April 23, 2009

TO: Ward P. Beyermann, Department of Physics and Astronomy (Vice Chair)
Larry Wright, Philosophy, (Secretary Parliamentarian)
Richard Arnott, Economics (Research)
Steven Axelrod, English (Preparatory Education)
Richard A. Cardullo, Biology (Committees)
Mary Gauvain, Psychology (Planning and Budget)
John Haleblian, AGSM (AGSM Executive Committee)
Manuela Martins-Green Cell Biology (Junior Rep to the Assembly)
Douglas Mitchell, GSOE (GSOE Executive Committee)
Mart L. Molle, Computer Science and Eng. (Sr. Rep to the Assembly)
Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM (CAP)
Leonard J. Mueller, Chemistry (Academic Computing)
Thomas C. Patterson, Anthropology (CHASS Executive Committee)
Richard A. Redak, Entomology (Faculty Welfare)
Pete Sadler, Earth Sciences (Undergraduate Council)
Dan S. Straus, Biomedical Sciences (CEP)
Christopher Y. Switzer, Chemistry (Graduate Council)
Kambiz Vafai, Mechanical Engineering (PRP)
Frank Vahid, Computer Science and Engineering (COE Executive Committee)
Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences (Biomed Executive Committee)
Marylynn V. Yates, Environmental Sciences (CNAS Executive Committee)
Juliet McMullin, Anthropology, (Diversity)

FR: Tony Norman, Chair
Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda, April 27, 2009

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, April 27, 2009, at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 145 University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Action/Information</strong></td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the April 27, 2009 Agenda and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes of 04-13-2009 meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Information</strong></td>
<td>2(pp. 6-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 2:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC Charles Louis, Prof. Helen Henry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation on of IACUC as well as a presentation (focusing on UC) of the threats and actuality of animal terrorism on our campuses over the past 5 - 10 years. What are the implications for UCR?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Action/Information</strong></td>
<td>3(9-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15-2:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw Change – Undergraduate Council 8.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the proposed name change from Undergraduate Council to Undergraduate Admissions and approve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Action/Information</strong></td>
<td>4(11-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:25-2:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of the Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion item – review and come prepared to discuss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Action/Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45-3:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Awards Administered by the Senate and the Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the various awards currently available on campus for faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. Action/Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45-3:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminders:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Division Meeting – May 19 followed by a reception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chili cook-off – May 29, 2009 – Botanic Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chair’s Reception by the Chancellor – June 4 2009 – Chancellor’s residence – please mark the date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
APRIL 13, 2009

PRESENT:
Anthony W. Norman, Biochemistry, (Chair)
Ward P. Beyermann, Department of Physics and Astronomy (Vice Chair)
Larry Wright, Philosophy, (Secretary Parliamentarian)
Richard Arnott, Economics (Research)
Steven Axelrod, English (Preparatory Education)
Richard A. Cardullo, Biology (Committees)
Mary Gauvain, Psychology (Planning and Budget)
Mart L. Molle, Computer Science and Eng. (Sr. Rep to the Assembly)
Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM (CAP)
Leonard J. Mueller, Chemistry (Academic Computing)
Thomas C. Patterson, Anthropology (CHASS Executive Committee)
Richard A. Redak, Entomology (Faculty Welfare)
Pete Sadler, Earth Sciences (Undergraduate Council)
Christopher Y. Switzer, Chemistry (Graduate Council)
Kambiz Vafai, Mechanical Engineering (PRP)
Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences (Biomed Executive Committee)
Martin Johnson, Philosophy (for Undergraduate Council)

ABSENT:
John Haleblian, AGSM (AGSM Executive Committee)
Manuela Martins-Green Cell Biology (Junior Rep to the Assembly)
Douglas Mitchell, GSOE (GSOE Executive Committee)
Dan S. Straus, Biomedical Sciences (CEP)
Marylynn V. Yates, Environmental Sciences (CNAS Executive Committee)
Frank Vahid, Computer Science and Engineering (COE Executive Committee)
Juliet McMullin, Anthropology, (Diversity and Equal Opportunity

GUESTS:
Martin Johnson, Political Science (representing Undergraduate Council)

CONSENT CALENDAR:
The items under the consent calendar were accepted as written.

CHANCELLOR WHITE:
The Chancellor indicated that he was happy to meet with the Executive Council and the three items he would like to discuss with them were, Smoking on Campus, School of Public Policy and Consultants.

He indicated that one of the topics discussed at that morning’s cabinet meeting was related to the sale of tobacco products on campus and the administration was trying to decide on whether to make UCR a smoking free campus. After extensive discussion regarding the
pros and cons of smoking, the EC took a straw vote indicating that they unanimously supported a ban on the sale of cigarettes on campus. Of the 16 members present, 8 voted to have a complete smoke free campus and 14 voted to have zones where those who wish to smoke will go to.

