

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Fall 10-13-1993

Senate Meeting, October 13, 1993

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, October 13, 1993" (1993). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 780.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/780>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

October 13, 1993

XXV, No. 4

Call to Order

Seating of Graduate Student Senators

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of September 29, 1993

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

- ACTION ITEMS:
1. Endorsement of Academic Affairs Committee Recommended Changes to the ISU Mission Statement
 2. Election of Two Faculty Members to the Academic Planning Committee:
Paul Borg, Music
Keith Stearns, SED
- INFORMATION ITEMS:
1. Rules Committee Presentation of College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws Changes

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University Community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussions with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

October 13, 1993

Volume XXV, No. 4

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:04 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

SEATING OF TWO GRADUATE STUDENT SENATORS

Chairperson Schmaltz introduced two new graduate student senators: Heather Manns, Communication who is filling the vacant graduate seat. She will serve on the Budget Committee. Frank McCune, Political Science, who is filling the seat vacated by Heather Zenk. He will serve on the Faculty Affairs Committee.

ROLL CALL

Secretary Jan Cook called the roll and declared a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 29, 1993

Senator Borg: I have a correction on Page 4, where it says "unintelligible." My question was: "Senator Strand, have any other Illinois Public Universities taken part in the comparison study you refer to? How do the higher boards view our participation?"

XXV-19

Motion to approve Academic Senate Minutes of September 29, 1993, by Wilner (Second, Razaki) carried on a voice vote.

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Chairperson Len Schmaltz had no remarks.

Senator Zeidenstein: The Executive Committee Minutes of October 4, 1993, the last page, next to last paragraph, stated: "A discussion concerning ASPT Changes and proposed guidelines for faculty raises using reallocated and appropriated funds took place. The Academic Senate would have to approve any changes in the ASPT process. University

Review Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee are both investigating the proposed guidelines."

First, I want to determine the substance of what was discussed. Was it the back page of the September 22nd memo from David A. Strand to members of CFSC's and DFSC's and the URC, regarding the "Proposed Faculty Salary Distribution Program.?"

Chairperson Schmaltz: Yes.

Senator Zeidenstein: The next to last sentence of that summary read: "The Academic Senate would have to approve any changes in the ASPT process." Is that a conclusion arrived at by the Executive Committee, or was that the subject of what the Executive Committee discussed?

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Chair of the Senate and I think the members of the Executive Committee as well stated the fact that if the ASPT document is to be changed in any way, it would have to have the approval of the Academic Senate. The President agreed that there are parts of that document which if implemented would change ASPT policy. The Executive Committee wanted to make clear that we all agreed that that would not happen without the approval of the Academic Senate.

Senator Zeidenstein: The last sentence of that paragraph reads: "The University Review Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee are both investigating the proposed guidelines." --to determine what? Are they investigating the guidelines to see what parts may or may not violate the existing policy, what parts are consistent with the existing policy, or does it mean they are examining them as a preliminary to possibly proposing some or all of the changes before the Senate.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Senator Razaki can speak to what the Faculty Affairs Committee is going to do, but it is my understanding We don't want what happened this past summer to happen again next summer. The Provost has indicated that he is in agreement with that. Is there some possible compromise here, or is there a way that we can avoid this by setting up some procedure for distributing funds which are internally reallocated.

Senator Zeidenstein: Are we still talking about the last two sentences of that paragraph -- the proposed faculty salary distribution program?

Chairperson Schmaltz: We are talking about it in general, although that proposal is one that could be considered as a way of avoiding what happened last summer.

Senator Zeidenstein: I asked what was being investigated. Is there a deadline for the conclusion of whatever this investigation is about, or is the Faculty Affairs Committee going to make the same mistake they made when I was a member of it, to wait until the University Review Committee reaches its conclusions. A lot of people have become frustrated with the URC. If some conclusion is not arrived at before either of the proposed evaluations starts, this is halfway between a recommendation and something stronger than a recommendation. If a policy is not determined or agreed to before anything else is determined, then these things will just go sliding through again. Waiting for a committee or a second committee to generate something might be too late or repeat the chaos of the past.

