

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447
e-mail acouncil@acpub.duke.edu
fax (919) 681-8606

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, October 20, 2005

The regular Academic Council meeting began after the Annual Faculty Meeting, chaired by President Brodhead.

Paul Haagen (Law, Chair of the Council) The first order of business is to approve the minutes of the September 22 meeting. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Announcements

Haagen: There were no questions for the President or Provost...As an announcement, please come to the reception following the meeting today. It will be in the Rare Book Room across the quad in Perkins library.

University Priorities Committee

We have only two items on our agenda. The first is a preview from Jim Cox of the agenda of the University Priorities Committee. The University Priorities Committee is one of the most important and central committees of the university. Jim does an extraordinary job and I am certainly grateful that in my first year as chair I've had him to lean on.

James Cox (Law, Chair of the UPC): Actually I can be brief, I don't need the overheads. This reminds me of one of the last times I testified before the Senate. I was on the second panel and there were major political figures on the first panel. When I went up to do presentation, not only did everyone on the committee, except the chair, leave, but they were disassembling the nine cameras. One of them fell over. So I'm used to it, I can handle it.

Let me just identify a couple of things. I'll come back and see all of you again in the Spring, and at that time I'll be reporting to you on the agenda items that I do have here that I want to share with you. So, sparing the overhead, I will just list up there so you can listen to them, and these are in my database and I'll come back to them. Some of these I know a little bit more about right now, some of them I know very little about right now. They're listed in no particular order, and there's only eight of them.

The last item is parking, which is a reliable item, and I'll start off with that one. The issue there is to look at not just the location of parking but the strategy for funding parking, as we've been adding more and more of it. And of course that relates to the quality of life here, particularly among our graduate students.

Related to those students is one of the other items, the method for funding the graduate school...This agenda item, about the Graduate School, came from a nonmember of the UPC — it would be good if any of you have items that you would like us to look at that you submit them also. Send an email. I'm easy to find. I'll tell you whether we're going to take it up or not. I'll be really straight with you about what kinds of issues we are likely to cover and what not, because we tend to like issues that cut across several schools.

The second item we're looking at, as Paul mentioned earlier, is the funding of athletics at Duke. That's starting out at our subcommittee level to frame the issues. But it will be moving fairly quickly, I believe, to the full committee for the discussion about funding. The problem is

that we're running a fairly sizeable deficit in the athletic budget, and we need strategies to address it, either by increasing revenues or decreasing expenses.

[Another item is] the transition of the Sanford Institute to school. This possibility is coming before our committee. As you know, there's a task force that prepared a very thoughtful document on it. There are resource issues related to this obviously, and it will be making several appearances before our committee.

The question of differential spending rates from the endowment: Right now we have one rate applying across all the endowment sources. The issue there would be, of course, do we gain anything, and what do we gain, and what are the risks of having differential rates depending on the nature of the endowment, and which person the gift was [from]? We're looking at that.

We're obviously engaged, as are many other committees and many of you, in the long-range planning effort. So that is an issue where several items will be bucked over from the central planning committee to us.

Something not on my list, but was on the overhead here, is Central Campus. That's an ongoing matter, and there are several other items that are ongoing that are not on the list.

A final item that I haven't mentioned, is the administration of human resources. It's not a question about whether we want to have a benefits administrator. The more global issue would be whether there are some functions that the office performs that may get in the way of efficiencies at Duke. That also is going through the subcommittee at this point — the subcommittee is taking up the human resources administration question and parking; those eventually will go to the full committee.

The other items I mentioned are graduate school funding, the rising athletic department budget deficit, possible transition of Sanford Institute to a school, differential endowment spending, engagement in long-range planning are the other issues. Again I invite your suggestions as to what would be appropriate topics for us to take up. Your emails will be responded to. We tend to take up matters that cover more than one school. I'll come back to you in the Spring to talk about these, as well as some proposals.

Paul Haagen: Thank you, Jim. Next we invite Dick Cheney to leave his undisclosed secret location and give us an update on the strategic plan.

