

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

November 3, 2010

1. Call to Order

CHAIR PATRICK NOLAN (Sociology) called the meeting to order, and welcomed Senators, faculty and staff colleagues, and University Officers.

2. Corrections and Approval of Minutes

CHAIR NOLAN noted two corrections to the minutes of the meeting of October 6, 2010: (1) On page 3, the year regarding the GI Bill of Rights should be “1945,” not “1845.” (2) On page 9, in the second paragraph under “New Business,” in the second sentence of Chair Nolan’s comments, “involved” should be changed to “involve.” Chair Nolan asked for further corrections. There were none and the minutes were approved as corrected.

3. Reports of Committees

a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Rebekah Maxwell, Secretary

PROFESSOR MAXWELL (Law Library) reported on various vacancies on faculty committees. The Committee on Honorary Degrees has four vacancies: one for a new term that ends in 2013, two 2-year slots with terms ending in 2012, and one partial term ending in 2011. The Tenure Review Board has a vacancy for a new term that runs until 2013. The Admissions Committee has a vacancy for a new term ending in 2013 and a vacancy for a partial term ending in 2011.

Professor Mark Tompkins (Political Science) has volunteered for the Committee on Honorary Degrees, to fill the vacancy of the partial term ending in 2011. Where vacancies are for terms of a year or less, the Steering Committee is permitted to appoint volunteers, and it gratefully appoints Professor Tompkins to this vacancy.

Professor Maxwell brought forward two additional nominees:

Professor Jerry Hackett (Philosophy) has volunteered to be nominated for the three-year term on the Committee on Honorary Degrees. Professor Brant Hellwig (Law) has volunteered to be nominated for the three-year term on the Tenure Review Board. Coming from a committee, the nominations needed no second. The Faculty Senate voted to accept the nominees. Professor Maxwell left the floor open for further nominations.

b. Committee on Admissions, Professor Ernest Wiggins, Chair:

PROFESSOR WIGGINS (Mass Communications & Information Studies) greeted the Senators and guests and directed their attention to Attachment 4 in the agenda packet, which contained a policy proposal from the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions regarding behavioral/criminal infractions (please see Attachment, page 29). The Committee recommended that the Faculty Senate approve the proposal. Professor Wiggins had invited Scott Verzyl, Executive Director for Undergraduate Admissions, to be present at the meeting in case Senators had any questions about the policy. There were no questions and the Senate approved the policy as written.

c. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Jennifer Vendemia, Chair

PROFESSOR VENDEMIA (Psychology) reported changes in courses and curricula from the College of Arts and Sciences, the Moore School of Business, the College of mass Communications and Information Studies, the College of Nursing, the Arnold School of Public Health, and System Affairs and Extended University (please see attachment, pages 13-23).

The changes were adopted.

d. Faculty Budget Committee, Professor Duncan Alford, Chair:

The Committee had no report, but Chair Nolan updated the Senators on the status of faculty representation on the University's Capital Planning Committee. The Committee met the previous Tuesday, and Chair Nolan attended, along with a representative of the Faculty Budget Committee. Chair Nolan recognized the University's Administrative Team for this positive move in implementing faculty representation on this important committee.

4. Reports of Officers

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES greeted his faculty colleagues, and opened his report with an insight from his State of the University address, which he had delivered the previous week. He noted that he spent about 90% of his time in the address talking about the University's students and faculty, in which he takes particular pride. He remarked that through the seasonal changes and through the governmental changes, he can take comfort and pride in the quality of our faculty, of his faculty colleagues, and of our student body.

The President reported on his outreach efforts to the candidates in the recent state and local elections. He expressed enthusiasm for working with the newly-elected officials and noted that it is up to us and to the University's advocates and friends to get off on the right foot with the new state government. President Pastides met with both gubernatorial candidates in the weeks

leading up to the election, and Governor-Elect Haley talked about increased flexibility for the University, accountability, and the fundamentals of teaching and learning. The president noted that, in the season of campaigning, none of those concepts were defined in any great detail, but feels that increased flexibility would be a good thing for the University. He expressed the hope that such flexibility would not come with fewer resources, and noted that the University welcomes accountability at all times.

President Pastides had expressed to both gubernatorial candidates the value of future higher education summits that focus on the work done by the State's higher education system and by the University of South Carolina.

