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| Nursing, WellStar School of                              | Mary Beth Maguire |  |
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| Communication and Media, School of | Justin Pettigrew (proxy: Laura Beth Davis) | Y |
| Conflict Management, Peacebuilding and Development, School of | Heather Pincock | Y |
| English                                                     | Jeanne Bohannon | Y |
| Foreign Languages  | Noah McLaughlin | Y |
| Geography and Anthropology | Paul McDaniel | Y |
| History and Philosophy | Marianne Holdzkom | Y |
| Interdisciplinary Studies | May Gao |  |
| Government & International Affairs, School of  | Steve Collins | Y |
| Psychological Science | Daniel Rogers | Y |
| Sociology and Criminal Justice | Brian Starks for Darina Lepadatu (Fall) | Y |
| Technical Communication and Interactive Design  | Uttam Kokil | Y |
| **College of Science and Mathematics** |   |  |
| Chemistry and Biochemistry | Michael Van Dyke | Y |
| Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology         | Joe Dirnbeger |  |
| Mathematics                                                                                | Josip Derado |  |
| Molecular and Cellular Biology                            | Jerald Hendrix | Y |
| Physics                                                                  | Russell Patrick |  |
| Statistics and AnalyticalSciences                                                        | Josip Derado |  |
| **Southern Polytechnic College of** **Engineering and Engineering Technology** |   |  |
| Civil and Construction Engineering | M.A. Karim |  |
| Computer Engineering  | Scott Tippens |  |
| Electrical Engineering | Walter Thain | Y |
| Engineering Technology                                       | David Stolberg | Y |
| Mechanical Engineering                                          | Simon Nasseri for Mohammed S. Mayeed (Fall) |  |
| Mechatronics Engineering | Ying Wang |  |
| Systems and Industrial Engineering                     | Lin Li |  |
| **University College** |   |  |
| Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality, Michael A. Leven School of | Jonathan Brown | Y |
| First-Year and Transition Studies                           | Richard Mosholder |  |
| Leadership and Integrative Studies                      | Ginny Boss | Y |
| **Honors College**  |   |  |
| **Horace W. Sturgis Library** | Barbara Wood  | Y |
| **VISITORS** |  |  |
| Office of Undergraduate Research (NCUR) | Amy Buddie | Y |
| Internal Audit | Lesley Netter-Snowden | Y |
| Museums, Archives and Rare Books | Mariel Fox | Y |
| Museums, Archives and Rare Books | Amber Smith | Y |
| Distance Learning Center | Tamara Powell | Y |
| Office of Institutional Effectiveness- Policy Process Council | Kevin Gwaltney | Y |
| General Education | Kris DuRocher | Y |
| Legal Affairs | John Marshall | Y |
| Legal Affairs | Andrew Newton | Y |
| Office of Diversity and Inclusion | Nathalia Jaramillo | Y |
| Office of Diversity and Inclusion | Erik Malewski | Y |

**Faculty Senate Meeting:** Monday, Sept 24th 12:30-1:45pm KSU Center Room 300

## Call to Order

## The meeting was called to order by Jennifer Purcell at 12:31pm.

* 1. **Welcome – Dr. Jennifer Purcell**

Dr. Purcell welcomed everyone to the meeting.

* 1. **President’s Update – President Pamela Whitten**

President Whitten provided the following updates:

First, progress continues on the Provost Search. The deadline for applications is coming up. We will conduct airport interviews in October. Finalists will visit campus in early November.

Second, Academic Learning Center—really pushing to make this a priority this year. Capital budget 39+million. It is one of the projects going forward out of the BOR budget request. 140K square foot building for classroom space and space for students and faculty to interact. Pushing forward with that.

Third, rankings news. UG Engineering are in top 100 in the nation for first time. Second year in a row we are a National U not a Regional U. Business School in top 150 of US. Diverse Magazine rankings place KSU 17th in nation with Bachelors to African Americans nationwide (up from 24). Combining all MA, ranked 90 in the US for most African American graduate degrees. 80th in the nation to all minorities in all disciplines.

Fourth, growth in the Grad College. 3200 students enrolled (8.5% increase, 14%+ increase since consolidation). An important trend. Bureau of Labor statistics show jobs requiring grad degrees are growing faster than those requiring UG degrees. Top 5 graduate programs by enrollment, MSIT, MBA, WebMBA, EDD and MED Instructional Tech.

