

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
May 2, 2005**

Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:
<http://w3fp.arizona.edu/senate/minutes.htm>
Visit the faculty governance webpage at:
<http://w3fp.arizona.edu/senate/>

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Mitchell at 3:04 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146.

Present: Senators Asia, Bernsen, Brobbel, Burd, Christenson, Conway, Cromwell, Cusanovich, D. Davis, Garcia, Green, Gruener, Hammann, Howell, Jenkins, Jones, Kiefer, Marchalonis, Mitchell, Mitchneck, Mountford, Mutchler, Pintozzi, San Martin, Smith, Songer, Spece, St. John, Tatnan, Wheeland, Willerton, Witte and Zizza. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Baca, Bui, Chandler, Dahlgran, G. Davis, Eddy, Estrada, Hildebrand, Joens, Kinney, Larson, Likins, Patterson, Powell, Silverman, Sterling, Strittmatter, Swanson, Timmermann, Ulreich, Weinand, and Worle.

2. OPEN SESSION

Graduate Student and former GPSC representative Kyle Bowman expressed concern on behalf of all graduate students who, just last week, received a very late notice of the change to Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) taxes which removes the student exemption for graduate students enrolled in fewer than 6 units for Fall and Spring, or at least 3 units for Summer I & II. The main problem is that the University offers virtually no classes for graduate students in summer to maintain their tax-free status. One proposal for dealing with this problem is 100% tuition remission for TAs/RAs for summer only which would also allow the University to waive the employer's FICA contribution.

3. REPORTS

3A. ASUA President Cade Bernsen

Newly-elected ASUA President Cade Bernsen described his main interests as politics and the outdoors. His father is a Texas state senator. Mr. Bernsen transferred from the University of Texas-Austin and is the first transfer student and also the first non-ASUA member to be elected as ASUA President in ASUA's 92-year history. He looks forward to working with the Faculty Senate, the faculty officers and the administration to represent students' interests and to continuing his predecessor's efforts in the coming year.

3B. GPSC President Amanda Brobbel

GPSC President Amanda Brobbel reported that the GPSC online elections ended with most of the college representative slots filled. Voter turnout numbered over 650 and of the 26 seats on the Council, 15 are women and 6 are international students. President Brobbel will continue next year as an at-large representative on the GPSC. The GPSC officers will be elected tomorrow night. Elaborating on Kyle Bowman's Open Session remarks, President Brobbel explained the problem created by the late notice which she received in an email on April 28th: in order to retain their tax-free status, TAs/RAs needed to register for summer session classes by April 29. Although UA is allowed to set this policy, GPSC was not invited or involved in any discussion about the change. Since the 100% graduate tuition remission for summer has not yet been achieved, GPSC would have liked an opportunity to work this out beforehand. This problem is compounded by the lack of summer session graduate courses and the lack of motivation to enroll, given that there is no tuition remission for summer. GPSC hopes to work this problem out with the Graduate College and asked that faculty senators be aware and try to help solve the problem in the departments.

3C. Secretary of the Faculty Jennifer Jenkins

No report.

3D. Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert Mitchell

Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert Mitchell welcomed the 2005-06 Senate, including five new At-Large representatives, Estrada, Green, Hammann, Mutchler and Wheeler, and newly-elected College of Fine Arts representative Daniel Asia who is replacing Jennifer Jenkins for this year. He also thanked returning re-elected senators and thanked them for their continued service. Vice Chair Mitchell called attention to the Annual Reports of the standing committees which are either in senators' packets or on their desks. The Senate meeting schedule for 2005-06 is also included in the packets. Vice Chair Mitchell invited senators to attend a May 10th reception for outgoing Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock from 4-5:30 p.m. in the North Ballroom of the Student Union.

