

FILE COPY

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California 93407  
ACADEMIC SENATE

Meeting of the  
Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Tuesday, March 28, 2000  
UU220, 3:00-5:00pm

*minutes from  
1.25 and 2.22.00  
were removed*

- I. Minutes: Approval of Executive Committee minutes for meetings of January 25 and February 22, 2000 (pp. 2-4).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair:
  - B. President's Office:
  - C. Provost's Office
  - D. Statewide Senators:
  - E. CFA Campus President:
  - F. ASI Representative:
  - G. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
  - A. **Resolution on the Approval of a Policy for the Use of Human Subjects in Research at Cal Poly:** Clay, chair of the Research and Professional Development Committee (pp. 5-14).
  - B. **Resolution on Bylaws Change: Election of Academic Senate Officers:** Executive Committee (pp. 15-16).
  - C. **Resolution on Bylaws Change: Designation of Academic Senate Committees:** Executive Committee (p. 17).
  - D. **Resolution on Bylaws Change: Term Limit for Committee Chairs:** Executive Committee (p. 18).
  - E. **Academic Senate committee vacancies for 1999-2000:** (p. 19).
  - F. **Academic Senate committee vacancies for 2000-2002:** (pp. 20-26).
  - G. **University-wide committee vacancies for 2000-2002:** (pp. 27-28).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
- VII. Adjournment:

ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS\_\_\_-00/

RESOLUTION ON THE APPROVAL OF A  
POLICY FOR THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH  
AT CAL POLY

1 **Background Statement:** The Human Subjects Committee was established at Cal Poly to review  
2 proposals for research involving human subjects. The committee has been charged with the evaluation of  
3 research *only* in terms of its compliance with ethical standards regarding the treatment of human subjects  
4 in research. On October 2, 1996, The Human Subjects Committee forwarded its *Policy for the Use of*  
5 *Human Subjects in Research* to Provost Zingg. This document confirms Cal Poly's commitment to the  
6 protection of human subjects in research. The Research and Professional Development Committee was  
7 asked by the Academic Senate to review the Policy for the Use of Human Subjects in Research and to  
8 respond to the Senate in the form of a resolution.

10 WHEREAS, Cal Poly is committed to the protection of human subjects in research; and

12 WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Strategic Plan outlines a greater emphasis on research and other scholarly  
13 activities by faculty in the future; and

15 WHEREAS, The Human Subjects Committee has developed a policy statement outlining Cal Poly's  
16 role in insuring that the treatment of human subjects in research is fully compliant with  
17 regard to necessary legal and ethical standards of practice; and

19 WHEREAS, The Research and Professional Development Committee has reviewed this policy and  
20 feels that it is an appropriate statement of policy for Cal Poly; therefore be it

22 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate approve the *Policy for the Use of Human Subjects in*  
23 *Research*, and recommend that this policy be formally implemented at Cal Poly.  
24

Proposed by: Research and Professional Development Committee  
Date: March 28, 2000

**POLICY FOR THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH**  
**California Polytechnic State University,**  
**San Luis Obispo**

**Introduction**

Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo is committed to the protection of human subjects in research. To assist with this goal, the University has designated a Human Subjects Committee (also called Institutional Review Board, or IRB) to review proposals for research involving human subjects. The Committee evaluates the research only in terms of its compliance with ethical standards regarding the treatment of subjects. While individual researchers are ultimately responsible for their practices, the Committee's review is designed to provide objective input as an additional protection for the subjects. In addition, the independent review by the Committee is of benefit to those who could be held accountable for the research practices -- the researchers and the University.

**Applicability of this Policy**

All institutions at which research involving human subjects is carried out are required by law to have an institutional review board (IRB) to oversee those projects when the research is supported by a federal agency. Even if the research is not federally funded, however, it is Cal Poly's policy that a review for compliance with ethical guidelines be completed on all research involving human subjects conducted at Cal Poly. Similarly, reviews must be done of all off-campus research on human subjects carried out by Cal Poly faculty, staff, and students when they are conducting the research as an aspect of their roles as faculty, staff, or students of the University. The Committee is not responsible for reviewing research on human subjects that is conducted by a University employee or student as a function of their independent consulting work or their work with another institution.

In accordance with federal guidelines for the protection of human subjects, research involving human subjects is defined as any systematic investigation of living human subjects that is designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Human subjects research which requires review by the Committee includes faculty research, master's theses, and senior projects as well as research conducted on campus by parties not directly affiliated with the University. While the ethical principles for research are often applicable to classroom activities, demonstrations, and assignments, the Human Subjects Committee does not review classroom activities unless data will be collected and used in a systematic investigation.

**Committee Composition**

The Human Subjects Committee members and chair are appointed by the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs. The members will include representatives from a range of campus departments involved in human subjects research. Consistent with federal guidelines for IRB membership, the Committee will also include at least one member not affiliated with the University (and having no close relatives affiliated with the University), at least one non-scientist, and individuals of various races, cultural backgrounds, and genders. A list of current Committee members is available from the Dean's Office (Bldg. 38, Rm. 155; ext.

