Positive Campus Climate – A Missing Ingredient in Your Compliance Program?
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Objectives

• Learn how strong leadership commitment to structure, communication and resources can aid students, staff and faculty to navigate through change and conflict, and can help identify and mitigate compliance issues

• Identify strategies used in a rapidly growing campus to build an ethical and conflict-competent environment that drives compliant behavior, reporting of noncompliance and overall wellbeing

• Understand how perception workshops and discussion groups may be used to effectively drive awareness, identify compliance and ethical issues and control environment risks, and solicit potential improvement opportunities from all levels of the workplace
Leadership Commitment: Structure, Communication and Resources

• Climate & Compliance functions co-localized
  o Structure to allow Compliance Officer to be fully engaged in climate issues

• Climate units need to be fully funded
  o Personnel and programming

• Early communication and timely responses are key
  o Multiple reporting options
  o Timely connection of stakeholders to resources
  o Timely internal coordination, response and formal communication from leadership

UC Merced Office of Campus Climate & Compliance (OC3): Structure

Climate (informal)
• Conflict Resolution & Mediation
• Ombuds Office
• Sexual Violence Victim Advocacy
• Training & Awareness
• Chancellor’s Advisory Councils
• Behavioral Threat Assessment
• Protest Oversight
• Bias Response

Compliance (formal)
• Complaint Oversight/Management
• Ethics & Compliance Program
• Investigations/Fact Finding (Whistleblower, Title IX/VII, EEO/AA)
• Internal Audit
• Policy & Procedures
• Privacy
Funding & Commitment Matters

Climate (informal)
- Conflict Resolution & Mediation
- Ombuds Office
- Sexual Violence Victim Advocacy
- Training & Awareness
- Chancellor’s Advisory Councils
- Behavioral Threat Assessment
- Protest Oversight
- Bias Response

• Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Grant Program (15K/year)
• Establishment of a CARE Office (Sexual Violence Victim Advocacy) (183K/yr)
• Threat Assessor (15K/yr)
• Training for Ombuds Office (10K/yr)
• Chancellor’s Dialogue on Diversity and Interdisciplinary series (10K/year)
• Diversity Educator Training (40K/year)

Funding & Commitment Matters: Results

• Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Grant Program (15K/year)
• Campus-generated proposals funded to increase awareness of diversity, equity & inclusion issues

• Establishment of a CARE Office (Sexual Violence Victim Advocacy) (183K/yr)
• This year provided advocacy services to 40 clients, 1,056 follow-up services, 65 mandatory programs, and 122 prevention activities with approx 4,600 people in attendance

• Threat Assessor (15K/yr)
• Prevented potential harm to others by disgruntled employee; demonstration to unit that university responds to climate issues

• Training for Ombuds Office (10K/yr)
• Creation of conflict mediation website and delivery of mediation services
Formal Reporting Mechanisms for Climate Cases – Options for Anonymous Reporting

- University of California Systemwide Whistleblower Hotline – Climate Partition
  - 5 cases received in Fiscal Year 17-18
- BIRST (Bias Incident Response Team) – Climate Feedback report option
  - 27 cases received since inception over past 4 months

Notes about Anonymous Reporting:
- Anonymous reporters talk
- Respect anonymous nature of complaints to encourage reporting
- Communicate institutional actions using multiple approaches to reach multiple stakeholders
  - Ability to send private messages to anonymous reporter
  - General messages from leadership to address climate issues if multiple anonymous reports

Not Everyone Wants to Report – Need to Offer Confidential Resources

Conflict Resolution Resources (Informal)
Supervisors, managers, staff, faculty, professors, resident assistants (RAs) and teaching assistants (TAs): The best conflict resolution method is to address the conflict early. Start with the people closest to the situation. Reach out to informal resources when needed and know your formal resources.