The President noted three particular legislative concerns for the University in addition to the economy: a regulatory approach toward tuition that would result in a tuition cap at the University, a regulatory approach toward out-of-state enrollment at USC and other universities, and the moratorium on construction that the Governor's Office announced the day after the higher education summit. President Pastides noted that the vast majority of the construction done at USC does not utilize state appropriations or student tuition. The University will be advocating for its interests on these subjects in the coming year. The President notes that there are so many indications that the University is being impacted by the economy that he hopes that the new gubernatorial administration will be willing to listen to a plea for less, rather than more, regulation.

President Pastides is also looking forward to a conversation with the new administration regarding annual appropriations to the University, particularly about the formula that the state uses to allocate funding. The funding formula has remained constant for many years, and the efforts of the University to provide more accessible education to more students, more public service and, overall, a higher-quality product have not been reflected in the formula. The President plans to encourage dialog about the achievements of the University at a time when its appropriations have fallen: we have increased enrollment, increased the number of South Carolinians educated at the University, and increased the percentage of African American students at the University (with a 26% increase this year) relative to the year before.

President Pastides observed that USC continues to be in the media spotlight, but noted that the opportunity for coverage is preferable to having our University ignored. He plans to invite Luanne Lawrence, our new Vice President for Communications, to address the Faculty Senate. Vice President Lawrence came to us from Oregon State University and is very experienced in higher education communications. She will address the Faculty Senate about the University's plans for ongoing public relations and branding, as well as our look, our website, and our forthcoming capital campaign.

President Pastides recently attended a celebration of the 5th anniversary of USC's Magellan Scholars Program, a centerpiece of our undergraduate research program that has been highly ranked by US News and World Report. We have had 450 Magellan Scholars in the five-plus years of the program.

A press conference is scheduled at 9:00 a.m. for the day after this meeting, where the Governor's Professor of the Year will be announced. USC has finalists from four of our campuses:

- Professor Bob [Jesselson](#) from the School of Music in Columbia, renowned cellist and cello professor
- Professor Babet Villena-Alvarez from USC Beaufort, Chair, Humanities and Fine Arts Department
- Dr. Pearl Fernandes from the Biology Department at USC-Sumter
- Professor Sarah Miller from the History Department at USC-Salkehatchie

The President noted that USC has more finalists this year than we've ever had before, and recognized the finalists for their outstanding work.

President Pastides provided an update on the search for Vice President for Human Resources. The search is moving toward a conclusion. We have a good and diverse pool of candidates and are looking forward to concluding the search later this year.

The President noted that, as the State's government is poised to change, our Board of Trustees has transformed as well over the past year and a half. We have a younger Board with new members who are very politically engaged. The President expects that we will be better organized for the advocacy that the University needs, but that we are unable to predict what lies ahead regarding our relationships with the incoming gubernatorial administration. We will, however, be prepared and the University will continue to advance.

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS greeted his faculty colleagues throughout the University and opened his remarks with a report on the 2009-10 Tenure and Promotion cycle. Last year, the University had 137 applications for promotion and tenure. Of the 137 decisions, the President, the Provost, and the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure disagreed on only three. The Provost was in agreement with the UCTP on 134 out of 137. Of the three other files, the President agreed with UCTP on two and agreed with the Provost on one. Agreement at this review level was over 98%.

The President was in agreement with the Deans on 131 of 137 files, or 96%. UCTP agreed with the Deans on 132 of the 137 files, and the Provost agreed with the Deans on 129 of 137 cases.

Agreement with Department chairs was at a level of over 90% or 107 out of 115, 108 out of 115, and 105 out of 115.

The President, Provost, and UCTP agreed on 60 of the 60 tenure applications submitted, and on 44 of 44 promotions to associate professor. The 3 disagreements that occurred all related to promotions to full professor.

Provost Amiridis noted that he is frequently asked by faculty and by tenure candidates, “What is the percentage of faculty applying who are awarded tenure?” While the Provost does not have figures on the number of files that stop in the units, he is able to report on the number that reach his office. This year, 40 out of 43 applicants were awarded tenure and promotion to associate professor. Eleven of 12 applicants were awarded tenure at the rank of associate professor, and 31 of 33 candidates were awarded tenure and promotion to full professor.

