**From:**"George A. Sandison" <[sandison@uw.edu](mailto:sandison@uw.edu)>  
**Subject: RE: Question from UW-AAUP**  
**Date:**May 16, 2020 at 4:56:48 PM PDT  
**To:**Eva Cherniavsky <[ec22@uw.edu](mailto:ec22@uw.edu)>, JoAnn Taricani <[taricani@uw.edu](mailto:taricani@uw.edu)>, "Daniel M. Ratner" <[dratner@uw.edu](mailto:dratner@uw.edu)>, "Wendy E. Barrington" <[wendybar@uw.edu](mailto:wendybar@uw.edu)>, "Craig H. Allen" <[challen@uw.edu](mailto:challen@uw.edu)>, "[djg@cs.washington.edu](mailto:djg@cs.washington.edu)" <[djg@cs.washington.edu](mailto:djg@cs.washington.edu)>, Morgan Herbert <[mherbert@uw.edu](mailto:mherbert@uw.edu)>, "Cheryl L. Greengrove" <[cgreen@uw.edu](mailto:cgreen@uw.edu)>  
**Cc:**Joseph Janes <[jwj@uw.edu](mailto:jwj@uw.edu)>, Michael E Townsend <[met@uw.edu](mailto:met@uw.edu)>, Robin Angotti <[riderr@uw.edu](mailto:riderr@uw.edu)>, "[execaaup@uw.edu](mailto:execaaup@uw.edu)" <[execaaup@uw.edu](mailto:execaaup@uw.edu)>  
  
  
Dear Professor Cherniavsky,  
I am following up on your request of April 29. At the last SCPB meeting, held 05/11/20, the committee discussed whether the proposed Intensive English Program (IEP) closure constituted a program that requires triggering of an RCEP process (limited or full) under the definitions provided in the Faculty Code or Executive Order VI. SCPB determined that the IEP does not meet the definition of a program and consequently an RCEP process will not be triggered. This determination is binding.  
   
Sincerely,  
   
George Sandison  
Chair of SCPB  
   
**From:** George A. Sandison   
**Sent:** Thursday, April 30, 2020 8:40 AM  
**To:** \_ [ec22@uw.edu](mailto:ec22@uw.edu) <[ec22@uw.edu](mailto:ec22@uw.edu)>; JoAnn Taricani <[taricani@uw.edu](mailto:taricani@uw.edu)>; Daniel M. Ratner <[dratner@uw.edu](mailto:dratner@uw.edu)>; Wendy E. Barrington <[wendybar@uw.edu](mailto:wendybar@uw.edu)>; Craig H. Allen <[challen@uw.edu](mailto:challen@uw.edu)>; [djg@cs.washington.edu](mailto:djg@cs.washington.edu); Morgan Herbert <[mherbert@uw.edu](mailto:mherbert@uw.edu)>; Cheryl L. Greengrove <[cgreen@uw.edu](mailto:cgreen@uw.edu)>  
**Cc:** Joseph Janes <[jwj@uw.edu](mailto:jwj@uw.edu)>; Michael E Townsend <[met@uw.edu](mailto:met@uw.edu)>; Robin Angotti <[riderr@uw.edu](mailto:riderr@uw.edu)>; [execaaup@uw.edu](mailto:execaaup@uw.edu)  
**Subject:** RE: Question from UW-AAUP  
   
Dear Professor Cherniavsky,  
   
Thank you for your continued interest and for offering your opinion and advice. I will consider further the points and arguments you have raised regarding whether IEP should be considered an academic program and whether the issue is appropriately referred to SCPB. I would point out that the SCPB is still holding meetings via Zoom.  
   
Best wishes,  
   
George  
   
**From:** \_ [ec22@uw.edu](mailto:ec22@uw.edu) [<mailto:ec22@uw.edu>]   
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 29, 2020 6:14 PM  
**To:** George A. Sandison <[sandison@uw.edu](mailto:sandison@uw.edu)>; JoAnn Taricani <[taricani@uw.edu](mailto:taricani@uw.edu)>; Daniel M. Ratner <[dratner@uw.edu](mailto:dratner@uw.edu)>; Wendy E. Barrington <[wendybar@uw.edu](mailto:wendybar@uw.edu)>; Craig H. Allen <[challen@uw.edu](mailto:challen@uw.edu)>; [djg@cs.washington.edu](mailto:djg@cs.washington.edu); Morgan Herbert <[mherbert@uw.edu](mailto:mherbert@uw.edu)>; Cheryl L. Greengrove <[cgreen@uw.edu](mailto:cgreen@uw.edu)>  
**Cc:** Joseph Janes <[jwj@uw.edu](mailto:jwj@uw.edu)>; Michael E Townsend <[met@uw.edu](mailto:met@uw.edu)>; Robin Angotti <[riderr@uw.edu](mailto:riderr@uw.edu)>; [execaaup@uw.edu](mailto:execaaup@uw.edu)  
**Subject:** Re: Question from UW-AAUP  
   
Dear Professor Sandison,  
   
Thank you for your reply on the issue of whether the Continuum College may close the Intensive English Program without triggering the RCEP process in the Faculty Code. Unfortunately, this interpretation of the Faculty Code is difficult to reconcile with the actual contributions of IELP.   
   
