

## **Appendix II**

### **Executive Summaries of Signature Initiatives Plans**



## **Institute for Genome Sciences & Policy Executive Summary**

The Duke Institute for Genome Sciences & Policy (IGSP) was established with the explicit understanding that scientific advances in genetics and genomics require more than just exceptional science carried out within the confines of traditional disciplines; it requires exploration and scholarship carried out at the intersection of traditional disciplines in the life sciences, social sciences and engineering, embedded in a thorough discussion of the relevant social, political, ethical, legal and public policy issues. Launched as a direct result of the previous strategic planning process, the IGSP has become a multi- and interdisciplinary network of centers, research programs, and educational activities that together reflect an integrated, campus-wide approach to advancing aspects of the Genome Revolution and to addressing its implications for science, health and society. The creation of the IGSP represented Duke's recognition of the need to build bridges among researchers, clinicians, policy experts, and scholars based in virtually all of Duke's schools and to ensure that the next generation of scholars are trained across the range of experimental, quantitative and social disciplines needed to successfully address the challenges represented by the Genome Revolution.

Our overall goal is to achieve national prominence as the leading academic institute that addresses in a balanced, interdisciplinary and integrated manner both genome discovery and the translation of those discoveries into useful advances for society.

Our strategy is to define focused areas of strength where we can blend our interdisciplinary efforts in both the genome sciences and genome policy and to partner in a truly meaningful way with various schools and departments from across the Duke campus in order to establish areas of real leadership in research, translation, and education.

Several major themes and opportunities emerged from the Institute's strategic planning process, which will guide the development of Institute initiatives during the next five years.

### **Building Distinction: "Ask Big."**

The hallmark of the genomics era in science is the ability to address significant questions in biology and medicine in a comprehensive, high-throughput and data-intensive manner – put simply, to "Ask Big."

In the next five years, the IGSP will focus on a number of major, potentially transforming interdisciplinary programs that involve significant partnerships with multiple groups across the University and the Health System, will attract the attention and passion of a broad cross-section of faculty and students, and will build on the strengths and synergies of both genome science and policy at Duke. For each of these programs, fully resonant with the broader strategic themes of the University, the IGSP has the potential to be seen as *the* place of leadership nationally.

- *Genomic medicine and its effective translation into clinical practice*

This signature program includes scientists, engineers, clinicians and nurses at the medical center, but also faculty with expertise in health economics, health policy, statistics, decision-making, intellectual property, sociology, technology and information science. This personalized medicine program presents major opportunities for collaboration with the new Duke Global Health Institute and with the new Duke-NUS Medical School in Singapore.

- *Genetic variation and its implications for speciation, human origins and the concept of race*

This “Ask Big” project involves faculty in biology, biological anthropology, the Duke Lemur Center, and the medical center, but will also engage those in history, sociology, philosophy, the Franklin Center and the humanities. There is no better – or bigger – example of an issue that transcends science and society today.

- *Gene-environment interactions and their impact on behavior, health and disease*

A gene-environment “Ask Big” program would build on a growing area of importance in the genome sciences and medicine and would engage faculty in the IGSP and those in psychology, biology, psychiatry, and the Nicholas School, as well as the planned Brain, Mind, Genes and Behavior Institute.

### **Expanding Undergraduate Opportunities**

Over the next five years, the IGSP will greatly expand opportunities for Duke undergraduates as part of our commitment to fully engage the next generation in the Genome Revolution, its scientific challenges and its societal implications.

In the formal curriculum, course offerings will be broadened across a wider range of topics and departments in order to engage groups of undergraduates across all divisions. This expanded curriculum should be coordinated in a way that is evident to departmental advisors and Directors of Undergraduate Studies and should explicitly offer courses in each of the areas of knowledge that comprise the Trinity College curriculum. The IGSP will develop an interdisciplinary certificate program in genome sciences and policy and will make efforts to better define genome science pathways under Program II.

The IGSP will also greatly expand its opportunities for undergraduate research by working with faculty to more closely integrate teaching and research. Where desirable, students will be encouraged to consider multiyear, integrated experiences that might, in the fullest implementation of such a plan, begin with research during the freshmen year, involve projects in multiple IGSP laboratories or groups to obtain broad exposure to different approaches and perspectives, and conclude with a Senior Honors thesis project.