Provost Amiridis then reported on the National Research Council rankings. The rankings were released in October, but they won’t be old news for quite a while, as it took 15 years to produce a new set of rankings. The Provost is very proud of USC’s standings in the NRC rankings, which validate the Carnegie designation that we have had for very high research activity. He notes that the rankings emphasize the transformation of our University from an institution focused on undergraduate instruction to into a national research university – without sacrificing our core mission, which is still undergraduate education.

Provost Amiridis summarized the improvement in USC’s rankings since the last time they were released in 1995. At that time, USC had 16 programs, and only 3 of them were in the top 50 nationally. Now we have 25 programs, and 14 of those are in the top 50.

The Provost also highlighted the breadth of our programs. Programs recognized in this year’s rankings come from different colleges and areas of expertise. Our English program for example, is ranked number 5 in the south, and is in the top 30 in the nation – at the same time that our Chemical, Mechanical, and Electrical Engineering programs are also ranked in the top 10 in the south and top 50 nationally. Other programs that also ranked are Public Health, Pharmacy, History, and Geography. The Provost notes that the breadth of the areas where we have shown substantial growth is important to publicize.

Provost Amiridis pointed out that, as proud as he is of these rankings as a faculty member and as University Provost, he views our growth in these areas not as the ceiling but as the bar against which we should measure our continued success during the next 10 years. We as a University have our own measures of success and our rise in the rankings reflects ongoing improvement in what we do, because we are doing it well.

Provost Amiridis reported on two initiatives that will soon be underway at the University. The first addresses faculty retention, and gives the Administration the ability to make available to the

deans a relatively limited amount of available funding for salary enhancements to retain highly qualified faculty members.

The second initiative is a faculty replenishment plan. It is not as extensive as all of us would like to see, but it is a good start. The initiative will ask for competitive proposals from any unit that is interested in an effort to hire. The Provost's office has now 27 new lines, and he would like the majority – 15 out of 27 – to be senior hires to address the need for senior hires across campus. Last year on his campus visits, Provost Amiridis became aware of the need in many departments for mentors for junior faculty. The initiative also includes 4 clusters, to build on the success of the model involved in the FEI program. The clusters will involve a senior faculty member and two junior faculty members. Proposals submitted should include elements that address the impact that these hires will have on the department's scholarly output, as well as the impact on teaching, learning, and our ability to create a better learning environment for our students. The Provost's Office will be providing guidance to the Deans and Chairs on how to write competitive proposals in this process.

Provost Amiridis recommended to the Senators the November issue of the newsletter of the American Association of Colleges and Universities. The issue features the University of South Carolina, and talks about our general education integrative core that we are putting together. It also addresses our Quality Enhancement Plan. The Provost feels that the article highlights our status as a research university that maintains a focus on undergraduate education. The article is available at http://www.aacu.org/aacu_news/AACUNews10/November10/feature.cfm.

The Provost then reported on the activities of two Provost Office committees that have heavy faculty involvement. He spoke first of the Classroom Enhancement Committee. The University has allocated \$2 million this year to be able to upgrade several of the classrooms in many buildings across campus. The committee generated a list of the rooms with the most need for improvement and the upgrades will be based on the list. Provost Amiridis recognized Professor Jennifer Vendemia (Psychology) for checking classroom by classroom during the summer and identifying where the problems were. The committee is also setting up a process for suggestions for future classroom improvements. The Deans will be involved and the Committee will have a website where faculty can make recommendations for classroom improvements. The Provost expects this to be an annual process and anticipates a high degree of faculty input in deciding which classrooms to fix.

Provost Amiridis also reported on the activities of the Committee on Classroom Spacing and Scheduling. This is a Provost committee with representation from many different colleges whose membership includes faculty members, a student, and representatives from the Bursar's and Registrar's Offices. The committee has been looking at scheduling and spacing for classrooms, and has investigated how these issues are handled at other universities. The committee worked on its report for a year and has recently presented it to the Provost, along with

its recommendations. The recommendations include scheduling classes longer into the day, and to extend the breaks between classes. Provost Amiridis plans to vet the report and then submit the report to the Faculty Senate and to the University's Deans for feedback. Once the feedback has been collected, the University will be better prepared to schedule the space that it has.

The Provost provided updates on the University's current dean searches. The University has four searches underway.

