**Kentucky Academy of Science**

**Governing Board Meeting Minutes**

August 17, 2022

The KAS Board virtual (Zoom) meeting was convened on Wednesday April 17, 2022 at 5:00 PM(EST). Members present include: Amanda Fuller, Dr. Rodney King, Dr. Trent Garrison, Dr. Kate He, Dr. Wei Song, Dr. Seyed Allameh, Dr. Frank Ettensohn, J. Scott Miller, Melony Stambaugh, Dr. Noel Novelo, Dr. Justin McFadden, Dr. Julie Ann Reizner, Dr. Marilyn Akins, Dr. Mark Cerna, and Dr. Wei Song. (15 members logged in Zoom)

Members absent: Dr. Elizabeth Thomas (prepared minutes from recording) and Dr. Melissa Mefford

1. Junior Academy Report

Melony Stambaugh presented junior academy of science report. Key points of Melony’s report include-

* Expanded view of the junior academy this fall at Morehead State University
* Thursday evening sessions, junior academy of science will be presenting Thursday evening KAS annual meeting

1. Teacher Workshops

Amanda Fuller presented an update on the teacher workshops, interdisciplinary theme sessions, and student research evaluations as rating not ranking. Key points of Amanda’s report include-

* Teacher Workshops three people have volunteered to present workshops
* In touch with Section leaders since we are changing things up
* Planning interdisciplinary areas with themes, we have not announced those topics yet, not choosing top three but every student will get a rating, still get recognition, Friday 26th follow-up meeting with section leaders
* Will be putting together a budget together and get registration open by September 1st.
* Getting the local arrangement team together soon
* Julie Reizner has secured the key note speaker.

1. Journal Report

Dr. Frank Ettensohn presented Journal report. Key points of the report include-

* Journal editors met on July 29th discussed about journal workflows and editor rolls
* Big things include trying to get articles-right now we have 9 new science articles to review but still lacking articles from the social sciences-doing really well on the sciences
* Discussed things might do to make it easier to submit articles, possibly approaching the regional organizations to submit articles, would like to dedicate our BioOne money (now will be done on the number of pages so the money will decline) to the journal and award a best paper.
* In the past $5000/year from BioOne but now that will change since the revenue will be based on the number of pages. Our revenues will be going done. ***Frank’s proposal is to take the money that we receive from BioOne and use it to support the journal. Use this money to provide a best paper award.*** The academy itself invests very little money into the journal.
* It would be good to have something written up.
* Discussion: Sayed statement $80K-90K/year to support knowledge. $5K compared to $80K is not much so take that money off and dedicate the journal online for free. Can people reach these articles easily and are they free? Frank says the journal is available online and free to all academy members and those who join BioOne. ***Marilyn says since we do not know what our revenues are going to be, could we just start this with a small amount like $500***. Frank says we should think about the amount of the award for the best paper as a way to encourage others to submit. Encourage our grant recipients to submit a paper to our journal. The language is already there to encourage the recipients to present at the annual meeting. Frank will write a formal proposal to take $500 from BioOne input and put that towards a best paper award for our journal. He has not written that up but he can. Mark asked if we can just put whatever revenue comes in from BioOne to put that into the journal? Amanda stated we haven’t got a recent fix for the cost of publications are so that maybe something that needs to be resolved. Rodney stated that one of our ideas is to encourage people to publish in the journal. He supports Marilyn’s proposal to put $500 from the BioOne profits toward a best paper award.

Marilyn seconded the motion, Julie everyone in agreement? Katie asked if it is for student or anyone? Frank says it would be for anyone who publishes. Julie states in the future we could set aside other awards one for students.

* Question in chat, how do we determine which is best? We would have to have a committee of editors and this would be the choice of the editors committee.
* Wei states that for the award should be based on a criteria. Frank stated we will have some sort of a rubric but sometimes this comes rather subjective when comparing papers from different disciplines. Frank believes the editors are capable for working this out. Katie asked about the number of reads/downloads and that could be one of the basis.
* Julie asked what is the specifics for this award? Frank do we operate on academic year or fiscal calendar year? Julie said for the meeting we could present this award. Frank asked submissions or publications? Julie states it should be for publications. Amanda states Spring 2023 that would be announced.

