

VIRGINIA 2020 PRIORITIES
Report to the Board of Visitors
April 2002

This report covers the University's Virginia 2020 goals for the next five years. These goals derive from the VA 2020 planning initiatives and from related activities undertaken by various units of the University. It includes assessments of which VA 2020 goals are likeliest to be achieved in this time frame, and which, because of financial or political constraints, seem likeliest not to be achieved until later. A good bit of this material has come to you before. The appended financials have not come to you in this form, but they have come to you separately in reviews of the VA 2020 process. The prioritizations are largely new.

VA 2020 began in what were for the nation and for the University heady times. The economy was hot. Our capital campaign was in high gear: private donors were making remarkable commitments; the political climate, after the turbulence of the early 90's, was almost placid. The picture is different today, but not utterly different. The experts now disagree on whether or not the recession that began last spring has ended. Virginia's public revenue projections suggest that the next few years will be lean ones, although perhaps not as lean as the first $\frac{3}{4}$ of the 1990s. Our performance in raising money from private donors has never been better than in the months since the recession began, and December 2001 was (by a large proportion) our best month ever. Given enough time, lean years give way to more prosperous years. As the Board has recognized, this is not a time to admit defeat or to ignore planning. It is, however, a time to be strategic and smart.

The plans outlined in this report will advance programs critical to our mission, especially in the disciplines that are weakest within the University. In its 183 years, the University has experienced a remarkable continuity of purpose. In 2002, the mission is much as it was in 1819: to create knowledge to benefit humankind, and to educate students to be themselves intellectually free and capable citizens of free societies.

In a period of unprecedented declines in state tax support, the generosity of alumni and friends has enhanced our capacity to achieve the original vision of the University as the "bulwark of the human mind in this hemisphere." The simple arithmetic is this: the difference between the University with the benefits of the private generosity of the last decade and the University without these benefits is the strongest sustained performance achieved by any public university in our time. We became the nation's top-ranked public university in the worst year of the deepest cuts in tax support sustained by any major university in any

state. We have stayed at or near the top for some six years after other states restored their prior levels of support. The support of private individuals did far more than hold us harmless in the 1990s. That this support followed on the publication of academic plans that were in their time audacious is not accidental.

In the last ten years we have learned that, to achieve ambitious institutional goals, planning is not optional. We must plan for change, or the University might become time's plaything, acted upon but not participating in shaping its future.

Institutional planning is a fairly recent activity here. Between the publication of the University's first plan, Thomas Jefferson's path-breaking "Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia," also known as the "Rockfish Gap Report," and the Plan for the Year 2000 submitted to the Board in 1991, there were a couple of key planning efforts—(1) for the expansion of the University in the sixties, and (2) for the admission of women in the seventies. Subsequent to the Plan for the Year 2000, other strategies for the future were developed. These included the planning for the last capital campaign (1995), the SACS accreditation report of 1996/7, and VA 2020, which began in 1998 and continues. In addition, the state has required, but not acted in response to, various plans developed during the 1990s. One, a report on restructuring completed in 1994, became our rationale for successful efforts to persuade state government to decentralize various controls that had historically cost money without enhancing quality or essential soundness.

In several ways, the environment has changed. First, the University's relationship with the state has changed both functionally, as a result of decentralization (much now written into law), and financially, because some of the lost tax support from the state has been replaced by other monies, including endowments under the Board's control or the control of related foundations subject to the Board's oversight. Having become state-assisted instead of state-supported (some have described us as state-located), we have moved toward a greater level of self-sufficiency. Business practices here have become national models for similar universities. Alumni and friends, filling financial holes left by the state's pullback, became a significant source of financial support. With new kinds of institutional autonomy, with multiple financial partners, and with various revenue streams rerouted, the University finds itself in a better position to endure bad times and to direct change in good times.

Second, we must understand that the University's peers, with whom we compete for students, faculty, and resources, are advancing academic programs in substantial ways. We must do the same. Fixed at number 20 or 21 overall (privates and publics listed together) in the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings, we can now calculate the costs involved in advancing to the next tier. The Board

has received detailed information on these costs in the Baum and Rodgers report of 2000, and subsequent experience has begun to validate this information. But we need to look at our goals with steely realism, because tax-based support in Virginia is not getting better while various kinds of support (including state general fund support) elsewhere have grown and are growing. About one-third of the states have made cuts recently, although none so large as those embedded in the Virginia state budget adopted last week. Studying our playbook, other universities have announced their billion-plus-dollar capital campaigns. Some are succeeding; others seem not to be succeeding. None has our capacity to plan, then to put private dollars behind the plans, and then to achieve the promised results. This demonstrated capacity is our greatest asset in the current environment.

Third, with a growing demand for enrollment expansion and for programs that train students for a changing job market, the University needs to retool—both in services to students and in academic programs. What our culture wants from its flagship universities grows ever more complex, especially in the context of the emerging realization among state leaders that starving research is starving the public interest.

So we will change. If we take the course charted by the Virginia 2020 commissions, the University will advance by mastering opportunities, instead of by being mastered by social troubles. Active advancement is consistent with our founder's ambitious plans for the University and is necessary to its continuing vitality and educational relevance. But this advancement will cost money. Some funding will come from the state; much will need to come from private donors.

Even to achieve a less ambitious goal—say, to maintain our present position as a top public university, or, if financial conditions do not improve, to stay ranked in the *U.S. News and World Report* top 25—we would need to continue raising philanthropic money at rates well above the level achieved in the campaign, and to adopt many of the recommendations of the Virginia 2020 commissions. This is the essential finding in the Baum and Rodgers analysis. With wisely articulated programmatic and building plans for the future and philanthropic fundraising as our preferred strategy, we have a blueprint for advancement, and we have the possibilities detailed in these pages. What follows is an attempt to define these possibilities and determine what they cost and how we can realize them.

The Future in Broad Strokes

VA 2020 covers four areas that have not previously been subjects of institution-wide planning or sustained investment. In addition to VA 2020, each

academic school and the library have participated in Envision, a related planning program engaging faculty, key donors or University backers, and administrators. Headed by Mr. Block and Mr. Sweeney, this program has produced vision statements for the schools and for their roles within the institution. What emerges from these activities is a more comprehensive picture of our future intentions than we have had before. These sub-documents address both things that need to be preserved and those that need to be changed or added.

Next Steps for Implementing 2020 Projects

Fine and Performing Arts

- **Develop and endow a vigorous visiting artist program.**
- **Begin and (over the course of a decade) complete design and construction of four buildings within the Arts Grounds project, and obtain funding commitments for the remaining projects.**
- **Recruit and empower leaders to coordinate and connect program development, building planning, and fund raising and to build linkages between the arts, the University community, and other constituencies.**
- **Secure funds to raise the level of operations and maintenance support. This involves the number and deployment of faculty positions and specialties as well as support for new performance and creative activities.**
- **Develop communications and marketing vehicles to promote the fine and performing arts to a variety of audiences.**

These steps will raise the level and quality of support for existing programs and will capitalize on growing strength in the relevant technologies. These initial steps are crucial for building strong and vigorous programs that can achieve world-class excellence in the future. Within five years, these steps will allow us to make significant progress on building out the planned Arts Grounds; to enhance the academic program and arts community by bringing eminent performers and practitioners to the University; and to position fine and performing arts here among the world's leaders in applying technology in creation, performance, and scholarship. Personnel strategies and successes are critical. Without the right faculty leaders and deans, no amount of new money will solve the problems that exist within programs that have never seen adequate financial support or facilities.

- **Develop and endow a vigorous visiting artist program to bring eminent performers and practicing artists to the Grounds.**

This new program will bring together a collection of disconnected, under-financed programs and supplement them with thematic direction and strengthened resources to attract world-class talent to the Grounds. Arts programs within universities of our kind must generate excitement. No device works as well as bringing into the community an endless stream of distinguished artists and practitioners. Visiting artists (like the writers in residence who have contributed strength and stature to English and especially to Creative Writing)

will enrich the scholarly and educational program, and also enrich the larger community. Whether they are on Grounds for a few days, a few weeks, or even longer, distinguished guest artists bring fresh perspectives to departments and students through lectures, workshops, exhibits, and performances.

- **Begin and (over the course of a decade) complete design and construction of four buildings within the Arts Grounds project, and obtain funding commitments for the remaining projects.**

Our fine and performing arts programs are constrained primarily by the poor quality and short supply of space. (The quality of faculty is excellent, but our specialties are more generally in theory and history than in practice. Currently, we do not address the full range of specialties within these fields. We are especially understaffed in the practitioner occupations – sculptors, painters, musicians, dancers, etc.) Building the Arts Grounds is a necessary but not sufficient step in program development. The Arts Grounds design benefits from its modularity. That is, its buildings can be built as funds are available. It benefits also from the close proximity of the arts programs to one another, proximity that encourages collaboration and new and distinct contributions to the arts.

The overall plan for the Arts Grounds on Carr’s Hill includes:

- Fayerweather Hall renovation, to house Art History
- Architecture School expansion (*12,000 gsf*)
- New Studio Art building (*36,860 gsf*)
- New Arts Library, with café, (*63,000 gsf*)
- New Art Museum, with auditorium (*41,200 gsf*)
- New Music Building, with small recital hall (*55,000 gsf*)
- Drama Building expansion (*38,250 gsf*)
- New Performing Arts Center, with 1200-1500 seat concert hall (*110,220 gsf*)
- New Parking garage on north edge of Carr’s Hill Field

Feasibility studies and a landscape framework for all buildings have been done. The first project—Studio Art—is under design. The funding for this facility includes \$9 million in state general funds (currently in a bond bill) and \$3 million from the Ruffin Foundation. The bond bill includes another \$5.4 million for renovation of Fayerweather Hall. Working drawings for this project are complete. We now have a \$5 million pledge for the Music building. Donations to support two other buildings (the museum and the Drama addition) are in reasonably good shape. The Architecture project has an ongoing academic component. Faculty members are working in collaboration with local architects to design several small additions to the school. Finally, the University

Development Office has hired a senior major gift officer to lead fundraising for the remaining components of the Arts Grounds project. The team has recently submitted its 18-month plan aimed at producing funding for these projects.

- **Recruit and empower leaders to coordinate and connect program development, building planning, and fund raising and to build linkages between the arts, the University community, and other constituencies.**

Mr. Block will begin this work in Spring 2002 by appointing an advisory/coordinating committee on implementation of recommendations of the VA 2020 Commission on the Fine and Performing Arts.

