

Ombuds Annual Report May 1, 2004 – April 30, 2005

Introduction

Most people would agree that it is important that all members of the university community be treated fairly. Such treatment would, no doubt, enhance the educational experience of students, uphold the legal obligations of the university, and ensure that decision-makers are accountable to university stakeholders.

The difficulty comes, often, in determining what fairness means in any given context. As Ombuds, we concern ourselves fundamentally with fair processes, with an understanding that a tainted process can lead to an incorrect outcome. Individuals often approach us with concerns that a policy has not been properly followed, that a decision-maker is biased against them, that they have not been given adequate reasons for a decision, or that others in a similar situation have been treated differently. In some such cases, an Ombuds may investigate with the permission of the complainant and assist in developing a satisfactory resolution to the dispute.

In cases where fair process is not an issue, “an Ombudsperson can help people by working with them to identify, construct, and evaluate options - by helping them help themselves.”¹ This type of assistance is especially important in a university where the complainants are often students who are unfamiliar with university policies, practices and procedures, and are often unsure where to take their issues.

In addition to assisting students who have a problem with some aspect of their university life, the Ombuds also provide advice to decision-makers on policy matters, usual practices, and issues of procedural fairness.

Often disputes among co-workers have a significant interpersonal dimension that cannot be resolved by referring to rules and regulations. Our office has mediated four employee or faculty conflicts over the period of this report, and offered advice on several others.

Each year, the Ombuds office releases a report, the purpose of which is to document emerging issues and trends in the university community, and to make general recommendations to improve fairness. This year has been another year of transition for the Ombuds office. Marge Huntley filled in for Carolyn Brendon during her maternity leave and was involved in some of the case work included in this report. Carolyn and Shelley are continuing their job-sharing arrangement.

¹Gadlin, H., and Pino, E W, “Neutrality: A Guide for the Organizational Ombudsperson,” *Negotiation Journal*, (1997): 23.

Anyone wishing more information about our office is encouraged to visit our website at www.mcmaster.ca/ombuds.

I **Statistics**

Each year the Ombuds Office prepares some statistical tables (attached) to provide the University community with an idea of the number and types of cases handled by the University Ombuds during the reporting period. During the period from May 1/2004- April 30/2005, there were 369 cases and 59 inquiries (Table 1). These numbers are comparable to the last twelve month reporting period. Inquiries involve issues outside the Ombuds jurisdiction and individuals bringing these types of issue to the Office are often referred to outside community resources - legal and otherwise.

Our database has enabled us to track some additional information. Of particular interest is in the number of visitors who bring more than one issue to the Office. Last year, 132 visitors raised secondary issues. The most common secondary issue, by far, is interpersonal concerns. So, for example, an employee comes to discuss a discipline issue but feels that the underlying problem is a long-term personality clash with his/her supervisor. Often, a visitor is not looking for a solution to this secondary issue but just appreciates an opportunity to discuss it with an impartial listener. Similarly, students often want some information on grade appeals, although this is not the primary reason they chose to visit the office.

Other interesting information our database has revealed is the “year of study” of student visitors to the Office. Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, the numbers are fairly evenly broken down over Years 1- 4 with a slight increase in Year 3. We see more Masters students than Ph.D. students. As always, we tell readers that since we see only about 2% of the total student population each year, we are cautious in drawing too many conclusions from our statistical data.

Given the fairly small sample we work with, the consistency of the statistical data year over year is surprising. The breakdown between student/staff and faculty cases remains fairly constant with the bulk of the Office’s work still centered on student issues (82.5%). (Table 2) Even within categories, the ranking of complaints by number remain fairly constant. So, for many years now, academic appeals and academic integrity issues have been the most common academic issues brought to the office - with petitions and withdrawals not far behind (Table 3). Teaching quality issues are up slightly when you include how many times this was raised as a secondary issue. Under the heading of non-academic student complaints, fees and services have consistently headed the list (Table 4). Both faculty and staff continue to contact the office primarily to discuss issues

pertaining to students and policy interpretation questions (Table 5 and 6). The number of cases in which we actively intervened remained at around the 30% mark (Table 7). This year we tracked our referrals more closely, and not surprisingly, the largest number were to Associate Deans Offices, CSD and HRES. Others we referred to included: Instructors, Career Services, Chairs, MSU Clubs Administrator, MAPS, GSA, Registrars, Graduate Studies, Security, MUSA, Public Relations, Hurst Place, the Chaplaincy and Continuing Education. Whenever we make a referral, we always ask the visitor to come back to our office if they are not satisfied with the help they receive.