### **Computational and Quantitative Science and Engineering**

There is a strong need to expand efforts in the IGSP related to the computational and quantitative sciences. This new interdisciplinary area creates an opportunity for Duke to assume a leading role nationally in computational biology and medicine, both at the level of faculty recruitment and at the level of an expanded Ph.D. Program in Computational Biology and Bioinformatics. We propose consideration of a campus-wide Section of Computational Biology, which might in time grow into a new department. Such a section would provide a suitable

environment for the academic development and mentoring of a cadre of new faculty in this area. With appropriate support and vision and because of Duke's history of cross-unit initiatives, Duke could establish itself as a leader in this emerging new discipline.

### **Integrated Interdisciplinary Space: “A Scene of Constant Combustion”**

At its best, interdisciplinary activities in research, teaching and service to society would take place in the same setting, creating what the Prologue to the University Strategic Plan calls “a scene of constant combustion.” Currently, however, the primary IGSP faculty are located in at least six different buildings on campus, which creates a challenge and a potential barrier to true interdisciplinary connections that bridge genome science and genome policy.

In the next five years, to remain competitive on the national scene with other institutions, we will need to expand substantially the amount of space allocated to IGSP programs and centers (currently 38,000 net square feet, about 3- to 6-fold less than competing genome institutes elsewhere). Our priority is to develop fully integrated, interdisciplinary space that will allow the policy and science arms of the IGSP -- including faculty and students at all levels from multiple schools -- to be located in the same physical space. The greatest opportunity for synergy requires that faculty and students from different disciplines be brought together on a regular basis; this will facilitate tackling “Ask Big” questions in a way that bridges experimental science, computational science and genome policy and thus addresses the scientific opportunities of this new era, as well as their implications and consequences for society across the full range of human reflection and inspiration.

### **Impact of the Genome Revolution on Society**

The Genome Revolution is not just about science anymore. Its reach encompasses the arts (music, studio and performance art, film), religion, internationalism, political science, public policy studies, women's studies, gender and sexuality, journalism and media studies.

Over the next five years, the IGSP will expand these efforts to translate the discoveries of the genome sciences to society at large, both locally and nationally; improve our ability to communicate the importance of advances in this field to members of the public at all levels; and educate the public about the science and consequences of the Genome Revolution. Further, we should expand our horizons internationally to include global outreach, to partner in both research and education with groups from around the globe in areas that provide compelling opportunities for improving welfare through application of knowledge at the intersection of genome science and policy.

### **Facilitating a Balance between Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Scholarship**

Finally, the IGSP plans to contribute to a “Duke-sized” vision to facilitate a balanced approach that will ensure a sustainable future for major interdisciplinary initiatives at Duke. We will work to identify and, where possible, eliminate barriers to hiring and retaining faculty whose own research and scholarship lies in the interdisciplinary space between departments or schools. We will work to develop sound fiscal policies and to secure a strong financial base for crosscutting institutes that lack traditional revenue streams, but that contribute to the missions of individual schools and of the University as a whole.



## **Social Science Research Institute Executive Summary**

The Social Science Research Institute (SSRI) grew out of Duke's preceding strategic plan, and this plan capitalizes on its growing momentum. SSRI distinguishes Duke from its peer institutions. SSRI offers an extent of resources not found at other interdisciplinary institutes. Its small size enables it to innovate quickly in response to need, to address the specific needs of a faculty and students, and to accomplish these goals in a supportive context that promotes interdisciplinary interactions and collaborations among all its members.

Only Duke's SSRI locates focused programs of research, methodological support and training, and proposal development services in a single place. SSRI alone offers scholars opportunities to convene with others of like interests yet different backgrounds to examine a topic in depth, offers these scholars on-site statistical consulting and training (as well as laboratory facilities and computing resources), and supports their efforts by assisting them in locating and securing external funds for the projects they seek to undertake as a result of their involvement in SSRI.