- **Secure funds to raise the level of operations and maintenance support. This involves the number and deployment of faculty positions and specialties as well as support for new performance and creative activities.**

This is ongoing work, and it involves allocations from institutional general funds as well as requests for future state support.

- **Develop communications and marketing vehicles to promote the fine and performing arts to a variety of audiences.**

A staff writer in University Relations has begun to cover the arts. The assignment includes producing special publications (or inserts) on the arts and developing a formal marketing plan. To implement the plan and sustain current commitments, stable funding for this work will be identified and committed.

For Further Development

- Establish and endow a joint visiting artists' fund to be shared by the arts programs and the museum. This program could be expected to bring four to five artists/performers to Grounds for residencies of five days to one month and up to two longer-term residencies.
- Build technological capacity in the fine and performing arts departments and programs. The goal of this initiative is to create a world-class model of the application of emerging technologies to scholarship and learning in the arts. This concept resembles our successful and widely recognized integration of technology into the humanities. It is not science fiction. Rather, it is the platform necessary for contemporary practice in painting, sculpture, music, etc. A computer music laboratory has existed in Old

Cabell Hall for several years. This facility is one model for work to be done throughout the fine and performing arts departments.

Science and Technology

- **Generate endowment support for the Fund for Excellence in Science and Technology (FEST).**
- **Commission and fund program directors to formulate plans for implementation and building of excellence in the three focus areas: Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine, Nanotechnology, and Information Technology.**
- **Recruit 5-10 new faculty members per year to strengthen core science disciplines and contribute to the development of the three focus areas.**
- **Build a Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine building.**
- **Build a Nanotechnology building.**
- **Build an Information Technology building.**
- **Generate endowment support for research laboratories and graduate students.**

The essential strategy is to develop areas of excellence in research while simultaneously enriching the graduate and undergraduate learning experience. This strategy differs from strategies employed elsewhere and in different times in that the proposal is *not* to build strength department-by-department. Instead, we are building centers of excellence that cut across the historic discipline lines that separate departments. These initiatives are designed to capitalize on the University's existing strengths and emerging research opportunities rather than to build new departmental infrastructures. Because education and research are intimately linked, the proposed initiatives address current and future needs for expansion in those areas. The proposed multidisciplinary research and education buildings constitute efficient uses of resources, take advantage of our relatively small size, and move students and faculty toward common pursuits built on what we already do in their home departments.

- **Generate endowment support for the Fund for Excellence in Science and Technology (FEST) to support innovation in all scientific disciplines.**

Novel research ideas require cultivation in the form of start-up and bridge investments before they can hope to attract significant external funding. We have not previously had access to the kinds of capital that Ivy League and generously supported public research universities command. To help faculty members compete successfully for external funding, the University has taken a

proactive, entrepreneurial approach, providing seed monies (in the basic and applied sciences) for original ideas not yet ready for traditional extramural support. Although a relatively new departure for us, funding truly innovative research is a necessary step if the University is to sustain momentum in the sciences into the future.

The focus areas not only reflect scientific strengths within the University. They also reflect emerging research issues within the larger scientific community. Both of these values will change over time. The University must stimulate innovative research outside the boundaries of the focus areas. FEST is a competitive research fund available to all faculty. It includes a component dedicated to translating the results of research into the marketplace. Criteria include merit and feasibility of the research proposal, potential for the creation of an area of excellence, and potential for extramural funding and for the creation of intellectual property. The program has been in existence for more than a year and already is yielding returns. A recent example is FEST support of Thomas Skalak's program in biomedical engineering, which received a \$3.6 million NIH award, a 36:1 return on the University's investment.

Modeled after the NIH review system, FEST involves both fundraising and judicious planning within the framework of a stringent peer-review process. We have now invested \$1 million in FEST. Our goal is to raise \$20 million for endowment over five years so that we can invest approximately \$1 million per year in the small "Exploratory Grants" and larger "Excellence Grants" that comprise FEST.

- **Commission and fund program directors with responsibility for building excellence in the three focus areas, extending the reach of these programs beyond the College, the School of Medicine, and the School of Engineering and Applied Science.**

The focus areas (Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine [i.e., Biodifferentiation] and related disciplines), Nanotechnology, and Information Technology) were selected because in each we already have a core of strength and because these areas hold great promise for significant discoveries and technological development. The emphasis on these areas has already provoked interaction among the various schools, and has begun to attract world-class scientists and students to the University. Two working groups are developing plans for the Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine and Nanotechnology Institutes. A similar team will be involved in the planning process for Information Technology.

The Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine and Nanotechnology groups are working on interdisciplinary recruitments, space, and scientific planning with the goal of strengthening the traditional disciplines while accomplishing the goals of the Institutes. Recent events have included the hiring of Barry Gumbiner, who will begin this summer as Chair of Cell Biology and Director of the Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine Program. Similarly, the NSF-supported Center for Nanoscopic Design, directed by Robert Hull, was the precursor for the Nanotechnology initiative. Success in both of these ventures has required prioritization of goals and University-wide strategic planning.

Similar work will begin on Information Technology before the beginning of the fall semester. During the next year, the planning for program development will be completed. In the course of the next three years, three to five new hires in each area will be made, with planning under way for new capital projects to support these areas. Scientific research in the university setting is by nature collaborative and faculty-driven. Continuing faculty will have opportunities to collaborate with new faculty as they develop next phases in their own research programs. Deans will be charged with recruiting, retaining, and supporting faculty whose work will be focused on extramural funding, new jobs and intellectual property, and the quality of student involvement in faculty research projects.

Appendix A details funding requirements for these projects. Over five years, the projections include three part-time project directors (\$250,000/year); project planning funds (ca. \$150,000/area); capital planning funds (ca. \$3 million); and \$1.25 million in salary and benefits and \$11.25 million in start-up costs for 15 new faculty hires (5 full, 10 assistant). These expenditure levels are consistent with current spending on analogous projects.

- **Build a Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine building.**

The mission of the Institute is to study how cells and organisms acquire and maintain their characteristic form and function, to understand how this process goes awry in disease states, and to apply acquired knowledge to preserving human health. This is both basic and applied science. To accomplish this mission will require the expertise of researchers from multiple disciplines, departments, and schools. A new building of 125,000 square feet at an estimated cost of \$50 million will house existing faculty and fifty new faculty jointly appointed in the Institute and in one or more academic departments. Faculty recruitment will begin with 10 faculty in stem cell biology, morphogenesis, and tissue engineering. Fundraising for this building will require about five years.

- **Build a Nanotechnology building.**

We already have recognized faculty strength in nanotechnology. We have an excellent track record in building the multidisciplinary teams necessary for successful competition for major research awards. To increase our competitive edge and secure our leadership will require state-of-the-art research space for nanotechnology researchers who are now spread throughout the University. In addition to housing and sharing modern (and costly) new instrumentation, a dedicated nanotechnology building will provide for new partnerships with the biological sciences. A dedicated nanotechnology building will deliver a strong message to industrial partners about our resolve to be at the front line of discovery and applications in this field.

Over five years, we anticipate completing the nanotechnology building in Engineering, and establishing a new wing to house biological programs in nanotechnology. The cost estimate is 50,000 assignable square feet at \$31 million. If the current bond issue is approved in November, this initiative will be fully funded.

- **Build an IT building designed to bring together the University's IT-related science and technology initiatives.**

Several of the schools have proposals for new IT buildings pending. (The best known is probably the Digital Academical Village proposal that was advanced by the College, and then withdrawn.) The VA 2020 Commission on Science and Technology brought the schools together to plan a common IT building for multiple purposes, including teaching, bridge centers (combining technical expertise with non-technical faculty toward ground-breaking research), undergraduate and graduate research, and computer laboratories. This facility offers the prospect of reduced initial cost and a richer technological environment than the various school proposals did. The new building will support hands-on access to state-of-the-art technology with applications in various disciplines. The proposal gains economies of scale by combining similar projects. Bringing together faculty and students from many disciplines engaged in the creation and application of technology will itself generate benefits throughout the University. A new 30,000 net assignable square-foot building will house the IT Institute. Fundraising and planning will require five years.

- **Hire 5-10 new faculty members per year that strengthen core science disciplines and contribute to the development of the three focus areas.**

Several factors drive this initiative. First is the relatively small size of U.Va.'s basic science departments when compared with its peers or its aspirant group members. Second is a cohort of upcoming retirements in these departments and the high cost of replacing these faculty members. Third is the recognized need to grow enrollments in science and technology in light of the demand for scientifically educated graduates in the rapidly growing science and technology markets. Judicious faculty hiring can build these departments while also supporting the focus areas.

In the first three years, we will obtain funding for the initial cohort of replacement hires. In years four and five, we will begin new hiring consistent with the VA 2020 model, departmental priorities, and focus area plans. The primary benefits will involve growth in science enrollments/majors and research expenditures from external sources.

Normal turnover from retirements, the tenure process, and voluntary departures will make some 40 hires possible over the course of the next five years. One year's incremental costs above current expenditures in each of the five years will be ca. \$2 million in salary and benefits and \$5 million in start-up funds for ten replacement hires.

- **Generate endowment support for research laboratories to fund faculty start-up and equipment renewal costs.**

New faculty members and faculty members shifting from one kind of research to another require start-up funds until they secure external (generally Federal) grants to sustain their work. Research universities generally provide this funding from a central overhead recoveries pool, from a research endowment funded by intellectual property recoveries or other sources, or (in the case of Land Grant universities that receive state research appropriations under the matching provisions of the Hatch Amendment to the Land Grant College Act of 1865) from restricted state appropriations. We have never had funds of this kind—the historical explanation of our weakness in the areas of science addressed in VA 2020.

Start-up costs vary for several reasons—because some laboratory set-ups are more extensive than others are, because the need for support personnel varies from one research project to another, and for other reasons. Looking only at science faculty (research costs in the humanities or social sciences are not covered in this discussion or in VA 2020), current start-up allotments range from \$300,000 to \$2 million per faculty scientific researcher. Deans ration discretionary funds to create start-up packages. These funds are more generous in some disciplines than in others, and the wealthier discretionary funds are in

some instances held by deans who have no role in funding science. The Medical School, for example, uses a variation of the old “Dean’s Tax” model, which arguably works fairly well. The Darden and Law deans have relatively large discretionary funds that support executive education, summer research stipends, and various physical costs, but do not support science. The Engineering and College deans have smaller discretionary funds, and larger science expenses. Start-up funds often determine which of several job offers a young scientist accepts. They can determine which successful researchers stay and which leave for jobs elsewhere.