At least a couple of times a year, we refer students to the Ontario Ombudsman's Office. More often than not, these referrals involve OSAP policy issues that are outside the jurisdiction of our Financial Aid Office. The Ontario Ombudsman's *Annual Report 2004-2005* contains four case summaries where the Ontario Office successfully intervened on behalf of students with OSAP issues.

Over the last couple of years, we have also been tracking specific issues that may arise in a case, but are not the focus of the visitor's concerns. This year, 60 cases had a "customer service" component, 21 involved a "disability related" issue and 36 raised "confidentiality" concerns.

Any cases mentioned in this Report are described broadly enough to remove any identifying information.

II Update on policies, practices, legislation and prior recommendations

The following lists are not meant to be comprehensive and include only those policies etc. that have come to the attention of the Ombuds Office.

Completed policies

The *Post Doctoral Fellows Policy* was amended and passed last spring, as were the revisions to the *Residence Discipline Code*. The *Deferral of Attendance at Convocation* policy was also passed, effectively granting students some flexibility in when they attend convocation. The McMaster Student Union (hereafter, the MSU) has adopted the University's *Sexual Harassment and Anti-Discrimination Policies*. Unfortunately, it is not entirely clear how the MSU and University policies will interact with each other - from both a practical and procedural standpoint. The University and the MSU need to settle the details and complete any needed revisions to the policies.

On-going policy work

An *ad hoc* committee has been established through Student Affairs and the MSU to revise the *Student Event Risk Management Policy*. This work is nearing completion. A number of *ad hoc* committees have been established through the

Associate Deans group to consider (i) religious accommodation of students (ii) grade changes on University transcripts and (iii) academic accommodations for students who represent McMaster. The Associate and Assistant Deans continue to meet regularly to discuss petitions for missed deferred examinations. These meetings have been very beneficial in helping to develop consistent criteria across faculties on when these petitions should be granted.

Academic integrity on-going work

There is now a Graduate Studies course, mandatory for all graduate students, on academic integrity issues. This three-hour non-credit course familiarizes students with the basic principles of acknowledging sources, as well as alerting them to the technical and conceptual issues they may confront in their efforts to document properly. For some international students, this course may only be a first step in understanding the intricacies of citation rules.

In addition to the policy discussion that takes place in this course, students are also alerted to the various on-campus resources that are available to assist them. One new such resource is a computer program called RefWorks that was recently obtained by Mills Library. According to the library website:

RefWorks is a web-based bibliography and database manager that allows users to create their own personal database by importing references from text files or online databases. They can use these references in writing their papers and automatically format the paper and the bibliography in seconds.

The Academic Integrity Officer has completed a survey of Canadian University's sanctioning practices and will soon be presenting the results of this survey to the Senate Committee on Academic Integrity.

Re-read survey results

Last year, the Ombuds Office circulated a survey on re-reads to the Associate Deans. One goal of the survey was to achieve greater consistency in how re-reads are handled across faculties in order to ensure fairness for students. To this end, the results of the survey were discussed at an Associate Deans Meeting and a consensus was formed regarding best practices in this area.

It was agreed that the process should be as transparent as possible. For example, a student should know before submitting a re-read request if the faculty will only change the grade in those instances where the re-read process results in a mark more than one sub-letter different from the original evaluation.

It was also agreed that, in accordance with the informal inquiry provisions in the *Student Appeal Procedures* guide, instructors should be willing to meet with students who have questions regarding the evaluation of their work: it is not sufficient to simply direct them to the formal appeal routes.

