



Ombuds Office

ANNUAL REPORT

2004-2005

OCT. 2005

IAN DARLING

VOLUME XII

In accordance with the Ombuds Office terms of reference, this annual report is submitted to the President of the College and the Ombuds Advisory Committee. The report covers the period from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005, and is available to any member of the Fanshawe College Community.

ANNUAL REPORT MESSAGE

In this year’s annual report message I would like to discuss two issues which face the college community. These relate to closing the policy gap and the customer service paradox.

Closing the policy gap.

I am a member of the Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons. As part of that network we often use other members for help and fresh perspectives resolving difficult cases, and as a resource to see how other institutions respond to common problems. Through this experience I have come to appreciate the general quality and thoroughness of Fanshawe’s policies. Despite the quality of the policies, every year I encounter problems caused when policies were not followed. I am perplexed at how frequently an underlying issue in a complaint is exacerbated by employees’ lack of knowledge of the rules governing the college’s operation.

An example of how these break-downs occur comes from an exercise in which I was involved. Several years ago I recommended changes to the college’s academic offences and code of conduct policies. A small working group was struck, revised the policies, and presented them to College council where they were approved. An announcement in Fanshawe News and Happenings stated that the policies were revised, nothing further happened. Over the next several months I conducted sessions with interested faculty about academic offences on an ad hoc basis, but there was no comprehensive education program.

At the June 2005 College and Administrative council meetings, the following academic policies were amended or approved:

- 2-A-09 Accommodation of Applicants and Students with Disabilities
- 2-B-03 Review and Formal Evaluation of College Programs
- 2-B-10 Program and Course Information
- 2-B-17 Graduation from Approved College Programs
- 2-B-18 Fanshawe College Credentials (formerly called “Fanshawe College Symbols of Academic Achievement”)
- 2-C-02 Examinations (formerly called “Evaluations”)
- 2-C-04 Course Grade System (formerly called “Course Grade System for Recording Academic Standing”)
- 2-C-05 Academic Standing
- 2-G-02 Student Appeal of a Grade or Other Academic Decision

Changes for these policies were announced on Happenings on August 5, and September 2, 2005. This is not sufficient notice.

(continued on page 2)

Contents

Annual Report Message.....	1
Ombuds Mandate.....	3
Overview.....	3
Discussion of Cases.....	3
Case Studies.....	5
Recommendations.....	7
Thanks.....	8
Statistics.....	9

I have the following concerns about the gap between policy development and implementation:

- There are significant gaps in how policies are revised and implemented.
- There is no process to ensure everybody with a vested interest has a chance to provide their perspective when policies are revised. This results in inconsistent participation from the Student Union and lack of perspective due to inadvertent exclusion of other interested parties.
- Once policies are approved, there is no process for explaining the changes or on-going education to help people understand the impact of the changes, and to ensure their effective use. The code of conduct is an example of a complicated policy which, when implemented, was supported with a comprehensive education program; but there was little or no follow-up and as a result its use is fraught with errors.
- It is not always clear who is responsible to ensure a policy is used appropriately. As a result, it appears that no one takes leadership in ensuring it is implemented and operating effectively.

Adlai Stevenson once said that “bad administration, to be sure, can destroy good policy; but good administration can never save bad policy.”¹ I am convinced of the value and relevance of college policy; however, poor administration is threatening to undermine their usefulness. In order to close the policy gap, I recommend that:

- The college appoint an individual or department to be responsible for coordinating policy review, implementation and on-going education.
- Create a mandatory stage in approving new or revised policies to include assigning responsibility for education and implementation.
- Announcements about policy revisions include a brief summary of the changes so that employees have a sense of their scope and purpose.

The customer service paradox.

Recently, a parent criticized the college as providing poor customer service because the college would not grant his daughter’s request to waive rules. On the same day a college employee said that he was frustrated with the college’s focus on customer service because he felt it was misdirected. His thesis was that private sector businesses tend to operate with a “customer is always right” approach, but this is untenable in the college because students are not typical customers. Although the incident with the parent and subsequent conversa-

tion precipitated my commenting in the annual report, I have noticed an increasing trend where complainants do not take responsibility for their role (either through acts or omissions) in creating the problems.