Ultimately, this initiative generates endowments for laboratories, much as endowments in the Darden and Law schools have endowed classrooms and other spaces, but the object is to endow work in labs rather than maintenance and future refurbishments. These endowments provide naming opportunities for donors.

In addition to laboratory start-up funds, there is a need to develop competitive recruitment packages for our top graduate students. Our science and engineering departments are finding it increasingly difficult to match the graduate student recruitment offers of leading private institutions. Endowment for graduate fellowships will place us in a strong position to attract the very best graduate talent.

International Activities

- **Establish 10 - 12 self-supporting University study-abroad programs led by University faculty.**
- **Establish the International Institute for American Studies.**
- **Build endowment for the Center for Global Health.**
- **Establish the Center for Southern Africa Regional Environmental Change.**
- **Build infrastructure to improve services for University students and faculty studying, teaching, and conducting research abroad and for international students and faculty members here, and to expand opportunities for study abroad.**

Work began last year on all of these objectives. By and large, international programs are profit centers for large universities. We have not realized these profits because previously few students have enrolled through the University for foreign study (instead, they have enrolled independently through other universities) and because we have not charged the customary fees to cover our expenses in what are ultimately enterprise or self-sustaining activities. In addition, our procedures for accepting credit earned abroad generally differ from the procedures in place at similar universities. Consequently, students who

study abroad often do not even try to bring their credits here. Many have simply accepted that foregoing or losing credit is the academic cost of studying abroad. The programs developed in the last year include strategies to remedy these problems.

- **Establish 10 - 12 self-supporting University study-abroad programs led by University faculty.**

Study abroad programs already exist in many places. Examples include our largest program, established 15 years ago by faculty members who had ties to the University of Valencia, a set of well-known Architecture programs in northern Italy and in Denmark, the alumni programs at Trinity College (Oxford) and in Paris, and the program in Jordan. New programs: Five summer programs led by University faculty (Shanghai, St. Petersburg, Lyon, Rabat, and South Africa) will be in place in summer 2002. In addition, a new semester-long program in London will be offered by University faculty in partnership with New York University, starting in fall 2002. These programs involve a physical presence (a base) in each place. The locations were chosen for their relevance to academic priorities here and their appeal to students and faculty. Each site will accommodate faculty exchanges, programs for alumni, and courses offered on both traditional (semester, summer) calendars and other calendars. Safety and reasonable amenities, including relationships with other American universities and with local universities, have been primary considerations in selecting the sites.

The new VA 2020 programs will eventually be self-supporting, but I have provided small sums from sundry gifts and the Harrison Trust to cover start-up and non-recurring costs. The most ambitious estimates, tracking experience in other top universities that sponsor their own study-abroad programs (Dartmouth, Indiana, Yale, etc.), project that as many as 30% of our students will study abroad in our sponsored programs after five years.

- **Establish the International Institute for American Studies**

This is Dean Ayers' project, but it builds on a number of well-established ventures. The Institute took shape before Mr. Ayers became Dean as part of the first phase of implementation of the VA 2020 International Studies recommendations. The goal is to make the University the leading international center for the scholarship and teaching of American studies – to draw foreign scholars and students to Charlottesville when they study America. The Institute wants to attract foreign scholars to use archival and other resources here. Our paper and digital holdings in American history and literature and the Harrison

Institute and Small Library have emerged as major assets in this effort. The larger goal is to establish funded collaborations with international colleagues and universities, thus enriching both education here and education abroad.

Conferences and exchanges of faculty and students are the customary means of building international awareness of programs of this kind. Our unique strengths in digital media, including the library's digital imprint series, make this effort more promising than similar efforts elsewhere.

The new institute is now scheduling its summer workshops. In late May 2002, an international advisory panel led by our faculty will meet to discuss themes to be addressed in future workshops and conferences.

- **Build endowment for the Center for Global Health**

The Center for Global Health was established in 2001 to foster and attract external funding for multidisciplinary research and training to address the "diseases of poverty," illnesses that are prevalent in much of the world and that require more than just a medical response. By bringing together scholars with backgrounds in education, medicine, administration, law, and politics, the Center supports an uncommonly broad set of responses to global health issues. Undergraduate students have been especially responsive to announcements of the first programs offered. These first programs have addressed geographic medical issues in South America and Africa.

The "Scholar Awards," of \$2,000 - \$5,000, are modeled on scholarships and student research grants now offered by the Jefferson Scholars Program and the Harrison Trust. Recipient students will work directly with faculty mentors. Shortly after the announcement of these scholarships in late 2001, nearly 100 students applied. The Center will eventually offer fellowships to allow established researchers from overseas to come here for research and training before returning to their home institutions.

- **Establish the Center for Southern Africa Regional Environmental Change**

Environmental Sciences has emerged as a leader in the study of global climate and environmental change in a regional context. Research in this area requires sophisticated monitoring and analytical technologies and on-the-ground knowledge, and it must be multi-disciplinary and multinational. In recent times, we have worked in Russia, Southeast Asia, and (the largest and most important of our VA 2020 environmental projects) in southern Africa. From sundry gifts, we have provided seed money pending receipt of external grants and fees to cover sustaining costs. Vice chancellors from four southern African universities

and relevant scientists will be here in May for an organizational meeting. Our students began working there last summer. This summer's student program will function in Zimbabwe and South Africa.

- **Build infrastructure to improve services for University students and faculty studying, teaching, and conducting research abroad and for international students and faculty members here, and to expand opportunities for study abroad.**

The position of Vice Provost for International Activities was created in summer 2000 to implement the VA 2020 commission recommendations on international programs. The office is staffed and functional. It has subsumed several functions formerly performed by scattered agencies throughout the University, and it has been especially active since September 11 in implementing new and emerging federal requirements for foreign nationals studying in American universities.

Public Service and Outreach

- **Provide a diverse and rich portfolio of educational opportunities for citizens of the Commonwealth and beyond.**
- **Use new technologies to deliver educational and programs to Virginia's citizens and to open access to the University's educational resources.**
- **Enable the School of Continuing and Professional Studies to better meet its educational mission by building a "public service" endowment for the school.**
- **Stabilize funding for Engaging the Mind, the University's first free, statewide outreach program offered to general public to encourage the life of the mind.**
- **Stabilize funding for programs that enrich the intellectual lives of K-12 teachers, both in training and in the classroom. Programs include those offered through the Center for the Liberal Arts, the Center for K-12 Outreach in Continuing and Professional Studies, the Curry School of Education, and other units throughout the University.**
- **Create or strengthen research groups or centers with strong public service missions focused on key issues facing the Commonwealth of Virginia.**

This discussion is brief because most of the foregoing summary points relate internally to the budget of the School of Continuing and Professional Education, which is, to a great extent, a self-sustaining enterprise function. Full detail is available to anyone who wants it.

The rationale for these initial steps is to articulate and strengthen the crucial relationship between outreach and the University's teaching and research activities. These steps define an agenda to match University strengths with Virginia's and the nation's needs. While individual and collective voluntary and scholarly service and outreach would continue unfettered, the University as a whole would stake a claim to specific topical areas to which it is uniquely positioned to respond.

- **Our overarching goal for public service is to provide a diverse and rich portfolio of educational opportunities for citizens of the Commonwealth and beyond.**

This initiative responds to U.Va.'s mission as a public university and its founder's bold ideas about expansive access to education. In its fullest expression, it will put education within the reach of more of this country's population, regardless of age, ethnicity, income, or location. Outreach programs will help the youngest among us to create the drive for higher education and help set them on an appropriate path toward that goal; with those of high-school and of traditional college-attending age outreach programs will ensure that race, geography, and income are not barriers to higher education; and, with adult learners, including alumni, these programs will ensure that quality programs are available to them on their terms.

We have made substantial progress in the first two years of centralized public service function: *Outreach Virginia*; Engaging the Mind; special interest publications, such as the Youth Outreach Directory; and increased coordination with University Relations, State Relations, and Community Relations. We have modestly expanded our infrastructure to support this centralized function, adding positions for a university outreach officer and outreach/research webmaster.

- **Create or strengthen research groups or centers with strong public service missions focused on key issues facing the Commonwealth of Virginia.**

We intend to make these areas the University's central service and outreach priorities. The Commonwealth faces challenges in areas such as transportation, K-12 education, rural health, environmental concerns, and aging, matters on which the University has substantial research strengths. The purpose of this initiative is to define as the University's public outreach agenda 4-5 areas that are responsive to current challenges facing the Commonwealth and that reflect current research strengths and to develop research/outreach centers whose purpose is to advance knowledge and disseminate it to the public.

Student Life

Ultimately, the University's chief commitments to student life are educational and cultural. We deploy and support programs of study and related activities, and we support a culture that is at once functional and educational. In this latter respect, the University may be said to differ from most peer institutions. The Honor System and the Judiciary System, which teach practical responsibility and provide structure for student life, differ fundamentally from discipline systems in other universities. Self-governance and responsibility for one's behavior are fundamental teaching devices here, and arguably they are unique.

On the other hand, curriculum has a more general meaning among universities. It involves required and optional courses conceived as supporting progress from the elementary or general levels of learning to more advanced and specialized learning. It assumes that faculty-student interactions are inherently beneficial, and it puts a premium on independent, inquiry- or research-based learning in which students move beyond courses or packaged learning toward making independent contributions to learning. And it assumes that command of subject matter and demonstrated competencies at the end of a course of studies will meet the most rigorous national or global standards of comparison. No single theme is more dominant in the discussion of how to establish our curriculum as a national leader than the determination to make independent student research or scholarship, pursued collaboratively with faculty mentors, the hallmark of our upper-division programs.

VA 2020 does not directly address either student life or the larger curriculum, but parallel enterprises have examined how students live on and around the Grounds and various aspects of athletics, especially varsity sports, and the deans are now in the first year of a two-year reassessment of undergraduate curricula. The curricular reports will come to the Board as they are completed. What follows is a summary of the report on student life and progress toward its recommendations.

Ms. Lampkin has worked with advisory groups of students, faculty, and others to define the following statements about the undergraduate student experience as it will change during the coming two decades.

- **If we are to produce educated citizens, we must rededicate ourselves to the University's core values.**
 1. Academic rigor

2. Honor
 3. Student self-governance
 4. Public service
- **To meet the challenges of external educational, cultural, and institutional change, we must address five values within our institutional culture.**
 1. Faculty-student interaction
 2. Diversity
 3. Internationalism
 4. Technology
 5. Community-building
 - **To meet goals in these regards, we will advance certain general initiatives, including:**
 1. The Virginia 2020 Student Experience Task Force, which made recommendations on the undergraduate experience, based on the work of the four 2020 academic planning commissions.
 2. The Honor Team, which is identifying ways to afford for all students a set of experiences in which they confront, question, and reflect on their own ethical foundations, values, and integrity.
 3. The Student Self-Governance Team, working to foster and promote student self-governance.
 4. The Student Enrollment Services Process Owners' Group, working to improve student services, including streamlining transactions and integrating functions.

