

MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
THURSDAY, 3 June 2010
Architecture Hall, Room 147, 2:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m. and the agenda was approved as drafted.

Faculty Senate Chair Bruce Balick welcomed Senators and guests to this special meeting of the Faculty Senate. He advised participants that all those wishing to speak must be recognized by the Chair. Preference would be given to Senators, who should raise their blue cards to identify themselves as such. And, in order to have a useful and accurate recording of the discussion, he asked everyone to use a microphone and to identify themselves by name and departmental affiliation. He added that according to the *Code*, nonmembers of the Senate do not have privileges of the floor but may be invited to speak by the Chair.

2. Remarks of the Faculty Senate Chair – Professor Bruce Balick.

Balick then turned to his remarks. This began with a statement of the purpose for the meeting, which was to gather the opinions of Senators about the proposed revisions to EO 64 to inform an official response to the President. He reported that Senate leadership made a principled decision not take a position on the revised EO 64 in advance of the Senate's response.

To put the meeting into context, he recited some of the history leading to the calling of the meeting. A working group consisting of JW Harrington, Marcia Killien, David Lovell, Gerry Philipsen, Lea Vaughn, Miceal Vaughan, Cheryl Cameron, Carol Niccolls, Doug Wadden, Phyllis Wise, and himself had been addressing the faculty salary policy for an extended period of time and had been charged with the assignment to rewrite EO 64 to alleviate the need for future suspensions by March 2010. The focus of their work was to:

- provide flexibility in exigent times;
- redesign procedures to be more specific and lawsuit-proof (timing of merit raises, process of re-evaluation);
- clarify approval authority.

On May 4, 2010, the President proposed extending EO 29, to suspend EO 64 for an additional year. At its May 20th meeting, the Senate formally objected to its timing as premature. Revisions based on five months of working group discussions resulted in a revised EO proposed by the President on May 24, 2010. The revised EO 64 was sent to the Senate Chair the following day for response by June 7, 2010.

In subsequent discussions and polling of the faculty, consensus emerged on the following:

- Multiple references to the authority of the Regents that weaken the status of the role of the Senate and President in implementing salary policy;
- There must be a clear statement that 2% is the minimum merit-based annual raise except under conditions of severe financial stress;
- If less than 2% is rewarded, then the principles and priorities of the salary policy in the *Code* must be preserved, including the firm commitment to 7.5% promotion raises;
- In this case, funding for secondary salary objectives, including retention, needs to be limited;
- The purpose of salary policy is to develop confidence that meritorious service will be properly recognized in a timely manner.

3. Remarks of the President – President Mark A. Emmert.

The President stated that he did not have much to add to what Chair Balick had already said. He was there to listen to the views and opinions of the Senators on this matter. He felt he had been responsive to the message of the Senators at their last meeting by withdrawing his proposal for EO

29 and instead focusing on an adjustment to EO 64. He continues in his hopes to demonstrate responsiveness to the advice of the faculty. He has read all comments on the Catalyst survey that Senate Office had launched the week before on the subject, and is looking forward to hearing comments this afternoon.

4. Remarks of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor David Lovell.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) Chair David Lovell reported that at the suggestion of several members of the SCPB and Senate leadership, he had called a special meeting of the SCPB the afternoon before (June 2). He had drawn up a statement of consensus of that meeting that he then displayed on the overhead projector:

SCPB Faculty Consensus

1. We appreciate the administration's commitment, since 2004, to substantial general merit increases for all meritorious faculty, which until the recent fiscal crisis succeeded in reducing inequities and narrowed the gap between UW faculty salaries and those at peer institutions;
2. We believe that the principles, priorities, and objectives of the existing EO 64 are fundamentally sound, but we acknowledge the need for greater clarity about how the university may respond to a severe fiscal crisis, such as the one we're now enduring, with a general merit increase below the 2% level called for in current policy;
3. We believe that the response of faculty to the proposed revisions to EO 64 express legitimate doubt about whether the language is compatible with the commitment to salary progression, over the career of meritorious faculty members, which is critical to the mission of the University of Washington;
4. We cannot support revisions to EO 64 that fail to sustain the commitments at the heart of our current salary policy.

Working through the Senate and the elected faculty leadership, we will cooperate with the administration in making the few revisions to the current salary policy needed to safeguard the university's financial stability during times of severe fiscal distress. If the administration determines that immediate action is needed to safeguard the university because of a current lawsuit, we suggest that the administration issue a new EO that confines itself to the issue of immediate concern: defining the point at which merit is earned.

He proposed that should it be the advice of the Senate at this meeting, Senate leadership would suggest the few revisions required to safeguard the University during these times of fiscal exigency. If administration continues to feel that immediate action must be taken, then Senate leadership's advice would be to simply define the point at which merit is earned.

