



NEUROBIOLOGY GROUP
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY, 0357
FAX NUMBER: (619) 534-7309

9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0357

May 8, 2001

TO: MARSHA A. CHANDLER
SENIOR VICE CHANCELLOR-
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

RE: REPORT FROM THE TASK FORCE ON ENDOWED CHAIRS

The Task Force on Endowed Chairs was charged with the responsibility of reviewing current UCSD policies on endowed chairs and making recommendations for the future. We have met and considered a variety of items: past and present policies on endowed chairs at UCSD, policies at sister UC campuses (UCD, UCLA, UCSF), and issues raised by CAP both last year and the year before. We also met with the current Chair of CAP, Joel Dimsdale, and with the current Chair of CEP, John Goodkind, to solicit their comments firsthand. Here is our report.

The Task Force recognizes the important role of endowed chairs as an instrument for honoring extraordinary academic accomplishment and for recruiting and retaining the most distinguished scholars. To achieve these goals, it is essential that the process of selecting chair holders ensure the highest standards yet be timely and efficient. Current policy generally meets these goals well. The Task Force did, however, identify several potential problems and makes the following recommendations to address them.

1) Narrowly defined endowed chairs do not serve the best interests of the University. They prevent new research directions from being taken and may dangerously limit the candidate pool. Accordingly, the Task Force recommends that departmental chairs at the outset be informed about the guidelines for establishing endowed chairs, and that they work together with the donor and the Development Office to ensure that the proposed chair meets the criteria for subject, breadth, and flexibility. After review by the divisional dean, the proposed chair on the Main Campus should then be reviewed either by the Graduate Council in the case of chairs emphasizing scholarship or by CEP in the case of chairs emphasizing teaching. In the interests of efficiency and timeliness, the Task Force refrained from requiring both the Graduate Council and CEP to review each proposal and resisted a temptation to appoint yet another committee for this purpose. For the School of Medicine the appropriate body for review would be the Faculty Council. In all cases, the definition of the chair should meet the four criteria recently established for CEP reviews (Appendix 1). Periodic review of existing chairs (e.g. every 10-20 years) should also be

encouraged to permit some re-definition of selection criteria if necessary to accommodate changing academic directions.

2) It is essential to maintain the highest standards when filling endowed chairs, both to preserve the significance (and therefore utility) of such appointments and to avoid dissension within the faculty. The most logical instrument for this is review by CAP. The initial selection of candidates for the endowed chair should be carried out by the relevant department(s), in consultation with the corresponding dean. Review by CAP will then occur as part of the normal evaluation of the candidate. Thus, when the individual is either an external recruit or an internal candidate being reviewed for a major promotion, CAP can make use of the same ad hoc committee or act as its own ad hoc committee to review the individual's credentials simultaneously for the appointment/promotion and for the endowed chair. When an internal candidate is not being considered for a major promotion, CAP should be strongly encouraged to serve as its own ad hoc committee. It is our belief that these procedures will enable CAP to provide the essential evaluation and judgment while avoiding unnecessary delay and duplication.

3) The traditional definition of endowed chairs as lifetime appointments for tenured faculty excludes certain opportunities and fails to accommodate many University needs. Principal among these are endowed chairs for clinical/in-residence faculty, term chairs for recruitment of outstanding junior faculty, and administrative chairs. UCLA employs seven types of endowed chairs combining these features, and a recent UCSD CAP report independently distinguished six possibilities. The Task Force felt that, broadly defined, at least three kinds of endowed chairs should be encouraged: (i) the classical lifetime chair reserved for tenured faculty, (ii) a term chair (3-5 years) for which all Academic Senate members would be eligible whether or not they were tenure-track, and (iii) task-specific term chairs commonly associated with administrative appointments for the duration of the appointment. All endowed chairs would be required to conform to the articulated criteria for breadth and excellence.

Sincerely,

Darwin K. Berg
Task Force Chair & Professor
Neurobiology Section, Biology Div.