Envision Sessions with the Deans

The first step beyond the VA 2020 model was some 13 meetings convened with the deans and faculty by Messrs. Block and Sweeney over a six-month period starting in September 2001. These University Envision sessions provided opportunities for each school to identify its defining characteristics, to elaborate a vision for the future, and to identify opportunities and barriers to success in achieving goals. These discussions were guided by an awareness of University-wide priorities (e.g., 2020 commission reports) and the changing economic climate of the Commonwealth and the country. That is, participants understood and accepted larger contexts for their local planning.

Although each school identified issues specific to its mission (e.g., clinical vs. basic research in Medicine), common themes emerged. Foremost among them was the power of the student experience on both the undergraduate and

graduate/professional levels, and the need to reinforce the primacy of the student experience in our mission.

Virtually every school professes that its educational system is the best, or among the best, in higher education. Most schools see their role in higher education in terms of developing leadership potential. These are not unusual assumptions when people address the future of enterprises to which they have committed their professional lives. Among flagship universities, especially those that are public, we are small. Faculty members are keenly aware that they have individual and personal responsibilities to educate students for leadership. Many see size (that is, larger future enrollments) as mitigating against success in this mission. Consistent with the Honor System and other core cultural values, each school has reexamined how it integrates ethics into its curriculum. Applied ethics in the conduct of government, business, and the professions appeared as an almost universal theme. All of these issues will eventually reappear in the second year of the ongoing review of undergraduate curricula.

Along the lines of student experience, another constant theme was our success in increasing diversity among our undergraduates and our less successful efforts in achieving the same with graduate students and faculty. Acknowledged was the vital importance of difference—in viewpoints, experiences, family backgrounds – in promoting creative thinking and deep learning. The kind of growth we seek to effect is not necessarily in the size of our community, but rather in its makeup. Challenging our ability to build a diverse community will be the availability of funds for scholarships and salaries.

The deans recognize that the University's size offers special opportunities for inter-school collaboration in various areas that are physically and intellectually contiguous to one another. We can foster these collaborations in programmatic and building plans, plans that start from the premise of the academical village.

Although the deans extol the virtues of small size, they also see a need to physically grow. Virtually all schools identified space for both research and teaching as their most critical need. Various plans for building projects should go a long way toward meeting the need for space. In growing, we will constantly keep in mind the need to plan for educational space that promotes collaborative learning and research.

Finally, there was a recurring theme about the University as a digital leader – encompassing the library and the schools and units. Each school wants to leverage the substantial reputation of our library system in digital studies. While digital technology is sometimes seen as an impersonal mode of learning, there are ways to exploit the digital capability for inclusiveness, to bring together

many people in far-flung areas in an intimate way, a way that might extend the academical village across the globe.

Projects Parallel to VA 2020: Current, ongoing initiatives and future plans

- **Enrollment**
- **Morven**
- **Refinancing Graduate Education**
- **Athletics**

Change is a constant in an institution that lives in historical time, but it sometimes occurs in ways that escape those who belong to the institution. In the 1960s, all of us knew that the University was growing. We expected massive changes to result from coeducation, “state u-ism,” and other forces perceived as contributing to enrollment growth. In truth, changes occurred, but few tracked the predictions. For all of the rough spots that Mr. Jefferson (and we who were students and active alumni during the 1960s) predicted in the system of student self-governance, the system survives and by most standards thrives. The fraternities did not collapse. Women and minority students have added depth and breadth, which is to say quality, to the work done here. And we have reached what many would describe as a high water mark.

Enrollment

In 1989, the Board accepted the proposition that calculated growth in the number of undergraduate students is inevitable and beneficial, and it targeted growth at the rate of ca. 100 new undergraduate students (not all first-year entering students). Subsequent Boards have rolled forward the plans adopted then. The basic assumptions continue to drive an increase of about 100 undergraduate students each year. By and large, we have met this target, and we can continue to meet it in the foreseeable future. Indeed, Virginia’s current problem is that the lack of investment in its colleges and universities is producing in this decade a recurrence of the unplanned enrollment surges that occurred in the last decade. State planners project that 39,000 more students will have to be accommodated throughout the system before 2010. The wild card in the deck is, as it has been since 1990, the financial one.

Planning for future enrollment centers on two issues. First, for academic and research programs, and also for the University’s identity, relatively small size has allowed us to promote intimate experiences and unique collaborative

activities for our students. People say that the University seems smaller than it is—a perception that all of our planning seeks to reinforce, not least because of Mr. Jefferson’s conviction that the institution ought to exist on a human scale. Growth has to be weighed against the prospect that it may diminish this advantage. Second, to ensure financial health, we must constantly assess who will pay for new students. Virginia has not provided full-cost funding for in-state students since the late 1980s. The net of tuition and the tax appropriation is only 87.8% of the cost of educating in-state undergraduate students, while the tuition charged to out-of-state students is 135.4% of cost. Out-of-state students contribute directly to the cost of educating in-state students. In that our total annual revenues from philanthropic sources now exceed the total state tax appropriation by a substantial factor, financial considerations must color every programmatic decision, including enrollment decisions. As we are able to analyze the budget actions of the recently concluded Session of the General Assembly, we will bring to you proposals related to the new financial environment in which we find ourselves in consequence of the state’s most recent financial crisis.

Morven

John W. Kluge’s extraordinary 7,379-acre gift of real estate, valued in excess of \$45 million, more than doubles the University’s land holdings. Located in southeastern Albemarle County, the properties comprise eleven farms and estates, including historic Morven Farm. Mr. Kluge’s remarkable gift provides an opportunity to extend Thomas Jefferson’s vision for public education beyond the Grounds. Morven Farm offers an ideal environment for the development of a new kind of academical village.

In January 2002, the University began long-term planning for use of Morven Farm to further the academic mission. Over the next several years, the University will mount a collaboration of faculty, students, administrators, and staff members to design a comprehensive plan for Morven Farm. The preliminary plans addressed four primary areas: environmental and landscape studies; performing and creative arts; international activities; and public service and outreach. These areas reflect academic priorities for the future as well as the physical and financial conditions of use at Morven, and they are consistent with VA 2020. Many of the fundamental objectives of VA 2020 (fine arts, environmental studies, etc.) fit uncommonly well at Morven.

Refinancing Graduate Education

The inadequacy of financial aid for graduate students working as graduate teaching/research assistants (GTAs) in the core graduate programs has been a matter of concern for many years. This issue does not involve students enrolled in first professional degree programs in Law, the Darden School, and Medicine, which operate within their own economies. So far, each school (or even department) has had to fend for itself to remedy the problem. Not all have succeeded. The reports underscore the pervasiveness of the problem, and the sense that it will be best addressed through joint effort. So the issue has now become a central University concern to be addressed in fundraising, in financial control systems for funded programs, and in requests for state support.

We provide three types of support to graduate students: tuition waivers (full or partial); stipends and other salary; and health insurance. We lack adequate funds to support all of the graduate assistants desired by the schools and departments, and our stipends are no longer competitive. Consequently:

- Some departments cannot attract top candidates;
- Some schools cannot grow as quickly as they would like;
- Some departments are splitting funding to support more students than the benchmark (1 faculty FTE:4 GTAs) assumes, causing overloads and reduced stipends for teaching assistants;
- Graduate students are making decisions on course loads and programs based not on pedagogical reasons but on the funding that they receive each year;
- Awards (especially stipends) vary widely among departments and schools.

Messrs. Block and Sandridge and Ms. Reynolds are developing proposals for new tuition policies, with the objective of increasing funds for graduate student assistance. These initiatives will provide some relief, but no option currently available will be adequate to provide funding at the levels requested by the schools. We eventually will have to refuse to allow some of what the schools want. Assuming future restoration of lost state funds now replaced by overhead recoveries that would in more normal times support graduate students, we will almost certainly implement central financial control to capture indirects and apply these funds to this problem.

For the longer term, these issues must be addressed:

- Financial Aid policy: Do we intend to provide 100% of tuition assistance for every graduate assistant? Is variation in stipends paid and GTA workload bad? How do we set priorities when programs must necessarily receive unequal resources for support of graduate students?

- The optimal number of GTAs: We will need to link the number funded in each school to:
 - the mission and long-term plans for growth (or reduction) of programs within the school;
 - the appropriate ratio of faculty to graduate assistants for the programs;
 - the appropriate undergraduate enrollment of sections taught by GTAs;
 - the appropriate course-load and workload by year of study for GTAs.

The tuition structure by year-of-study may have to be changed. In-state and out-of-state tuition should more closely reflect the costs of education and our market position. Additional revenue must be developed to support these policies and plans. The funding plan must be flexible, to accommodate changes in mission.

Athletics

As the academic planning commissions finished their initial work, the Department of Athletics began an internal VA 2020 review. A planning committee reviewed programs and facilities, academic and student life, compliance, and finances and fundraising. Over some 16 months, this group studied our 24 intercollegiate sports, as well as some issues involving intramural and recreational sports. Emerging from this process were four primary Athletics Department goals:

- Academic excellence (top 20 nationally in graduation rates)
- Athletic excellence (top 10 in Sears cup and comparable external rankings)
- Fiscal prudence (balanced annual budgets)
- Compliance (Title IX, NCAA, ACC)

Department finances and the academic performance of student-athletes emerged as central concerns in the work of the task force. Athletics calculated a potential cumulative deficit of some \$47 million over a decade if program costs accelerate at the current rate and cost reductions and revenue enhancements do not occur.

To address the potential financial crisis, the committee recommended assigning sports to four tiers, with different funding levels for each tier. The Board of Visitors rejected this proposal, and opted instead for a more aggressive fundraising program and other steps to generate the revenue necessary to support the 24 varsity sports. Funding priorities in Athletics for the next five years are several: (1) maintaining current operations (requires \$3.8 million in additional funds), (2) investment in existing and new programs (\$6.3 million), and (3) establishing a capital projects/contingency fund (\$3 million).

The core academic issue was the perception, supported by some evidence, that the student body has generally grown stronger in recent years than it was two decades ago, when the Corrigan Report examined these issues, and that academic standards have become more rigorous. The group found no evidence that incoming student-athletes nowadays are less well prepared academically than prior groups were, but it concluded from its review that general academic improvements may be leaving some varsity athletes behind. The committee received and passed along to me anecdotal evidence to support the notion that some student-athletes have believed that they have been victims of the perception that they are second-class citizens.