- College of Social Work: Dean Dennis Poole is returning to the faculty, and a search is being initiated.
- College of Education: the search committee has been constituted and they have an ad that they are about to place.
- School of Law: the search committee has six applications, but the ad has only been out for a couple of weeks.
- Honors College: Tommy Chandler reports that the search committee has 35 applications and that it is a good pool. With further enhancement of the pool, the committee will begin bringing in candidates for interviews.

Provost Amiridis opened the floor to questions from the Senators.

VICE PRESIDENT TED MOORE brought greetings from the Division of Finance and Planning.

He recalled last month's meeting and the concern expressed by various faculty members regarding the operations and services of the University Bookstore. Several faculty members responded to Vice President Moore's invitation to send him their concerns, and he provided a status update on the situation. The most common concern reported by the faculty was an inadequate number of textbooks being ordered at the University Bookstore. Other issues included the wrong edition of a book being ordered and incorrect ISBN numbers being used, resulting in the wrong book arriving. Some faculty expressed concern regarding pricing issues, and confusion regarding recommended versus adopted textbooks. Vice Provost Helen Doerpinghaus has scheduled a meeting on November 10 at 1:30 p.m. in Room 107C in Osborne Hall. Helen Zeigler, our Associate Vice President for Business Affairs who oversees the Bookstore will attend, as will Andy Shaffer, the Bookstore manager. Anyone who has concerns about the Bookstore is invited.

Vice President Moore noted that we need not wait for the meeting to begin solving some of the problems, and outlined a few solutions that are in process:

- We are increasing substantially the number of textbooks that are ordered across the board at the University Bookstore. Andy Shaffer will personally review every book order this coming spring semester to insure greater availability of books.
- We are establishing a dedicated faculty hotline to the textbook department in the Bookstore. The telephone had not been installed at the time of this meeting, but the number is 777-4270.
- We will be more aggressive about marketing the preordering of textbooks to the students. It is easier to manage supply and demand if students do not wait until the day before class to order textbooks.

The Vice President noted that some problems are inevitable in a retail operation serving 28,000 students, but some of the systematic problems will respond to systematic remedies. He invites contact from anyone with problems with the Bookstore or any other operation within his division.

Another item that was mentioned on the Senate floor at the last meeting was the NCAA investigation. Vice President Moore has spoken with the University's General Counsel, who has confirmed that the accounts in The State newspaper are more or less accurate. There is an ongoing investigation. The rules involving athletics are complex and the cases are complex and, as such, will take time to resolve. The University is cooperating fully with the NCAA. Our General Counsel Office does not expect to hear anything definitive before the end of the calendar year. University Administration will report to the faculty as soon as information becomes available.

Vice President Moore provided a financial outlook, noting that his prediction of a \$20 million cut in recurring funds for Columbia appears to be accurate. We will know more in the next few months, but the upcoming cut appears to be around \$20 million for Columbia and \$24 or \$25 million for the University system. We have already lost \$105 million from the system, so this is a very serious loss.

Related to the budget cut is the matter of tuition. On September 29, the day after the Higher Education Summit, the state Budget and Control Board issues a moratorium on capital spending for institutions which had raised their tuition this year above 7%. Vice President Moore explained that "capital spending" does not mean only new buildings; it also means renovations, deferred maintenance, and outfitting laboratories. Anything that costs more than \$500,000 – which is fairly common in the construction business – is considered a state project regardless of the source of funding.

USC Columbia was not under the moratorium, as we had raised our tuition 6.9%. That increase was, as it always is, based on strategic planning, assessment of our needs, and finding the lowest

number of a tuition increase that we possibly can and still maintain excellence. That is our philosophy, has been and always will be.

The cap for four-year campuses was 7% and one of our campuses – Beaufort – was over 7%. The cap for two-year campuses was 6.3%, and ours had raised their tuition by 6.5%, so they needed a small rollback. The Board of Trustees approved a rollback in the tuition for Beaufort and the for two-year campuses, so now all of our eight campuses in the system are within the bounds of the moratorium, meaning that we can go forward with capital projects.

The Budget and Control Board almost surely will impose another cap, another moratorium, and we take this very seriously. We always have capital projects in play, so this affects our whole system. Additionally, there is likely to be legislation introduced to cap tuition, as well. Whether it passes or not, we don't know, but going into the next fiscal year, we can expect another substantial cut in recurring funding and very limited room in tuition to deal with that cut. We are employing our computer budget model to help us find the tuition increase that satisfies those very, very restrictive parameters, and Vice President Moore pledged to keep Senators updated on the continuing work on the budget.