The discussions then moved on to the budget situation and the Chancellor indicated that there is currently no policy for furloughs for the UC campuses. There was a discussion systemwide where a policy is being formulated on how to deal with the issue of furloughs. This policy will probably come to the campus for comments. The policy will be written to allow Chancellors flexibility to decide on an implementation plan. He indicated that it is not clear at this moment where they will draw the line, but the general idea is to draw a line at an annual salary, say less than or equal to $40,000-$50,000 and decide that those staff members whose income fall within this figure would be exempt from furloughs. The problem though would be with the union who will probably be opposed to furloughs which means that there will be compensatory lay-off in the areas of unrepresented staff. He also thought that if the system decides to go on a furlough, it would affect every fund number not just 19900 (general) funds. He reminded everyone though that staff and faculty furlough was a last step and that the Regents will want to see firm examples of other attempts to raise funds first.

In discussing the pros and cons of furloughs vs. salary cuts, Chancellor White stated his belief that furloughs are preferable to salary cuts for two reasons. First, furloughs were temporary and secondly, furloughs were easier to reinstate than salary cuts which could prove difficult and may not play out well in terms of public perception. When asked what happens to service credit accruals and how furloughs affected these accruals, Chancellor White indicated he did not know and nobody really knows at the present time until they have worked out the details. More details will come out after the May Regents meeting.

Chancellor White reminded the EC that a lot hinges on the election. If 1A fails, there is a guess that it will add another six billion dollar deficit to the state.

In closing, Chancellor White indicated that he will be making an announcement on the general parameters of the budget around May 21st at which time, there will be a draft report on the web. Final recommendations will be done in June.

There then followed a very brief discussion on whether the campus should go ahead with the plans for the Public School of Policy given the dire financial state of the system.

**Naming Opportunities for EC Approval**
The Executive Council unanimously approved the proposed name for the unnamed road from East Campus Drive that runs east between the Chemical Sciences Building and Visitor Lot 10 and then turns east to the Botanic Gardens.

**Revised Faculty Exit Survey:**
After further discussion, the EC members endorsed the survey instrument and agreed that after discussions between the ad hoc committee and Kathleen Montgomery, they could proceed without returning to the EC with another draft version.
**P&B Report on the Budget Crisis:**
Mary Gauvain, Chair of Planning and Budget gave a thorough summary of the P&B report that they had just completed for the Chancellor. P&B had met over the last one month with all the College Deans and some of the Administrative units in an effort to understand their budget situation. The report, she indicated began with what P&B considered to be their overarching philosophy and a set of general principles and included recommendations derived from that view. They discuss in the report the lack of transparency and some of the issues that are of concern to the faculty. The report has now been finalized and a copy given to the Chancellor. It will be posted on the Senate website later this week. She also mentioned that the first draft of the *P&B-BAC Subcommittee on Administrative Growth at UCR* of the joint Planning and Budget/Budget Advisory Committee had also been finalized and a copy sent to the Chancellor and Chair Norman.

**Other Business – Chair Norman:**
- Chair Norman reported that the agenda of the Senate Assembly is now available on the UC Senate website at [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/apr2009/assembly.4.22.09.agenda.pdf](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/apr2009/assembly.4.22.09.agenda.pdf).
- He also reported that the upgrading and ‘branding’ of our Senate website is almost 50% accomplished and is scheduled to be launched in May.
- Finally, he reported that Council Chair Mary Croughan will be the guest of honor at the May 19th Division meeting and he would like to host a reception at his home later after the meeting. The reception will include EC members. More information will be sent out later.

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Sellyna Ehlers*
*Executive Director*
*Academic Senate*
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
MAY 19, 2009

Proposed change in Bylaw 8.23
Undergraduate Council

To be adopted:

PRESENT:

8.23 Undergraduate Council (En 5 Jun 75)

8.23.1 The Council consists of seven members of the Division, one of whom shall be the Chair and the Divisional representative to the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools; one undergraduate student representative; and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, ex officio (Am 5 Nov 87)(Am 18 Nov 03)

8.23.2 It is the duty of the Undergraduate Council to:

8.23.2.1 Advise the Division and the administration on matters having to do with admissions and enrollment on the Riverside campus. These matters, which are the primary concern of the Undergraduate Council, include but are not limited to: recruitment and outreach; special action admissions; articulation with community colleges; and relations with high schools and community colleges (Am 5 Nov 87)