The committee recommended redesigning academic advising and support services for student-athletes, requiring participation of at-risk student-athletes in the University's College Transition Program (i.e., the summer program), and modulating academic and athletic scheduling requirements to benefit students who might otherwise suffer in one activity or the other. Most of these recommendations are now in process. Athletics and the College have a new agreement on academic advising services. Mr. Block is working on the summer prep program, which was abandoned some years ago. We have taken action to enforce the principle that students, once admitted, are students without conditions, which is to say that deans and others do not treat course work or other academic exercises as boot camps or secondary tests of students' fitness to study here.

Revenue Assessment

General Fund support

Virginia now faces a deficit estimated at \$3.8 billion by 2004. To balance the 2001-02 budget, the General Assembly applied a 3 percent General Fund reduction across all state agencies. The calculation generates a reduction of \$4.8 million for us in the current fiscal year. The 2002-04 budget now on the Governor's desk includes a \$25.4 million or 15.8 percent general-fund reduction for the University in 2002-03 and a \$33.3 million or 20.7 percent general-fund reduction in 2003-04. We will fund about 50 percent of the budget reduction through tuition increases (see discussion below) and the remaining 50 percent by reducing the base budgets of academic departments by 4.35 percent and administrative departments by 4.6 percent.

In December 2001, the General Assembly recommended a new funding methodology for higher education (i.e., the base adequacy computation). The

new model estimated that the University was under-funded by approximately \$18 million (before taking into account operations and maintenance of plant and the funding of medical education) in FY 2001, before any budget reductions.

Beginning in 2004-06, any incremental General Fund appropriations will be allocated on the basis of the base adequacy computation, with first dollars going toward the components that address the guidelines of the new higher education funding methodology and to compensation adjustments for faculty and classified staff. In light of the known budget cuts in 2002-04 and a presumed 5-percent increase annually thereafter, the revenue from the General Fund appropriation over the next five years should be:

2001-02 (approved)	\$162.9 million
2002-03	\$136.4 million
2003-04	\$128.6 million
2004-05	\$135.0 million
2005-06	\$141.8 million
2006-07	\$148.8 million

Tuition

Tuition amounts to ca. 25% of the 2001-02 E&G budget. For the most part, planned tuition increases for 2002-03 and 2003-04 will be used to cover part of the base General Fund reductions. That is, student dollars will replace tax dollars. Thereafter, the state probably will develop a cost-sharing policy that will require incremental tuition revenue to be applied to help fund, along with tax monies, the higher education funding guideline calculations. The assumptions below reflect only the enrollment growth previously approved by the Board of Visitors through 2006-07.

Tuition and Fees – In-state Undergraduate

Beginning in 1996-97, Virginia capped in-state undergraduate tuition. With the tuition freeze currently in place and the replacement of 20 percent of in-state tuition by general funds in 1999-2000, the 2001-02 in-state undergraduate tuition and E&G fees (\$3,144) is lower than in 1992-93 (\$3,265).

The freeze on tuition and E&G fees for undergraduate Virginians expires with the current budget on June 30, 2002. The 2002-04 Appropriations Act now before the Governor allows increases in tuition and required E&G fees for undergraduate Virginians, and it suggests that any increase be limited to 9 percent in each year of the biennium. The General Assembly's tuition policy encourages the Board of Visitors to consider the consumer price index; in-state

tuition and fees at peer public institutions; the maximization of charges to out-of-state undergraduate, graduate, and professional students; financial aid; access; and the impact on the applicant pool.

Assuming 9% increases in 2002-03 and 2003-04 and 3% increases thereafter, the revenue grants for undergraduate in-state tuition over the next five years should be:

2001-02 (approved)	\$25.5 million
2002-03	\$27.8 million
2003-04	\$30.3 million
2004-05	\$31.2 million
2005-06	\$32.2 million
2006-07	\$33.1 million

Tuition and Fees—Out-of-state Undergraduate

Increases in out-of-state tuition have funded necessary operating and maintenance costs as well as faculty salaries during the freeze that began in 1996. In 2001-02, out-of-state undergraduate students pay 135.4 percent of the cost of their education, thus subsidizing in-state students. Among public universities, only the University of Michigan charges more tuition to out-of-state students than we do. The differential between in-state and out-of-state tuition is also considerable: out-of-state tuition is 4.3 times the in-state tuition (other AAU institutions are at 3 times). The University must assess its capacity to continue to increase out-of-state tuition without decreasing the quality of the student body or negatively impacting its demography.

The General Assembly's 2002-04 tuition policy states that institutions shall not increase the current proportion of out-of-state undergraduate students if the current out-of-state undergraduate enrollment exceeds 25% of the total. Assuming 8.5% tuition increases in 2002-03 and 2003-04 and 3% increases thereafter (to minimize growth in the in-state/out-of-state tuition differential), the revenue generated from undergraduate out-of-state tuition over the next five years should be:

2001-02 (approved)	\$67.5 million
2002-03	\$73.2 million
2003-04	\$79.4 million
2004-05	\$81.8 million
2005-06	\$84.3 million
2006-07	\$86.8 million

Tuition and Fees – Graduate

The University has been examining the differential between in-state and out-of-state tuition, particularly in light of the financial aid requirements for graduate students. The 2002-03 graduate tuition proposal will reflect the desire to minimize growth in the in-state/out-of-state tuition differential. This exercise assumes that in-state tuition will increase at a rate of 10% in 2002-03 and 2003-04, then at a rate of 3% annually. It assumes also that out-of-state tuition will increase at a rate that will maintain the 2001-02 differential of \$13,090. Given these assumptions, the revenue generated from graduate tuition over the next five years should be:

2001-02 (approved)	\$22.1 million
2002-03	\$22.9 million
2003-04	\$23.8 million
2004-05	\$24.1 million
2005-06	\$24.4 million
2006-07	\$24.7 million

Other Tuition and Fees

School of Medicine: Medicine is considering a set differential between in-state and out-of-state tuition. This will be achieved through surcharges and tuition increases in excess of those needed for institutional purposes. For this model, it is assumed that Medicine increases will reflect historical increases that have gone to the benefit of the institution (2% for in-state, 5% for out-of-state). Actual increases will most likely be different, but any incremental revenue resulting will benefit Medicine directly rather than the University generally. Accordingly, these revenues have been ignored in this model.

Law and Darden: Under the self-sufficiency agreements (Darden's was signed in 2001; Law's will be signed in 2002) between the University administration and the Darden and Law schools, Darden and Law are expected to be self-sufficient beginning in 2003-04. At that time, 100% of their tuition revenues will be allocated to those schools. In 2002-03 and 2003-04, Darden and Law will participate ratably in the General Fund reductions assessed by the General Assembly. Owing to agreements with the schools, incremental revenues resulting from tuition or enrollment changes will be credited directly to the schools. The schools will return to the University a share of indirect costs in the form of a tax.

Other Dedicated Tuition and Fees: A CPI increase has been assumed for this category. However, approximately 85-100% of the revenues in the "dedicated" category will flow back to the unit generating these revenues, rather

than to central resources. Examples include the Continuing and Professional Studies, Darden, Law, and Medicine tuition, the McIntire executive-style programs, and the Cooper Center fees.

Given these assumptions, the revenue generated from other tuition and fee sources over the next five years should be:

2001-02 (approved)	\$68.3 million
2002-03	\$69.2 million
2003-04	\$71.5 million
2004-05	\$73.5 million
2005-06	\$74.7 million
2006-07	\$76.4 million

Sponsored programs

Sponsored research and the related indirect cost recoveries are expected to grow 4%-6% on average through 2007-08. The majority of these funds are restricted (i.e., they must be spent for the purposes of the grant awards). Seventy percent of related indirect cost recoveries support research overhead; 30% are available for E&G expenditures. This model assumes that we continue to use the historical model, which directs 70% of indirect cost recoveries back to the units generating the revenue.

Given these assumptions, the revenue generated from grants and indirect cost recoveries over the next five years should be:

2001-02 (approved)	\$207.3 million
2002-03	\$217.7 million
2003-04	\$228.6 million
2004-05	\$240.0 million
2005-06	\$252.0 million
2006-07	\$264.6 million

Private support

Private philanthropy is essential over the next five years, perhaps doubly so in light of the limited resources available from the state. The success of the recent campaign has put us in a strong position to raise greater private support than ever before. The campaign raised \$1.43 billion, 10 times the total of the previous campaign of the 1980s, and the 8th largest capital campaign ever completed. Perhaps even more significantly, the total raised is at least twice the total raised by any other public university on a per capita basis. We have many of the elements necessary to continue to be successful: experienced, skilled

fundraisers; well-defined University goals; impressive teamwork, especially given the University's decentralized system; and staff, alumni and volunteers who are passionate about the University of Virginia and its future.

The campaign attracted more than 200 gifts of \$1 million or more, a total of more than \$850 million, nearly 60% of the final total. To reach a larger future campaign goal will require many more gifts at this level. Our goal over the next 5-10 years is to identify 1,000 prospects at the \$1 million level, with the expectation of negotiating 500 gifts of this magnitude.

We continue to actively cultivate alumni and seek new prospects. VA 2020 began and continues in small gatherings of alumni who are, or will become, the major volunteers and donors in our fundraising efforts. Besides these and similar (but briefer and more targeted) Envision sessions, we are now working in small group sessions with younger alumni, women graduates, and venture philanthropists, among others. With the help of new research tools and prospect qualifying sessions, we are identifying previously unknown individuals, corporations, and foundations as major gift prospects. Our principal gifts activities (for gifts of \$1 million or more) have been re-organized, and dedicated staff are assigned to this enterprise.

Several factors are in our favor as we launch new major gift fundraising efforts. We have a core group of veteran fundraisers with reputations for excellence. They command the confidence of the faculty and administration, and also of many donors. Strategic planning has positioned the University more strongly than ever before. New, transformational funding opportunities have been identified to attract the passionate interest of our supporters. The use of various media to tell our story has become sophisticated and effective. Alumni and parents know more now about the strengths and needs of the University than in the past. We have not lost momentum from the last campaign, and the state's problems have created a sense of urgency about private philanthropy.