A further goal of the re-read survey was to review the validity of the statistical information provided on "Form A" of the *Student Appeal Procedures*. These statistics indicate to students considering requesting a re-read of their work, what the odds are of their mark increasing/decreasing/or staying the same. Based on the survey results, it was determined that this statistical information was not accurate for the period in which the survey was conducted. The Ombuds Office also questions whether statistics should be a factor in a student's decision whether or not to appeal a grade. For these reasons, the Senate Office has agreed to remove statistics from future printings of "Form A" of the *Student Appeal Procedures*.

Up-date on the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act

As of May 2006, the University will become subject to the Provincial privacy legislation - *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (affectionately know as FIPPA). This *Act* has been in effect since 1988 but until now, universities have been exempt. The University is already subject to the Federal legislation - *The Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA)* but this only applies to a commercial activity, for example the bookstore.

What changes will result when the University is drawn under FIPPA's umbrella? Our current University policy was developed in response to our exclusion from FIPPA and in many respects covers much of the same ground. There is no doubt, however, that FIPPA is a much more detailed document and contains many new reporting, administration and procedural requirements. As well, amendments to FIPPA have been drafted to address some specific university concerns (e.g. research, testing practices, peer review, letters of reference given in confidence). Initially, the number of requests for public access to University records may increase, although based on the experience of Ontario colleges, the number of requests will, hopefully, be manageable.

The University will need to revisit (on a dept.-to-dept. basis) how it: (1) collects personal information from students (2) uses the information collected and (3) discloses the information. Where personal information is collected, students will need to be clearly notified of the legal authority

under which the institution is collecting the information, the principal purpose for the which the information is intended to be used, and the contact information of someone whom students may approach if they have questions about the collection of this information. There will also be a host of administrative matters to attend to including updating record retention policies, ensuring the security of data and organizing regular government reporting. A recent conference on how universities will be impacted by FIPPA stressed that FIPPA'S implementation would require well-planned educational programs for staff (including refresher courses) and the development of an ongoing compliance and due diligence program. We know that efforts are underway in the University to begin addressing all of these issues.

A couple of cautionary notes: surprisingly, FIPPA does not cover university-employee information (see www.ipc.on.ca , Privacy Commissioner's 2004 Annual Report). In addition, student information must fall under the definition of "personal information" to be protected under the *Act*. Furthermore, all of the access rights described in FIPPA only apply to recorded information; and it is generally within the university's purview to decide what information to collect.

Other policy/procedural initiatives

Career Services and Human Resources have developed much needed "Hiring Practice Guidelines" for offices employing McMaster students. It might be helpful if the MSU developed a similar set of guidelines written from a student's perspective.

A thank you to Graduate Studies for putting the results of their Doctoral Exit Surveys on-line. We understand that they are currently working on some refinements to this survey.

The MSU has also established a Diversity Services Initiative and is shortly to launch a student mediation service.

The University Secretariat has scheduled a meeting of the Senate Board for Student Appeals, in part, to address the many issues raised in last years report. There are also plans to discuss training of University tribunals early in the new year.

The MSU will begin, as of January 1st/2006, to send letters to individuals no longer welcome in *Quarters*. These letters will include the reasons for the

decision, the length of time they are to be excluded from the bar, and any appeal route available to them.

III Issues and Recommendations

1. Issue: Complete and correct information

Some documents provide incomplete or misleading information about students' appeal rights. It is important for decision-makers to note that there are university-wide grievance procedures available to students above and beyond what a particular faculty, department, or office may have in place. Information providers should also be aware that not all grievances are amenable to *Petitions for Special Consideration*. Some examples of the kind of cases we have seen on the issue of complete and correct information are as follows:

- A student was advised by a faculty office to submit a *Petition for Special Consideration* to resolve an issue when, in fact, he had a Type 2 grievance under the *Student Appeal Procedures*; specifically, that the method of evaluation was not fair and reasonable. We saw the student for the first time after his petition was denied.
- A course syllabus stated that students had three days to appeal a grade on an assignment or mid-term and that the decision of such an appeal would be final.
- A course syllabus stated that students are required to submit assignments to turnitin.com. According to the *Academic Integrity Website* (2005), "If a student refuses to submit his or her work to turnitin.com, he or she cannot be compelled to do so and should not be punished."
- An application form stated that the decision of a committee was final and no appeal was available.