Provost Lange [for it was he...] rose to respond: Now that is a truly scary thought. Before I begin this presentation, I want to make an announcement about something else. It is my pleasure to announce that this is going to be the first year of an annual series of related lectures on a topic of major campus and broader societal importance, which for purposes of description is called the **Provost's Annual Lecture Series**, primarily because I'm paying for it. The symposium, or the lecture series, will bring the university's research and teaching mission to bear on some timely societal issues. It will have the campus community as its core audience but will be directed as well to Durham, national, and international audiences. The substance of this series will be selected by an appropriate committee of faculty and will draw its presenters from outside speakers and members of the university's faculty. Events in the series will include public lectures, visits to classes, and smaller seminars and opportunities for more informal interactions with speakers and panelists.

This year's series will address the theme of **"Science, Religion, and Evolution."** It will seek to illuminate questions such as what are science and the scientific method and how do these engage the subject of evolution? What is the historical relationship of religion and science? How has the theory of evolution itself evolved, what are the preeminent scientific puzzles in the theory, and what is the relationship of religious beliefs to the theory of and empirical support for evolution?

The series is designed to provide for those on our campus and the broader community, the background required to understand the debate currently underway in American society regarding the theory of evolution and its scientific status. It will address the relationship between evolution

and systems of beliefs that invoke alternative explanations for the history of the past and current living organisms.

The first lecture in the series will be a week from this Thursday at 5 pm in Love Auditorium by **Sean Carroll**, an eminent evolutionary biologist from the University of Wisconsin and a Howard Hughes medical investigator.

The next lecture will be in early December and will be by **John Haught**, who is a theologian of science at Georgetown University, and the third lecture, which will occur late in January or early in February will be by **Ed Larson**, who is a historian of science and who has studied the history of the theory of evolution over a number of generations and centuries.

This is a preliminary announcement; there will be two subsequent lectures later in the spring. So I just wanted to bring it to your attention. We have, for those of you who want more information...

I should say that one of our purposes in this series is not only to have more than the choir attend (as in “preaching to the choir”). So we ask you to encourage those who you encounter, and those students of yours who perhaps are not as familiar with this subject, to also go to the lectures and to take advantage of this series.

Strategic Planning

“The future ain’t what it used to be.” Well, as in so many things that Yogi Berra said, there’s an element of truth to this expression. If I asked you five or six years ago to think about what the future of Duke would be like in 2006, I doubt that many of you would have imagined that you could walk from the West Quad to the LSRC through that magnificent new space that we’ve created with a new library building, a new engineering building jointly with medicine, the new Goodson Chapel, and a new wing on the Divinity School, just to take one example. I chose this quotation because I think it brings to our attention in a humorous way the fact that we can affect our own future and that strategic planning is a way to do it. And what we’re engaged in here is a process of strategic planning designed to assure that the phrase which would have been so apt six years ago by Yogi Berra, will be once again apt six years from now.

To begin this discussion, I’d like to talk a little bit about what were the major accomplishments of Building on Excellence, and I’ve listed them here. Obviously the first one, the most visible one, but not necessarily the most important one over the long term of the university, was that we’ve built enabling facilities. I stress the word *enabling* because we built facilities in order to accomplish other things that we really wanted to accomplish: the development of our faculty, the development of our students, the production of outstanding research, the development of outstanding teaching. I would just remind you of the Perkins library and the Bostock wing, of the Fitzpatrick Center, of the Nasher Museum, and of numerous other facilities that we have put in place or that are still coming into place. The last of the major ones is the French Science Center which will be ready in about a year.

We have also, over the past 5 years, I think, substantially mitigated the fragility of many of our academic units. When we last presented the strategic plan, when we talked about Building on Excellence, one of the things that we clearly noted was that many of our critical academic units were very fragile, susceptible to a significant decline with the departure of a very small number of faculty members — or in which the level of coherence and synergy in the unit did not allow us to gain the most from the faculty that were there. I think we’ve made major inroads there, we have a lot of work to do, but as we look around the university we think that we’ve significantly mitigated that problem. We’ve added new peaks of excellence, and one of the things that the strategic planning exercise was supposed to do was promote the possibility of developing those peaks of excellence, delivering resources to areas that were identified as being of potentially great value.

I want to just highlight two for the purposes of discussion. The first one has already been mentioned, which is *intellectual property* and the ability to bring and create a peak of excellence in

the Law School in the area of intellectual property, but link it to the biological area and to medicine, thereby being able to go into the whole area of intellectual property and its impact on global health, and more generally on the development of the pharmaceutical industry and the medical industry more generally.

