

- Perhaps could combine a few terms from more than one suggestions. Collaborative and integrative are both powerful, important concepts, as is sustainability. I like the dual focus of Vermont and Global of the final listing, as any effective solutions we design will need to work at multiple scales.
- The high-tech geek-speak of a lot of these names will probably be offputting to many people. "Solutions" is a meaningless term & sounds like corporate-speak; I wouldn't trust anyone who used it a lot. The focus on solutions denies the fact that there isn't always a consensus on the nature of the problems, environmental problems being extremely complex and not at all solvable through easy techno-fixes. These names give the wrong impression. The best sounding names here (to me) are VT Partnership for Global Solutions (the Vermont reference is nice, and the VT-global connection is worthy of being played up), Partnership for Sustainability ("partnership" is a nice word, not yet hackneyed and overused by the corporate world, "sustainability" is of course overused, but still retains some currency in most places), and Collaborative for a Sustainable Future (the noun use of the word "collaborative" sounds fairly innovative and fresh). And how about "Vermont Partnership for a Sustainable Future"? Just my thoughts, of course, but the broader point is that these "solutions" won't work unless there are more arts & humanities people involved to help with crafting the way they "feel" (to different audiences). Science and technology alone will not solve our environmental/global problems.
- Synter? Please - absolutely not that ridiculous name. That screams academic masturbation. Synter... Collaboratives carry too much baggage with the name... please avoid at all costs. Too many MetaCollege & MetaCenter are excellent. Clear, concise, cutting-edge. KISS - keep it simple stupid - 3 to 4 words, not a whole sentence for a name (Center for Integrated Solutions for a Sustainable Future)... more academic masturbation Catalyst for integrative solutions - vague, misuse of the word catalyst (in otherwords, simply poor english)
- Keep the title simple, it will speak to more people and be more inclusive. Here's my breakdown: Catalyst, what like PeopleSoft? Bleh. Integration is explanatory, but harsh. Collaborative doesn't roll off the tongue and lends itself to mis-spelling. Center for Sustainable Solutions is too close to Center for Sustainable Agriculture, may be confusing. Leave "Global" out, conveys the idea that this project is more concerned with global processes, not local. "Meta" is so bad it doesn't even deserve a comment. Synter, too twee. "Sustainability" is a great word, encompassing organic, agriculture, industrial processes, transportation, everything. I would use it; it's friendly, can be defined in many ways. "Partnership for Sustainability" leaves an open door to all kinds of collaboration. It even invites it. It could be located anywhere, on campus, off campus, in VT out of VT. You never know where the future will take this project, call it something it can grow into.
- I am most drawn to the words: integrative, partnership, collaborative, and solutions. I think language that alienates the community or fails to represent that connection should not be used (college and science). I have never seen the word synter, so that was new. I love the idea of sustainable futures and sustainability,

but I feel this is implied and inherent in "solutions." Finally, I could go either way on including Vermont in the title, but I feel "global" should be included.

- All in all, the older name "Leading by Design" actually carries more information than any of the suggestions above. None of the names suggest anything in the way of either "leadership" (there are a gazillion centers of this that and the other) ...
- After reading the intention of this center and the names presented. I think the key words are Vermont, Partnership, and Sustainability. The last one is the closest for me, because it reads as originating from a local landgrant mission but goes further. I would have liked to see the word sustainability included. Vermont Partnership for Sustainability - Local and Global Solutions
- Vermont Center for Global Sustainability would be my alteration of choice number 7 -- I'd give it a score of 9 or 10
- This is tough. I like gerunds myself, to connote a continuing work in progress (e.g, Creating Integrative Solutions for a Sustainable Future; Transforming toward Sustainable Solutions; etc.)
- These names are all jargon. None are very good.
- These are all legitimately awful and a mouthful. I picked the one that would make the best pronounceable and unique acronym: VPG.
- There was a comment on the blog about certain titles being associated with specific functions within the university system (is an Institute different than a Center, legally or otherwise, in the administrations rules?) How do these names fit within a context, such as UVM's _____ or the _____ at the U. of Vermont? It's critical to understand this when results come out of this organization, for marketing or publicity, but also for credibility. Are the masses going to pay attention to and respect something called a MetaCenter, MetaCollege, or Synter (is that even a word)? These are critical issues you're working on and it would be a shame to lose credibility or be dismissed as 'new age nonsense,' even if your content is respectable, accurate, and important I guess my main point is: consider your target audience - Environmentalists, UVM, Burlington, Vermont, New England, the US, the World? All of the above? What is most effective at transcending all scales?
- The range of names suggests that there is not a clear idea of what this proposed entity is supposed to do.
- The names I like the most are short simple (remember the KISS principle), descriptive and with a minimum of buzzwords. Personally, when I hear a name that contains a lot of buzzwords, I stop listening because (in my experience) groups that rely on buzzwords talk a lot and don't accomplish anything (except a lot of talk). Short is especially key. It should be a name, not a sentence. I would STRONGLY recommend avoiding using 'Synter' in the name. I guess that it's supposed to be a play-on-words combining 'synergy' and 'center', but it ends up just looking like a misspelling of 'sinter' or 'center'. I guess 'sinter' is sort of on-topic as well, but either way it just seems like you can't spell.
- The name should be short, descriptive and make sense. Anything with 'catalyst' in it would not be good because at UVM it is often used to indicate PeopleSoft, and would also be an incorrect use of the word. I liked Ctr for Global Sustainability