Recommendation: that course outlines and other documentation be reviewed periodically to make sure they contain complete and correct information, particularly in the area of appeals; that forms used by non-academic university offices should also be scrutinized because many non-academic processes also

have appeal rights; that information-providers become familiar with the *Student Appeal Procedures* Policy and use caution when categorizing student complaints.

2. Issue: Information on petitioning

Currently, information on *Petitions for Special Consideration* can be found in the *Student Appeal Procedures*, and information on *Relief for Missed Work* and for *Petitions for Deferred Examinations* can be found in the Undergraduate and Graduate calendars.

Recommendation: that all information on petitions involving missed work and deferred exams be included in the *Student Appeal Procedures* when it is next reviewed.

Academic Integrity

Inappropriate Collaboration

We have seen a number of cases where students are permitted to collaborate but then are charged under the *Academic Integrity Policy* for handing in assignments that are too similar. In one case, a student reported that his instructor told him he was being charged because he didn't "cover his tracks well enough." It is important that instructors be sensitive to the possibility that students may be receiving mixed messages on what is and is not acceptable when it comes to collaboration. The Academic Integrity office is working on developing more extensive guidelines on the topic of inappropriate collaboration.

Fair opportunity to answer charge.

Under the policy, students are afforded a "fair opportunity to answer the charge". Several students have complained that they have been found in violation of the policy without having had such an opportunity. In several cases, the instructor made a decision either before or without having listened to the student's side of the story. It is important that instructors keep an open mind and consider all relevant information before finding that a student has breached the policy.

Procedural Safeguards

We have also seen students who have been told by an instructor that if they confess to plagiarism, they will receive a lesser penalty: students are often too vulnerable to make informed decisions under these conditions, and may admit to something that they have not done out of pressure. Given the trusting nature of the professor-student relationship, students may believe they are getting disinterested advice in such a situation when this many not

be the case. It is important to remember that we are dealing with a vulnerable population and, that, as decision-makers, we have a duty to uphold the procedural safeguards afforded students under the policy.

Further Academic Consequences

On occasion students who are found guilty of academic dishonesty may receive a sanction that has an impact beyond what is apparent at first blush. So, for example, a student receives an “F” in a course and when combined with his/her other marks, this leads to a request for the student to withdraw. Similarly, a student is suspended for a year but when they try to return they are not reinstated because of their poor grades. Students are often surprised (rightly or wrongly) by this domino effect. It would be helpful to these students to be told that the sanction they receive may result in further academic consequences and that they be referred, where appropriate, to academic counselling.

3. Issue: The role of dishonest intent in academic integrity cases.

There is a lack of consensus among decision-makers on how to interpret the *Academic Integrity Policy*: some believe that dishonest intent should not be a factor in reaching a conclusion as to whether or not a paper has been plagiarized, while others believe that, without concluding that a student has been dishonest, there can be no finding that the policy has been breached.

This issue comes up most often in situations where a student accused of plagiarism has provided some documentation in an assignment, but the references are inadequate.

This difference of opinion among decision-makers may be, in part, a result of the evidentiary issues involved in establishing dishonest intent: it is difficult to know for certain the “intent” of anyone. Intent must be inferred based on the evidence.

The Graduate Calendar (2005-06) offers some guidance on when a decision-maker should or should not infer dishonest intent: a complete “failure to note sources”, will invariably be construed as an attempt to deceive however, “the inadequate notation of sources may (or may not) be construed as an attempt to deceive” (14).

Other factors should also be considered in deciding whether or not there is dishonest intent - such as the amount and type of instruction on proper documentation, whether the student is a graduate or undergraduate,

whether a student comes from a culture familiar with Western notions of ownership of ideas, and whether this is a first or second offence.

