Called to order at 3:01pm

Senators present: Paula Adams, Becky Becker, Greg Blalock, Roger Brown, Tammy Condrey, Josh Eyler, Pat Hogan, Rita Jones, Burnhannettin Keskin, Ellen Martin, Gisung Moon, Jim Owen, Elizabeth Parker, Jacqueline Radebaugh, Neal Rogers, Dan Ross, Brian Schwartz, Kimberly Shaw, Melody Shumaker, Gary Sprayberry, Glenn Stokes, John Studstill, Paul Vaillancourt, Dan VanKley, Troy Vidal, Jeff Zuiderveen

Guests present included: President Tim Mescon, Interim Provost Tom Hackett, Iris Saltiel, Troy Keller, David Mitchell, Tina Butcher, John Lester, Tom Ganzevoort

Location: Schuster Center, Room 130

In July there has been a tradition of an informal meeting for new/continuing senators. No meetings are regularly scheduled in June.

It was moved and seconded to add Tom Ganzevoort (Faculty Handbook Committee) to the agenda. Motion passed.

1. Report from the President and/or Provost

President Mescon – I want to thank everyone for a lot of hard work this year. I thought having all committees report was productive. I also want to ask the committee regarding admission standards to consider: We are on a modest pace to incrementally improve or enhance criteria for baccalaureate program. That will be your call. As we have moved into doctoral education and other graduate programs, our baccalaureate admission standards are relatively low. I would ask the committee to review this at your pace as we try to establish criteria for the fall semester. I met briefly with Chip Reese, and the timing is not a dramatic issue, but we would benefit mightily if faculty would meet to discuss this over the summer. I would like for us to develop a multi-year strategy to increase expectations for matriculating freshmen. I am happy to answer questions, but we should be reviewing this to see if there is logic to doing this incrementally

Senator Stokes – for this upcoming fall?

President Mescon – if I understood chip correctly, it would be preferable, but I don’t know if it is possible. Chair of this committee is Terry Irvin. An interesting reinforcement for this idea is that the appointment of the first Dean of the Honors College at Georgia State College was announced recently. Many universities have already begun this odyssey. Not looking for a spike, just a tweak.

Senator Stokes – We don’t need a motion, just a consensus. We will send the committee that note, and ask them to meet quickly. It may be that this isn’t feasible.

President Mescon – I recently had an extensive meeting with Regent Kessel D. Stelling Jr. (and Synovus CEO) who represents Cobb County. His career is now located here, and we think we have an advocate in him. He has agreed to advocate for us. We haven’t had that for 9 years. He will also be speaking at commencement on May 9th. This is very generous of him. Faculty will determine look, location, for new class/lab building. Designs for lab buildings are much more flexible than historically. We have tried to get funding for years, with no success. Recently, we had Linda Daniels here. Leadership can advocate for or block these capitol building appropriations. They can enter the system by Regents, by the legislative delegation, or by staff recommendation. Regent Kessel will advocate for this project, but staff could still
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block this. We met with Ms Daniel last week, who was here for 1st time in order to meet with Mr. Helton, Pres. Mescon, and Mr. Medlock. She will now support a $22M class/lab building for new construction funds. Will ask Hackett to reinvigorate a faculty committee to work on this, and it may be the best shot we have had in 12 years. This takes alignment of all to make it go forward. Staff in Atlanta has been very resistant to this project until now. Campus average from annual review of classroom usage has always been skewed. Theater in the Park, University Hall – that square footage works against us in those reviews – will now put asterisks by facilities like these that are not primarily used as academic space like University Hall – staff in Atlanta have never offered this concession before.

Interim Provost Hackett – First, let me say that I thought we had a terrific year with the Senate this year. We have made tremendous strides – new promotion and tenure standards have been passed, and I believe we are on the short roads on shared governance. In principle there is some agreement there. Detailing it out will be the challenge for all of us. What we had approved at Board of Regents was 4 graduate and 1 undergraduate program. We also have a second group, which includes an EDS degree. We are on track with our 3 year game plan. The Regents have approved an international studies fee for us (several other campuses have it), and these fees are earmarked to send kids overseas. We think this will mean $300,000. This will be a game changer for us.

We have 2 dean searches ongoing. We made offers on both searches, but we were declined. The committees have met since that time, and are going on. Operating them will now be supported by HR, rather than by the external search firms. Hopefully each committee will bring forward 3 names after interviews. In that vein, we have asked Richard Baxter to be Interim Dean of COA effective July 1. We can’t tell you about Acting Chair in Communications yet, as we are awaiting his recommendation. The present Interim Dean of COA will be the Director of International Affairs for the Provost’s Office.

We plan to address salaries. As a chair, had a bigger picture than I did as a faculty member. As Interim Provost, I have a much bigger picture. Why international education, why now? With $300k in fee money, I think we’re going to have a lot to do in the Center for International Education. In looking at faculty salaries, representatives from the Colleges and from the Senate are looking at where we are with that group – in the process of getting a consultant. Reviewing portfolios to choose a consultant.

The issue is that funding has been cut by 33% from the state. We don’t know yet how much the next year’s budget will really be cut. Any personnel cuts to date did not affect the academic side of the house. That money is not coming back. We must generate more revenue – grants won’t do, must increase enrollment to do so. We can do this with graduate studies, with distance learning. This fiscal year, not counting summer, have gotten $300k. In order to raise salaries, we can increase enrollments (for example, via graduate studies, distance learning, international recruiting, and recruiting in north crescent of Atlanta.) Bringing in someone already employed by CSU to help with this is a good move. Not only are CSU salaries not equitable with respect to our peers, but the second thing is that there’s a lot of disparity on this campus. It’s a matter of public record. There are also senior faculty who have been caught in compression, who make less than the newest Assistant Professor. The newest promotion raises have moved to $5k. It’s a starting point, it’s what I had. We have to grow our way out of this problem.

