College where complaint originated

Consequential Consequential Consequences					
College	# of students	offenses	Complaints	offenses/10,000 Credit hrs taught	complaints/10,000 Credit hrs taught
Agriculture	2,854	6	25	13	54.3
Arts & Sciences	6,051	109	195	33.7	60.3
B & E	2,772	2	31	3.27	50.7
Communication	ns 1,348	5	14	14.9	41.7
Dentistry	269	1	9	9.6	86.4
Design	380	0	10	0	159.5
Education	2,543	2	24	5.34	64
Engineering	2,751	2	8	5.24	21
Fine Arts	890	0	13	0	43.4
Health Sciences	s 701	0	4	0	24.8
Honors		1	3		
Law	418	0	3	0	24.1
Medicine	1,356	0	5	0	15.7
Nursing	1,254	0	2	0	12.8
Pharmacy	628	2	4	11	22
Public Health	258	0	3	0	60.2
Social Work	579	9	3	79.7	26.6
NA		0	11		

Ombud's Report to the Senate 9-12-2011

Thank you Professor Swanson, Senators and guests.

It is my pleasure to present the report for the 2010 - 2011 academic year. My first objective is to thank Michelle Sohner for the concise statistical report which will be included in the senate minutes for your future reference. Following a few brief comments about the data, I will share a few personal perspectives and then, if you have questions, I will attempt to answer them.

Last year, it was requested that we relate the number of cases handled to the number of students. In the breakdown of cases by college in which the cases originated, Michelle has listed the student enrollment in that college. This may not provide the information desired, because in an A&S class, the students may come from several colleges. If one looks at the data based upon credit hours taught in the college one can see that while the College of A&S generates a large number of offenses and complaints relative to their student numbers, their complaints are not unusually high relative to the number of credit hours taught.

The number of complaints handled by the office (367) is similar to the 377 last year. However the number cases involving academic offenses increased (139 compared with 105 for the 09/10 year). Seventeen of those 139 charged with an academic offense contacted the Ombud but did not appeal and eleven appealed the charge. Eight of the eleven appeals were denied. One appeal was upheld. One student received a reduced penalty and one student's penalty was increased.

Four offenses represented a second offense and one third offense was seen.

As an overall perspective, I continue to believe that most instructors and most students attempt to resolve their issues with integrity though we often start from different perspectives. I appreciate that spirit of good will. In some cases the perspectives of student and instructor are decidedly different and it becomes correspondingly difficult to achieve a resolution. Such cases are more likely than others to end up at the appeals board and the judgment of the board may leave all parties feeling frustrated. Such differences of opinion cannot always be avoided. However, my belief is that when we sense an irreconcilable difference of opinion, encouraging students to seek input from a neutral party such as the Ombud, diminishes their sense of being treated unfairly. It also frees us, the instructors, from the need to commit ourselves so firmly to a position that we cannot graciously accept an alternative ruling should the student win an appeal. Thus I encourage all of us to use the office of the Ombud. Utilized early in a conflict, I believe it can save all parties time and frustration. Please feel free to contact the office if you believe Michelle Sohner or Dr. Fiest-Price, the current Ombud, can be of assistance.

In closing, I note that serving as Academic Ombud has been a meaningful part of my career and I express my sincere thanks to the University for allowing me to serve in this capacity.