Recommendation: that the Senate Committee on Academic Integrity discuss the role of dishonest intent in relation to academic integrity cases in an effort to develop a consensus on the correct interpretation of the policy, and if need be, review the policy and make appropriate changes.

4. Issue: The importance of confidentiality / privacy concerns

Three years ago the Ombuds *Annual Report* contained a section on confidentiality. We commented at the time on how many visitors to the office raised a confidentiality concern, either related to their primary complaint or as a side issue. The same is true again this year, presumably reflecting society's increasing concerns in this area. We tracked 36 cases where this issue arose. Some of the cases included the following:

- a student has trouble obtaining security reports relating to a Student *Code of Conduct* issue
- an e-mail is accidentally sent to the wrong student in an academic dishonesty case
- an employee is told he must hand in an original VISA statement to be reimbursed for an expense
- a student's phone number is released to an instructor without a "need to know" being established
- grades are posted by student number and result in identifying the grades of a mature student whose number is distinct
- a departmental meeting is taped over the objections of some of the attendees (there is no reason a meeting cannot be taped, although it certainly raises some issues from a collegiality standpoint)
- notification of an academic dishonesty charge is sent to individuals not entitled to notice

In some of the above examples-- the request for the security report, the issue with the phone number, and the posting of the grades--the new legislation will require the University to tighten up its procedures. In some of the cases, however, it is more a question of people's perceptions of what should be put into the public arena and what is acceptable behaviour in this regard. Of course, it is extremely difficult to remedy these situations once they have occurred.

Recommendation: that decision-makers continue to be sensitive to the privacy implications of the decisions they make, whether or not they fall explicitly within the University's policies or provincial legislation.

Graduate Students

We continue to see students regarding difficulties with supervisors, often having to do with the hierarchical nature of the relationship. For example, several students have complained that their supervisor has shared too much personal information, requiring the student to act as a confidant. In one case, a student complained that her supervisor instructed her not to talk to any other members of her committee about her work unless she vet it through the supervisor first. As long as they are behaving reasonably, students should be able to contact any member of their committee to discuss their work.

5. Issue: Ownership of student work/academic integrity

We have seen several graduate students on this issue. In one case, a graduate student felt that his professor had plagiarized work the student had done for his Ph.D. thesis. In another case, a student had concerns about the order in which his name had been listed on a joint research project involving his supervisor and other researchers. In another case, a student was encouraged by her supervisor to include research results at a conference that were not appropriately verified. Students are often confused about where they can take these concerns and how their confidentiality will be protected.

Recommendation: that the university publicize to graduate students that the Associate Deans of Graduate Studies are available for confidential consultations on matters of ownership of student work and academic integrity involving professors

6. Issue: Graduate students who become employed by their supervisors

It is not uncommon for graduate students to stay on after they have completed their degrees as employees of their former supervisors. This arrangement often leads to difficulties: the relationship is often highly informal compared to most employment relationships, and the terms and conditions are frequently not discussed in advance. For example, the student-turned-employee may not know how much money he/she will be

making, what hours he/she is expected to work, or what is the duration of the contract.

If things start deteriorating, these former-student employees may find it difficult to complain, as they are likely to need references from their former supervisors and are sensitive to the power imbalance in the relationships.

Recommendation: that professors who wish to employ someone whom they have supervised, formalize the relationship as much as possible ahead of time, and turn their minds to the fact that an employment relationship is much different than a student -professor relationship.

7. Issue: Graduate Students switching from a thesis-based to a course based Masters program.

A case this year revealed that in some faculties, Master students are prohibited from switching from a thesis-based to a course- based Masters program once they have started their program. However, there seems to be some discrepancies between Faculties on this issue and not all faculty members are aware that transfers between programs are not permitted.

Recommendation: that Graduate Studies clarify and communicate their position on whether Masters students within the University are permitted to switch from a thesis-based to a course-based Masters program (and visa versa).