Fifth, inaugural class of the Coca-Cola scholars. Gift of 1.25 million from Coca-Cola foundation. Scholarships and wrap around funding for first generation students. 35 scholars at KSU this year, one of the larger program in GA. A 5K award to each student. 3.55 GPA average. Declared majors in 10 colleges across KSU.

Sixth, College of Arts, Dept. of Dance received 350K gift. Funds to support Dance students.

Seventh, gap work we did this year. Trustees meeting early this year. We featured students at these meetings. Financial Aid (Ron Day, Director) reported numbers of those who can’t finish degrees at KSU in their last semester due to a shortfall of funds. We called an emergency conference call and asked the Trustees to release funds for top up/gap funds this fall when there are students in their last semester a bit short. We will be tracking it and we are grateful to the Trustees for acting so quickly.

Eighth, National Conference for Undergraduate Research (NCUR), we will hear more from Amy Buddie later in the meeting. We have a real opportunity to step up for the event on campus. She asks that faculty look for ways to build this in to your classes.

* 1. **Provost’s Updates – Interim Provost Linda Noble (represented by Ron Matson).**

Dr. Noble planned to join virtually but technology didn’t allow for this. She asked Dr. Matson to give updates on her behalf.

First, regarding the pause on new curriculum. We are still looking at that. No timeframe at the moment as to when that will be lifted.

Second, workload is also an ongoing project. Administration has heard faculty about the “pile on”. Working team (Dean, Chair, Jennifer Purcell, Ron Matson) is looking at best practices with workload (not P&T). No details or conclusions yet.

Third, she intends to start searches for Deans for Arts, CHSS, and Engineering this semester starting in October. That process will be starting fairly soon. She will start forming the committees and go through the normal search processes that we follow.

1. A Senator asked what the tentative deadline for the workload working group’ report is. Dr. Matson responded that they are aiming for a report at the end of October but that there is no official deadline.
2. A Senator asked about the timeline for the Deans searches. Dr. Matson said they are aiming to start in October, interviews in the Spring, and July 2019 start dates.
3. A Senator asked if the workload group will be engaging in an iterative process where they will invite feedback from Senate or other bodies? Dr. Matson said the recommendations of the group will go through the shared governance process.

## Approval of the Agenda

## Agenda approved.

1. **Approval of Minutes**

## Request that the minutes be amended to indicate that Peter St. Pierre was present at the August meeting. Noted and amended. Minutes approved.

1. **Reports**
	1. Part-time Faculty Council – Dr. Joanne Lee

Circulated to Senators with the Meeting Agenda.

* 1. Staff Senate – Dr. Cristen Dutcher

 Distributed in hard copy at the meeting.

* 1. SGA - Dr. Heather Pincock

 Distributed in hard copy at the meeting.

 Reports approved.

## Old Business

1. Intellectual Property (IP) Policy – Dr. Jonathan McMurry

Dr. McMurry (Associate Vice President for Research, Office of Research) was unable to attend and John Marshall (Part-Time Associate General Counsel, Legal Affairs) spoke in his place.

He explained that he and Don McGarey (Interim Vice President for Research) visited back in May (sic—April), discussed the policy, posted a proposed revision to the policy to the website as a draft and solicited comments. He stated they have tried to incorporate comments received into the current draft. He would be outlining the differences between the old and new policy and take further questions because they would love to see this eventually adopted.

He identified three broad areas of concern in the current policy that they have sought to address in the proposed policy:

1. Disclosure and Definitions

Current policy:

If you google it, you find multiple versions. There is one in the University Handbook which we assume is the official current policy.

Issues: not much clarity in defining University support to determine what is a University assisted effort. Not clear on how student rights are protected. Biggest problem, there is no requirement for disclosure of inventions. Disclosure avoids problems down the line with IP that the University has a claim to. Disclosure allows us to determine if it was University assisted and enables the University to protect IP (patent protections).

Proposed policy:

Contains a disclosure requirement.

Does not cover traditional academic works (ex. textbook)—and this is hopefully clearer in the new version. You are only required to disclose traditional academic works if you received obvious University support (ex. course release) in which case the work is now considered University assisted. The new policy seeks to clarify what exempts something from being University assisted. Students and staff are more clearly addressed in the new policy (it does cover their IP).

1. Sharing of royalties

In many cases no royalties are accrued so sharing of 0 remains 0.

Current policy:

100% for individual effort to the creator.

