, including policy questions, principles of conflict resolution and to discuss the issues at stake in a dispute. Over the year many fair solutions were found to difficult problems with the co-operation of all constituencies within the College.

Last year's annual report appeared as an article in the *Interrobang*, and was made available to all staff as an electronic file. In February, I presented the third annual report on Academic Dishonesty to College Council. The report was an important foundation for subsequent discussions with academic areas. Copies of these reports are included in an archive on the Ombuds Office web site (www.fanshawec.ca/ombuds).

The Ombuds Office website remains a useful resource for visitors to the office. It features information on how the office operates, and includes links to policies and publications. Publicity for the office was also included in College publications.

I attended various meetings to promote the office, answer questions and to act as a resource to groups and committees. These included meeting with academic managers, members of the student union executive, faculty and staff to discuss a variety of issues. These are excellent opportunities for me to discuss the role of the Ombuds Office and hear concerns from a variety of stakeholder groups. I continue to make myself available to groups or individuals interested in issues related to the Ombuds Office. In addition to these activities, I am also the Notary Public for the College. For more information on the commission, please feel free to contact me.

Professional Development

I participated in a variety of professional development activities last year. In March I attended a mediation course that incorporated perspectives from Narrative therapy. I have found these skills useful as I coach visitors in how to resolve their concerns. In May

I attended the annual conference of the Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons (ACCUO). I am a director of the Forum of Canadian Ombudspersons, and chairperson of the ACCUO standards of practice committee.

DISCUSSION OF CASES

This section provides a statistical breakdown and analysis of this year's caseload. 645 members of the College community were in contact with the Ombuds office this year, regarding 333 files. This is an increase of 64 cases (24%) over last year, and is the highest caseload since the inception of the Ombuds office. This is the second consecutive year with significant growth in activity. The average number of days it took to conclude each case was 4.5. This compares to 4.5, 3.2, 3.9 and 5.9 days for the previous four years.

NOTE: all tables are include in the statistics section of this report.

Cases by Action

The first area of discussion, illustrated in Table 1, illustrates what action was undertaken by the Ombudsperson upon receipt of a complaint. This can include providing information or advice, or some form of intervention. Cases were reported as information when I provided case-specific information to the client. Cases are classified as advice when we discussed a visitor's concern, identified possible paths toward resolution, and helped the visitor to assess which path is most appropriate to their circumstances. The forms of intervention ranged from the most common type, which involved a form of shuttle diplomacy, to mediation, or a more formal investigation. In some cases, merely gathering information and providing feedback resolved the problem. In a minority of cases, I conducted a formal investigation and issued a report containing recommendations on how to resolve the situation. Whenever possible, I attempt to empower visitors to pursue their own solutions in an informed and appropriate manner. By spending time discussing expectations, fairness and options, individuals are better prepared to make wise choices and take effective action on their own. This strategy has been found to be of more value to students and preferable by College employees.

Advice was given in the highest proportion of cases, which is consistent with previous years. Cases

where the only contact with the Ombuds Office is to gather information remained relatively infrequent. This is because the majority of cases require an involved discussion consistent with advice. The number of cases where the Ombuds intervened remained relatively consistent with last year, breaking a trend where the incidence of intervention decreased over the previous two years.

In the past two years, the percentage of cases where the Ombudsperson intervened has dropped significantly when compared to 1999-2000. As always, I attempt to help visitors resolve their concerns on their own first, and will only intervene if circumstances warrant. 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 reflect higher levels of intervention due to staffing changes, and differences in styles of practice. Additionally, with the increasing number of cases, there is a need to ensure appropriate allocation of resources. Therefore, I have created specific criteria that a case must meet before I intervene. This has improved the consistency of case management and has resulted in decreasing proportion of cases where intervention is appropriate. It is clear that continued growth in caseload may compromise the office's ability to fulfil its mandate.

Caseload by Issue

Table 2 shows sixteen categories of complaints, and the number of complaints about each issue. At times, the nature of complaints and inquiries are difficult to categorize if they overlap or are unclear. In some cases there are multiple issues involved in a complaint. While both primary and secondary issues are recorded, for the sake of brevity, only the primary issues (recorded according to the best matching issue description) are contained in this report.

Over the past 3 years, academic complaints account for the greatest proportion of cases. Table 3 shows the underlying issue in detail for 2003-4. The largest single academic issue bringing visitors to the Ombuds office relates to appeals.