The University must decide what level of investment in development will sustain its goals. A consistent, reliable source of funding for development efforts should be identified. Not only do we need to retain experienced fundraisers; we must also develop the next generation of development leadership. In addition, we must find incentives for schools to work together strategically on fundraising. Many of the initiatives emerging from the 2020 recommendations require greater faculty collaboration. The same consideration applies to the fundraising that will finance these projects.

Conclusion

Much depends on what we do in the next 20 years. All of us who have thought hard about our purpose in planning for the University's future believe that when we advance the University's academic programs and the infrastructure that supports those programs, we advance education itself; and when we advance education itself, we advance the hopes and dreams and well being of humankind. In difficult financial times, to achieve the ambitious goals outlined in these pages, perhaps before all else we need commitments from the women and the men who play parts in determining the University's future: the Board, the state, our faculty, our friends and alumni. All of these groups have been essential to the University's advancement in the past. If the past is prologue to the future, and I think it is, the future to which we aspire is assured. Our job is to go there.

Appendix A Summary

Virginia 2020 Summary of Five Year Plans

2020 Group	Incremental Annual Operating Expenses						Capital Projects	Endowments
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total		
International Activities	\$1,425,000	\$1,620,000	\$2,215,000	\$2,215,000	\$2,215,000	\$9,690,000	\$7,000,000	\$20,200,000
Science and Technology	\$1,200,000	\$16,507,000	\$18,247,000	\$18,757,000	\$13,568,000	\$68,278,000	\$113,250,000	\$20,000,000
Fine and Performing Arts	\$710,000	\$1,090,000	\$1,710,000	\$4,140,000	\$5,290,000	\$12,940,000	\$189,300,000	\$5,000,000
Public Service and Outreach	\$450,000	\$725,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,100,000	\$4,325,000	\$0	\$3,000,000
Grand Total	\$3,785,000	\$19,942,000	\$23,172,000	\$26,162,000	\$22,173,000	\$95,233,000	\$309,550,000	\$48,200,000
Funding from Committed Sources	\$615,000	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$0	\$10,615,000	\$57,140,000	\$11,550,000
Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)	\$1,570,000	\$14,158,333	\$15,138,333	\$15,678,333	\$12,885,000	\$59,430,000	\$256,150,000	\$48,200,000
Additional Funding Requirements	(\$1,600,000)	(\$2,450,333)	(\$4,700,333)	(\$7,150,333)	(\$9,288,000)	(\$25,188,000)	(\$256,150,000)	(\$48,200,000)

**Appendix A
International Activities**

Expenses

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total	Capital Projects	Endowments
1	Study Abroad Programs (Provost)								
	New Programs	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$300,000		
	Existing Program		\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$60,000		
	Scholarships for London Program		\$30,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$210,000		\$1,200,000
	Scholarships for Other Programs		\$75,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$525,000		\$3,000,000
	Sub-Total	\$60,000	\$180,000	\$285,000	\$285,000	\$285,000	\$1,095,000		
	Funding From Committed Sources	\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,000		
	Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)	\$0	\$105,000	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$735,000		
	Additional Funding Requirements	\$0	(\$75,000)	(\$75,000)	(\$75,000)	(\$75,000)	(\$300,000)		
2	International Institute for American Studies (CLAS)								
	Scholarship Program	\$30,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$230,000		
	Administrative Support		\$20,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$170,000		
	Sub-Total	\$30,000	\$70,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$400,000		
	Funding From Committed Sources	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
	Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
	Additional Funding Requirements	(\$30,000)	(\$70,000)	(\$100,000)	(\$100,000)	(\$100,000)	(\$400,000)		
3	Center for Global Health (Medicine)								
	Initial Scholar Awards (20 @ \$5,000)	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$500,000		\$2,000,000
	Administrative Costs	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$400,000		\$1,600,000
	New Curricula/Seminars/Speakers	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$100,000		\$400,000
	Initial Fellow Awards	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$500,000		\$2,000,000
	Eminent Scholars Professorships in International Health			\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$600,000		\$4,000,000
	Research Endowment In Geographic Medicine			\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$300,000		\$2,000,000
	Additional Visiting Fellowships in Global Health			\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$300,000		\$2,000,000
	Additional CGH Scholarships			\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$300,000		\$2,000,000
	CGH Laboratories						\$0		\$2,000,000
	Sub-Total	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$3,000,000		\$4,000,000
	Funding From Committed Sources	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
	Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)	\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$2,400,000		
Additional Funding Requirements	(\$300,000)	(\$300,000)	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$600,000)			
4	Center for Southern Africa Regional Environmental Change (CLAS)								
	Technical Support	\$20,000	\$50,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$130,000		
	Administrative Support	\$133,500	\$118,500	\$118,500	\$118,500	\$118,500	\$607,500		
	Center Fellows Support	\$71,500	\$91,500	\$91,500	\$91,500	\$91,500	\$437,500		
	Center Workshops	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$125,000		
	Summer Abroad Courses	\$10,000	\$10,000				\$20,000		
Sub-Total	\$260,000	\$295,000	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$1,320,000			
Funding From Committed Sources	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)	\$260,000	\$295,000	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$1,320,000			
Additional Funding Requirements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
5	International Studies Office (Provost)								
	Additional FTEs (incl. OTPS)	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$1,050,000		
	Materials and Other	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$75,000		
	Sub-Total	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$1,125,000		\$3,000,000
Funding From Committed Sources	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$650,000			
Additional Funding Requirements	(\$95,000)	(\$95,000)	(\$95,000)	(\$95,000)	(\$95,000)	(\$475,000)			
6	Infrastructure and Support (Provost)								
	Additional FTEs in Vice Provost's Office (incl. OTPS)	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$1,750,000		

**Appendix A
International Activities**

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
	Discretionary Funds for Vice Provost	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$1,000,000
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	<i>\$550,000</i>	<i>\$550,000</i>	<i>\$550,000</i>	<i>\$550,000</i>	<i>\$550,000</i>	<i>\$2,750,000</i>
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
	<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	<i>\$180,000</i>	<i>\$180,000</i>	<i>\$180,000</i>	<i>\$180,000</i>	<i>\$180,000</i>	<i>\$900,000</i>
	<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	<i>(\$370,000)</i>	<i>(\$370,000)</i>	<i>(\$370,000)</i>	<i>(\$370,000)</i>	<i>(\$370,000)</i>	<i>(\$1,850,000)</i>
	<i>Grand Total</i>	<i>\$1,425,000</i>	<i>\$1,620,000</i>	<i>\$2,215,000</i>	<i>\$2,215,000</i>	<i>\$2,215,000</i>	<i>\$9,690,000</i>
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	<i>\$60,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$60,000</i>
	<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	<i>\$570,000</i>	<i>\$710,000</i>	<i>\$1,575,000</i>	<i>\$1,575,000</i>	<i>\$1,575,000</i>	<i>\$6,005,000</i>
	<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	<i>(\$795,000)</i>	<i>(\$910,000)</i>	<i>(\$640,000)</i>	<i>(\$640,000)</i>	<i>(\$640,000)</i>	<i>(\$3,625,000)</i>

Capital Projects	Endowments
\$7,000,000	\$20,200,000

**Appendix A
International Activities**

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Revenues -- Funding from Committed Sources							
Priority	Source	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
1	Indirect Cost Recoveries, Current University Funding, Other Expand Study Abroad: President's Start Up Funds	\$60,000					\$60,000
Total		\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,000

Capital Projects	Endowments
\$0	\$0

Total Funding from Committed Sources

1	Study Abroad	\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,000
2	International Institute for American Studies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	Center for Global Health	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	Center for Southern Africa Regional Environmental Change	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5	International Studies Office	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6	Infrastructure and Support	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,000

\$0	\$0

Revenues -- Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)

Priority	Source	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Fees							
1	Expand Study Abroad: Special Fee to be determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5	Support ISO: Fees for Visa Work (\$50 proposed)	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$250,000
5	Support ISO: Fees for International Students (\$50 proposed)	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$250,000
5	Support ISO: Application Processing Fee (\$30 proposed)	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$150,000
6	Vice Provost's Office: Fee per FTE student (\$10 proposed for 2002-03)	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$900,000
Sponsored Programs							
4	Center for Southern Africa Regional Environmental Change (Grant)	\$260,000	\$295,000	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$1,320,000
Endowments, Philanthropy, Gifts							
1	Expand Study Abroad: Scholarships		\$105,000	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$735,000
3	Center for Global Health: Admin/Operating/Scholarships			\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$900,000
3	Center for Global Health: Eminent Scholars			\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$600,000
3	Center for Global Health: Research Endowment			\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$300,000
3	Center for Global Health: Visiting Fellowship			\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$300,000
3	Center for Global Health: CGH Scholarships			\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$300,000
3	Center for Global Health: CGH Laboratories						\$0
5	Support ISO: Capital Improvements						\$0
Total		\$570,000	\$710,000	\$1,575,000	\$1,575,000	\$1,575,000	\$6,005,000

Capital Projects	Endowments
\$7,000,000	\$20,200,000

Total Funding by Commission Proposals (to be funded)

1	Study Abroad	\$0	\$105,000	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$735,000
2	International Institute for American Studies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	Center for Global Health	\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$2,400,000
4	Center for Southern Africa Regional Environmental Change	\$260,000	\$295,000	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$1,320,000
5	International Studies Office	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$650,000
6	Infrastructure and Support	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$900,000
Total		\$570,000	\$710,000	\$1,575,000	\$1,575,000	\$1,575,000	\$6,005,000

\$0	\$4,200,000
\$0	\$0
\$4,000,000	\$16,000,000
\$0	\$0
\$3,000,000	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$7,000,000	\$20,200,000

