



# FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

THE JESUIT UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

## Faculty Senate

Joseph M. McShane, S.J., Hon. President

Micki McGee, President

Andrew H. Clark, Vice President

Christopher GoGwilt, Secretary

William Baumgarth

Fran Blumberg

Martin Chase, S.J.

Jeffrey Colon

Edward Dubrovsky

Marcia Flicker

Ralf Hepp

Janna C. Heyman

Judith Jones

Eve Keller

Winnie Kung

Mark Mattson

Matthew M. McGowan

Patricio Meneses

Haim Mozes

Diane Rodriguez

Berish Rubin

Aditya Saharia

Henry Schwalbenberg

Grace M. Vernon

Sarah Zimmerman

Excused: Senators GoGwilt, Clark, Heyman, Rodriguez  
 Guests: Mary Ann Forgey, Dean Virginia Roach  
 Meeting: O'Hare Special Collections, Walsh Library, Rose Hill Campus

### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Micki McGee at 11:37 am in the O'Hare Special Collections, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, Walsh Library, Rose Hill.

### 2. Invocation

Senator Baumgarth delivered the invocation.

### 3. Modifying the agenda.

The Senate President invited proposals to modify the agenda in light of new items needing to be addressed.

a. On a motion from Senator Vernon, seconded by Senator Flicker, the Senate voted to postpone until January the report from Benjamin Crooker, Associate VP for Academic Affairs. The motion was approved by a vote of 16 – 0 – 1.

b. On behalf of the Student Life Committee, Senator Jones moved that the agenda be modified to include discussion of the Rodrigue's Café incident. The motion was seconded by Senator Meneses and passed by a vote of 18 – 0 – 0.

c. Following a request from the Provost to include

a brief report on Online/Hybrid Learning from Dean Virginia Roach from the Graduate School of Education, Senator Flicker moved, seconded by Senator Blumberg, that Dean Roach be invited to the January meeting. Following discussion, the question was called (Flicker, Blumberg) and the Senate voted in favor of calling the question (18 – 0 – 0).

The motion to invite Dean Roach to the January meeting and not to the current meeting failed by a vote of 5 – 11 – 2.

Senator Mattson moved, seconded by Senator Meneses, that Dean Roach be invited to the present meeting. The motion passed by a vote of 13 – 4 – 1.

d. During the meeting, Senator Schwalbenberg agreed to postpone his report on the Budget Task Force until the January meeting.

**4. Minutes**—Approval of the Minutes of April 7, 2017 (Special Meeting RH); April 18, 2017 (Special Meeting LC); April 28, 2017 (Regularly Scheduled Meeting RH); May 1, 2017 (Special Meeting RH); May 1, 2017 (Organizational Meeting RH); May 12, 2017 (Special Meeting RH); November 17, 2017 (Regularly Scheduled Meeting LC).

On a motion from Senator Jones, seconded by Senator Rubin, the Senate moved to postpone approval of the six sets of minutes from April and May, 2017. The motion was approved by a vote of 18 – 0 – 1.

The President asked for amendments or

corrections to the November 2017 minutes which were approved by a vote of 18 – 0 – 1.

**5. Report of the University President: Fr. Joseph McShane, S.J. (in absentia)**

Fr. McShane's report to the Senate, which because of time constraints could not be read at the meeting, is appended to the minutes.

**6. Report of the Provost: Dr. Stephen Freedman**

The Provost wished everyone a happy holiday season. He had four items to discuss.

1. Phased retirement. The Provost announced that the opportunity for eligible faculty to participate in the phased retirement program will be made available.

2. Budget Task Force. Referring to the Budget Task Force report to be presented by Senator Schwalbenberg, the Provost said he had met with Senator Schwalbenberg and that the Senator's report has been shared with the President. He is confident about the possibility of adding more faculty to the Task Force itself and ensuring that the work of the Task Force incorporates, through the Huron Consulting Group, the input of faculty.