- **Office of the Ombuds** - for students, staff and faculty. Confidential, informal, neutral and independent.
- **Office of Campus Climate** - for students, staff and faculty. Private, conflict resolution and mediation on an informal basis.
- **Behavioral Intervention Team (BiT)** - for students, staff and faculty when there is a perceived danger to self or others.
Case Management Teams (CMT): Cross-Functional Communication that includes Climate & Compliance

- CMT-V: reviews cases of sexual harassment/violence
- BIRST (Bias Incident Response Team): reviews bias/acts of intolerance cases with goal of addressing campus-wide climate issues
- BIT (Behavioral Intervention Team): reviews potential threats to self or others

Cross-Communication Structures to Mitigate Emerging Climate Issues & Address Formal Complaints

Effective use of climate information to mitigate non-compliance starts with coordinated *internal* communication
Institutional Response and Communication

Office of Campus Climate and Compliance

- CMT-V: Sexual Harassment & Violence
- CMT-HR: High-risk personnel cases, Reorganizations
- CMT-WB: Whistleblower Investigation Workgroup
- BIT: Behavior Intervention Team, Threats to self/others
- BIRST: Bias Incident Response Team

- How will institutional response be communicated to reporter? to workforce?
- Need central coordinating point of contact to advise senior leadership about pros/cons of various communication strategies
- When does an emerging climate issue warrant communication to all campus stakeholders from senior leadership?

Strategies for Building an Ethical and Conflict Competent Campus

Challenges
- Mistrust
- Lack of Communication
- Lack of Policies & Procedures
- High Conflict Environment

Strategies
- Communicating Values/Principles of Community
- Responding Timely to Complainants – Sending Strong Message to Would-Be Respondents
- Climate Surveys & Focus Groups – ASK for Feedback
- Provide Opportunities for Formal Dialogue about Controversial Issues
- Policy Development – Provides Platform to Reiterate Values & Expectations
### Workplace Bullying
#### UC Merced

#### UC Merced 2018 Risk Assessment

**Risk:** Experience discrimination, bias or harassment
- Definitely/Likely to occur or has occurred: 69%
- Needs Improvement/Not being handled: 78%

**Comments:** Too much bias and nepotism, bigger problem as we grow, issues reported are ignored or not addressed appropriately, observe but do not report due to fear of retaliation

**Risk Type:** Strategic, Compliance, Operational, Reputation

**Risk:** Fear of retaliation for reporting improper conduct or other issues
- Definitely/Likely to occur or has occurred: 73%
- Needs Improvement/Not being handled: 100%

**Comments:** Rumors of retaliation, do not see problems getting corrected or issues addressed, lack of confidentiality, don’t want to get involved, campus is too small so everyone knows WHO

**Risk Type:** Strategic, Compliance, Operational, Fraud, Reputation

---

### Workplace Bullying
#### UC Merced

#### Policy Details

- **Scope:** applies to ALL University employees, administrators, staff, faculty, other academic appointees, including graduate student employees, fellows and visiting scholars, and non-affiliates.
- **Effective Date:** January 1, 2017
- **Purpose:**
  - Reinforces UC Merced’s dedication to maintaining a respectful workplace environment that is free from violence, threats of violence, harassment, intimidation, bullying or any behavior that a “reasonable person” would find abusive.
  - Includes information about how to report concerns about this type of behavior.
Campus Perception Workshops and Discussion Groups

• How they drive awareness;
• help Identify compliance, ethical issues and control environment risks; and
• enable us to solicit potential improvement opportunities from all levels of the workforce.

Risk Areas - Governance

UC Merced Ethics and Compliance Program (ECP) - Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECP Executive Committee/Audit Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellors, CECO, Campus Counsel, CIO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECP Management Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CECO, Chair and CECO Designee, Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CECO &amp; LDO</th>
<th>Ethics, Financial Compliance, Policy and Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Student Health &amp; Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
<td>Safety and Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Privacy and Security Committee (IPSC)</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Member UCOP Office of Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Operational Risks Committee (F&amp;O)</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Member Campus Counsel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ad-Hoc Committees – As Needed for Emerging Risks and Work Plans
Risk Assessment and Ethics/Climate Intersect

- **Annual risk assessment process**
  - Higher Ed Environment
  - Committees
  - Data analysis
  - Investigation and audit activity
  - Interviews

- **Need to assess the ethical and climate pulse of our campus environment**
  - Identify potential ethics and climate issues
  - Provide a more complete view of risk for Office of Campus Climate and Compliance planning

Perception Workshops and Discussion Groups Drive Awareness and Help Decrease Risks

- **Events**
  - Ethics and Compliance Week
  - Student Integrity Week
  - Risk/Perception Workshops
  - Town Halls
  - Other Forums

- **Value is in discussion and developing relationships**
  - Goal - Focus on the big stuff
  - Perception versus reality
  - Importance of ethical foundation and positive campus environment
  - Head off potential formal complaints?