I understand that these are hard times, that you have families – but it is not an easy fix, and it is not going to be fixed overnight. It depends on faculty recruiting students, creating new revenue models. I am happy to answer questions - and if you want to talk to me, I’ve never had a closed
Call or email or walk in. But it bothers me when colleagues use an email listserv without talking colleague to colleague first. So I’m here, now.

Comment: What you say sounds good, and the justification does too – but what’s behind this, is that we have seen nationally (since our budget is hard to get hold of, and harder to read) is that there is a trend to spend less and less on academics. Justifications for new administrators are usually good, but with the trend to spending less on classroom instruction. It may be there is a way to move it the other direction. Nationally, 25% of university budgets are now spent on faculty salaries, and that seems kinda small.

Dr. Hackett: I appreciate that. I can’t tell you the specific percentage, but faculty salaries are a substantial part of our budget. Academics are 60% of our budget. I will do everything I can to increase tenure line faculty positions on this campus. We added them when I was Chair, but we added them because we increased enrollment. We have to make the case by generating revenue. I’m not politicking. As long as I’m in this role, I’ll do this. I’m about growing the university. It would be good to get faculty group to look at the big picture spending choices.

Comment: I do think the listserv is not a bad thing, but let me just say that what I find disturbing is the process. You’ve been involved, you’re committed to shared governance, but then these positions are created. The process does concern us, and when these things are done with no faculty involvement concerns us, and breeds distrust. We’ve been through a year where your predecessor has been paid a handsome sum for doing almost nothing. It’s not about who’s right – it’s about how we do things. We think the listserv is an open process, for all to see, like sunlight.

Dr. Hackett: I said it bothers me when someone doesn’t bother to pick up the phone and call. It’s great to use the listserv, but if you have questions about what I’m doing, call.

Comment: You may be right, and I hope you are, but in these times, this is a touchy issue. Inequities about salaries on campus: are there any plans to act on this? It is something we need to look at. The market bears certain things. But some very productive senior colleagues just aren’t making very much. Committee is broad based, has staff and faculty. Anyone welcome to attend.

Comment: The technique of paying per head for online courses is also creating inequities. Most other institutions don’t do that. It might be contributing. A colleague at Georgia Southern says that they limit enrollment in sections, in order to reward them to teach online. This addresses inequities in salary, as well as quality of course issues. It is a totally different approach.

Dr. Hackett: We certainly need to tweak those things. On DL, it has had some unanticipated consequences for work and salary.

Senator Stokes: We asked for an update on Provost search. It sounds like we are continuing searches for deans first.

Dr. Hackett: It seems as if we are best suited to continue as we are, at some time later this calendar year (with deans).

Senator Stokes: My concern is that many don’t want to go into a job application process if you don’t know who your boss will be a year later.

Dr. Hackett: We have had very robust pools of candidates. There are Interims (in various leadership positions) throughout system. Search committees tell us it doesn’t seem to affect quality of applicants.

Comment: But the positions don’t fill.
Response: The nuances about how recommendations made to the Provosts’ Office restricted final applicants, and we had to respect that. What we need are 3 or more acceptable candidates for these positions, since the odds are that one may not accept an offer.

Question: Could we have some idea of how much Parker (search firm) fee was? Response: Over $100k for all 3 searches total.

Question: Distance Learning again – at our last college meeting, it was projected that we will have a fully online sociology major soon. Where are these decisions being made? This concerns me beyond just the salary issue.

Response: I understood it from the sociology faculty. It has to come from the department.

Comment: It didn’t come from my dept. Response: Let’s circle back on that.

2. Old Business
   a. Committee on Committees – Student evaluation of faculty committee formation – John Studstill
      Comments about the handout. I got an email from Tina Butcher about this process. It seemed like Digital Measures is now the past, this committee’s work will be future.
      The Committee is charged with creating student evaluation process. We were mandated to choose 1 from basic studies, 1 from library, 2 from each college. I added one alternate member. The Provost should determine if other ex officio members should be added.
      In a sense, institutional committees are more under the Provost and charges them. The Faculty Senate staffs them all, and provides a charge to Senate committees.
   b. Staff Appreciation Celebration
      May 13th, 11-1. Staff and Faculty members are ALL welcome this time, sponsored by Provost. At Cougar Caf in Davidson.
   c. Shared governance – Dan Van Kley
      This will be part report, part request for advice. On left of handout (attached separately), you see the makeup of the proposed University Council. We need advice on how to distribute the 10 faculty members. This should be job of Faculty Senate, and we have two plans. With plan A, each college gets 2 members, 1 each for library and basic studies. In plan B, there is 1 faculty member per College, and 6 faculty members at large. This plan gives more flexibility. However, a bigger college may have undue influence. Faculty Senate will still get representation in same way as before.
      Question: Are you looking for comments on overall makeup, preference between A and B plans?
      Response: Yes. Here’s what we discussed – plan A seems fairest in that each college guaranteed a certain number of representatives, but by College instead of by membership size.
      Comment: House vs Senate fairness.
      Response: In plan B, we thought about a cap of no more than 3 per college. But we decided details would be a Senate job.
      Question: Any motion on which to support? Do I have a motion for either?
      How many (by hand) favor plan A?
      Comment: Plan B would have limit of 3 max, so it is possible that library/basic studies would have no representation. The disparity of sizes of the colleges is rather enormous. The other 3 colleges are around 50, but COLS is around 110. Do you want it to be like the Senate, or the House?
Comment: I should remind everyone that there is still the Faculty Senate, which is represented in a proportional way.

Votes in a straw poll: Plan A – 13; Plan B – 8
Slightly more in favor of Plan A.

Comment: Thanks.
President Mescon: We’d like to take a small contingent to the summer AAUP meeting, so if you have any interest, please let Senator Van Kley know.