Senator Razaki: The way this information was disseminated in my department was that faculty found a copy of the Provost's Letter in their mailbox, and then the department chairperson held a discussion. When I saw that, I felt that the administration was acting like the IBHEsetting up the rules and regulations some of which are in contradiction of the current ASPT policies. Since then, it has been discussed, and the procedure is that the administration contacted the URC because it comes under their domain.

Senator Zeidenstein: But, the URC reports to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Senator Razaki: The Faculty Affairs Committee met with the Chairperson of the URC, Professor George Palmer, of Milner Library, for the first time this past Monday. He had only received the document the Friday before. We had a one hour discussion with Professor Palmer and Faculty Affairs Committee. We decided we needed a time line. Faculty Affairs Committee wanted something by January or February from the University Review Committee.

Senator Zeidenstein: The deliberative process would begin by then.

Senator Razaki: The Executive Committee of the Senate did want the administration to know that we felt that it was within the Academic Senate powers to make decisions regarding this issue.

Chairperson Schmaltz: The problem is non-appropriated funds which come from internal reallocations, which depend on who is interpreting the constitution. It is unclear as to how those funds should be distributed.

Senator Zeidenstein: But one can still render to the Senate what is the Senate's.

Chairperson Schmaltz: That is the point. Executive Committee was asserting the domain of the Academic Senate.

Senator Zeidenstein: Might the Executive Committee consider submitting a very brief statement of this sentence here to Chairpersons of CFSC's and DFSC's, so that they would know. Not many people read the back of the Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes.

Chairperson Schmaltz: That question and that suggestion does have merit. A number of departments are having meetings on this, and at least one chair sent out a memo prior to the meeting that said the Academic Senate had no influence here or no involvement in the process. People called me immediately to find out if that was true. I said, "Not as far as I am concerned." That impacts or changes the ASPT document. Clearly, the Senate has domain there.

Senator Razaki: I would like to suggest that since Provost Strand sent out the original letter, that he send a follow-up letter saying that the administration's position on this issue is that anything in that letter should not be taken as governing policy.

Provost Strand: The President and I are meeting with college personnel from each of the five colleges to talk about a number of topics. That message is being transmitted during that discussion. I would hope that between those meetings and the discussion here on the floor of the Senate that would be quite apparent. This discussion will appear in the Minutes of the Senate which are distributed across campus.

Senator Zeidenstein: One of the considerations that got buried in the deliberations of the University Review Committee sometime in the last two years was a fairly last minute amendment proposed by President Wallace the last time we debated the ASPT policy, which was that each department might determine the number of merit categories. I don't know if that proposal is still before the URC, whose personnel has changed, but it is certainly an alternative to be considered to the urging of a third merit category. At least it was acceptable to one of our senators, who proposed the amendment about a year and a half ago. It might be a viable option.

President Wallace: That suggestion was put on the table a year ago March, and still remains on the table. I think that discussion with colleges and department chairs, the idea of having a fourth category has come up. There is some merit in that.

Senator Zeidenstein: As I recall, I don't remember if the Senate voted down the proposal for four categories, or what.

Senator Walker: It was sent back to the URC. The Senate approved all the changes proposed at that time except the fourth category and the salary increment changes. That was withdrawn and sent back to the URC for them to reconsider. It was not tabled on the floor of the Senate.

Senator Zeidenstein: What happened to the "Wallace Amendment" that each department would be free to determine their own number of categories.

Senator Walker: Immediately after that amendment, I withdrew the motion and then the Faculty Affairs Committee met after the Senate and voted to send it back to the URC.

Senator Liedtke: Point of order, aren't we borderlining on debate here on an issue that is not formally before the Senate?

Chairperson Schmaltz: Yes. Your point of order is well taken.

