

Annual JRB Report

December 8, 2009

This report has been **unanimously approved** by the JRB.

JRB Membership (January – December 2009)

- 1- Jon Davey (ASA)
- 2- Paula Davis (COEHS)
- 3- Leonard Gross (LAW)
- 4- Frances Harackiewicz (ENGR)
- 5- Allan Karnes (COBA)
- 6- Saliwe Kawewe (COEHS)
- 7- Elizabeth Klaver (COLA)
- 8- Mary Ellen Lamb (COLA)
- 9- John McIntyre (COEHS)
- 10- Farzad Pourboghrat (ENGR), JRB Chair
- 11- Matthew Whiles (COS)
- 12- Vacant position – (originally was filled by Philip Howze, Faculty Senate President)

Hearings

Early in the spring semester, the JRB met with Chancellor Goldman to review his responses to the JRB decisions and to find why these decisions were not accepted in their entirety. It was the JRB's understanding that, according to the new Grievance Procedure for Faculty (GPF), its decisions shall stand as final, except when there are serious/substantial procedural errors or unless the findings of facts were clearly erroneous. The meeting with the Chancellor revealed a substantial disagreement between the Chancellor and the JRB on this interpretation of the GPF. Subsequently, the JRB suspended itself indefinitely until these disputes were remedied.

At the beginning of the fall semester, the JRB reactivated itself due to the fact that the main disputed decision of the Chancellor was reversed at the President's level and because the non-contractual faculty needed a formal committee to hear their grievances.

So far two grievances were filed with the JRB, both of them non-tenure/promotion cases. Both cases were accepted by the JRB for hearing. For each case, according to the GPF, a five-member hearing panel and alternatives were randomly picked. The parties to the grievances have been informed and the hearings are now being scheduled. It is expected that these cases should be heard early in the spring semester 2010.

Results of the Hearings

None to report!

Concerns and Recommendations

Treatment of the JRB Panel Decisions

The recently approved "Grievance Procedure for Faculty (GPF)" was put into place to improve the grievance process and to strengthen the position of the JRB. A clarification/interpretation of the GPF was prepared by the JRB, as was requested by the Chancellor, which is attached.

The JRB expects that its decisions are treated with the highest respect and are normally considered as final. The JRB further hopes that, in the spirit of shared governance, the GPF guidelines are followed, as explained in the attached GPF clarification, in order to avoid future disruption to the JRB services.

Workload Problem

In the new Grievance Procedure for Faculty, it states: "Released time for members of the JRB equivalent to one three-hour course each semester of service is strongly suggested." This is a very important recommendation, which unfortunately the JRB cannot enforce. Hence, the JRB requests that due to its highly demanding workload an equivalent workload release or one month summer compensation be **required and implemented** (not just recommended) for all the JRB members. However, to avoid any conflict of interest, the JRB also requests that the money be allocated annually for this purpose directly from the Faculty Senate budget, which should be adjusted/ increased accordingly.