We will further develop our leadership role at the cutting edge of the social and behavioral sciences by innovating with new programs while developing and enhancing existing research facilities, training programs, and scholarship. SSRI and affiliated programs and initiatives will move into the forefront of the social and behavioral sciences at Duke, will integrate a series of programs in these interconnected disciplines, and will assist in securing Duke's place as a world leader in the social and behavioral sciences. The plan details six interrelated, yet discrete, components:

- A Center for Advanced Research, fostering interdisciplinary scholarship in the social and behavioral sciences at Duke and throughout academic and policy institutions.
- An Interdisciplinary Initiative in Social Science Statistics, working to advance knowledge across interdisciplinary boundaries by developing and adapting quantitative methods to test hypotheses and explore data structures and to train students and faculty in the use of these methods.
- A sequence of training experiences providing social and behavioral scientists with skills that represent the state of the science research capabilities.
- A summer Institute in Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models, bringing to Duke the best advanced graduate students and junior faculty from the social and behavioral sciences and fostering closer linkages between theory and empirical testing.
- A series of sponsored, peer-reviewed national and international conferences.
- An integrated set of research facilities.

We know of no other center that offers this comprehensive package of services to scholars in the social and behavioral sciences. This is the unique profile of SSRI across the country. We anticipate that SSRI's model will rapidly become one that other universities emulate.



## John Hope Franklin Humanities Institute Executive Summary

Based on input from faculty and department chairs, our advisory board, and our own observations and conclusions, the John Hope Franklin Humanities Institute has identified six strategic goals that will guide our development. These strategic goals are as follows:

- 1) Contribute to a productive **balance** between interdisciplinarity and disciplinarity.
- 2) Enhance FHI involvement in **curriculum** development and teaching innovation.
- 3) Continue to facilitate **arts/humanities** connections.
- 4) Support collaboration and community in the humanities through **information exchange**.
- 5) Develop engaged and visible **community engagement** initiatives.
- 6) Enhance the FHI's role as a **leading organization** in its field.

To build tangibly on these themes, our plan offers a series of proposed new initiatives and programs, including: the development of **postdoctoral teaching fellowships** in exchange for the loss of faculty members to the FHI seminar; **interdisciplinary faculty positions; additional external fellowships**; programs designed to **contribute to arts/humanities** linkages at Duke; the development of **community engagement programs** keyed to successful existing program frameworks; the creation of new **communications and community building** mechanisms for the humanities at Duke; and the development of a **national leadership role** in the humanities through greater involvement in organizations such as the Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes (CHCI).

Our approach to the challenges posed in our planning mandate assumes that we will maintain a baseline set of programs such as our major lectures, Franklin Seminar, dissertation working groups, Duke Press partnership, and serial programs such as the highly successful *Wednesdays at the Center*. In keeping with our founding principles and mission, we will continue to pursue programs that highlight the study of race and inequity in historical and global perspectives.

Indications of the FHI's uniqueness on the Duke campus are pervasive in our plan: the FHI's function is a crosscutting one, and our operative metaphor is that of a research laboratory for the humanities, whose resources and programs are intended to benefit the largest possible range of constituencies. As such, our planning has focused on the creation of robust programmatic structures designed to support, but be somewhat independent of, specific intellectual themes.

To reflect the cross-cutting, interdisciplinary nature of the FHI's mission, the content of this plan was developed with extensive input from the FHI's Advisory Board and humanities department chairs, to whom we owe a great deal of gratitude for their time, energy, and collaborative spirit.



# Kenan Institute for Ethics

## Executive Summary

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Kenan Institute for Ethics (KIE) is uniquely positioned to lead Duke's efforts to aim high by making ethics a cornerstone. KIE has already had a significant impact both at Duke and beyond as an ethics "think and do tank" and has served the university in many ways as a consultant, facilitator, and convener for ethics-related activities across the curriculum and in campus life. More recently, in accordance with its 2003 Strategic Plan, KIE has strengthened faculty engagement in its work and has begun developing a scholarly research agenda, launching three interdisciplinary research initiatives on "good and evil," "debating moral education," and "changing institutional cultures," the first two of which are nearing completion as edited volumes. We have also expanded our efforts to promote ethics across the Duke curriculum and in our business and K-12 initiatives. This Strategic Plan seeks to take the Institute to a new level by focusing on four goals:

#### **Goal #1: Leadership**

- To make Duke a national model by leading an integrated, university-wide initiative to promote ethics in research, teaching, and practice.

#### **Goal #2: Research & Scholarship**

- To make the Kenan Institute for Ethics an internationally recognized center for innovative, interdisciplinary research in three areas: organizational ethics, moral education & development, and civic & global ethics, with particular emphasis on scholarship that bridges theory and practical application.