Students have rights and privileges, but they also have responsibilities that traditional consumers do not. A recently published article on customer service advised “Never say “never,” “no,” “can’t be done,” “it’s policy,” “it’s against the rules,” “you’re wrong,” ... or anything of that ilk to the customer.”² This excerpt has two subtexts, the first is do not be rude, the second is that an inherent component of good customer service is the primary objective to please the customer. This focus is not compatible with academic institutions due to the requirement for students to meet admission standards, then to meet the academic standards for graduation. When students see themselves as customers, one can see where they might expect a level of service consistent with the private sector. While it is never appropriate to be rude, there are many valid reasons to say “No.” The college cannot waive admission requirements, or change grades because the customer requests it—and students and parents have made such requests. In order to prevent these situations from occurring, students need to be aware of these expectations and responsibilities. While it is essential that the college continue to provide exceptional service, and work toward its improvement, it also needs to continue to be proactive in informing students of their rights and responsibilities while notifying current and prospective students and parents of the unique service relationship at the college.

OFFICE HOURS.

One final note in closing; in the 2003-4 annual report, I indicated that the office faced several challenges related to levels of service. Over the past several years, the case load for the office increased to the extent that it was difficult to meet the need while operating the office four days per week. The Student Union and College agreed that the office should be in operation five days per week, so since December 2004 the office has been operating Monday-Friday.

¹ ADLAI E. STEVENSON, governor of Illinois, speech before the Los Angeles Town Club, Los Angeles, California, September 11, 1952.—*Speeches of Adlai Stevenson*, p. 36 (1952).

² Lunch, Elizabeth A. (2004). Keeping your customers happy: a customer service refresher *Defense AT&L Magazine*. Nov-Dec, 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.

For the full text of the mandate, please refer to the Ombuds Office website www.fanshawec.ca/ombuds

2004-2005 OVERVIEW

Ombuds Advisory Committee Activities

The members of the Ombuds Advisory Committee during this report period were: Steve Andrusiak (Dean Communication Arts); Dean Coutu (Local 109 Representative); Karrie McQuaig (Student Union President); 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 during this reporting period to discuss the 2003-2004 annual report and increasing demands presented by the increased caseload. 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. 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.

Last year's annual report appeared as an article in the *Interrobang*, and was made available to all staff as an electronic file. Students were able to access the report through Fanshawe Online. In February, I presented the fourth 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.

Professional Development

In September I attended an Ombudsman Investigation Workshop presented by the Forum of Canadian Ombudsmen (FCO). I also attended the Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons annual mid-year meeting hosted by Algonquin College. I was the Chairperson of the FCO biannual conference. At the conference I was elected to a two year term as Vice-President of the FCO.

DISCUSSION OF CASES

This section provides a statistical breakdown and analysis of this year's caseload. 625 members of the College community were in contact with the Ombuds office this year, regarding 335 files. This is an increase of 2 cases over last year, and is the highest caseload since the inception of the Ombuds office. This represents a relative plateau after two consecutive years with significant growth in activity. The average number of days it took to conclude each case was 5.2. This compares to 4.5, 4.5, 3.2, 3.9 and 5.9 days for the previous five 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 was 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.

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 increased slightly, but 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 almost doubled relative to last year, breaking a trend where the incidence of intervention decreased or remained consistent over the previous years.

In last years' report, I discussed the decrease in the instances where the Ombudsperson intervened. I specu-

lated that this was due in part to increased caseload and the need to be selective about allocation of resources. I believe that the increase in interventions this year is due in part to switching the office to five days a week from four. This in turn has reduced the immediate concern about the caseload growing beyond the means of the office to meet the need. I suspect that over time this issue may need to be addressed again.

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.