Who visits the office?

Tables 4 through 7 illustrate distribution of files into constituent areas. The tables make reference to complainants and respondents. Individuals that initiate complaints are referred to as complainants. Those responding to complaints are referred to as respondents. For example, a student in Building Technology may complain about a college service. The complainant tables would reflect the fact that a student from Building Technology made a complaint, and the respondent tables illustrate the area against which the complaint

was directed. The tables do not reflect the differences in size between divisions nor do they indicate the nature of the issue at stake in the complaint.

Table 4 reports the number of files according to the division from which the complaints originate. Table 5 shows to which constituent group individual complainants belong. Table 5 demonstrates that the majority of complainants are full-time students, but employees and other groups also initiate complaints and inquiries.

Table 6 reports the number of files relating to the area about which the complaint is being made. Table 7 shows which constituent group respondents belong. Table 7 demonstrates that the majority of respondents are employees, but other groups are also the subject of complaints. When there is no specific individual being complained about, complaints are recorded in such a manner to avoid incorrectly attributing complaints about departmental policies or unknown staff members to individuals.

Outcome of Cases

The effectiveness of the Ombuds Office is often measured by its ability to facilitate the resolution of complaints. Table 8 shows the outcomes of cases in the 2003-2004 report year.

Several trends represented in these statistics should be discussed. The proportion of cases where the Ombudsperson provided information has increased consistently over the four years presented. This also accompanies a significant drop in the number of cases where the outcome favoured the complainant, and cases that concluded with a compromise, and an increase in the number of cases closed with the submission of a formal complaint. There are two reasons for these trends. The first is that with increased caseload it is difficult to conduct effective follow-up to assess how cases were resolved. The second reason was mentioned previously; with the increased caseload for the office, I have had to become more selective about which cases meet criteria for intervention, thereby reducing the proportion of cases in which I intervene.

CASE STUDIES:

The following case studies illustrate principles of natural justice and give readers a detailed view of the Ombuds office work. Each features a brief summary of the case with some comments. These cases are fictionalised accounts of actual cases. Details were modified or omitted to protect the identity of individuals and departments. Cases are chosen for their interest and educational value only.

A Question Of Teaching Style

Josh was in his first week of his first semester at the College when he approached the Ombuds Office to express his concern with one of his teachers. Josh said that the teacher singled him out in class and was intimidating. Josh and I discussed his concerns and identified specifically what he found to be of concern. We also discussed ways for Josh to resolve the situation, including; approaching the teacher, submitting a formal complaint, or choosing not to do anything about the matter. By the end of the meeting, Josh decided that he was afraid of the teacher enacting reprisals against him if he complained. We then agreed that I would approach the teacher to discuss the matter. Josh asked that I keep his identity confidential.

I met with the teacher later that week and explained Josh's concerns. The teacher explained her teaching methodology. She stated that she used case studies in the class, and students did a lot of their work on their own. As a result, she found that when one student encountered a problem, others could benefit from hearing her explanation. This approach meant that when students encountered problems, she would stop the class identify the problem and discuss how to solve it. I told her that it was apparent from my conversation with Josh that he did not understand her intent.

When I next spoke with Josh to discuss the teacher's perspective and reaction, he told me that the teacher had taken some time to explain her intent to the class. Josh said that he understood what she was trying to accomplish, and was more receptive when she identified his problems to the class.

Discussion:

When visitors come to my office, I attempt to assist them in identifying how they might resolve the situation on their own. There are circumstances where people are either incapable or unwilling to resolve things on their own. In most cases I would not have intervened, however, Josh's circumstances warranted an intervention. It was apparent that Josh was disillusioned by the interaction and that he was considering withdrawing from the program. In this case, I was able to present the student's concerns to the teacher in a manner that protected his anonymity, while helping both parties understand the cause of the problem.

Outstanding Fee Stalemate

Marius contacted the Ombuds office to express concern about a difficulty with the Office of the Registrar. Marius had just completed his final semester of his program. Marius had trouble throughout the

program, particularly in the final semester when one teacher had lost some of his work, and had incomplete and inaccurate marks for tests and assignments. Marius' attempts to seek assistance from the chairperson were unsuccessful. Marius had a series of unresolved complaints with the division, and questioned the Chair's willingness to fully investigate the teacher's behaviour. Marius' final mark was in doubt when the term ended because of the missing assignment.