Senator Thomas: What is the status of the letter that Provost Strand sent out regarding the "Proposed Faculty Salary Distribution Program?"

Chairperson Schmaltz: It is a proposal or trial balloon sent out by the Provost for response from department chairs and college councils. I think the Provost understands fully that if that proposal were to be implemented as it is, aspects of it would have to be approved by the Academic Senate.

Senator Thomas: The Senate would have to approve the process.

Provost Strand: Let me clarify that there are changes at the DFSC and CFSC level which do not come before the Academic Senate. But when changes occur in the ASPT document, those changes come before the Academic Senate.

Senator Razaki: I would like to point out that decisions made by the DFSC and CFSC cannot be in violation of the ASPT document.

Provost Strand: Certainly, that is understandable.

Senator Thomas: I would like the record to indicate that changes would come before the Academic Senate.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Vice Chairperson, Renee Mousavi had no remarks.

SGA PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Senator Diane Shaya had no remarks.

ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS

PRESIDENT WALLACE: I would like to report to the Senate that last Thursday and Friday the IBHE had its October Board meeting. Each institution had fifteen minutes of presentation and fifteen minutes of response time. I decided it would be a good idea to put in next week's ISU Review the brief comments that I had to summarize my report and some of the changes that have been made. I would say to you that the tenor of the meeting was such that at this point I would have to report to you that the new attitude that I thought had been reached with the IBHE having a better working relationship with institutions is not prevailing. The November report will contain the third annual IBHE staff report on what is wrong with higher education. I am afraid that is going to be another pretty tough report of what is going wrong with higher education in Illinois. I think it is becoming quite clear that this issue is one of governance; on who will make decisions regarding program elimination and a variety of other issues. I would like to point out to students that the State has a coordinating board, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, which has certain legal responsibilities, and they recommend to the legislature distribution of monies based on state policy which could be a formula that provides money based on credit hours or as in Illinois on a comparative cost study. There is policy which restricts the use of money. The governing boards, like the Board of Regents, have the legal power to eliminate programs and also make decisions regarding where individual institutions spend their money and for what. The IBHE said last year that they were going to the General Assembly to eliminate programs. The General Assembly has realized that this is a responsibility of the Governing Boards, and cut the IBHE off before they did anything. I would say that it is very clear that some within the leadership of the IBHE are moving this way again. We have been very fortunate that the Board of Regents has been very supportive of maintaining their legal authority and responsibility and not giving it up to the IBHE. That has not happened with other governing boards. I think we may be in for another rough year. We have no indication as to what that will be. The posturing that is going on indicates that it will be a tough November IBHE report, and probably as they stated, they will attempt to have an

appropriation next year based on whether institutions followed or did not follow the IBHE guidelines. We will have to wait and see what happens.

Senator Walker: When you say a tough report in November, does this mean another PQP process program cut, or are you talking about it strictly from the appropriation side in light of what we have already done?

President Wallace: Both.

Senator Walker: Comprehensive, in terms of listing programs.

President Wallace: I would only be guessing. I think my comments referred to the degree of aggression and hostility. The mood is not very good.

Senator Walker: In light of what we did relative to other universities PQP processes, how do we look in comparison to them, in terms of programs or dollars cut, etc.?

President Wallace: I would say that a couple of people who have looked at that thought we looked favorable. However, you have others at the meeting who had different views. Of the programs recommended for elimination at ISU, the IBHE recommended elimination of eleven programs. ISU recommended elimination of five. But, only two of the five were those recommended by the IBHE. In addition, we did a major amount of our work in the area of administration. We cut 66 non-faculty positions, and eliminated the College of Continuing Education and Public Service, including the Dean. So far in the process we have reallocated \$4.1 million dollars. Out of a \$100 million dollar appropriation, that looks very good. However, the Chairman of the IBHE said very clearly that he didn't care about administrative costs, that they would get to administration later. You have to keep in mind that our reductions which were different from other institutions, totaled \$4.1 million dollars in two years compared to the recommended six to nine percent over two years, looked very good. They just did not like that we did not choose the programs that they chose. The Chairman mentioned Agriculture, and that was the only program that was mentioned specifically. The Board of Regents has done more to protect the institutional rights and preserve the rights of the governing board than any other board. The IBHE does not like that. One member of the Board of Higher Education said that he was intrigued with what ISU had done and supported it. There were negative comments made by two IBHE Board members. Other board members had no comment, and one member, a former trustee of the U of I, said that we chose to do it differently.

