

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO RECORD



Volume 39, Number 2

February 17, 2005

CONTENTS

2 Provost's Initiative on Minority Issues Annual Report for Academic Year 2003–04

Section I. Introduction and Overview of AY 2003–04
Section II. Committee and Subcommittee Membership
Section III. Master List of Subcommittee Recommendations AY 2003–04
Section IV. Master List of Subcommittee Goals and Objectives AY 2004–05
Section V. Conclusion

9 Annual Report of the Provost for 2003–04—Richard P. Saller

11 Diversity Statement

13 Maternity, Parental, and Other Caregiving Leaves of Absence

14 Report of the Student Ombudsperson for 2003–04—Urmi Sengupta

15 The 477th Convocation

Address: "The United States and the World in the Twenty-first Century"—*John J. Mearsheimer*
Address: "Universities and Business Schools: The Right Fit?"—*Gary S. Becker*
Remarks—*Christopher J. McGurk*
Bachelor's Degree Candidates' Remarks—*Forest Timothy Gregg, Anne Therese Pretz, Edward Tyrrell*
Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching
Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching
Honorary Degrees
Summary

23 The 478th Convocation

Address: "Nature's Puzzling Answers"—*Angela V. Olinto*
Summary

THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO RECORD
5710 South Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Chicago, Illinois
Permit No. 8070

Provost's Initiative on Minority Issues

Annual Report for Academic Year 2003–04

October 25, 2004

SECTION I

Introduction and Overview of AY 2003–04

We would like to take the occasion of our second annual report to observe that it has been almost two decades since the University of Chicago Faculty Committee on Minority Concerns published its landmark report, "Black Enrollment at the University of Chicago," commonly known as the Norton Report. In 1983, in response to a significant decline in African-American student enrollment at the University of Chicago, the Faculty Committee on Minority Concerns embarked on a two-year effort to identify issues specific to the situation of African Americans at the University, present the facts on African-American student matriculation in all the educational units of the University, and make recommendations consistent with the University's mission and long-term goals.

In making its recommendations, the Faculty Committee on Minority Concerns placed the effort to reverse the trend of declining African-American student enrollment in the context of a belief that "advanced education in a nation composed of people from many origins should develop scholars, professionals, and leaders who will draw on that diversity to contribute to a more enlightened, productive national environment" (*University of Chicago Record*, April 10, 1986). The Norton Report notes that although there were, and are, issues specific to improving the quality of the intellectual and social experience of African-American students at the University, these issues implicate the University as a whole in an effort to understand the full nature of its intellectual mission.

Since the publication of the Norton Report, the University has made varying degrees of progress in important areas. During this period, the proportion of our faculty of color has increased by 50 percent; unfortunately it is still unacceptably low, particularly the proportion of African-American and Latino/a faculty. At the same time, we have made substantial advances in developing resources provided for the Center for the Study of Race, Politics, & Culture. This growth in the activity and influence of the Race Center, especially over the past few years, presents an important opportunity to develop more focused curricular choices which, in turn, might spur the hiring of more faculty of color who specialize in these areas.

Our student body continues to grow—slowly—in terms of racial and ethnic diversity. Fully 22 percent of all students in AY 2003 were of African-American, Latino/a, Asian-Pacific Islander, or Native-American descent, with the greatest gains in recent years coming from Latino/a undergraduate students and Asian-Pacific Islanders. At the same time, we have successfully increased our retention of these students so that the percentage persisting to graduation is higher than ever before. The Amandla Student Resource Center—a student-driven initiative—opened in February 2003 and is in the process of being much more fully utilized concomitant with the reorganization of the Office of Minority Student Affairs.

The University has also made substan-

tial commitments in recent years relative to its role as a major economic engine on the South Side of Chicago, committing tens of millions of dollars to the hiring of minority-owned businesses, including construction firms, service providers, and product vendors.

While we have made noticeable progress in many of these important areas, we must note that the University has substantially higher aspirations for itself relative to the diversity of our community. In dissecting our statistics on students, for example, we find that we have made minimal progress in recruiting African-American students, and the overall proportion—approximately 5 percent—remains frustratingly low. The same is true for Native Americans who account for a fraction of 1 percent of our total student body.

Our slow progress in recruiting faculty of color highlights the challenges faced by our peers across the country, underscoring the necessity for a holistic, "pipeline" approach to creating opportunities for students of color to successfully pursue careers in research and teaching at the collegiate level. Although African Americans make up only 2.7 percent of faculty, this is approximately the same percentage represented at places like Harvard and Princeton—institutions that house two of the most highly regarded African-American studies departments in higher education. In addition, the fact that only 1 percent of faculty are Latina/o and none are Native American, points to a troubling lack of progress relative to faculty representation of these populations. And, while nearly 11 percent of our faculty are Asian, this representation is concentrated in a handful of disciplines.

How should the University proceed to match its actions to its aspirations? Why is diversity so important to the University of Chicago in particular? How do we build on the gains made since the Norton Report to establish the future that we envision for this great institution? These questions are at the heart of the Provost's Initiative on Minority Issues (PIMI) and are or will be answered by this annual report and the processes which the PIMI subcommittees will undertake this year.

We recall the Norton Report and its conviction that diversity is essential to the mission of the University of Chicago in order to remark that the existence of PIMI stands both as a testament to the progress the University has made over the past two decades in addressing minority issues and as an admonishment that much work remains yet to be done if the University is to fulfill its broader mission. A commitment to diversity is not merely or even primarily a matter of public relations. The production and the testing of knowledge for the benefit of all demand intellectual and social restlessness. We must be willing to ask whether or not our visions of the true and good are shared or contradicted by those whom we deem different from us. We must be willing to hear from a variety of sources to determine if our research agendas and priorities suffer from unintended biases rather than reflect a proper estimation of the state of knowledge in our respective fields. We must understand that we do not exist outside of the society we study but

that we act within it and upon it, and that part of our responsibility as an institution for reflection and research is to be aware of and to assess how what we do affects the world around us. All of these activities and responsibilities presume diversity as a necessary condition of their fulfillment. To fail to ensure social and intellectual diversity at the University of Chicago is to fail to realize our educational and research missions in a fundamental way.

In our first annual report, we highlighted our efforts to collect and assess baseline data, to identify areas for further study, and to develop an organizational structure to address these areas. For this report, we would like to note some important strides that have been taken by the subcommittees comprising PIMI in the past twelve months. In so doing we should recognize that many students—as well as some faculty and staff—have voiced consistent frustration with the pace of PIMI's work. In many ways, the act of opening up broad campus dialogue between various stakeholder groups and decision makers itself represents important progress. Among other things, these conversations have led to strengthened definitions of institutional accountability while putting a refined focus—and direction for priority setting—on the specific issues that must be addressed to meet PIMI's central objectives.

It is our goal in this annual report to:

- Establish goals for AY 2004–05 and beyond.
- Present a set of critical recommendations for action items, which we urge the senior administration of the University to begin addressing strategically and holistically.

We conclude this report by noting that our 2004–05 annual report will likely recommend evolving PIMI's charge into a central, senior-level administrative office responsible for enhancing and monitoring campus diversity. We also anticipate that a modified form of PIMI will serve as an advisory board for that office.

PIMI adopted a new structure in academic year 2003–04 by launching five subcommittees, some of which were composed of yet another layer of advisory committees and workgroups. The primary objective for developing these subcommittees was to provide a more focused and actionable approach to understanding and addressing the following crucial diversity-related issues: the recruitment and retention of students of color, faculty of color, and staff of color, programming and support for students of color, and community affairs. An additional advantage to the subcommittee format was that it allowed us to engage a broader set of constituents in this important work.

PIMI also took on a much more public role this year, primarily through a set of three open fora/workshops as well as through ongoing consultation with a dedicated student advisory committee and other students. A set of themes emerged from these public discussions that will continue to inform and challenge the work of the various subcommittees that comprise PIMI throughout the following year. These themes focused on *communication, trans-*

parency, accountability, and measurable outcomes. While not every issue that PIMI will address is comprised of elements that are easily measured in units of time or product, it is still incumbent upon PIMI to be effective in communicating what we're learning about ourselves vis-à-vis our efforts in enhancing diversity on campus as well as the status of our near- and long-term plans in the most transparently public manner possible.

As the year progressed, many students expressed frustration over the perceived lack of real progress on diversity-related issues, particularly in the areas mentioned in the following section of this document. From their collective viewpoint, our subcommittees engaged in considerable amounts of discussion and analysis but didn't meet student expectations relative to producing timely, tangible improvements. In the coming months, some of this frustration should be addressed by communicating publicly and in substantive detail the systemic/procedural challenges inherent in many of the faculty, student, and staff recruitment processes, for example. These communications must be supported by concrete action timelines wherever possible.

Recommendations and Action Items

We have distilled seven central issues from the extended list of subcommittee recommendations for special emphasis in the context of these introductory remarks. These central issues provide the essential framework for the action items in which PIMI will engage in AY 2004–05, particularly as they relate to the recruitment, retention, and quality of life of the University's community of color. Our students in particular have pointed to these seven issues as those having the most impact on the overall quality of their experience at the University and those that must be addressed systematically if we are to make ourselves more attractive to a deeper and broader pool of students of color.

A. Executive-Level Communication

First and foremost, every subcommittee cited the urgent need for the issuance of a strong and consistent message from the President and the Provost about the importance of diversity to the mission of the institution. This statement will reaffirm and strengthen the University's commitment and will provide language for future University written and public statements on the topic.

B. Recruitment and Retention of Faculty of Color

While this is perhaps the most complex and most vexing of diversity-related issues at all institutions across the country, it remains one of the most frequently mentioned objectives in a majority of our student interactions. The Faculty Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee report points to a variety of fronts on which we should be attacking this issue, emphasizing that this is very much a "pipeline" issue that cuts across the charges of the various subcommittees and that necessitates a collaborative plan for addressing the various elements it comprises. An important first step will be to develop a document for general communication that describes the faculty hiring

process in substantive detail so that everyone involved in these conversations—students, faculty, and staff—share the same basic understanding of this necessarily complex process.

At the same time, we must develop and refine effective strategies to improve the diversity of our faculty, share these strategies with the entire campus, and, eventually, implement and measure the effectiveness of these strategies over time. As detailed in their annual report, the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee has identified the following action items to address these issues:

1. Review existing strategies for recruiting and hiring faculty of color in all divisions and professional schools.

- Request that all Deans detail their strategy and goals regarding recruiting and retaining faculty of color.
- Invite department chairs to meet with Faculty Subcommittee members during 2004–05 as follow-up to the survey.
- Establish and/or improve the lines of accountability within departments, divisions, and schools; and throughout the University.
- Emphasize formal mentoring of junior faculty to improve likelihood of retention and promotion.

2. Administer and analyze a survey of minority scholars who have been hired recently, have been retained, or have left the University.

- Coordinate this effort with Ingrid Gould, Assistant Vice-President and Associate Provost, who is in the process of conducting a similar survey for all faculty.
- Use these data to improve the work environment of faculty of color.