Marius contacted me following the end of the term about the mark. Marius was in a stalemate with the Office of the Registrar regarding unpaid fees. Marius owed money for outstanding tuition. He knew that without paying his fees, his transcript would not be released. Marius was so disillusioned by his experience during the program that he refused to pay the outstanding fees until he knew that the teacher had entered a mark for his class. Marius' refusal to pay the outstanding fees was an attempt to protect his investment. Ultimately, it was misguided because it directed Marius' anger at the Office of the Registrar, rather than the source of the frustration.

Marius and I discussed his options. If he passed all his courses he was set to graduate. His main interest was to ensure that he successfully completed the program. He had no desire to pursue his complaints because he did not trust the college to respond. He did not want to invest a great deal of time in resolving the matter because his program was complete. Marius confided that he had the money in his pocket, and was perfectly willing to pay the outstanding fees, provided he knew that the mark was entered into the college computer system. With Marius' permission I accessed his file and told him that a mark was entered. Marius then went to the Office of the Registrar, paid the outstanding fee, received his transcript and attended graduation several weeks later.

Discussion

Marius' situation is a useful case study because it demonstrates several principles. It is an excellent example of how a negative experience when attempting to resolve a complaint can undermine trust in all college services. The Office of the Registrar was in a difficult situation due to Marius' protest over his concerns with his academic division. This demonstrates the importance of ensuring a fair and open process when receiving complaints. It should also serve as a warning to students of the negative consequences of attempting to voice a complaint in an inappropriate venue.

The final reason this case is useful is that it illustrates the informal role that the Ombuds Office can play in resolving complaints. When we discussed

Marius' priorities, he was clear that his main interest was to ensure that he had completed the program and he wanted to leave the difficulties behind him. Therefore, there was an opportunity for the Ombudsperson to provide the information that would allow the student to achieve his goals, while meeting the college's objective of securing payment for outstanding fees.

Code Of Conduct

Jessica visited the Ombuds office to complain about receiving a code of conduct report in the mail. The report followed a confrontation between Jessica and one of her teachers three weeks previously. When we met, Jessica indicated that she regretted the incident and she thought the teacher had forgiven her because Jessica and the teacher had briefly discussed the problem a week after it had happened and come to an understanding about the issue. Jessica was angry and felt that the teacher had betrayed her trust. Jessica acknowledged that the incident did occur, but she disagreed with how the incident was portrayed in the conduct report. Other students witnessed the argument, but did not hear what Jessica said. Inspection of the conduct report showed that the teacher had completed the form the day of the incident. He submitted the report indicating that Jessica had used abusive language and was disruptive in the classroom. Several days later, the Dean reviewed the form, decided the student was guilty, that a hearing was not necessary, and imposed a sanction. The completed form was mailed to Jessica.

Jessica and I discussed her concerns with the process, and her options. She decided to appeal the conduct report because she disagreed with the teacher's description of events. Jessica chose not to request a hearing with the Dean because she did not trust him to make a fair decision because she felt that she had been denied due process. Jessica eventually won the appeal because the college could not prove that she had committed the alleged act.

Discussion

In reviewing previous annual reports, I was struck by how frequently conduct issues were mentioned. This might lead one to think that the college is in a constant state of anarchy! Fortunately, this is not the case; however, it reflects the complexity of the policy and demonstrates the importance of Managers having working knowledge of the policy, and respect for fairness principles.

Through my involvement with this case, I became convinced that Jessica was appealing because she was angry about how she was notified of the conduct offence. She acknowledged that the confrontation occurred. She objected to how the facts were portrayed, and that she was sanctioned without an opportunity to respond to the charge. She also felt that the matter should have been closed when she had discussed the problem with the teacher.

On several occasions, students have visited the office after receiving conduct offence forms without any explanation of the offence or sanction. The policy does allow students to be found guilty without a hearing—but this should only be used when the offence is minor, and the facts are not in dispute. The policy states that in cases where a hearing is not deemed necessary, the administrator can choose not to include a letter when the form is distributed however; this is not consistent with the tenets of natural justice. I would recommend that if Managers feel that a hearing is not necessary, the conduct form should be accompanied by a letter which explains the college's version of the events, the sanction and the student's option to request a hearing. Informality should not trump fairness as a consideration.