1508). Nonmembers may be consulted if additional expertise is deemed useful in evaluating a research proposal; however, nonmembers will not have a vote regarding the approval of the project. Committee members are responsible for removing themselves from reviews of projects for which they may have a conflict of interest (e.g., when he or she is an investigator or advisor for the research).

### **Types of Human Subjects Review**

Some forms of research are considered exempt from review, others may be given an expedited review, and the remainder are subject to full review. *Even when a project falls into one of the categories for exempt status (listed below), researchers are still expected to submit an approval form and a brief research protocol for confirmation of the exempt status to the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs (Bldg. 38, Rm. 155) or the Human Subjects Committee Chair.* Confirmation of exempt status should be received by the researcher prior to initiating the research. The following categories are typically considered **exempt from review**:

- (a) Research conducted in educational settings involving normal educational practices, such as research on instructional strategies, curricula, or classroom management methods;
- (b) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey or interview procedures, or observation of public behavior, provided (1) information is recorded in such a way that human subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers, (2) any disclosure of the subjects' responses outside the research could not place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation, and (3) the topic of the research does not involve a very sensitive or emotional issue (e.g., personal experience with family violence, HIV, or sexual assault).  
Research involving educational tests, survey or interview procedures, or observation of public behavior may be considered exempt even if the provisions (1) through (3) listed above have not all been met if the subjects are elected or appointed officials or candidates for public office, or if federal statutes require without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter;
- (c) Research involving the study of existing data, documents, records, or pathological or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or the information is recorded in such a way that subjects cannot be identified directly or through identifiers;
- (d) Research and demonstration projects designed to study public benefit or service programs or changes or alternatives to those programs; and
- (e) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, provided wholesome foods are consumed that have no additives or include a food ingredient, agricultural chemical, or environmental contaminant at or below the level and for a use found to be safe by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.



Research proposals may be given an **expedited review** if the procedures used involve no more than minimal risk. Minimal risk is involved when the probability and magnitude of anticipated harm or discomfort are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. Examples of research classified as minimal risk in the federal guidelines include: voice recordings of speech defects, moderate exercise by healthy volunteers, research on individual or group behavior or characteristics in which stress to subjects is not involved and the researcher does not manipulate subjects' behavior, and noninvasive procedures such as weighing and testing of sensory acuity.

An expedited review will be conducted by a subcommittee of the full Human Subjects Committee. The subcommittee for each expedited review will typically consist of the Human Subjects Committee Chair, one Committee member with expertise related to the proposed research topic, and one member whose area of expertise is in a discipline other than that of the researchers. Research projects involving greater than minimal risk to subjects (e.g., studies on the effects of stimulus deprivation, experimental drugs, or physical activities with significant risk of serious injury) will be subject to a **full review** by the Human Subjects Committee as a whole.

### **The Review Process**

The first step a researcher should take to request approval for a research project with human subjects is to obtain and carefully read copies of the Human Subjects Committee's submission materials, which include: (a) an approval form, (b) a research protocol, (c) a sample consent form protocol, and (d) the Cal Poly Policy for the Use of Human Subjects in Research. The submission procedures, which are outlined in detail below, are slightly different for projects considered exempt from further review, than for those classified as needing an expedited or a full review. Researchers who are uncertain as to whether their project would be categorized as exempt, as opposed to needing either an expedited or a full review, should *feel free to consult with the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee or the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs prior to submitting the research proposal.*

In fact, consultations with the HSC Chair or the Dean are encouraged for clarification of any aspect of the review process, both prior to initiating a review and during the review. Advance consultations can often reduce the amount of time needed for the researcher to prepare the submission materials as well as the time for a proposal to receive approval. HSC submission materials are available both from the office of the **Dean of Research and Graduate Programs (Bldg. 38, Rm. 155; 756-1508)** and from the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee. **The name and location of the current HSC Chair can be obtained from the Dean's office.**

Proposals for human subjects research that the researcher believes are **exempt** from further review should be submitted to *either* the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs *or* the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee. Please note that the HSC Chair will typically not be available to review projects during academic breaks and summer quarter; at those times, researchers should submit proposals to the Dean. Only *one copy* of the HSC approval form and a brief research protocol (including informed consent materials) need to be submitted if you are applying for exempt status as typically only the Dean or the HSC Chair will need to review the

proposal. Researchers should generally allow one week to receive confirmation of exempt status, although feedback can often be provided within a shorter amount of time if needed and requested.

*During the academic year*, proposals for which the researcher anticipates **an expedited or a full review** should be submitted *directly to the HSC Chair*. As noted above, the name and location of the current Chair are available from the office of the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs in Bldg. 38, Rm. 155 or at 756-1508. *During quarter breaks and summer quarter*, submissions should be made *to the Dean's office*. The submission for an expedited or full review should include *three copies* of a fully completed HSC approval form and *three copies* of a research protocol, including an informed consent form. Every attempt will be made to provide feedback to the researchers as soon as possible but typically not later than two to three weeks following receipt of the submission for expedited reviews. Full reviews may require additional time to provide the researcher with a response from the Committee. Researchers should not expect to have proposals reviewed by the HSC during finals week, holidays, or quarter breaks. Subject recruitment and data collection should not be initiated prior to obtaining approval from the Human Subjects Committee. The Committee reserves the option of withdrawing approval of a project if circumstances warrant, for example, if the research procedures are found to produce greater risk of harm than previously anticipated. The researcher must promptly report to the HSC Chair or the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs any alterations in their materials or procedures not addressed in their initial submission materials as well as any unforeseen problems or complaints regarding the research project.