Academic complaints account for the greatest number 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. Individuals initiating complaints are referred to as complainants. Those responding to complaints are referred to as respondents. If a student in Building Technology complains 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 made. Table 7 shows to which constituent group respondents belong, and indicates that the majority of respondents are employees, but other groups are also the subject of complaints. When no specific individual is subject of a complaint, complaints are recorded in a manner to avoid incorrectly attributing complaints

about departmental policies or unknown staff members to individuals. The number of complaints outnumbers respondents for three reasons. There are cases where the complainant expresses a concern without identifying the respondent in question. In other cases, it stems from a concern to ensure anonymity. The final reason is that several cases each year are outside of the mandate for the office. In these cases, I try to refer complainants to appropriate community resources. Table 6 Clients by Division of Respondent 2000-2004 report year. In last year's annual report, I identified several trends related to outcome of cases and incidences where I intervened. I also expressed concern that the increased caseload for the office was making it difficult to be effective. As a response, the Ombuds office was increased to five days per week. Last year there was an increase in the number of cases resolved through compromise. This is tied to an increase in the number of cases where the Ombudsperson interviewed. It is also interesting to note that 2001-2002, which was the year with the most effective on-going follow, there was the fewest proportion of cases where the complaint was withdrawn. Increasing the Ombuds Office to five days per week should help ensure that there are resources when an intervention is appropriate, and conduct follow-up.

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.

Workplace incivility mediation.

Two co-workers were referred to the Ombuds Office following a confrontation in their workplace. I met with each party to discuss their perspectives of the problem, and what they wanted to achieve through my involvement. Initially, both parties wanted to forget the incident and ignore the problem, but the severity of the conflict prevented them from doing so. Following these meetings, each party agreed to a meet with me acting as a mediator. We agreed that it would be a voluntary, confidential process and that the purpose of the meeting would be to discuss the confrontation and work to prevent further problems from arising. After several discussions and on-going follow-up the parties were able to establish the groundwork for developing a new working relationship.

Discussion:

After two complete report years with the expanded mandate to deal with employee complaints, I can report that the majority of employee complaints stem from interpersonal conflicts. In many of these cases, the presenting problem (the confrontation or argument) is just the latest in a string of incidents. It is rare that these occurrences are not accompanied by a rich and storied history of conflict, raw emotions and uncorrected past wrongs—often for both sides. In some cases, the history is of such a pattern that it suggests that the incivility borders on bullying. I recognize that bullying is a loaded term, but it does not serve to shy away from the problem.

In many of these incidents, managers seem unaware or unwilling to take necessary steps to prevent these problems from occurring. Therefore, I recommend that the college develop and implement a training program for managers that focuses on identifying characteristics of bullies (both in themselves and others) and provides managers with coaching skills to help their employees resolve conflict constructively before situations escalate. If these measures are insufficient, a more comprehensive approach will be necessary including: creating a new college-wide approach to bullying that incorporates new policy, education and enforcement components.

Admissions appeal:

Cadel contacted the Ombuds office after hearing that he was not accepted into his program of choice. He received an offer to his second choice program, but he really wanted to be admitted to his first choice. Cadel reported that it was unfair because he had heard that someone with a lower GPA had received an offer of admission. When Cadel and I spoke it was three days before the deadline for him to respond to the offer of admission. Cadel said that he attempted to speak with the Office of the Registrar, but was unable to achieve a satisfactory result. Due to the three-day deadline we felt it appropriate that I discuss the matter with the Office of the Registrar.

I met with a representative from the admissions area and they informed me of the admission criteria. After a review of Cadel's application, I concurred with their decision. Although Cadel had a high GPA, he was missing one of the required criteria for admission; therefore, he was ineligible for admission. I met with Cadel and explained the situation. He reluctantly accepted the news and accepted the offer of admission into his second-choice program.

Discussion:

I chose to include this case because the 2004-5 report-year saw a marked jump in the number of complaints about admissions. It is interesting to note that in looking at the outcomes of the 19 admission complaints 9 were resolved in favour of the college, 3 complaints were withdrawn, 3 compromises, and there were one each of appeal, complaint, ombuds withdrew and provided information. This suggests that the process being used is fair and correct, but that there are problems with how users understand the admissions process.

When discussing the rise in admission complaints with College staff many ask me if it is because of the new FACS administrative computer system. The short answer is yes, but not for the reason one may think. It is true that the new FACS system has fundamentally changed how the admissions staff interact with computers however the number of complaints I received where the FACS system was a factor was minimal, and did not substantially changed the outcome of admissions decisions in question. The affect that FACS has had outside of the Office of the Registrar is that it has provided the opportunity for people (applicants and college staff) to question the fairness of decisions. This is part of the reason for the increase in number of complaints.