- **Importance of engagement**
  - Engagement at all levels
  - Open and honest input
  - Request detail to act on
When I see or hear something that is disrespectful, dishonest or unfair, I tend to look the other way unless it affects me personally.

- **Total**: 86% Disagree, 14% Agree
- **Other**: 100% Disagree
- **Staff Member**: 3% Disagree, 97% Agree
- **Undergrad**: 22% Disagree, 78% Agree
- **Grad**: 50% Disagree, 50% Agree

**2017 Participants**
- 51% Undergraduate Students
- 45% Staff Members
- 3% Graduate Students
- 1% Other

**Up from 79% in 2016**
- 97% of Staff Disagree
- 78% of Undergrads Disagree
- 50% of Grads Disagree

People who are willing to lie, cheat, or break the rules are more likely to succeed than those who do not.

- **Total**: 86% Disagree, 14% Agree
- **Other**: 100% Disagree
- **Staff Member**: 14% Disagree, 86% Agree
- **Undergrad**: 15% Disagree, 85% Agree
- **Grad**: 0% Disagree, 100% Agree

**2017 Participants**
- 51% Undergraduate Students
- 45% Staff Members
- 3% Graduate Students
- 1% Other

**Up from 78% in 2016**
- 86% of Staff Disagreed
- 86% of Students Disagreed
Ethics and Compliance Week Surveys

If a person in a leadership/authority role directed me to do something I feel is unethical, I would:

- Follow Directions
- Refuse

2017 Participants
- 51% Undergraduate Students
- 45% Staff Members
- 3% Graduate Students
- 1% Other

2018 Risk Perception Workshop
- 42 Participants
- Still Collecting Data Electronically
- Survey – Risk Perceptions
- Faculty Input from Liaison Workshops
- Specific Risk Scenarios
  - Capital project and internal controls (or lack thereof)
  - Unhappy employee with unique skillset looking for another job
  - Faculty dilemma in understanding process for submitting a grant
  - Hiring dilemma and waiver process
Workshop Format – Identifying and Assessing Perception Risks

• Share assessment purpose, value, how information will be used
• Anonymity is key
  o No attendance check or sign-in sheets
  o Clicker software for real time data gathering and anonymous voting
  o Anonymous input sheets for comments, examples and details for clarity
• Value is in discussion and developing relationships
  o Dialogue about questions and scenarios help provide context and invite discussion
  o Ensure attendees are on the same page with topic before voting
  o Reiterate importance of questions and comments before voting
• Anonymous voting on risk questions
  o Is it a risk currently or will it be in the next year
  o Is the risk being handled, does it need improvement, or is it being ignored
• Show results of voting during workshop
• Solicit what we’re doing well and potential improvement opportunities

Top 10 FY18-19 Risk Perceptions by Highest Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Perception</th>
<th>Definitely or Likely to Occur</th>
<th>Needs Improvement or Not Being Handled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accountability if serious organizational issues are reported.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability to retain qualified faculty, staff and management</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of clear organizational responsibilities, process maps, policies, or separation of duties that could result in errors, omissions, opportunity for...</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient faculty, staff and management to adequately perform key controls and management reviews</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of unfair hiring practices; hiring unqualified staff, faculty, or management</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of retaliation for reporting suspected violations of laws, fraud, waste, abuse and noncompliance issues</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure to circumvent or override existing policies or controls, or do something you feel uncomfortable about</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing discrimination, bias or harassment?</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability to recruit qualified faculty, staff and management</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture/perception of unethical behavior or poor tone at the department management level</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top Risk Perceptions - Putting the Pieces Together

2. Lack of Ability Retain Qualified Faculty, Staff and Management
- No. 1 in 2015 and 2016
- No. 2 in 2017 and 2018
- Declined from 2015, but stayed at 78% in 2016 and 2017, and went up to 82% in 2018
- 87% of participants stated risk Needs Improvement or Not Being Handled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Repeated Risks</th>
<th>Workshop Participant Input Perception or Reality</th>
<th>Audit and Compliance Program Action Plan, Projects/Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of ability to retain qualified faculty, staff and management.</td>
<td>• Reality - Know of instances where employees left to get ahead. Many believed employees should be responsible for their own career path.</td>
<td>• Research reality, turnover in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scenario: Unhappy employee with unique skillset looking for another job.</td>
<td>• Adverse - University loses out on valuable skills and potential institutional knowledge, more resources needed to recruit and train.</td>
<td>• Exit Interviews and action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mitigate - Need to find out why people are leaving. Is it money, development, career path, other?</td>
<td>• Mitigate - Need process maps, desk procedures, easy to locate policies and procedures, communication of responsibilities.</td>
<td>• Audit employee turnover and success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workshop feedback/communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Risk Perceptions - Putting the Pieces Together