3. Benchmark Chicago's diversity efforts against those of peer institutions who are regarded as successful in recruiting and retaining faculty of color.

C. Curricular Development

Closely linked to the issue of low numbers of faculty of color is the small proportion of curricular and academic program choices in areas of special interest to students of color. Students have complained consistently and pointedly in public venues, in advisory committees, and in focus groups about their concerns in this area. In response to student concerns, an ad hoc subcommittee to study these issues and to make recommendations was formed midway through the 2003–04 academic year. The Steering Committee voted to make this group a formal subcommittee in AY 2004–05 with a faculty chair whom we hope to name by the beginning of the academic year. Much like the issues faced by the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee, important first steps for this group should include documentation of the processes employed by various departments when developing curricula that can be shared with the community. Once these processes are demystified and made more transparent, next steps should include recommendations as to how we might expand these focused curricular offerings across a broad range of disciplines.

D. Recruitment and Retention Strategies for Staff of Color

This subcommittee pursued the following action items relative to the recruitment and retention of under-represented minority employees, while maintaining a particular emphasis on developing meaningful career paths that would lead to the attainment of more senior job opportunities:

- Investigate best practices and obstacles to recruitment and retention of minorities by reviewing literature on strategies for creating and maintaining a racially diverse workforce.
- Examine the policies, programs, and/or practices of selected universities and non-educational organizations.
- Survey twenty-two University of Chicago hiring administrators.

This research led them to identify a significant overlap in best practices described by other universities and non-University employers, as well as in the literature. These best practices include:

- The communication of a strong executive statement in support of diversity as a core institutional value is vital for employers who seek to convey their commitment in this area.
- Model employers encourage a multidirectional approach that creates a web of support for diversity, elevating it as a factor for consideration in all levels of decision-making.
- Leaders in minority staff recruitment and retention sponsor and coordinate multifaceted diversity initiatives that are monitored and assessed.
- Institutional research is done to measure and evaluate climate concerns that are then addressed.
- Significant resources are committed for a wide range of outreach, training, and professional development programs.
- Units set goals for improving their diversity and are accountable for achieving them.

Based on these best practices, the subcommittee made the following recommendations:

- The President should issue a very public statement describing the value of diversity and its importance to the institutional mission. This statement should provide language for future University written and public statements on the topic.
- The University should develop tools, processes, and outreach that will improve the effectiveness of recruiting to result in an increasingly diverse workforce.
- The University should focus on developing training and educational resources and programming to create an environment that fosters diversity and inclusiveness.
- The University should develop mentoring and internship programs that will make minority staff more competitive candidates for higher-level positions in the organization and recognize managers who promote such programs.
- The University should require an annual reporting of progress on diversity initia-

tives to be made by all academic and administrative units. This report should be circulated broadly and featured in University publications. Outstanding progress should be recognized and rewarded.

- The University should create an office for organizational diversity that reports to the President. The office will guide and coordinate the broad range of University diversity initiatives, develop key outreach contacts, and oversee communication on these initiatives within and outside the University. The work of this office should be supported by a permanent Council on Diversity.

E. Community Relations

The Community Relations Subcommittee established the following mission for its work:

To make substantive, implementable recommendations as to how we can improve both the reality and perception of the University's role as a partner working in our diverse communities.

The subcommittee launched a number of research-oriented strategies to collect baseline data regarding internal and external perceptions of the realities of the University's role in the community. These efforts led to five general conclusions, each of which carried a set of action items and related time lines.

The subcommittee built on this exercise by creating the following multipart statement of guiding principles for community engagement:

Objective

As one of the nation's leading universities and health-care providers and as a major employer and purchaser of goods, the University of Chicago strongly affects local and regional economies and the quality of life in our diverse neighboring communities. With this influence comes responsibility. This document outlines the shared set of values and principles that guide the University's interactions with these communities.

Value Statement

The University strives to be an "engaged University" inviting and strengthening partnerships that support strong communities.

Guiding Principles

1. The University's excellence in education, scholarship, and research, as well as its commitment to institutional citizenship, forms the basis for community engagement strategies and initiatives.

2. The University will strive for mutually beneficial outcomes in our work with community partners.

3. The University's community involvement is concentrated primarily in nearby South Side Chicago neighborhoods. The University's experiences and expertise in community development, urban education, and urban health care will, however, be shared to help address these challenges faced by many cities, states, and nations both here and abroad.

4. All appropriate areas of the institution

will periodically review their involvement with the community and strive to honor the University's commitment to community engagement.

5. The University strives to be transparent and broadly consultative, welcoming broad participation in the decisions and activities that are relevant to community life.

6. All community members can expect behavior from the University's administration, faculty, staff, and students based on personal integrity, open communication, respect for diversity, and an appreciation for partnership.

7. The University is committed to rigorous and public evaluation of major community programs.

The Subcommittee on Community Relations makes the following recommendations:

1. Reaffirm the University's commitment to working respectfully and in partnership with its diverse community as reflected in University policy, including the Diversity Statement.

2. Support and promote the Value Statement and Guiding Principles for Community Engagement.

3. Encourage better communication of the University's commitment to working with its community and to sharing its expertise on urban issues. Our unique South Side location should be viewed as an important "positive" and as a valuable point of differentiation from other schools in our competitive set.

4. Fund the community survey project.

F. Reconstitution and Repositioning of OMSA

This initiative was the primary focus of the Student Programming and Support (SPAS) Subcommittee, which generated both a workgroup that focused on benchmarking successful offices at peer institutions and a student advisory committee. The work of this subcommittee (in addition to a separate consultant's report commissioned by the Vice-President and Dean of Students in the University) resulted in a number of highly detailed recommendations regarding OMSA that can be found later in this report. The two key recommendations are:

1. OMSA should be reorganized to meet more effectively the needs of students of color and the University's need for diversity.

The impact of the groundwork laid by SPAS and its workgroups can best be summarized by the following excerpt from a letter from the Provost and the Vice-President and Dean of Students to the University community:

For the past two years, a key component of the University's focus on diversity-related issues has been the evaluation of the nature and effectiveness of the various support programs that the University provides to benefit students of color, with particular emphasis this year on the

Office of Minority Student Affairs (OMSA). These efforts have included the subcommittee work of the Provost's Initiative on Minority Issues and the review, analysis, and recommendations of an outside consultant. We would like to express our gratitude to the many students, faculty, and staff who are providing such thoughtful feedback throughout these ongoing processes.

Collectively, this work has highlighted the University's responsibility to re-envision and develop a student affairs office that enhances the campus experience of students of color. This office should be seen as the central provider of important programs and events that focus on matters of diversity and as an effective advocate for issues important to students of color.

Provost Richard Saller and I have decided that these important objectives would best be met by a complete reorganization of the Office of Minority Student Affairs. One part of this reorganization will be to transfer institutional oversight for the federally funded Summer Research Opportunities Program (SROP) from OMSA to the Office of the Dean of Students in the College, the office that currently oversees the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship Program.

The other part of this reorganization will be to restructure OMSA so that it will be able to provide a higher level of support for students of color. To achieve this, we are launching a national search for a new Deputy Dean of Students/Director under whose leadership this restructured office will be organized.

By the time this annual report is submitted, the search for the new Deputy Dean of Students/Director will be underway. As we move forward to reconstitute the office, we will do so guided by the organizing principles detailed in the SPAS Subcommittee recommendations that follows.

2. The Amandla Center should be more centrally located in larger space, and OMSA should be located within or directly next to it.

Institutionally speaking, space continues to be one of our most valued and constrained resources, particularly in the central campus locations requested by students for the relocation of Amandla and OMSA. As we continue to search for appropriate space, we will have to reprioritize and balance the following attributes relative to availability—size, centrality of location, and time horizon.

G. Diversity/Sensitivity Training

The closely related issues of diversity education and sensitivity training are multitermed and, consequently, require multiple strategic responses. Students of color have related incidents of insensitivity and a perceived lack of personal agency in dealing with faculty in the classroom; they have related stories of insensitive comments from fellow students; and they have compiled a long list of offices that work closely with

students whose staff they would like to see receive focused education in the following areas:

- Sensitivity training—how to interact with someone whose race, ethnicity, religious background, etc., are not the same as your own.
- Situational training—understanding the impact of certain responses and words with meanings that may vary from culture to culture.
- Customer service training—what it means to be a service provider.

The long list of individuals, offices, and services of concern listed by these students to a special SPAS workgroup on the subject included a variety of central student services offices as well as faculty. We have much more work to do to begin tackling this wide-ranging challenge, including the evaluation of existing training programs, beginning internal dialogue between students and various offices, and speaking with Deans and department chairs about faculty-oriented initiatives. We expect to continue with this topic via further workgroup study and implementation in the upcoming academic year.

SECTION II

Committee and Subcommittee Membership

PIMI Steering Committee

Stephen P. Klass, Cochair
Vice-President and Dean of Students in the University
sklass@uchicago.edu

Kenneth W. Warren, Cochair
The William J. Friedman and Alicia Townsend Friedman Professor, Department of English Language & Literature, Committees on African & African-American Studies, Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities, and History of Culture, and the College
kwarren@uchicago.edu

Aneesah Ali
Associate Provost and Affirmative Action Officer
aali@uchicago.edu

Susan Art
Dean of Students in the College
art3@uchicago.edu

Michael Behnke
Vice-President for University Relations and Dean of College Enrollment
mbehnke@uchicago.edu

Cathy J. Cohen
Director, Center for the Study of Race, Politics, & Culture; Professor, Department of Political Science and the College
cjcohen@uchicago.edu

Emilio Kouri
Director, Mexican Studies Program; Associate Professor, Department of History and the College
kouri@uchicago.edu

William J. Michel
Assistant Vice-President for Student Life, Associate Dean of the College
wmichel@uchicago.edu

Nancy B. Schwartz
Dean, Graduate Affairs in the Biological Sciences Division; Professor, Departments of Pediatrics and Biochemistry & Molecular Biology, Committee on Developmental Biology, and the College; Director, Kennedy Mental Retardation Research Center
n-schwartz@uchicago.edu

Henry S. Webber
Vice-President, Community and Government Affairs, Senior Lecturer, SSA
hwebber@uchicago.edu

Students

Lizette Durand
Graduate Student, Department of Microbiology
lodurand@uchicago.edu

Justin Hill
Second Year, College
jlhill@uchicago.edu

Ellen Wu
Graduate Student, Department of History
ellenwu@uchicago.edu

Faculty Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee

Cathy J. Cohen*, Cochair
Director, Center for the Study of Race, Politics, & Culture; Professor, Department of Political Science and the College
cjcohen@uchicago.edu

Fernando Covas
Student, College
fcovas@uchicago.edu

Emilio Kouri*
Director, Mexican Studies Program; Associate Professor, Department of History and the College
kouri@uchicago.edu

Mary Harvey
Associate Provost
mj-harvey@uchicago.edu

Sheila A. Hohmann
Associate Dean for Administration, Physical Sciences Division
s-hohmann@uchicago.edu