A second one I would stress is social psychology. Five years ago, Duke had an excellent reputation in social psychology, but a very fragmented and relatively weak group taken as a whole. We had many excellent social psychologists on campus, but they never talked to each other, they didn't work together, and we weren't able to apply that knowledge to the kinds of problems we wanted. In the last few years, through the application of strategic funds, we've been able to build a major program in social psychology to restore Duke's reputation, with excellent leadership and through the synergies that we're developing through faculty that range from the Fuqua School of Business to the Psychiatry Department to the Psychology Departments to the Sociology Department and beyond. And we've created a new facility, in the Erwin Mill building, which enables us in fact to drive that initiative with a research agenda, ... in order to do excellent work in that field.

We've also created outstanding interdisciplinary initiatives, some of them I've just mentioned, but there's also the Center for Biologically Inspired Materials and Materials Science, which is centered in the Engineering School and joined with the Medical School and which has raised over \$20 million in grant funds in 5 years.

We have the John Hope Franklin Center, which has truly become an animating voice for interdisciplinary work in the humanities.

We have a new social science research initiative; we have an enormously successful Center for Child and Family Policy.

And we've seen substantial improvement in our student quality. I'm just going to give you a few statistics which are useful and interesting. For admitted students, before matriculation, over the last 7 years, the SAT's — and I only use SAT's because they are the one convenient, cross-time, cross-student measure that we have — have gone up forty points in 7 years. In fact, we believe that the quality of those students over a wide range of qualities has also improved dramatically. The average SAT of matriculants last year went up 20 points. The yield has remained steady despite the major improvement in our students.

We have much work to do to take full advantage of those students and to make our programs fully commensurate with the quality that those students demand. In fact there's a kind of ratchet there, right? Win better students, develop better programs, which attract better students, so that we can develop better programs ... We've had some discussion about that even today.

What were some of the major lessons that we learned from the last strategic planning exercise? Well the first one, and the one I want to most stress, is *leadership*. When we look across the initiatives that we promoted in the last strategic plan, the ones that succeeded and succeeded excellently were the ones that had excellent leadership. The ones that did not do so well were those where we were unable to find the kind of animating leadership that was needed.

A second major lesson was that facility development takes time. We were going to do these buildings right away. Well we did, actually, do a pretty amazing thing, we built about \$600 million worth of buildings in 5 years. But at one time we thought we'd do it in three or four. Facilities development takes time; but faculty development also takes time. It takes time to make the best hires, people don't just move immediately. And linking facility development to faculty development, in those areas where without good facilities you can't hire excellent faculty, takes even more time.

Which leads me to our next strategic plan, which is how do we take maximum advantage of our new facilities to hire the best faculty? What is the faculty development strategy that we now have to pursue to really achieve the excellence which our facilities in a way demand of us?

The impact of hiring depends on school size. There's no question that in the smaller schools, a few key strategic hires can make a rather immediate and rather dramatic difference. In

some of the larger schools, it takes more hires, which shouldn't be surprising, but it should be understood...

We also need to be receptive to unforeseen opportunities. One of the problems and dangers of strategic planning is that you build such a rigid box that when somebody comes up with a good idea, you say, "Sorry, not in the plan." Or you don't even recognize it to be a good idea. And here I would come back to Paul's point about governance. Because it seems to be that one of the excellent things that comes out of our faculty governance system is the fact that we create all these points of interaction between the administration and the faculty, which opens space for people to bring good ideas. It may be the administrator who brings the good ideas. He says, "You know we thought about that, but what do you think of this good idea?" But it also may be that faculty in those same settings, say, "Wait a moment. Why are you doing it that way? There is this new possibility here, a new development." We had a number of major successes because we could be flexible.

Finally, build synergies across a full portfolio of goals. It's been extremely important to think creatively across the span of the university, not just always in adjoining units. The one I like in some ways the most is going into the new Fitzpatrick Center, where you go in and there's a room which is built around music, dance, and its interaction with technology and engineering. Nobody would have imagined that six years ago, yet that is one of the things which has really come to the fore. The same thing is true in the Arts Warehouse. Again I would stress the IP development in the Law School with the biomedical and genomics developments in the medical school.