and Partnership for Sustainability because they show that the agency is multi-disciplinary and what the point of the agency is--Sustainability.

- The name should be easy to say and not too long. Otherwise people will just give it an acronym and then the name loses its power & meaning.
- Synter?? What is that??
- synter is a creative word! sustainable is over-used fewer words are better.
- Synter for Integrative Science and Solutions? You mean Center?
- Sustainability is a necessary word, and future and global are both good as well. The titles that do not have these words are too vague
- Some of these didn't convey the concept that this is a Center (e.g., "catalyst"). Some of them are just too non-descript (e.g., "integrative solutions" to what??). Some were too wordy. "Synter" is too corny. "MetaCollege" and "MetaCenter" sound misleading.
- Since this is going to be a transdisciplinary network, I thought that words such as "collaborative", "integrative", and "partnership" were important factors for the name.
- Simpler is better.
- Simpler is better!
- Please keep it short, simple, and sweet. And please, no "metacollege"s or "synter"s.....they're not Vermont words, they're "we're better than you" words.
- Partnership for Sustainable Solutions Partnership for a Sustainable Future
- One thing to keep in mind with a final selection is any interesting or undesirable acronyms it might spell.
- None of these capture what you're trying to do.
- Names that are too long or lofty sounding are likely to alienate some potential partners. I like the simple, snappy names best. I think "Vermont" should be included in the name somehow, since effectively working toward global solutions requires local roots and connections.
- My choices were based on my belief that the new organization should emphasize the integrative aspect of all these efforts. Saying "sustainable future" or "sustainable solutions" does not emphasize integration explicitly.
- MetaCollege for Integrative Solutions? Most people wouldn't be able to discern what that even means. I think we need to keep it simple and I also think the word "sustainable" should undoubtedly be included in the name. "Center for Sustainable Solutions" is concise and clear and it's a winner for me.
- Key elements: integrative, solutions, sustainability. For a long name that incorporates all of these, think about the acronym first. Sorry I don't have any great suggestions.
- Key elements: integrative, solutions, sustainability. For a long name that incorporates all of these, think about the acronym first. Sorry I don't have any great suggestions.
- Keep it Simple.
- It has to be something exciting, eye catching, and something that rolls off the tongue.

- Is "Synter" a typo, or a play on synthesis? If the latter, I think it is too obscure, but I would like the name if spelled normally. The longer names are too much of a mouthful.
- Integrative Science, Integrative Solutions = I.S.I.S works best by me.
- Integrated Studies for Integrative Solutions
- Integrated Solutions Center for a Sustainable Future is my suggestion.
- If the 2nd to last name was supposed to be "Center for Integrative Science and Solutions" then I would alter my numeric selection to be a 7. Thanks so much for taking this on for all of us!
- I would be nice to have a name that generally points to the area of interest for the group--for those outside UVM. Also my affiliation is as a temporary employee, emeriti, alumni. Need a few more categories, I guess.
- I think you need a name with a good acronym. CSF or CIS and the rest are pretty bland. How about GREEN or UNITE or something?
- I think the word "partnership" is good. Denotes teamwork and commitment. The word "Vermont" showcases the leader of that partnership. This makes the last entry the strongest choice of those offered. "Meta" and "Synter" and "Catalyst" are not user friendly. "Collaborative" just does not make sense. The ones starting with "Center for" are OK - but they don't "WOW" me. They all seem so bland/collegiate. How about something with some energy? How about "Vermont Agency for ECOSTRONG Challenges"? ECOSTRONG stands for "Enivironmental, Collaborative Ownership of Sustainable Transformations of Real and ONGoing Global..." Challenges". Just a thought - probably too late.
- I think the names that only include global sustainability or solutions leaves out the sense of community that this center is trying for. It doesn't feel like a local effort, although the "Vermont Partnership for Global solutions" has a more local feel. I liked "Synter for Integrative Science and Solutions" except for the "Synter" part--couldn't that be "Center?" I don't know what a "synter" is and I don't think most people do either.
- I think that maybe another suggestion for name could be: Vermont Partnership for Sustainable Solutions
- I think it is important to stay away from cutesy plays on words ("Synter") or jargon such as using the prefix "meta". The majority of people do not know what this is and might be intimidated by it. I personally like using Sustainability or the concept of Partnership. Longer names such as Center for Integrated Solutions for a Sustainable Future are just too much. Less is more!!
- I think all of these are too broad. I'd like the entity to have a focus on a topic or an area of expertise and for that to come out in the name. ISIS is a decent acronym. Integrative is ok, but not terrific enough to use twice. And while Science can have a broad meaning, people usually see it as fairly narrow. How about Integrative Studies, Interdisciplinary Solutions? Or another appropriate adjective starting with I?
- I really like the Center for Global Sustainability the best. I would add the name Vermont to make it the Vermont Center for Global Sustainability, to link our state