Dwight Hopkins
Professor of Theology, Divinity School
dhopkins@uchicago.edu

Michael R. Jones
Associate Dean for Programs and Development, The College
mrjones@uchicago.edu

José Quintans
Professor, Department of Pathology and the College; Associate Dean and Master, Biological Sciences Collegiate Division
qui4@uchicago.edu

Nancy B. Schwartz*
Dean, Graduate Affairs in the Biological Sciences Division; Professor, Departments of Pediatrics and Biochemistry & Molecular Biology, Committee on Developmental Biology, and the College; Director, Kennedy Mental Retardation Research Center
n-schwartz@uchicago.edu

Robin Wagner*, Staff
Associate Dean of Students, Health Affairs and Strategic Planning
rbwagner@uchicago.edu

Kenneth W. Warren*, Cochair
The William J. Friedman and Alicia Townsend Friedman Professor, Department of English Language & Literature, Committees on African & African-American Studies, Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities and History of Culture, and the College
kwarren@uchicago.edu

Ellen Wu*
Graduate Student, History
ellenwu@uchicago.edu

* Indicates member of PIMI Steering Committee

Student Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee

Michael Behnke, Chair
Vice-President for University Relations and Dean of College Enrollment
mbehnke@uchicago.edu

Carla Peralta, Staff
Database Analyst/Technology Coordinator, OMSA
cgperalt@uchicago.edu

Yvette Adeosun
Director, Graduate Student Affairs, OMSA
yadeosun@uchicago.edu

Gerald Doyle
Associate Director, Director of Internet Strategy, College Admissions
gdoyle@uchicago.edu

Don Martin
Associate Dean, Admissions and Financial Aid, GSB
don.martin@chicagogsb.edu

Ann K. Perry
Assistant Dean, Admissions, Law School
akperry@uchicago.edu

André E. Phillips
Associate Director, College Admissions
phi5@uchicago.edu

Alicia Reyes
Director, College Aid
areyes1@uchicago.edu

Anne W. Robertson
Deputy Provost for Research and Education, Office of the Provost
awrx@uchicago.edu

Lois Stein
Dean of Students, Social Sciences Division
lstein@uchicago.edu

Jacqueline M. Stewart
Associate Professor, Department of English Language & Literature, Committees on African and African-American Studies and Cinema & Media Studies, and the College
jacqueline@uchicago.edu

Student Programming and Support Subcommittee

Stephen P. Klass, Chair
Vice-President and Dean of Students in the University
sklass@uchicago.edu

Dana W. Rivers, Staff
Assistant Director, Financial Operations, ORCSA
drivers@uchicago.edu

Susan Art
Dean of Students in the College
art3@uchicago.edu

Christopher E. Barker
Assistant Director, University Housing
Systems
cebarker@uchicago.edu

Pamela Bozeman-Evans
Associate Dean and Director, University
Community Service Center
pbozeman@uchicago.edu

Lucia Cantero
Assistant Director, College Admissions
lecanter@uchicago.edu

Linda Choi
Special Assistant to the Vice-President and
Dean of Students for Diversity Affairs
lchoi@uchicago.edu

Rosalind Fielder
Associate Director, Center for the Study
of Race, Politics, & Culture
rfielder@uchicago.edu

Sharlene A. Holly
Director, ORCSA
sharlene@uchicago.edu

Elizabeth G. Michaels
Director, CAPS; Associate Dean of
Students in the University, Associate Dean
of Students, Student Services
lizm@uchicago.edu

William J. Michel
Assistant Vice-President for Student Life;
Associate Dean of the College
wmichel@uchicago.edu

Jessica Pounds-Bryant
Director, Diversity Affairs, GSB
jessica.pounds-bryant@chicagogsb.edu

Kathy Stell
Deputy Dean of Students in the University;
Director, OMSA; and Assistant to the
Provost
kstell@uchicago.edu

Thomas Thuerer
Dean of Students, Humanities Division
thue@uchicago.edu

Lizette Durand
Graduate Student, Microbiology
lodurand@uchicago.edu

Milca Pierre
Soul Umoja; Student, College
milca@uchicago.edu

Student Programming and Support Student Advisory Committee

William J. Michel, Chair
Assistant Vice-President for Student Life,
Associate Dean of the College
wmichel@uchicago.edu

Michael Kessler, Staff
Project Analyst and Assistant to the
Assistant Vice-President for Student Life;
Lecturer in the College
mkessler@uchicago.edu

Malika Anand
Third Year, College
malika@uchicago.edu

Cathy Chao
Third Year, College
cathyc@midway.uchicago.edu

Lizette Durand
Graduate Student, Microbiology
lodurand@uchicago.edu

James Estrella
Second Year, College
estrella@uchicago.edu

David Ferguson
Graduate Student, Sociology
dferg@uchicago.edu

Justin Hill
Second Year, College
jlhill@uchicago.edu

Y. Angela Lam
Graduate Student, Harris School
yalam@uchicago.edu

Akia Mitchell
Second Year, College
alee@uchicago.edu

Milca Pierre
Second Year, College
milca@uchicago.edu

Yenisey Rodriguez
Second Year, College
yenisey@uchicago.edu

Ellen Wu
Graduate Student, History
ellenwu@uchicago.edu

Staff Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee

Aneesah Ali, Chair
Associate Provost and Affirmative Action
Officer
aali@uchicago.edu

Arnold L. Aronoff, Facilitator
Director of Training and Development,
UHRM; Lecturer, Humanities, Arts,
Sciences, Graham School
aronoff@uchicago.edu

Norma Carmona
Director, Student Loan Administration,
Office of the Bursar
ncarmona@uchicago.edu

Roberta Cohen
Deputy Dean of Students, Administration
and Planning, Office of the Vice-President
and Dean of Students in the University
rcohen2@uchicago.edu

Marsha East
Human Resources, GSB
marsha.east@chicagogsb.edu

Judith Friedberg
Executive Assistant to Vice-President for
Administration and Chief Financial Officer
jfriedbe@uchicago.edu

Kathy Irving
Assistant Director, Employee/Labor
Relations, UHRM
kirving@uchicago.edu

Karmaleta C. Mosley
Director, Diversity Business Programs;
Associate Director, Purchasing,
Community Affairs and CPS
kcmosley@uchicago.edu

Rudolph E. Nimocks, Sr.
Executive Director, University Police
rend@uchicago.edu

Ellen Romberg
Executive Director, Human Resources &
Organization Development, GSB
ellen.romberg@chicagogsb.edu

Denise M. Weintraub
Administrative Manager, Administrative
Services, Regenstein Library
d-weintraub@uchicago.edu

Stacie Braddix, Staff
Training Delivery Specialist, Training and
Development, UHRM
sbraddix@uchicago.edu

Community Relations Subcommittee

Henry S. Webber, Chair
Vice-President, Community & Government
Affairs; Senior Lecturer, SSA
hwebber@uchicago.edu

Michelle Olson, Staff
Assistant Director, Community &
Government Affairs
molson@uchicago.edu

Olusola Akintunde
Assistant Director, ORCSA
sola@uchicago.edu

Larry Arbeiter
Director of University Communications
l-arbeiter@uchicago.edu

Bill Balan-Gaubert
Assistant Director, Admissions, College
wbalang@uchicago.edu

Alison L. Boden
Dean, Rockefeller Memorial Chapel; Senior
Lecturer, Divinity School and the College
alboden@uchicago.edu

Vanessa Georg
Assistant Director, Degree/Credit
Programs, Graham School
vgeorg@uchicago.edu

David Hays
Assistant Director, University Community
Service Center
dhays@uchicago.edu

William A. McDade
Associate Professor, Anesthesia & Critical
Care; Associate Dean, Multicultural Affairs,
Pritzker School of Medicine
wamcdade@uchicago.edu

Karmaleta C. Mosley
Director, Diversity Business Programs;
Associate Director, Purchasing,
Community Affairs and CPS
kcmosely@uchicago.edu

Haydee Nunez
Assistant Director, Diversity Affairs, GSB
haydee.nunez@uchicago.edu

Michelle R. Obama
Executive Director, Community Affairs,
University of Chicago Hospitals
michelle.obama@uchospitals.edu

Kim Ransom
Director, University Collegiate Scholars
ransom@uchicago.edu

Donald J. Reaves
Vice-President for Administration and
Chief Financial Officer
dreaves@uchicago.edu

Duel A. Richardson
Director, Neighborhood Relations/
Education, Community Affairs
duel@uchicago.edu

Jamie Stanesa
Associate Dean for Programs, SSA
jstanesa@uchicago.edu

Winnifred F. Sullivan
Dean of Students and Senior Lecturer,
Divinity School
wsulliva@uchicago.edu

Ashley Paige White-Stern
Student, College
ashleyws@uchicago.edu

SECTION III

Master List of Subcommittee Recommendations AY 2003–04

A. Faculty Recruitment/Retention Subcommittee Recommendations

1. The University's diversity efforts need to be supported by strong written statements by the President and Provost.

2. We need to develop arenas and forums to discuss openly why diversity matters across the schools and disciplines. For example, justifications for diversity in the humanities and the social sciences do not necessarily carry the same weight in the disciplines within the physical and biological sciences.

3. Given that successful faculty recruitment depends on the availability of a pool of qualified candidates, we need to address the "pipeline" issue, which cuts across the charges of various subcommittees. We need to develop a plan within PIMI for addressing these issues.

4. In all likelihood, the University will need to move towards institutionalizing a process, probably to be administered through a high-level administrative office, to monitor and assess diversity on an ongoing basis. If not a part of routine reporting, diversity issues tend to fall off the radar.

5. Emphasize mentoring of junior faculty to improve likelihood of retention and promotion.

B. Student Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee Recommendations

1. Communicate an official University statement articulating our understanding of diversity and why it is essential to our educational mission.

2. Increase the number of minority faculty members.

3. Make financial aid awards competitive with those at our peer institutions.

4. Establish a comprehensive divisional graduate recruitment plan with responsibilities and accountability assigned for the various stages of recruiting (from identifying a strong applicant pool to convincing students that they are a good match for our programs). This effort should have central direction and be shared by OMSA, divisional Deans of Students, and departments.

5. Develop a tracking system for divisional graduate admissions, in conjunction with central systems, which records initial contact, application submission, admission decision, accept or decline response, academic progress, degree completion, and placement.

6. Fully understand the reasons for the gap between the graduation rate of African-American and Hispanic students and that of Caucasian and Asian-American students at the undergraduate level.

7. Evaluate the current model for supporting students. With multiple offices/individuals involved in working with undergraduates, who becomes accountable for retention? How is information shared among College advisers, financial aid officers, faculty, and others who work with students? We need to develop more student-driven approaches to our service.

8. At the undergraduate and graduate level, continue to explore the extent to which financial aid packages—aid, stipends, and scholarships—impact retention.

9. At both levels, benchmark the experiences and delivery systems at peer institutions. Benchmark the retention experience across different departments and schools at the University.