Following the review of the researcher's materials, the Committee may approve the project, deny approval, or request specific clarifications or changes in order for the project to fully comply with ethical guidelines. If clarifications or changes have been recommended, once the Committee receives written verification from the researcher that the clarifications or changes have been made, approval will be granted. Proposals may only be denied by a majority vote of a quorum of the full Committee. (A quorum is defined as a majority of the total membership.) More specifically, if an expedited review committee does not approve a project, the researcher will be notified, and, unless the researcher chooses to withdraw the proposal, it will then be reviewed and voted on by the full committee. A researcher is welcome to submit additional information to clarify the planned research practices at any point during the review process and may request to meet with the HSC Chair, the Dean, or the Committee to discuss the decision on the research proposal.

### Overview of the Ethical Principles

Cal Poly's ethical guidelines for the use of human subjects in research are based on the principles and procedures outlined in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (Federal Register, June 16, 1991) and the Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR) Institutional Review Board (IRB) Guidebook. The OPRR IRB Guidebook provides a detailed interpretation and discussion of the Federal Policy guidelines. The Federal Policy provides a common policy to be implemented across a broad spectrum of federal agencies including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Environmental Protection

Agency, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Departments of Agriculture, Energy, Education, Justice, Defense, Housing and Urban Development, and Health and Human Services. Cal Poly's policy is similarly intended to apply to the range of disciplines represented on campus while at the same time acknowledging the value of the ethical guidelines of individual disciplines' professional associations (e.g., the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the American College of Sports Medicine, the American Association on Mental Deficiencies). Should a specific circumstance not be fully addressed by the Cal Poly policy, the Federal Policy and the OPRR IRB Guidebook will provide the guidelines for the Committee's decision-making. The Federal Policy will be the primary reference for the review of federally funded research.

The Federal Policy and Cal Poly's guidelines draw heavily on the three basic ethical principles laid out in the Belmont Report, a 1979 report of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. These three basic principles are: respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. **Respect for persons** entails treating individuals as autonomous agents who enter into research voluntarily and with adequate information (i.e., informed consent). Those with diminished autonomy, such as children, prisoners, and individuals who are in some way incapacitated, have a right to be protected. The second basic principle, **beneficence**, refers to the obligation to secure the well-being of research subjects. Possible benefits should be maximized, while possible harms should be minimized. The final principle explicated in the Belmont Report is that of **justice**. Justice implies that both risks and benefits of research should be distributed equally across various groups. For example, the burden of serving in research should not largely fall on certain groups such as the poor or the imprisoned, while others primarily benefit from the knowledge gained from the research.

Copies of the Belmont Report, the Federal Policy, and the OPRR IRB Guidebook are available in the office of the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs (Bldg. 38, Rm. 155; 756-1508).

### Specific Ethical Criteria

Consistent with the principles outlined in the Belmont Report, the Federal Policy, and the OPRR IRB Guidebook, the following criteria will be used to evaluate research proposals at Cal Poly:

- (1) **Risks** to subjects are **minimized**. Exposure of subjects to unnecessary risks is avoided, and precautions, safeguards, and alternatives are utilized to reduce the probability of harm and limit its severity or duration. An example of an appropriate safeguard is the presence of medically trained personnel during the administration of physical endurance tests. While a degree of risk may be unavoidable in some research, the risks that are present must be **reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits** of the research, including possible direct benefits to the subjects and the general benefits of the knowledge that may be gained from the research. An adequate research design is implemented to ensure that the results will be meaningful and, therefore, of potential benefit to increasing knowledge. Regarding studies of the direct benefit to subjects of an intervention or treatment method, investigators should offer the treatment or intervention to

members of control groups if and when it has been found to produce beneficial results. Similarly, members of groups receiving alternative treatments that are determined to be less effective should be offered the more beneficial treatment as well.

The risks that must be identified and addressed include: (a) **physical harm** (e.g., pain, discomfort, injury, side-effects of drugs, dizziness), (b) **psychological harm** (e.g., stress, guilt, depression, loss of self-esteem, confusion, embarrassment), (c) **social harm** (e.g., the possible stigmatizing effects of diagnostic labels such as "delinquent" or "schizophrenic"), and (d) **economic harm** (e.g., threats to employment if a subject's involvement in research on HIV carriers or alcohol abusers were revealed). An additional risk involving social, economic, and/or psychological harm could result from having subjects reveal illegal activities. Some of the social and economic risks may be adequately addressed by appropriate procedures for maintaining confidentiality or anonymity. When relevant, referrals for assistance (e.g., counseling or medical treatment) or other appropriate efforts must be made to attempt to ameliorate any type of harm or distress that might be brought on, even in part, by the research.

