

PROGRAM

PROGRAM

MONDAY

Registration		
Introduction and Welcome		
Introduction to Arbitration		
Break 4:30p.m 4:45p.m.		
Videotape		
Assign Arbitration Team 6:00p.m 7:00p.m.		
Reception		
TUESDAY		
Preparing the Case		
Break		
Preparing the Case Exercise		
Framing the Issue		
Lunch		
Threshold Issues		
Break		
Review		
Dinner		
Work with Arbitration Team		

WEDNESDAY

Exhibits and Stipulations 9:00a.m11:00a.m.
Break
Opening Statements
Lunch
Direct Examination
Cross Examination
Break
Cross Examination
Review
Review 5:00p.m 5:30p.m. THURSDAY
THURSDAY
THURSDAY Rules of Evidence
THURSDAY Rules of Evidence 9:00a.m10:00a.m. Objections 10:00a.m11:00a.m.
THURSDAY Rules of Evidence 9:00a.m10:00a.m. Objections 10:00a.m11:00a.m. Break 11:00a.m11:15a.m.
THURSDAY Rules of Evidence 9:00a.m10:00a.m. Objections 10:00a.m11:00a.m. Break 11:00a.m11:15a.m. New Evidence & New Arguments 11:15a.m12:30p.m.
THURSDAY Rules of Evidence 9:00a.m10:00a.m. Objections 10:00a.m11:00a.m. Break 11:00a.m11:15a.m. New Evidence & New Arguments 11:15a.m12:30p.m. Lunch 12:30p.m 2:00p.m.

FRIDAY

Closing Statements		
Finality of Awards		
Break		
Demonstration Arbitration		
Lunch		
Review		
Preparing for Mock Arbitration		
Dinner		
Preparing for Mock Arbitration		
SATURDAY		
Mock Arbitration		
Lunch		
Mock Arbitration		
SUNDAY		
Graduation Breakfast		

We Thank You for Attending. Have a Safe Trip Home!

ARBITRATION: THE SEVEN TEST OF JUST CAUSE

ARBITRATION: THE SEVEN TEST of JUST CAUSE

The concept of "just cause" is central to any case of arbitration. Unfortunately, the term does not have a universally accepted, clear definition. Just cause is an attempt to maintain civil rights and due process in an industrial or corporate setting. However, there are seven measurable criteria for just cause that may be used to determine the appropriateness of a disciplinary action for alleged misconduct. These criteria are:

- 1. Reasonable rule or order
- 2. Clear and unambiguous notice
- 3. Timely and thorough investigation
- 4. Fair investigation
- 5. **Proof**
- 6. Equal treatment
- 7. Fair penalty

The videotape **Arbitration: The Seven Tests of Just Cause** is based on a true situation. Adolph Koven, the arbitrator in the video actually conducted the investigation and provided the ruling that bound the real-life supervisors and union members in this hearing. However, their names have been changed and actors play their roles in this highly engrossing re-enactment of an arbitration case.

In this videotape, arbitration is necessary because two parties, the supervisors of the Blackacre Aircraft Company and the National Union of Workers, Local 202 disagree on whether the firing of three workers for alleged alcohol-related offenses was appropriate. As in any case of arbitration, the two parties have agreed to accept the decision of the arbitrator as final and binding. During this formal hearing, each side is represented by a lawyer; counsel may provide its own witnesses and may cross-examine witnesses from the opposing side. After all witnesses are questioned, each lawyer summarizes his or her side 's evidence for just cause. After their arguments are presented, you may stop the video so that participants can discuss their evaluations of the evidence and reach a verdict. When participants have concluded their discussion, you should show the rest of the video in which Mr. Koven explains his verdict. As in a regular court, the accused parties are presumed innocent until proven guilty. The company must prove that it had just cause for its disciplinary actions.

VIOLATING THE DUTY OF FAIR REPRESENTATION

VIOLATING THE DUTY OF FAIR REPRESENTATION

The union is vested with the responsibility to represent all employees, both members and nonmembers to the best of its ability. **The Duty of Fair Representation** dictates that no union official may represent an employee in a **capricious**, **perfunctory**, **arbitrary or bad faith** manner.

Arbitrary The shop steward doesn't have an explanation why he/she failed to

appeal the grievance.

Example: When asked why the grievance was not appealed, the shop steward

states that he/she does not recall.

Capricious The shop steward has a reason why he/she did not appeal the

grievance, but the reason is not logical.

Example: A shop steward refused to appeal all cases ending in the number five (5)

because five (5) was his/her unlucky number.

Perfunctory The shop steward does not conduct a proper investigation before

closing the case. He/she puts forth little or no effort.

Example: The grievant gives the shop steward a list of witnesses to interview; the

steward has a heavy case load and does not follow up.

Bad Faith The shop steward allows personal feelings, union politics or bias to

interfere with the representation of the employee.

Example: A national arbitration advocate withdraws a removal case prior to going

to arbitration. Later, it is discovered that the grievant had dated the

advocate's spouse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preparing the Case	Part 1
Framing the Issues	Part II
Threshold Strategies	Part III
Exhibits and Stipulations	Part IV
Opening Statements	Part V
Direct Examination	Part VI
Cross Examination	Part VII
Rules of Evidence	Part VIII
Objections	Part IX
New Evidence and Arguments	Part X
Closing Statement	Part XI
Finality of Awards	Part XII
Glossary of Legal Terms	Part XIII
Mock Arbitration	Part XIV