8.23.2.2 Serve as the normal mechanism of liaison between the Division, the athletic director, and the administration on matters relating to athletic policy. (Am 5 Nov 87)

PROPOSED:

8.23 Undergraduate Admissions Committee

8.12.1 The Committee consists of seven members of the Division, one of whom shall be the Chair and the Divisional representative to the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools; one undergraduate student representative, who shall not have the right to vote; and the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, ex officio and the Admissions Director, ex officio

8.23.2 It is the duty of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee to:

8.23.2.1 Advise the Division and the administration on matters having to do with admissions and enrollment on the Riverside campus. These matters, which are the primary concern of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee include but are not limited to: recruitment and outreach; special action admissions; articulation with community colleges; and relations with high schools and community colleges.(Am 5 Nov 87)
8.23.2.3 At its discretion, make recommendations relating to undergraduate education and student life. (Am 5 Nov 87)

Justification:

1) Through the cooperative efforts of the Admissions Director and Undergraduate Council, the Riverside campus has recently been advanced from “non-selective” to “minimally-selective” status, with regard to its undergraduate admissions. It is in Senate members’ best interests that we become a fully-selective campus and there are reasons to believe that this could be realized soon: competition for admission is increasing across the UC system in response to reduced enrolment targets; the new Entitled-to-Review (ETR) admission pathway will replace the sharp eligibility cut-off with a broader band of applications, within which we will select on the basis of achievement in the context of opportunity; and our move to comprehensive review of applicants’ files that will be necessary for ETR is about to be accelerated by a systemwide introduction of shared review. In the UC system, the Academic Senates determine and evaluate the local criteria for admission and the process of comprehensive review. As long as Riverside was a non-selective campus, this component of shared governance was almost moot and our Senate did not need to develop the habits of assertive and proactive engagement in the admissions process that characterize our sibling campuses.

2) UCR is the only UC campus that has representation on the systemwide Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) but does not have a dedicated Admissions Committee, Board, or Subcommittee. This is a disadvantage with regard to the depth of experience and local analysis that our Division can bring to the Board’s deliberations.

3) It is not enough that Undergraduate Council continue to review systemwide proposals and respond to requests to clarify and modify our admissions criteria. We need more time for systematic monitoring of admissions trends here and at the institutions with which we compete for students. This level of activity is not sustainable in those periods when Undergraduate Council is requested to consider matters unrelated to admissions; recent examples include general education requirements and undergraduate advising. These matters of educational policy and student life are typically also handled by the Committees on Educational Policy and Preparatory Education. A duplication of effort results, sometimes leading to the need for joint meetings of the Council and the Preparatory Education committees or their Chairs. The BOARS representative is Chair of Undergraduate Council and an ex-officio member of the Preparatory Education Committee; thus, information flows more efficiently between those committees, but it also means that the BOARS
representative can vote twice on the same issues. Matters of educational policy and student life come to Undergraduate Council as a result of addition 8.23.2.3 to Council’s mandate. We propose to remove that item and signal the return to the committee’s primary purpose by changing its name. We believe it is better that committees develop expertise in well-defined and separate areas.

4) In the past 4 years or longer, no business connected with the Athletic Department has come before the Undergraduate Council. There is a Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) outside of the Undergraduate Council who serves as liaison between the Division and the Athletic Director. Such activities would be a duplication of the charge to the FAR and/or the special review committee which review the student petitions from the Athletic Department for admission. Therefore, we are proposing deleting 8.23.2.2.

5) Experience on sibling campuses suggests that a dedicated Admissions Committee will successfully attract the active participation of Senate members with research expertise in K-12 education, academic testing, and college admissions practices. The committee work is not a distraction from their research.

6) The change from Undergraduate Council to Admissions Committee was part of the broader restructuring proposed last year for the Academic Senate committees. Although that proposal was not adopted as a whole, some of its parts had considerable merit and can be implemented individually. Transforming Undergraduate Council into a dedicated Admissions Committee is one such change.

7) For several years, and with the approval of the Council, it has been the practice of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs to delegate Undergraduate Council attendance to the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management. We propose to formalize this recognition of the committee’s primary focus. The committee is pleased to record that we benefit considerably from the active participation of the Assistant Vice Chancellor and the Admissions Director, who we invite as a guest consultant to all meetings. The Vice Chancellor is a welcome occasional guest. This pattern of members, ex-officio members, guest consultants, and non-voting student delegates reflects the BOARS structure.

Approved by Undergraduate Council: April 15, 2009

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: April 23, 2009

Endorsed by the Executive Council:
Berkeley Retirement Incentive Program

This memo supercedes the Council of Deans memo of 4 November.