For University Assigned effort 50% (Creator)/30% (Creator’s Dept.)/10% (Office of Sponsored Programs)/10% (Faculty Development budget- but nobody is sure what this refers to).

Proposed policy:

100% for individual effort to the creator.

University Assigned or Assisted: 50% (Creator)/25% (KSURF)/25% (Creator’s Dept. or College)

He showed a slide with sampling of the royalty sharing formula from other institutions’ IP policies and highlighted that 50/50 is fairly generous when compared to many of the other institutions in the sample.

1. IP Committee Composition

Current policy:

Composition of IP Committee refers to some areas of the university that don’t exist anymore. There is a committee functioning that was appointed by the President and it has met a few times to address a few issues.

Proposed policy:

Similar to the old but it does not have a student (this did not seem like a good idea for an IP Committee). We hope those on the committee will have some experience with IP from across the disciplines. Students serving just one year would not have required expertise. There will be seven committee members and they will serve three-year terms.

Mr. Marshall said he will make PowerPoint available to Faculty Senate for distribution with the minutes. Questions or additional feedback should be forwarded to: Don McGarey at dmcgarey@kennesaw.edu

1. A Senator asked about the comparison institutions shown on the slide and noted that one of our peer institutions, Georgia Southern has a 70/30 royalty sharing policy. Why isn’t KSU modeling our policy after theirs?

Mr. Marshall stated that Georgia Southern’s model is an outlier. They have had 0 patents filed generating royalties, and only a couple of patents. He noted that 50% for the creator is significant and generous compared to other examples.

1. A Senator noted that stimulating research is the broader goal of a University and that compensation is part of the motivation. She asked what research or study might exist to identify the optimal balance?

Mr. Marshall said he does not know and has not seen such as study and what tends to make a difference is getting more disclosures. He said they are also concerned with generating funds to support their work to protect patents.

1. A Senator noted that in his experience at Florida State the University’s royalty share on patents went directly to research grants for junior faculty. It doesn’t seem like the policy addressed specifics about where the funds captured will be directed. That should be part of the discussion.

Mr. Marshall said this was a fair point and stated that the intent of those running the research foundation in past is to use funding to both support protection of IP and to provide research initiative grants to keep stimulating more research.

1. A Senator pointed out that in her discipline patents and significant royalties are not part of the kind of work they do. She asked if manuscript completion grants would make the journal article or book manuscript produced “university assisted” under the policy?

Mr. Marshall said the IP Committee would have to look at that on a case by case basis. It would depend if the grant were thousands of dollars or a very small amount.

1. A Senator asked about adding a lower threshold amount in the policy so that the royalty sharing doesn’t kick in unless the work generates a certain amount of revenue. This would allow for the cases where a work might qualify as University assisted but the amount of royalties we are talking about, from a University Press book for example, are so insignificant they are really not the reason for the policy. It had been suggested last time we discussed this that having a clause where 100% of the royalties go to the Creator for the first X thousand might be a good way to draw a distinction between traditional academic work vs. the kind of work the policy is really aimed toward.

Mr. Marshall said they do have language cued up for a threshold minimum but haven’t added it because not many people have brought it up. The thing they are still wrestling with is a scenario where a 5K grant supports the creation of a book that generates 5K in royalties and whether the University should first subtract that 5K before any royalties go to the individual creator. If a threshold minimum would make the policy more acceptable it is something they are open to. They would love feedback on whether that is an issue that would make folks feel better about the policy.

1. A Senator asked for a point of clarification about the last comment made. He noted that this was a significant new element if the idea was to claw back any kind of assistance provided from royalties generated.

Mr. Marshall stated that the existing policy has language that probably allows for that.

1. A Senator asked who is on the Committee that was referred to because the Senate has been trying to get that information since last year.

Mr. Marshall said that those who have been working on the policy are Don McGarey, Jonathan McMurry, with assistance from him and that it has been run through the Policy Process Council on a few occasions. Dr. McGarey has personally solicited faculty for comments and has incorporated that into revisions. There is an existing IP Committee that is there to address disputes that arise (but it is not the seven member committee outlined in the revised policy- it sort of conforms to the committee outlined in the current policy). There has only been one dispute for this committee to address in recent memory.

1. A Senator asked whether the IP policy allows for tracking down students who publish games/apps to get the money back?

Mr. Marshall stated that students likely own the IP they create under the new policy even if they develop it as part of class assignments.