Lovell noted that work on these drafts over the course of the past several months, though complex and arduous, were collegial, with both sides making concessions to the other.

5. New Business.

Discussion: Proposed Changes in Executive Order 64.

Exhibit A – President's Cover Letter and Proposal. The President's proposed changes to EO 64 and a cover letter that explains their rationale and urgency.

Exhibit B – Comparison Document of Proposed Revisions. A document that facilitates a comparison of the old and proposed new versions of EO 64.

At this point, Chair Balick opened the floor to Senators (and guests, as time permitted) to speak to the issues under consideration.

Gordon Watts, Physics, began with a question to David Lovell. With due collegiality, he challenged Lovell and Faculty Senate leadership on the possibility that their initial take on this issue had been ill-

advised and premature. Would leadership acknowledge that -- and now be prepared to move on, given the advice of Senators and other faculty who had expressed grave concerns about where things were headed with the Faculty Salary Policy?

Lovell responded that the Faculty Salary Policy Group (FSPG) had focused primarily on the 2% question – including funding mechanisms and the consultation required if it looked as if something other than a 2% raise would be possible in a given year. On this issue, the group reached saturation, if not complete agreement. The possibility that the multiple references to Regental action might reasonably be interpreted as undermining the whole policy only emerged after comparing the old and new policy drafts, in light of the reaction of faculty to the proposed revisions.

William Wilcock, Oceanography, then expressed his conviction that there is an urgent need for an effective means of communication for faculty during times like these. The week has shown that there currently is no good way to do that. The only existing avenues for communication are *The Daily* (a student publication), *University Week* (which does not include letters from readers) and the AAUP list. Senate leadership is working in a vacuum without any reliable means of discovering the concerns and opinions of those they represent. This should be seen as a priority if the concept of shared governance is to work effectively. He hastened to add that his observation is that this problem is systemic and not due to the actions or inactions of any current members of Faculty Leadership. He insisted that the University will be better served by a faculty united through the ability to communicate effectively with each other and administration.

Chair Balick responded that Wilcock's concerns had been a topic of discussion among his colleagues for the past two years, and he noted that in-coming chair JW Harrington is especially committed to developing channels for communication such as Wilcock had suggested.

Michael Blake, Philosophy, argued the extraordinary response of a temporary suspension of policy might be the best response to extraordinary circumstances, whereas building in procedures for awarding less than 2% might weaken the commitment to that level as a minimum standard. He wonders if the proposed remedy relinquishes to some extent the power of the faculty.

Chair Balick responded that he is more concerned about the possibility of making any inconvenient suspensions of an Executive Order habitual. He would prefer the revision of the original EO 64 in such a way that is acceptable to both faculty and administration than continue to work on wording of another EO that would suspend EO 64.

Carol Thomas, History, reported that a meeting of her department had been called the day before to provide advice to her in preparation for this meeting. She brought with her a memo to the Faculty Senate from the Department of History dated June 3, 2010. It states:

The faculty of the Department of History discussed the issue of the New Executive Order at its meeting on June 2, 2010. We submit the following position to be considered in the review of the changes to the EO by President Emmert.

In 1999, after prolonged negotiations with the administration, the faculty agreed to post-tenure review in exchange for annual merit pay increases of 2%. The proposed revision of EO 64 suspends those pay increases while appearing to leave post-tenure review intact. The Department of History strongly believes that the abrogation of one side of the agreement must entail the abrogation of the other side as well. We hold that the suspension of merit pay increases must be accompanied by a removal of the faculty's obligation to undertake post-tenure review.

Thomas emphasized that this statement was not a recommendation that accountability of faculty should be disregarded, but that there are degrees of documenting accountability that don't necessarily include post-tenure review.

Jack Lee, Mathematics, then moved adoption of the following Class C Resolution:

Whereas, the current faculty salary policy as embodied in the Faculty Code and Executive Order 64 was carefully negotiated and endorsed by the faculty, administration and regents as being in the best interests of the University; and

Whereas, the proposed revisions to Executive Order 64 are numerous and substantive, weakening the faculty salary policy to the degree that it would fail in its stated fundamental purpose to provide to the faculty "confidence that their continuing and productive contributions to their units and to the University's missions of teaching, research, and service will be rewarded throughout their careers"; and

Whereas, the current financial crisis has been effectively addressed during the current biennium by a timely suspension of the requirement for 2% merit increases; and

Whereas, there is ample time before the beginning of the next biennium to work out clarifications in the policy (if necessary), via appropriate consultation between the administration and faculty; therefore

Be it resolved, that the Faculty sees no reason to enact a change to the faculty salary policy at this time, and strongly opposes ~~the proposed revision of~~ Executive Order 64 R dated May 24, 2010. (*revisions indicated were made as a result of subsequent discussion – see below*)

The motion was seconded, and supported by a strong round of applause.

