Prologue: This resolution is about the proper conduct of, and respect for, shared governance and the importance of a mutually agreed upon, effective and fair salary policy. Given the severity of the economic crisis, the current salary freeze is not at issue.

Whereas, in 1999-2000, after years of careful consultations and based on faculty-administrative agreement, a new faculty salary policy [see class A legislation] was enacted in the Faculty Code [see Faculty Code 24-70 – 71] and through Executive Order (EO) 64 [see original EO 64] that instituted annual minimum 2% merit increases as the highest priority in salary allocations, that ended an arbitrary salary system that had led to gross inequities over time, and in return for which the faculty agreed to a new policy of annual post-tenure peer reviews; and

Whereas, from Spring 2009 to the summer of 2010, the following events and developments occurred:

- Spring 2009: in the face of a state-imposed public employee salary freeze, EO 29 suspended the 2% minimum merit increase provision for the 2009-2011 biennium. The Senate took no position on EO 29. [See text of EO 29] A joint Administration/Senate Salary Working Group formed and started deliberations on possible revisions to the salary policy in light of unforeseen fiscal problems.

- May 3, 2010: at the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting, the President and the Salary Working Group were asked for updates on their deliberations. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting Chair, as a member of the Salary Working Group, indicated that deliberations were at an impasse. However, the President made no response to the invitation to update the SEC on the faculty salary deliberations. [See 5/3/10 SEC meeting, points 4, 5].

- A day later, on May 4, 2010: a year before the actual 2011-13 budget would even be known, President Emmert proposed EO 29's extension through 2011-12. [See presidential letter and proposal of 5/4/10.]

- May 20, 2010, a regular Senate meeting rejected EO 29's extension as "unnecessary at this time" and called for later good-faith reconsideration of EO 29's possible extension after the 2011-2013 biennial budget was better understood. [See minutes of 5/20/10 Senate meeting and full text of resolution.] Within days President Emmert withdrew the proposed EO 29 extension.

- May 25, 2010, five days after the last regular Senate meeting of the academic year and just before the Memorial Day weekend, and despite the on-going work of the Salary Working Group, President Emmert suddenly introduced EO 64R (revised). He imposed a June 7 deadline for a Senate response, despite code provisions allowing the Senate up to 60 days, at the Senate's discretion, for reviews of newly proposed EOs. [See presidential letter with proposal of 5/25/10 and EO 3, section 1.] At one of the busiest times of the academic calendar, and over an extended weekend closure of campus business, the Senate had eight days to study the details and implications of EO 64R, consult with its faculty constituents, set up an extraordinary meeting, and come to a considered position. Compared with EO 64, EO 64R substantially weakened and undermined the existing salary policy in key provisions.
A June 3 special Senate meeting overwhelmingly voted that the Senate "sees no reason to enact a change to the faculty salary policy at this time, and strongly opposes EO 64R" while calling for continuing deliberations. [See minutes of 6/3/10 special Senate meeting and full text of resolution.]

June 7, 2010: a letter by the Senate Chair and the Secretary of the Faculty to President Emmert explained the faculty's objections. [See letter.]

June 21, 2010, i.e., a week after the end of the academic year, when the University and the Senate could no longer be in full operation: after only minor revisions, President Emmert signed and enacted the unilaterally imposed EO 64R. [See letter.]

June 22, 2010: in response, the Senate leadership stated it was "unfortunate that the president felt compelled to act before reaching a fuller consensus with the faculty on the need to revise the Salary Policy." [See correspondence.]; and

Whereas, the implementation of an executive order in the face of an explicit resolution of opposition by the Faculty Senate appears to be without precedent in the fifty-five years of shared governance at the University of Washington; and

Whereas, unilateralism of this sort has damaged shared governance and violates the spirit and longstanding practice of good-faith consultations; therefore

Be it resolved, that the Senate:

- expresses its regret that our new President must deal with fallout from actions taken by President Emmert in 2010;
- respectfully urges the new presidential administration to re-commit to long-established shared governance principles and traditions and to refrain from unilateral actions;
- reaffirms its opposition to the June 2010 revisions of EO 64;
- and invites President Young to engage in good-faith consultations with the Senate to once again revise EO 64 in order to reestablish a sound and fair Faculty Salary Policy.

[also to be forwarded to the UW Board of Regents]
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