10. Review the “exit interview” strategy for students leaving the College.

C. Student Programming and Support Subcommittee Recommendations

1. The senior administration must communicate explicitly the importance of diversity at the University of Chicago.

- A strong and consistent message from the executive level of the institution must be articulated and reinforced through communication from the officers of the University, Deans, directors, staff, and faculty.

2. OMSA should be reorganized to more effectively meet the needs of students of color and the University’s need for diversity. The key points are:

- OMSA should be a strong advocate for minority students’ interests and should manage campus community support programs.
- OMSA should facilitate mentorship programs and access to academic support programs to ensure the continuing success of students of color.
- OMSA should be a dynamic place for students to gather, network, and build community for the entirety of their time at the University.
- OMSA should act as liaison to all University student affairs offices and departments to ensure that they are responding to and aware of the needs of students of color.
- OMSA should help provide central communication coordination regarding diversity issues across campus through its Web site, publications, and forums.
- The OMSA staff should reflect the diversity of the communities that OMSA represents, but not rigidly so.

- OMSA should have a diverse staff that represents to the greatest degree possible the populations that it serves: African American, Asian American, Latino American, and Native American.

- OMSA must be recognized as the collaborative central location for multicultural student affairs.

- The office needs not only to offer support and programs to target student populations but should also provide expertise and guidance on diversity issues across campus.
- For target student populations, OMSA should serve as a clearinghouse resource for information geared towards these groups and as an advocate for issues affecting individuals and groups of students. For example, students should be able to seek guidance from OMSA staff on issues concerning academic support, financial support, counseling, and scholarships and fellowships, and be directed to the appropriate office/person. Students should also be able to turn to OMSA when faced with personal incidents or actions involving their race or ethnicity.
- Offices and student organizations across campus should be able to turn to OMSA for expertise and guidance on diversity training, speakers, seminars, workshops, etc. The office should plan and execute various programs throughout the year to educate the entire campus on diversity issues. These programs should be presented in collaboration with offices across campus such as Admissions, Alumni Association, CAPS, Center for the Study of Race, Politics, & Culture, CPO, DOS, ORCSA, UCSC, etc. All of these programs should be evaluated formally on a regular basis.
- OMSA should create events and programs through which majority students are encouraged to collaborate with minority students on issues of diversity. Suggestions to enlist majority students in minority issues include diversity training for all RSOs, leadership training for cultural RSOs, and Allies workshops.

- The current Student Advisory Committee should instead provide two different standing advisory committees to a reorganized OMSA, one for graduate students and one for College students. There should continue to be meaningful student input into the discussion about the mission, goals, and activities of OMSA.
- It is of critical importance that there be meaningful and effective relationships between OMSA and the faculty. The development of strong collaborative ties with the Center for the Study of Race, Politics, & Culture is critical to the success of the new OMSA. Other faculty connections might take place through the codevelopment of academically oriented events, as well as informal opportunities for faculty to spend time with students and staff in Amandla.

3. The size and location of Amandla Center and OMSA require improvement.

- The Amandla Center requires a larger and more centrally located space.

- The Amandla Center’s location on the upper floor of Harper is not conducive to high traffic volumes or informal drop-in activity that defines the successful kind of daily student interactions that take place in the Reynolds Club, for example. In addition, its hours of access are limited, making late-night and weekend activities difficult to manage.

- OMSA should be housed in, or adjacent to, an expanded Amandla Center to take advantage of potential programming, community building, and student support synergies.

- In general, OMSA should be a dynamic place for students to gather, network, and build community. OMSA’s current location in the Administration Building is too isolated from the rest of the major student services offices on campus and does nothing to encourage students to view OMSA as an effective resource for informal student activities and community building.

4. The ongoing design of integrated student information systems must take into account access to, and management of, those data that support our understanding of the academic progress of those students of color who identify themselves as such.

- This information is critical to our ability to track and better understand the needs of students of specific ethnicities in order to support their academic success and, consequently, their persistence toward graduating from the University.
- It is also very helpful to have updated contact information in order to target specific events and programs to these populations of students.

5. Develop diversity/cultural awareness training for University staff, particularly those who have substantial contact with students.

- Students listed enough departments that it became clear diversity/cultural sensitivity training would be a good idea for all University staff. How the training should be delivered would be more of an HR decision, but programming should include a combination of sensitivity, situational, and customer service training. A suggestion would be to have an initial training session (possibly during new employee orientation) and then have a mandatory refresher course after a given amount of time.

6. Develop curricula that are academically strong and ethnically diverse.

- PIMI will launch a sixth subcommittee to focus on curricular issues.

7. Recruit more faculty of color.

- While the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee will be making specific recommendations focused on this need, students consistently named this as a critically important element in our ability to recruit and retain a more diverse student body.

D. Staff Recruitment/Retention Subcommittee Recommendations

1. *The President should issue a very public statement describing the value of diversity and its importance to the institutional mission.* This statement should provide language for future University written and public statements on the topic.

- Supporting steps:

- Reaffirm and strengthen vision, goal, and definition.
- Top leadership should communicate this.
- Define concrete examples of what University leadership would like to see as a result.
- Distribute the statement widely (Web site) and talk about it often.
- Focus University communications so that the diversity theme is consistently reinforced.

2. *The University should develop tools, processes, and outreach that will improve the effectiveness of recruiting to result in an increasingly diverse workforce.*

- Create and update an ongoing Recruitment Source Directory listing diversity-focused recruitment agencies, publications, job posting sites, and job fair resources so that users can easily identify the most useful sources for their particular recruitment needs. Feature resources with success in reaching strong minority candidates for higher-level positions.
- Link University job postings to other, more broadly viewed job posting sites.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of resources to attract qualified minority job applicants.
- Develop relationships with representatives of these agencies.
- Work with unions and contractors to improve recruitment and retention of minority employees.
- Establish a staff search protocol wherein the hiring manager or committee creates a search plan up front that articulates the extra efforts that will be made to generate a diverse applicant pool.

3. *The University should focus on developing training and educational resources and programming to create an environment that fosters diversity and inclusiveness.*

- Sponsor minority employee networking events and facilitate the creation of affinity groups.
- Promote comprehensive diversity-related programming to create an environment that both educates and celebrates diversity.

4. *The University should develop mentoring and internship programs that will make minority staff more competitive candidates for higher-level positions in the organization and recognize managers who promote such programs.*

- Foster training on leadership, culture, skills, and sensitivity.
- Create an internal Internship/Mentoring/Apprenticeship program. Identify talented minority employees and provide them with the opportunity to work with and learn from high-level administrators.

5. *The University should require an annual reporting of progress on diversity initiatives to be made by all academic and administrative units.* This report should be circulated broadly and featured in University publications. Outstanding progress should be recognized and rewarded.

6. *The University should create an office for organizational diversity that reports to the President.* The office will guide and coordinate the broad range of university diversity initiatives, develop key outreach contacts, and oversee communication on these initiatives within and outside the University. The work of this office should be supported by the permanent Council on Diversity described under Goals for Next Year.

E. Community Relations Subcommittee Recommendations

1. Reaffirm the University's commitment to working respectfully and in partnership with its diverse community as reflected in University policy, including the Diversity Statement.

2. Support and promote the Value Statement and Guiding Principles for University-wide Community Engagement.

a. Value Statement

i. The University strives to be an "engaged university" inviting and strengthening partnerships that support strong communities.

b. Guiding Principles

i. The University's excellence in education, scholarship, and research, as well as its commitment to institutional citizenship, forms the basis for community engagement strategies and initiatives.

ii. The University will strive for mutually beneficial outcomes in our work with community partners.

iii. The University's community involvement is concentrated primarily in nearby South Side Chicago neighborhoods. The University's experiences and expertise in community development, urban education, and urban health care will, however, be shared to help address these challenges faced by many cities, states, and nations both here and abroad.

iv. All appropriate areas of the institution will periodically review their involvement with the community and strive to honor the University's commitment to community engagement.

v. The University strives to be transparent and broadly consultative, welcoming broad participation in the decisions and activities that are relevant to community life.

vi. All community members can expect behavior from the University's administration, faculty, staff, and students based on personal integrity, open communication, respect for diversity, and an appreciation for partnership.

vii. The University is committed to rigorous and public evaluation of major community programs.

3. Encourage better communication of the University's commitment to working with its community and to sharing its expertise on urban issues. Our unique South Side location should be viewed as an important "positive" and as a valuable point of differentiation from other schools in our competitive set.

4. Fund the community survey project.

SECTION IV

Master List of Subcommittee Goals and Objectives AY 2004–05

A. Faculty Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee Goals

The faculty subcommittee will need to continue to meet during the 2004–05 academic year to complete its work, most notably in two areas:

- To administer and analyze a survey of minority scholars who have been hired by, left, or been retained by the University of Chicago. We will coordinate this work with Ingrid Gould, who is in the process of conducting such a survey for all faculty.
- To benchmark our diversity efforts against those of our peer institutions.

B. Student Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee Goals

The subcommittee has identified the following goals for AY 2004–05:

- Collect current data on recruitment and retention.
- Communicate again with leaders of all the admissions offices to update and complete the interview templates.
- Gather more data on benchmarking.
- Gather more information on best practices with particular attention to gathering opinions from enrolled students.
- Monitor response to recommendations in this report.

C. Student Programming and Support Subcommittee Goals

1. Financial Aid Workgroup

The group will continue:

- To identify those financial aid policies that disadvantage or advantage students of color.
- To analyze the cost to the University of making policy changes.
- To consider what other strategies the University can employ to support students of color in completing applications, budget planning, etc.

2. Communications Workgroup

Recommend an annual survey instrument to ascertain if students are familiar with and utilizing communications outlets. It is probably not necessary to convene another workgroup in AY 2004–05.

3. Forum Workgroup

Future PIMI fora should focus on present-

ing quarterly workshops along with an annual State of Diversity at the University of Chicago presentation in Spring Quarter. Ongoing communication of general information should take place via Web sites, listhosts, and related media.

These workshops should be focused around a specific issue, sufficiently narrowly defined so that the key individuals who "own" the area or areas can be present. The workshop needs to be able to come up with tangible goals that are achievable within a well-defined timeline with clear accountability for action or intentional inaction. While there are many long-term issues and concerns that can not be addressed in this format—and students understand that many of these issues require long-term initiatives—they are interested in feeling that they are able to have a visible, concrete impact on important issues while at the University. For those students who are interested in focusing on longer-term initiatives, there are many committees in place for students to get involved in.

The workshop fora should be scheduled to run once per quarter and the schedule with topics should be posted at the beginning of the year. Should an issue come up that might be best addressed by this format, additional workshops can be added. The proposed topics for next year include:

Fall Quarter:
University Police and the Community

Winter Quarter:
Faculty Hiring and Retention

Spring Quarter:
Student Admissions and Retention

An additional State of Diversity at the University of Chicago should be a one-hour presentation followed by one hour of Q&A. Depending on administrative availability, this presentation should be held twice to allow all interested students to attend. This presentation should be divided into ten-minute presentations that reflect the work of the current PIMI subcommittee structure.