Motion to approve, J. Scot Miller motion to approve. Wei Song seconded. Everyone agreed. ***Motion approved to offer a $500 award for anyone student or professional that has a publication in our journal and have it announced in Spring 2023.***

1. Executive Director’s Amanda Fuller presented key points regarding amending bylaws, election update, and strategic planning which included the following:

* Amanda amending the bylaws
* Election update four candidates for the At-Large Representatives and we might have one candidate for treasurer. Amanda will be working with Trent for the regular elections. The bylaws say the elections need to be open for 30 days. Trent counted like 8 or 9 candidates.
* Bylaws informational Rodney and Amanda identified some bylaws that need to be updated. Let’s do that in November.
* Strategic Plan Discussion: Amanda timeline we are trying to get comments to Caroline by August 30th and she will get a draft together in two weeks. Discuss the comments today. Caroline has been looking at what people have been writing. Rodney’s comments really do not see anything in the strategic plan about identifying additional revenue. There was something about establishing MOU’s but should include a plan to be proactive to bring in revenue to support the initiatives. Strategic priority #5 partners like the Ky Science Center, Center of EKU, those that have mission-based alignment. We have not had any new affiliates in quite awhile. Incorporate some of the online funding like what Rob is trying. Explore new funding partnerships (Amanda and Rodney) Julie if people have comments then people can reply/edit the file. This needs to be done by August 30th. Noel thinks maybe Rodney brings up a good point and that perhaps the funding needs its own point. We should have it on our Strategic Plan. Rodney will draft something up and put it on the document. J. Scott commented that to support a particular strategy by how we would pay for the goal. Rodney talked about writing grants for non-for-profits to explore. Melony commented about the three bullet points for the values to include thinking about the money in regards how we want to fund raise or how we want to spend the money. Amanda commented that perhaps we should be thoughtful for where the money comes from and how we are going to use it. Noel commented we value we ethical guidelines for money and we value the involvement of women and diverse minorities groups in science (LGBGT, Racial). Wei agreed we should have a similar statement in the value section. Noel will provide a template statement. J. Scott commented shouldn’t a statement like that appear in our bylaws? Noel propose that we could include it in any document because if we do not write it and state it, then we will not become aware. We have a code of conduct but we do not have a DEI (Diverse, Equity, Inclusion) statement. Amanda commented to include a DEI on the bylaws. Rodney asked if we are changing the mission plan. Amanda wants the board to formally approve the final strategic plan. J Scott asked will we be adopting Noel’s comments in the bylaws. Noel will write up something by Nov 1st. Mark commented are strategic priority #1 it is not clear what KAS is about as it is written and the alignment is not there, for example the priorities are not in correct order. Rodney said perhaps we should not state priority. Amanda asks would everyone want to propose an order? Rodney and Julie propose a circle and changing it to goal. As a group we should think about our priorities/goals and then which are in the most alignment. Sayed’s comments that we need to be careful about goals because we can’t have a lot of goals because goals have to be smart, achievable, quantified, targets, and measurements. Mark discussing the words: Initiatives instead of priorities, some universities use pillars. Sayed discussed innovation, new discoveries, new fields, etc and needs to be one of our core values. This compliments research; ultimate goal is innovation. Amanda asks if there was a particular place to where the wording should come up. Caroline can figure this out with our guidance. Rodney’s comment is to remember we are a membership of lots of different disciplines and likes innovation but not to replace other words since we are not producing a product. Sayed defines innovation as not a new product but novelty. J. Scot says if Strategic Priority #1 includes K-12 teachers then our goals should focus on the teachers. There seems to be a disconnect with the priority and goals. Its seems like our goals are not supporting priority #1. If the wording address science education support teachers the operation goal 1b should focus on the teachers and not the students. We either change the words in the priority statement or drop the word students from the statements and the goals need to be stated and aligned with the statement. Marilyn states we need consistency and there is not at the moment. Mark comments the first priority address threats to science education. The threats are not identified. This is very broad and needs to address something specific. J. Scott if there are threats to be addressed then there should be goals to back the threats up. Change the order were priority 1 looks like what we do and what our bylaws say we are going to do. Wei’s comments if we want to keep priority 4 and 1 and address the specifics how we support science education. Amanda is encouraging everyone to write their comments into the document. Amanda asks whether the priorities have numbers and orders? J Scott align strategic 1 and strategic 6. Bring 1 and make it 6. Advocating support is where number 1 is going to come into place. Try to reduce the number of strategic priorities and combine. Marilyn comments that even if we don’t number them the order will imply importance. Melony comments can we prioritize the order? Amanda encourages input. Sayed wants an order. Amanda and Melony stated priority #2 and #3 and #4 were the highest priorities; then 5, 6, and 1, Melony suggests a doodle poll. Mark thinks #4 should be #1 priority. J. Scott says we can’t do #4 without #2 and #3 first; the importance of the infrastructure in place. Amanda will send out a doodle poll to rank the priorities for Caroline. Marilyn supports Scotts suggestions that the bylaws should support the strategic plan. J Scott says the priorities should be in alignment with the bylaws.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.