3. AVPAA Ben Crooker's report on the composition of the faculty in January will be very important.

4. Online / Hybrid learning. The Provost's main item concerned the expansion of online and hybrid learning. The Graduate School of Education and Graduate School of Social Science have signed a contract with 2U with programs to begin in May 2018. He made a case for respecting the decisions of deans and faculty concerning the curricula in their particular schools, given that appropriate consultation with faculty has happened.

Dean Roach reported on the history of online and hybrid learning in the Graduate School of Education. With guidance from the School's Curriculum Committee, the faculty were

consulted about new online programs within the school. Dean Roach reported that she had consulted with the chair of the Curriculum Committee regarding the move of GSE's Catholic and Faith-based Leadership Program; at that time the Curriculum Committee Chair, determined that since that program had previously been approved in an online context, there was no need for additional faculty consultation.<sup>1</sup> Relying on this precedent, the Dean convened the specific faculty involved in the first of the proposed 2U programs (the Masters of Special Education Dual Degree), who approved it, and their request for accreditation was forwarded to the state for approval. They have another program, educational doctorate program, that 2U was interested in; the faculty voted to move forward. This particular program needed to be redesigned. The redesigned program was approved by the Curriculum Committee. The Dean asked the faculty to develop a policy for expanding their online and hybrid learning. Senator Blumberg is on that committee. Two more faculty have asked to expand programs they direct into the 2U program. The Dean reported that GSE is using all of their usual governance structures, including the School Council, as they make these changes.

Jonathan Crystal added that, although the Provost has not authorized hires for GSE in some time, the school was authorized to engage in multiple searches this fall. This decision was based both on his confidence in the strategic vision of Dean Roach, as well as projected growth in enrollments. He assured the Senate that new online programs will be appropriately staffed.

The Provost explained that he had been worried about the viability of GSE given the challenging environment for schools of education, and that he supported the development of online and hybrid programs partly for that reason.

One senator asked Dean Roach who was responsible for recruiting students, and who was responsible for accepting students. The Dean responded that 2U does the recruiting; they advertise and market the program. The decision to

<sup>1</sup> GSE's Master's in Catholic and Faith-based Leadership had previously moved from JesuitNet to Blackboard

without Curriculum Committee review; this precedent informed decisions on how to proceed with 2U consultation.

accept students belongs entirely to the faculty. The senator asked if there is a target class size that they have to meet. The Dean responded that the courses are capped at 15. If a class enrolls at a lower number there is no penalty in terms of revenue. One senator questioned the notion that faculty are being directed that in order to protect their IP rights they should sequester material that they want to retain IP rights in the synchronous, lecture comments of the course. The point was made that decisions on whether to include particular content in asynchronous vs. synchronous parts of the course should be for pedagogical reasons, not to provide the only avenue to ensure that faculty can protect their IP rights.

Senators asked a range of questions that led to discussion on a range of matters. The Provost wanted to be on record that he is still in conversation with the Deans about Intellectual Property issues. He asked for time to make sure this is done effectively. A senator asked when those issues must be resolved, given that contracts have already been signed in the Graduate School of Education. The Provost defended individual School decisions in going forward with agreements with 2U.

**7. Preliminary Report from the Senate Interdisciplinary Task Force on Online/Hybrid Learning: Professor Mary Ann Forgey, Task Force Chairperson.**

Dr. Forgey began by thanking the Senate for the opportunity to speak; and thanking members of the Task Force for their work. She provided an overview of their key activities before getting to the concerns they have been addressing and their recommendations. She observed that their charge was broad and it was not initially clear what the Task Force's role should be in addressing particular issues raised about 2U. The Senate subsequently clarified that these issues were within the Task Force purview since the Task Force was the only body that could address these issues. As a result, given the immediacy of these issues, they became a primary focus of their work. In addition to responding to the 2U issues, the