Okay, what does all of this accomplish? I think basically, it's moved our university to something which I like, for shorthand, to call being at the "bottom of the top." Now, being at the bottom of the top, you may recognize, is a very uncomfortable place to be. Okay? It's not more comfortable than being at the top of the middle. It's not more comfortable; in fact, it's much less comfortable, but of course, it's also better because it says you have places to go if you can live up to the challenge.

Now what am I referring to by being at the bottom of the top? I'm going to make reference to things which many of you will know from your own experience, things which you have felt but perhaps didn't fully understand in terms of the broader structural position of the university. One of the things that we're finding is that we've hired fabulous junior and younger tenured professors. And they began, over time, to establish reputations that were not recognized at that thin range of top institutions when those people were first on the market. But lo and behold, they thrive at Duke, and then guess who comes calling? So one of our challenges is how do we identify and then retain such people? How do we identify them early enough, so it's not a last minute: "oh Jeez you mean you got an offer from X? Well Jeez, *now* we see how good you are." You need to be anticipating what your strength is and applying your resources there. So ... contemplating less time in rank for some people, is one of our critical responses to being at the bottom of the top.

The other one which I think many have recognized, is that we're still not quite getting the absolute top, top faculty we go after when we have to compete with the institutions that are above us in the rankings or in the strength of their faculty compared to Duke's. We're still not quite breaking through on as many of those hires as we would like. Again, that's a challenge. It's partly a challenge of making sure that we find those folks who will like what we're doing at Duke and may not like what goes on at those other schools.

The President already referred to our *interdisciplinarity*: We have been able to hire people that we would not otherwise have been able to hire precisely because we could do things for them that competing schools could not. As an example, we wanted to hire a genomicist... in the School of Medicine, who almost casually during his visit said, "You know it would really be great if I could teach undergraduates." And we said, "Hey, not a bad idea. That would work; we could do that." He said, "You can?" And he has an offer which is joint between the Department of Biology

and the IGSP and the Genetics Department (which is not called the Genetics Department anymore; it has a longer title which I can't remember). So we need to be doing clever things to hire the absolute best.

But there's another injunction here which I need to say in this body. We cannot self-censor our ambitions. Too often at Duke we have self-censored our ambitions for hiring the best faculty, we've said, "Oh, the dean will never give us the money. Oh the Provost will never give us the money. Oh, my colleagues will never want to spend the money." We have self-censored ourselves with respect to quality. "They'll never come, so we don't even ask." In our next strategic plan, we've got to set an ambition to ask, to be prepared to be turned down more often, but also to get more really great people because we ask many more and we go after the very best.

And I can assure you that our deans are prepared to spend the resources to get the very best even if it means not hiring quite as many. The other thing is, and this is again a bottom of the top thing, as we've gotten better, we're competing for more and more students who are also being competed for by the very best schools. As I said earlier, we're getting more of those students to come to Duke, but our yield among those students is not really changing very much. We'll really break through when we also get a higher percentage of those students to come to Duke.

So what's our aspiration? Our aspiration, which was articulated in our last strategic plan, but which we haven't really yet realized, is to be among that small number of institutions that define what is best in American higher education. The more important phrase is the next one and not the preceding one, because anybody can say the preceding one: Certainly Duke can learn from other institutions, but we must also set our own sights and help set the standards for others. *That* is what leadership means. It means we need to achieve distinction, but we also need to achieve *distinctiveness*. And what the President's speech today was about was, in part, about one of those areas where we can achieve not only distinction, but distinctiveness through putting our knowledge at the service of society. How should we organize ourselves to do that? That's going to be absolutely critical. It comes back to who we hire, what kind of students we attract, who we retain, what kinds of programs to build, what kinds of eggs we're willing to break to make *our* omelets and not somebody else's omelets.

So what are some of the major things for the next strategic plan? The first is faculty excellence in all of our schools, and I've already alluded to this. We have to push even harder, we have to raise our aspirations; we have to drive ourselves higher. We have to have our dean say *yes* if the appointment's really good, and *sorry* if it's not. We cannot settle for the "okay," we have to settle for the really, really good. The deans and the faculty need to figure out how they get those absolutely top people, what strategy they need to use to attract those people; and they need to figure out who are the people who are going to love Duke because it's Duke, and who are the people who may never come here — and maybe it's not even worth wasting your time because they don't want to do the kinds of things that we want to do here at Duke.