Lee went on to say that although he greatly appreciated President Emmert's work on behalf of faculty salaries in the past, he and many of his faculty colleagues at the UW question the assumptions regarding the UW's vulnerability to lawsuits and the urgency in the timing of changing this Executive Order. He surmised that a decision to act now, and against the will of the faculty, could be more damaging than the impact of any possible legal ramifications. Not since the 1990s has he been aware of so much doubt among his colleagues about support for faculty by the administration – nor so much discussion about unionization. He sincerely hopes the President will be able to move on to his next career with the support and continued appreciation of the faculty.

John Zahorjan, Computer Science, was the first to speak to the motion. He suggested that the motion may be pre-mature and that administration should be given an opportunity to demonstrate why they are committed to Executive Order 64 and why they feel this is the best answer for the UW, including the faculty.

President Emmert spoke to Zahorjan's concerns and those raised by a previous speaker about the workings of shared governance. Various permutations of revisions to the Executive Order and the Faculty Salary Policy have been discussed at length in the FSPG, the SCPB, the SEC and the Faculty Senate. He has been a participant in many of those conversations, especially within the SEC and Senate, and has assumed all along that in speaking with those groups, as well as with those in Senate leadership, he was communicating with the elected representatives of the faculty. This is the model of shared governance provided by the *Faculty Code* and the *University Handbook*. He asked if there is now a question whether this is an effective model, as over the past several months there has been an abundance of collaboration between faculty and administration. He has been engaged in honest and frank discussions and has made every effort to be a participant when there have been opportunities to discuss this issue.

Gerry Philipsen, Communication, provided some historical perspective. He was Chair of the Faculty Senate at the time when EO 64 was first issued by then President McCormick. At that time the two faculty members empowered to review and respond to a proposed Executive order were the Chair and the Secretary of the Faculty, at that time Lea Vaughn. But the process that had been undertaken over the past several months has been much different – a healthier model with good discussion. In contrast, this Class C proposal has not had the benefit of any previous faculty council or committee discussion. Although he supports, in principle, the idea of spontaneous Class C resolutions, those that come forward from a faculty council or committee are much strengthened by the vetting received in those deliberations.

With regard the FSPG, he noted that never before had faculty been invited to join a group to help draft an Executive Order. The task was not easy or particularly smooth, but the idea of including faculty in writing language for an Executive Order was by no means required or expected – and was a significant gesture of outreach on the President's part. Should this discussion have found its way to the faculty at large? Perhaps. But Philipsen suggested that the Senate now turn to the SCPB, as elected representatives of the faculty, which has taken another position, as outlined earlier by Lovell during his remarks, and show support for that effort.

Philipsen then took issue with the post-tenure review issue. Post-tenure review is not mentioned as such in the *Faculty Code*. What his colleague in History was referring to was *Code* language that addresses the possible consequences of a faculty member that is not found meritorious in two successive merit reviews. Philipsen, who asserts that administration had the power to deal with such a situation even before this language was included in the *Code*, sees this section as enabling faculty (rather than administration) to address problems with their fellow faculty members in a collegial way.

He expressed his hope that this Class C resolution would not be approved – that the SCPB continue to work with administration on the revised Executive Order in whatever time is allowed as provided by the *Faculty Code*.

Robert Wood, Atmospheric Sciences, expressed his support for the resolution. He stated that the University should not allow the threat of a law suit to triumph over the Faculty Salary Policy. He reminded those present that faculty had been given only thirteen days to discuss this important issue, and suggested that the entire process should be started over again. His remarks were supported by applause.

Gordon Watts, Physics, strongly agrees with the resolution but hopes there can be some modification that makes it clear that discussions and deliberations should continue on this issue.

Watts then moved an amendment of the resolution by deleting the first phrase about seeing no need to change EO 64.

Karin Frey, Education, expressed appreciation for an opportunity to reflect on what it means to be moving forward on this issue, albeit in opposition. She agreed that the original motion did appear to cut off any further debate and simply to state that what was proposed is unacceptable. She suggested that in this case, faculty only have the power of persuasion. The motion clearly states a lack of support for the changes but should include an endorsement of continued discussion that would include the faculty's elected representative.

Chair Balick interjected a request for clarification on the Senate's direction for leadership. He noted that as originally proposed, the resolution stated that the Senate did not wish to accept any change to EO 64, and if the Senate's will was to end discussion on this issue with administration he would follow that advice.