#### **Goal #3: Teaching & Practice**

- To shape an institutional culture at Duke that promotes ethical reflection, deliberation, and commitment through expanded opportunities across the curriculum and in campus life.
- To develop and provide innovative resources for promoting ethics in K-12, higher education, and business.

#### **Goal #4: Evaluation**

- To develop approaches to evaluating and improving ethics teaching and practice that set clear benchmarks grounded in research while respecting the complexity of moral development, organizational change, and civic engagement.

In the course of our strategic planning process, we have identified three key strategic opportunities that the Institute must seize in order to reach these goals. The Institute must (1) establish a focused intellectual agenda, (2) develop a strategic effort to infuse ethics into campus life, and (3) formalize its university-wide leadership role in service to ethics at Duke. The strategies to achieve these goals are presented in detail in the plan.



## **Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions Executive Summary**

The Nicholas Institute launched in September of 2005 with the intent of becoming a unique and distinct “honest broker” in the often divisive debates that characterize environmental policy. With the foundation of a generous gift pledged by Boston Scientific Chairman and Duke alumni Peter and Ginny Nicholas, the Institute’s objective is to become an institution that, in Mr. Nicholas’ words, “take[s] all that Duke does and do some social good.” Or, as President Richard Brodhead envisioned it, “...the Nicholas Institute will excel at these gifts of community building, communities of understanding, communities of problem solving, and communities of possibility creation.”

The Nicholas Institute’s creation comes in a time of great need for such an institution. The environmental policy dialogue in the United States has become paralyzed and polarized, with most participants perceived to be aligned with one political party or the other. Given the centrality of the United States to many environmental problems, this paralysis has spilled over into the international sphere as well. Unfortunately, this phenomenon has prevented progress on some critical needs to shift environmentally unsustainable practices through public and private sector action. The entry of a credible third party institution into these discussions – one not perceived to carry its own political agenda – can help catalyze progress on environmental problems in ways that work toward a consensus or a common understanding of the problems and thereby reduce unproductive debate. Duke, with the Nicholas Institute as a central player, has the reputation and credibility to play the role of honest broker.

Duke can credibly claim to have as much environmental expertise on its campus as any other University. In the Nicholas School, Duke has one of the preeminent professional schools in environmental science and policy, and a core faculty enthusiastic about policy-relevant research that draws on interdisciplinary cooperation across campus. Complementary faculty expertise exists throughout campus – in the law school, Fuqua School of Business, Sanford Institute of Public Policy, medical school, Pratt School of Engineering, and Trinity College of Arts and Sciences– that can be harnessed to tackle the complex problems confronting developing and developed countries alike as they struggle to make sustainable use of natural resources for current and future generations. As a major research university, Duke also has the ability to access expertise outside of Duke’s faculty in order to incorporate the greatest range of insights into Institute work.

In the short-term, the Institute will inject the knowledge and capabilities of Duke University into selected environmental policy debates. The nation is on the cusp of significant debates in areas such as oceans policy, climate policy, issues of national security and oil, and water – areas in which Duke has considerable expertise amongst its faculty. The Institute will bring Duke into those debates by partnering with existing players that will provide access and context for Duke’s expertise. For example, the Institute: (1) will host a CEO-level dialogue on climate policy, hosted by the incoming chairman of the utility trade organization, (2) has collaborated with the Joint Oceans Commission Initiative, a joint campaign by the heads of the U.S. Commission on Oceans

Policy and the Pew Oceans Commission, to assist in the assessment of ecosystem-based reform in federal oceans law; and (3) will convene experts in oil and national security issues to look at how internal structuring of energy business and politics in supplier nations affects U.S. energy security and the global energy market..

At the same time that the Institute is working on today's current debates, it also will take a longer view of the problems to analyze how to reshape those debates and facilitate resolution. There are many trends facing the world now that are not on a sustainable path, and where people and institutions may soon bump up against resource constraints, be they water or energy or habitat. The Institute will seek to reframe these questions in a way that makes decision-makers understand the inevitable need to address them, and shows ways forward that fit within the evolution of our economy and society.