with the global outlook that we all need to have. The work we do here is important in creating models for the country and the world.

- I don't really like any of these :(
- I believe that we need more of a Local Sustainable Future, building partners is crucial.
- I am partial to "Collaborative" rather than "Center". I'm tired of "Sustainable". Am also partial to "Integrated Solutions". I am also partial to "Innovative". So how about "Vermont Collaborative for Innovate Solutions" (VCIS)?
- I actually prefer Vermont Partnership for Global Sustainability because it is specific enough to tell you;
Who- Vermonters What -
Partnership Where - Vermont When- Why - Global
Sustainability How- Partnership
- How about: Integrative Solutions Cooperative
- How about "Center for Integrated Solutions for Global Sustainability". I like "Solutions" and "Sustainable", but with all talk of China & India, if we don't consider "Global" it won't work.
- Global Sustainable Solutions - those are key words, not center, partnership, or metacolleges. Thanks for letting us be a part of this process.
- Fewer words are better, global isn't appropriate for a UVM centered group, it should be easy to say.
- Don't get too long or too trendy in wording.
- Collaborative is an adjective, not a noun. "Science" (as in "Integrative Science..." is an activity, not an organizational entity. "Catalyst" implies that this new entity will do the work, rather than being an organizational entity that facilitates the doing of the work by people. "Center for Solutions Toward a Sustainable Future" and "Center for Solutions Toward a Sustainable Future" are too long. Among the three "Center for Integrative/Collaborative/Sustainable Solutions", sustainable is the one that I'd most like to see emphasized.
- Center seems to be the only recognizable academic unit type approved in the Officers' Handbook; I'm not sure an of the other interesting ideas could get through the Board of Trustees. Also, just curious... often big gifts/grants like this offer a "naming opportunity" --would this by any chance become the Lewis Center for...? And my other question is: who actually is authorized to choose a name for an academic unit? I'm not sure how this works at UVM. Happy to hear answers to these questions if you have them -- thanks, Stephanie Kaza
- Center for Sustainable Solutions (CSS) takes the crown -- its short, covers the intended purpose of the organization, and is a nice succinct sound byte. As a random note, the second to last option (Synter for Integrative Science and Solutions) is probably the most horrendous spelling of the word "center" I have ever seen.
- Center for Integrated Solutions for a Sustainable Future tells you the most
- Center for a Sustainable Future?
- catalyst is a broadly understood term and indicates a specific function that does not consume component elements.
- Catalyst has seriously negative associations with the Peoplesoft project. Oh come on, "Synter"? "Integrative Science, Integrative Solutions"? Pick one, not both.

Anything with "Meta" in the name is instantly too buzzy. Any name that begs "to what?" or "for what?" questions isn't going to work. I like "Vermont Partnership for Sustainability" but that's not on the list.

- best of luck in the process
- Anything with "meta-" in it sounds way too pretentious. "Synter" sounds even more pretentious than "meta-". "Catalyst" isn't something you name an agency. If you're good enough and lucky, it's how a newspaper article might describe your agency. "Solutions Toward"??? More than 4 words = bad.
- All of them are pretty good, but some seem a little long.
- 10: CPN -- Center for Pompous Nomenclature
- I think that these names are all pretty awful, but Collaborative for Sustainable Future is the least awful, and Synter for Integrative Solutions is awful. Synter is not even a word.