It is necessary to reiterate that the college's appeal policy states that in cases where students appeal conduct or academic offences, and the college is alleging that the student's behaviour violates a norm, the onus is on the College to prove that the behaviour occurred, and that it constituted a violation of proper conduct. Jessica's case was overturned because there was insufficient evidence that the offence she was alleged to have committed actually occurred. Careful investigation and discussion with the student about appropriate behaviour would have mitigated Jessica's grounds for appeal and saved everybody a great deal of effort.

Administrative Responses – Who Deserves Fair Treatment.

Estella contacted the Ombuds office to express her concern about delays in her application to be readmitted to a program. Estella had done poorly in her first two terms at college, so she was required to take time off. It was also suggested that she to upgrade her skills. After spending eight months working to meet these conditions, Estella felt that she had met the requirements and should gain admission. During the reapplication process, Estella was concerned with the coordinator's role in the process, so had complained to the Dean. Estella was aware of the Student Concerns and Complaints policy, and the College's obligation to

respond to a complaint within 14 days. Estella contacted the Ombuds Office after three weeks had passed and she had heard nothing from the Dean. She felt that she had completed all that was asked of her, she had not been granted admission, and now felt that the College was not responding to her questions. Estella indicated that she had attempted to contact the Dean, but her messages were not returned.

We discussed Estella's concerns, identified the appropriate venue to appeal admissions decisions, and discussed the appropriateness of the complaint policy. I agreed to contact the Dean in order to get an explanation of the delays. The Dean's perspective was that Estella's complaint was partially founded, but because she was not a student, the timelines in the complaint policy were not relevant. Following our conversation, the Dean sent a letter to the student to conclude the complaint. The student reported that she was satisfied with this conclusion and withdrew her complaint to the Ombuds Office.

Discussion:

An ongoing theme in annual reports has been on the importance of providing a fair and transparent process for dealing with concerns. In this case, the complaint about the coordinator's behaviour stemmed from interactions while Estella was not a student. Therefore, technically the Dean was correct – however, Estella did not perceive herself to no-longer be student. She expected a response within two weeks, and grew angry when her requests for information were rebuffed. While the Dean's actions complied with the complaint policy, they violated its spirit. Often the college places too great a focus on the technically correct answer to the detriment of more humanistic concerns. The cost of taking extra time to ensure people are treated fairly and given the chance to voice their concerns is minimal in comparison with the negative feelings that can linger when people feel they have been treated unfairly.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Appeals through the Office of the Registrar.

Last year I made several recommendations with regard to the fee appeal process administered by the Office of the Registrar. I recommended that:

"...the fee appeal process should be reviewed, its purpose clearly articulated, and that the process and communication revised such that:

- *It is clear which official makes the decision.*
- *It is apparent what information will be considered by the decision maker.*
- *Timelines for how long the appeal process will take are clear.*
- *The policy makes reference to regulations governing how the decision will be made.*
- *Decisions are consistent with the rules.*

In order to ensure that decisions do not appear arbitrary or inconsistent, decisions should:

- *Provide an adequate explanation of how and why the decision was made.*
- *Provide the appellant with information related to how they might appeal (should further appeals be available)."*

The purpose of these recommendations was to encourage the College to establish a clear purpose for these appeal processes and criteria to evaluate the appeals, to use the criteria as part of decision-making, and to refer to these criteria in communication with appellants. This would increase transparency in the fee appeal process, thereby making it easier for students to assess if their circumstances might merit a refund, and will help decision-makers by providing clear criteria to guide their decisions.

In response to the recommendations in the annual report, and coinciding with a wider examination of fees, College staff conducted a review of fee priorities, policy and practice. This included a comprehensive review of tuition and ancillary fees and an analysis of the college's fee appeal process. Analysis specifically related to the fee appeal process resulted in twelve recommendations – including a preliminary framework for the development of a new policy and interim measures until implementation of the new policy. I am confident that these changes, if implemented, will meet the substantive recommendations contained in the 2002-3 Ombuds Office Annual report. The challenge will then be to incorporate these changes, develop and implement a new policy in a timely manner, and once the policy is in place, to operate in a manner consistent with both sets of recommendations. I will continue to

monitor these efforts and the implementation of proposed changes.