Christoph Giebel, International Studies, spoke in support of keeping the language as it is. He suggested that it doesn't indicate an unwillingness to engage in further discussion, but that the deadline for a final decision is unacceptable. He asserted that the fourth "whereas" makes that clear.

Niels Andersen, Chemistry, reported that given conversations he has had in his department, he would have to support the resolution since the proposed revisions of the Executive Order do not give confidence to faculty that their service will be rewarded. He is encouraged that the lack of confidence reflected here is in line with the sentiments in his department, and also that Senate Leadership is not particularly in favor of the revision they apparently were about to sign off on. These remarks were supported by a round of applause.

Gordon Watts, Physics, noted that the discussion so far indicates that the authors of the proposed Class C intended that discussions continue between faculty and administration. He asked if there

were a simple modification that would make that clear in lieu of the proposed amendment he had made.

Duane Storti then proposed the following substitute amendment: "The Faculty Senate sees no reason to enact a change to the Faculty Salary Policy at this time and strongly..."

Gordon Watts, Physics, withdrew his amendment.

Jack Lee, who had proposed the Class C resolution, accepted Storti's proposal as a friendly amendment.

Helen Anderson, School of Law, asked where the power really lies. She suggested that since the faculty's role in this process is strictly consultative, it is in the faculty's interest to work within the context of this reality. That being the case, she said she would vote against this resolution. In doing so, she is not blindly supporting administration. She believes there have been some bad decisions made, but she is convinced that discussions and collaboration should continue with no shadow of ambiguity.

Chair Balick again urged consideration of the SCPB document as one to guide future discussions.

Rebecca Logsdon, Nursing, stated that her department would probably be in agreement with the proposed resolution, given clarification that collaborative work continue on any revision under consideration.

In response to Logsdon's comments, a suggestion was made, and accepted by the drafter, to designate this version as EO 64-R, dated May 25, 2010.

Vice Chair JW Harrington suggested that for the sake of fuller discussion he would propose consideration of the document SCPB Chair Lovell had introduced to see if there was support for that as a possible alternative to the resolution currently under consideration. After a very brief discussion, Harrington withdrew the proposal.

The question was called on the amendment to the motion.

Stuart Reges, Computer Science, said that he shares the frustration that his colleagues have expressed concerning the apparent power brokers and the lack of control which is reflected in the resolution, but he feels strongly that it's not good to block further collaboration. He will vote no because of this and as a reflection of his support for his faculty colleagues who have been working hard over the past several months in their capacity as elected faculty representatives. He trusts that group of people.

Christoph Giebel, International Studies, urged Senators to keep their eyes on the prize and focus only on a statement to administration concerning EO 64-R – that it is not acceptable as is and requires further deliberation and discussion that may take longer than the current deadline allows.

The question was called again, and hearing no objections, Chair Balick took a vote on the amended resolution, which was approved.

Chair Balick reminded the Senate that the SCPB statement provides a solid basis for further discussion.

Zoe Barsness, UW Tacoma, Business, expressed some concerns of her colleagues from UWT, including how to define what the triggers might be in future consideration of merit increases for faculty. Ensuing discussion revealed that this thorny and complex issue has been the subject of much discussion over a number of years and has come to no resolution.

John Zahorjan, Computer Science, asked for feedback from the President on the SCPB document.

The President responded that this is the first he has seen of it, and he is not in a position to comment. He would need to consider the legal aspects, but stated that it was an interesting proposal and perhaps could be a temporary solution.

Chris Bretherton, Atmospheric Science & Applied Math, expressed appreciation for the work on this, but felt that the whole faculty should have been engaged in this earlier in the process. Perhaps monthly updates from the Senate would have been helpful.

In response, Chair Balick protested that the complexity and fluctuation of the discussion would have added only confusion, rather than clarity, to the faculty's understanding of this situation.

Jake Faleschini, GPSS President, said that he was in support of the Senate action. He doesn't fully agree with the proposed EO 64. He also reminded Senators that exigent circumstances that impact faculty are also impacting students.

Christoph Giebel, International Studies, suggested the SEC and full Senate, at the very least, should be consulted at the outset of any consideration that the 2% rule be suspended.

Steve Schwartz, Pathology, spoke to the need for better avenues of communication for faculty. He reported that he had been agitating for this for some time, and he described a new website. TheAve.us is a blog that is off campus and therefore outside the restrictions of free speech found on campus.

Hazel Taylor, Information School, said that she was concerned about the deadline and how little time there had been to discuss this issue. If administration holds to this deadline, some action will be taken very soon. She urged the President to consider seriously the minimum-impact model suggested in the SCPB document for now, and leave all the rest to a fuller discussion. This suggestion was greeted with a round of applause.