Background material and related information should be posted either in advance or immediately following the presentation so that students can seek out more details on subjects that are of interest to them. There should be virtual boards created to allow for post-presentation discussion, follow-up, etc., with appropriate staffing to ensure timely and accurate administrative responses.

4. Diversity Training Workgroup

Begin planning for diversity training:

a. *Research outside vendors.*

b. *Determine format.*

- Meet with the Student Advisory Committee for student insight on potential programming.

D. Staff Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee Goals

PIMI has fulfilled its role in launching the administration's revitalized commitment to improvement in this arena. The University should establish permanently an advisory Council on Diversity to address faculty, student, and staff issues. The coun-

cil would advise a newly created office for organizational diversity on such issues as diversity communications and continued investigation of best practices for recruitment and retention of minorities, as well as the research, measurement, and monitoring of programs designed to improve campus climate.

E. Community Relations Subcommittee Goals

June 2004: The subcommittee's survey group will work with the Survey Lab to solidify approach and implementation of the survey design.

July–August 2004: The interviewing process will take place in the four community areas.

July–August 2004: The group will evaluate information and recommendations from other PIMI subcommittees and discuss how Community Affairs efforts can be leveraged to assist in the recruitment and retention of minority faculty, staff, and students. A recommendation for further research with internal groups on community issues will also be considered.

November 2004: The Survey Lab will prepare and submit its report to the Office of Community Affairs, and a meeting will be held to review the report with the full subcommittee.

December 2004: After evaluation and discussion of the report, the subcommittee will make final recommendations as to how we can continue to improve both the reality and perception of the University's role as a partner working in our diverse communities.

January 2005: Final report submitted; subcommittee disbands.

SECTION V

Conclusion

This report has highlighted the substantial analysis and ensuing recommendations generated by the large number of students, faculty, and staff engaged in PIMI-related work and events over the course of the previous academic year. In turn, the strategic recommendations that have resulted from this work underscore the substantial challenges ahead of the University if we are to make meaningful progress toward enhancing the campus experience of our community of color as well as the entire campus; progress that can be measured concretely via improvements in our recruitment and retention of students, faculty, and staff of color.

Throughout the past year, the concepts of accountability, open and frequent communication, and a desire for measurable outcomes have informed most of the internal and external conversations held by the various elements of PIMI. It is in addressing these critical issues that we face the reality of PIMI's structural shortcomings. We have to recognize that PIMI is, after all, a committee. PIMI does not have permanent, full-time staff to ensure that the various streams of critical activity take place in a timely and effective manner. As a committee we carry neither the intrinsic clout nor the consistent focus of a central, senior-

level administrative office. As students continue to challenge us to create and follow detailed timelines associated with our work in AY 2004–05—particularly in the areas that they stress are of most importance to them, e.g., improving the diversity of our faculty and increasing the number of curricular choices in related areas—we will not be able to respond meaningfully to these requests. We cannot develop timelines for improvement of offices that we don't control; we don't have the resources or the organizational weight to measure the progress of academic departments and

hold them accountable for lack of progress.

Within the context of these structural constraints, the PIMI Steering Committee believes that AY 2004–05 likely represents the final year of meaningful activity for this body in this form. If we are to make significant improvement in our ability to recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff of color, it will require the establishment of a senior-level office founded on the appropriate guiding principles, goals, and objectives. Cultural change of this order of magnitude requires systemic institutionalization of these guiding principles; commit-

tee work alone cannot generate this depth and scope of change over time.

The Steering Committee recognizes that the current-year objectives of the various subcommittees as described above will require all of our energies and commitment over the course of the next twelve months. At the same time, we anticipate that our AY 2004–05 annual report will be centered upon a final recommendation that the current committee structure should be reformulated, perhaps as an advisory board. This board would serve a senior-level office whose mission would be to provide

central impetus and administrative oversight to a broad range of substantive initiatives designed to enhance the diversity of the University community. Establishing this office will require a significant investment in financial and political capital. While we recognize the seriousness of this investment, the Steering Committee also believes that the importance of creating this central, senior diversity office to the success of our broader objectives cannot be over-emphasized.

Annual Report of the Provost for 2003–04

By Richard P. Saller

November 3, 2004

As friends encounter me on the quads, they often ask how the University is faring. I hesitate to answer because it is difficult to sum up the status of an institution with 1,200 faculty and 13,000 students in an answer short enough to hold the attention of the questioner. Here are some of the main topics that have occupied the Provost's Office over the past year. Overall, the future is bright as we maintain our tradition as the most intellectually focused university in the country.

Faculty

I believe that the most telling measure of the strength of the University is the comparison of faculty recruitments and retentions, on the one hand, and departures to peer institutions, on the other. By this standard, last year was on the whole a success, despite some disappointing decisions to leave. Seven senior faculty members made the decision to move (half the long-term average), but many more declined attractive offers in order to enjoy the unique intellectual atmosphere of Chicago that each of you helps to create. There is no higher priority than the preservation of that special climate that nourishes young faculty and invigorates senior colleagues.

Joining us in 2004–05 are the following untenured associate and full professors:

John Birge (GSB), from Northwestern, an operations researcher whose research in stochastic programming and stochastic scheduling optimizes decision-making under conditions of uncertainty.

Judith Farquhar (Anthropology), from North Carolina–Chapel Hill, an ethnographer of contemporary China whose recent book, *Appetites: Food and Sex in Post-Socialist China*, examines current cultural developments through bodily experiences of health, healing, and sexuality.

Frances Ferguson (English Language & Literature), from Johns Hopkins, distinguished scholar and theorist of English Romanticism, her current work theorizes the evolution of modern pornography in tandem with the rise of utilitarianism in the late eighteenth century.

T. Conrad Gilliam (Human Genetics), from Columbia, a biochemist researching the genetic basis for heritable diseases, including such complex conditions as autism, epilepsy, and schizophrenia; he joins us as chair of the department.

Steve Goldstein (Pediatrics), from Yale, whose seminal contributions to the ion channel field include determining the structure and function of minK proteins; he joins us as chair of the department.

Jeffrey Grogger (Harris School), from UCLA, an empirical economist known particularly for his work on the effect of arrest and incarceration on labor market outcomes and on the effects of recent welfare policy reforms.

Sydney Hans (SSA), from Chicago, a psychologist, her research program focuses on the relational, biological, and environmental factors influencing the development of children of substance-abusing, schizophrenic, or adolescent parents.

Jean-Luc Marion (Divinity School), from Paris-Sorbonne, historian of philosophy and philosopher, his work on Descartes, on the phenomenology of religion, and in theology has profoundly altered the terms of

debate across all these areas.

Bruce Meyer (Harris School), from Northwestern, an empirical economist whose contributions to labor economics and social policy include foundational studies on unemployment insurance and related labor market phenomena.

William Mieler (Ophthalmology & Visual Science), from Baylor, a vitreoretinal surgeon who has contributed important new knowledge and technical advances in the diagnosis and management of vitreoretinal diseases; he joins us as chair of the department.

Colm O'Muircheartaigh (Harris School), from NORC, a statistician whose work on survey designs has addressed questions ranging from response/measurement error to the cognitive aspects of survey methodology.

Callum Ross (Organismal Biology & Anatomy), from SUNY–Stony Brook, who studies the functional design of primate skull morphology in relation to feeding, vision, and brain evolution.

S. Murray Sherman (Neurobiology, Pharmacology, & Physiology), from SUNY–Stony Brook, among whose contributions to the understanding of vision are pioneering work on the connections from retina to thalamus and on the functional organization of the thalamus; he joins us as Chair of the department.

Michael Vannier (Radiology), from Iowa, a founder of the field of computational anatomy and leader in the development of three-dimensional imaging technology for study, diagnosis, and treatment.

We welcome them and also the new, untenured faculty. In addition, congratulations are due to the twenty-four faculty members who received tenure in 2003–04.

The senior leadership of the University, like the faculty, remained generally stable in 2003–04. We marked the retirements of Janel Mueller as the Dean of the Division of the Humanities and Martin Runkle as Director of the Library with grateful thanks for their dedicated work. I extend a warm welcome to Danielle Allen as Dean of the Division of the Humanities and Judith Nadler as Director of the Library. In the School of Social Service Administration, Dean Edward Lawlor resigned to move to Washington University. A search is underway to find a new Dean; in the meantime, Jeanne Marsh has graciously agreed to return to service as Acting Dean.

Faculty Honors

Our faculty drew many awards and accolades this year. I offer here a short selection of some of the principal honors. *Eugene Parker* won the Kyoto Prize for lifetime achievement in the basic sciences. *Elwood Jensen* was honored with the Lasker Award for Basic Medical Research. *Dipesh Chakrabarty*, *Jeffrey Harvey*, and *William Sewell* were elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. *Joseph Lykken* and *Russell Tuttle* were selected as Fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. *Rustem Ismagilov* received the Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers. The recognition of our faculty's scholarly achievement extended beyond our national borders: *Charles Larmore* won the Grand

Prix de Philosophie of the Academie Française; *Philippe Desan* was awarded the Ordre National du Mérite (Chevalier) and *Thomas Pavel* the Ordre du Chevalier des Arts et des Lettres by the French Republic.

Planning and Priorities

In 2003–04, many faculty, Deans, and administrators participated in the process of extending the Campus Master Plan of 1999. The firm of Ayres Saint Gross (ASG) led the effort, which started with an inventory of current plans and needs of the College, divisions, and schools in the wake of the completion of the projects under construction. Throughout the year, ASG met with faculty groups, including the Council of the Senate; administrators at all levels; and the Trustees. The planning process is nearly finished, and the results will be presented in many fora in the coming quarter for feedback. It is in the nature of long-term plans, covering two decades, that they will not materialize exactly as drawn. Nevertheless, a vision is essential if we are to avoid mistakes of piecemeal decision-making.

The last Campus Master Plan was completed in 1999 under the leadership of Geof Stone and guided the siting and building of the Gerald Ratner Athletics Center (opened last October), the Palevsky Residential Commons, the Hyde Park Center of the Graduate School of Business (opening on time and on budget as I write), and the Interdivisional Research Building (scheduled to open in spring 2005 and nearly on schedule). These world-class facilities, together with the Comer Children's Hospital (scheduled to open in November), will make great contributions to the research capacity and community life of the University.

One might think that with the completion of these buildings it would be a good moment to pause and take a deep breath before proceeding with a new phase of planning and construction. After all, this is a university that has emphasized its human talent, especially its faculty and students, over its physical plant. ASG metrics confirm this self-image, suggesting that we have 20 percent less space for the size of our student body and faculty than many of our peers. That characteristic is appropriate for a serious university that values ideas above all else, and it will continue, as is evident in the Chicago Initiative's priorities, including named professorships, graduate fellowships, and undergraduate aid. Nevertheless, the University has added, on average, two-million square feet per decade over the last half century. The planning by the academic units underlines the fact that future research and teaching will require additional building at roughly the same pace in the next two decades, as (for instance) the Library acquires an additional 150,000 volumes per year and lab groups in the sciences grow in size and number. The planning effort has addressed not only the need for new space but also the need for major renovations of older buildings that no longer meet the requirements of research in the twenty-first century. As a part of the process of reaccreditation in the coming year, we will analyze the role of buildings as one aspect of the research infrastructure of the University.