3. New Business
a. Handbook Committee: (Tom Ganzevoort): I became Chair of this Committee in August after submitting gigantic handbook revision last year. We decided to wait on new revisions until after the P&T vote this spring. As luck would have it this was about when the university grants process was proposed. We met last week. Have P&T, grants, and some BOR changes to incorporate. We will work over summer, and we will set up a Google site and be consulting with each other via email over summer. We will submit changes to Senate in Fall. If necessary, we can reappear before senate in fall.

Question: Do you have a draft available? Can you make a draft of the whole enchilada available? Response: What’s up on the Senate site is most current version. Dr. Hackett will be part of the process. We will post new version when available.

b. Committee on Committees – new committee membership list – John Studstill
Senate committee handout first. On page 3, add LouMarie Guth from Library to Handbook Advisory Committee. Also to Honors Scholarship Committee.

Senator Studstill: Some committees have term limits, and these have been added where known. However, there are a few blanks in here. First, we want this to be a temporary list to be corrected in fall. We will revisit in fall to do changes due to summer. We are depending on you to tell us where those errors are. We have included in some lists a notation where a position is needed, and if that need is from a particular college.

Handout for institutional committees distributed.
We have several new committees, and a few that have changed names. If you were left out of a committee, let Senator Studstill know.

Question: When do the committees need to be set? Response: We try to have them very early in fall, so that they can be active in fall. We probably need to send emails by late July. We can have committees elect own chair, but need someone to convene that first meeting.

c. Intellectual Property Committee – David Mitchell
Distributed handout before the meeting via email.
After 5-6 committee meetings, looking at what other schools have done, we want to present this draft policy to the faculty. We have presented to the Academic Council, Chairs Assembly, now the Faculty Senate. I have a few slides here about key points. The policy has 17 points, most dictated by BOR. Key definitions show up in all policies. We have added a 5th category: university managed/operated efforts. Cunningham/CCSSC/Social research center fall into this category. CCSSC has already created intellectual property – a full dome planetarium show. IT has developed mobile apps. We may be first university to develop these kinds of things.
Our old policy had no way to share revenue – university would keep any revenues. None of our sister universities work that way, either. There will be percentages for sharing try to err on the side of the creator and their department and college, to benefit their research. Some profits will also go to the CSU enterprise foundation (created within the CSU foundation to commercialize faculty ideas). For CCSSC, etc, much less goes to creator, more to Center as support for the Center is expected to be self-generated.

The plan is to post the policy for all faculty next, and to request comments for a month or so before submitting to administration for final approval.

Question: How does this apply to humanities and arts. If someone writes a book, has a faculty grant from university to work on part of it? If university provides resources, it is generally owned by university. Generally, if a professor writes a scholarly work, that is generally what you are expected to do, and it is your property. We will be clarifying this when posted. It is mostly clear now in area 5b, and that will be moved closer to front.

Question: Is committee going to distribute funds to market, to take ideas out?
Response: Committee deals with issues inside. CSUEF will be involved with the marketing, and is tasked with figuring out ways to generally licence things.

Question: I’d like to ask about language of #15 – use of words “all” and “any”….. read from policy. To some of you, this sounds like the loyalty oath (which is a real dis-incentive to hiring). I wonder if that language can be softened. Then it says that even if you don’t sign, it still applies.
Response: We don’t want to scare anyone off.

Question: Who owns IP? CSU or Foundation?
Response: Foundation.

Comment: In UGA case, their foundation was primarily fundraising. Not a research foundation. After the incident with UGA, state law changed significantly, and those foundations recently recombined.

Question: In the arts and theater and music, what if you use the theater, university instruments? Response: That came up in Chairs…. It isn’t clearly stated. In other schools, if you use university resources, the school owns it and can commercialize it. We want to ask other schools about non-scientific IP.

Question: What about something basic – sponsored grants for Distance Learning. University owns the material. If I don’t take the grant, would I own that material? If CSU assigned you to do this, it would still be university property. If you create it on your own time, then it would be yours.

Question: In terms of RPG, doing research on it – can I take the research with me if I leave? CSU owns it – but we would work something out.
We will post the policy on CSU web for review by all faculty.

d. Faculty Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning - Iris Saltiel
Handout. The Center was created for infrastructure to support QEP. Front of the handout lists its history and activities.
On the back, it lists programs offered this year. QEP will wrap up officially in Dec 2011, report filed in March 2012. If you have needs, ideas for book studies – let me know. This year we did workshops on tenure, reviewed articles, peer evaluations for faculty.

e. Writing Center – Crystal Woods
At our first meeting, it became clear that the focus would be: members didn’t know how to feel about sending a student to the Writing Center if he/she had more issues than one meeting could address. We talked about ways we could serve these students better. Elliott Rendleman looked at what other colleges were doing (and found little); we also met with Susan Lovell. Some of our students need more help than Writing Center can provide. We developed an intervention form (new). It will be given to a student in a conference setting – it gives options to student, includes regularly scheduled meeting between faculty and student, tutorials with ACE, disability services testing, and counseling as possibilities. Reception so far has been positive. We can (perhaps) post with other university forms, if so desired.

**Question/comment** – We don’t have Senate Committee for general learning support. Should we expand charge of your committee? There is confusion over where students should go for help. **Post-meeting note:** there have always been links on the front CSU page for tutorial services, as well as email announcements each semester. Tina Butcher’s office is working to make these tutorial services links more prominent.

**Comment:** Related to that – I recently visited another institution and they had a flat screen tv. Instead of another dose of CNN or Fox News, however, it flashed tutorial service notices on the TV. As a faculty member, I often don’t know what’s available. Could we do something to adopt a strategy to be in students’ face about these things?