3E. Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell

Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell reported that at the recent Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) meeting, the Regents allowed proposals regarding program fees to be presented. All three provosts expended considerable resources to generate and present these proposals, but ultimately ABOR decided not to grant any requests for undergraduate program fees. All graduate program fee requests did pass, however. UA will proceed with developing more precise undergraduate program fee requirement guidelines and try again next year. The Board also received a Learner Centered Education presentation from the three universities. Two of the presenters were faculty members from UA and were extraordinarily good. Project abstracts are available on the ABOR website. This past year, the Arizona Faculties Council (AFC) worked diligently with the Arizona Higher Education Redesign to ensure that the stakeholders' concerns were heard, and some of the uncertainties about research endeavors for faculty members from ASU East and West Campuses have been allayed. With the redesign's conclusion to "expand on demand," some people felt the study was "much ado about nothing." Chair Howell presented her goal for this term to be "E²SG," Efficient, Effective Shared Governance. She hopes to accomplish her goal through timely communication and consultation among all entities, creating a faculty newsletter to begin this academic year, spotlighting activities and articles on shared governance as well as on individual faculty activities, creating a tracking document to monitor policy development through implementation, and enhancing communication and de-briefing among the faculty officers to set up appropriate strategies.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR AGENDA ITEM 3

There were no questions on the reports.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF April 4, 2005

The minutes of April 4, 2005 were approved with one correction.

6. ELECTIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION, UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND COMMITMENT, UNIVERSITY HEARING BOARD, SENATE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AND SENATE REPRESENTATIVES TO THE SHARED GOVERNANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE (attachment)

The Senate conducted its annual elections for the Committee on Conciliation, University Committee on Ethics and Commitment, University Hearing Board, Faculty Senate Elected Representative to the Senate Executive Committee, and Faculty Senate representatives to the Shared Governance Review Committee. Vice Chair Mitchell announced that Senator Silverman, who is a candidate for two positions, asked that senators be advised that he is unable to attend today's Senate meeting because he has to be in Juvenile Court with his students. Votes were cast using written ballots. Parliamentarian Sankey and Secretary Jenkins served as tellers. In accordance with the General Faculty Bylaws, those elected were:

Committee on Conciliation

Lane A. Beck
Stephen J. Coons
Frederick P. Kiefer, Jr.

University Hearing Board

Connie J. A. Beck
Laura Berry
James Farrell
Susan Crane

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Representative

Andy Silverman

University Committee on Ethics and Commitment

Mary Berg Bielski
Todd D. Camenisch
Norman Levine
Stuart E. Marsh
Mark Riley (special 2-year term)

Faculty Senate Shared Governance Review Committee

Representatives

J. D. Garcia
Andy Silverman

7. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FORWARDED AS A SECONDED MOTION FROM THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE (attachment)**

The revised consent agenda items forwarded by the ICPC, placed on senator's desks today and detailed at the end of these minutes [Motions 2005/06-1, 2005/06-2, 2005/06-3], were approved.

8. **FIRST READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: RISK MANAGEMENT AND LOSS PREVENTION POLICY (attachment)**