Task Force had drafted a broad inventory of questions in relation to Online and Hybrid Learning in general following their initial meeting on 8 November. In relation to the 2U issues, they requested a copy of the 2U contract and all faculty agreements from the Provost but have not yet received the 2U-Fordham contract in written form. They hope it is forthcoming. They met with Ron Jacobson, 2U liaison with the Provost's office, on November 21st. But he was not able to answer most of their specific contract questions. The Task Force Chair and GSE and GSS task force members, along with the Senate President, met with the Provost Office and the GSS and GSE deans on 11/28. The Deans addressed the issues of faculty involvement in the contract decision making. Based on what was learned, it seems that, prior to the university's signing the contract, the faculty governance bodies within the schools had no involvement with developing the terms of the contract and in the decision to enter into the 2U partnership. Task Force members also met with the Provost on 12/6 and with Dr. Crystal and Dr. Fahey-Smith on 12/13 to review the list of concerns regarding faculty governance, contract terms and the Faculty Course Development Agreement.

At 1:21 pm, on a motion from Senator Rubin, seconded by Senator Baumgarth, the Senate went into Executive Session. The Senate came out of Executive Session at 1:30 pm.

Dr. Forgey outlined several major issues of concern provided in a List of Faculty Questions and Concerns (see Appendix II):

1. The question of faculty governance and the extent to which faculty were involved in vetting different companies, with their different approaches. Why was 2U chosen over other companies? Were faculty involved in the negotiation of terms? Who decided what bodies of faculty should be consulted, and what criteria would be used to evaluate 2U? What role does faculty play in implementation? If curriculum is the faculty's primary responsibility why do we not have a seat at the tables where decisions were made and are being made?

2. Transparency in terms of the contract: why so little transparency? Some terms of the 2U contract, including the length of the contract, type of online delivery (synchronous vs. asynchronous) directly impact the curriculum. What are the enrollment projections? What will it mean for the size of the adjunct pool and the ratio of full time to adjunct faculty?

3. Questions around the Faculty Course Developer Agreements: 1) the role of faculty vs. the dean's authority: within the agreement the dean has more authority in course development and accreditation than in the traditional curriculum; 2) how is compensation being calculated? 3) the issue of intellectual property: why does Fordham need to own "subject matter and course materials"? Is it because of the contract with 2U?

Dr. Forgey concluded that there are many questions needing to be answered, but "the train has already left the station" with respect to the University's contracts with 2U signed in the summer, school soliciting agreements from faculty to develop courses, and a very tight production timeline.

Dr. Forgey summarized the Task Force's four recommendations in relation to the 2U contract. Senators then asked questions about the different procedures that had been followed with GSE and GSS; Dr. Forgey responded that they appear to have been different. At GSS there was not a vote, there was only a 2U demonstration. What happened at GSE was clarified by a senator: at GSE, as noted by the Dean in her early remarks, there was a smaller vote by a small group of faculty (not a standing committee) based on a precedent that had been set the year prior by a previous Curriculum Committee chair. The senator also noted that the current Committee Chair is not in accord with that decision).

The President added, for clarity, and based on prior information from Dean Roach, that the dean had inquired of a Curriculum Chair about whether the move of a course online would require review by the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee chair at that time advised her that no

vote was needed (because the move was from one online platform to another) and thus the matter was not heard by the Curriculum Committee. This guided the dean's approach to faculty consultation regarding 2U at GSE, and the decision has been used as a precedent with respect to the review of 2U program developments.

A senator asked if hiring is going to be done based on projected enrollments then other schools will want to be involved. Another senator disputed the fact that GSE was getting new lines because of the new online and hybrid learning programs; that individual understood that the new hires were due to concerns regarding accreditation and faculty attrition.

Questions were also raised about Fordham's IP policy. Dr. Forgey explained that in accordance with Fordham's IP policy, there needs to be a separate agreement signed by faculty if any of their IP rights were to be altered due to "extraordinary resources" being provided for course development. In the past, no agreements were asked to be signed and therefore everything a faculty member developed in both traditional and online course was their intellectual property. Now Fordham is requiring faculty course developers for 2U courses to sign an agreement, which they have a right to do. The concerns being raised, however, are in relation to the content of the agreement itself, and the extent of the IP rights being claimed by the University.