With the move to a GPA, it is more common for applicants to ask why someone with a 3.4 GPA was not admitted whereas their acquaintance with a 3.2 GPA did receive an admission offer. In most cases it is a situation like Cadel's where he did not meet the admission criteria. Now that there is an apparent objective number, it appears people are misunderstanding the degree to which factors other than GPA play in arriving at an admission decision.

I believe another cause of increased complaints is that faculty, counsellors and staff outside the Office of the Registrar, do not understand how admission decisions are made. This has led to some bad advice and bad choices by students who take a certain path in the belief that it will further their chances of admission. In discussions with staff in the Office of the Registrar over the past several months, I understand they are developing a document that will allow for greater transparency in the admissions process. I am hopeful that this, along with orientation sessions for coordinators, counsellors and advisors, will reduce the number of poor choices.

The final reason for increased complaints about admissions comes from applicants unwilling to take any accountability for their own actions (or inaction). The college should not be criticized for rescinding or cancelling offers of admission when applicants do not return letters of acceptance on time, do not pay

fees before the fee deadline, or blatantly disregard conditions which must be satisfied before the start of classes. I am constantly surprised by the apparent refusal of some applicants to be accountable for their own part in creating the problems they face.

Service expectations:

Carmella visited the Ombuds Office to complain about how she was treated by one of the service areas in the college. Carmella had visited a service area in the college and was frustrated by the long wait. She indicated that she had inquired about the duration of the wait and the staff in the office was rude to her. Carmella reported that while she waited, several other students came in and were seen before her. She thought this was very unfair. Carmella left, and returned several hours later to meet with the manager. Carmella reported that the meeting with the manager was unproductive. She left even more frustrated. Carmella then visited the Ombuds Office.

During our discussion, Carmella indicated that she had immigrated to Canada and was still having difficulty adjusting. She openly wondered if she was treated differently because of her appearance. I agreed to investigate the matter because Carmella had not achieved success when she attempted to resolve the matter on her own. When I met with the manager responsible for the service area, she told me that Carmella had stopped by the office during a time when they have walk-in appointments as well as scheduled appointments. Walk-in appointment are seen on a case-by-case basis when the staff have an opportunity to receive these students. I was told that Carmella's wait was not longer than what is typical for such drop-in appointments. Several students did come into the waiting area and received service before Carmella, but they all had scheduled appointments. The manager also stated that she found Carmella very rude and aggressive when they met. The manager stated that she did not know why Carmella felt that she should skip the line for immediate service while others in her situation would wait. The manager was more understanding once I shared that Carmella was unaware of how appointments were scheduled or how the office treated walk-in clients.

Following this meeting, I relayed my findings to Carmella. She was satisfied to hear that she was not treated differently than someone in similar circumstances. Carmella and I also discussed her experience adjusting to Canada. I encouraged Carmella to share this experience with the manager of the service area. Carmella subsequently wrote a letter explaining her perspective of the problem. Carmella appreciated the

response, and it was clear that the manager had a new sensitivity to how Carmella perceived the situation.

Discussion:

Over the past few years, complaints from international students and newcomers to Canada have shared a common theme; stemming from misunderstandings based on cultural differences. With plans to internationalize the College, and London becoming increasingly diverse, problems of this sort will not go away. I have found that many of these misunderstandings can be resolved, and indeed prevented, by explaining the rationale for rules or procedures rather than assuming that students are attempting to flaunt the rules. Carmella's complaint could have been prevented if front-line staff, or the manager had shown empathy for Carmella's concern, then taken time to explain procedures in the office. The underlying cause of Carmella's complaint can be generalized to both service and academic areas.

The evolving role of the Ombudsperson.