Academic Personnel Policy Committee Chair Aleamoni informed the Senate that the APPC reviewed this policy from the Office of Risk Management and Safety (RM&S) and recommended several revisions which were not incorporated by RM&S into this version. Nevertheless, the policy comes to the Senate as a seconded motion [Motion 2005/06-4]. Chair Aleamoni described each committee's recommended changes in detail: 1) At the beginning of Article V (page 3), the Committee suggested adding the words "Personnel mentioned in sections A, B and D (below) as well as the Senior VP for Business Affairs, the VP for Legal Affairs and General Counsel, the VP for Research and Graduate Studies, the Vice Provost for Instruction, and the Senior VP for Campus Life, shall have the primary responsibility to identify noncompliance and take action to make sure that we are in compliance." Risk Management Director Steve Holland felt that the parenthetical statement in Article V, Section A, "Senior University leaders (Vice Presidents and Deans)" should compensate for that statement. APPC member and Senator Spece recalled that the committee's concern was that the policy provides for severe discipline for faculty without ensuring adequate resources for compliance, and would like the policy to be very explicit about the primary responsibility of administrators to provide those resources. APPC member and Senator Mitchneck noted that often department heads are also involved in trying to make the changes required for compliance, which reinforces the need to be explicit that the ultimate responsibility does not lie with the unit head. Senator Spece moved [Motion 2005/06-5] to insert the language at the beginning of Article V, "Personnel mentioned in sections A, B and D (below) as well as the Senior VP for Business Affairs, the VP for Legal Affairs and General Counsel, the VP for Research and Graduate Studies, the Vice Provost for Instruction, and the Senior VP for Campus Life, shall have the primary responsibility to identify noncompliance and take action to make sure that we are in compliance." Motion was seconded and passed with two abstentions. The second recommended revision from APPC adds to Article V, Section C, "consistent with the resources made available to them." Senator Spece moved [Motion 2005/06-6] to amend the end of Article V, C with the recommended revised language. Motion was seconded. Senator Pintozzi commented that the language of the recommended revision is vague. Senator Mitchneck explained that one of the underlying issues is that faculty are simply not receiving the necessary resources from deans or the administration to ensure that labs are in compliance, and that grants are inadequate to cover these expenses. Senator Spece explained that the goal of the language is to protect faculty who have made reasonable good faith efforts to ensure compliance but may lack adequate resources, and that documentation about requests for resources would also provide a record of the particular circumstances in each case. Presiding Officer Mitchell offered a friendly substitution amendment [Motion 2005/06-7] which would simply add, "and resources" to the original language of the policy, to read, "... minimizes losses consistent with University policy and the guidance, direction *and resources* provided by management and senior University leaders." This substitution was accepted by both Senator Spece and the seconder of his motion. Motion carried unanimously. Chair Aleamoni referred the Senate to the second sentence of the second paragraph of Article V, F, "Responsibility for Non-Compliance," on page 4. APPC recommends and Senator Spece moved [Motion 2005/06-8] to substitute this sentence in place of the second sentence: "A person can be dismissed or given a sanction involving loss of pay or benefits only if the particular violation alleged and established is of a serious nature." Motion was seconded. Senators questioned why APPC wanted to remove the appeal process in the second sentence and suggested simply adding the APPC's sentence to that paragraph instead of replacing the second sentence. RM&S Director S. Holland explained that the appeal process was intended to determine whether a non-compliance issue *is* serious and asked who would make that determination. Senator Spece said they could attempt to define serious, or allow the University's various bodies to make this determination. Presiding Officer Mitchell suggested that the Senate could ask APPC to continue to work on the policy and return it to the Senate floor in the fall. Senators Mitchneck and Spece objected to a delay because the University and faculty need this protection now. Motion passed unanimously. Senator Garcia moved [Motion 2005/06-9] to approve the entire Risk Management and Loss Prevention Policy as amended. Motion was seconded. Senator Pintozzi asked whether the authors of this policy have consulted all of the stakeholders. S. Holland responded that yes, all department chairs, chairs of relevant committees, and other stakeholders and administrators have vetted the policy. Presiding officer Mitchell advised the Senate that when a policy is amended on the floor of the Senate, it must return for reexamination and review by those same vetting bodies. Motion carried unanimously.

9. **FIRST READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: REVISED CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (attachment)**

Student Affairs Policy Committee Chair D. Davis called senators' attention to the new and old versions of the Code of Academic Integrity, and the combined new and old versions and the flowchart placed on senators' desks today. SAPC forwards this revised Code to the Senate for approval as a seconded motion [Motion 2005/06-10]. Chair Davis asked Associate Dean of Students Alexis Hernandez to present a PowerPoint discussion of the proposed revisions. Dean Hernandez noted that the policy has been reviewed and approved by Academic Council, ASUA and GPSC and the Faculty Senate is the final step in the approval process. Dean Hernandez explained that the basic appeal process began in 1990 and was tweaked slightly in 1992 and in 2000. In response to concerns coming forward from both student and faculty in 2003-04, a cross-campus working group developed the