Jack Lee, Mathematics, moved that the Senate endorse the SCPB document.

The motion was seconded.

The quorum was called, and a count confirmed there was no longer a quorum.

6. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned following determination that there was no longer a quorum at 4:45 p.m.

However, Senators were invited to wave their blue cards as they were leaving if they were in favor of the proposal to endorse the SCPB document. All but one of the Senators participating waved a blue card.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Bruce Balick, Chair, Faculty Senate



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Exhibit A
RECEIVED
MAY 25 2010
Faculty Senate Office

May 25, 2010

Professor Bruce Balick
Chair, Faculty Senate

Professor J. W. Harrington
Vice Chair, Faculty Senate

Professor Marcia G. Killien
Secretary of the Faculty

Dear Bruce, JW, and Marcia:

Enclosed for your review is a draft of a new Executive Order, which modifies and replaces Executive Order No. 64, "Faculty Salary Policy," contained in the *University Handbook*, Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Section 24-57. Also enclosed for your information is the procedure for promulgation of executive orders. This draft Executive Order is based upon extensive consideration and reflection, including five months of frequent meetings (about 20 to date) and hours of discussion and consultation with a group of Faculty Senate leaders and administrators, including the Provost. I am deeply grateful to these university colleagues for their thoughtful review of Executive Order No. 64 and for their careful assessment of the issues raised in that Executive Order. Without their good work, we would not have made such significant progress.

As you recall, on May 4, 2010, I sent you a proposed Executive Order that would have extended the current suspension of the Faculty Salary Policy (Executive Order No. 29, which will otherwise expire at the end of the 2009-11 biennium) through the 2011-12 academic year. This extension of the suspension would not have precluded future raises, but there was, nonetheless, significant and understandable concern expressed about adopting another extension of the suspension. Those concerns were underscored in the Faculty Senate through a Class C Resolution passed on May 20, 2010. I listened carefully to the Senators and, based on their articulated concerns, I have decided to withdraw my proposed Executive Order to extend the current suspension of the Faculty Salary Policy through the 2011-12 academic year. I thank the Faculty Senate for advising me on this important issue.

It is critical to this university that we honor the concepts set forth in the Faculty Code regarding faculty salaries. It is also extremely important for us to preserve the objective of a 2% faculty salary increase in an executive order. To do both those things and also to protect the university against unnecessary legal exposure, it became clear that I needed to redraft Executive Order No. 64 and to incorporate the comments I have received from faculty and administrators.

Professors Bruce Balick, J. W. Harrington, and Marcia G. Killien
May 25, 2010
Page two

The enclosed draft honors the Faculty Code and its principles. It also provides for the preservation of the objective of a 2% salary increase and for meaningful consultation between the administration and the Faculty Senate on salary issues for each and every budget cycle. Our faculty is the key to our success as a university and we are committed to achieving and maintaining equitable, competitive faculty salaries at this university. That is a principle that I underscore as I proceed with this revised Executive Order.

I believe that this restated policy will appropriately maintain pressure on us to seek steady improvement of faculty salaries and to avoid having to seek clarification through the courts. I am asking for your suggestions or comments to this proposed Executive Order by Monday, June 7, 2010. I am withdrawing the proposed extension to the suspension of the salary policy, but I still need to protect the university from legal exposure by either adopting that extension or adopting this revised Executive Order No. 64 before July 1, 2010. I now believe that modifying Executive Order No. 64 rather than extending its suspension is the right direction, and I appreciate your responses to me by June 7, 2010.

Sincerely yours,



Mark A. Emmert
President

Enclosures

cc: Board of Deans and Chancellors
Dr. Cheryl A. Cameron
Ms. Rebecca Goodwin Deardorff
Mr. Paul E. Jenny
Mr. Jack G. Johnson
Dr. David Lovell
Ms. Carol S. Niccolls
Dr. Gerry F. Philipson
Ms. Lea B. Vaughn
Dr. Mícheál F. Vaughan
Mr. Douglas J. Wadden
Dr. Phyllis M. Wise

B. Executive Order and Administrative Order Procedure

1. Before an Executive Order is promulgated or revised by the President, it shall be reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Additionally, the President may request reviews of the Executive Order from other individuals or campus bodies as desired. The President shall forward the proposed Executive Order (or revision) to the Faculty Senate Chair and to the Secretary of the Faculty, noting reviews that have taken place and requesting appropriate Faculty Senate review. The Faculty Senate Chair shall arrange a review and notify the President of the outcome of the review within a reasonable time, but in any event no longer than sixty days after receipt of such request for review. If revisions to the proposed order suggested by the Faculty Senate are not approved by the President, there shall be consultations with the Chair of the Faculty Senate to seek to resolve the differences. Following such consultations, the decision of the President is final. When signed by the President, the original of the Executive Order shall be retained in the Executive Order file in the President's Office. The Rules Coordination Office shall assign a number to any new Executive Order and publish all orders. Executive Orders become effective on the day signed by the President, unless otherwise noted within the text of the order.