Senator Walker: One more question. In the short term, does it look like it would be to our advantage to maintain a stance in favor of the Board of Regents rather than the separate Board issue. Are they in our favor in this crisis with the IBHE, or should our game plan be for a separate board?

President Wallace: I think we should be very appreciative and supportive of what the Board of Regents has done. I can't say enough positive things about the support that the Board of Regents has given us on that. The Board of Regents has stood up for not giving up the legal portion of their governance. That is very very important. If the IBHE becomes the pseudo governing board in Illinois, then higher education in the state will really be in big trouble. They will continue to exert pressure. Think about it, if the IBHE decides again to put programs on the chopping block, the same programs that they did before, and the General Assembly was not supportive, and said that governing boards were going to make those decisions, it would be interesting. Fortunately, the General Assembly has supported the governing boards. If you talk to local legislators, you should stress that you hope they become knowledgeable about the legal rights of the governing board vs. the coordinating board. This will be an issue within the next year. The Board of Regents has stood firm on the issue of their legal rights.

Senator Schroeer: A number of the faculty members had a discussion with Senator Maitland and he realizes that work needs to be done with the legislature on this. The people of Illinois don't think much of higher education.

President Wallace: That was a good meeting. I wanted to say that I appreciated the faculty who showed up. They made a nice job in making their case. They presented the needs of University faculty, had the facts, and were very professional in presenting the case for our institution to get its fair share.

PROVOST STRAND: I am pleased to report that the University Studies Review Committee has completed work on the report they were assigned to do and the committee has transmitted to the President and me a proposal for a University Studies Program which has subsequently been transmitted to the Chair of the Senate. The President and I both believe that this is an excellent proposal. You may recall that one of the foremost educators in the nation, Dr. Earnest Boyer, was here on the campus and discussed the proposal with us and was of a similar mind in commenting that it was a very bold and exciting proposal. Committee members are willing to meet with individuals and students who have questions about this proposal. The proposal will also wind its way through

the traditional curriculum approval processes and come before the Academic Senate. It is my hope that as the committee processes take place, the proposal will move expeditiously through the curriculum approval processes. I would also remind members of the Senate that there are dollars available through this fiscal year to be used in the initial work of exploring ways in which that proposal can be refined. There will be faculty grants available for members of the faculty. This is a matter that will come before the Senate.

Senator Schroeer: Can you quickly review for us the order in which each committee approves this? Also, please outline the dollars which are available for faculty grants and how departments can avail themselves of this money.

Provost Strand: It is my understanding that this proposal will be referred by the Executive Committee to the Academic Affairs Committee, and then it will subsequently be referred to the Council on University Studies, the University Curriculum Committee, and the Council for Teacher Education, and come back to the Academic Affairs Committee and to the Senate for approval. There has been no publicizing across the campus as to the availability of these funds at this point in time because I felt it was premature to do that before we knew the exact nature of the proposal. We now know what the proposal looks like, and depending on how quickly the Senate can move, there is a minimum of \$160,000 available this fiscal year for work on the University Studies Program if it is approved by the Senate.

Senator Liedtke: Many of the senators, particularly students, were not on this body when the first two components of this were approved. Is it possible for the members of the senate to receive an orientation to the document? This is a document that requires thorough understanding before we can vote on the issue.

