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OMBUD Role

- Provide confidential assistance in the informal resolution of interpersonal issues in the interest of the good functioning of CERN & the wellbeing of all its contributors
- Promote a respectful workplace environment through actions aimed at raising awareness & providing guidance on the day to day application of the CERN Code of Conduct
- Contribute to Organizational culture change by raising systemic issues with management, as applicable
OMBUD Principles

Confidentiality
Neutrality / Impartiality
Informality
Independence
OMBUD Actions

Discussion — a ‘safe place’ to tell your story & get another perspective
Advice — information regarding other services or resources available
Coaching — support in identifying options to work out a strategy for action
Mediation — meet in Ombud presence to find mutually acceptable solution
Intervention — Ombud action only on authorisation of person concerned
Referral — Ombud referral to other services as applicable
OMBUD Visitors 2015

Contract Type

- IC: 44%
- LD: 15%
- Fellow: 7%
- Student: 10%
- User: 22%
- PDAS: 1%
- Other: 1%

Total: 106
OMBUD Visitors: Gender - 2015

Gender: visitor total

- Female: 58%
- Male: 42%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender: staff member visitors

- Female: 40%
- Male: 60%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender: staff member visitors relative to CERN

- Female: 72%
- Male: 28%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OMBUD Categories of Issues 2015
[Classification according to International Ombudsman Association]

Issues: main category

- Career progression and development
- Evaluative relationships
- Organization, strategy related
- Peers relationships
- Safety, health and physical environment
- Services and administrative issues
- Values, ethics and standards

http://ombuds.web.cern.ch
Evaluative relationships also typically most representative category in other international organizations
OMBUD Outcomes

Distribution of Outcomes - 2015

- Action: 21%
- Advice/Coaching: 35%
- Discussion: 40%
- Mediation: 4%

http://ombuds.web.cern.ch
OMBUD Other Activities

Blog

“It’s not fair…”
31 May 2016

The perception of unfair treatment can be quite detrimental, as it can lead to feelings of demotivation, which ultimately leaves employees feeling discouraged and helpless. What are some of the strategies that would allow managers to prevent or limit the risk of alienation, or to help those who have already experienced it? On the other hand, as colleagues facing these circumstances, to cope with these feelings and to move on?

Third letter from ombudsman: Focus on fairness.
16 May 2016

Spring is here again, and once again it is time to reflect on the role of the International Ombudsman Association.

Defeating unconscious bias
06 April 2016

Do you have a tendency to switch off at meetings every time a particular colleague starts talking? Is it obvious to you that your colleagues will never accept a peer as a project leader? And does a candidate from your own alma mater clearly have a definite edge over the others?

...communication...
...need for more guidance & feedback...
...respect across professions / levels...
...everyday sexism...
...toxic tales / information flow...
...fairness...bullying...
...inclusiveness...
...trust...
The Ombud is there for YOU
Staff Members, Fellows, Students, Users, Contract staff...
And supervisors…!

Make contact as soon as possible
→ the quicker an issue is addressed, the easier it is to resolve

Tel: 74127
Case Studies
OMBUD Case Study 1: Barbara

Barbara has just taken up an offer of internal mobility after returning from sick leave.

However, within a very short time, she starts to feel isolated, realising that she is often left out of invitations to meetings and informal exchanges and, as a result, lacks the up-to-date information she needs.

Quite by chance, she learns that Sasha, her supervisor, had not been keen for her to join the team and had warned the others not to share too much with her, as she “was very close to someone in a rival project”.

Despite all her efforts, the label persists and she is unable to establish good working relationships with Sasha or anyone else in the team.

She decides to raise the issue with Luca, her section leader, but he brushes her off saying that he has known Sasha for years and trusts his judgments implicitly.
Sergey is in charge of an important project that was recently moved into a newly created section.

He explains his work to the new section leader and keeps him up to date through regular weekly briefings, providing him with input for the upper management as needed.

A few months later, Sergey happens to attend a meeting on a related topic where his results are cited and he is extremely surprised to realise that his department head is not aware of his leading contribution to the project.

What should he do?
John is not happy about the recent appointment of another colleague to a project leadership role that he believes should have been assigned to him. He cannot understand this choice as he is clearly the most technically qualified in the team.

Max, his Section Leader tells him that “the selection was made on the basis of a combination of factors” and that he counts on him to support the new project leader.

John does not understand what these factors might be… all he sees is that once again the leadership role is given to someone else and he is left “doing all the work”.

When John challenges him about his choice, Max shouts at him, saying that it is time that he stopped moaning & started behaving like a team player.
OMBUD Case Study 4: Peter

Peter was very keen to lead a particular project.

He spoke to his supervisor Philippe who told him that he had in fact already proposed him to the board.

When he did not get the job, Peter shared his disappointment with Charles, one of the board members, and he was very surprised to learn that his name had never been put forward for consideration.

Who should he believe? He turns to his Section Leader for advice
Carlo needs to appoint a project leader to replace a colleague who has just retired.

He announces this to his team and invites all the members to express their interest. Both François and Jane put themselves forward and he thanks them for their commitment.

The same afternoon, the whole group gets an e-mail announcing that Mats, a young engineer from another department has been appointed to the position.

When questioned, Mats tells them that this had been agreed weeks ago.

When challenged, Carlo tells his team that the decision had been imposed on him by the Group Leader.
Marc and Anna are asked to produce a status report on their joint project, and they agree that he should prepare the first draft.

He writes the report and sends it to her on Thursday for comment. Anna spends her weekend revising it.

However, when she sends it to Marc on Monday morning, he tells her that he had forgotten to mention that Friday was the deadline for the report and that he has already sent it to the review board.

She storms into her Section Leader’s office to complain, and is told not to be so competitive – the important thing is that the report was done, and she is lucky to have a colleague who met the deadline.
Susan has just accepted a new position.

Very quickly, she realises that Philip, her supervisor, constantly has his eye on her - observing what she does and how she does things, regularly correcting tiny details in her work and intervening with stakeholders before she has a chance to address them herself.

Despite being herself a recognised expert in the field, she begins to doubt her own choices and becomes timid and tentative in her work, even hesitating to take the actions that she knows have been successful in the past.

Philip interprets this as proof that she needs to be constantly supervised and complains to the Section Leader saying that Susan is not up to the job.
Stefan, Paul and Lucas work together on a challenging project.

Over time, Lucas has started to notice Paul’s verbally aggressive behaviour towards Stefan: he frequently criticises him in public, cuts him short at meetings when he is trying to make his point and is known to make derogatory remarks about him behind his back.

Stefan does not seem to react but the tension between them is evident and Lucas feels increasingly uncomfortable in their company.

When Lucas asks his Section Leader for advice he is told ‘not to rock the boat’ as Paul is critical to the project and Stefan should learn to stand up for himself.
Gert is a CERN Fellow assigned to work on a critical project under the supervision of Max, a senior physicist. As the days pass, Gert realises that he only gets repetitive, maintenance type assignments to do. He feels that he is not learning much at all and tries several times to ask Max for more challenging work but Max never responds. Things come to a head one day when Max loses his temper and shouts at Gert saying that he ‘doesn’t have time to waste on showing him what to do’ and tells him to find himself something useful to do. Gert talks to his HRA who recommends that he explain the situation to his section leader and when he does this, his section leader promises to speak to Max about it. Weeks pass and nothing changes.