**Appendix A
Science and Technology**

Expenses

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total	Capital Projects	Endowments
1	Fund for Excellence in Science and Technology (FEST)	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$5,000,000		\$20,000,000
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$5,000,000		
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
	<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$5,000,000		
	<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
2	New Faculty in Core Science Disciplines								
	Salary and Benefits (High Estimate: 10 @ \$200k per year)	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$8,000,000		
	Faculty Start-Up Costs (Negotiated; Avg. = \$500k)	\$0	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$20,000,000		
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	\$0	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$28,000,000		
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	\$0	(\$7,000,000)	(\$7,000,000)	(\$7,000,000)	(\$7,000,000)	(\$28,000,000)			
3a	Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine							\$50,000,000	
	Building								
	Start-Up Operations	\$200,000	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$560,000		
	Continuing Activities: Seminar Series		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$80,000		
	Continuing Activities: Symposium		\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$60,000		
	Continuing Activities: Admin/Staff		\$230,000	\$230,000	\$230,000	\$230,000	\$920,000		
	Continuing Activities: Operating Expenses		\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$60,000		
	Continuing Activities: Scientific Advisory Board		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$80,000		
	Graduate and Postdoctoral Training: student stipends and tuition		\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$1,600,000		
	Graduate and Postdoctoral Training: postdoctoral salaries		\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$1,600,000		
	Recruitment of Key Faculty: Salary Lines		\$560,000	\$560,000	\$560,000	\$560,000	\$2,240,000		
	Recruitment of Key Faculty: Start-Up Packages		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,000,000		
	Endowed Professorships		\$140,000	\$280,000	\$420,000	\$560,000	\$1,400,000		
	Building Utilities/Operations						\$0		
	Maintenance Reserve (3%)						\$0		
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	\$200,000	\$2,890,000	\$3,030,000	\$3,170,000	\$3,310,000	\$12,600,000		
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000		
<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	\$0	\$2,890,000	\$3,030,000	\$3,170,000	\$3,310,000	\$12,400,000			
<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
3b	Nanotechnology							\$31,000,000	
	Building								
	Research Instrumentation		\$6,666,667	\$6,666,667	\$6,666,667		\$20,000,000		
	Endowed Professorships		\$100,000	\$200,000	\$300,000	\$400,000	\$1,000,000		
	Start-Up Packages		\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$6,000,000		
	Exceptional Creativity Awards (\$200,000 x 5)		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,000,000		
	Technician/Research scientist positions (10)		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,000,000		
	Building Utilities/Operations			\$720,000	\$740,000	\$760,000	\$2,220,000		
	Maintenance Reserve (3%)			\$930,000	\$930,000	\$930,000	\$2,790,000		
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	\$0	\$10,266,667	\$12,016,667	\$12,136,667	\$5,590,000	\$40,010,000		
<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	\$0	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$0	\$10,000,000			
<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	\$0	\$6,933,333	\$7,033,333	\$7,133,333	\$3,900,000	\$25,000,000			
<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	\$0	\$0	(\$1,650,000)	(\$1,670,000)	(\$1,690,000)	(\$5,010,000)			

**Appendix A
Science and Technology**

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total	Capital Projects	Endowments	
3c	Information Technology									
	Lab Space							\$1,800,000		
	Bridge Center Space Building							\$450,000		
	Director/Admin (incl. Benefits and OTPS)		\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$1,400,000	\$30,000,000		
	New Faculty (incl. Benefits)		\$750,000	\$900,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,900,000			
	Start-Up Packages		\$500,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$800,000			
	Technical Support Staff (incl. Benefits)		\$375,000	\$450,000	\$525,000	\$600,000	\$1,950,000			
	Release Time for Bridge Center Directors		\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$300,000			
	Admin Support for Bridge Centers		\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$300,000			
	Information Technology Institute and Bridge Center Programs		\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$400,000			
	New Graduate Students or Post Docs		\$125,000	\$150,000	\$175,000	\$200,000	\$650,000			
	Building Utilities/Operations						\$967,500			
	Maintenance Reserve (3%)						\$967,500			
	Sub-Total		\$0	\$2,350,000	\$2,200,000	\$2,450,000	\$3,667,500	\$9,700,000		
	Funding From Committed Sources		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)		\$0	\$2,350,000	\$2,200,000	\$2,450,000	\$2,700,000	\$9,700,000			
Additional Funding Requirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$967,500)	(\$967,500)			
Grand Total		\$1,200,000	\$16,506,667	\$18,246,667	\$18,756,667	\$13,567,500	\$68,277,500	\$113,250,000	\$20,000,000	
Funding From Committed Sources		\$200,000	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$0	\$10,200,000	\$31,000,000		
Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)		\$1,000,000	\$13,173,333	\$13,263,333	\$13,753,333	\$10,910,000	\$52,100,000	\$82,250,000		
Additional Funding Requirements		\$0	\$0	(\$1,650,000)	(\$1,670,000)	(\$2,657,500)	(\$5,977,500)	\$0		

**Appendix A
Science and Technology**

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Revenues -- Funding from Committed Sources							
Priority	Source	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
3b	Sponsored Programs Nanotechnology: Research Instrumentation (NSF Grant)		\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333		\$10,000,000
3a	Indirect Cost Recoveries, Current University Funding, Other Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine: Start-Up Operations	\$200,000					\$200,000
3b	Building Funds: Nanotechnology Gifts: Greg Olsson						\$0
3b	Gifts: Chemical Engineering gift funds						
3b	Gifts: Other						
3b	State: GOB						
3b	Overhead Recovery						
3b	Other: Governor's Reserve (Overhead from Provost)						
Total		\$200,000	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$0	\$10,200,000

Capital Projects	Endowments
\$15,000,000	
\$3,000,000	
\$1,000,000	
\$7,000,000	
\$1,000,000	
\$4,000,000	
\$31,000,000	\$0

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Total Funding from Committed Sources							
1	Fund for Excellence in Science and Technology	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	New Faculty in Core Science Disciplines	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3a	Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000
3b	Nanotechnology	\$0	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$0	\$10,000,000
3c	Information Technology	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$200,000	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$0	\$10,200,000

Capital Projects	Endowments
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$31,000,000	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$31,000,000	\$0

Revenues -- Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)

Priority	Source	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
1	Endowments, Philanthropy, Gifts FEST	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$5,000,000
Indirect Cost Recoveries, Current University Funding, Other							
3a	Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine: Building						
3a	Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine: Continuing Activities		\$390,000	\$390,000	\$390,000	\$390,000	\$1,560,000
3a	Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine: Graduate and Postdoc Training		\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$3,200,000
3a	Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine: Faculty Recruitment		\$1,560,000	\$1,560,000	\$1,560,000	\$1,560,000	\$6,240,000
3a	Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine: Endowed Professorships		\$140,000	\$280,000	\$420,000	\$560,000	\$1,400,000
	<i>sub-total</i>						
3b	Nanotechnology: Building						\$0
3b	Nanotechnology: Research Instrumentation		\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333	\$3,333,333		\$10,000,000
3b	Nanotechnology: Endowed Professorships		\$100,000	\$200,000	\$300,000	\$400,000	\$1,000,000
3b	Nanotechnology: Start-Up Packages		\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$6,000,000
3b	Nanotechnology: Exceptional Creativity Awards		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,000,000
3b	Nanotechnology: Technician/Research Scientist Positions		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,000,000
	<i>sub-total</i>						
3c	Information Technology: Lab Space						\$0
3c	Information Technology: Bridge Center Space						\$0
3c	Information Technology: Building						
3c	Information Technology: Director and Admin Support		\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$1,400,000
3c	Information Technology: New Faculty		\$750,000	\$900,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,900,000
3c	Information Technology: Start-Up Packages		\$500,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$800,000
3c	Information Technology: Technical Support Staff		\$375,000	\$450,000	\$525,000	\$600,000	\$1,950,000

Capital Projects	Endowments
	\$20,000,000
\$50,000,000	
\$50,000,000	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$1,800,000	
\$450,000	
\$30,000,000	

**Appendix A
Science and Technology**

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
3c	Information Technology: Release Time for Bridge Center Directors		\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$300,000
3c	Information Technology: Admin Support for Bridge Centers		\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$300,000
3c	Information Technology: Institute and Bridge Center Programs		\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$400,000
3c	Information Technology: New Graduate Students or Post Docs		\$125,000	\$150,000	\$175,000	\$200,000	\$650,000
	<i>sub-total</i>						
Total		\$1,000,000	\$13,173,333	\$13,263,333	\$13,753,333	\$10,910,000	\$52,100,000

Capital Projects	Endowments
\$32,250,000	\$0
\$82,250,000	\$20,000,000

Total Funding by Commission Proposals (to be funded)

1	Fund for Excellence in Science and Technology	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$5,000,000
2	New Faculty in Core Science Disciplines	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3a	Developmental Biology and Regenerative Medicine	\$0	\$2,890,000	\$3,030,000	\$3,170,000	\$3,310,000	\$12,400,000
3b	Nanotechnology	\$0	\$6,933,333	\$7,033,333	\$7,133,333	\$3,900,000	\$25,000,000
3c	Information Technology	\$0	\$2,350,000	\$2,200,000	\$2,450,000	\$2,700,000	\$9,700,000
Total		\$1,000,000	\$13,173,333	\$13,263,333	\$13,753,333	\$10,910,000	\$52,100,000

\$0	\$20,000,000
\$0	\$0
\$50,000,000	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$32,250,000	\$0
\$82,250,000	\$20,000,000

**Appendix A
Fine and Performing Arts**

Expenses

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total	Capital Projects	Endowments
1	Visiting Artist Program	\$100,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,100,000		\$5,000,000
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	\$100,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,100,000		\$5,000,000
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000		\$0
	<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,000,000		\$5,000,000
	<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000		\$0
2	Arts Grounds								
	<i>(note: projects in approximate sequence of completion and/or priority)</i>								
	Studio Art Building							\$12,000,000	
	Fayerweather Hall Renovation							\$5,400,000	
	Music Building							\$31,200,000	
	Drama Building Expansion							\$18,900,000	
	New Museum							\$30,000,000	
	Campbell Hall Addition							\$6,000,000	
	Arts Library							\$26,400,000	
	Performing Arts Center							\$59,400,000	
	Building Utilities/Operations		\$70,000	\$330,000	\$700,000	\$950,000	\$2,050,000		
Maintenance Reserve (3%)		\$160,000	\$520,000	\$2,030,000	\$2,930,000	\$5,640,000			
<i>Sub-Total</i>	\$0	\$230,000	\$850,000	\$2,730,000	\$3,880,000	\$7,690,000	\$189,300,000		
<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,140,000		
<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$166,900,000		
<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	\$0	(\$230,000)	(\$850,000)	(\$2,730,000)	(\$3,880,000)	(\$7,690,000)	\$3,740,000		
3	Infrastructure and Support								
	Additional FTE(s) (including OTPS)				\$250,000	\$250,000	\$500,000		
	Discretionary Funds	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$350,000		
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$850,000		
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	(\$50,000)	(\$50,000)	(\$50,000)	(\$350,000)	(\$350,000)	(\$850,000)			
4	Operations and Maintenance								
	<i>(Drama, Music, Museum, Studio Art)</i>								
	9 FTEs, plus fringes	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$1,800,000		
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$1,800,000		
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$125,000		
<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	(\$235,000)	(\$360,000)	(\$360,000)	(\$360,000)	(\$360,000)	(\$1,675,000)			