Fair Process Cases

8. Issue: The need to ensure fair processes

As mentioned earlier, as Ombuds we are concerned about promoting fair processes within the University. This year we saw a number of cases on this issue including the following:

- a member of a hearing panel had previous knowledge of a prior finding against one of two co-accused
- a decision-maker had previous confidential information about an appellant
- a decision-maker was potentially in a conflict-of-interest situation because of his relationship with a prior decision-maker

In the first two cases, the decision-makers believed that they could proceed to make an unbiased decision and that the students could consent to them hearing the cases. Fair process demands more, particularly when students are

unrepresented and relying on University decision-makers to ensure that they are treated fairly. It is also important in these circumstances to remember the old adage, “the process must not only be fair, it must be *perceived* to be fair”. Errors by decision-makers pertaining to fair process may lead to appeals. This year, a sanction was reduced by the Senate Board, in part, on the basis that the initial decision-maker had information on a student’s prior record before concluding whether he/she was in current breach of a policy.

Recommendation: that more education be directed to decision-makers (at every level) on the meaning of fair process, how to make a fair decision, and when they may be in a conflict of interest situation.

Other Activities and Professional Development

We continue to work hard to raise awareness of the office on campus by attending a number of orientation sessions including the New Faculty Meet and Greet event, Clubs Fest, and the Residence staff training sessions. Information on the office is included in the Calendar, the MSU and CSD Almanacs, and many other University and MSU handbooks and publications. This year, the Ombuds Office participated in “Prelude to McMaster” – thank you for including us in this first year initiative. A work-study student is again assisting us in our efforts to inform the campus of our service.

We are members of a number of committees including: the Anti-Violence network, Students in Difficulty, President’s Advisory Committee on Building an Inclusive Community, as well as several ad hoc committees. We continue to assist with policy development on campus and we participate in the Mary Keyes Leadership Certificate Program by leading a workshop on “How to Handle Difficult Behaviour in a Work Setting”

We continue to be active in our national organization - ACCUO (Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons), attending a mid-year conference in Ottawa in January 2005. In addition, we are members of an umbrella Ombuds organization - the Forum of Canadian Ombudsman, attending their conference in Toronto in May, 2005. As well, Carolyn attended the SASA conference on students and mental health in March 2005.

In Appreciation

We would like to thank the many staff and faculty who provide us with information, clarification, and other forms of assistance in resolving issues brought to our attention. In particular, we would like to thank Eleanor Frank, Assistant Dean for Social Sciences who is always willing to explain a university issue and discuss best practices. A thanks also to Pauline Taggart, MSU Network Administrator for her patience. And as always, thank you to the students, staff and faculty who entrust us with their concerns.

Ombuds Office Annual Report
May 1, 2004 – April 30, 2005

Issues and Recommendations

1. **Issue:** Complete and correct information
Recommendation: that course outlines and other documentation be reviewed periodically to make sure they contain complete and correct information, particularly in the area of appeals; that forms used by non-academic university offices should also be scrutinized because many non-academic processes also have appeal rights. That information-providers become familiar with the Student Appeal Procedures Policy and use caution when categorizing student complaints.
2. **Issue:** Information on petitioning
Recommendation: that all information on Petitions for missed work and deferred exams be included in the Student Appeal Procedures policy.
3. **Issue:** The role of dishonest intent in academic integrity cases
Recommendation: that the Senate Committee on Academic Integrity discuss the role of dishonest intent in relation to academic integrity cases in an effort to develop a consensus on the correct interpretation of the policy, and if need be, review the policy and make appropriate changes
4. **Issue:** The importance of confidentiality/privacy concerns
Recommendation: that decision-makers continue to be sensitive to the privacy implications of the decisions they make, whether or not they fall explicitly within university policies or provincial legislation
5. **Issue:** Ownership of student work/academic integrity
Recommendation: that the university publicize to graduate students that the Associate Deans of Graduate Studies are available for confidential consultations on matters of ownership of student work and academic integrity involving professors
6. **Issue:** Graduate Students who become employed by their supervisors
Recommendation: that professors who wish to employ someone whom they have supervised, formalize the relationship as much as possible ahead of time, and turn their minds to the fact that an employment relationship is much different than a student /professor relationship.