**Comment:** We have the Schuster Center for Student Success.

**Comment:** Should we reconstitute and have one committee for all student help?

**Comment:** Great idea – how can we provide this to more students? Charge the committee on committees with this question? RPG committee?

**Comment:** We do have a disability committee as well, although it has disappeared from the website.

**Comment:** The writing center committee shouldn’t have to be concerned with disability services.

**Comment:** It wasn’t long ago that we reorganized committees.

**Comment:** The point is – that’s important committee, with work to be done. The Committee on Committees will now look into this issue.

f. **Sustainability Committee** – Troy Keller

I will try to follow our motto and not pass out paper. We met 3 times this year – focus on developing four core elements, incorporating them into mission statements. This is still ongoing: Transportation; Energy; Solid waste; Education.

We are doing things to participate: we have met with and talked with folks on CSU shuttle program, adding new shuttle stops between campuses. We actively encourage the alternative commutes campaign – you can earn money to work with other folks. Please participate.

Our campus can apply for bicycle friendly status. There is a new no idle policy on campus. We have worked with clean air campaign, who will buy signs for us. Busses no longer idling.

We are even thinking about biodiesel.

As far as recycling, there are interesting opportunities for composting, but no funding. Education is key. Last week was Sustainability Week – we didn’t run it, did participate. There was a good turnout for these events, and we are hoping to build on it. New website
for sustainability has been established in association with these events, and it will be maintained. Certainly want to make commitment to incorporate sustainability across disciplines. If you have ideas, contact Dr. Keller.

g. Elections Committee
Senator Stokes: I would like to thank all of the outgoing members of Senate. It has been a rigorous three years. Recognize Gary Sprayberry, Dan Van Kley, Kim Shaw. Becky Becker, Rita Jones, and Jackie Radebaugh (who completed term for another senator). Welcome incoming senators: Jim Owens (had to leave early). Burnhanettin Keskin, Gayle Jones, Jackie Radebaugh, Tom Ganzevoort (alt), Teresa Lang, G.Moon, G. Chuchang (alt), Brian Schwartz, Roger Brown, Joe McCallus (alt), Elizabeth Parker, Shellie DeBruyn (alt). Now we need to elect officers.

Last year’s tradition was that all senators (new and old) vote. Any objections? None.

Nominations?
Exec officer: Glenn Stokes
Nominations closed

Secretary – Jackie Radebaugh
Nomination closed

Executive committee –
Roger Brown
Mike McFalls
Nominations closed

Elections to the Executive Committee are complete.
I know some folks going to Spencer House in Oxford this summer – Kyle Spencer made donation to fund this.
We have received a donation from Kyle Spencer through the Community Foundation in the amount of $70,000. This brings Kyle’s total contribution to The Spencer Oxford Program during this academic year to $163,582 (including a gift through the M. M. Fort Foundation Trustee Fund of $40,000). This completely funds The Spencer Oxford Program through June 2012.

We also need to choose the Elections Committee – need at least 3 nominees.
Nominate Troy Vidal; Jim Owens. Josh Eyler.
Nominations closed.

Committee on Committees needs to be elected.
Nominations? Currently Studstill, Eyler, and Adams.
Studstill declines to serve another year.
Nominate Adams. Volunteer – Tammy Condrey (nursing) and Melody Shumaker
Nominations closed.

Senate meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.
DRAFT
Intervention Form for __________________________

Class: __________________________

I have noticed that you seem to be struggling in this class. Below are a few options that might assist you:

Regularly-Scheduled Writing Center Sessions
___ Weekly    ___ Bi-weekly    ___ Other: __________

I recommend dedicating time each week to strengthening your weak areas. Take this form to an administrator in Woodall 116 to schedule a series of appointments. Please forward me your Writing Center reports from each visit.

Regularly-Scheduled Office Sessions
___ Weekly    ___ Bi-weekly    ___ Other: __________

I recommend dedicating time each week to strengthening your weak areas. Send me an e-mail with possible times and I will schedule a series of visits with you.

Tutorial Services
Through the Academic Center for Excellence (ACE), tutors are available in many fields such as math, business, and education. Find out more at http://ace.columbusstate.edu/

Disability Services Testing
If you think you might be struggling with critical thinking and writing due to an undiagnosed disability, here are the next steps you should take:

1 — Contact the Office of Disability Services in Schuster Student Success Center for an appointment.

2 — If you have any documentation of your disability, bring it with you.

Being covered by Disability Services allows students to receive accommodations for which they may qualify, such as extended time for in-class writing assignments, use of assistive technology, and extended time for exams.

Joy Norman is the Disability Services Coordinator, and she can be reached at 706-507-8755. Her office is in Schuster 221.

Counseling Services
If you think you might be focusing poorly due to anxiety or because of personal/family issues that need attention, the Counseling Center might be the place to start. Counseling is free to students and is completely confidential.
The Counseling Center can be reached at 706-507-8740 and is located on the 3rd floor of Schuster.

See [http://counsel.columbusstate.edu/workshops.php](http://counsel.columbusstate.edu/workshops.php) for a current list of workshops

---

**History of the Faculty Center**

- The faculty center created in fall 2006, serves as the infrastructure for faculty professional development activities, in particular the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP).

- Jim Owen served from July 2007 to December 2010 as the founding director. Iris Saltiel started as Director of the Faculty Center September 1, 2010.

- Robert Cummings was the first QEP writing specialist serving from August 2007 to May 2009. Since fall 2009, Angela Green has served as the QEP writing specialist.