Several general conclusions have emerged as the units' plans have been drawn

together by ASG. First, the current campus area with a few small additions can accommodate our projected needs over the next twenty years or so. The Division of the Physical Sciences, Division of the Biological Sciences, and the Hospitals will fit on the available land on the west campus in a way that will promote intellectual exchange through contiguities, but it will require the higher density of buildings typical of modern biomedical centers. Secondly, the campus south of the Midway will be transformed in the next twenty years, as surface parking lots (our version of a land bank) give way to new facilities for the professional schools, the College, and the Division of the Humanities, to name only a few. In place of surface parking—a luxury in an urban environment—it will be necessary to build parking structures and also to develop a broader transportation policy to encourage use of other modes of transportation. Thirdly, our decision-making must take into account the impact of campus changes on neighboring communities with respect to public amenities, architecture, parking, and open spaces.

Setting the order of priorities for building and renovation and interweaving those priorities with other priorities of the University will be complex and open-ended. Some facilities (e.g., the Library extension) will be centrally funded; others will be paid for from the revenues of the units (e.g., the New Research Building for the BSD); while others will require substantial gifts. The challenge for this and future administrations will be to follow through on these plans even as we continue to increase support for the faculty and students—graduate and undergraduate. It goes without saying that a new Library extension to house three-million volumes or state-of-the-art laboratories will not be worth the investment unless they are filled with first-rate faculty and students.

Minority Initiatives

Over the past year Professor Ken Warren and Vice-President Steve Klass led the Provost's Initiative on Minority Issues (PIMI) to collect data and assess the University's position almost twenty years after the Norton Report. PIMI's report (see page 2 or <http://www.uchicago.edu/docs/education/pimi.pdf>) suggests that some improvements have been realized but not nearly enough to meet our aspirations in this area. The President and I believe that the diversity of the faculty, students, and staff is central to the fulfillment of our central missions of research and education (see our letter on page 11 or at <http://www.uchicago.edu/docs/education/diversity-statement.html>). A major step to provide better support to minority students was taken over the summer when the Office of Minority Student Affairs was reorganized, as recommended by an external review. We are now engaged in a national search for a strong leader of this office. The departments, divisions, and schools will have to join the administration in a focused effort in order to make further progress in the recruitment and retention of minority faculty, students, and staff. In the coming months, we will discuss the best practices for success, sound approaches to implementation, and the appropriate measures of progress.

Women's and Family Issues

A working group of faculty and administrators met monthly over the last academic year to analyze issues affecting women faculty and, more broadly, families. A range of topics connected with equity and work environment were investigated, based on information on hiring, promotions, and workload gathered by the Provost's Office. The data suggest that measurable progress has been made in the appointment of women to our faculty. But progress has been very uneven across units, leaving much room for improvement. Once hired, women on the faculty have the same rate of success as men in tenure and promotion decisions. As a result of the group's work, certain policies regarding parental leave and part-time effort for clinical faculty have been changed to allow greater flexibility (see page 13 or <http://www.uchicago.edu/docs/policies/provostoffice/maternity-other-policy.pdf>). Furthermore, the need for child-care was highlighted, and the administration is exploring possible means of meeting the need. The working group will continue to advise me in the coming year on matters of particular concern to faculty women.

Financial Condition of the University

This year it is possible to strike a more optimistic note than in the recent past. Progress in the Chicago Initiative passed the \$1-billion milestone early in 2004—a cause for celebration with our donors in April. At the halfway point, this campaign is nearly 50 percent more productive than

the previous one. President Don Randel, Vice-President Randy Holgate, and all of the Development staff deserve congratulations, as they step up the pace in the remainder of the Initiative in order to reach the \$2-billion goal.

Meanwhile, the annual returns on the endowment showed major gains in 2003–04 for the first time since 2000. The return on the investment was 16.6 percent over the four quarters ending June 2004; the value on June 30 was \$3.6 billion. These improvements will be only gradually felt, because the payout from the endowment is based on an average over three years. Just as the averaging allowed the University to avoid real budget cuts and staff reductions during the years of declining market returns, so also we will not immediately realize the full impact of the improved returns. Overall, the financial health of the University is strong and improving. A handful of peer institutions are markedly wealthier, but many more are less well-off. The University has a great tradition of focusing our resources on our core mission more effectively than most of our peers, and this tradition will continue to enable discovery and teaching at the highest level in the future.

Threats to Open Research and Academic Exchange

Last year's annual letter mentioned the USA PATRIOT Act, noting that our university had not experienced any direct impact. Over the past year, it has been

necessary to resist threats to restrict open research and discourse on several fronts, with success for the most part. The major foundations have sought to impose conditions on grantees, requiring some version of a guarantee that neither the University nor its constituent parts promote terrorism, violence, bigotry, or the overthrow of any state. The University of Chicago joined others in a protest to argue that the language was vague and could be construed in ways that would limit academic freedom. As a result, some foundations changed the language of the condition to restrict its scope to obeying the law on terrorism. The Ford Foundation added an explicit acknowledgement of the need for free speech for faculty and students.

More troubling, in my view, are the efforts of various federal agencies pursuing anti-terrorist and security agendas. The concern for national security is understandable, but some proposed measures would pose very serious obstacles to our twin missions of research and education. For example, the Departments of Defense and Commerce are considering a change of policy that would require the individual licensing of large numbers of those foreign-born faculty, students, and staff (even naturalized citizens) who have access on our campus to technology regarded as sensitive and hence subject to export controls. This would represent a massive, domestic extension of the current export controls that make it difficult or impossible for our archaeologists to take laptop computers to

the field in Syria. At every step, the administration will advocate the virtues of open research and teaching and will seek to negotiate applications of rules that meet security concerns while protecting open discourse and research. The climate of anxiety over security has already led to a marked decline in applications from international students at our university and across the nation. We must hope that this trend is temporary and that the nation will not lose its enviable position as the global magnet for intellectual talent.

I wish you the very best in your teaching and research in the coming year.

Richard P. Saller is the Edward L. Ryerson Distinguished Service Professor in the Departments of History, Classical Languages & Literatures, and New Testament & Early Christian Literature, Committee on the Ancient Mediterranean World, and the College, and Provost of the University.

Diversity Statement

Don M. Randel, President
Richard P. Saller, Provost

Autumn 2004

The University over the past years has made some clear strides toward our goal of a more diverse community. After a year's work by the Provost's Initiative on Minority Issues (PIMI), this is the right moment to restate and explain our goals and to reaffirm as a priority of this administration the goal of far more progress along the lines stated in PIMI's report (see page 2 or <http://www.uchicago.edu/docs/education/pimi.pdf>). The character of our university will be powerfully shaped by our successes or failures.

A commitment to diversity has profoundly shaped the course of research and education at the University throughout its history. From its beginning, the University was open to women as well as men. The first black woman to earn a doctorate in the United States, Georgiana Simpson, earned that distinction in 1921 at the University of Chicago. One of the first black tenured faculty members at a major non-historically black university was the University of Chicago's Professor Allison Davis. The University's refusal to set quotas made it accessible to Jews in the mid-twentieth century when other elite institutions practiced discrimination. Our intellectual preeminence across a variety of disciplines has derived from the commitment and the ability of our scholars to engage, understand, and, when appropriate, ameliorate the myriad differences that constitute the human condition. We celebrate our proud tradition of inclusion even as we acknowledge the need for marked improvement.

Faculty

The most difficult challenge facing a premier research institution such as ours is to attract and retain those faculty at the forefront of research, a growing number of whom are faculty of color. We are happy to report that, over the past two decades, the proportion of faculty of color at the University of Chicago has increased by 50 percent; and yet it is still unacceptably low. Recruitment of underrepresented minority faculty will succeed in the competitive environment only if the President, Provost, Deans, and department chairs together with their faculty display a serious commitment to improvement. The University will continue to provide the resources necessary to appoint faculty of color, but a focused effort is needed to identify, attract, and retain them. Some departments have developed effective practices, and those will be shared with all units. Moreover, the University has the responsibility as a leading educator of graduate students to enlarge the faculty pipeline through the recruitment and training of minority doctoral students. In addition to making resources available to support these students, we will devote more concentrated attention to their recruitment and retention through the Office of Minority Student Affairs.

To increase the diversity of our faculty along the dimensions of race, gender, ethnicity, and national origin is more than just a moral good—though it is certainly that. It has a clear impact on research across a broad spectrum of disciplines from art history, music, literature, and religion, through the social sciences to the biological sciences. Of course, it is not essential for a researcher to be a member in order to study

the culture of a particular group or its social experiences. But it is an undeniable empirical fact that what a researcher takes to be a significant problem for investigation is deeply influenced by her or his experiences. A more diverse faculty and graduate student body will certainly expand the range of research undertaken at this University, and we all will be correspondingly intellectually enriched.

The cross-disciplinary tradition of research at the University presents a special opportunity with regard to diversity issues. The Center for the Study of Race, Politics, and Culture has developed a mission to move beyond the conventional black/white dichotomy to understand how our diverse society has come to be divided into particular categories and how those categories are related and structured; the center aims further to understand how race affects other social spheres such as gender relations. Recognition of the impact of race on our lives grounds a major new research center in the Divisions of the Biological and Social Sciences and the School of Social Service Administration: the Center for Interdisciplinary Health Disparities Research has as its first project research on group differences in the experience of breast cancer between black women in the United States and West Africa and white women. The research will move from the social to the molecular in order to understand why black women suffer from more aggressive and lethal forms of breast cancer than women from other racial groups. It is no accident that the principal investigators are black and white women—a researcher's own experience often guides his or her identification of important research questions.

Students

The composition of our student body—undergraduate and graduate—deeply influences the educational experience that students receive at Chicago, as was argued in the *amicus* brief cosigned by the University and other leading institutions in the cases brought against the University of Michigan.

Students are both recipients and providers of the learning that takes place at universities, and [universities] have a vital interest in what students bring to the task of educating each other. . . . Diversity helps students confront perspectives other than their own and thus to think more vigorously and imaginatively; it helps students learn to relate better to persons from different backgrounds; it helps students become better citizens. The educational benefits of student diversity include the discovery that there is a broad range of viewpoint and experience within any given minority community—as well as learning that certain imagined differences at times turn out to be only skin deep.

On the basis of both research and personal experience, we believe that classes of students from diverse backgrounds, taught by faculty of varied backgrounds, will be richer and better educational experiences. The quality of exchange depends not only on

the intelligence and talent of individual students but also on the experiences and values they bring to the table. Homogeneity perpetuates unchallenged assumptions—the very antithesis of what the University stands for. In addition, effective education entails the ability to communicate with those of different backgrounds. To take one simple and obvious example, in order to take accurate case histories from patients, our medical students need to be trained to communicate with people who speak different dialects and start from different cultural assumptions.