Section #1 from Executive Order No. 3 of the President, June 12, 1996, revised January 6, 2003; May 11, 2007.

DRAFT EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. _____

(Replacing and Superseding Executive Order No. 64)

The fundamental purpose of the University of Washington Faculty Salary Policy is to allow the University to recruit and retain the best faculty. To accomplish these two objectives, the faculty must have confidence that their continuing and productive contributions to the goals of their units and to the University's missions of teaching, research, and service will be rewarded throughout their careers. To compete for the best faculty, the University must be competitive with its peers. To retain the best faculty requires a similarly competitive approach. Therefore, the University places as one of its highest priorities rewarding faculty who perform to the highest standards and who continue to do so throughout their appointments at the University. This policy is designed to provide for a predictable and continuing salary progression for meritorious faculty.

Salary funds must be used to attract, retain, and reward those faculty whose continuing performance is outstanding, while recognizing that disciplinary variations exist in the academic marketplace. Accordingly, the University's Salary Policy must allow for differential allocations among units. This provides the necessary flexibility to address the market gaps that develop between UW units and their recognized peers, acknowledges existing and future differentials in unit performance and contribution, and also recognizes that differing funding sources and reward structures exist among schools and colleges. The policy must ensure that equity considerations and compression are also addressed as needed.

The University's Salary Policy is founded upon the principle that individual salary decisions must be based on merit as assessed by a performance review conducted by faculty and administrative colleagues. Salary adjustments for performance and retention, as well as salary awards stemming from differential unit performance and marketplace gaps, are based upon a consultative process of faculty and administrative evaluation. Merit/performance evaluations are unit-based and reward the faculty for their contributions to local units as well as to the University's goals.

Allocation Procedure. As described below, this Faculty Salary Policy calls for deliberations among the administration and faculty. As such, the policy seeks to manifest shared governance that is at the core of the *Faculty Code*. Regardless, the final decision on the University budget, including salaries, rests with the Board of Regents.

Salary progression as envisioned in this policy and the regular merit salary increases or promotional increases for those faculty members otherwise eligible will be implemented only if the Board of Regents in its sole discretion determines there are sufficient funds and approves a budget that expressly provides for such increases. Further, the Board of Regents will take into consideration any limitations that the Governor and/or Legislature enact on salary progression.

Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, the Provost will consult with the Board of Deans and Chancellors, the Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee, and the University Budget Committee to formulate a recommendation for a salary distribution plan, including providing an opportunity for input into the criteria to be considered in formulating the plan. If the salary distribution plan to be recommended by the Provost includes a minimum equal-percentage salary

increase less than a 2% regular merit increase, an explanation of the basis for the recommendation will be provided to the Board of Deans and Chancellors, Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee, and University Budget Committee, with an opportunity to provide comment and feedback before a final recommendation is forwarded. The Provost shall then make a recommendation to the President for faculty salary allocations. The President shall then make a recommendation to the Board of Regents for faculty salary allocations for the fiscal year. Upon adoption of the University budget by the Board of Regents, which will include any approved faculty salary allocations for the fiscal year, this decision shall be reported to the Faculty Senate and to the University community more broadly.

Allocation Categories. Consistent with the stated objectives, the first priority shall be to support regular merit and promotion awards to current faculty. Further, each biennium the minimum salaries by rank will be reviewed and, if adjusted, support will be provided to ensure those minimum levels are achieved. Other funds, as available, may be allotted among the following faculty salary adjustments:

1. Additional merit to all faculty;
2. Differential distributions by unit to correct salary gaps created by changing disciplinary markets or assessments of unit quality;
3. Retention;
4. System wide adjustments to raise the salaries of all meritorious faculty.

Merit Principle and Review. The University commits to support salary adjustments based on performance evaluations for those faculty deemed meritorious after a systematic review by faculty colleagues, department or unit head, Dean, and Provost. In order for these performance evaluations and merit salary recommendations to be meaningful, they must be done systematically and over an appropriate length of time to be able to make true quality assessments about performance and progress, considering the cumulative record of faculty.