---

**Workshops, Webinars, Receptions, and Lunch N’ Learn Programs**

To maximize the dissemination and impact of the information and achieve the goals of the Faculty Center, a variety of venues have been used to cover topics. Workshops, webinars, receptions and luncheon meetings facilitated faculty dialogue and engagement. Functions and topics sponsored by the Faculty Center this academic year included:

- New faculty orientation
- Teaching something you do not know
- Retention improvement
- QEP Advisory Committee
- Opportunities for grants and internships
- Grant writing
- Learning communities
- Faculty collaboration in scholarship
- Sessions on using technology in teaching

---

**Other Services**

The Faculty Center is a resource to all faculty members. Consultations to individual faculty, small groups or departments are available by request.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Colleges/Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>New Faculty Orientation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>COEHP; COLS; LIBRARY; TCOBCS; UITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 9/10/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 9/24/10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>COEHP; COLS; TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching What You Don’t Know webinar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>COEHP; TCOBCS; COLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>New Faculty Orientation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>COEHP; COLS; TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ten Ways to Improve Retention webinar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>COLS; ACADEMIC SUPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Committee Meeting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>COA; COEHP; COLS; TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Faculty Center Open House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch &amp; Learn for the College of Business &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Committee Meeting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>COA; COEHP; COLS; TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch &amp; Learn About Faculty Collaboration in Scholarship and Grants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>COA; COEHP; COLS; LIBRARY; TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2/08/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2/15/11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>COEHP; COLS; LIBRARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learn About Teaching in a Learning Community meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2/9 &amp; 10/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for Grants &amp; Internships with the Naval Surface Warfare Center</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Lunch &amp; Learn About Faculty Collaboration in Scholarship and Grants</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>COLS; LIBRARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3/01/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch &amp; Learn for the College of Business &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USG presentation on Open Source &amp; Etextbooks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>COEHP; COLS; TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rite of Passage Convocations sponsored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3/15; 17; 22; 24/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iPad Basics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FACULTY CTR; VPAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3/15/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3/18/11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>COA; COEHP; COLS; LIBRARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch &amp; Learn About Grant Writing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>COA; COEHP; COLS; TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3/29/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3/31/11 (RiverPark campus)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>COLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Lunch &amp; Learn About Grant Writing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>COEHP; COLS; TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4/05/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4/07/11 (RiverPark campus)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>COA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QEP Advisory Committee Meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>COLS; TCOBCS; LIBRARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch &amp; Learn About NSF Grants</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>COLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman Learning Communities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>COA; COEHP; COLS; TCOBCS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSU Intellectual Property Policy  
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1. Preamble

Columbus State University (CSU) is dedicated to teaching, research and the extension of knowledge to the public. Its personnel recognize as two of their primary objectives the creation, development and production of new knowledge and the dissemination of both old and new knowledge. Inherent in these objectives is the need to encourage the development of new and useful materials, devices, programs and processes and other inventions and creations, some of which may have potential for commercialization, and the production and publication of creative and scholarly works and educational materials. CSU believes such activities:

A. Contribute to the professional development of the faculty, staff and students involved;
B. Enhance the reputation of the University;
C. Provide additional educational opportunities for participating students; and
D. Promote the general welfare of the public at large.

Patentable inventions and copyrightable materials often come about because of the activities of CSU faculty, staff and students who have been aided through the use of CSU resources. As part of the University’s mission, it is important to insure the utilization of such inventions, creations and materials for the public good and to expedite their development and delivery to the public.

At the same time, the University encourages the protection of the rights and privileges, and endorses the initiative and incentive of the creator(s) so that his/her/their abilities, as well as those of all other faculty, staff and students, are further stimulated and rewarded.

CSU recognizes and encourages the publication of scholarly works as an integral part of the processes of teaching, research and service. The University encourages faculty, staff and students to regularly prepare for publication, either through individual or collaborative effort and initiative, articles, pamphlets, books and other scholarly works which may be subject to copyright and which may generate royalties for the author.

Publication may also result from work supported either partially or completely by the institution. With the advent of current and future technology, the variety and number of materials that might be created in a university community has increased significantly, causing the ownership of such copyrightable materials to become increasingly complex.

CSU strives to be at the forefront of teaching and to provide diverse high-quality learning environments. To achieve these goals, CSU encourages and provides incentives for innovators and creators in the development of improved educational materials. Through the efforts of faculty and staff, digital and other storage, and transmission media will have an increasing role in expanding educational effectiveness and accessibility. When such materials are used to expand programs outside the traditional campus, they deserve Intellectual Property (IP) protection.

CSU recognizes the need for enhanced development and dissemination of software technology as a means of expressing both old and new knowledge. CSU is also aware of the dynamic nature of software and that the value
of such IP is derived from the ability of its owner to control its use. Its value is directly related to the degree of protection it enjoys under the law. CSU encourages the protection of such expressions of knowledge by the utilization of appropriate IP laws and the creation of comprehensive software technology transfer policies and procedures.

The foregoing considered, and in order to establish the respective rights and obligations of the University and its faculty, staff and students with regard to current and future Intellectual Property, Columbus State University does hereby establish the following Intellectual Property Policy. Students working on research and other projects which fall under this Policy will also be required to agree in writing.

2. Definitions

A. “Commercialization” means the process of marketing and licensing Intellectual Property to parties outside CSU who, in turn, will develop products or services based on that IP to sell or license to others. By way of counter-example, this term does not apply to CSU offering a course or seminar for a fee.

B. “Copyrighted Materials” shall include the following: (i) books, journal articles, texts, glossaries, bibliographies, study guides, laboratory manuals, syllabi, tests and proposals; (ii) lectures that are written, recorded or otherwise captured, musical or dramatic compositions, unpublished scripts; (iii) films, filmstrips, charts, transparencies, and other visual aids; (iv) video and audio cassettes, compact discs; (v) live video and audio broadcasts; (vi) programmed and instructional materials; (vii) mask works; (viii) research notes, research data reports, and research notebooks; and (ix) other materials or works other than software, which qualify for protection under the copyright laws of the United States (see 17 U.S.C. 102 et seq.) or other protective statutes whether or not registered there-under.

