



Southwestern Oklahoma State University  
**SWOSU Digital Commons**

---

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

10-29-2010

## October 29, 2010 Minutes

SWOSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/fsminutes>



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

SWOSU Faculty Senate, "October 29, 2010 Minutes" (2010). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 139.  
<https://dc.swosu.edu/fsminutes/139>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at SWOSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of SWOSU Digital Commons. An ADA compliant document is available upon request. For more information, please contact [phillip.fitzsimmons@swosu.edu](mailto:phillip.fitzsimmons@swosu.edu).

**Southwestern Oklahoma State University**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**October 29, 2010**  
***APPROVED* Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

- I. Call to Order:** The October 29, 2010 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 2:01 p.m. in Education 201 with FS President Muatasem Ubeidat presiding.
- II. Establish Quorum:** The following members were present: Warren Akers, Amy Barnett, John Bradshaw, Kathy Brooks (Sayre), Nina Morris for Erin Callen, Dayna Coker (Sayre), Kevin Collins, David Esjornson, Leyland Turner for Fred Gates, Terry Goforth, Rita Hays, Dick Kurtz, Jim Long, Scott Long, Ralph May, Evette Meliza, Patsy Parker for Warren Moseley, Edna Patatanian, Eric Paul, Chad Ramirez, Les Ramos, Ann Russell, Lisa Schroeder, Muatasem Ubeidat, Tamra Weimer, Dennis Widen, and Jonathan Woltz.
- III. Certification of Substitutes:** Nina Morris for Erin Callen, Leyland Turner for Fred Gates. Patsy Parker for Warren Moseley.
- IV. Presentation of Visitors:** Dr. Blake Sonobe, Senior Vice President and Provost, addressed the Faculty Senate and answered questions about the impact to SWOSU in the event that State Question 744 passes. Dr. Sonobe stressed that both Common Education and Higher Education are underfunded in Oklahoma. State question 744 mandates that Oklahoma spend the regional per student average on Common Education. The State Question does not designate revenue source to support the additional spending. The spending would be phased in over three years. The first year would require an additional \$350-\$400 million, the second year ~\$600 million, and the third year ~ \$800 million. If the funding burden for State Question 744 were to be equally distributed to all state agencies, SWOSU would see a 5-6% reduction in the first year. By year three, that reduction would be 10-12%. Dr. Sonobe also pointed out that Federal Stimulus money prevented a 6% cut in SWOSU budget for the current year. Since the stimulus ends this year, SWOSU is looking at a 6% reduction in State support even if State Question 744 does not pass. The University has planned for the end of the stimulus funding, but any additional cuts will be difficult. The current economic downturn has led to 10% cuts at other State Agencies, so Higher Education may take a greater share of any future cuts. Dr. Sonobe stated that SWOSU has committed to trying to keep staffing levels strong, so that we will be well positioned when the economy improves.
- V. Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of September 24, 2010 meeting were approved by voice vote.
- VI. Announcements:**
  - A. From FS President Muatasem Ubeidat:**
    1. Dr. Blake Sonobe thanks all Faculty members on SWOSU campuses for their involvement and help during the HLC visit. Thank you for your great work.
    2. All advisors must follow the enrollment schedules for students. It has been noticed that some advisors were enrolling freshman during the time that been reserved for seniors and juniors enrollment.
  - B. FS Secretary/Treasurer David Esjornson:**
    1. **Roll Sheet** – please sign.
    2. **Treasurer's Report:** No activity in either account.

<b>a. BancFirst Checking Account</b>	
September Meeting Balance:	\$2126.55
CURRENT BALANCE:	\$2126.55
<b>b. University account:</b>	
September Meeting balance:	\$106.00
Current Balance:	\$106.00

**C. FS President-elect Kevin Collins:** Nothing to report.

**D. FS Past President Scott Long:** Nothing to report.

**E. Student Government Representative:** Nolan Lawless for Josh Buxton.

1. The SGA has been looking into ways to make the campus more pedestrian friendly. In particular, there is concern crossing the four lanes of Davis Road on campus. The SGA has been examining several ideas including the introduction of speed bumps and the possibility of equipping campus security with radar guns in order to slow traffic.
2. The SGA was also gathering information on the campus alcohol policy. Although alcohol is banned from campus certain functions allow alcohol. The Faculty Senate shared their current understanding of the conditions under which alcohol is permitted. The alcohol ban is a RUSO statewide policy. Alcohol is not permitted at any university-sponsored functions. Alcohol is not permitted in any buildings built with state funds (the Wellness Center and the Student Union were not state funded). A non-profit organization may serve alcohol at a fundraiser provided they obtain a state permit, and obey applicable state laws.
3. The Student Government Center has expanded hours of operation to better serve student. The center hours are: Monday, 2pm-6pm; Tuesday 1pm-7pm; Wednesday, 9am-Noon, 2pm-5pm; Thursday, 2pm-6pm; and Friday 9am-11am.