All faculty shall be evaluated annually for merit and for progress towards reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, as appropriate. Upon approval by the Board of Regents of a regular merit salary allocation, a faculty member who is deemed to be meritorious in performance shall be awarded a regular 2% merit salary increase in the following academic year. Higher levels of performance shall be recognized by higher levels of salary increases as permitted by available funding. The Board of Regents also has the discretion to provide a minimum equal-percentage merit salary increase that is less than 2%.

Any faculty member whose performance is not deemed meritorious shall be informed by the Chair/Dean of the reasons. If deemed meritorious in the next year's review and a regular merit salary allocation has been approved by the Board of Regents, the faculty member shall receive a regular 2% merit increase in the following academic year. A departmental advisory committee, appointed consistent with Section 24-55H of the Faculty Code, will consider the development needs of faculty members not receiving regular merit salary increases for two consecutive years.

Promotion. Upon approval by the Board of Regents of a promotion allocation, each faculty member who is promoted in rank shall be awarded a 7.5% promotion salary increase beginning on the date the promotion is effective.

Unit Adjustments. Additional salary funds may be allocated by the Provost to colleges and schools at any time during the biennium, after appropriate consultations with the Faculty Senate Planning and Budgeting Committee, to address differentials occurring in the academic labor markets and to reflect assessments of the quality, standing, and contributions of units to College, School, and University goals. Unless specifically allocated by the Provost for a particular unit or purpose, the Deans shall consult with their elected faculty councils before distributing any additional salary increase funds among their constituent units. The procedures of Section 24-55 of the Faculty Code will be followed in distributing funds allocated to adjust faculty salaries based on merit.

Retention Adjustments. With approval from the Provost, college-administered or University funds may be used to adjust faculty salaries as a means to retain faculty members at the University of Washington either at the time of merit reviews or at other times as necessary throughout the academic year. Assessments of a faculty member's quality and unit contribution are essential elements in decisions to make retention adjustments. Consultative processes to recommend retention adjustments shall be established at the unit level following the procedures set forth in Section 24-71 of the Faculty Code.

Executive Order No. ____ of the President, June ____, 2010

Existing EO64 with Revisions Proposed by President Emmert on 5/25/10**Footnote #2: Faculty Salary Policy**

The fundamental purpose of the University of Washington Faculty Salary Policy is to allow the University to recruit and retain the best faculty. To accomplish these two objectives, the faculty must have confidence that their continuing and productive contributions to the goals of their units and to the University's missions of teaching, research, and service will be rewarded throughout their careers. To compete for the best faculty, the University must be competitive with its peers. To retain the best faculty requires a similarly competitive approach. Therefore, the University places as one of its highest priorities rewarding faculty who perform to the highest standards and who continue to do so throughout their appointments at the University. This new policy is designed to provide for a predictable and continuing salary progression for meritorious faculty.

Salary funds must be used to attract, retain, and reward those faculty whose continuing performance is outstanding, while recognizing that disciplinary variations exist in the academic marketplace. Accordingly, the University's Salary Policy must allow for differential allocations among units. This provides the necessary flexibility to address the market gaps that develop between UW units and their recognized peers, acknowledges existing and future differentials in unit performance and contribution, and also recognizes that differing funding sources and reward structures exist among schools and colleges. The policy must ensure that equity considerations and compression are also addressed as needed.

The University's Salary Policy is founded upon the principle that individual salary decisions must be based on merit as assessed by a performance review conducted by faculty and administrative colleagues. Salary adjustments for performance and retention, as well as salary awards stemming from differential unit performance and marketplace gaps, are based upon a consultative process of faculty and administrative evaluation. Merit/performance evaluations are unit-based and reward the faculty for their contributions to local units as well as to the University's goals.

Allocation Procedure. As described below, this Faculty Salary Policy calls for deliberations among the administration and faculty. As such, the policy seeks to manifest shared governance that is at the core of the Faculty Code. Regardless, the final decision on the University budget, including salaries, rests with the Board of Regents.

Salary progression as envisioned in this policy and the regular merit salary increases or promotional increases for those faculty members otherwise eligible will be implemented only if the Board of Regents in its sole discretion determines there are sufficient funds and approves a budget that expressly provides for such increases. Further, the Board of Regents will take into consideration any limitations that the Governor and/or Legislature enact on salary progression.

