June 2010:

Faculty Senate Committee appointments for the academic year 2010/2011:

Audit Committee
Rita Hays, Chair
Warren Moseley
Dick Kurtz
Lisa Schroeder

Budget and Program Committee
Kevin Collins, Chair
John Bradshaw
Edna Patatanian
Erin Callen

Curriculum Committee
Dennis Widen, Chair
Warren Akers
Erin Callen
Fred Gates

Judiciary Committee
Terry Goforth (CAS), Chair
Edna Patatanian (COP)
Dana Coker (CAAS)
Amy Barnett (CPGS)

Nominating Committee
Scott Long, Chair
Terry Goforth
Michael Catterson

Personnel Policies Committee
Jim Long, Chair
Fred Gates
Warren Akers
Les Ramos
**University Policies Committee**
Les Ramos, Chair
David Esjornson
Dennis Widen
Ralph May
Kevin Collins

**Student Affairs Committee**
Ralph May, Chair
Michael Catterson
Todd Helton
Tamra Weimer
Joshua Buxton, Student Senate Rep.

---

**July 2010**

**FS Motion 2010-7-01: Request for Modification of the Faculty Senate Constitution on eligibility of Parliamentarian:**

The Faculty Senate proposes to submit the following amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution for consideration by the full Faculty at the August 16, 2010 meeting. We hereby recommend that Article III, Section 2, Bullet item 5 be amended to read as follows: “appoint a Parliamentarian (need not be a Senate member) to be approved by the Senate.”

*The motion passed by voice vote.*

*This amendment was approved by the majority vote of the faculty members on August, 16th, 2010*

---

**FS Motion 2010-7-02: Request for Modification of the Faculty Senate Constitution on authorization of substitutes at Faculty Senate Meetings:**

The Faculty Senate proposes to submit the following amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution for consideration by the full Faculty at the August 16, 2010 meeting. We hereby recommend that Article II, Section 5 of the Faculty Senate Constitution be amended to read as follows: “A Senator must authorize in writing a voting substitute at any meeting. The authorization must specifically name the voting substitute and be delivered to the President either in hard copy with the signature of the absent Senator or by email from the absent Senator’s account. The substitute must come from within the academic unit that elects the Senator.”

*The motion passed by voice vote.*

*This amendment was approved by the majority vote of the faculty members on August, 16th, 2010*
August 2010

FS Motion 2010-8-01: Faculty Senate Budget:

It is proposed the Faculty Senate adopt the following 2010-2011 Faculty Senate budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Dues</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awards Years of Service Plaques</td>
<td>$495</td>
<td>$495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers Plaques and Senator Certificates</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty Reception</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Reception</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying, Travel, and Misc.</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion passed by voice vote.

FS Motion 2010-8-02:

We hereby recommend that the university administration examine the compensation system to assure that all faculty are motivated to fill summer courses with the maximum number of students allowable.

The motion passed by voice vote with opposition.
This motion was presented to the Provost.
September 2010

FS Motion 2010-9-01

It is proposed the University Policies Committee, in conjunction with Provost, examine the current forms regarding continuance, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure review for clarity and compatibility with the Faculty Handbook policies and procedures for these processes.

The motion passed by voice vote.

FS Motion 2010-9-02:

It is proposed that the Faculty Senate Personnel Policies committee review the policy of automatic promotion to the rank of assistant professor for a faculty member upon completion of a Ph.D.

The motion passed by voice vote.

The committee reported to the senate and found that the promotion is not automatic. Please read the full report in the minutes of September meeting.

The FS caucused by College to select members of the Faculty University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (FUPTRC) and University Promotion/Tenure Appeals Committee.

Results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>FUPTRC</th>
<th>Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Dr. Steve Pray</td>
<td>Dr. Erin Callen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Boggs</td>
<td>Dr. James Silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Sophia Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. John Hayden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate and Professional Studies</td>
<td>Dr. Melody Ashenfelter</td>
<td>Dr. Nancy Penner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Arden Aspedon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Warren Moseley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate and Applied Programs</td>
<td>Dr. Tommye Davis</td>
<td>Ms. Kathy Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October, 2010

**FS Motion 2010-10-01:**
It is proposed that the Faculty Senate request clarification from the Provost on the policy of allowing tenure candidates to know the outcome of the vote of the Academic Unit committee to see if it is consistent with the Sense of the Senate regarding this policy.