## **VII. Reports from standing or ad hoc committees.**

### **A. Report from the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee**

The FS Curriculum Committee currently consists of only members from the College of Arts and Sciences and Pharmacy. Volunteers for Non- Arts and Sciences/Pharmacy representation are requested. The Provost has indicated the University Curriculum Committee will be re-activated, so the Faculty Senate Committee will be addressing this issue.

### **B. Report from the Faculty Senate Personnel Policies Committee**

Review of Promotion for Instructors Upon Completion of A Doctorate. At this time, there is not an official policy referring to the automatic promotion of an instructor to assistant professor upon completion of an earned doctorate. Historically, this has been a human resources issue managed at the departmental and college level as a procedural matter on a case-by-case basis. In general, colleges and departments have utilized the following process: (1) an instructor expresses interest in pursuing a doctorate, either of his or her own initiative or by suggestion by the department chair; (2) the faculty member enrolls in a doctoral degree program and upon completion of the requirements for the degree, submits an official transcript to the department chair; and (3) after review, the chair forwards a request for

promotion of the faculty member to the appropriate associate dean and/or dean, who then forwards the request and supporting documents to the Provost for approval. Approval of promotion does not appear to be automatic and is dependent on an evaluation of the academic aspects (nature and origin of the degree, the quality of the program of study, and the impact of the promotion on the department) and budget impact of the request and the continuance process. As a result, one or more factors may favor approval or denial of the promotion. Instead of an “automatic” promotion, it may be more appropriately described as a “pending approval” promotion.

### **C. Report from the Faculty Senate University Policies Committee**

The Policies Committee requests input from the Senate regarding the interpretation of two Tenure/Promotion Policies as stated in the Faculty Handbook.

1. Requests the sense of the Faculty Senate regarding the interpretation of confidentiality as implied in the RUSO Policy Manual section below. Historically, the administration has interpreted the RUSO policy to indicate that the candidate for tenure cannot be informed of the departmental committee vote and the overall grant or deny decision. As a result, deletion of the grant and deny boxes from the Tenure Cover Sheet has been proposed to ensure compliance with RUSO policy (see New Business). The sense of the Faculty Senate is also requested in respect to the consistency of the Faculty Handbook (pertinent passages below, italics added) with the interpretation of the RUSO policy.

**RUSO Policy Manual (Page 3-11, February 2005) 3.3.5 Procedure for Granting Tenure and Reviewing of Tenured Faculty** a) When a faculty member is to be considered for tenure, the chair of a division or department shall call a meeting of the tenured members of the division or department for a discussion of the case. The faculty member's contributions to the mission of the university shall be reviewed and evaluated by the tenured members of his or her division or department including his or her division and/or department chair if applicable, and a poll by secret ballot will be taken to determine whether a recommendation for the granting of tenure will be made. *The results of all balloting will be confidential and will not be included in the faculty member's personnel file.* This review may be conducted in a manner that allows for input from non-tenured colleagues, students, alumni and administrative information from the department chair. In the event that the number of tenured faculty members in a division or department is fewer than five (5), the actual tenured members in that division or department, plus additional tenured faculty members appointed by the chief academic officer or his or her designee to form a group of at least five (5) tenured faculty members shall act as an ad hoc committee for tenure recommendation. A simple majority rule shall prevail. The division or department chair shall report the results of the vote, separate from his or her recommendation, to the dean who will forward that recommendation as well as the dean's recommendation to the chief academic officer. The chief academic officer will report these recommendations as well as his or her recommendation to the president.

**SWOSU Faculty Handbook 2010-2011 (Pages 103-104)**

With the exception of the Academic Unit Committee, the chair or individual from each level of the hierarchy shall report its decision (i.e., grant or deny) to the applicant on the coversheet for promotion/tenure documents. The results of the balloting of the Academic Unit Committee are confidential. The applicant shall have access to the comments at every level of review. The Academic Unit Committee summary should reflect the majority opinion of the Committee; minority opinions should be so indicated. The Academic Unit Committee should carefully review its comments to ensure that the results of its balloting remain confidential.

Those applicants receiving unfavorable recommendation (vote to deny) may respond on the Cover Sheet which accompanies each application and return the Cover Sheet and/or application to the chair or individual at the next level. The options shall be (1) to hold a conference with the chair or individual in the event of a recommendation to deny, (2) to withdraw the application, and/or (3) to forward the application to the next level. If the applicant decides to continue, the summary report from each level, excluding rankings where indicated, shall be sent to all higher levels as input and shall be communicated to the applicant.

The following motion was moved and seconded:

**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.

*Rationale:* The Senate last visited this RUSO policy interpretation in 2003. At that time it was the opinion of the RUSO attorney that it was necessary to keep only the actual vote count confidential. Once the current RUSO interpretation of the policy is clearly understood, the Senate will act to make the Faculty Handbook consistently reflect this policy.

2. Requests the sense of the Faculty Senate regarding the interpretation of a sentence in the Faculty Handbook that could be interpreted as allowing a candidate for Tenure and Promotion to add written comments to their Tenure and Promotion document in response to comments made by the Academic Unit Committee (pertinent passage below, italics added).