Academic Appeal Timelines

In last year's annual report, I expressed concerns with the apparent abuse of process by College administrators related to timelines contained in the student complaints and appeals policies. From January-June 2003, in 75% of appeals the college was in violation of its own policy, and only 25% of first level appeals were decided within the time limits allowed under college policy. I had first identified the issue as an area of concern in the previous year's annual report, but was concerned that the problem remained. This resulted in the following recommendation to the Vice President Academic:

"... that steps be taken to ensure the actions of Academic Managers are consistent with timelines contained in the student appeals policy. This may mean reconsidering the appropriateness of the timelines, or developing a mechanism to encourage compliance. (Ombuds Office Annual report 2002-3)"

Academic managers identified several possible solutions, including altering the policy so that a meeting to hear the appeal must occur within 14 days, and a response sent to the student within a further 7 days. The Vice-President Academic also stated that excessive delays might result in finding in the student's favour. A year has passed since the recommendation was made, and no changes have been made to the policy because the academic structure has undergone a major review and restructuring over the past 12 months.

Table 9 contains information about academic appeal timelines for the past two years. An analysis of this year's data provides some interesting information. It shows improvement in the average time for an appeal decision to be rendered by academic managers. The majority of appeals would comply with the proposed timelines. This leads to the conclusion that the emphasis on timely responses has resulted in better compliance with the policy. While this is good news, the data also provides enough of a perspective to temper my enthusiasm. Appeals that were submitted before April 30 were closed on average within 14 days of when they were filed, however those submitted after May 1 were resolved on average 24 days after they were filed. I expect that vacations over the summer are a factor that contributes to these delays. This suggests that simply redrafting the policy and extending timelines will not be sufficient to rectify problems.

While no substantive changes were made to the policy, the academic restructuring presents a significant opportunity to rectify the underlying issues. Under the previous system, academic managers from individual divisions were responsible for hearing appeals and complaints. This precluded academic managers from being active in facilitating resolution to appeals informally in order to avoid a conflict of interest in a formal appeal. The new academic structure features programs organized into faculties with program chairs overseen by Deans of the faculty. Under the new structure, it is proposed that Deans would receive the first formal level appeals and complaints. This provides Chairpersons with the opportunity to play an important preventative role in the informal stages of complaints and appeals. I would recommend that Chairpersons receive training in how to facilitate discussions between students and teachers, and to help students gather information, and evaluate the likelihood of a successful appeal. This would reduce the total number of appeals heard by the Deans.

It is important now that policies clearly articulate the roles and responsibilities of academic managers under the new academic structure. These changes, and those proposed last year should be made sufficiently early in the academic year such that the changes can be communicated in advance of the 2005-6 school year. I will continue to monitor the situation, and hope I will be able to report on substantive progress next year.

Informal recommendations

In addition to the formal recommendations discussed above, I have submitted several informal recommendations, and have advised of areas where improvement can be made to specific departments. In several cases I have seen positive changes result from these recommendations. I trust that the consideration and implementation of these recommendations will improve the College's capacity to respond to complaints, and serve to prevent problems from escalating.

THANKS

I thank those people who supported the Ombuds office this past year, including: the Ombuds Advisory Committee for their work and support; the many people who have found fair solutions to difficult problems; the Student Union personnel; the College personnel with whom the Ombuds deals regularly—including, Counselling and Student Life Services, Office of the Registrar, Financial Aid, The President's Office; Chairs, Co-ordinators, Faculty members and Support staff who have worked to resolve a variety of student complaints. Finally, I thank the visitors who have used the Ombuds Office.

*Ian Darling,
Fanshawe College Ombudsperson,
September 2004.*

STATISTICS

Table 1. Cases by action 1999-2004

	2003-4		2002-3		2001-2		2000-1		1999-2000	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Advice	259	77.8	222	82.5	210	84.3	197	69	126	56
Information	48	14.4	26	9.7	16	6.4	38	13	25	11
Intervention	26	7.8	21	7.8	23	9.2	52	18	74	33
Total Cases	333	100	269	100%	249	100%	287	100%	225	100%