A second major priority in the next plan will be the arts. Why the arts? Well first of all, because we have neglected the arts, and in neglecting the arts, we have neglected a critical feature of what contributes to a liberal education and a strongly liberal community. And ultimately, to attract a faculty that we want, to attract the students that we want — this is the instrumental part — we need to be able to show that this is a community which will not only enrich you when you go to work but will also enrich you when you're not at work. The arts are absolutely central.

Now we have a fabulous launching pad in our new museum. Okay it's a statement: when I went in there the night of the opening and there were 500 or 600 people, or 800 or whatever the number was, we went in there, and I said "You know, there are faculty that we have brought to this campus and students that we've brought to this campus, who in the past have said, 'you know, I know Duke's a pretty Cosmopolitan place, but you know I just don't have the feel that they really get the full deal.'" Well when you go to the Nasher, you understand that we have crossed into a

zone where we realize we need to be a strong cultural community and not just a strong intellectual community in the academic sense of that word.

A third challenge and a third planning thing: We have made an enormous number of changes and improvements in the undergraduate experience. Start with the old freshman campus, think about the Focus program, think about moving all sophomores to West, think about moving the fraternities off the main quad, think about curriculum 2000 + or whatever we called it. But we haven't brought them together; this is a theme that the President really brought home last spring. We haven't brought them together so that our students understand the principles that we're trying to advance and embody those principles in their choices both inside the classroom and out. We have commissioned a task force on the undergraduate experience, the central core of which is to devise and think through that coherence to the undergraduate curriculum and how we should best develop it, not just the curriculum but the whole experience, to be best prepared for the world they're going to enter.

And that of course intersects with the question we had earlier today about what their major should be. We spent a lot of time on the pre-major, now we need to spend time on the major, and on the experience of students who are in the major time, if you like, of their undergraduate life.

Service to society: A lot of time has been spent on that. What we need to do is make sure that it infuses how we think about hiring, how we think about the experiences of our students, and how we think about our faculty.

Central Campus: I'm also not going to spend a lot of time on today because we will come back and talk to you separately, but Central Campus intersects with almost all of this. In terms of the undergraduate experience, Central Campus is going to allow us to build spaces that say to seniors, "be on campus, it's a place where you can prepare yourselves for your life beyond Duke, and where you can really have fun while you're still at Duke. You don't need to go off to Watts Street!" But, Central Campus is also going to be a place where we can assemble our arts faculty and our languages and cultures faculty, perhaps, in a new and exciting way, linking it up to the Nasher Museum but also linking those faculties up to each other.

We had a fascinating discussion just last week with the languages and cultures faculty who were saying, "Wouldn't it be great to be near some of the arts departments so that we could draw on the visual cultural and on the other cultural forms other than written language as part of our teaching exercise, as part of our education, and the education we provide." That would be great, but we need to create the spaces and central gives us the opportunity to do that. The Franklin Center will also help to do it.

There are also, of course, some continuing priorities and themes which will cut across all this strategic planning. A lot has been said about interdisciplinarity, a good deal has already been said about internationalization, I've already talked about making our programs commensurate with our facilities. Our facilities represent for us a *challenge*. It is a challenge we cannot fail to meet. We need to hire the faculty and develop the programs and bring the students that are worthy of the facilities we have put in place. Five years ago Duke was considered a technology backwater; we are now considered a technology innovator. That's required a lot of effort and a lot of attention; it's also an area where we have to keep pushing. But we can't do it just for the buzz. It's not just the iPod, okay? But it is *also* the iPod. It ways that we can bring technology to bear — I mean, until today I had never seen President Brodhead use an overhead, and you saw that magnificent display, and the way it enhanced his already outstanding speech. PowerPoint can do wonders! And, of course, we cannot slack on our commitment to diversity.