The motion passed by voice vote.
The motion was forwarded to the administration.

**FS Motion 2010-10-02:**
It is proposed that the following revised or new versions of forms related to continuance, tenure, and promotion be forwarded to the Provost for review.

- Departmental Continuance Committee Recommendation (new)
- Department Chair Recommendation for Continuance (revised)
- Committee Member Recommendation for Continuance (revised)
- Recommendation of the Academic Review Committee: Tenure (new)
- Recommendation of the Academic Review Committee: Promotion (new)
- Promotion Cover Sheet (revised)
- Tenure Cover Sheet (revised)

The following amendment was offered to FS Motion 2010-10-02

**FS Amendment 2010-10-03:**
It is proposed that a change be made in the Committee Member Recommendation Form for Continuance. The form currently reads, “This form is a source of information for the Chair and should be destroyed once a summary has been developed. The identity of the faculty member submitting the form must be kept confidential by the Chair.” These statements should be replaced on the form with “This form is a source of information for the Continuance Committee Chair and should not be destroyed until the process has been completed. The identity of the faculty member submitting the form must be kept confidential by the Continuance Committee Chair.”

The amendment passed by voice vote.
The amended motion passed by voice vote.
It was forwarded to the administration. The administration approved it and will be effective starting fall 2011.

Attachments to Motions: **FS Motion 2010-10-02, FS Amendment 2010-10-03:**
DEPARTMENTAL CONTINUANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Faculty Member Considered for Continuance

Date of Appointment

Date of Last Continuance

Check one of the boxes below:

☐ Recommend Continuance

☐ Recommend Non-continuance

The statements listed below reflect the the opinions of the majority of the committee members. Any minority opinions are so indicated.

With regard to instructional effectiveness, scholarly effort, and service:

What are the candidate's perceived strengths?

What are his/her perceived weaknesses?

My signature below indicates that the above summary accurately represents the deliberations of the committee, but does not necessarily reflect agreement with everything in the summary.

Committee Chair Signature & Date

Committee Member Signature & Date

Committee Member Signature & Date

Committee Member Signature & Date

Committee Member Signature & Date

Committee Member Signature & Date

pro-continuancecommittee - rev.10.19
DEPARTMENT CHAIR
RECOMMENDATION FOR CONTINUANCE

Faculty Member Considered for Continuance

Date of Appointment

Date of Last Continuance

Check one of the boxes below:

☐ Recommend Continuance

☐ Recommend Non-continuance

The Department Chair/Associate Dean has the responsibility of sharing the Departmental Continuance Committee recommendation and perceived strengths and weaknesses with the faculty member.

With regard to instructional effectiveness, scholarly effort, and service:

What are the candidate’s perceived strengths?

What are his/her perceived weaknesses?

Signature of the Department Chair

Date

This form is a source of information for the Dean. The Department Chair/Associate Dean should share summary information and the recommendation outcome with the candidate for continuance.
Committee Member Recommendation for Continuance

Faculty Member Considered for Continuance

Check one of the boxes below:

☐ Recommend Continuance  ☐ Recommend Non-continuance

With regard to the instructional effectiveness, scholarly effort, and service.

What are the candidate’s perceived strengths?

What are his/her perceived weaknesses?

Committee Member Signature & Date

This form is a source of information for the Continuance Committee Chair and should not be destroyed until the process has been completed. The identity of the faculty member submitting the form must be kept confidential by the Continuance Committee Chair.
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT REVIEW COMMITTEE: TENURE

Academic Unit/Department

Candidate Name

Please indicate the method by which the committee was formed:

☐ If possible, when evaluating a candidate for tenure, the Academic Unit/Department Review Committee for should consist of at least five (5) tenured faculty members from the academic unit/department excluding the chair/associate dean of the academic unit and any other candidates for tenure.