A motion to extend discussion on the Task Force's recommendations for 10 minutes was made and seconded. The vote was 16-2-1.

A motion was made by Senator Flicker, seconded by Senator Vernon, to accept the Task Force's report. The Senate voted to adopt the report 19 – 0 – 0.

A motion was made by Senator Flicker, seconded by Senator Baumgarth, to adopt all four of the Task Force's proposals. A discussion followed. It was observed that in the Faculty (2U) Course Developer Agreement, faculty lose all IP rights to the asynchronous materials. Senators raised concerns about how faculty governance is being

defined by the administration. Dr. Forgey and the Task Force believe that the Provost has the responsibility to ensure that faculty have their proper governance role in relation to online decision making since it is a “method of instruction” and therefore meets the definition of curriculum as defined by the statutes. Given this, a strong statement on this issue needs to be made by the Senate. A senator asked to whom the faculty should appeal if they are unhappy with the decisions being made in negotiating with the online and hybrid learning companies. One senator expressed concern that by leaving the decisions entirely within the schools too much decision-making power is being ceded to the deans of those schools rather than the faculty in those schools. Another senator expressed concern about the second proposal of the motion: he suggests that it could be argued that the University Statutes were not violated in relation to GSE, so perhaps it should be revised. A revised version of the second proposal in the motion was developed to address these concerns. Senator Flicker accepted the revised version of proposal #2 as a friendly amendment.

On a motion from Senator Keller, seconded by Senator Baumgarth, the Senate voted to call the question (16 – 0 – 3).

The Senate voted on the motion (Flicker/Baumgarth) to adopt the following four recommendations from the Interdisciplinary Task Force on Online / Hybrid Learning:

***1) Resolved, that pursuant to the University Statutes (4-01.02) which state, “The University Faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status and those aspects of student life which are related to the educational process,” the Senate affirms the primary role of the faculty in the determination of policies and practices in both traditional in-class and online/hybrid education programs and courses within the University and that decisions in relation to this responsibility are carried out by the faculty organizations at the schools and***

***department level, including the faculty committees charged with curricula development, delivery and oversight.***

***2) Resolved, that pursuant to the University Statutes (4-01.02) the Faculty Senate has serious faculty governance concerns about the way in which the Administration entered into contracts with 2U resulting in the establishment of a long-term partnership between 2U and GSE and GSS in June of 2017. In response to these concerns, the Senate hereby requests the Provost Office to take all necessary steps to ensure that the existing faculty governance process in relation to the curriculum are followed within each school and department so that proper faculty review and oversight of the 2U curriculum development and implementation process can occur. The implementation of these contracts should only proceed if and when the curriculum matters of the contracts are under the direct control of the faculty bodies responsible for the curriculum in each school.***

***3) The Faculty Senate directs the Salary and Benefits Committee to review all Online Faculty Course Development Agreements dealing with faculty compensation and Intellectual Property and to address with the administration all faculty concerns and questions that have been raised in relation to these documents.***

***4) To ensure clear and effective decision-making mechanisms for faculty to carry out their statutory responsibilities in relation to online and hybrid education, the Senate directs the Interdisciplinary Task Force on Online and Hybrid Learning to focus its remaining work on conducting a review of the faculty role within the Online and Hybrid learning decision making processes and structures within each school and the University and make any necessary recommendations in this regard. The Senate expects full cooperation from the Provost Office in carrying out this review and requests that a list of all Online/Hybrid***

*courses offered across the University be provided to the Task Force. A report on the findings and recommendations will be submitted to the Senate by March 1, 2017.*

The motion passed by a vote of 18 – 0 – 1.

### **8. Committee Elections and Nominees**

a. UTRC Election. Results were announced.

b. A motion was made by Senator Mattson, seconded by Senator Saharia, to approve the nominees for the Research Council Nominees. The Senate approved the nominees by a vote of 16 – 0 – 0.

