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OMBUD Visitor Profiles
2016-17

January to December 2016: 103 visitors
January to August 2017: 87 visitors

Discussion – Advice - Coaching – Mediation - Intervention - Referral
OMBUD Visitor Profiles 2016
- Contract type

**Contract Type**

- **IC**: 44%
- **LD**: 19%
- **Fellow**: 13%
- **Student**: 7%
- **User**: 13%
- **Other**: 4%

**Total**: 103
OMBUD Visitor Profiles 2016 - Gender

Gender: visitor total

- Female: 56 (54%)
- Male: 44 (46%)

Gender: staff member visitors

- Female: 31 (53%)
- Male: 28 (47%)

Gender: staff member visitors relative to CERN population

- Female: 81%
- Male: 19%
OMBUD Categories of Issues 2016
[Classification according to International Ombudsman Association]

Issues: main category

- Career progression and development
- Evaluative relationships
- Peers relationships
- Safety, health and physical environment
- Services and administrative issues
- Values, ethics and standards
OMBUD Outcomes 2016

Distribution of Outcomes

- Advice/Coaching: 49%
- Action: 15%
- Discussion: 33%
- Mediation: 3%

http://ombuds.web.cern.ch
Ombud’s Corner Articles

+ 4 Examples
## OMBUD’s Corner 2016-17 - 25 articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>Sowing the seeds of trust (1 &amp; 2) / Nurturing trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>“That’s not what I meant…” / Lost in the layers / A world without lies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRNESS</td>
<td>Third letter from Ombudsland: focus on fairness / ‘It’s not fair…!’ Defeating unconscious bias / Horns &amp; halos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY</td>
<td>A land of equal opportunity? / Do we not owe it to our daughters? / Accelerating gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Stepping out of our comfort zones / Watch out for those warning signs!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>The gift of feedback (1 &amp; 2) / Empathy – a manager’s key to empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPECT &amp; ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE</td>
<td>Its all about respect… / Bullying in the workplace / Due credit! / Are you being served? / Fourth letter from Ombudsland: bystander action matters!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMBUD MATTERS</td>
<td>The Ombud clock ticks on / Its never the tip of the iceberg…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 September 2017

2016-17 Annual Report / Sudeshna Datta Cockerill
Based on issues brought to Ombud Office

Raise awareness…
… could this apply in any way to me?

29 March 2017

539 unique visitors in one day
10% from CERN people page
Peter has just taken up an offer of internal mobility after returning from sick leave.

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

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

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

He decides to raise the issue with Luca, his Group Leader, but he brushes him off saying that he has known Sasha for years and trusts his judgments implicitly.
Barbara was very keen to lead a particular project.

She spoke to her supervisor Philippe who told her that he had in fact already proposed her to the committee.

When she did not get the job, Barbara shared her disappointment with Charles, one of the committee members, and she was very surprised to learn that her name had never been put forward for consideration.

Who should she believe? She turns to her Section Leader for advice, but her Section Leader refuses to discuss this with her.
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 GroupLeader for advice he is told ‘not to rock the boat’ as Paul is essential to the project and Stefan should learn to stand up for himself.
Gert is a CERN Fellow assigned to work on a key project under the supervision of Max, a senior member of the team.

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 plucks up the courage to explain the situation to his Group Leader and when he does this, his Group Leader promises to speak to Max about it.

Weeks pass and nothing changes.
Observations over 7 years
2011 – 2017

Questions
OMBUD Distribution of Issues 2011- Aug 2017
[Classification according to International Ombudsman Association]

*Evaluative relationships also typically most representative category in other international organizations*

Issues: main categories

- Safety, health and physical environment
- Values, ethics and standards
- Services and administrative issues
- Organization, strategy related
- Peers relationships
- Law, regulations, finance and compliance
- Compensation and benefits
- Career progression and development
- Evaluative relationship

14 September 2017
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http://ombuds.web.cern.ch
Evaluative relationships also typically most representative category in other international organizations
OMBUD Observations
2011-2017: over 7 years

Significantly high proportion of issues raised fall into evaluative relationship: **supervisory (in)effectiveness**

**Are we doing enough to support our managers in their role?**

- **Selection:** interest – competence – people focus…?
- **Training:** initial – regular – ‘sharpening skills’ – exchange…?
- **Expectation:** decision making – early intervention - objectivity…?
- **Accountability:** assessment – lessons learned – incentive…?
Issues raised by Females

- Evaluative relationship: 45
- Career progression and development: 20
- Organization, strategy related: 5
- Safety, health and physical environment: 5
- Services and administrative issues: 16
- Values, ethics and standards: 18

Issues raised by Males

- Evaluative relationship: 43
- Career progression and development: 30
- Organization, strategy related: 21
- Safety, health and physical environment: 13
- Services and administrative issues: 3
- Values, ethics and standards: 11

Evaluative relationships also typically most representative category in other international organizations.
OMBUD Gender of Visitors 2011- Aug 2017
[Classification according to International Ombudsman Association]

Gender: Visitors relative to Staff Member Population

*Evaluative relationships also typically most representative category in other international organizations*

http://ombuds.web.cern.ch
Proportionally higher numbers of women visitors to Ombud persists:

Are we doing enough to provide an equitable and enabling environment for all?

- Equitable
- Unconscious bias
- The ‘whole’ person

Focus on what is needed to give of best
Un-earned advantage/ self awareness
Rapport – risk of collateral damage…
OMBUD 2011 – 2017
- Outcomes

![Graph showing outcomes from 2011 to 2017]

- Mediation
- Discussion
- Advice/Coaching
- Action
Majority prefer discussion or coaching over intervention - citing fear of retaliation or lack of belief in system as reasons.

Are we doing enough to build and maintain trust and a caring work environment?

- Recognition: individuals and teams – outside the MAPS/MERIT system
- Opportunity: attitude to conflict
- Credibility: self awareness - including the ‘right to be wrong’
- Proactive: Continuous dialogue - Visible steps – Modelling the behaviour
Conclusion
OMBUD Action

Perceptions – issues as experienced by the Visitor
Options – strategies by which to deal with the issues
Intervention – only when authorised
Insights – input for concerned employer

If conflicts are handled correctly…

Those little bits of sand can also become pearls…

It is often the “little acts of disrespect and failures in performance feedback that seem to corrode some professional relationships like bits of sand at the beach.”
I have another 11 years to go - I need to feel useful…

People used to be important before – now it’s only the deliverables…

I tried to talk to my supervisor about it – she told me it was all in my imagination…

If you want to continue this [physics] discussion you’ll have to follow me to the men’s room…

I asked my supervisor if he could tell me what I needed to develop in order to avoid another ‘fair’ rating but he told me he couldn’t do that as I would always be a ‘one-step’ man…

He said he had to attribute the ‘fair’ qualification to someone – it was my turn this year…

It’s a masonic structure – there’s no hope if you are not in the ‘in’ group

I was told I had better not involve HR or the Ombud…
Individual responsibility → CERN – wide culture

+++ Visitors to Ombud ‘early intervention’ +++ mediation

Seen to value ‘non-technical aspects’
Input – Action
Communication

Optimise the Investment!

It is worse to know and not act than not to know at all

Perception is key……..
“...it is never the tip of the iceberg that causes the damage [...] it is what lurks under the surface.”

Indeed the image of an Organization is not measured only by the success of its most prominent figures, but also by the way it treats its most vulnerable members.”

CERN Ombud’s Corner, April 2017