1. A Senator asked about the next step with the policy given that there are still a number of concerns being raised and it was mentioned that some changes that could still be made so what is the next step?

Mr. Marshall said he hopes the next step will be that faculty will send suggestions for changes and that they will bring it back to the October Faculty Senate meeting.

Dr. Purcell noted that one concern raised last Spring and then reiterated last Monday was about discrepancies on the website regarding what was current vs. proposed policy and that it was corrected within 24 hours. She thanked Mr. Marshall and his team for addressing that and for speaking with us today and to all Senators for sharing their feedback.

1. Elections – Parliamentarian

Dr. Purcell announced that Faculty Senate is still seeking a Senator to serve in the role of Parliamentarian.

## New Business

1. Conflict of Interest and Commitment – Dr. Cristen Dutcher

Dr. Dutcher shared three primary concerns raised by her colleagues in the School of Accountancy, regarding the Sept. 5 Legal Affairs email about the Conflict of Interest and Commitment policy:

1. How do faculty define normal working hours since we do not work a 9-5 job?
2. What is the reason for uncompensated outside activities to be reported? What is the scope of this and how are we to know when our responsibility to the University ends and where our personal lives begin?
3. Confidentiality—public disclosure. What is the depth or detail of the disclosures and how much will be shared?

Dr. Purcell welcomed Andrew Newton (Acting Vice President and Chief Legal Affairs Officer) to respond to Dr. Dutcher’s questions and noted that we have received many similar questions from across multiple Departments.

Mr. Newton said they are working on a set of FAQs and hope to post those to the web soon. They have run some of their answers past the USG and are waiting for approval before they post. He noted they have received the three questions Dr. Dutcher asked before and that he would address each in turn.

1. In response to the first question about normal working hours he stated that normal working hours only comes into play for uncompensated outside activities. You need approval for an uncompensated activity that will take place during your normal working hours. So, for uncompensated activity—what are normal working hours? FAQs will address this. People have different hours and it depends on your job. Advice he has given so far: working hours are something between your supervisor and you. For example, you may teach late in the evenings and that could affect what your normal working hours are at other times.
2. Regarding why we are reporting uncompensated activities and what the scope of that is, he noted this is also a common question and that a simple answer is simply that the BOR policy requires it. But the reason they ask for this is that you are missing work to do something that isn’t work and it is therefore reasonable for the employer to have oversight over that. Regarding scope, what many people ask about are service activities or normal scholarly and professional activities that are not for KSU specifically but are valued by KSU (ex. professional service or community engagement) and these are even described often in the FPA and in some ways approved there so how much of those are covered by the policy. He stated that his answer today is that they are covered but they are seeking clarification from the USG if they really want one by one approval from KSU and all USG institutions. He stated it is important to address concerns about conflict of commitment and to be clear about how much time people are spending serving the profession vs. time spent on their core KSU duties. The point many have made is that the two circles overlap.
3. Dr. Dutcher asked where does BOR policy address uncompensated activities. Mr. Newton replied it is in section 8.2.18.2.4.
4. A Senator asked that he talk more about the approval process in terms of who will approve requests?

Mr. Newton replied that it will be the Provost for faculty requests. UITS is working to make it into an electronic workflow system where faculty could view a dashboard of all requests and hoping to make it live next year. He acknowledged the current process is a bit clunky where faculty generate a pdf, send it up chain, and it comes back to faculty. Legal Affairs maintains a spreadsheet that is currently updated manually and they are working to automate it. For non-faculty it is the President who approves requests.

The Senator followed up to clarify that it is only the Provost and no committee?

Mr. Newton said yes and that they will propose for consideration a Conflict of Interest committee who would not be involved in pre-approval but for review of conflicts and advice on “management plans”.

The Senator followed up with her concern that some activities are very specific by discipline and raised the prior controversy with the term “social justice” and that the current policy leaves approval of activities entirely at the Provost’s discretion. What if some activities are rejected based on personal beliefs?

Mr. Newton said that if that is an actual rather than a hypothetical concern to take it up with your management, or with Legal Affairs, or the Ombuds to try to resolve that. The policy does not include any appeals at this point. If you think people misunderstand the dynamics then you should talk about that.

1. A Senator asked about the timeline for approval and about pre-approval vs. approval. Should faculty put action on hold until approved especially when it concerns ongoing activities? How long can we expect to wait?

Mr. Newton said yes pre-approval is required but there isn’t current data on the average approval time during the current process. For faculty it could take a week or more. Put requests in as soon as you can and let people know if there is an urgent deadline.