### **9. Report from the Student Life Committee**

Senator Jones gave a report from the Student Life Committee about the sharing of the video of the incident at Rodrigue's Coffee House on national television. She read a draft motion standing in solidarity with the students. A senator raised a question about the motion's language, that included verbatim quotations of vulgar hate speech included in harassing emails that had been sent to Rodrigue's student club members in the wake of the broadcast of the video. A friendly amendment was made to remove those comments.

The following motion from the Student Life Committee was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 15 – 0 – 3:

- *Whereas the sharing of the video of the December 7th confrontation at Rodrigue's Coffee House with media outlets occurred without the permission of some of those who were filmed;*
- *Whereas the broadcasting of that video has resulted in the subjection of individual students associated with Rodrigue's to virulent misogynist, racist, sexist, and homophobic attacks on social media;*
- *Whereas many of those students are people of color, LGBTQ, and members of other groups often marginalized at Fordham and beyond;*

- *Whereas the members of Rodrigue's governing board, along with the collective of students who manage the Facebook and email accounts, have been flooded by violent threats since the confrontation took place, many of which articulate explicit desire for physical and sexual violence;*
- *Whereas students affiliated with the board of Rodrigue's have expressed fear for their personal safety, and note the emotional toll that absorbing a litany of hateful speech has taken on them during the most demanding time of the semester.*

*The Senate expresses its solidarity with these students as they face this torrent of abuse, and urges the University to provide every possible protection for their safety and well-being.*

### **10. Announcement of results of non-binding Faculty Referendum on Merit**

The Senate President explained the voting procedures and the results.

1. To continue current merit policy: 183 (43.6%)
2. To discontinue merit irrespective of merit for the duration of the contract: 123 (29.3%)
3. To reduce merit if inflation is at 2% or higher: 73 (17.6%)
4. To suspend merit if inflation is 2% or higher and maintain: 40 (9.5%)

Total number of people who participated who were eligible to vote: 78% (420 out of 535)

Segmented vote (that includes only faculty who are not currently serving in full-time administrative appointments):

1. To continue current merit policy: 172 (42.4%)
2. To discontinue merit irrespective of merit for the duration of the contract: 122 (30.0%)
3. To reduce merit if inflation is at 2% or higher: 72 (17.7%)

4. To suspend merit if inflation is 2% or higher and maintain: 40 (9.9%)

The Salary and Benefits Committee will now consider these results and report to the Senate in January.

The Senate President regretted that time constraints precluded having the University President's report read into the meetings record and noted that it will be attached to the minutes.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:43 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Senate Secretary Chris GoGwilt, with thanks to Senator Zimmerman for taking the minutes.

Appendix I  
University President's Report

Dr. Micki McGee  
President, Fordham University Faculty Senate  
Cunniffe House Room 117  
Rose Hill Campus

Dear Dr. Micki McGee:

In the past few weeks, the U.S. House of Representatives and the United States Senate have passed separate versions of a tax reform Bill that if enacted into law would have serious detrimental and extremely adverse consequences for college students, their families, our faculty, staff, and the entire sector of private, independent not-for-profit higher education in this country. Just last week Moody's downgraded its outlook for the higher education sector to negative citing the GOP tax plan. Of the two Bills, the Senate version is less onerous, but nonetheless still contains some extremely dangerous elements. Like all committed to private, independent higher education, I believe that numerous parts of this proposed legislation will result in increased costs for institutions as well as reduced access to higher education for talented and deserving students many of whom are needy. The two Houses are now in the process of reconciling the differences between their respective Bills, which they hope to complete by the beginning of next week.