Having identified Duke's strength in environmental questions, and the vacant niche that the Institute can fill, the question becomes how best to organize the Institute's ongoing efforts. To do this, the Institute must address three main challenges:

- 1) to produce timely applied work product that is of a quality consistent with Duke's world-class reputation;
- 2) to communicate the work product, once produced, to appropriate decision-makers and opinion leaders; and
- 3) to act with the deepest scientific and ethical integrity to ensure that the Institute's credibility cannot be impugned.

The Institute's work product must have the credibility that comes from an academic process, yet be produced on a schedule that comports with the decision making cycles of government, industry and other institutions. To do so, the Institute must draw on faculty, but not rely exclusively on them, as they typically have conflicting preexisting duties. Instead, the Institute intends to hire a core group of professional staff, whose experience and knowledge places them as peers to faculty, but whose focus will be to pull together interdisciplinary teams to provide relevant research and analysis for decision makers in the public and private sectors. These core staff will coordinate projects that bring in faculty (using devices such as faculty time buyouts, faculty consulting fees, funding for doctoral and postdoctoral students, visiting faculty appointments, and fellowships) but remain focused themselves on the delivery of the work product on schedule to meet the needs of decision makers. The Institute already has begun to build this capability in key areas identified as ones in which the Institute can make a contribution. Institute staff are on board to work on global warming, energy, the economic analysis of policy options, and oceans and coastal policy, and recruitment is underway to hire staff in water policy and North Carolina initiatives. The staff is likely to expand into other substantive areas as the Institute grows, based on an assessment of a clear opportunity and the capabilities of Duke to make a contribution.

The Institute's ability to access the relevant decision-makers will evolve from leveraging established relationships. The Institute's leaders, all of whom possess significant policy experience, have already brought some of these relationships to bear on

Institute business already, and the Institute will continue to use this network as effectively as possible to further establish its reputation in environmental policy circles. The Institute board, which includes the CEO's of major corporations, nonprofit organizations, and foundations, will help gain access to audiences who can effect change. In addition, the Institute would seek to use the powerful networks of the Nicholas School and Duke to buttress the efforts of its Board and staff. Finally, it is essential that the Institute open an office in Washington, D.C., the location of many of the environmental debates with which the Institute will concern itself, so that it can build and maintain relationships with the ever-shifting array of the nation's policymakers. The Institute plans to launch its D.C. office in November of 2006, coincident with its second board meeting.

Finally, the Institute must not erode its credibility as it involves itself in the environmental policy dialogue. This credibility can be undermined by subpar work or through compromising the integrity (real or perceived) of the Institute's work by virtue of its funding source or a pre-conceived agenda. The Nicholas gift has already provided a generous foundation for financial independence, but the Institute must raise further funds to ensure continuing independence over time. Thus, significant efforts aimed at expanding and securing the Institute's financial base must occur over the next few years.



## **Creation of the Sanford School of Public Policy Executive Summary**

The provost on March 2, 2005, charged a 20-person task force with considering “whether the moment is right, under appropriate conditions, to move toward the creation of a school of public policy.” The Task Force, at its final meeting on August 29, 2005, unanimously endorsed a 117-page report that recommended initiating the process of creating a school of public policy. Among the report’s findings was the judgment that the University’s goal of “advancing our ability to put our knowledge at the service of society” could be best met by authorizing the creation of a school. The Department of Public Policy Studies in the Sanford Institute on September 5, 2005, unanimously endorsed the Task Force recommendation, noting that Terry Sanford’s original goal in establishing the institute was to bridge the gap between the academy and the real world, to sponsor more policy-related research in the university, to improve the quality of decision-making in society, to educate people for public service and to make a difference in the world.

Following a year of discussions under the aegis of the provost, agreements were reached on how to implement the task force’s recommendations. The Academic Council (AC), on May 11, unanimously endorsed the Provost’s recommendation to go ahead (it being understood that the AC wanted the University to bring the issue back to the council before it gave its final approval), and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees unanimously endorsed the same recommendation on the following day. The Sanford Institute is confidently proceeding with the early stages of a \$65 million endowment initiative, with an initial target of \$40 million by June 30, 2009. Assuming that it reaches this target, it will return to the Academic Council and the Academic Committee of the Board of Trustees for formal endorsement of its desire to become a school.