The Senator followed up to say that in his case an ongoing activity he was told to resubmit was requested at least two weeks ago and have not heard back.

Mr. Newton said he would raise this with Provost and suggested the Senator raise it up their chain of command. Another commonly asked question is about ongoing activity and the FAQ will address this. Faculty have asked about one request for a similar activity that occurs on reoccurring basis. For now, each instance should be reported but they are working on a possible ongoing approval with possibility of backwards reporting.

1. A Senator asked how the COI Policy affects Part-Time Faculty for whom work for KSU is their “outside activity” or almost uncompensated activity?

Mr. Newton stated that the BOR does not distinguish between different types of employees- the policy applies to all employees. The current policy would require reporting of uncompensated activities during normal working hours (but these would be much less for a Part-Time faculty member who perhaps teaches one course). For compensated activities, yes under the current policy Part-Time Faculty are required to get approval for their other paid work. They are seeking clarification about this from the USG because it is right to call KSU the “outside activity” for many Part-Time employees.

1. A Senator asked if the policy then also applies to Graduate Research Assistants?

Mr. Newton said yes if they are compensated. If HR lists them as employees then yes if, for compensated activities, it is related to what they do at KSU. For compensated outside activities, the policy applies for outside work that is compensated and related to KSU duties. For uncompensated activities, the policy applies to work that is uncompensated but during normal working hours. He acknowledged that as for faculty it may be difficult for GRA’s to delineate their normal working hours.

1. A Senator asked if his freelance business, related to the subject he teaches, needs to be disclosed?

Mr. Newtown replied yes because it is compensated and related to your KSU duties. He clarified that the form does not ask for any client information or a detailed description of the work. He also shared that if there are concerns about the information being requested then faculty should contact Legal Affairs to discuss. They need enough information to apply the policy but are willing to discuss concerns and work with individual faculty.

1. A Senator noted that the form does not ask faculty to report the amount they are being compensated. She noted that one Dean emailed his faculty that this may be developed for 2019 and asked if Mr. Newton could comment on this.

Mr. Newton stated that it has not been brought up with him but that the Dean may be looking at that in his particular College. He said the reason it is sometimes included in similar policies is because it could be an indicator of whether or not KSU has your full-time effort. Specific case by case details would matter a lot to assess that. That is just to give an example for why it could be included. No one has brought it up with me but there are places it is included.

The Senator followed up to inquire about the overlap and interplay between the COI and IP policies and whether there may then be an expectation of revenue sharing for consulting practices for both Faculty and Part-Time faculty?

Mr. Newton replied that is why there are some specific IP and Research Sponsored Project questions on the form because we do need to tease those out. KSU’s policy (and the general rule/law concerning most employers) is that if you create a work in the scope of your employment then it is owned by your employer—our policy creates many nuances on that stating that individual works are owned by you for example but yes the policies are very related. One of the reasons to ask for approval is to coordinate that and avoid scenarios where two or three people are claiming ownership for the same work.

1. A Senator followed up on the comment about earning 2X your KSU salary. She stated that this could be the case and not interfere with one’s KSU performance and asked if this would be considered? She noted this makes faculty feel like property and that this relates to faculty morale and the question of “are you giving KSU your all” is tough to accept for faculty who are spending 80-90 hours per week on KSU work at the expense of their personal lives.

Mr. Newton said that people do appreciate the important and hard work that KSU faculty do and are here to listen to faculty concerns.

1. Dr. Whitten stated that this is not a new policy but something we were supposed to be doing all along and that we are out of compliance. She stated that if we do not address that faculty are at great risk for the security of their job and that we are making sure this policy is being followed and that work is pre-approved to protect faculty. She noted that with regard to the focus on outside pay—from her perspective there is no plan to include that. She went on to say that the pressing piece of this is the issue conflict of interest and perceived conflict of interest. It is about the perception that a faculty or staff member is doing work elsewhere with someone who is a vendor of the institution or seeks to be a vendor. The other piece of Conflict of Interest, she said, is the push back from industry that faculty have unfair competitive advantage because they rely on infrastructure of University (ex. office support) when those competing with them for contracts don’t have that infrastructure.

Mr. Newton reiterated that these rules are based on maintaining our integrity and to protect faculty. He noted that when you discuss resources and the 50/50 split in the IP policy, keep in mind all the contributions the University makes to the work faculty complete. In that context he said he thinks it’s very reasonable.