Now let me talk a little about process, because that's already been mentioned. We have planning groups working all over, these are just examples. We have hundreds of faculty engaged across the campus in working groups on different topics, and there will be more, because I just saw an email today from ECAC asking me tomorrow, "What happens if somebody has a big idea, how do they get into the process?" Well I'll answer the question tomorrow, but it means more

working groups, I can tell you, more integrating/innovating with one another. So we've had a lot of activity. We are going to use our governance structure to make sure that our strategic planning is not only good, but that it is participatory. We are planning a Steering Committee which is chaired by Prasad Kasibhatla, which has made itself into a sort of hub. All of the planning documents coming from our schools and from our interdisciplinary initiatives that are coming forward will feed into that group, and they will then feed them out to the other relevant standing committees of the faculty in order to get feedback, which we will then take as an administration back to those deans and chairs and the leaders and say, "Look, here are the things that look well. Here's how you have integrated with the university themes, here's where we see deficiencies." And over time, of course, there will also have to be some messages [like] "You know, this is just not working as well as some other things; we're not likely to be able to do it."

But what's really gratifying, is that the success of the last plan, and the sense of the faculty that they participated in that plan, and that the things we said we were going to do happened with resources behind them, has given an enormous amount of energy to these planning exercises throughout the university. And of course again that's a challenge to us, we had better deliver, right? Money, intelligence, participation.

There's a timeline for this, I want to thank John Simon for this. We refer to our planning process as controlled chaos, and right now we're in a more chaotic and less controlled part of the process because we've launched all of these initiatives. So, in this line, you can see, here's May when the plan will go to the Board, and we're somewhere around in here. We have all these committees working on all these issues, we have the schools and institutes giving us articulated outlines of their school plans — right now, they're coming in. They're all then going to go to these faculty standing committees and sometime around January, February, or March, we're going to have to sit down and actually take all of that, take all the input from those committees, and actually put together a three or four page report... (We hope not again a 175 page report, which was the last one. John is actually desperately hoping it's not that long.)

There are a few challenges which we have and which we need to address. One, there are some external challenges. The President already alluded to the fact that the external funding environment is very unlikely in the next five years to be as favorable as it was in the last five years. Presumably, if we've gotten better as a faculty, that will impact us less, because they're going to knock grants off at the bottom. Nonetheless, we need to be very thoughtful and aggressive about how we approach that funding environment, and one thing we have to avoid is any sense of defeatism in that environment. We've got to believe that we're good enough to go and get that money, and then we need to go out and get it.

There are also, as it has been mentioned here today, public tensions about higher education at the moment, and we need to be sensitive to those, and we need to promote an understanding of what we're contributing. I think that the theme of knowledge and the service to society and how we do that is absolutely central, as the President outlined earlier.

We also have some internal challenges. Laurie [Shannon], you already mentioned this. How do we strengthen or maintain our attention on the core disciplines, even as we push the new initiatives? You know, we've referred in the past to a matrix structure, where you have departments and the core disciplines going across the rows, and interdisciplinary things coming down the columns. Maintaining such a structure takes a lot of effort. We've put more and more underlying procedures in place to strengthen that, but there's still a lot of craft exercise there, it still takes a lot of time, and we need to continue working at that, and we need to make sure that we don't weaken the core disciplines. I'm not talking about necessarily making it harder or not for departments to mount the activity for all of the administrators and bureaucratic things, although that's also a consideration. I'm talking about the intellectual core of the disciplines, how we maintain those because they fundamentally underpin long-term interdisciplinary success. We also need to make the most of new facilities; I've already stressed that. We need to build strength while not letting

weakness develop where we really can't afford it. There are places where we will just have to let things go. But there are also places where weakness in one spot will radiate out to create weakness across many, and those are the ones we have to identify and say, "No, we can't let that decline; we need to actually put resources in there to assure that that area is strengthened."

And finally, as I've said before, we need to read and not copy; we need to achieve distinction with distinctiveness. And we need to think very hard about how we do that. If we do all that, and I think this last quote will hold true: *The best way to predict the future is to invent it*. Part of our strategic planning is fundamentally to plan and invent — and I love the word invent — our own future for Duke.

Thank you very much. (clapping) Are there any questions? I know everyone wants to go have a drink.

Paul Haagen: That was going to be my line, for those of you who were thinking after listening to these items, "I need a drink." I invite you all to the Rare Book Room, and declare this meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, November 4, 2005

The Annual Faculty Meeting and the October Academic Council Meeting



Council Chair Paul Haagen, Peter Agre (Vice-Chancellor for Science and Technology), Marie Lynn Miranda (Nicholas School), President Brodhead...and the après ski.