I now ask that you phone or email your respective members of Congress (House and Senate) post haste, and urge them to ensure that the final bill, now under consideration by a conference committee, accomplishes the following:

- Preserve current tax-free educational benefits for employees, their spouses and children, and for graduate students by retaining respectively Section 117 (d) that provides for Tuition Remission for undergrads and Section 127 that provides for Employer Provided Tuition Remission up to a certain level for graduate and professional students;

Reject any Provision that would impose a tax on the endowments of private educational institutions like Fordham. The Public Colleges are exempt from such a Provision in both versions of the Bill, that would nevertheless levy such a tax at 1.4% of endowment income of a certain size on the private colleges. While this would not immediately affect a school like Fordham, given its current endowment size, it would nevertheless establish the principle that private endowments are subject to taxation, and once so established, any sized

endowment could be subject to taxation at any rate desired by the Congress;

Preserve the issuance of tax-free bonds by private educational institutions for renovation and construction projects and technology upgrades. Otherwise the University will be forced into the non-exempt bond market with its higher market rates.

Continue allowing the deduction of interest paid on student loans.

Preserve all existing state and local tax deductions currently in the Internal Revenue Code, as well as the full mortgage interest deduction, without which high tax and high cost states like New York and its region would be placed in a competitive disadvantage for recruiting faculty and staff at schools like Fordham.

You may utilize the link <http://www.congressweb.com/naicu/legislators/> to determine the identity of your Senator or Representative. Simply type in your address and zip when you open the above link, and your Senators and Representative's telephone and mail contacts will be provided. To be most effective, if you chose to place a telephone call, contact their DC office. If the phone lines are jammed, then try the District Office. For electronic mail communications, you need to go directly onto their official website, which may limit correspondence to actual constituents.

Private higher education makes valuable and irreplaceable contributions not only to our own society and domestic economy, but also to people around the world in this global, social world. Federal tax policy should assist educational institutions in their mission, in a manner that helps meet the needs of students and families, and that provides resources necessary for the uniquely American set of colleges and universities to maintain their place in global education.

Sincerely,

Joseph M. McShane, S. J.

**Appendix II**  
**List of Faculty Questions and Concerns**  
**Interdisciplinary Task Force on Online/Hybrid Learning**  
**2U Related Faculty Concerns and Questions**  
**Updated 12.11.17**

**Faculty Responsibility for the Curriculum - Subject Matter and Methods of Instruction**

- 1) Were the GSS & GSE curriculum committees involved in the vetting process? What criteria were used to select 2U as the online curriculum developer and deliverer? Who developed these criteria?
- 2) As part of the vetting process, who evaluated the way in which 2U does course design and production and how their process interfaces with the course development system in GSE and GSS?
- 3) Were the relevant curriculum committees involved in the development of the terms of the contract that impact the curriculum?
- 4) Did the relevant curriculum committees approve the decision to partner with 2U? Was there a vote by the faculty of each school to approve the 2U partnership?
- 5) How is the curriculum committee's responsibility for oversight of the curriculum being carried out in relation to the implementation of the 2U contract?

**Questions about 2U Contract Terms that Relate to the Curriculum**

- 6) What is the length of the 2U contract?
- 7) What timelines were agreed to for curriculum development and delivery? Can they be adjusted? Under what conditions?
- 8) How will 2U be held accountable in relation to their responsibilities for course development and delivery?
- 9) Under what conditions can Fordham terminate the contract?
- 10) What will happen to all of the 2U courses created when the contract ends? Will 2U have any rights to use the course material after the contract ends? Will faculty?
- 11) How many students are projected to be enrolled in the online program each year? What are the estimates for the # of faculty needing to be hired? Field placements to be found?
- 12) Will face to face students be able to take online courses if there is space available? And alternatively, can online program students take face to face courses? If not, what is the basis for this educational programmatic decision? Who made this decision?

- 13) Are there any provisions in the 2U contract that address the necessary technological accommodations that must be made for disabled students?

### **Online Faculty Course Development Agreements**

- 14) Given that faculty have primary responsibility for the curriculum, why do the agreements give the Dean the authority to make curriculum related decisions in relation to:

- a. deciding what courses will be developed online?
- b. determining if accreditation standards are met in the course being developed?
- c. reassigning faculty and terminating agreements if the Dean determines that accreditation standards are not being met?