1. Dr. Lieberman (CDA Liaison) said her question picks up on that and also relates to the IP policy. She said she had been asked by several faculty who were completing the form what “making use of KSU resources” and reimbursing the University refers to? For those in the Humanities this is confusing, for example if we are writing an article on our KSU computers is that a use of KSU resources?

Mr. Newton replied that it is but we are looking at whether there is a minimum and advised answering the question for now as “normal office support”.

1. A Senator asked how the Provost and President are going to approve all these requests in a timely way given the number of employees at KSU? Could a reoccurring activity go through expedited approval?

Mr. Newton answered that he has faith in the President and Provost to do their task but noted that about 4 or 5 days ago they had a total of 300 entries. He said some of them could be approved quite quickly and that others may require more back and forth. He said he would leave it up to the President and Provost to determine whether it is feasible for them.

1. A Senator stated he would second the earlier comment about faculty morale and understands the process was not generated by KSU and that it was a BOR policy. He said that we know the attention to the policy was all generated by 1-2 egregious cases at GA Tech. He asked that a “reasonable person standard” apply to this and not to burden faculty with trivial matters in its implementation. He also asked about Mr. Newton’s comment about work done in the scope of work being property of the employer. He asked if this was intended to apply to every lesson plan or recorded lecture, or power point by KSU faculty? He said we have always been told that these things are our intellectual property and asked for clarification.

Mr. Newton stated that the phrase he used “anything created in the scope or course of your employment”, that’s a matter of law, what governs us here is the BOR policy. Keep in mind that you create all those things and you are also paid to do these things. And we do have carve outs for indivdiual efforts and traditional academic works and careves out different rules for those but frankly the idea that you “own” your syllabus is not reasonable— if KSU wants to use that with the next person who teaches the class after you leave KSU, I do not think the policy would prevent KSU from doing that.

The Senator responded that it would come as a surprise and would fly in the face of what we have been told before. It has been the practice and understanding that the opposite is true.

Mr. Newton responded that faculty could certainly take those materials with them and use them elsewhere in a new position at another University but that yes KSU does have rights to that work.

Dr. Purcell called for a motion to table the discussion and return to it in October. Moved, seconded and approved.

Dr. Purcell called for a motion to extend the meeting by 5 minutes. Motion, seconded, and approved.

1. QEP Updates – Dr. Amy Buddie

Dr. Buddie said the QEP update could wait until next time and moved on to NCUR.

1. National Conference on Undergraduate Research – Dr. Amy Buddie (Office of Undergraduate Research). She introduced Chris Cornelison (Associate Director of OUR) accompanying her.

NCUR is taking place on April 11-13. There will be 5000 people on campus for the event. Campus will be at capacity. She highlighted the following:

1. Classes will be redirected to the Conference. Thursday, Friday, Saturday week after Spring Break. There will be workshops, career fairs, and presentations/proposals etc. She encouraged faculty to have their students go to the conference and create an assignment they can complete while participating in the conference.
2. We expect 4000 abstracts. Abstracts are reviewed by host institution faculty. The deadline is December 4th and decisions will be made by mid-late January. Hoping that faculty from all departments will pitch in to review abstracts. Biology, Chemistry, Psychology are big departments but we need everyone to pitch in.
3. Encourage students to submit abstracts by the Dec. 4th deadline. There will be workshops for students to create the abstracts. They can be at a proposal stage. January 28th, decisions are due.
	1. A Senator asked if she can have Spring semester students apply to present.

Dr. Buddie explained that they would unfortunately miss the Dec. 4th deadline to submit. Students in your classes now can definitely apply.

1. Open houses for departments. Link to sign up. Deadline Sept. 28. Committee will review and you will hear within 2 weeks. Michael Sanseviro is chairing.
2. Faculty will be asked to volunteer as panel moderators.
	1. A Senator asked if presentations can be done in languages other than English.

Dr. Buddie answered yes, they can but abstracts need to be submitted in English.

1. Student registrations for KSU student presenters will be paid by KSU. Non-presenters can attend all sessions for free but cannot eat without registering.

## Informational Items

1. Academic Affairs Shared Governance Workshop
	1. Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 1:30-3:30pm – Kennesaw Campus, HS1105
	2. Thursday, October 11, 2018, 1:30-3:30pm – Marietta Campus, Q202

## Announcements

## None.

1. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximated 1:55pm.