**Appendix A
Fine and Performing Arts**

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
5	Communications and Marketing	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$450,000	\$450,000	\$1,500,000
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$450,000	\$450,000	\$1,500,000
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	(\$200,000)	(\$200,000)	(\$200,000)	(\$450,000)	(\$450,000)	(\$1,500,000)
	<i>Grand Total</i>	\$710,000	\$1,090,000	\$1,710,000	\$4,140,000	\$5,290,000	\$12,940,000
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	\$325,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$325,000
	<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,000,000
	<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	(\$385,000)	(\$840,000)	(\$1,460,000)	(\$3,890,000)	(\$5,040,000)	(\$11,615,000)

Capital Projects	Endowments
\$189,300,000	\$5,000,000
\$26,140,000	\$11,550,000
\$166,900,000	\$5,000,000
\$3,740,000	\$11,550,000

**Appendix A
Fine and Performing Arts**

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Revenues -- Funding from Committed Sources							
Priority	Source	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
	Indirect Cost Recoveries, Current University Funding, Other						
1	Visiting Artists Programs (Existing Funds)	\$100,000					\$100,000
1	Visiting Artists Programs (Existing Funds)	\$100,000					\$100,000
2	Fayerweather Hall Renovations (working drawings): State						
2	Fayerweather Hall Renovations: State GOB						
2	Studio Art Building: State (Caboose GF)						
2	Studio Art Building (Ruffin Foundation Gift)						
2	Music Building (pledge received)						
2	Music Building (pledge received)						
2	Music Building (pledge received)						
2	Arts Grounds						
2	Arts Grounds						
2	Museum						
2	Museum						
2	Museum						
2	Museum						
4	Arts Endowment (\$3 mil.-Grad. Fellowships, \$2 mil.-Drama chair)						
4	Music Endowment (bequest)						
4	Music Program Endowment						
4	Music Performance Endowment						
4	Museum (sundry gifts)	\$125,000					\$125,000
Total		\$325,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$325,000

Capital Projects	Endowments
\$800,000	
\$4,600,000	
\$9,000,000	
\$3,000,000	
\$5,000,000	
\$1,100,000	
\$300,000	
\$1,000,000	
\$400,000	
\$500,000	
\$150,000	
\$150,000	
\$140,000	
	\$5,000,000
	\$6,100,000
	\$250,000
	\$200,000
\$26,140,000	\$11,550,000

Total Funding from Committed Sources

1	Visiting Artist Program	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000
2	Arts Grounds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	Infrastructure and Support	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	Operations and Maintenance	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$125,000
5	Communications and Marketing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$325,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$325,000

\$0	\$0
\$26,140,000	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$11,550,000
\$0	\$0
\$26,140,000	\$11,550,000

**Appendix A
Fine and Performing Arts**

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Revenues -- Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)							
Priority	Source	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
1	Endowments/Philanthropy Visiting Artist Programs	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,000,000
2	Music Building: State						
2	Music Building: Private Philanthropy						
2	Drama Building Expansion: State						
2	Drama Building Expansion: Private Philanthropy						
2	New Museum: Private Philanthropy						
2	Campbell Hall Addition: Private Philanthropy						
2	Arts Library: Private Philanthropy						
2	Performing Arts Center: Private Philanthropy						
Total		\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,000,000

Capital Projects	Endowments
	\$5,000,000
\$15,600,000	
\$10,600,000	
\$4,000,000	
\$14,900,000	
\$30,000,000	
\$6,000,000	
\$26,400,000	
\$59,400,000	
\$166,900,000	\$5,000,000

Total Funding by Commission Proposals (to be funded)

1	Visiting Artist Program	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,000,000
2	Arts Grounds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	Infrastructure and Support	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	Operations and Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5	Communications and Marketing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,000,000

\$0	\$5,000,000
\$166,900,000	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$166,900,000	\$5,000,000

**Appendix A
Public Service**

Expenses

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
1	Infrastructure and Support	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$1,000,000
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	<i>\$200,000</i>	<i>\$200,000</i>	<i>\$200,000</i>	<i>\$200,000</i>	<i>\$200,000</i>	<i>\$1,000,000</i>
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
	<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
	<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	<i>(\$200,000)</i>	<i>(\$200,000)</i>	<i>(\$200,000)</i>	<i>(\$200,000)</i>	<i>(\$200,000)</i>	<i>(\$1,000,000)</i>
2	Programs						
	Distributed Learning						\$0
	SCPS Operational and Programmatic Needs	\$0	\$25,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$325,000
	Engaging the Mind (Associates Program)	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$250,000
	K-12 Teacher Programs						
	Intellectual Enrichment Programs	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$250,000
	Matching Funds for External Grants	\$0	\$250,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$1,750,000
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	<i>\$100,000</i>	<i>\$375,000</i>	<i>\$650,000</i>	<i>\$700,000</i>	<i>\$750,000</i>	<i>\$2,575,000</i>
<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	<i>\$30,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$30,000</i>	
<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$25,000</i>	<i>\$50,000</i>	<i>\$100,000</i>	<i>\$150,000</i>	<i>\$325,000</i>	
<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	<i>(\$70,000)</i>	<i>(\$350,000)</i>	<i>(\$600,000)</i>	<i>(\$600,000)</i>	<i>(\$600,000)</i>	<i>(\$2,220,000)</i>	
3	Research Groups/Centers						
	Annual Needs (3 Centers @ \$50,000)	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$750,000
	<i>Sub-Total</i>	<i>\$150,000</i>	<i>\$150,000</i>	<i>\$150,000</i>	<i>\$150,000</i>	<i>\$150,000</i>	<i>\$750,000</i>
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
	<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	<i>(\$150,000)</i>	<i>(\$150,000)</i>	<i>(\$150,000)</i>	<i>(\$150,000)</i>	<i>(\$150,000)</i>	<i>(\$750,000)</i>	
	Grand Total	\$450,000	\$725,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,100,000	\$4,325,000
	<i>Funding From Committed Sources</i>	<i>\$30,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$30,000</i>
	<i>Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$25,000</i>	<i>\$50,000</i>	<i>\$100,000</i>	<i>\$150,000</i>	<i>\$325,000</i>
	<i>Additional Funding Requirements</i>	<i>(\$420,000)</i>	<i>(\$700,000)</i>	<i>(\$950,000)</i>	<i>(\$950,000)</i>	<i>(\$950,000)</i>	<i>(\$3,970,000)</i>

Capital Projects	Endowments
	\$3,000,000
\$0	\$3,000,000

**Appendix A
Public Service**

Priority	Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Revenues -- Funding from Committed Sources							
Priority	Source	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
2	Indirect Cost Recoveries, Current University Funding, Other Engaging the Mind (Current University Funding)	\$30,000					\$30,000
Total		\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000

Capital Projects	Endowments
\$0	\$0

Total Funding from Committed Sources							
1	Infrastructure and Support	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	Programs	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
3	Research Groups/Centers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000

\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0

Revenues -- Commission Funding Proposals (to be funded)

Priority	Source	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
2	Endowments/Philanthropy SCPS: Operational and Programmatic Needs	\$0	\$25,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$325,000
Total		\$0	\$25,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$325,000

Capital Projects	Endowments
	\$3,000,000
\$0	\$3,000,000

Total Funding by Commission Proposals (to be funded)							
1	Infrastructure and Support	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	Programs	\$0	\$25,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$325,000
3	Research Groups/Centers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$25,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$325,000

\$0	\$0
\$0	\$3,000,000
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$3,000,000

Appendix B
Virginia 2020 Accomplishments
2000-2001

- **Science and Technology**
 - Established FEST fund
 - VPR&PS directed funds toward 2020 goals (Ivy Foundation grant for Biodifferentiation initiative)
 - Created the Center for Nanoscopic Materials Design
 - Received \$15 million gift for materials science/nanotechnology building
 - Received \$25 million gift for the Digital Academical Village

- **Fine and Performing Arts**
 - Established ArtSems
 - Received funding for construction of Studio Arts building
 - Completed feasibility studies for Art Museum, Music Building, Performing Arts Center, Arts Library, Drama and Architecture building additions, and renovation of Fayerweather Hall.
 - Received \$2 million endowment to bring back Master of Fine Arts in Directing (in Department of Drama)
 - Created new education endowment at University Art Museum to reach at-risk and underserved children through art. (Link to PSO)

- **Public Service and Outreach**
 - Developed Strategic Outreach Communication plan
 - Began planning for K-12 Education center
 - Developed proposal for Engaging the Mind Lecture Series
 - Expanded and promoted Outreach Virginia

- **International Activities**
 - Developed proposal for International Institute of American Studies (implementation to begin in summer 2002)
 - Completed University-wide survey of international activities
 - Developed plans for Center for Global Health
 - Improved staffing and services of International Studies Office
 - Created the Office of Vice Provost for International Affairs
 - Established Lyon Academic Center and completed designs for Rabat, St. Petersburg, Shanghai, and London

Appendix C

Common Themes (steps with impact on multiple areas)

- **Develop and implement a University strategy for distance education.**
- **Provide for adequate library support as new academic and research programs are implemented.**
- **Address education in science and technology, international activities, public service, and the arts through curriculum review.**

The steps below are suggested to address topics that either arose from several of the Virginia 2020 areas or arose as a result of the critiques received from faculty, deans, and others. Like most of the other Virginia 2020 initiatives, they will benefit from coordination across schools and disciplines rather than from independent approaches.

- **Develop and implement a University strategy for distance education, including participation in Universitas 21.**

To date the University has not determined to what extent it wishes to invest time and resources *as an institution* in distance education as opposed to allowing individuals to pursue projects on their own. At the direction of the Provost, the University's Committee on Information Technology devoted the first half of the 2001-02 academic year to developing a statement about the University's future engagement of distance (or distributed) technology for consideration. This statement will form the basis of a broader planning effort intended to chart a course for University action in this arena. Several of the next steps proposed above have natural applications for distance technologies. The University's commitment to distance education will determine the extent to which those applications can move forward.

- **Provide for adequate library support as new academic and research programs are implemented.**

An area not addressed by the four Commission reports was the Library. As new programs are proposed, they often place demands on library resources that are not considered at the outset. This planning initiative is intended to devise strategies for ensuring that these demands are reflected in the program development phase and funded appropriately.

- **Address literacy in science and technology, international activities, public service, and the arts through curriculum review.**

Implicit in the four Commission reports was that raising the quality of the programs in these areas would result in better learning experiences for our undergraduate students. Indeed, one of the reasons this is necessary is that literacy in these areas has become

either critical to success in the world or is an important rubric of liberal arts education today. Through the ongoing undergraduate curriculum review, the schools will address literacy in the four 2020 areas.