Lexington Campus:
John Crosby
Connie Wilson
Louise Graham

Medical Center outside College of Nursing:
John Mink
Ralph Crhistensen

It was suggested that further nominations be postponed to a later date. Chairman Rees announced that he would be open to suggestions and asked Council members to call or send additional nominations.

7) Proposed to include Extension Professors in University Senate: Professor Canon

Professor Canon's comments follow. There are two parts to the proposal. The first relates to whether Extension Professors be enfranchised and the committee believed unanimously that they should be entitled to vote for and sit in the Senate. If this is done, there will be a change in apportionment. There are three suggestions here. The committee was not of one mind on the second part. The three suggestions are as follows:

a) We could do nothing about apportionment. Agriculture would get two additional Senate seats and two other colleges would lose a Senate seat.

b) Recommend to the President for revision in the Governing Regulations increasing faculty representation in the Senate from 85 to 87.

c) Recommend to the President that the Governing Regulations be changed so that while Extension Professors are able to vote for and serve in the Senate, their number would not be included in the formula by which the Senate is apportioned.

Either of the last two would require Board of Trustee action. My own feeling is that it would be easiest to follow the second suggestion.

Discussion followed during which the following comments were made:

Bostrom: I like the first suggestion.

Wilson: I don't like giving a college more representation.

Canon: The President asked for a recommendation on this issue, so technically, we are in a recommending position only--and to him. Further, if the first suggestion is endorsed by the Council, some members of the Senate may vote against the proposal simply because it may cause the loss of a Senate seat in their college.

Grimes: I like the idea of keeping the numbers as they are-- just including the Extension Professors on the eligibility roster.

Frye: The number of seats was not a motivating factor in any way. I've had contact with numerous persons in the College of Agriculture and there is no objection to keeping the numbers as they are.

Some discussion then followed on whether the proposal would go to the Senate floor. Technically it does not have to go because the Senate would be in a recommending position only. It was the consensus, however, that the proposal --no mater what alternative is adopted regarding apportionment--should go to the floor.

Motion was then made to accept option #3. Motion was seconded and passed.

Motion was then made to approve the entire proposal with option 3 to be submitted to the Senate for action. Motion was seconded and adopted.

It was noted that the proposal would go to the Senate floor as a recommendation from the University Senate to the Administration.

It was also suggested and affirmed that the Senate Council Chairman write/ contact the President to notify him that this is "coming down the pike."

8) Proposed Curriculum Change: Metallurgical Engineering
Some concern was expressed by Council members regarding the lack of free electives after which motion was made to approve the proposed changes. Motion was seconded and passed.

9) Winer Report: Course Processing
Following brief discussion, the Council endorsed the original report of the ad hoc Committee for action on the Senate floor. It was suggested and affirmed that the proposal be scheduled for the October 10 University Senate meeting.

10) Lowery Report
Chairman Rees went over the summary that he had prepared. He then invited further comments from Council members, particularly Professor Jewell.

MEJ: The monitoring committee suggested in the Lowery Report and Resource Allocation Subcommittee charge could be combined into one committee and made a standing committee of the Senate. In addition, it would be useful to have a committee to explore the alternatives presented in the Lowery Report with the Administration before we reach the point of financial exigency.

Hochstrasser: In other words, the items listed under I. in the Chairman's summary would go to the monitoring/resource allocation committee, and the items listed under II. would be explored by a separate committee?

Rees: Yes, that's a good way to divide them up (cf. minutes of 16 June Senate Council meeting).

Dhawan: May we add some alternatives? For example, I think replacement is important. The institution should take responsibility for the individuals it lets go.

Grimes: Formal placement process is difficult and not meaningful in many cases. This is such a personal, individual network.

Wilson: I still like the principle and feel we should include it as an alternative to be discussed.