3. Lack of Clear Organizational Responsibilities, Process Maps, Policies, or Separation of Duties
- No. 4 in 2014, No. 10 in 2015
- No. 5 in 2016, No. 4 in 2017
- No. 3 in 2018
- Declined from 2014, but increased steadily since 2015
- 85% of participants stated risk Needs Improvement or Not Being Handled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Repeated Risks</th>
<th>Workshop Participant Input Perception or Reality</th>
<th>Audit and Compliance Program Action Plan, Projects/Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of clear organizational responsibilities process maps, policies, or separation of duties that could result in errors, omissions, opportunity for inappropriate behavior, miscommunication, noncompliance, opportunity loss, etc.</td>
<td>• Reality - Know of instances of lost opportunities and internal controls issues. Most believed campus needs better policies, websites, process maps and identification of responsibilities.</td>
<td>• Policy/procedure, delegation of authority and desk procedure projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scenario: Faculty dilemma with submitting a grant</td>
<td>• Adverse - University loses out on grant opportunities, employees can’t figure out the right way to do things, different answers from different people when not documented.</td>
<td>• Internal control mapping and reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mitigate - Need process maps, desk procedures, easy to locate policies and procedures, communication of responsibilities.</td>
<td>• Update/improve websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Training and communication on Key Controls and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workshop feedback/communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Highest Repeated Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Unfair Hiring Practices, Hiring Unqualified Staff, Faculty, or Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insufficient Faculty, Staff and Management to Adequately Perform Key Controls and Management Reviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception or Reality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit and Compliance Program Action Plan, Projects/Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of unfair hiring practices, hiring unqualified staff/faculty, or management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario: Hiring dilemma and waiver process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality – Discussion of purported personal knowledge, and lack of communication around certain hires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse – Poor climate, low morale, turnover affects everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigate – Better communicate process around hires and waivers. Open up more jobs instead of moving people into positions without show of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit planned in 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal controls and policy reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on Key Controls and Fraud Red Flags</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Top Risk Perceptions - Putting the Pieces Together

#### 4. Insufficient Faculty, Staff and Management to Adequately Perform Key Controls and Management Reviews

- No. 1 in 2014 and 2017
- No. 2 in 2015 and 2016
- No. 4 in 2018
- Declined from 2014, but increased to 83% in 2017
- 93% of participants stated risk Needs Improvement or Not Being Handled

---

#### 5. Unfair Hiring Practices, Hiring Unqualified Staff, Faculty or Management

- No. 5 in 2015
- No. 3 in 2016 and 2017
- No. 5 in 2018
- Declined from 2015 to 2016, but increased from 2016 to 2018 even though ranking declined
- 83% of participants stated risk Needs Improvement or Not Being Handled

---

#### Workshop Participant Input

- Perception of unfair hiring practices, hiring unqualified staff/faculty, or management.

#### Action Plan, Projects/Activities

- Audit performed in 2016 and management actions completed
- More communication about changes made and new internal promotion/waiver policy
- Publish policy article.
Solicit Improvement Opportunities

• Workshops enable us to solicit and discuss potential improvement opportunities from all levels of the workforce
• Encourage out of the box ideas for addressing issues
  o Mentorship and job share programs
  o Flexible work options
  o More workshops and safe place to vet issues/concerns
• Help identify other risks and opportunities
• Plans for action

Plans for Action/Moving Forward

■ Hold feedback session with campus – Share results, comments and additional information on action
■ Develop other communication strategies for addressing perceptions
  o Training on policies, procedures, new processes
  o Articles (Cyber risk, Phishing, Smoke free campus, Peaceful Assembly, Abusive Conduct, Reporting outcomes, Hiring and promotion policies)
  o Quiz Games for selected ethics and compliance topics
  o Forums to reinforce what we’re doing and communicate new policies and processes
  o Ethics and Compliance Week/Student Integrity Week
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