



COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

March 20, 2020

To: Dylan Rodriguez
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Abhijit Ghosh, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Proposed Agreement: Resubmission-UCR Online Course Agreement (ILTI Agreement)

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) initially reviewed the proposed UCR Online Course Agreement (ILTI Agreement) at its October 15, 2019 meeting. As the contents of the proposal submitted for rereview have not changed, the CFW reiterates the concerns expressed in its November 4, 2019 memo attached.

November 4, 2019

To: Dylan Rodriguez
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Abhijit Ghosh, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Proposed Agreement: UCR Online Course Agreement (ILTI Agreement)

The CFW has discussed the proposed ILTI agreement in a meeting on Oct 15, 2019. The committee has found a number of major concerns in the proposed agreement. Overall, the proposed agreement seems to lack a number of important details. For example – how is the department involved in all these? Does teaching online courses count towards regular teaching load? Who owns the content after a stipulated number of offerings as per the agreement? What is the delivery system and how is the content protected? How would the current online and hybrid courses be handled in this new paradigm?

Following are the major concerns:

1. The agreement says that “the Contributor owns the portions of the Course created”. It is not clear who owns what part, or how that would be determined.
2. Section 1.1.2: "The Regents owns the portions of the Course created by it". What exactly is meant by "it"; is it the vehicle of delivery, the monetary compensation, or some other factor?
3. It is not clear what and how much each campus can transfer to the contributor for ownership of materials owned by the regents (with no explanation of what exactly is owned by The Regents).
4. It appears that The Regents reserve absolute authority to distribute and modify as they may see fit, royalty free. The CFW thinks that such a wide-ranging blanket authority over the course materials by anyone other than the contributor may not protect the interest of the contributor (that is the faculty) and may alter the course content in a way not intended by the contributor.
5. Copyright issues and related responsibilities are pushed entirely on the contributor. The Regents should share some responsibility and provide resources to make sure that the copyrights issues are taken care of while course is being developed.

Finally, we recommend that any proposed agreement should be drafted in consultation with professional lawyers and most importantly faculty members who have already developed and taught online/hybrid courses in the UCR system.