proposed revisions. The flowchart offers a basic comparison of the process which includes a slight change in the types of cases that can be appealed to the University Hearing Board. The faculty role remains essentially unchanged. The "Prohibited Conduct" section has been expanded to include violations of professional ethics, such as might occur in the College of Pharmacy. The faculty's sanctions in this area have also been expanded to include a notation on the transcript, and expulsion or suspension from the department, college, or University. Another issue was a student with multiple violations: previously the faculty member would decide a sanction but in the proposed revision the dean of that student's college decides. Academic Council vetted this proposed change three times and the deans wanted more voice in Code of Conduct cases. A new and critical change exists in the timeline. The proposed process calls for the dean of the college in which the class is located to hear the appeal. From there, the dean makes a decision about whether or not a violation occurred and what is the appropriate sanction. What can be appealed to the University Hearing Board (UHB) has changed slightly, to include the most severe sanctions such as suspension or expulsion of any type, as well as a notation on the transcript. ASUA specifically asked that deans be allowed to grant the option to appeal the failing grade sanction to the UHB in the event that the dean agrees that reasonable persons might disagree about whether a violation occurred. The final change involves "Interim Action" which provides for suspending a student from classes, clinical rotation or an applied setting for an interim period (until the academic integrity proceeding is completed) if the student's continued presence poses a threat to any individual, property or University function. An appeal of suspension from a clinical setting or would go directly to the Provost. Senators' questions and concerns included: 1) Does this academic integrity process dovetail with federal expectations regarding fabrication, falsification or plagiarism? Yes, if the violation occurred as part of a class, thesis or dissertation. However, if a grant is involved another process would be involved to satisfy federal regulations. 2) The language "University function" is too broad and could promote administrative mischief. The language should be clarified to mean physical safety/danger. 3) What are the statistics about the numbers of appeals that are resolved at the level of the department heads? 20% of cases are appealed beyond the faculty member and 5% of the total cases are appealed to the UHB. 4) Can a faculty member recommend the same sanction for a second or third offense? Yes, but the student's dean may impose additional sanctions in the case of multiple violations. A faculty member may not have information about previous violations. 5) How many University attorneys reviewed this document and did any of them have a medical background? S. Adamczyk of the Office of General Counsel responded that two attorneys plus the Health Sciences attorney, Vicki Gotkin, reviewed the document and noted that this language is the same language that is in the student Code of Conduct from ABOR. It also provides for due process and five days for appeal. 6) With respect to the research misconduct and grants, someone or some committee should review this policy to be certain it aligns with conflict with regulations that surround grants. 7) If someone believes that this issue should be reviewed, the Code can be amended appropriately in the fall. Senator Spece moved [Motion 2005/06-11] to amend the first sentence of Article IV, "Interim Action" on page 4, to read "... continued presence of the student in classes or class-related activities, *more likely than not*, poses a *significant* threat to *persons or property*." Motion was seconded. Senator St. John suggested a friendly amendment to the amendment to omit the language "more likely than not" because a case in which potential harm could be severe, although it might be more likely than not that this would not occur. Senator Spece and the seconder agreed. The amended motion 2005/06-11 reads "... continued presence of the student in classes or class-related activities poses a *significant* threat to *persons or property*." Motion to amend the Code of Academic Integrity passed with 6 opposed and 2 abstentions. Motion to approve the Code of Academic Integrity as amended passed with 2 opposed and 2 abstentions.

10. INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM LESLIE TOLBERT, CHAIR OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FUNCTIONS REVIEW TEAM

Dr. Leslie Tolbert thanked the Senate for the invitation to report about the findings and recommendations of the Financial Support Functions Review Team, which she chaired. The broadly representative team included faculty and staff, David Baca, Richard Davis, Caroline Garcia, Julius Parker, Marilyn Taylor, and Jim Wyant. The team was charged by Vice President for Research Richard Powell and Senior Vice President for Business Affairs Joel Valdez with reviewing the effectiveness of five units that fall under their domains: Budget Office, Department of Procurement and Contracting, Financial Services Office (FSO), Sponsored Projects and the Office of Research Control Analysis (ORCA). The goal was to review the effectiveness of how these units function as a whole, rather than individual, Academic Program Review (APR)-style analyses. As background for the current situation, she reminded the Senate that budget cuts from over ten years ago led to a decision to decentralize University business management. That decision was not accompanied, however, by the creation of new business structures necessary to accommodate this new operating environment. Also, as more budget cuts have been imposed over the years, the central units have taken disproportionate cuts. The result is that, absent a comprehensive, coordinated approach to financial business, the University meets its needs ineffectively and actually runs a risk of serious findings on audit. Essentially, the sum of the new parts created by restructuring in the early 90's is less than the previous whole. Some functions fall through the cracks with the currently existing units and some of those units are severely short-staffed or have some employees functioning above their levels of competence or expertise. Leadership and staff work very hard in these units, but they aren't always working towards useful ends. Finally, there are a number of separate, sometimes redundant bookkeeping practices and unit-developed, unit-specific software programs that don't interface with other departments, and a mentality of mistrust and antagonism between the central financial support units and the academic/research and administrative communities that they serve. The team recommended strongly that the University should be conducting overarching, coordinated and forward-looking planning across financial support units on an ongoing basis. The planning should begin from a premise of focused excellence; it should determine the needs and then set priorities for those needs, and this should be done in consultation with personnel in those academic departments and programs. It should delineate roles and responsibilities for each central financial support unit, colleges,