STATISTICS

Table 2. Caseload by Issue 1999-2004

	2003-4		2002-3		2001-2		2000-1		1999-2000	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Academic	179	53.8	160	59.5	155	62.2	166	57.8	63	28
Admission	2	0.6	With registration		With registration		With registration		With fees	
Conduct	31	9.3	22	8.2	9	3.6	3	1	15	7
Harassment & Discrimination	13	3.9	2	0.7	6	2.4	3	1	5	2
Employee Case	6	1.8	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Financial Aid	15	4.5	16	5.9	14	5.6	30	10.5	24	11
Fees	17	5.1	8	3.0	5	2.0	11	3.8	23	10
Other	22	6.6	24	8.9	19	7.6	23	8.0	59	
Other Student	4	1.2	2	0.7	4	1.6	5	1.7	0	0
Outside Mandate	7	2.1	10	3.7	4	1.6	6	2.1	N/A	
Inter-Personal Relations	5	1.5	4	1.5	8	3.2	5	1.7	14	6
College Policy	4	1.2	4	1.5	6	2.4	12	4.2	N/A	
Registration & Withdrawal	16	4.8	12	4.5	16	6.4	12	4.2	With fees	
Residence	1	0.3	0	0	1	0.4	2	0.7	N/A	
Disability	11	3.3	5	1.9	2	0.8	6	2.1	8	4
Student union	6	2.1	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	1
Total Cases	333	100	269	100	249		287	100	225	100

Table 3. Breakdown of Academic Issues 2003-4.

Issue	# of Cases	% of Total
Academic Appeals	66	36.8
Academic Dishonesty	17	9.5
Evaluation concerns	18	4.5
Inter-personal relations	12	6.7
Other (Academic)	30	16.7
Practicum/Placement/Co-op	15	8.4
Program Policies	6	3.3
Program structure/ operation	6	3.3
Readmission	7	3.9
Teaching style concerns	2	1.1
Total Cases	179	100

Table 4. SEE NEXT PAGE

Table 5. Complainants by Group Status 2003-4

Group description	# of Clients	% of Total
EMPLOYEE		
Administration	29	8.0%
Faculty	31	8.6%
Support	8	2.2%
Group Total	68	18.8%
OTHER		
Alumni	2	0.6%
Other	19	5.3%
Student Union	2	0.6%
Group Total	23	6.4%
STUDENT		
Continuing Education	4	1.1%
Full-Time	239	66.2%
Other	23	6.4%
Part-Time	4	1.1%
Group Total	270	74.8%
Total # of Complainants	361	100

STATISTICS

Table 4. Clients by division of complainant 2000-2004

	2003-4		2002-3		2001-2		2000-1	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ACADEMIC AREAS								
Academic services	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Art and design	16	4.8	14	5.2	12	4.8	22	6.5
Building technology	8	2.4	13	4.8	10	4.0	15	4.5
Business studies	22	6.6	18	6.7	20	8.0	41	12
Communication arts	26	7.8	15	5.6	13	5.2	22	6.5
Electrical/electronics**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	3.6	9	2.7
General studies	22	6.6	30	11.1	24	9.6	27	8
Health sciences	35	10.5	17	6.3	16	6.4	39	11.6
Human services	46	13.8	37	13.7	25	10	33	0.3
Information technology	14	4.2	16	5.9	17	6.8	26	7.7
James n. Allan campus	3	1	3	1.1	4	1.6	4	1.2
Manufacturing sciences	28	8.4	22	8.2	11	4.4	15	4.4
Motive power technology	4	1.2	3	1.1	5	2.0	1	0.3
Nursing	15	4.5	21	7.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oxford county campus	8	2.4	5	1.8	5	2.0	7	2.1
School of continuing education	8	2.4	4	1.6	14	5.6	16	4.7
St. Thomas/elgin campus	2	0.6	2	0.8	5	2.0	0	0
Tourism & hospitality studies	7	2.1	13	4.8	8	3.2	14	4.2
SERVICE AREAS								
Athletics	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Counselling and student life services	13	3.9	5	1.8	4	1.6	3	1
Finance and corporate services	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Human resources	2	0.6	0	0	1	0.4	1	0.3
Information systems services	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information technology (service)	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library & media services	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Office of the president	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	2	0.6
Office of the registrar	2	0.6	3	1.1	0	0	0	0
Partnerships	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.6
Student and staff services	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical support services	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	3	1.1	1	0.4	6	1.8
COMPLAINTS WITHOUT DIVISION	43	12.9	25	9.3	27	10.8	15	4.5
Total complainants	333	100	269	100	249	100	336 *	100

* The 2000-2001 report included individual complainants rather than compiled cases.