(2) **Selection of subjects is equitable** considering the purpose of the research and the special needs of vulnerable populations. Equitable selection is intended to ensure that the burdens and benefits of research are fairly distributed.

Researchers should exercise caution regarding the use of certain groups of subjects who are easily available, in a compromised position, or susceptible to manipulation. Voluntariness of participation could be diminished for prisoners or for students, patients, or employees of researchers, given that there may be an implied, if not overt, indication that grades, employment status, or treatment may be dependent on the individuals' willingness to participate in research. On the other hand, competent adults should not be overprotected and, thereby, excluded from research in which they might wish to participate. Thus, it should be especially clear in research proposals involving easily available subjects or those in a potentially compromised position, that appropriate measures are taken to ensure that their participation is not coerced in any direct or indirect manner. For example, if students constitute the subject pool, extra credit should only be offered for participation in research if at least one other equally attractive option for obtaining extra credit is also offered. Participation as a subject of research may not be a course requirement. In addition, while incentives for participation such as a few extra credit points or small monetary payments are generally allowable with appropriate informed consent, very large inducements may be inappropriate as they could be coercive, blinding prospective subjects to potential risks and reducing the voluntariness of their participation.

In studies of interventions for diseases or disorders to which women, minorities, or other specific groups might be susceptible, it is especially important that they not be underrepresented as subjects. In other situations, however, researchers may need to take steps (e.g., screening interviews or questionnaires) to exclude certain groups of potential subjects if those individuals might be particularly vulnerable to the procedures implemented (e.g., pregnant women in studies of the effects of drugs or individuals with



anorexic tendencies in weight loss studies). In the case of studies involving physical exercise, researchers should follow the health screening procedures and other recommendations provided in the current edition of Guidelines for Exercise Testing and Prescription by the American College of Sports Medicine. It is recognized that some studies obviously require selecting prospective subjects only from specific groups that are relevant to the purpose of the study (e.g., children with learning disabilities in a study of the effectiveness of an educational intervention for such children).

(3) **Informed consent** is sought from every prospective subject or the prospective subject's legally authorized representative.

A legally authorized representative (e.g., a parent or guardian) must provide consent for children under the age of 18 or for individuals with diminished capacity to give their own consent (e.g., developmentally delayed adults). Informed consent should ensure that potential subjects or their legally authorized representatives understand the nature of the study and can knowledgeably and voluntarily decide whether or not to participate. Informed consent may not contain exculpatory language that attempts to waive the subject's or representative's legal rights or to release the investigator, research sponsor, or the institution from liability for negligence.

Section .116 of the Federal Policy lists the basic elements that must be included in each informed consent statement. These basic elements are concisely listed in the Guidelines for Human Subjects Research Protocols. Section .116 also contains additional elements that may be appropriate to include in informed consent statements in some studies, as well as a brief discussion of exceptions to the need to obtain informed consent or to include all of the basic elements of consent (e.g., a full disclosure of the nature and purpose of the study). Full disclosure of the purpose of the study is not required at the onset of the subject's participation in studies with no more than minimal risk if complete disclosure would render the findings of the research invalid. For example, a researcher could justifiably fail to inform subjects that their attention span will be assessed as a function of the type of background music being played, given that that information could itself produce changes in the subjects' behavior (e.g., greater attempts to focus their attention in spite of distracting music). Deception (e.g., telling students their problem-solving ability will be tested when, in fact, they are being observed regarding their competitiveness) is similarly allowable in research of no more than minimal risk when the deception is methodologically necessary to test the desired hypotheses. In cases of deception or a lack of full disclosure, subjects must be subsequently debriefed regarding this information. An example of an allowable exception to the need to obtain informed consent is research involving only nonintrusive naturalistic observations of public behavior in which data are recorded in such a way that observed individuals cannot be identified.

The informed consent should generally be documented in a written and signed consent form containing the appropriate elements of informed consent. Each potential subject or legal representative should be given adequate time to read the consent form before being asked to sign it. **The consent form should be written in language easily understandable to the prospective subject or legal**



**representative.** This implies that consent forms should be available in an appropriate language other than English for prospective subjects or legal representatives not fluent in English. It also implies that technical jargon, which may be familiar to the researcher but not necessarily to others, should be avoided or explained in the consent form. A signed consent form may be waived if (a) the only record linking the subject and the data would be the consent form and the principal risk to the subject would be harm that could result from a breach of confidentiality, and (b) no more than minimal risk is involved and the study involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

(4) When appropriate, plans are included for adequately **monitoring the data** to ensure the safety of the subjects. Researchers are required to monitor their procedures carefully throughout the data collection process to reevaluate the risks to human subjects. If the risks are determined to be greater than initially predicted (e.g., an exercise protocol results in dangerous increases in heart rate), the Human Subjects Committee Chair or the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs should immediately be notified and prompt, appropriate steps should be taken to reduce the risks, obtain additional informed consent, and/or discontinue the procedures.

