

Annual JRB Report December 13, 2011

This report has been **unanimously approved** by the JRB, less one member who is on sabbatical.

JRB Membership (January – December 2011)

- 1- Daren Callahan (LIB)
- 2- Jon Davey (ASA)
- 3- David Gibson (COS)
- 4- Frances Harackiewicz (ENGR)
- 5- Alice Noble-Allgire (LAW)
- 6- Saliwe Kawewe (COEHS)
- 7- Elizabeth Klaver (COLA)
- 8- James LeBeau (COLA)
- 9- Farzad Pourboghraat (ENGR), JRB Chair
- 10- Kounosuke Watabe (MED)
- 11- Matthew Whiles (COS)
- 12- Karl Williard (AG)

Hearings

This year there were four grievances, including three regarding tenure and promotion (T&P). Two of the T&P related grievances were heard by the JRB and the other was withdrawn since the grievant moved to another university. The non-T&P case, which was carried over from last year, is scheduled for hearing later this month. For each case, according to the Grievance Procedure for Faculty (GPF), a five-member hearing panel and two alternates were randomly picked; hearings were scheduled; and the grievances were ultimately heard (or to be heard) by their respective JRB panels.

Results of the Hearings

In one of the T&P grievance cases that were heard by the JRB, the panels' decision was not unanimous and was in favor of the respondent. In this case, the decision of the JRB was accepted by the Chancellor. In the other T&P case the decision of the panel was unanimous in favor of the grievant. As of this writing, the JRB has not yet received the Chancellor's response on its decision in this case. The JRB Panel's decision on the non-T&P case is yet pending a hearing later this month.

Concerns and Recommendations

Difficulties with scheduling the hearings

Scheduling of hearings has proven to be both difficult and time consuming, sometimes causing months of delay. Picking two alternates for each case, to substitute for main panel members when there is a scheduling conflict, has been helpful to some extent. Thus, increasing the number of alternates can further reduce the scheduling problem. However, this may be possible if the number of JRB members is increased from 12 to possibly 15. An increased membership also reduces the overall workload. Additionally, it would be preferred if every year only one-third of the JRB members are newly elected. This way each randomly picked panel will have a better chance of having experienced members.