Provost Strand: I think that is an excellent suggestion. We are fortunate to have three members of that committee who sit on the Senate: Senator Paul Borg, Senator Paul Walker, and Senator Macon Williams. Perhaps Chairperson Schmaltz and Senator Borg who chaired the University Studies Review Committee can facilitate providing the documents and an orientation.

Senator Liedtke: It is one thing to read the document, and another to understand the Philosophy, etc.

Senator Shaya: For the student senators as well as the regular student body, on October 26th at 5:30 in Room 375 in the Student Services Building, Senator Borg will be leading a lecture series on this topic. We encourage student

senators to attend and become more familiar with it, as well as any interested faculty members who are interested.

Senator Wilner: You said there was \$160,000 available for faculty grants. If faculty don't take that for grants, what becomes of it.

Provost Strand: The only thing that would deter such a use of funds would be the failure of the Senate to approve the document. In that case, I would discuss with a number of people how best to reallocate this money. We would hope that decision would not have to be made.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS, WILLIAM GUROWITZ:

I have one announcement. The second in a forum series sponsored by the Commission to Combat Intolerance and Harassment, the Inter-fraternity Council, and Pan Hellenic Council, will be held October 18, 1993, from 1 to 3:00 p.m. in the Ballroom of the Bone Student. Professor Carlos Cortes of the University of California at Riverside will speak on "Ethnic Diversity in the University Curriculum: Preparing Students for a Multicultural Future." Respondents to the forum include: Professor Paul Borg, Music, who chairs the University Studies Review Committee; Professor Lou Perez, History; Professor Paul Walker, Agriculture, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate; and Professor Richard Payne, Political Science.

INFORMATION ITEMS

***(NOTE: Information Item was considered out of order due to the necessity of a guest speaker to leave early.)**

1. Rules Committee Presentation of College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws Changes

Senator Eric Johnson, Chair of the Rules Committee, introduced Dr. Karen Pfof, Psychology, who represented the College of Arts and Sciences Council.

Senator Johnson: As required, the College of Arts and Sciences reviewed their Bylaws last year and forwarded the changes to the Senate for approval. If you have looked at the material contained in your Senate packets, they are all minor changes.

Dr. Pfof: The changes that were made were not substantive changes. We replaced a masculine pronoun was replaced with a better term, etc.

Senator Johnson: As you can see in the letter from Dr. Owen, the minor changes include: Page 2, Social Work is being listed as a separate department; Page 4, forty-eight hours has been changed to two working days; and on Page 10, his has been changed to his/her and vita has been changed to vitae.

Senator Leon: The term her/his is the more popular way now.

Dr. Pfost: I will suggest that to the College Council.

Senator Hesse: Is there a necessity of reproducing massive pages of minor changes. Perhaps we could only reproduce the paragraphs affected by changes. The document is twelve pages long times the number of senators.

Senator Johnson: That has been considered. But some people might feel the changes were taken out of context.

Senator Hesse: There should be a middle ground somewhere in between that and waste of paper.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Endorsement of Academic Affairs Committee Recommended Changes to the ISU Mission Statement

XXV-20

Senator Walker: I move endorsement of the Academic Affairs Committee Recommended Changes to the ISU Mission Statement as outlined at the last meeting. (Second, Cook)

Changes:

First Paragraph: Illinois State University is a student centered, multipurpose institution.....

Goal number five:

- support research and creative activity which are recognized at national and international levels

Goal number eight:

increase understanding of global and national interdependence and expand knowledge and understanding of other cultures in the context of a multicultural society.

Senator Walker: These changes in the Academic Mission Statement were approved by the Academic Affairs Committee and presented to the Academic Senate as information at the last meeting. In the Executive Committee, some of the Senators expressed a need for the Academic Senate to have the full senate endorse those minor changes in the Mission

Statement. It was thought that a formal endorsement would look good for the NCA accreditation procedure.

Academic Senate approved the endorsement of the Changes in the Academic Mission Statement by a voice vote.