(5) The privacy of subjects and confidentiality of data are adequately protected. **Privacy** refers to the subject's right to have control over the extent, timing, and circumstances of sharing him- or herself with others. Privacy is typically protected by informed consent which ensures that subjects have voluntarily agreed to share themselves with others. More complex privacy issues are involved in studies that use private records (such as medical records) to identify prospective subjects and in some observational studies (e.g., those in "quasi-public" places such as hospital emergency rooms). Individuals conducting research of this nature should consult the discussion of such privacy issues in Part 3 of Chapter 3 in the OPRR IRB Guidebook, available in the Dean's Office (Bldg. 38, Rm. 155; 756-508).

Maintaining **confidentiality** requires that researchers take steps to ensure that the information revealed by the subject is not divulged to others without the subject's permission. Information is regarded as *confidential* when the researcher *could* identify which data are associated with an individual subject but agrees not to reveal this information to others. Appropriate measures to achieve confidentiality include removing face sheets containing identifying information from questionnaires, substituting code numbers for names or other identifiers, limiting the number of individuals with access to data containing identifiers, and storing data in locked cabinets. If codes are used and a list matching the codes with the identity of the subjects is maintained, the list must be kept in a secure location separate from the data. **Anonymity** of subjects' responses is the most certain method of ensuring that the identity of a subject will not be associated with his or her data. When data are collected *anonymously*, even the researchers have no means by which they could identify which data belong to which subjects.

(6) **Additional safeguards** have been implemented to protect the rights and welfare of special classes of subjects, particularly **subjects who might be vulnerable** to undue influence or coercion (e.g., children, prisoners, mentally disabled persons, economically or educationally disadvantaged persons). One safeguard applicable to children and mentally disabled persons is the requirement of obtaining the informed consent of a legal representative of the prospective subject. The legal representative must be a competent adult whose primary concern in the research situation is the best interests of the prospective subject who is the representative's ward. Even when a legal representative gives informed consent for a ward to take part in a research project, the individual subject/ward must still give assent, or agreement, to participate as well.

When applicable, researchers should consult Chapter 6 of the OPRR IRB Guidebook for specific considerations regarding studies of the following groups: fetuses, pregnant women, children and minors, cognitively impaired persons, prisoners, traumatized and comatose patients, terminally ill patients, elderly/aged persons, minorities, students, employees, and individuals in countries other than the United States.

(7) Adequate **debriefing** of subjects regarding the purpose of the study and any deception involved in the procedures is included. Subjects are offered a method of obtaining a summary of the research findings when available. For example, all subjects may be given a copy of the informed consent form which includes the name, business phone number, and business address of the researcher or advisor for the project and an invitation for interested subjects to contact that individual when it is expected that the results will be available. Alternatively, a summary of the results might be posted in a location accessible to the subjects, such as an information bulletin board in a gym at which athletes had participated in research on an exercise program. Such summaries, as well as other reports of findings, should, of course, refer to no subjects by name or other information that would indicate individuals' identities.

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE  
Of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-\_\_\_\_-00/EC  
RESOLUTION ON  
BYLAWS CHANGE: ELECTION OF ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICERS

**Background:** The office of Academic Senate Chair is elected annually with the average length of service being two years. Since each new Chair comes to the position untrained and unsuspecting, this resolution recommends the election of officers take place in winter quarter so spring quarter can be used as a period of orientation to the duties, responsibilities, and requirements of the position before officially taking office. Therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Articles III.B and IV.C of the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* be modified as follows:

III. ELECTION PROCEDURES

Elections shall be held for membership to the Academic Senate, Senate offices, statewide Academic Senate, Grants Review Committee, appropriate recall elections for the preceding as per Section IX of these Bylaws, and ad hoc committees created to search for such university positions as president, provost, vice presidents, college deans, and similar type administrative positions.

B. ELECTION CALENDAR

1. ~~At the first January meeting of the Senate, impending vacancies in the following memberships shall be announced: (a) campus Academic Senate (according to the filled full-time equivalent faculty positions for the previous fall quarter as determined by the university Human Resources office), (b) statewide Academic Senate, and (3) Grants Review Committee. At the same time, each caucus chair shall be notified in writing of its vacancies.~~
2. ~~By Friday of the following week, each caucus chair shall notify the Senate office, in writing, of any discrepancies in the number of vacancies in its constituency.~~
3. During the ~~third~~ **first** week of January, the Academic Senate office shall solicit nominations ~~for the impending~~ **to fill** vacancies ~~for the next academic year. At the same time, each caucus chair shall be notified in writing of such vacancies. By Friday of the following week, each caucus chair shall notify the Senate office, in writing, of any discrepancies in the number of vacancies in its constituency.~~ Accepted

37 nominations shall include a signed statement of intent to serve from the  
38 candidate. Eligibility to serve shall be determined for each college and  
39 Professional Consultative Services.

40 4. At the first Senate meeting in February, the names of all nominees, the  
41 dates of the elections (including a runoff, if necessary), and the time and  
42 place at which ballots will be counted shall be reported.

43 5. Elections shall be conducted during the last week of ~~February~~ **January**.  
44 Any runoff elections, if needed, shall be conducted during the following  
45 week . . . .