- 15) Compensation: Both the GSE and GSS (draft) agreement states that faculty are to be paid \$7000 to develop a course.

- a. How was this amount calculated?
- b. Why compensation after the course is delivered? (Nothing in Statement of Work)
- c. How will compensation be handled if teams of two or more develop a course?
- d. What will the faculty developer's responsibility be to the 2U course post development?
- e. Will course release be considered in addition to or in place of compensation?

- 16) Timeline:

- a. Will the timeline be adjusted in any way to account for the added time needed when there is joint work on a course?
- b. How much academic flexibility will be allowed when a non-University entity is helping with the preparation of a given course?

- 17) Intellectual Property:

The last section of the GSE and GSS agreements state that:

“The faculty member acknowledges and agrees that the above resources that GSE will commit are ‘extraordinary resources’ as defined in the Fordham University Intellectual Property Policy and pursuant to the Policy, GSE shall claim and retain all intellectual property rights and ownership in the Online course, including, but not limited to, the instructional materials, courseware, and online course materials”

- a. Why is the University claiming “all intellectual property rights and ownership in the online course, including, but not limited to the instructional materials, courseware and online course materials?”
- b. Why are the “particular identified intellectual contributions” that are being commissioned not specified within the agreement? (as seems to be a requirement of Fordham’s IP policy)
- c. Will 2U be given any ownership rights to the material by the University? If so, what exactly will they own and how will this impact the faculty control and use of the course materials during the time of the contract and after its termination?
- d. In claiming “all IP rights and ownership.....” will faculty have the right to use:
  - i. the subject matter that they contributed to these course (e.g. lectures, exercises, assessment methods,) in the equivalent face to face courses, in other face to face courses and other educational forums while at Fordham or if they were to leave the University?
  - ii. the educational course materials and products that they developed using their subject matter expertise for the 2U course (e.g. videos, PP lectures) in their equivalent face to face courses, in other relevant courses, and in other educational venues within and outside Fordham or if they were to leave the University?
- e. What rights and ownership will faculty have to course materials (videos, PP lectures, exercises) that they developed previously for other courses and for which they own the copyright (no agreement otherwise was ever signed), if this material was to be made a part of a 2U courses? Will the University be asking the faculty developers of this previously developed material for permission (right to use?) this material? And if so, how would this impact the ownership of it once it becomes a part of a 2U course for which the University is claiming all of the ownership?
- f. Will there be any credit given to the course developer for any of the course materials they developed for 2U?
- g. What will be the faculty developer’s rights in relation to the course revision process?
- h. Were any other alternative ownership arrangements, such as joint ownership or faculty ownership with University right to use, considered by the University that could have addressed some of the issues identified above?

18) Agreement Development Process:

- a. Who developed these agreements? When? Faculty involvement?
- b. How was the (GSE) faculty or will the (GSS) faculty be selected for course production? Selection criteria? Were these criteria developed by faculty? Will faculty have responsibility for these decisions?
- c. When were each of these agreements first shared with faculty?

**2U Implementation and Programmatic Concerns:**

- 19) What is the faculty role on the 2U Implementation Committee? How is faculty carrying out their curriculum oversight responsibility as the contract is implemented?
- 20) What is the plan for faculty involvement in adjunct hiring for the courses that they develop for this program?
- 21) What is the plan for faculty supervision of these adjuncts to ensure the quality of the teaching within the program?
- 22) Will the course credits for online courses be the same as for face to face courses? If this differs in any way, what is the explanation for this difference?
- 23) What is the plan for recruiting GSS field placements and field advisors? What role will the faculty be playing in this? Has the Field Policy Committee been involved in any of the decisions around field placement recruitment?
- 24) What is the role and responsibilities of the Online Program Director in relation to the faculty and administration? Who does the director report to? Does anyone report to the Director?
- 25) The GSE faculty have been informed that the Fordham Director of Online will be based at Westchester with 2U because of space issues. This seems problematic as the online GSE are largely based at LC.