[Faculty Code Section 26-41](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH26.html#2641)(Section A) on "Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination Procedures” (RCEP) calls for a process to be launched for termination of any "distinct option in the University Catalog,” which this certainly is. The relevant Catalog entry is [HERE](https://www.ielp.uw.edu/). The entry for ILEP advertises five levels of instruction, and “experienced instructors with advanced degrees in teaching English as a second language."  
   
While the program itself does not offer degrees, it issues certificates; those students finishing at least two quarters of instruction (20 hours per week) at an extremely demanding, advanced level of academic English proficiency are issued “completion” certificates. This credential is accepted by a number of degree-granting institutions (including both graduate and undergraduate degree programs at two of three UW campuses) as a demonstration of English proficiency.   
   
ILEP courses are part and parcel of the UW’s Global Executive MBA. Further, the UW’s international LLM  program requires ILEP participation (the LLM degree is an internationally recognized JD law degree), along with the Afghan Legal Scholars masters degree. ILEP is also important for a number of degree programs awarded by cooperating institutions in Japan and China.  Furthermore, to say that extension lecturers teaching full time are not governed (or protected) by the faculty code because they are unionized and (therefore) have been (re) categorized as “professional staff” is deeply concerning to us.  Surely, the spirit and intent of the faculty code is to guarantee the rights of people holding advanced degrees, whose primary job description is teaching and curriculum design.    
   
The Code section cited above states, "**A disagreement**as to whether the object of a proposed action constitutes a program **shall be resolved by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting**, whose decision shall be binding. The dean or chancellor and the faculty group affected by the proposed action shall each submit a statement of their position to the chair of the committee, which shall deliver its ruling within ten instructional days of the receipt of both statements.”   At the very least, it seems to us that there is a sufficient basis for disagreement here, which would seem to require SCPB to put this item on your agenda and to solicit the statements described above. The issue of whether meetings are now being held is entirely separate from the decision of PCE/C2 to act unilaterally or with impunity. Many other sectors of the UW have managed to meet within the guidelines of the Open Meeting Act, including the Graduate School Council.   
   
The process description is quite detailed and lengthy, requiring a thoughtful approach to considering the matter. The haste with which this matter has been shuffled through should, by itself, be a source of concern to the Faculty Senate.  
   
To allow PCE to make this decision without the oversight of faculty governance bodies appears to us to set a very alarming precedent.   We would ask for your prompt attention to this matter, as PCE has already announced the termination of the program on its website, again *entirely without*Faculty Senate consultation or approval.  
   
Sincerely,  
Eva Cherniavsky  
on behalf of the UW-AAUP  Executive Board  
   
Eva Cherniavsky  
Andrew R. Hilen Professor of American Literature and Culture  
Acting President, UW-AAUP  
Director of Graduate Studies  
Department of English   
Box 354330  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195  
   
   
On Mon, Apr 20, 2020 at 7:29 PM George A. Sandison <[sandison@uw.edu](mailto:sandison@uw.edu)> wrote:  
Dear Professor Cherniavsky,  
   
No RCEP process has been initiated for the proposed Intensive English Program (IEP) closure. IEP courses are non-credit and teachers in that program are not faculty as defined under the faculty code but professional staff represented by their ATF staff union and governed under their union contract not the faculty code contract. To my knowledge, the IEP is not a degree granting unit with courses delivered by faculty nor is it an academic sub-unit which offers a track within a degree. Therefore it does not appear to meet the criteria of a “program” covered by the RCEP process under the Faculty Code.  
   
My understanding is that University administration representing CC and academic HR have been working closely for a considerable time with ATF union representatives of the affected professional staff. Faculty Senate leadership have not been party to any of those discussions, as is appropriate.  Although previously profitable, I was informed that the accumulated deficit over the past 5 years for the IEP is approaching $4 million due to a considerable drop in international student demand beginning in 2014 and competitive forces both internationally and domestically from other US educational institutions for what is the reduced demand.  
   
The only way that SCPB may become involved is if there is a convincing argument presented to the committee that the proposed IEP closure does meet the definition of a “program” under the Faculty Code. However that argument must be brought to SCPB for a binding decision by one of the following; a Dean, Chancellor or group of faculty affected by the proposed action.  
   
Please note that as SCPB Chair I am taking an interest whether any academic program will be meaningfully impacted by the proposed IEP closure. Therefore I have been in recent contact with the Vice-Provost for CC and the Chair of the English Department  on the Seattle campus. They are also in communication with each other independent of me and any other member of our senate leadership.  
   
Best wishes, George