departments, and individual faculty and staff members. It should incorporate standardized business rules in all transactions. It should devise an integrated, university-wide information system that is capable of handling the comprehensive financial needs of the University. It should emphasize a nimble and flexible approach to University business. A substantial investment in personnel and an information technology system must be made soon in order to achieve long-term savings. More specifically, the central financial services unit (FSO) must provide a consistent set of rules relating to financial transactions. FSO should be leading the way and setting the tone for the University's financial business and in developing or procuring an integrated IT system that will serve the University more broadly than any of the piecemeal systems in place now. A codified, work-flow process for planning, developing, and instituting new central initiatives such as e-business must be developed with an emphasis on incorporating more, earlier and ongoing departmental involvement of end users. Communication must be improved at the level of unit leadership, although staff communication across units is very good. Between central support units and the academic unit stakeholders, communication must be regular, open and constructive. In particular, efforts should be made to emphasize a consumer or customer-centered attitude in the service unit and to reverse the culture of non-compliance among faculty and business staff by providing mandatory training in roles and responsibilities and producing more accountability for their business transactions. The team asked Cabinet for leadership in mandating this University-wide financial planning activity and to hold their reporting units accountable for smooth, efficient and legal financial operations. Sharing this responsibility may result in a culture change to maximize constructive interactions. The team will be meeting with the President and Provost and the two vice-presidents to develop a strategic plan and the full report should be online following that meeting. Senators' questions and comments: 1) Did the administrators you interviewed favor individual unit reviews similar to an APR? There was no particular resistance to this idea but the hope is that 7-year APR-style support unit reviews will be conducted.

11. **INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM STEPHEN MACK, DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTING SERVICES**

Stephen Mack thanked senators for the opportunity to address them. He has been director of Procurement and Contracting Services (PCS) at UA for four years. One of his major tasks has been to bring UA purchasing operation up to "best in class" status by being more inventive and more attuned to the needs of the users. His second major task was to find a way to use technology in the way his office delivers services to the University community. Some significant changes have been made in the past four years. These changes begin with automating the procurement process and eliminating the practice of individually handling every single transaction or requisition, identifying those things that we all buy in common and utilizing the leverage of the institution as a purchaser, and establishing better University-wide contracts and agreements. Another significant change is the development of a revolutionary proposal process in which his department brings in potential supplier candidates for a bidding proposal, explains what the University's needs are, and then works with them in submitting proposals that address the UA's unique needs. Additionally, his department collaborates with corporations for support for students, research, and academic units not only in commodities pricing but also in alternative value propositions, such as UA's strategic alliance with Alltel Wireless Communications. The purchasing department is creating an electronic commerce tool, "Arizona BuyWays." Right now, ten vendors offering over a million products are available through a single portal which the user can "shop" similar to online shopping on Amazon.com. This electronic tool will automatically forward the request for purchase through the approval layers. Although some training is necessary for all potential users, the ultimate goal is for all UA purchases to go through this single portal, which will dramatically speed the work-flow process, add value to and streamline the process, minimize red tape and the distance between supplier and user/customer. Senators' questions and comments included: 1) How hard is it to undo a strategic alliance? Since these are long term agreements, and since both the vendor and the UA could change directions, the contract is written so that both may withdraw if desired. 2) It would be expected that strategic alliances would produce lower prices, but on a recent laser printer purchase, the strategic alliance price was higher than two other vendors. When that occurs, inform PCS and they will work to prevent it but occasionally loss leaders' prices may be lower. 3) What if a faculty member wants a specific product that the UA doesn't offer? 3) Purchasing asks that you first look at the alliance to see if there is a product that will satisfy your need. If not, with documentation that the product offered by the alliance will not meet your needs, Purchasing will work with you to get what you need.

12. **INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM KATE JENSEN, DIRECTOR OF MARKETING, OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT**

Ms. Jensen presented PowerPoint slides detailing the new marketing campaign, "Arizona's First University," which highlights UA's historical significance but also taps the power of the "first/best" connotation. Key themes in the campaign will include student and faculty successes (achieve), research strengths (discover), community connections (serve) and economic impacts (build). The marketing campaign will provide graphic design tools to give each department or unit an opportunity to tell its "story," which will rotate on the website. The Arizona.edu website is being redesigned to offer a stronger presence since, for people all over the world, our website is the front door to the UA. Marketing the all of the tourist attractions on campus is also a part of this campaign, since that can draw potential students.