Jefferson contacted the Ombuds Office part way through the academic year to express his concern about a placement. He was concerned about its structure, and afraid that he would fail. We discussed his concerns and developed a plan for him to express his concerns to his supervisor, and if necessary the academic manager. Jefferson spoke with his supervisor, but was ultimately unsuccessful in resolving his concerns. Several weeks later, at the end of term, Jefferson requested a meeting so we could discuss how to appeal the class. At that point, I advised him how to appeal the grade and coached him how to approach the chairperson to attempt to resolve the issue informally. The chairperson then called me to ask for advice how to resolve the complaint. I did not inform the chairperson that Jefferson had visited my office, but we discussed the chairperson's perspective, and I advised how to approach the situation.

Ultimately, the informal resolution Jefferson and the chairperson developed was unsuccessful, so Jefferson was back in my office for guidance how to submit a formal appeal. Once the appeal was concluded and the case closed, the chairperson and I had a conversation about how to more effectively resolve future complaints.

Discussion:

In many complaints, I play several roles throughout the course of resolving a complaint. This case study does not offer any collected wisdom, but shows some of the informal roles the Ombudsperson can

play without a direct intervention in the resolution of a case. My contact with Jefferson lasted over nine months and involved complex complaints about the academic program and service areas. The matter was ultimately resolved following a series of appeals and formal complaints. It never required my direct intervention, but I was actively involved in guiding both sides to ensure a fair process.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

In the 2002-2003 report I made two systemic recommendations about the Fee appeal process and timelines for academic appeals. I am pleased to report that the college has revised the relevant policies, and have put in place procedures that should help to ameliorate the concerns. It is important to keep in mind that good policy is only effective if implemented. I am hopeful that the college will implement and adhere to the principles outlined in these revised policies.

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 2005.*

STATISTICS

Table 1. Cases by action 1999-2005

	2004-5		2003-4		2002-3		2001-2		2000-1		1999-2000	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Advice	242	72.2	259	77.8	222	82.5	210	84.3	197	69	126	56
Information	42	12.5	48	14.4	26	9.7	16	6.4	38	13	25	11
Intervention	51	15.2	26	7.8	21	7.8	23	9.2	52	18	74	33
Total Cases	335	100	333	100	269	100	249	100	287	100	225	100

Table 2. Caseload by Issue 2000-2005

	2004-5		2003-4		2002-3		2001-2		2000-1	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Academic	178	53.1	179	53.8	160	59.5	155	62.2	166	57.8
Admission	19	5.7	2	0.6	With registration		With registration		With registration	
Conduct	21	6.3	31	9.3	22	8.2	9	3.6	3	1
Harassment & Discrimination	11	3.3	13	3.9	2	0.7	6	2.4	3	1
Employee Case	11	3.3	6	1.8	NA		NA		NA	NA
Financial Aid	11	3.3	15	4.5	16	5.9	14	5.6	30	10.5
Fees	8	2.4	17	5.1	8	3.0	5	2.0	11	3.8
Other	6	1.8	22	6.6	24	8.9	19	7.6	23	8.0
Other Student	2	0.6	4	1.2	2	0.7	4	1.6	5	1.7
Outside Mandate	9	2.7	7	2.1	10	3.7	4	1.6	6	2.1
Inter-Personal Relations	6	1.8	5	1.5	4	1.5	8	3.2	5	1.7
College Policy	16	4.8	4	1.2	4	1.5	6	2.4	12	4.2
College Service	9	2.7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Registration & Withdrawal	14	4.2	16	4.8	12	4.5	16	6.4	12	4.2
Residence	3	0.9	1	0.3	0	0	1	0.4	2	0.7
Disability	7	2.1	11	3.3	5	1.9	2	0.8	6	2.1
Student union	4	1.2	6	2.1	0	0	0	0	4	1
Total Cases	335	100	333	100	269	100	249	100	287	100

STATISTICS

Table 3.
Breakdown of Academic Issues 2003-2005.