Although the national economy is showing signs of improvement, we still expect a very, very difficult budget year in the State of South Carolina for higher education.

However, there is a thin thread of good news – the state's tax receipts have stabilized. In the last couple of months, they've been a little higher than they were the year before.

The Vice President closed his report by reminding Senators and faculty of the upcoming Veterans Day, and saluting and thanking our Veterans for their service.

CHAIR NOLAN noted that the issue of textbook problems is one of a kind particularly suited to bringing to the Faculty Senate. This forum is especially well-suited for issues that cannot be addressed in other places, and the Chair encouraged faculty and Senators to continue to use the Faculty Senate to address issues of concern.

Chair Nolan also reiterated that the NCAA violations do not involve issues of courses, programs, or academics overall.

6. Report of the Secretary

There was no report.

7. Report of the Chair

CHAIR NOLAN deferred his comments to reserve time for New Business.

8. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

9. New Business

PROFESSOR MIKE MATTHEWS (Chemical Engineering) presented the Carolina Core, and sought Senate approval for the proposal (please see attachment, pages 24-27). In April, 2009, the Senate approved the seven core components and nine learning outcomes associated with them. The proposal brought forward deals with the distribution requirements, the number of credit hours to be apportioned to each one of the core areas, and some matters of policy and procedure going forward as courses are developed.

With the approval of this document, the committee would go forward with the dissemination of information regarding approval of Carolina Core courses. All courses will have to be approved from the new core and go through the Faculty Senate Committee on Curricula and Courses as usual. It will be required that the entire Carolina Core program be approved at the General Faculty meeting in the Spring of 2011. Following approval by the General Faculty, programs can begin submitting courses for approval. The goal is to launch the Carolina Core curriculum in the Fall of 2012 and have it incorporated in the Undergraduate Bulletin.

Regarding the attachment, the seven core areas are summarized in the left-hand column in the table that is in the package. The material in the left two columns was approved by Faculty Senate in April 2009. The hours to be apportioned in each area are in the right column. These are lower division courses. These are the courses that are similar to the current general education curriculum. As the committee implemented the recommendations of working groups and study committees in the past five years, the areas of speech, information literacy, and values, ethics, and social responsibilities rose to a new prominence compared to the current general education program.

The committee grappled with the issue of how to achieve a meaningful revision of the Carolina Core without increasing the number of credit hours within a particular program. It proposes the concept of overlay courses wherein one of these three core areas – speech within effective, engaged communication, or information literacy, or values, ethics and social responsibility – might overlay with another lower division course available to freshman. One reason for doing is this is to achieve integration of learning – integration in different styles of thought within the curriculum. Another reason for developing the overlay course concept is to allow students to be able to achieve their general education requirement with as little as 31 hours of course work.

The committee conducted a forum on this proposal earlier this year, and has received much feedback from faculty. The committee believes that this will be good for the students not only in terms of learning but in terms of their degree program and not adding extra hours to their degree.

The majors will be required to develop an upper division course that provides integration of some of the learning outcomes in an upper division course in the major as is appropriate to the major. Professor Matthews invited questions on the proposal.

PROFESSOR CHARLES BRICE (Electrical Engineering) offered an amendment that would change the description of overlay courses to read: “An overlay course meets learning outcomes from one other course (either another Carolina Core course or a lower-division course not in the Core) as well as S, IL, or VESR. An overlay course could combine two learning outcomes from S, IL, or VESR (e.g., S and VESR).” Professor Brice noted that such a language change would allow units to have the ability to combine some of the learning objectives with learning objectives in some of their other learning courses within the major.

PROFESSOR MATTHEWS noted that the question was raised at the faculty forum earlier this fall, “Could a course in the student’s major meet one of the overlay requirements?” At that time, the committee said “No,” but it has considered the issue further and feels that Professor Brice’s suggested would be a good one. Professor Matthews illustrated the application of the amendment with the following scenario: “Suppose there is a course Introduction to Modern Business – 101 that primarily suits business majors. It is possible that in such a course they might use some aspects of information literacy or talk about the ethics of modern business. There could be a substantive academic contribution that would satisfy the overlay requirements. After careful discussion the committee feels that it might be wise and it might be a benefit to students and to programs to allow them to meet that component in such a course, where the rest of the business does not overlay with one of the core areas. The caveat to that would be that the course must otherwise be open to freshman. There cannot be a series of prerequisites that freshman cannot take. It would not be a course that is limited to business majors only. Any remaining seats after the business majors are served could be allowed. A student who wanted to explore business just a little bit and meet an overlay course could do that. “

The Committee is in favor of accepting Professor Brice’s amendment.