If the above was not possible, then additional members were selected by the following method:

☐ Since the number of tenured faculty members in the academic unit/department is fewer than five (5), the committee is composed of the actual tenured faculty members in the academic unit, plus additional tenured faculty members appointed by the Provost or designee to form a group of at least five (5) tenured faculty members acting as an ad hoc committee for tenure recommendation.

RESULTS OF ACADEMIC UNIT COMMITTEE FACULTY VOTE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Number of Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (Must equal total number on committee including Committee Chair)

RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC UNIT COMMITTEE: Grant ☐ Deny ☐

(Please continue on the next page with a summary of rationale for the decision)

SUMMARY OF RATIONALE FOR ACADEMIC UNIT COMMITTEE DECISION:

Signature of Academic Unit Review Committee Chair Date
RECOMMENDATION OF THE
ACADEMIC UNIT REVIEW
COMMITTEE: PROMOTION

Academic Unit/Department

Candidate Name

Proposed Rank

Please indicate the method by which the committee was formed:

☐ If possible, the Academic Unit/Department Review Committee should consist of at least three (3) tenured faculty members in the department above the rank of the candidate for promotion, excluding the chair/associate dean of the academic unit and any other candidates for promotion to the same rank.

If the above was not possible, then additional members were selected by the following methods, in order, until a committee of at least three (3) faculty members was obtained:

☐ Addition of tenured faculty in the department at the rank of the candidate for promotion excluding the chair/associate dean of the academic unit and any other candidates for promotion to the same rank.

☐ Addition of tenured faculty in the department at or above the rank of the candidate for promotion have submitted a plan to select additional members to produce a committee of three (3) that is acceptable to the dean of the college.

☐ The Chief Academic Officer/Provost has appointed tenured faculty above the rank of the candidate from other academic units to produce a committee of three (3) excluding deans, associate deans, or applicants for the same rank.

RESULTS OF ACADEMIC UNIT COMMITTEE FACULTY VOTE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Number of Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (Must equal total number on committee including Committee Chair)

RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC UNIT COMMITTEE:  Grant ☐ Deny ☐

(Please continue on the next page with a summary of rationale for the decision)

SUMMARY OF RATIONALE FOR ACADEMIC UNIT COMMITTEE DECISION:

Signature of Academic Unit Review Committee Chair       Date
Promotion
Cover Sheet

Name ____________________________________________
Rank __________________________________________
Year of Last SWOSU Promotion _______________________
Year of Initial Appointment _________________________
Department ______________________________________
College __________________________________________

Administrative Title (if applicable) __________________________

Secondary Academic Appointment (if applicable)
Department ___________________ Rank _______________________
College _________________ Year of Initial Appointment __________

Type of Appointment
Non-tenure Track [ ] Tenure Track [ ]

Status of Tenure (if applicable)
Year Eligible _____________ Year Tenure Awarded ____________

Recommendations
Candidate shall indicate whether application is to be forwarded to the next level by checking “Yes” or “No” and initialing to the right of the action indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Forward to Next Level</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit Review Committee</td>
<td>Grant [ ] Deny [ ]</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair OR Associate Dean</td>
<td>Grant [ ] Deny [ ]</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Grant [ ] Deny [ ]</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University TPRC</td>
<td>Grant [ ] Deny [ ]</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completion of Process
My signature indicates that I have studied these recommendations; however it does not imply that I necessarily agree with the recommendation. I understand a copy of this review will be placed in my personnel file.

Candidate’s Signature ______________________________ Date ____________
Tenure Cover Sheet

Name
Rank
Year of Initial Appointment
Years in Tenure Track
Administrative Title (if applicable)
Department
College

Secondary Academic Appointment (if applicable)
Department
Rank
College
Year of Initial Appointment

Recommendations
Candidate shall indicate whether application is to be forwarded to the next level by checking “Yes” or “No” and initialing to the right of the action indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit Review Committee</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair OR Associate Dean</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUPTRC</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completion of Process
My signature indicates that I have studied these recommendations; however it does not imply that I necessarily agree with the recommendation. I understand a copy of this review will be placed in my personnel file.