Issue	#	%	#	%
Academic Appeals	39	21.9	66	36.8
Academic Dishonesty	11	6.2	17	9.5
Evaluation concerns	26	14.6	18	4.5
Inter-personal relations	10	5.6	12	6.7
Other (Academic)	6	3.4	30	16.7
Practicum/Placement/Co-op	15	8.4	15	8.4
Program Policies	2	1.1	6	3.3
Program structure/ operation	10	5.6	6	3.3
Readmission	1	0.5	7	3.9
Teaching style concerns	4	2.2	2	1.1
Specific issue unidentified	54	30	NA	NA
Total Cases	178	100	179	100

Table 4. SEE NEXT PAGE

Table 5.
Complainants by Group Status 2004-2005

Group description	# of Clients	% of Total
EMPLOYEE		
Administration	17	4.7%
Faculty	33	9.2%
Support	11	3.1%
Group Total	61	17.0%
OTHER		
Alumni	2	0.6%
Other	18	5.0%
Student Union	3	0.8%
Group Total	23	6.4%
STUDENT		
Continuing Education	9	2.5%
Full-Time	243	67.7%
Other	20	5.6%
Part-Time	3	0.8%
Group Total	275	76.6%
Total # of Complainants	359	100

STATISTICS

Table 4. Clients by division of complainant 2000-2005

	2004-5		2003-4		2002-3		2001-2		2000-1	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ACADEMIC AREAS										
Academic Services	0	0	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Art And Design	16	4.8	16	4.8	14	5.2	12	4.8	22	6.5
Building Technology	5	1.5	8	2.4	13	4.8	10	4.0	15	4.5
Business Studies	37	11.0	22	6.6	18	6.7	20	8.0	41	12
Communication Arts	16	4.8	26	7.8	15	5.6	13	5.2	22	6.5
Electrical/electronics**	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	9	3.6	9	2.7
General Studies	26	7.8	22	6.6	30	11.1	24	9.6	27	8
Health Sciences	27	8.0	35	10.5	17	6.3	16	6.4	39	11.6
Human Services	50	14.9	46	13.8	37	13.7	25	10	33	0.3
Information Technology	17	5.1	14	4.2	16	5.9	17	6.8	26	7.7
James N. Allan Campus	2	0.6	3	1	3	1.1	4	1.6	4	1.2
Manufacturing Sciences	24	7.2	28	8.4	22	8.2	11	4.4	15	4.4
Motive Power Technology	1	0.3	4	1.2	3	1.1	5	2.0	1	0.3
Nursing	21	6.6	15	4.5	21	7.8	Na	Na	Na	Na
Oxford County Campus	5	1.5	8	2.4	5	1.8	5	2.0	7	2.1
School Of Continuing Education	20	6.0	8	2.4	4	1.6	14	5.6	16	4.7
St. Thomas/elgin Campus	1	0.3	2	0.6	2	0.8	5	2.0	0	0
Tourism & Hospitality	5	1.5	7	2.1	13	4.8	8	3.2	14	4.2
SERVICE AREAS										
Athletics	0	0	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Counselling And Student Life Services	13	3.9	13	3.9	5	1.8	4	1.6	3	1
Finance And Corporate Services	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Human Resources	1	0.3	2	0.6	0	0	1	0.4	1	0.3
Information Systems Services	0	0	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology Service	2	0.6	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library & Media Services	2	0.6	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Office Of The President	0	0	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	2	0.6
Office Of The Registrar	1	0.3	2	0.6	3	1.1	0	0	0	0
Partnerships	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.6
Student And Staff Services	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical Support Services	0	0	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0	0	3	1.1	1	0.4	6	1.8
COMPLAINTS WITHOUT DIVISION	46	12.9	43	12.9	25	9.3	27	10.8	15	4.5
Total Complainants	335	100	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 2000-2005