The new School of Public Policy will serve as a concentrated home of interdisciplinary expertise, teaching, and research and will spearhead efforts to engage local, national, and international issues. It will provide synergies among Duke’s many schools, act as a conduit for the university’s interest in policy engagement, and serve as a portal for a number of university initiatives that seek to apply knowledge to real-world problems, to bridge the gap between the academy and the real world. The ambitions outlined in the task force report and subsequent planning find exact parallels in Duke’s strategic plan.

### **How the New School of Public Policy Plan Complements Duke University’s Strategic Plan**

**Goal 1: Increase the Capacity of Our Faculty to Develop and Communicate Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Knowledge:** With a major increase in the size of its faculty—from 21 current tenure-track faculty to 42—Sanford’s intellectual mission will be profoundly enhanced and its engagement mission fundamentally expanded. Sanford’s brand identity is innovation at fusing disciplines and addressing complex policy

questions, paired with active engagement in real-world policy issues, from the local level to the international level. Public policy scholars at Duke are deeply grounded in traditional research disciplines, yet focus their research on policy issues that cross disciplinary lines. New hires will add depth and breadth in areas in which the Sanford Institute excels and allow the new School of Public Policy to act entrepreneurially when opportunities arise, to build expertise in new areas, and to establish synergies with other schools at Duke in their efforts to put knowledge at the service of society.

**Goal 2: Strengthen the Engagement of the University in Real-World Issues:** Given the strength of the current public policy faculty, the quality of its instructional programs, the productivity of its research centers, and the extent of its research facilities, the added value that will come from investing in a School of Public Policy will make Duke a national and international leader in the field of public policy and enable the University to have a major impact on society. Environmental policy is just one area in which a small number of strategic faculty hires—perhaps through joint appointments with the Nicholas School of the Environment—will give Duke a full complement of experts to collaborate on how to design and implement relevant policies pertaining to global warming.

**Goal 3: Attract the Best Graduate Students and Make Them Full Partners in the Creation and Transmission of Knowledge:** The Sanford Institute's outstanding graduate programs will grow stronger. The new Ph.D. program will add an important student research dimension to the Sanford Institute's activities, while the enhanced MPP program will respond to the nation's need for qualified policy analysts who are interested in and willing to dedicate their lives to public service. With increased support for the Program in International Development Policy, the Geneva Program on Global Policy and Governance, and other international programs (such as a new policy institute in India) currently under consideration, the new School of Public Policy could become the most important international policy school in the United States. New endowment for fellowships will make the school even more attractive to the brightest graduates from top schools.

**Goal 4: Foster in Undergraduate Students a Passion for Learning and a Commitment to Making a Difference in the World:** With increased resources, what is arguably the best undergraduate program in public policy studies in the country will be significantly enhanced. A larger faculty will enable closer mentoring of research, while increased scholarship support will buttress the program's strengths, including a required internship that is unique among Duke undergraduate programs. The Hart Leadership Program will be able to better facilitate the policy engagement of its students, expanding the ethically grounded service learning it offers to all Duke undergraduates regardless of major, and enhancing their capacities to become leaders. Undergraduate teaching will continue to be a high priority in the new school, and the synergies among the undergraduate, master's, and PhD programs will benefit all of Sanford's teaching programs.

## **Why a New School Now?**

**Timeliness:** With the advent of the university's new strategic plan, the time is right for the creation of a new school that will build on existing strengths and be a powerful statement of the University's commitment to the goal of putting knowledge at the service of society.

**Resources:** The case for becoming a school is based on three key financial assumptions: 1) Public Policy Studies is currently supported by substantial resources, and these existing resources will be available to a new school; 2) A school of public policy, like other schools, will receive a portion of the University's unassigned income as determined by the Provost to help support its direct and indirect costs, and this would supplement current resources; and 3) Substantial fundraising will provide the resources necessary to achieve the task force's vision for the new school.

**Leadership and fundraising prospects:** The creation of a new public policy school at Duke should prove attractive to donors, particularly since it will build on an already well-established and successful program. The Director of the Sanford Institute is persuaded that there are enough prospects for raising a significant portion of the targeted sum in signed pledges by June 2009 and that the case for a school is sufficiently compelling that he is making it his most important priority to achieve that goal. With the strong support of the president and the provost, and with the endorsement of the Academic Council and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, he believes the goal is achievable.