C. “Creator” means a member of the Columbus State University faculty, staff, or student body who creates or develops an invention, as defined under the U.S. patent law, or who participates in the creation of a copyrightable work, under U.S. copyright law, or both. One is a participant in creating a copyrighted work when one makes an original work of authorship (or part thereof) fixed in any tangible medium of expression from which the work can be perceived, reproduced, or otherwise communicated, either directly or with the aid of a machine or device. Being an editor or otherwise facilitating a creation does not ordinarily qualify one as a “Creator.”

D. “CSU Enterprise Foundation, LLC” (CSUEF) is the entity formed within the CSU Foundation for the purpose of evaluating, administering, owning and licensing IP created by CSU faculty, staff and/or students. CSUEF is a not-for-profit foundation whose sole member is the CSU Foundation.

E. “Disclosure Form” is the document by which faculty, staff and/or students disclose to the CSUEF the project or program being conceived of or developed. This document is due before any work begins on such project or program.

F. “Faculty member, staff member and student” shall include, for the purposes of this policy, students who are enrolled for any course at the University, as well as all faculty or staff members who are employed on a full- or part-time basis by the University.

G. “Individual Efforts” are those undertaken by an individual(s) during which:
   i) there is no significant use of University resources; and
   ii) the project is not developed in accordance with the terms of a sponsored project; and
iii) the project is not undertaken in whole or in part as a University assignment.

H. “Intellectual Property” shall be deemed to refer to copyrighted materials, patentable processes or materials, software, trademarks, and trade secrets, whether or not formal protection is sought.

I. “Lead Creator” shall be the person in charge of the project or program which develops the IP. There may be more than one Lead Creator on a project or program, however, this must be specified in the Disclosure Form.

J. “Mask Work” means a series of related images, however fixed or encoded: (i) having or representing the predetermined, three dimensional pattern of metallic, insulating, or semiconductor material present or removed from the layers of semiconductor chip product; and (ii) in which series the relation of the images to one another is that each image has the pattern of the surface of one form of the semiconductor chip product (See 17 U.S.C. 901).

K. “Net Revenue” shall mean the revenue received through commercialization of any IP less the associated expenses which include patent costs, attorney’s fees, marketing costs, reproduction, mailing, consumables, accounting costs, unreimbursed development costs, etc.

L. “Novel Plant Variety” means a novel variety of sexually reproduced plant (See 7 U.S.C. 2321 et seq.).

M. “Patentable Materials” shall be deemed to refer to items which reasonably appear to qualify for protection under the patent laws of the United States or other protective statutes whether or not patentable there-under. These are to include Novel Plant Varieties and Patentable Plants.

N. “Patentable Plant” means an asexually reproduced distinct and new variety of plant (See 35 U.S.C. 161).

O. “Software” shall include one or more computer programs existing in any form, or any associated operational procedures, manuals or other documentation, whether or not protectable or protected by patent or copyright. The term “computer program” shall mean a set of instructions, statements or related data that, in actual or modified form, is capable of causing a computer or computer system to perform specified functions.

P. “Sponsored Efforts” are those research and other projects which are paid for, either wholly or substantially in part, by outside entities. Such entities may be governmental, corporate, Defense Department, or other institutionally based. A sponsored effort may be in the form of a grant or a contract whose purpose is to produce a result through research, writing, programming, construction or other effort.

Q. “Trademarks” shall include all trademarks, service marks, trade names, seals, symbols, designs, slogans, or logotypes developed by or associated with the University System or any of its institutions (see 15 U.S.C. 1127).

R. “Trade Secrets” means information including, but not limited to, technical or nontechnical data, a formula, a pattern, a compilation, a program, a device, a method, a technique, a drawing, a process, financial data, financial plans, product plans, or a list of actual or potential customers or suppliers which: (i) derives economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable by proper means by, other persons, who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use; and (ii) is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy (See O.C.G.A 10-1-761).
S. “University-Assigned Efforts” are those efforts which the University assigns to a College, department, specific faculty member(s), staff, and/or student(s). The assignment may be either explicit, as in a directive from the president, provost, a dean, department chair or other administrative or governance body, or implicit, as in an effort undertaken as a part of one’s job.

T. “University-Assisted Efforts” are those undertaken by an individual or group of individuals on their own initiative which receive institutional support (financial or otherwise) or use institutional resources in more than a purely incidental way.

Such resources include, but are not limited to, use of funding provided by the University or a University-associated foundation, use of University-paid time within the employment period and/or by others involved, use of support staff and/or students, and use of University facilities other than one’s office and the CSU library.

U. “University Managed/Operated Efforts” are those in which a department is expected to develop IP to help carry out its primary mission and to assist in defraying departmental expenses. The University, Faculty and Staff recognize that these departments include elements that go beyond the traditional teacher/student/classroom relationships, though those elements are included and considered of primary importance as well. Departments that fit this category include, but are not limited to, the Space Science Center, The Social Research Center, and the Cunningham Center.

*Note: “Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.” United States Code Annotated, Title 35, Section 101, as amended.

3. Intellectual Property Committee

A. Composition

Intellectual Property activities shall be under the general oversight of an institutional Intellectual Property Committee (IPC). This committee shall be appointed by the president and shall consist of up to nine (9) members as follows:

i. Up to six (6) faculty with at least one from each of the Colleges, and

ii. Up to three (3) staff with at least one each from the offices of the Provost/VPAA and the VPBF.

iii. Up to one (1) student.

Ad hoc advisors may be added by the Chair at any time to consider a particular case if necessary. Five members shall constitute a quorum. The Chair shall be elected by the committee and shall serve as Chair for the duration of his/her term.

Term length shall be three (3) years with staggered term lengths for the initial committee members. Members may request to remain on the IPC for successive terms subject to the approval of the President.