	2004-5		2003-4		2002-3		2001-2		2000-1	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ACADEMIC AREAS										
Academic Services	2	0.6	2	0.6	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.3
Art And Design	13	3.9	12	3.6	12	4.5	8	3.2	12	3.9
Building Technology	3	0.9	8	2.4	10	3.7	8	3.2	6	1.9
Business Studies	21	6.3	13	3.9	10	3.7	9	3.6	13	4.2
Communication Arts	8	2.4	18	5.4	8	3.0	7	2.8	11	3.6
Electrical/electronics	Na		Na		Na		10	4.0	1	0.3
General Studies	20	6.0	20	6.0	29	10.8	26	10.4	18	5.9
Health Sciences	17	5.1	25	7.5	11	4.1	8	3.2	30	9.8
Human Services	29	8.6	25	7.5	20	7.4	13	5.2	19	6.2
Information Technology (Academic)	11	3.3	10	3.0	9	3.3	9	3.6	11	3.6
James N. Allan Campus	2	0.6	1	0.3	3	1.2	1	0.4	3	0.9
Manufacturing Sciences	20	6.0	23	6.9	18	6.7	6	2.4	11	3.6
Motive Power Technology	1	0.3	1	0.3	2	0.8	3	1.2	1	0.3
Nursing	15	4.5	12	3.6	17	6.3	15	6.0	Na	
Oxford County Campus	2	0.6	2	0.6	2	0.8	6	2.4	6	1.9
School Of Continuing Education	18	5.4	6	1.8	3	1.2	15	6.0	10	3.1
St. Thomas/elgin Campus	1	0.3	2	0.6	0	0	5	2.0	0	0
Tourism & Hospitality	5	1.5	4	1.2	7	2.6	7	2.8	10	3.2
SERVICE AREAS										
Athletics	1	0.3	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.3
Awards & Schollarshis	1	0.3	0	0	1	0.4	1	0.4	0	0
Career Services	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	0	0
Counselling And Student Life Services	2	0.6	7	2.1	5	1.8	1	0.4	1	0.3
Environmental Health & Saefty Service	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	1	0.4	2	0.6
Facilities Maintenance	0	0	2	0.6	0	0	0	0	1	0.3
Facilities Management	2	0.6	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilities Support Services	3	0.9	3	0.9	2	0.8	5	2	4	1.3
Financial Aid Services	11	3.3	20	6.0	16	5.9	15	6.0	27	8.8
Fitness Centre	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	1	0.3
Human Resources	1	0.3	3	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Systems Services	0	0	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information Technology Service	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.4	0	0	0	0
Library & Media Services	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Office Of The President	0	0	0	0	2	0.8	1	0.4	1	0.3
Ombudsman	0	0	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Partnerships	1	0.3	0	0	1	0.4	2	0.8	1	0.3
Planning Services	0	0	2	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Registrar's Office	34	10.1	28	8.4	22	8.2	22	8.8	24	7.8
Retail Services	2	0.6	0	0	0	0	2	0.8	0	0
Residence	4	1.2	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	4	1.3
Security	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER										
Student Union	4	1.2	6	1.8	4	1.5	3	1.2	4	1.3
Respondents Without Division	0	0	7	2.1	5	1.8	11	4.4	8	2.6
Total Cases Without Respondent	78	23	72	21.6	43	16.0	28	11.2	52	16.9
Total Cases	335	100	333	100	269	100	249	100	307	100

STATISTICS

Table 7. Respondents By Group Status 2004-2005

Group description	# of Clients	% of Total
EMPLOYEE		
Administration	88	33.1
Faculty	136	51.1
Support	11	4.1
Group Total	235	88.3
OTHER		
Division	22	8.3
Student Union	4	1.5
Group Total	26	9.8
STUDENT		
Full-Time	5	1.9
Group Total	5	1.9
Total # of Respondents	266	100

Table 8. Cases by Outcome 2000-2005

	2004-5		2003-4		2002-3		2001-2		2000-1	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Appeal	44	13.1	59	17.7	50	18.7	45	18.1	42	14.6
Complaint Filed	19	5.7	36	10.8	16	6.0	10	4.0	6	2.1
Compromise	52	15.5	36	10.8	34	12.6	51	20.5	58	20.2
Complaint Withdrawn	54	16.1	46	13.8	40	15.0	24	9.6	33	11.5
Favoured Complainant	7	2.1	5	1.5	10	3.7	12	4.8	30	10.5
Favoured Respondent	28	8.3	29	8.7	22	8.2	26	10.4	27	9.4
No resolution	0	0	0	0	1	0.4	2	0.8	0	0
Ombuds Withdrew	13	3.9	5	1.5	5	1.9	3	1.2	4	1.4
Provided Information	81	24.2	98	29.4	73	27.3	50	20.1	38	13.2
Referral	37	11.0	18	5.4	18	6.7	25	10.0	49	17.1
Unknown	0	0	1	0.3	0	0	1	0.4	0	0
Total Cases	335	100	333	100	269	100	249	100	287	100