** Programs distributed between Manufacturing and Building technology Divisions in 2001-2 report year.

STATISTICS

Table 6. Clients by division of respondent 2000-2004

	2003-4		2002-3		2001-2		2000-1	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ACADEMIC AREAS								
Academic services	2	0.6	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.3
Art and design	12	3.6	12	4.5	8	3.2	12	3.9
Building technology	8	2.4	10	3.7	8	3.2	6	1.9
Business studies	13	3.9	10	3.7	9	3.6	13	4.2
Communication arts	18	5.4	8	3.0	7	2.8	11	3.6
Electrical/electronics	N/A		N/A		10	4.0	1	0.3
General studies	20	6.0	29	10.8	26	10.4	18	5.9
Health sciences	25	7.5	11	4.1	8	3.2	30	9.8
Human services	25	7.5	20	7.4	13	5.2	19	6.2
Information technology (academic)	10	3.0	9	3.3	9	3.6	11	3.6
James n. Allan campus	1	0.3	3	1.2	1	0.4	3	0.9
Manufacturing sciences	23	6.9	18	6.7	6	2.4	11	3.6
Motive power technology	1	0.3	2	0.8	3	1.2	1	0.3
Nursing	12	3.6	17	6.3	15	6.0	N/A	
Oxford county campus	2	0.6	2	0.8	6	2.4	6	1.9
School of continuing education	6	1.8	3	1.2	15	6.0	10	3.1
St. Thomas/elgin campus	2	0.6	0	0	5	2.0	0	0
Tourism & hospitality studies	4	1.2	7	2.6	7	2.8	10	3.2
SERVICE AREAS								
Athletics	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.3
Awards & schollarshis	0	0	1	0.4	1	0.4	0	0
Career services	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	0	0
Counselling and student life services	7	2.1	5	1.8	1	0.4	1	0.3
Environmental health & safety service	0	0	1	0.4	1	0.4	2	0.6
Facilities maintenance	2	0.6	0	0	0	0	1	0.3
Facilities management	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilities support services	3	0.9	2	0.8	5	2	4	1.3
Financial aid services	20	6.0	16	5.9	15	6.0	27	8.8
Fitness centre	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	1	0.3
Human resources	3	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information systems services	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information technology service	1	0.3	1	0.4	0	0	0	0
Library & media services	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Office of the president	0	0	2	0.8	1	0.4	1	0.3
Ombudsman	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Partnerships	0	0	1	0.4	2	0.8	1	0.3
Planning services	2	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Registrar's office	28	8.4	22	8.2	22	8.8	24	7.8
Retail services	0	0	0	0	2	0.8	0	0
Residence	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	4	1.3
OTHER								
Student union	6	1.8	4	1.5	3	1.2	4	1.3
Respondents without division	7	2.1	5	1.8	11	4.4	8	2.6
Total cases without respondent	72	21.6	43	16.0	28	11.2	52	16.9
Total cases	333	100	269	100	249	100	307	100

STATISTICS

Table 7. Respondents By Group Status 2003-4

Group description	# of Clients	% of Total
EMPLOYEE		
Administration	77	27.1
Faculty	157	55.3
Support	11	3.9
Group Total	245	86.3
OTHER		
Division	28	9.9
Student Union	6	2.1
Group Total	34	12.0
STUDENT		
Full-Time	5	1.8
Group Total	5	1.8
Total # of Respondents	284	100

Table 8. Cases by Outcome 2000-2004

	2003-4		2002-3		2001-2		2000-1	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Appeal	59	17.7	50	18.7	45	18.1	42	14.6
Complaint Filed	36	10.8	16	6.0	10	4.0	6	2.1
Compromise	36	10.8	34	12.6	51	20.5	58	20.2
Complaint Withdrawn	46	13.8	40	15.0	24	9.6	33	11.5
Favoured Complainant	5	1.5	10	3.7	12	4.8	30	10.5
Favoured Respondent	29	8.7	22	8.2	26	10.4	27	9.4
No resolution	0	0	1	0.4	2	0.8	0	0
Ombuds Withdrew	5	1.5	5	1.9	3	1.2	4	1.4
Provided Information	98	29.4	73	27.3	50	20.1	38	13.2
Referral	18	5.4	18	6.7	25	10.0	49	17.1
Unknown	1	0.3	0	0	1	0.4	0	0
Total Cases	333	100	269	100	249	100	287	100

Table 9. Academic Appeal Response Times

	1st Level Appeals		2nd Level Appeals	
	2002-3	2003-4	2002-3	2003-4
Total number of appeals	123	81	20	13
Appeals where closing dates not recorded	21	15	2	4
Shortest (in days)	1	1	3	14
Longest (in days)	124	74	52	36
Average # of days	29	25	37	20
Total within 14 days	26	35	1	1
Total within 14-20	23	26	1	0
21 days and over	53	28	16	8