CHAIR NOLAN noted that the Carolina Core Committee is not a committee of the Faculty Senate and entertained a motion to put forward this proposal as amended.

An UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR asked to see a hardcopy of the amendment.

PROFESSOR MATTHEWS directed Senators’ attention to page 24 in the agenda packet, and handouts were distributed to those in need of them.

It was determined that the handout contained a typographical error that did not mirror the text of the amendment as projected in Professor Matthews’s slide show.

PROFESSOR ERIK DOXTADER inquired how the amendment and the committee's discussion is related to the earlier discussion about not opening up the core such that the core is the core for everyone? He suggested that the amendment seems to open things up radically.

PROFESSOR MATTHEWS explained that it opens up participation; if a core course is an overlay in an otherwise non-core course, it must be open and accessible to all students. For instance if a freshman in Sociology wished to explore business a bit, she would be able to do that and still make progress toward the Carolina Core requirements. Business students would be served first but visitors could be served next. Professor Matthews notes that in his college a non-engineering major will occasionally come to take Introduction to Engineering because they are curious about that sort of thing. All core courses, overlay courses or not, still must be open to all undergraduate students. There cannot be a prerequisite sequence or a limit to majors only. The courses would still be open to any student admitted to the University of South Carolina.

PROFESSOR DAN SABIA (Political Science) asked whether the new Carolina Core would have the same core courses that we have now, and whether there would be substantive changes aside from the addition of the overlay courses.

PROFESSOR MATTHEWS explained that the committee is working on developing a call for course proposals and is working with the Provost's Office and the Committee on Curriculum and Courses to develop the forms and the guidance that would be needed for programs to propose a core course. The committee has posted on its website (which has been there for awhile) some contextual statements (possibly access via the "Appendix" link at the website) where it expands upon the core learning areas. The committee is preparing information to guide the preparation of courses. The units will provide those experts who can identify good courses in science that meet the requirements for scientific thought and that reflect the learning outcomes." The Carolina Core Committee will essentially sign off on that. That course will go to the Committee on Curricula and Courses to be approved according to the usual process.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – wished to make clear to the body that the overlay courses are considered and voted on by this body as part of the core. They are not secondary requirements. They are not lesser parts of the core. They exist on equal standing as voted by this body and as envisioned within the committee. He noted that this characteristic is articulated within the document and suggested that, if Professor Brice's amendment is adopted, it should be clear that the standards for these three elements of the core have the same rigor and the same standing as the rest of the core.

PROFESSOR MATTHEWS confirmed Professor Doxtader's impression of the overlay courses. To clarify, he noted that there are programs, for instance, that already have a mandatory 3 credit hour course in speech for instance. Those programs are not likely to be concerned about overlays in speech, but in another overlay such as information literacy, and it would be entirely

possible and acceptable for courses that focus strictly on information literacy a 3 credit hour course to be proposed and to be populated with students. He explained that the very idea of an overlay course suggests an interdisciplinary approach. Experts from a unit's faculty will help the committee develop the requirements, the explanation, and the standards for the courses during the course proposal process.

CHAIR NOLAN called for a vote on the motion. The "Ayes" and "Nays" appeared to be evenly represented.

AN UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR called for a quorum count.

Senators stood to be counted. AN UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR inquired whether remote Senators could be included in the quorum count. Secretary Maxwell explained that, while Senators were free to participate remotely in the discussions by the body, only onsite members were able to vote.

The required 66 persons were not present, so the meeting had to be adjourned.

CHAIR NOLAN observed that such an occasion illustrates the importance of attendance at Senate meetings.

PROFESSOR MATTHEWS thanked the Senators for their attention. He encouraged them to visit the Carolina Core website and to send the committee any questions and concerns so that it can address them before the December meeting of the Faculty Senate.

10. Announcements

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on December 1, 2010, at 3:00 p.m., in the Law School auditorium.