Candidate’s Signature __________________________ Date ____________
November, 2010: No motions.

December, 2010: No motions.
January, 2011

FS Motion 2011-01-01:
It is proposed that the Faculty Senate University Policies Committee examine the policy that final grades must be turned in less than twenty-four (24) hours after faculty give the last final exam.

The motion passed by voice vote.
The motion was forwarded to the administration. The registrar agreed to extend the final grade deadline by 5 hours and make it 5:00pm instead of 12pm.

FS Motion 2011-01-02:
It is proposed that the Faculty Senate reject the following recommendation of the registrar: “I propose that faculty members should no longer be able to have the option to grade students with a “W” at the end of the semester because this practice can sometimes cause problems with federal policies involving both international students and veteran students.”

The motion passed by voice vote. The motion was forwarded to the administration.

Attachment to the motion: The letter from the registrar reads as follows:
January 10, 2011

Dr. Foust:

I propose that faculty members should no longer be able to have the option to grade students with a “W” at the end of the semester because this practice can sometimes cause problems with federal policies involving both international students and veteran students.

While I can certainly appreciate that the faculty members that carry out this practice are trying to help out the student, this can actually cause more harm than good in some circumstances.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) and the United States Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) do not consider “W” grades as complete grades. Therefore, several issues came up following the Fall 2010 Semester when students were graded with a “W” at the end of the term. The following issues can be problematic when a student receives a “W”:

* International students are required to complete at least 12 hours to stay in good standing with USCIS. If a student is enrolled in 12 hours and receives a “W” in three of the 12 hours, the student is out of status and is in danger of being deported because they did not complete 12 hours. Therefore, an “F” is better than a “W” in this particular instance because an “F” is a complete grade.

* Veteran students are required to pay money back to the VA when they receive a “W”. They do not have to pay it back when they receive an “F” because an “F” is considered a complete grade.

I again want to reiterate that I appreciate it when faculty work with students when they have difficulties; however, I am concerned that the current grading policy that allows faculty to grade students with a “W” causes problems because the registrar’s office is not there to counsel the student on how it will affect non-academic issues.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Daniel Archer

Registrar
February, 2011

FS Motion 2011-02-01:  
It is proposed that reserved parking be created for faculty.

The motion failed by voice vote.

FS Motion 2011-02-02:  
It is proposed that an ad hoc committee be formed to study parking for faculty, staff, and students on the SWOSU campus.

The motion passed by voice vote.  
The FS president appointed an ad hoc committee to examine the options and report to the administration.

FS Motion 2011-02-03:  
The Faculty Senate commends President Beutler, the Administration, and the staff for their timely notification and overall handling of the recent weather related closings. The Physical Plant workers are to be commended for ensuring the Campus was safe when reopened.

The motion passed by voice vote and forwarded to the administration.

The FS caucused by College and selected faculty senate representation to the Presidential Task force for the Awarding of Honorary Doctorates. The following were selected to represent the faculty:

1. Mary Aspedon (College of Professional and Graduate Studies)  
2. John Hayden (College of Arts and Sciences)  
3. Les Ramos (College of Pharmacy)
March, 2011: No Motions in regular meeting.
In an online communication and according to Robert’s Rules, the FS passed the following resolution by a majority vote.
To the 53rd Legislature of the State of Oklahoma

The Faculty Senate of Southwestern Oklahoma State University requests that the Legislature consider our opinions regarding House Bill 2087 currently under consideration for passage, particularly Subsection D of the bill.

The Faculty Senate recognizes and values the historical importance of handguns and firearms in general to the development of our state, our region, and the western frontier in general. The abilities of frontier people to feed and defend themselves depended in large part on their right to keep and bear arms and on their ability to use them. Because of our heritage, the majority of the Faculty Senate respects the rights of many Oklahomans to carry firearms, including some of the rights specified in House Bill 2087.