13. **-ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Jennifer L. Jenkins, Secretary

Appendix*

1. Email: "Announcement: Change to FICA Taxation of Graduate Students."
2. Internal Revenue Bulletin 2004-10, Section 6: "Standards Applicable to Undergraduate and Graduate Students."
3. Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee Meeting Schedule 2005-06.
4. "May 2, 2005 Faculty Senate Election Candidate's BioStatements."
5. May 2, 2005 DRAFT ballot for Faculty Senate Election.
6. Consent Agenda items forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee.
7. REVISED Consent Agenda items forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee.
8. "Risk Management and Loss Prevention Program Policy," Interim Adoption January 2005.
9. "Code of Academic Integrity," September 2000.
10. "Draft Changes to Code of Academic Integrity" and "Draft Changes to Code of Academic Integrity" with tracking changes
11. Dean of Students Office flowchart comparing current/proposed processes for Academic Integrity appeals: April 7, 2005.
12. Academic Personnel Policy Committee Annual Report 2004-05
13. Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee Annual Report 2004-05.
14. Research Policy Committee Annual Report 2004-05
15. Student Affairs Policy Committee Annual Report 2004-05.
16. Committee on Conciliation Annual Report 2004-05.
17. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure Annual Report 2004-05.
18. University Committee on Ethics and Commitment Annual Report 2004-05.
19. Faculty Senate Task Force for Monitoring Labor and Human Rights Issues Annual Report 2004-05.
20. Shared Governance Review Committee Annual Report 2004-05.
21. Committee of Eleven Annual Report 2003-04.
22. Faculty Senate Roster 2005-06.

**Copies of material listed in the Appendix are attached to the original minutes and are on file in the Faculty Center.*

Motions of the Meeting of May 2, 2005

Motion 2005/06-1 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the proposal to reorganize and rename the Division of Dance as the School of Dance. Motion carried.

Motion 2005/06-2 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve renaming the School of Music and Dance as the School of Music. Motion carried.

Motion 2005/06-3 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve an update to the Course Syllabus Policy. Motion carried.

Motion 2005/06-4 Seconded motion from the Academic Personnel Policy Committee to approve the Risk Management and Loss Prevention Policy. Motion not acted upon.

Motion 2005/06-5 Motion to amend the beginning of Article V of the Risk Management and Loss Prevention Policy by inserting APPC's recommended revised language, "Personnel mentioned in sections A, B and D (below) as well as the Senior VP for Business Affairs, the VP for Legal Affairs and General Counsel, the VP for Research and Graduate Studies, the Vice Provost for Instruction, and the Senior VP for Campus Life, shall have the primary responsibility to identify noncompliance and take action to make sure that we are in compliance." Motion carried.

Motion 2005/06-6 Motion to amend the end of Article V, C with APPC's recommended revised language, "consistent with the resources made available to them." Motion not acted upon.

Motion 2005/06-7 Substitute motion to amend Article V, C by adding the words "and resources" to read, ". . . minimizes losses consistent with University policy and the guidance, direction and resources provided by management and senior University leaders." Motion carried.

Motion 2005/06-8 Motion to replace the second sentence of the second paragraph of Article V, F, "Responsibility for Non-Compliance," on page 4 with the following language: "A person can be dismissed or given a sanction involving loss of pay or benefits only if the particular violation alleged and established is of a serious nature." Motion was amended to add this sentence as the third sentence of this paragraph instead of replacing the second sentence. Motion carried.

Motion 2005/06-9 Motion to approve the Risk Management and Loss Prevention Policy as amended in motions 2005/06-5, 2005/06-7, and 2005/06-8 (*above*). Motion carried.

Motion 2005/06-10 Motion to approve the revised Code of Academic Integrity as amended in motion 2005/06-11 (*below*). Motion carried.

Motion 2005/06-11 Motion to amend the first sentence of Article IV of the revised Code of Academic Integrity to read, ". . . continued presence of the student in classes or class-related activities poses a *significant* threat to *persons or property*." Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER
1400 E. Mabel
PO BOX 210473