46 9. Election of Senate officers:

47 (a) ~~at the April~~ **prior to the last Senate** meeting of the Senate  
48 **winter quarter**, eligible nominees of the Senate shall be solicited  
49 for the offices of chair, vice chair, and secretary of the Senate.

50 (b) a petition of nomination signed by three senators which includes  
51 a consent to serve statement signed by the nominee shall be  
52 received by the Senate office. Such petitions shall be due at the  
53 Senate office ~~one week before~~ **prior to the May last Senate**  
54 meeting of the Senate **winter quarter**. The names of the eligible  
55 nominees shall be announced ~~in the agenda for the May~~ **at the**  
56 **last Senate** meeting of the Senate **winter quarter**.

57 (c) nominations for other eligible candidates will be received from  
58 the floor of the Senate provided that (1) at least two senators  
59 second the nominations, and (2) the nominee is present and  
60 agrees to serve if elected.

61 (d) the vice chair of the Senate shall conduct the election of Senate  
62 officers at the ~~regular May~~ **last Senate** meeting of the Senate  
63 **winter quarter**. Officers shall be elected one at a time: first the  
64 chair, then the vice chair, and finally the secretary.

65 (e) in the event of a vacancy in the offices of the Senate, an election  
66 will be conducted at the next meeting of the Senate to fill the  
67 unexpired term. Nominations shall be made from the floor of the  
68 Senate in compliance with subsection (c) above.

70 IV. OFFICERS

71  
72 C. TERMS OF OFFICE

73 Each officer shall be elected by the voting members of the Senate for a one-year  
74 term. These elections shall be held ~~in May~~ **at the last Senate meeting of winter**  
75 **quarter** and terms of office shall begin with the start of summer quarter. The only  
76 limitations to the number of terms that a senator may hold office are the eligibility  
77 requirements in Article II.A of these Bylaws and the terms of office restrictions in  
78 Article II.B of these Bylaws.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Date: March 28, 2000

ACADEMIC SENATE  
Of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-\_\_\_\_-00/  
RESOLUTION ON BYLAWS CHANGE:  
DESIGNATION OF ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES

**Background:** The *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* make a distinction between General Standing Committees and Special Standing Committees. This distinction was originally intended to designate which committee chairs would be appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee and which committee chairs would be elected by their membership. This designation has proved to be both confusing and unnecessary, and accordingly, this resolution recommends that such identification be eliminated. Therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Article VIII.C of the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* be modified as follows:

A. COMMITTEE CHAIRS

The Academic Senate Executive Committee ~~shall~~ may choose to appoint the chairs of ~~the General Standing Committees~~ the Academic Senate standing committees. The chairs of these committees shall be voting members and may be chosen from within or outside the committee. If the chair is chosen from outside the committee, the fact that one college may have two votes will be taken into account by the Academic Senate when it acts on the recommendation of the standing committee. Committee chair appointments will be submitted to each committee for its approval. ~~The chairs of the Special Standing Committees shall be elected annually~~ If the committee chair is not appointed by the Executive Committee, then the chair of the committee shall be elected by a majority vote of the eligible voters on the committee. Committee chairs shall be appointed by the Executive Committee or elected by the committee's membership annually.

The chair need not be an academic senator. The chair shall be responsible for reporting committee activities to the Academic Senate. The chair shall notify the chair of the college caucus whenever a member has not attended two consecutive meetings. Committee chairs shall meet with the chair of the Academic Senate at least annually.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Date: March 28, 2000



ACADEMIC SENATE  
Of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-\_\_\_-00/  
RESOLUTION ON  
BYLAWS CHANGE: TERM LIMIT FOR COMMITTEE CHAIRS

1 **Background:** In order to continually provide new perspective on the Academic Senate and  
2 its committees, membership to these bodies have term limits placed on them. In order to  
3 provide the same benefit to Academic Senate committee leadership, this resolution  
4 recommends that an individual serve no more than six years as chair of an Academic Senate  
5 committee. Therefore, be it

6  
7 **RESOLVED:** That Section VIII.C of the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* be modified as  
8 follows:  
9

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRS

11 The Academic Senate Executive Committee shall appoint the chairs of the  
12 General Standing Committees. The chairs of these committees shall be voting  
13 members and may be chosen from within or outside the committee. If the  
14 chair is chosen from outside the committee, the fact that one college may have  
15 two votes will be taken into account by the Academic Senate when it acts on  
16 the recommendation of its standing committee. Committee chair appointments  
17 will be submitted to each committee for its approval. The chairs of the Special  
18 Standing Committees shall be elected annually by a majority vote of the  
19 eligible voters on the committee. Committee chairs can serve a maximum  
20 of six consecutive years.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Date: March 28, 2000

## Vacancies For 1999-2000

### Academic Senate Committee

	Replacement for	Term expires
<u>College of Business</u> Curriculum Committee	Dan Bertozzi	2000
<u>PCS</u> Research and Professional Development Committee	Eileen Pritchard	2000

**COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE**  
**Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for**  
**Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2000-2002**