In addition, the Faculty Senate is honored that the Legislature expressed its confidence in members of the state’s college and university faculties by specifying, in D. 4. b., that faculty members are among those who are not prohibited from having a valid concealed handgun license and using it on campus.

The Faculty Senate considers it no coincidence, however, that institutions of higher learning never thrived in the American West until the closing of the frontier in 1890. Colleges and universities are places of great intellectual conflict, but these institutions have always settled their conflicts through argumentation, moral suasion, and proof rather than through the force that was so essential on the frontier. For this reason, the Faculty Senate views Subsection D of House Bill 2087 as an imposition of the ethic of one important historical era, the frontier era, upon the ethic of another era, the modern era in which people can seek to better their positions in life through intellectual vigor rather than physical force. We argue that the two ethics can coexist in Oklahoma, but only if licensed gun owners are permitted to keep arms in their homes and only if colleges and universities are kept essentially free of firearms.

The Faculty Senate acknowledges the reality of recent incidents such as the gun violence at Virginia Tech, and we acknowledge at least the possibility that an armed faculty member might have lessened that tragedy with one well-placed shot. Nevertheless, we have dedicated our lives to the primacy of reasoned discourse, and we consider the specific state-sanctioned right to carry arms on campuses to be a threat to its primacy.

Again, the Faculty Senate recognizes with gratitude the Legislature’s singling out of college and university faculty members as people who are entitled to bear arms. We agree in principle with the Legislature’s judgment about our overall competency and temperament. Nevertheless, we urge the Legislature to keep campuses as places where reason prevails over force, even if an armed manic should occasionally prove an exception to the rule. Teaching and scholarship at institutions of higher learning can be very stressful jobs, and we at Southwestern Oklahoma State University recall two incidents within the past thirty years when faculty members resorted to gun violence with tragic results. Though these incidents took place off campus, both illustrate the reality that, under stress, even the most admirable and reasoned of scholars has human flaws that can negatively affect the campus community. Similar stresses
affect students, staff, and even visitors to campus, and the Faculty Senate believes that the only people who should carry firearms on campuses are trained law-enforcement officers.

The Faculty Senate of Southwestern Oklahoma State University strongly urges the Legislature to revise House Bill 2087 to exclude college and university campuses from among the properties on which individuals have the right to carry concealed weapons.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Dr. Muatasem Ubeidat
President, Faculty Senate
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
April, 2011

FS Motion 2011-04-01:
It is proposed that the slate of candidates for University committees consisting of those volunteers not currently assigned to committees and the candidates for Faculty Senate Officers be accepted.

The motion passed by voice vote. Please see the attached list on the following page.
The following is the results of 2011 Faculty Senate Committee and Officer elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office/Committee</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS President-Elect</td>
<td>David Esjornson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Fred Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisory &amp; Scholarship Council</td>
<td>Jim Long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Gregory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lelmaid Turner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Appeals</td>
<td>Sylvia Esjornson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roberto Rivera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Henderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcy Tamer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jared Edwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellate on Dismissal of Tenured Faculty (Must be Tenured)</td>
<td>Barry Gales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arden Aspedon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joel Kendall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viki Craig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Guy Biyogman</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernhardt</td>
<td>Charles Rodgers</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Aspedon</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dayna Coker</td>
<td>Associate &amp; Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaehwa Choi</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Environment</td>
<td>Kathy Wolff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>Peter Grant</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Barnett</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randall Sharp</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Recruitment</td>
<td>Cliff McMahon</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Burgess</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dayna Coker</td>
<td>Associate &amp; Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardeep Singh Saluja</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jason Dupree</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance Advisory &amp; Appeals</td>
<td>Curt Woolever</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Property</td>
<td>Faruk Khan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tisha Wald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Center Policy Forming Board</td>
<td>Stephen Haynes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Todd Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cathy DeVauhghan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Computer/Telecommunication</td>
<td>Denise Landrum-Geyer</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tami Moser</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deborah Carpenter</td>
<td>Associate &amp; Applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respectfully submitted to the SWOSU Faculty Senate,

Muatasem Ubeidat, Ph.D.
FS President 2010-2011