Appointments as Professor of the Graduate School (PGS)

Retiring faculty who are fully engaged in research and who continue to contribute with distinction to the graduate program may be nominated for appointment.

Eligibility and Duties
- Faculty retiring in academic year 2003-04 may be nominated for an initial appointment of up to three years. Otherwise, appointments are for one year, renewable.
- Nominating deans and chairs should identify appropriate duties for each individual nominated. These include dissertation supervision, participation on orals committee, regular participation in graduate seminars, performance of administrative service.
- Continuation of the privileges of the title requires residence for the equivalent of one semester during any academic year. The title and any privileges will be discontinued if the residency requirement is not met.

Privileges
- Access to departmental support services extended to regular faculty.
- Identification in the campus catalogue and elsewhere as “Professor of the Graduate School” instead of “emeritus/a.”
- Authority to seek outside grants and serve as PI are the same for PGS as for regular faculty.
- In exceptional cases the Chancellor, upon the recommendation of the Dean, may allow a retiring faculty member holding an endowed chair to retain all or part of the income of the chair for the length of the initial PGS appointment or the end of the term of the chair, whichever comes first. Chair income may only be used for research expenses and the support of graduate students. It may not be used to provide summer compensation or any other form of income supplementation.
- PGS are considered to be “recalled” and have the departmental voting privileges of Emeriti/ae as established under Senate By-Law 55.D (3)

Criteria for PGS Appointment

Nominations for PGS appointment must be made by the department chair, accompanied by an affirmative departmental vote. The chair’s nomination letter should describe the departmental value of the appointment and the nominee’s expected duties and activities.
The nominations are reviewed by the relevant Dean and the Academic Senate’s Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations. Appointments are approved by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare.

**Recall Teaching Agreements.**

Arrangements to recall retiring faculty for teaching purposes may be made before the retirement date with faculty aged 60 and above. Multi-year agreements will not be considered binding, although an intention to recall for up to three years may be expressed. Recall appointments must be made annually, and must be based on programmatic need, budgetary capacity, and continued successful performance of duties.

The agreement must specify the course(s) to be taught and the rate of compensation. Compensation for recall teaching assignments is by agreement. In establishing the compensation for recall teaching, chairs and deans should be guided by the nature of the teaching assignment, the alternative cost of providing instruction, and the available financial resources.

Recall assignments may not commence until 90 days after retirement. However, if there is a compelling need for an earlier recall, the effective date of the recall must be at least 30 days after retirement or upon receipt of the first retirement check—whichever is later.

**Financial Incentive.**

For each faculty member who retires in 2003-2004, deans will be credited with $15,000 to be used in a manner agreed to with the retiree. Retirees need not be appointed as PGS to be eligible for this support, but they must be in residence and may not take other academic employment. The options include:

- A research grant, primarily to hire research assistants and otherwise support graduate students. PGS who continue to hold endowed chairs may use these funds only to provide fellowship support to graduate students.
- Financial support of recall teaching appointments.
- Renovation of offices or other physical facilities appropriate to the transition from regular to emeritus/a or PGS status.
- A combination of the above.

Department chairs may discuss these arrangements, but approval for the use of funds will be made by the relevant dean.

**Space**

All issues of office and laboratory space must be arranged by the dean and/or chair. In doing so, the campus guidelines for emeriti/ae offices (available at: [http://smcp.vcbf.berkeley.edu/policies/emeriti.htm](http://smcp.vcbf.berkeley.edu/policies/emeriti.htm)) should be followed.
SENATE ADMINISTERED AWARDS

I. DISTINGUISHED CAMPUS SERVICE AWARD
Purpose: To recognize exceptional effort and achievement in Campus service by a UCR faculty member.
A. Academic Qualification: Ladder-rank UCR Faculty member
B. Funded by: EVC/Provost
C. Selected by: Academic Senate Committee on Distinguished Campus Service
D. Presented by: Chancellor
E. Compensation: $5,000 upon receipt of award
F. Number of annual awards: Maximum of 2 per year

II. DISTINGUISHED TEACHING AWARD
Purpose: To recognize exceptional effort and achievement in teaching by a UCR Faculty member.
A. Academic Qualification: Ladder-rank UCR Faculty member
B. Funded by: EVC/Provost
C. Selected by: Academic Senate Committee on Distinguished Teaching
D. Presented by: Chancellor
E. Compensation: $5,000 upon receipt of award
F. Number of annual awards: Maximum of 2 per year

III. FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURER AWARD
Purpose: To recognize superior achievement in research
A. Academic Qualification: Highly ranked UCR Faculty member
B. Funded by: EVC/Provost
C. Selected by: Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer
D. Presented by: Chancellor
E. Compensation: $7,500 upon receipt of award
F. Number of annual awards: 1 per year

IV. CHANCELLOR’S AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH
Purpose: To (1) provide recognition to both students and faculty who have distinguished themselves through their excellence in and contribution to undergraduate research, and (2) encourage others to become involved in undergraduate research efforts.
A. Academic Qualification: Ladder-rank UCR Faculty member
B. Awarded change to Funded by: EVC/Provost
C. Selected by: Academic Senate Committee on Scholarships & Honors
D. Presented by: Chancellor
E. Compensation: $3,000 for faculty recipients and $500 for student recipients
F. Number of annual awards: Maximum of 4 per year (2 faculty and 2 student)
V. INNOVATIVE TEACHING AWARD

Purpose: To recognize exceptional effort and achievement in teaching innovation by a UCR faculty member.

a. Academic Qualification: Ladder-rank UCR faculty member
b. Awarded by: EVCP
c. Selected by: UCR Academy of Distinguished Teachers
d. Presented by: Chancellor
e. Compensation: $5,000 funded by EVCP funds
f. Number of annual awards: Maximum of two

VI. UNIVERSITY SCHOLAR AWARD

Purpose: To recognize early career tenured faculty of outstanding merit currently at UCR with title and research support for 3 years

A. Academic Qualification: At least Associate Professor; must show strong evidence of exciting and highly visible research program; may be used for retentions risks meeting qualification
B. Selected and Awarded by: EVCP
C. Nominated by: Deans with consultation from faculty at large, and Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
D. Duration: 3 years
E. Compensation: $25,000 per year in research support funded by Chancellor’s discretionary funds
F. Number of title holders: maximum of six
ACADEMY OF DISTINGUISHED TEACHERS

Selection Guidelines

1. Purposes of the Academy
   - To honor and reward excellence in teaching
   - To enhance teaching effectiveness, both at the undergraduate and graduate level
   - To create a central core of teachers who can serve as a resource and an inspiration to other teachers
   - To select a body of faculty who can promote a sense of community among teachers, foster research on effective college teaching and learning, and advise the institution on teaching policies and practices

2. Size of the Academy
   - The ultimate size of the Academy is limited to 5% of tenured faculty
   - Five members will be chosen each year
   - Academy members remain in the Academy for the duration of their stay at UCR.

3. Rewards of Membership
   - Following election to the Academy, each faculty member will receive, effective the next academic year, an overscale award of $5,000 that will remain as part of their salary while they are serving their 5-year term as Active members of the Academy
   - Each Academy member whether active or non-active, will be designated a UCR Distinguished Teaching Professor, which will entitle the holder to use this title on university stationery
   - On retirement, faculty members will be designated a Distinguished Teaching Professor Emeritus
   - If a faculty member is teaching a full load of 4.5/5 courses per year, one course relief will be granted and the college/school will be compensated for the 5 year period

4. Role of the Academy
   - The Academy will serve as an advisory group to the Provost on teaching excellence and will provide institutional leadership and guidance for the distinctive undergraduate experience available in our research university environment
   - Academy members might fulfill these broad roles in various ways, such as serving as teaching mentors for new faculty or organizing and taking part in seminars, colloquia, and workshops on teaching excellence

5. Selection of Academy Members
   - The Academy recognizes and honors tenured faculty members at UCR who have made sustained and significant contributions to education, particularly at the undergraduate level, within the context of their responsibilities as a full-time faculty member. A minimum requirement for selection is having received the equivalent of the UCR Senate Distinguished Teaching Award.
   - The Deans of the respective schools and colleges at UCR make nominations for the Academy. They are expected to consult broadly with faculty and students within their respective units. Current members of the Academy may also submit at-large nominations.
   - Selection will be made by a campus committee nominated by the EVC in consultation with the Academic Senate Committee on Committees. The members of the Selection Committee will be the inaugural members of the Academy.
Other Awards:

**President's Chair is an award made by the EVCP**
These awards are administered through APO and the funding, provided by Office of the President, is managed by AP&B. The number of appointments, length of appointment and amount of annual research funding has been variable over the years, but generally the award is for 3 years and carries an award of $25,000 in research funding each year. There have not been any renewals to my knowledge.

**The Chancellor's Chair is an award made by the EVCP**
These awards are administered through APO and the funding is managed by AP&B. It doesn't replace an endowed chair, it is a quasi-endowed chair. Beginning in 2008-2009 there should be a maximum of 4, each with a 3-year term and an award of $25,000 in research funding for each of those years. There has only been one extension to my knowledge.