The University of Chicago has a responsibility as a member of a tiny group of the most elite institutions of higher education to extend our opportunities beyond the wealthy majority. Today, the underrepresented include not only African Americans and Latinos but also all Americans with incomes below the median. In this respect, Chicago does better than most of its peers in recruiting from less well-off families, but more resources need to be made available to provide more aid for more of these students. Although the numbers for minority admissions have improved to the point that last year's matriculating College class had 16 percent African Americans and Hispanics and 14 percent Asian Americans, our ambition is to have a more representative body of students at all levels. To that end, our Collegiate Scholars Program is designed in part to enlarge the pool of applicants by enrolling sixty Chicago Public Schools students each year in summer classes on campus throughout their high school years.

Staff

The staff of the University plays a large role in shaping the University's image and how the missions are accomplished. While the staff is already quite diverse, improvements can be made. Although the current population of employees reflects the diversity of the census groups with which we are compared for purposes of Affirmative Action reporting, it is not representative of the population of our community. We will strive to make it more so. In particular, the University will continue to make a concerted effort to locate and recruit strong minority candidates for higher-level, managerial positions.

Community

Beyond the academic sphere, the University must recognize our responsibility as a large institution in a racially and economically diverse community on the South Side of Chicago. It is both right and in our interests that we develop better relationships that treat the community as partners rather than strangers to be kept at a distance, as Danielle Allen has argued in *Talking to Strangers*. How should we do this? It is essential to start from the basic principle of respect for differences and self-awareness of our own comparative advantages and limitations. The University is bringing its special expertise in education to bear through the Center for Urban School Improvement and its charter school in North Kenwood/Oakland. Research done at the University has demonstrably improved educational outcomes for children in those neighborhoods, and their success will make

their lives and the South Side in general a better community. Contributions to the community through education are among the many ways that our students become linked to the surrounding neighborhoods through the University Community Service Center.

The University's Pritzker School of Medicine and Hospitals take on a huge responsibility for the quality of life in our neighborhood, providing more than \$50 million per year in care for those who cannot afford to pay. They sponsor outreach programs to improve the health in neighborhoods on the South Side, and the new Comer Children's Hospital promises to provide state-of-the-art pediatric care, especially for those nearby.

Furthermore, the communities around our university also have knowledge resources that can contribute to the University's core mission. Residents have information about the history of the South Side of Chicago, about Chicago politics, about many aspects of music and the arts, about religion and theology, and about a wide array of socioeconomic experiences. Both the University and the community will profit from enhanced and mutual intellectual exchange.

Finally, the history of the University over the last century shows that its fate is directly affected by the prosperity of the surrounding communities. The University will benefit by paying attention to diversity in wielding its enormous economic power in order to improve the prospects of our neighbors. As part of the University's recent \$500-million capital construction program, well over 30 percent of all of our spending to date, or \$120 million, has been spent with minority vendors. This builds the economic base of our city and minority communities. We have worked with our vendors to create over fifty apprentice positions for young people on campus construction projects. Partnering with community groups, we have created new economic opportunities in the neighborhoods around the University.

Conclusion

Over the past year, a group of faculty, administrators, and students have been reviewing the University's present situation and formulating recommendations to improve diversity. Their report summarizes the rationale for their mission in the following words:

We recall the Norton Report and its conviction that diversity is essential to the mission of the University of Chicago in order to remark that the existence of PIMI [the Provost's Initiative on Minority Issues] stands both as a testament to the progress the University has made over the past two decades in addressing minority issues and as an admonishment that much work remains yet to be done if the University is to fulfill its broader mission. A commitment to diversity is not merely or even primarily a matter of public relations. The production and the testing of knowledge for the benefit of all demand intellectual and social restlessness. We must be willing to

ask whether or not our visions of the true and good are shared or contradicted by those whom we deem different from us. We must be willing to hear from a variety of sources to determine if our research agendas and priorities suffer from unintended biases rather than reflect a proper estimation of the state of knowledge in our respective fields. We must

understand that we do not exist outside of the society we study but that we act within it and upon it, and that part of our responsibility as an institution for reflection and research is to be aware of and to assess how what we do affects the world around us. All of these activities and responsibilities presume diversity as a necessary condition of their fulfill-

ment. To fail to ensure social and intellectual diversity at the University of Chicago is to fail to realize our educational and research missions in a fundamental way.

The report offers a number of recommendations to which we are committed. In the wake of the Norton Report, the University made some progress; we now need to

raise our aspirations, to monitor our improvements, and to confront our shortcomings. Our higher aspirations will be met only with the focused effort of the whole campus community.

Maternity, Parental, and Other Caregiving Leaves of Absence

June 1, 2004

Maternity Leave for Four-quarter Appointments

For full-time faculty and academic staff members on regular four-quarter appointments

Maternity leave is considered leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), a federal law permitting up to twelve weeks total of unpaid leave per year, after at least twelve months of employment at the University. University policy additionally provides that a faculty member or member of the academic staff on a regular four-quarter appointment who gives birth may take up to six weeks of the FMLA leave as paid leave and up to six weeks of the FMLA leave as unpaid leave within twelve months of the delivery. The faculty member or member of the academic staff should discuss her leave plans with her department chair and Dean a minimum of three months before the proposed leave. Most benefits may be maintained during maternity leave by arranging to continue the employee contribution to premiums.

Parental Leave for Three-quarter Appointments

For full-time faculty members on regular three-quarter appointments

Parental leave is considered leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), a federal law permitting up to twelve weeks total of unpaid leave per year, after at least twelve months of employment at the University. University policy additionally provides that a faculty member who gives birth or her spouse or University-registered domestic partner, if he/she is the child's

primary caregiver, may take a one-quarter leave without loss of salary or benefits within one year of the arrival of the child. Similarly, an adoptive parent who is the primary caregiver may take a one-quarter leave without loss of salary or benefits within one year of the arrival of the child. The primary caregiver is the parent responsible for the majority of the child-care. A faculty member whose normal annual teaching expectation is three or more courses will be relieved of teaching duties for one course. The faculty member should discuss his or her leave plans with the department chair and Dean a minimum of three months before the proposed leave. Where both parents are members of the faculty, only one may seek parental leave at a time. The parental leave may be split, but may not exceed one quarter total for the two. See also the Rearrangement of Teaching Duties section below for faculty parents not taking parental leave or for foster parents.

Child-care Leave

For parents not taking or not eligible for maternity or parental leave

and Caregiver's Leave

For full-time faculty and academic staff members

The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) permits up to twelve weeks total unpaid leave per year, after at least twelve months of employment at the University, under the following circumstances. A faculty member not taking parental leave or member of the academic staff either of whom is giving

birth, adopting a child, or receiving a foster child placement may request a leave without salary of up to twelve weeks for the purpose of caring for the child. Similarly, a faculty member not taking parental leave or member of the academic staff either of whose wife or University-registered, same-sex domestic partner is giving birth may arrange for an unpaid leave of absence. This leave must be taken within twelve months of the birth, adoption, or placement. The faculty member or member of the academic staff who anticipates a child-care leave should discuss the plan with the department chair and Dean at least three months in advance, if possible. A faculty member or member of the academic staff may request an unpaid leave of up to twelve weeks to care for a spouse; University-registered, same-sex domestic partner; child; or parent with a serious health condition. The faculty member or member of the academic staff should discuss the proposed FMLA leave with the department chair and Dean as far in advance as possible. Most benefits may be maintained during these leaves by arranging to continue the employee contribution to premiums.

Rearrangement of Teaching Duties

For full-time faculty members on regular three-quarter appointments not taking parental leave

In lieu of parental leave, a faculty member may request rearrangement of his or her course teaching schedule within twelve months of birth or adoption, in order to have a quarter free from classroom teaching. Likewise, a faculty member who

receives a foster child placement may request rearrangement of his or her course teaching schedule within twelve months of the placement. Rearrangement of teaching duties is available only to spouses and University-registered, same-sex domestic partners. Such a request is subject to the approval of the department chair and Dean. Over the course of the academic year, the faculty member is expected to teach the full complement of courses. During the non-teaching quarter, the faculty member is expected to continue other departmental and University responsibilities, including research, committee membership, and advising. Because this is a rearrangement rather than a suspension of duties, it does not constitute leave.

Report of the Student Ombudsperson for 2003–04

By Urmi Sengupta

The Office of the Student Ombudsperson exists to help students address issues in University life that they may find challenging to resolve otherwise. This includes diverse areas such as academics, interactions with faculty and administrators, and different elements of community life.

The office operates by engendering improved communications between all parties concerned and mediating solutions that remain acceptable and fair to all. It is also our role to draw wider learnings from the cases that are brought to our door and make recommendations where we believe there is room for systemic improvement.

Our activities over this last academic year could, broadly speaking, be divided into two groups. The first relates to our main line of work: cases brought to our office. The second relates to a continuing effort to improve visibility and operational efficiency for the office.

Within the first category, we addressed ongoing cases that were brought to the office. We hope to be influential by commenting on some aspects of the University administration in regard to student issues that were emphasized to us. The second category consists of systematic dissemination of information about the office, which is also an effort to maintain some level of continuity within the office.

2003–04 Case Analysis

At the outset, it is important to issue the caveat that very seldom is one case like another. Most issues that students bring to our office are unique and defy any categorization beyond the broad groups we identify in figure 2. Having said that, I shall still attempt to make comments on the cases brought to us that are based on my experience at the office over the last two years.

I believe that this year's cases were more varied and complex than those seen last year. At the same time, we found that a slightly smaller number reached our doors. Our time was spent in somewhat more intricate and challenging cases this year, which not only led us to examine several policy questions that arose out of the students' initial inquiries or complaints but also challenged our abilities as mediators to help structure creative solutions. The number and classifications of cases appears in figures 1 and 2. We then describe a couple of cases in some detail to give a flavor of our experiences.

Thus, we saw a dip during Winter Quarter in the number of cases. However—based on feedback from various discussions with faculty, administrators, and students—we believe more and more students are becoming aware of our office through the sustained efforts we have made (details follow). We also saw a sharp decline in housing cases this year; and, based on those brought to us, we have observed that students have greater clarity and understanding about rules and regulations. The other area that changed was health, and we have worked with the Office of the Dean of Students to address concerns regarding the processes of dealing with insurance and providing student care. Continuing with the analysis started last year, we saw a further dip in the number of undergraduate cases and a comparative rise in the number

Figure 1. Case Totals

	2002–03	2003–04
Summer	16	12
Fall	14	16
Winter	31	10
Spring	12	14
FULL	73	52

Figure 2. Case Analysis

	2002–03	2003–04
Academic	19	17
Grades	4	6
Other	15	11
Housing	17	8
Undergraduate	4	3
Graduate	9	4
Off Campus	4	1
Administrative	10	2
Financial	6	2
Health	5	9
Employment	4	1
Student Activities	3	1
Student Services	2	1
Facilities	1	7
Library	1	1
Miscellaneous	5	5
TOTALS	73	54*

*One case appears in three categories.

of graduate cases. However, in both groups, we found that the cases that made their way to us often involved multiple issues and required some dexterity to resolve. Interestingly, we also came across a couple of cases where we found that students not only were very aware of their rights and the most efficient ways to resolve their issues but also had initiated some action in those directions. This is a very encouraging finding, and we believe that administrators have also been working to create more channels of communication. All of this helps us to direct more resources towards analyzing policy issues that are brought to our attention and making recommendations to the University. To name a few examples, during this year we have been instrumental in initiating discussions concerning some changes for Office of the Reynolds Club and Student Activities (ORCSA), the University House System, and the Division of the Humanities.