2. Election of Two Faculty Members to the Academic Planning Committee

XXV-21

Motion by Walker to elect two faculty members to the Academic Planning Committee: Senator Paul Borg, Music; and Senator Keith Stearns, SED.

This is necessary because the immediate past Chair of the Senate and the immediate past Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee have succeeded themselves, so the Academic Planning Committee is short two people. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends these two people, and note that it now gives very meaningful balance to the committee in terms of college representation.

Motion carried on a voice vote.

Senator Schroeer: Who are the other members of the committee:

Senator Walker: Dr. Anita Webb Lupo, Provost's Designee, who acts as Chairperson; Dr. Alan Dillingham, Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning and Program Development; Dr. Gregory Aloia, Dean of Graduate Studies; James Hoffmann, Student Regent; Len Schmaltz, Chair of the Academic Senate; and Paul Walker, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee. The two vacancies occur because the Past Chairperson of the Academic Senate and the Past Chairperson of the Academic Affairs Committee also serve on the Committee, and Dr. Schmaltz and I both served in those capacities last year. Senators Paul Borg, Music, and Keith Stearns, SED, were just elected to fill those vacancies.

COMMUNICATIONS - NONE

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Senator Walker announced that his committee would meet following Academic Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator White reported that his committee met before the Senate meeting tonight and discussed three issues: the proposed bluebook language for placing responsibility for Facilities Planning Committee

duties under the Administrative Affairs Committee; the Provost's appointments to the Search Committee for Vice President of Instructional Technology; and the need to revisit search committee documents.

BUDGET COMMITTEE - Senator Wayne Nelsen had an excused absence. No report for Budget Committee.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator Khalid Razaki announced that the Faculty Affairs Committee would hold a joint meeting with the Student Affairs Committee following Senate.

RULES COMMITTEE - Senator Eric Johnson reported that Rules Committee has received a communication that there are faculty vacancies on the Entertainment Committee. If anyone has any suggestions or volunteers, please get the names to me. Rules Committee needs to meet after Senate.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator Casie Page said her committee would be meeting after Senate adjournment with the Faculty Affairs Committee.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

XXV-22

Motion to adjourn by Zeidenstein (Second, Barker) carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate Meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JANET M. COOK, SECRETARY

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT

Illinois State University is a student-centered, multipurpose institution committed to providing undergraduate and graduate programs which are of the highest quality in the state of Illinois. The central mission of the University is to expand the horizons of knowledge and culture among students, colleagues, and the general citizenry through teaching and research.

Illinois State University recognizes that teaching and research are mutually supportive activities. Therefore, while developing student potential through superior teaching is the first priority of the University, the promotion of research which is recognized at national and international levels is also a high priority. Illinois State University is committed to public service activities which complement the teaching and research interests of the faculty. The University is committed to expanding student involvement in learning through the provision of outstanding campus-life programs and activities.

The goals of Illinois State University are to:

- provide the premier undergraduate education in Illinois;
- provide premier graduate education in selected areas;
- provide an academic atmosphere which nurtures intellectual activity within the University community;
- support research and creative activity which are recognized at national and international levels;
- engage in public service and economic development activities which complement the University's teaching and research functions;
- expand and strengthen graduate programs in areas which build on the strengths of undergraduate programs and/or which have a unique educational focus;
- provide opportunities for students to increase their capacity for inquiry, logical thinking, critical analysis, and synthesis and to apply these abilities in the pursuit of one's discipline;
- increase understanding of global and national interdependence and expand knowledge and understanding of other cultures in the context of a multicultural society;
- provide co-curricular activities, programs and services that augment the formal education of students and maximize their involvement in the educational process;
- provide access and services for students from underrepresented groups and students with special talents;
- encourage academic diversity by supporting the unique missions and strengths of each of the colleges.

Revised by Academic Senate, Fall, 1993

ENDORSED BY ACADEMIC SENATE 10/13/93