**SWOSU Faculty Handbook 2010-2011 (Page 105)**

Procedure for voting by academic unit committee: Following discussion of a candidate, a vote is taken on recommendation to "grant" or "deny" promotion or tenure. Each vote is by separate, standardized secret ballot; ballots are prepared in advance but not distributed until discussion on a candidate is completed. Majority rule decides the recommendation. In the case of a tie vote (including abstaining votes) the recommendation is deny.

The committee chair shall record the recommendation and compile a written summary of the rationale ensuring that the responses from the individual committee members remain confidential. The written summary shall be added to the promotion/tenure documents for review by the applicant.

The options for the applicant shall be (1) to hold a conference with the chair in the event that unfavorable comments were received, (2) to withdraw the application, and/or (3) to forward the application to the next level. *The applicant may respond to the written summary by completing the appropriate form and adding it to the promotion/tenure documents for review by the next level.*

If the applicant decides to continue, a summary report is sent to department chair/associate dean as input. The summary report will include the results of the committee votes, majority/minority opinions and statements related to the applicant's qualifications for tenure or promotion. A record regarding the vote of individual committee members and statements or opinions expressed by individual committee members will not be included in the summary report or retained in committee records.

The discussion of the italicized statement from the page 105 of the Faculty handbook centered around the following points: (1) The statement must not mean that the applicant is allowed a written rebuttal of the Academic Unit report. That procedure is not part of the current practice. (2) The statement may be referring to the initialing of the cover sheet by the candidate. (3) If the above (italics) statement were to be deleted from the handbook, the ambiguity would be removed. Removal of that statement would not change the policy.

**VIII. No unfinished business.**

**IX. New business:**

The following motion was moved and seconded:

**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)



**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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Member Signature & Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Member Signature & Date



**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:**

<u>Action</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>
Grant	_____
Deny	_____
Abstain	_____
<b>Total</b>	_____ <i>(Must equal total number on committee including Committee Chair)</i>

**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:**

<u>Action</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>
Grant	_____
Deny	_____
Abstain	_____
<b>Total</b>	_____ (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.

	<b>Promotion</b>		<b>Forward to Next Level</b>		<b>Initial</b>
Academic Unit Review Committee	Grant <input type="checkbox"/>	Deny <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Department Chair <b>OR</b> Associate Dean	Grant <input type="checkbox"/>	Deny <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Dean	Grant <input type="checkbox"/>	Deny <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
University TPRC	Grant <input type="checkbox"/>	Deny <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	

**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.

	Tenure		Forward to Next Level		Initial
Academic Unit Review Committee			Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Department Chair <b>OR</b> Associate Dean	Grant <input type="checkbox"/>	Deny <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Dean	Grant <input type="checkbox"/>	Deny <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
FUPTRC	Grant <input type="checkbox"/>	Deny <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	

## 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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.

*Rationale:*

Continuance Forms

Given the recent change in the continuance policy to exclude the department chair from the Departmental Continuance Committee and to elect a committee chair from among the department faculty members eligible to serve, a new form was created for the departmental committee report and revisions were made to the existing department chair and committee member forms for consistency with the new policy.

Forms Related to Tenure and Promotion

Faculty members have expressed concerns regarding completion and interpretation of the existing Tenure/Promotion Recommendation of Departmental Faculty form, particularly in respect to the meaning of the alternative A, B, C, and other check boxes that refer to the nature of the committee composition as outlined in the Faculty Handbook 2010-2011 (p. 103) (below). The University Policies Committee proposes two new forms to replace the existing committee form: one for tenure and one for promotion. The new forms provide clarity in respect to the committee composition, particularly in light of different requirements for departmental tenure and promotion committees. The Promotion Cover Sheet has also been revised for clarity.

**SWOSU Faculty Handbook, page 103. Review Process and Schedule for Promotion and Tenure**

“In the event that the number of tenured faculty members in the academic unit is fewer than five (5), the actual tenured members in the academic unit, plus additional tenured faculty members appointed by the chief academic officers or the designee to form a group of at least five (5) tenured faculty members shall act as an *ad hoc* committee for tenure recommendation. For promotion purposes, the Academic Unit

Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty 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. In the event that a department is not able to form a committee of at least three members, additional members are selected by the following methods, in order, until a committee of at least three is obtained.

- a. Tenured academic unit faculty at the rank of the candidate for promotion.
- b. All academic unit tenured faculty at or above the rank of the candidate for promotion shall submit a plan to select additional members to produce a committee of three that is acceptable to the dean of the college.
- c. The Chief Academic Officer shall appoint tenured faculty above the rank of the candidate from other academic units to produce a committee of three.
- d. If committee members are drawn from outside the applicant's academic unit, no associate deans, dean's or applicants for the same rank shall be eligible for committee membership."

**X. Adjournment:** 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Muatasem Ubeidat, FS President

---

David Esjornson, FS Secretary

**Next Faculty Senate Meeting:  
November 19th, 2010 at 2:00 p.m. in EDU 201**