B. Duties of the Intellectual Property Committee
i. To advise the President on policy matters relating to Intellectual Property;

ii. To implement the IP Policies defined herein;

iii. To recommend IP policy revisions and amendments as it deems necessary;

iv. To arbitrate disputes over IP;

v. To approve deviations from this policy; and

vi. To review IP that is referred to it through the disclosure process.

C. Meetings

The IPC shall meet as necessary but at the least once during the academic year.

4. Intellectual Property Management

The IP Committee is responsible for implementation of the University’s Intellectual Property Policy. CSUEF is also responsible for determining, in its sole discretion, whether or not to administer such Intellectual Property by undertaking the efforts necessary to protect and/or license or otherwise commercialize same.

A. Management of Sponsor-Supported and University-Assigned Efforts

IP created through Sponsor-Supported Efforts, subject to provisions of the Sponsor, shall be managed by CSUEF should it opt to do so.

B. Management of University-Assigned Efforts

IP created through University-Assigned Efforts shall be managed by CSUEF should it opt to do so.

B. Management of University-Assisted Individual Effort

IP created through University-Assisted Efforts shall be managed by CSUEF should it opt to do so.

C. Management of Individual Efforts

It shall be the responsibility of University Personnel who are Creators to demonstrate that IP created as a result of individual efforts while employed by the University meets the criteria set forth in section 2.g. In each case so demonstrated and agreed to by CSUEF, the Intellectual Property will be acknowledged as belonging to the Creator to dispose of as the Creator sees fit.

Notwithstanding the above, the Disclosure requirement defined in Section 7 is waived for works of authorship such as scholarly publications and articles, and instructional material for internal use which are readily transferred to the public by the Creator without the need for further development or business or legal input. Conditional license of ownership to the author is provided with the Disclosure waiver.
If both the Creator and CSUEF agree in writing, Individual Effort IP may be managed by the CSUEF on the Creator’s behalf. For purposes of income distribution such IP managed by the CSUEF shall be treated as University-Assisted Intellectual Property.

D. **Declined Intellectual Property**

Whenever CSUEF elects not to manage Intellectual Property, or elects to cease managing Intellectual Property that is at the time under its purview, such Intellectual Property, subject to any obligations to a sponsor, may be assigned by CSUEF to the Lead Creator to dispose of as the Lead Creator sees fit.

5. Determination of Rights and Equities in Intellectual Property

A. **Sponsor-Supported Efforts**

Sponsored project agreements may contain specific provisions with respect to ownership of IP developed during the course of such work. Should ownership of any IP produced be shared between the sponsor and the university or individual performing the work, then ownership of the university/individual’s portion shall vest in the University.

Income, if any, from such IP developed from Sponsor-Supported Efforts shall be shared, subject to the sponsor agreement, in accordance with Section 6.

B. **University-Assigned Efforts**

Ownership of IP developed as a result of assigned University effort, including any effort normally associated with one’s discipline and position, shall reside with the University. Copyrightable works created by an employee in the course of that employee’s employment are considered to be works made for hire under copyright law, with ownership vested in the employer. The general obligation among faculty to produce scholarly and creative works, such as textbooks and associated supplementary material, books, musical compositions, and journal articles does not constitute a specific assignment for this purpose and would constitute an Individual Effort.

Work supported by University or University foundation grants or stipends shall be considered University-Assigned Efforts rather than the general obligation to produce scholarly and creative works.

Income, if any, from such IP developed from University-Assigned Efforts shall be shared as described in Section 6.

C. **University-Assisted Efforts**

Ownership of IP developed by University employees or students through University-Assisted Efforts as defined in Section 2 shall reside with the University.

Income, if any, from such IP developed from University-Assisted Efforts shall be shared as described in Section 6.

D. **Individual Efforts**
Ownership of IP developed by University personnel shall reside with the Creator(s) of such IP provided that it meets the definition of Individual Efforts in Section 2 and that the Creator(s) has decided not to use the CSUEF to commercialize the IP.

It shall be the responsibility of the creator(s) of the IP, if requested, to demonstrate that this classification applies to the IP.

E. University-Managed/Operated Efforts

Ownership of IP developed by University-managed/Operated Efforts are subject to the same considerations and definitions as those described above and defined in Section 2 and shall reside with the University.

Income, if any, from such IP developed by University Managed and Operated Efforts shall be shared as described in Section 6.

6. Distribution of Income

Licensing and other income generated from Intellectual Property administered by CSUEF shall be shared on the following basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Creator(s)</th>
<th>Creator's Department</th>
<th>Creator's College</th>
<th>Creator's Research Efforts</th>
<th>CSUEF</th>
<th>Faculty Research Devel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ-Assigned</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ-Assisted</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Efforts</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ-Managed/ Operated:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSC</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC*</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Revenues to be shared after initial investment is paid for.

Shares which go to the Creator's Department, College and to Faculty Research and Development shall only be used to fund new research or to pay for faculty development opportunities such as scholarly conferences.
The shares going to the Creator’s Department shall be administered by the department chairperson. The share going to the creator’s College shall be administered by the Dean of the College, and the share going to Faculty Research and Development shall be administered by the Provost. The share designated for the Creator’s Research Efforts may only be used for future research efforts by the project’s Lead Creator or for professional development and is only in effect while the Lead Creator(s) is employed by, and conducting research at, the University. If the Lead Creator(s) leaves the employ of the University, then this share is returned to CSUEF.

The Creator’s share of Net Revenue shall be divided equally among joint Creators of the IP unless a written statement signed by all joint Creators which provides for a different distribution formula is filed with CSUEF prior to the first distribution of shared Net Revenue.