~~Resources from both external and internal sources are used to fund faculty salaries. The Faculty Salary Policy anticipates new resources being made available from the Legislature, including legislative allocations for faculty salary increases and special legislative allocations for recruitment and retention, or through funds from tuition increases. Funds centrally recaptured from faculty turnover, grant, contract, and clinical funds available to individual units, and other internal resources which the Provost might identify are also used to support the plan.~~

Prior to the beginning of each biennium fiscal year, the Provost will meet-consult with the Board of Deans and Chancellors, the Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee, and the University Budget Committee to formulate a recommendation for a salary distribution plan, including providing an opportunity for input into the criteria to be considered in formulating the plan. If the salary distribution plan to be recommended by the Provost includes a minimum equal-percentage salary increase less than a 2% regular merit increase, an explanation of the basis for the recommendation will be provided to the Board of Deans and Chancellors, Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee, and University Budget Committee, with an opportunity to provide comment and feedback before a final recommendation is forwarded. ~~After consultation with the above groups,~~ the Provost shall then make a recommendation to the President for faculty salary allocations. The President shall then make a recommendation to the Board of Regents for faculty salary allocations for the fiscal year. Upon adoption of the University budget by the Board of Regents, which will include any approved ~~decide~~ faculty salary allocations for the biennium fiscal year, ~~and~~ this decision shall be reported to the Faculty Senate and to the University community more broadly.

Allocation Categories. Consistent with the stated objectives, the first priority shall be to support regular merit and promotion awards to current faculty. Further, each biennium the minimum salaries by rank will be reviewed and, if adjusted, support will be provided to ensure those minimum levels are achieved. Other funds, as available, may be allotted among the following faculty salary+ adjustments:

1. Additional merit to all faculty;
2. Differential distributions by unit to correct salary gaps created by changing disciplinary markets or assessments of unit quality;
3. Recruitment and rRetention;
4. System wide adjustments to raise the salaries of all meritorious faculty.

Merit Principle and Review. The University commits to support salary adjustments based on performance evaluations for those faculty deemed meritorious after a systematic review by faculty colleagues, department or unit head, Dean, and Provost. In order for these performance evaluations and merit salary recommendations to be meaningful, they must be done systematically and over an appropriate length of time to be able to make true quality assessments about performance and progress, considering the cumulative record of faculty.

All faculty shall be evaluated annually for merit and for progress towards reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, as appropriate. Upon approval by the Board of Regents of a regular merit salary allocation, A a faculty member who is deemed to be meritorious in performance shall be awarded a regular 2% merit salary increase at the beginning of in the following academic year. Higher levels of performance shall be recognized by higher levels of salary increases as permitted by available funding. The Board of Regents also has the discretion to provide a minimum equal-percentage merit salary increase that is less than 2%.

Any faculty member whose performance is not deemed meritorious shall be informed by the Chair/Dean of the reasons. If deemed meritorious in the next year's review, and a regular merit salary allocation has been approved by the Board of Regents, the faculty member shall receive a regular 2% merit increase at the beginning of in the following academic year. A departmental

advisory committee, appointed consistent with [Section 24-55H](#) of the Faculty Code, will consider the development needs of faculty members not receiving regular merit salary increases for two consecutive years.

Promotion. ~~In addition to regular merit salary allocations,~~ [Upon approval by the Board of Regents of a promotion allocation,](#) each faculty member who is promoted in rank shall be awarded a 7.5% promotion salary increase beginning on the date the promotion is effective.

Unit Adjustments. Additional salary funds may be allocated by the Provost to colleges and schools at any time during the biennium, after appropriate consultations with the Faculty Senate Planning and Budgeting Committee, to address differentials occurring in the academic labor markets and to reflect assessments of the quality, standing, and contributions of units to College, School, and University goals. Unless specifically allocated by the Provost for a particular unit or purpose, the Deans shall consult with their elected faculty councils before distributing any additional salary increase funds among their constituent units. The procedures of [Section 24-55](#) of the Faculty Code will be followed in distributing funds allocated to adjust faculty salaries based on merit.

Retention Adjustments. With approval from the Provost, college-administered or University funds may be used to adjust faculty salaries as a means to retain faculty members at the University of Washington either at the time of merit reviews or at other times as necessary throughout the academic year. Assessments of a faculty member's quality and unit contribution are essential elements in decisions to make retention adjustments. Consultative processes to recommend retention adjustments shall be established at the unit level following the procedures set forth in [Section 24-71](#) of the Faculty Code.

~~*Funding Cautions.* This Faculty Salary Policy is based upon an underlying principle that new funds from legislative appropriations are required to keep the salary system in equilibrium. Career advancement can be rewarded and the current level of faculty positions sustained only if new funds are provided. Without the infusion of new money from the Legislature into the salary base, career advancement can only be rewarded at the expense of the size of the University faculty. Without the influx of new money or in the event of decreased State support, a reevaluation of this Faculty Salary Policy may prove necessary.~~

Executive Order No. 64 of the President, January 7, 2000.

[Executive Order No. _____ \(Replacing and Superseding Executive Order No. 64\) proposed May 25, 2010.](#)