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long range Planning Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Curriculum Committee</u> Casey, Glen	AgEd&Comm	1 of 1
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u>		
<u>Faculty Ethics</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Fairness Board</u> Harris, John Vance, Robert	NRM AniSci	2 of 2 1 of 1
<u>Grants Review Committee</u>		
<u>Instruction Committee</u> Harris, John	NRM	1 of 2
<u>Library Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Program Review and Improvement Committee</u>		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Student Grievance Board</u>		

\*would be willing to chair committee if released time were available

**COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN**  
**Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for**  
**Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2000-2002**

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long range Planning Committee</u> Johnston, Hal	ConstMgt	1 of 1
<u>Curriculum Committee</u>		
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u> Lucas, Michael	Arch	1 of 1
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u>		
<u>Faculty Ethics</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Fairness Board</u> Berrio, Mark	ArchEngr	1 of 1
<u>Grants Review Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Instruction Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Library Committee</u> Wack, Paul* Yip, Christopher	C&R Plann Arch	1 of 1 1 of 1
<u>Program Review and Improvement Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u>		
<u>Student Grievance Board</u> NO VACANCIES		

\*would be willing to chair committee if released time were available

**COLLEGE OF BUSINESS**  
**Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for**  
**Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2000-2002**

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long range Planning Committee</u> Peach, David	Mgtmt	1 of 3
<u>Curriculum Committee</u>		
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u> Biggs, JR* Peach, David	Mgtmt Mgtmt	1 of 1 2 of 3
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u>		
<u>Faculty Ethics</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Fairness Board</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Grants Review Committee</u>		
<u>Instruction Committee</u> Shiers, Alden	Econ	1 of 1
<u>Library Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Program Review and Improvement Committee</u>		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Student Grievance Board</u> Peach, David	Mgtmt	3 of 3

\*would be willing to chair committee if released time were available



**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**  
**Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for**  
**Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2000-2002**

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long range Planning Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Curriculum Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u>		
<u>Faculty Ethics</u>		
Agbo, Samuel	ElecEngr	2 of 2
Mallareddy, H.	C&EEng	1 of 1
Niku, Saeed	MechEngr	1 of 1
<u>Fairness Board</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Grants Review Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Instruction Committee</u>		
<u>Library Committee</u>		
Agbo, Samuel	ElecEng	1 of 2
<u>Program Review and Improvement Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Student Grievance Board</u> NO VACANCIES		

\*would be willing to chair committee if released time were available

**COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**  
**Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for**  
**Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2000-2002**

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u><b>Budget and Long range Planning Committee</b></u>		
Long, Dianne	PoliSci	1 of 2
Lutrin, Carl	PoliSci	1 of 1
<u><b>Curriculum Committee</b></u>		
Keesey, Doug*	English	1 of 1
<u><b>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</b></u>		
NO VACANCIES		
<u><b>Faculty Affairs Committee</b></u>		
Bethel, Walter	Philo	1 of 1
Brown, Kenneth	English	1 of 1
<u><b>Faculty Awards Committee</b></u>		
<u><b>Faculty Ethics</b></u>		
Battenburg, John*	English	1 of 2
McKim, Patrick	SocSci	2 of 3
Tryon, Bette	Psych&HD	1 of 2
<u><b>Fairness Board</b></u>		
NO VACANCIES		
<u><b>Grants Review Committee</b></u>		
NO VACANCIES		
<u><b>Instruction Committee</b></u>		
McKim, Patrick	SocSci	3 of 3
<u><b>Library Committee</b></u>		
Peterson, Valerie	SpchComm	1 of 1
Schwartz, Debora*	English	1 of 1
<u><b>Program Review and Improvement Committee</b></u>		
<u><b>Research and Professional Development Committee</b></u>		
Long, Dianne	PoliSci	2 of 2
Orij, John	History	1 of 1
Ruggles, Phil	GrphComm	1 of 2
<u><b>Student Grievance Board</b></u>		
Battenburg, John	English	2 of 2
Levi, Daniel	Psyc	1 of 1
McKim, Patrick	SocSci	1 of 3
Ruggles, Phil	GrphComm	2 of 2
Tryon, Bette	Psych&HD	2 of 2

\*would be willing to chair committee if released time were available

**COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS**  
**Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for**  
**Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2000-2002**

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long range Planning Committee</u> Greenwald, Harvey	Math	1 of 1
<u>Curriculum Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u> Lewis, George*	Math	1 of 1
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u>		
<u>Faculty Ethics</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Fairness Board</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Grants Review Committee</u> Colome, Jaime Villablanca, Francis	BioSci BioSci	1 of 2 2 of 2
<u>Instruction Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Library Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Program Review and Improvement Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u> Agronsky, Steve* Colome, Jaime Villablanca, Francis	Math BioSci BioSci	1 of 1 2 of 2 1 of 2
<u>Student Grievance Board</u> NO VACANCIES		

\*would be willing to chair committee if released time were available

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES  
Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for  
Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2000-2002

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long range Planning Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Curriculum Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u> Davidman, Patricia	UCTE	1 of 1
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u>		
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Faculty Ethics</u>		
<u>Fairness Board</u>		
<u>Grants Review Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Instruction Committee</u> NO VACANCIES		
<u>Library Committee</u>		
<u>Program Review and Improvement Committee</u>		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u>		
<u>Student Grievance Board</u>		