*It is the Lead Creator’s responsibility to reach a signed income distribution agreement with all co-creators, including students, prior to the commencement of a project. This agreement must be filed with the CSUEF.*

In the event the Creator, or one of the Creator(s) leaves the University, that Creator will then receive half of his/her original share. The other half shall then go to the Faculty Research and Development fund. The only exception being a student Creator who graduates, in which case the student shall continue to receive his/her full share for 10 years after graduating and then shall receive a half share with the other half going to the Faculty Research and Development fund.

In the event of the death of a Creator, any payment due, or which would have been due to such Creator, shall be made to the Creator’s estate for a period of ten (10) years from the date on the Creator’s death certificate. After the ten year period, those royalties shall revert to CSUEF.

In the event the terms of the license of the IP provide CSUEF with equity, or an option to acquire equity, in the entity which licenses the IP, the share of such equity due to the Creator(s) as identified above will be distributed to the Creator(s) when such equity is transferable or convertible to cash.

In the event that the IP is licensed to the Creator(s), the Creator shall waive the right under the University Intellectual Property Policy to receive the Creator’s share of royalties specified above. Additionally, if the Creator owns or controls 25% or more of the entity that licenses the IP, the Creator shall waive the right under this University IP Policy to receive the Creator’s share of royalties specified above.

In the event the Creator does not receive the Creator’s share, that share shall be distributed to any joint Creators identified in writing in the proportions specified in the above chart.

7. Disclosure of Intellectual Property

It is required that all faculty, staff and students who initiate work on a research or other project which could produce Intellectual Property disclose their efforts at the outset of the project.

The purpose of IP Disclosure is to record intellectual property that may be, is being, or was created and the circumstances under which it is or was created. It provides the basis for a determination of patentability, for drafting a patent application, and/or for registering a copyright. It also provides the initial basis for determining the commercial viability of the possible IP to be created.

An Intellectual Property Disclosure Form should be completed when something new and useful has been conceived of or developed, or when unusual, unexpected, or unobvious research results have been achieved. This is a legally important document, which should be prepared carefully.
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An Intellectual Property Disclosure Form should also be completed when other forms of intellectual property are created by faculty, staff, or students, unless the works are specifically excluded as noted in Sections 2, 4 and/or 5.

Once the form is signed by the Creator(s), the form and supporting documents should then be submitted to the CSUEF, the Department Chair, and the College Dean for review and approval.

8. Dispute Appeals and Resolution

CSU personnel shall have the right to appeal the decisions of the Intellectual Property Committee. All cases in which questions arise as to equities, rights, division of royalties, or any other Intellectual Property-related matter shall first be referred to the Intellectual Property Committee for consideration, interpretation of policy, and decision.

Any appeal of an Intellectual Property Committee decision shall be to the Provost, then to the President, and finally to the Board of Regents.

Appeals within the University must be made in writing within thirty (30) days of written notice of a final decision and will be adjudicated within 30 days after receipt by the appropriate party. Appeals to the Board of Regents shall be made in accordance with Article IX of the Bylaws of the Board, which requires that all appeals be filed within twenty (20) days of the final decision of the President of the University.

9. Collaboration

Collaboration between University personnel and persons not employed or associated with the University, including researchers at other universities or companies can result in the development of Intellectual Property jointly owned by the University and other persons or their employers. Protection and commercialization of such joint Intellectual Property can be difficult without extensive cooperation and written agreement among the Creators. Accordingly, it is important for University personnel involved in, or contemplating collaborative efforts with outside entities which may result in the development of Intellectual Property to advise their immediate supervisors, the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs, and the Director of the CSUEF of such activities. An agreement in writing between the parties will need to be signed prior to the collaboration.

10. Confidentiality

Certain contractual obligations and governmental regulations require that information be maintained in confidence. Additionally, some works, such as certain computer software, may best be protected and licensed as trade secrets, and inventions must be maintained in confidence for limited periods to avoid the loss of patent rights. Accordingly, the timing of publications is important, and Columbus State University Personnel shall use their best efforts to keep the following items confidential:

A. All information or material designated confidential in a contract, grant, or the like;

B. All information or material designated or required to be maintained as confidential under any applicable governmental statutes or regulations; and

C. All information relating to Intellectual Property developed by University Personnel which may be protected under this Policy until application has been made for protection.
11. Obligations of Project Directors

Lead Creators shall be responsible for informing co-workers, including students, of their rights and obligations under this Policy as well as under contracts, grants and the like before initiation of the research or the project.

12. Heirs and Assigns

The provisions of this Policy shall inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the heirs and assigns of (i) all University personnel and (ii) all others who agree to be bound by it.

13. Prevailing Policy

In the event of a conflict between this policy and any policy of the Board of Regents, the latter shall prevail.

14. Changes in Policy

This policy may be changed by the President on the recommendation of the Intellectual Property Committee, with the endorsement of the Faculty Senate.

15. Assignment of Rights

All full or part-time faculty and staff, as a condition of employment with CSU, shall execute an Assignment of Rights Form, assigning all rights, title and interest, to the extent prescribed in this Policy, in any Intellectual Property to the CSU Enterprise Foundation LLC or successor Foundation or Corporation. Failure to execute the Form does not exempt such faculty and staff from the intent of this section or from the IP Policy contained herein.

Students shall not be required to execute an Assignment of Rights Form except in the cases where they are also employees of CSU whether part time or full time. This policy shall, however, be applicable to them and shall be set forth in the General Catalog and Student Handbook.

16. Retention of Ownership

Ownership of IP will normally be retained by the CSU Enterprise Foundation, LLC. This is to ensure that all licensable knowledge, processes and devices created or invented will be available for public use. Licensing agreements granted by the CSUEF will contain a due diligence provision which will require that the license revert to the CSUEF within a reasonable period of time if the licensee does not make the IP available to the public.

17. Policy Applicability

This Policy shall be applicable to all full or part-time faculty, staff and students of Columbus State University.