7. Issue: Graduate students switching from a thesis-based to a course based Masters program.

Recommendation: that Graduate Studies clarify and communicate their position on whether Masters students within the University are permitted to switch from a thesis based to a course based Masters (and visa versa).

8. Issue: The need to ensure fair processes

Recommendation: that more education be directed to decision-makers (at every level) on the meaning of fair process, how to make a fair decision and when they may be in a conflict of interest situation.

STATISTICS FOR OMBUDS OFFICE
May 1, 2004-April 30, 2005

Table 1 – Number of Cases

	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Total
Cases	25	30	16	18	31	29	37	26	50	39	25	43	369
Inquires*	6	7	4	5	7	6	3	2	7	2	6	4	59

*Inquiries involve matters outside the jurisdiction of the Ombuds Office e.g. landlord and tenant, employment, family, and civil cases. These matters are often referred to an outside resource.

Table 2 - Status of Individuals Who Initiate Cases

Full-time undergraduate	228
Part-time undergraduate	12
Graduate	29
Continuing Education	3
Staff – McMaster University	
▪ Roll 3	2
▪ Student	5
▪ TMG	27
▪ Union	11
McMaster Students Union	
▪ Full-time	4
▪ Student	1
Faculty	29
Other –	
▪ University Applicants	8
▪ Former Students	12
▪ Former Employees	2
TOTAL	373

** The number of inquirers is greater than the number of cases because sometimes two people or a group come in with the same problem.

Note: These statistics are collected by the manual inputting of data and while every effort is made to ensure accuracy, there may be minor discrepancies.

Table 3 – Student Cases (Academic)

Student Cases – Academic	Primary	Secondary	Total
Academic Misconduct	40	4	44
Accommodation	4	1	5
Admission			
▪ Program	2		2
▪ University	5		5
Course Rules/Mgmt	10	4	14
Examinations	17	3	20
Grad Thesis/Supervision	9	2	11
Grade Appeal/Practice	35	13	48
Interpersonal	7	20	27
Other	13	4	17
Petition			
▪ Deferred Exam	6	2	8
▪ Other	9	1	10
▪ Retro Withdrawal	8		8
Student Cases – Academic	Primary	Secondary	Total
Program Requirements	5	6	11
Teaching Quality	8	5	13
Transcripts	5		5
Withdrawal/Reinstatement	18	9	27
TOTAL	201	74	275

Table 4 – Student Cases (Non-Academic)

Student Cases – Non Academic	Primary	Secondary	Total
Association/Clubs	5		5
Fees/Financial			
▪ Financial Aid	6	1	7
▪ University/MSU	13		13
Interpersonal	3	8	11
Other	16	2	18
Registration	5	1	6
Residence – Discipline	5		5
Residence – Other	11	1	12
Services			
▪ MSU	7	1	8
▪ University	12	5	17
Student Code of Conduct	8	2	10
TOTAL	91	21	112

Table 5 - Staff Cases

Staff – University and MSU	Primary	Secondary	Total
Discipline	3		3
Disability/Accommodation		1	1
Interpersonal	3	8	11
Issue Involving a Student	6	4	10
Other	7	2	9
Process/Policy	17	1	18
Termination	7	2	9
Terms of Employment	3	2	5
Working Conditions	4	3	7
TOTAL	50	23	73

Table 6 – Faculty Cases

Faculty	Primary	Secondary	Total
Employment Issues	2	3	5
Freedom of Information/Confidentiality	1	1	2
Hearing Process	1	1	2
Interpersonal	2	4	6
Issue Involving Student	8	1	9
Other	2		2
Policy Interpretation	8	2	10
Practices in Other Programs	3		3
Role and Authority of Offices	1	2	3
Services	1		1
TOTAL	29	14	43

Table 7 – Frequency of Specific Types of Concerns

Customer Service	60
Disability Related Issue	21
Privacy/Confidentiality	36

Table 8 – Type of Action on Cases

Information	17
Referral	29
Advice	225
Intervention	
▪ clarification	45
▪ facilitation and mediation	3
▪ negotiation	48
▪ investigation and recommendation	3
TOTAL	370