\*would be willing to chair committee if released time were available

**UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEES**  
**Faculty Interest Questionnaires Vacancies for 2000-2002**

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<b><u>(504/ADA) ACCOMMODATION REVIEW BOARD</u></b>		
(1 Vacancy/2 Appointments)		
Harris, John	NRM	1 of 2
Taylor, Kevin	PE&K	2 of 2
<b><u>ASI STUDENT SENATE</u></b>		
(1 Vacancy/1 Appointment)		
<b><u>ATHLETICS GOVERNING BOARD</u></b>		
(1 Vacancy/3 Appointments)		
Frayne, Colette (Incumbent as replacement)	GISt&Law	1 of 1
Johnston, Hal	Const Mgt	1 of 1
<b><u>CAL POLY PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE</u></b>		
(3 Vacancies/3 Appointments)		
<b><u>CAMPUS SAFETY AND RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE</u></b>		
(1 Vacancy/2 Appointments)		
Cavaletto, Richard	Biores&AE	1 of 1
Goldenberg, Stuart	Mathematics	1 of 1
Kellogg, Bill	AgEd&Comm	1 of 1
<b><u>COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON AIDS AND HIV INFECTION</u></b>		
(1 Vacancy/1 Appointment)		
Colome, Jaime	BiolSci	1 of 1
Cook, Barbara	SocSci	1 of 1
<b><u>DISABLED STUDENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE</u></b>		
(2 Vacancies/4 Appointments)		
Ruef, Mike	UCTE	1 of 1
Taylor, Kevin	PE&K	1 of 2
<b><u>EL CORRAL BOOKSTORE ADVISORY COMMITTEE</u></b>		
(1 Vacancy/2 Appointments)		
<b><u>FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS</u></b>		
(1 Vacancy/2 Appointments)		
Biggs, J.R.	Mgmt	1 of 1
Duerk-Williamson, D.	Arch	1 of 1
Mallareddy, H.	C & E Engr	1 of 2



**INFORMATION COMPETENCE COMMITTEE**

(1 Vacancy/1 Appointment)

Levi, Daniel

Psych

1 of 1

**RESOURCE USE COMMITTEE**

(2 Vacancies/3 Appointments)

Dietterrick, Brian

NRM

1 of 1

Harris, John

NRM

2 of 2

Wack, Paul

C&amp;R Plann

1 of 1

**STUDENT AFFAIRS COUNCIL**

(1 Vacancy/3 Appointments)

Mallareddy, H.

C &amp; E Engr

2 of 2

**STUDENT HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

(1 Vacancy/1 Appointment)

# ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP for 2000-2002

(Highlighted names indicate newly elected members)

## COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE (7 representatives)

<b>Ampacher, William</b>	<b>Agribusiness</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
Dingus, Delmar	Soil Science	1999-2001
Hannings, David	EnvHortiSci	1999-2001
Stephens, Sarah	AgEd&Comm	1999-2001
<b>VACANCY</b>		<b>2000-2002</b>
<b>VACANCY</b>		<b>2000-2002</b>
<b>VACANCY</b>		<b>2000-2002</b>

## COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (5 representatives)

Boswell, Michael	City & Regional Planning	1999-2001
Clay, Gary	Landscape Architecture	1999-2001
Lucas, Michael	Architecture	1999-2001
<b>Yip, Christopher</b>	<b>Architecture</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
<b>VACANCY</b>		<b>2000-2002</b>

## COLLEGE OF BUSINESS (5 representatives)

Armstrong, Mary Beth	Accounting	1999-2001
<b>Bertozzi, Dan</b>	<b>Global Strategy and Law</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
<b>Burgunder, Lee</b>	<b>Global Strategy and Law</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
Geringer, Michael	Global Strategy and Law	1999-2001
Iqbal, Zafar	Accounting	1999-2001

## COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING (7 representatives)

DeTurris, Dianne	Aeronautical Engineering	1999-2001
Goel, Rakesh	Civil & Environmental Engineering	1999-2001
<b>Harris, James</b>	<b>Electrical Engineering</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
<b>Heidersbach, Robert</b>	<b>Materials Engineering</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
<b>LoCascio, James</b>	<b>Mechanical Engineering</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
Menon, Unny	Industrial Engineering	1999-2001
<b>Stearns, Daniel</b>	<b>Computer Science</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>

## COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS (9 representatives)

Conway, James	Speech Communication	1999-2001
<b>Evnine, Simon</b>	<b>Philosophy</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
Foroohar, Manzar	History	1999-2001
Laver, Gary	Psychology & HD	1999-2001
Rinzler, Paul	Music	1999-2001
<b>Rubba, Johanna</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
<b>Scriven, Talmage</b>	<b>Philosophy</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
<b>Wetzel, Jean</b>	<b>Art &amp; Design</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>
<b>Wilvert, Calvin</b>	<b>Social Sciences</b>	<b>2000-2002</b>