We now turn to some detailed discussions on a couple of specific cases. One of the more interesting cases in which we believed we were able to support the process involved a graduate student who had been asked to leave her/his program for academic reasons. The student believed that other factors contributed to this request; and, by the time the issue was brought to us, there was a complete breakdown of communication between all the parties concerned. While we did revert to the program authorities to gauge the best way forward, we also encouraged the student to fulfill the academic conditions required as a first condition to the discussion of readmission. We were instrumental in initiating discussions both within the program and with the student, which led to an eventual resolution that worked for both parties.

What we learned from the experience is that there is no substitute for the clear articulation of requirements and expectations—both initially and on an ongoing basis—by programs of study. While there were academic matters clearly at issue, the program could possibly have preempted the stalemate with timely discussion. We would encourage administrators to remain proactive about issues that are raised with regard to students, examining and addressing the issues at the onset. There are dual benefits to such a course of action. First, the immediacy of events helps establish facts and data points. Second, we end up with a speedy resolution that encourages all parties to address their responsibilities and use this as a learning experience to prevent future difficulty.

Another case that we believe illustrates some of the same points involved a graduate student who was repeatedly put on probation without being given what s/he believed to be sufficient guidance. In pursuing this issue, doubts were also raised in some quarters about the efficacy of the probation mechanism. Probation was sometimes seen as counter-productive (in adversely affecting student performance). At the same time, we also used this case to encourage the program authorities to explore avenues for reviewing their systems. After inviting input from students and faculty members, program authorities plan to develop a system of evaluation and feedback that may address some of the concerns raised in our various discussions. We were heartened to see a reiteration of the spirit of openness and objectivity that the University embodies come through in our various interactions, particularly with the willingness on the part of program authorities to work towards systemic betterment.

Systemic Changes

Now I turn to the second set of measures this office initiated over the last couple of years. We have spent much of this year also trying to ensure that more and more students are aware of the help we can provide. To this end, we participated in orientations in early fall with the College, some graduate divisions and some of the professional schools. This allowed us to talk about our office with both incoming and returning students. We arranged for mailings to newly admitted students to include information about our office. Throughout the year, we have attempted to meet with student groups such as the student councils and with administrators—with groups such as the deans of students and with individual officials. We have also kept alive the office's participation in working committees through continued membership, such as in the Campus Resources Education Committee. Another recent initiative has been for office members to attend residence hall meetings to provide a visible face of the office. We thus maintain an ongoing effort to address groups of students, faculty, and administrators throughout the year; and we plan to systemize this effort further next year.

In line with the continuity and succession planning envisaged to improve the functioning and productivity of this office, this year we discussed some changes in the process of selecting the Associate

Ombudsperson and Ombudsperson. Over the last few years, there has been an effort to select Associate Ombudspersons by keeping in mind the possibility of training a worthy candidate in the office to take on the leadership role of the Ombudsperson in the subsequent year. Starting next year, we propose a preliminary selection process to assess the suitability of the current Associate Ombudsperson before interviewing general applicants for the office. Depending on whether a selection committee recommends the Associate Ombudsperson to become the Ombudsperson for the next year, there will be a search for candidates either to fill both positions or to fill only the Associate Ombudsperson position.

By this process, we attempt to institutionalize the role of the office and benefit from experience gathered across the years. At the same time, this is expected to help the selection committee make its decisions by suggesting that it consider candidates for a commitment that would potentially be two years in length. This would also allow the consideration of competent candidates without relevant experience based on the premise that successful candidates would benefit from guidance by the Ombudsperson before they were fully equipped to lead the office.

This planned change will also impact the operation of the office this year. We are working to devise an improved system of ongoing performance evaluation and feedback for members of the office that will facilitate the process of selection in spring 2005. The early decisions on the choice of candidates for the upcoming year are useful in creating a period of transition over the course of the summer—allowing new candidates to learn about the office, receive guidance about cases, and initiate the processes for information-building activities with the student body even before the Autumn Quarter starts.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to thank the University community for this wonderful and challenging experience. I greatly enjoyed being Assistant Ombudsperson during 2002–03; Kyle Lakin, the Ombudsperson, gave me guidance when I needed it and also the freedom (and responsibility) to handle my cases in the manner I deemed fit. During my second year here, Phil Venticinque was a great support; and I believe he will do justice to the role of the Ombudsperson in 2004–05. I would also like to thank both Laura Grillo and Roberta Cohen, the two individuals who provided the office immense guidance over my years here. I would like to thank President Randel for the faith and confidence placed in me. Working at the office here has been all that I had hoped it to be and more. I appreciated the opportunity to work with students and be of some help to them. Last, there are many members of the administration who lent me strong support with the multiple issues I brought to them. It is they who enable our office to perform this role effectively and who give meaning to our function. Thank you.

Urmi Sengupta was the Student Ombudsperson for the 2003–04 academic year.

The 477th Convocation

Address: "The United States and the World in the Twenty-first Century"

By John J. Mearsheimer

June 11 and 12, 2004

It is an honor and a pleasure to speak to you on this solemn occasion. Graduating from the University of Chicago is a great achievement, and you deserve praise and respect for your dedication and hard work. I congratulate you.

I want to talk today about America's position in the global balance of power in the twenty-first century and your role in determining how wisely we use the power at our disposal.

The United States was the most powerful country in the world throughout the twentieth century. Henry Luce, the influential publisher of *Time* and *Life* magazines, put the point well in February 1941 when he dubbed that century the "American century." There were dangerous rivals for sure, but the United States played a key role in putting all of them on the scrapheap of history: imperial Germany in World War I, Nazi Germany and imperial Japan in World War II, and the Soviet Union in the Cold War.

There was talk in the late 1980s that America had reached the apogee of its power and was likely to decline in the years ahead, much the way Britain's strength withered away after 1900. But that pessimism was short-lived. By the mid-1990s, with the Soviet Union gone and the American economy catching fire, it became fashionable to call the United States a global hegemon.

But what does America's trajectory look like now? Instead of declining, it looks like the United States will become even more powerful in the twenty-first century than it was in the twentieth century.

Power in the international system is largely a function of two factors: population size and wealth. Great powers are invariably the states with the largest populations and the most wealth.

Population size matters because great powers require large militaries and because only large populations can produce abundant wealth. Wealth is important because a state cannot build a powerful military if it does not have the money and the technology to equip, train, and continually modernize its fighting forces. Furthermore, the costs of waging war are enormous, as we are now discovering in Iraq. Although the U.S. military easily routed Saddam's army, the war and the occupation have already cost us about \$150 billion. Imagine the cost of engaging a formidable adversary, not a feeble one like Iraq. In short, the mightiest states in the world have to be both populous and rich.

The main reason to think that the United States will grow increasingly powerful over time is demography. America's population is likely to grow at a rapid clip over the next fifty years, while its potential rivals are likely either to shrink or grow modestly.

Consider Germany, Japan, and Russia, our three main rivals during the past century. The United Nations projects that Germany's population, which was 82 million in 2000, will shrink to 79 million in 2050. Japan's population, which was 127 million in 2000, is projected to shrink to 110 million in 2050. Finally, the UN expects Russia's population, which was 146 million in 2000, to shrink to 101 million in 2050. If these projections prove accurate, Germany's population will shrink by 4

percent, Japan's by 13 percent, and Russia's by 31 percent.

What about Britain and France? Their populations are both likely to grow, but not much. Britain had 59 million people in 2000 and is expected to grow to 66 million in 2050, while France, which also had 59 million people in 2000, is projected to reach 64 million in 2050. The British and French populations, in other words, are expected to grow by 12 and 8 percent respectively over the next 50 years.

Contrast these projections with the expected numbers for the United States. There were 285 million Americans in 2000. The United Nations predicts that our population will grow to 409 million by 2050, an increase of 44 percent. Some experts believe that the American population will be 500 million by 2050, which if proved correct, would represent a staggering 75 percent increase in size.

Many of you are probably asking: what about China? For sure, China is the one country that might someday challenge the United States. It certainly has a huge population. The UN estimates that there were almost 1.28 billion Chinese in 2000 and that their numbers are likely to grow to about 1.4 billion by 2050, which is a modest 9 percent growth. Moreover, China has experienced robust economic growth over the past 25 years, and there is no sign that its economy is running out of steam.

Nevertheless, there is reason to doubt that China will emerge as a serious threat to the United States. Because of China's one-child policy, its population is aging at a rapid pace, which is likely to act as a drag on its economy over time. Not only does China have an inadequate pension system, but it will be increasingly difficult for its work force to support its vast army of retirees, mainly because the number of workers per retiree will decrease sharply over time. Moreover, most retirees will have only one child to whom they can turn for support.

But China is not the only country with a graying population. Japan is aging even more rapidly. In fact, almost all advanced industrial countries are facing serious problems on this front, except for the United States, which will remain relatively youthful in the years ahead and thus avoid the economic problems that come with a surfeit of senior citizens.

There is another reason why the American economy is likely to remain dynamic. One of the essential ingredients that societies need to generate wealth is a large pool of smart and ambitious people. The United States not only has an abundance of home-grown talent, but it also acts like a giant Hoover vacuum cleaner sucking up talented foreigners from all corners of the globe and transforming them into American citizens. The University of Chicago, I might add, plays an important role in making that aspect of the melting pot work well. Other industrialized countries, however, tend to be suspicious of—if not hostile to—foreigners, which puts them at a disadvantage relative to the United States.

The bottom line is that with the possible exception of China, the United States is likely to be more powerful in the new century than it was in the last century, when it was the 800-pound gorilla on the block.

If my predictions about the balance of power prove correct, then I have both good news and bad news for you. The good news is that there appears to be only one state that might be strong enough over the next fifty years to challenge the United States and possibly threaten its survival, and the prospects of that actually happening appear to be slim.

The bad news is that transforming actual power into influence is not a simple matter, and thus there will be many opportunities for American foreign policy to go awry. The present mess in Iraq is evidence of how the United States can use its formidable power in foolish ways and get itself into serious trouble. Even if one believes that the war was necessary, and that is certainly a legitimate position, there is no denying that the decision-making process that led to war was deeply flawed and that the planning for the occupation was badly bungled. No one should feel good about how we went to war against Iraq.

And Iraq is not an anomalous case. Parents and grandparents here today surely remember the tragic war in Vietnam and how that conflict divided our country. Of course, the key question is: how do we avoid future Vietnams and Iraqs in a world in which the United States has unparalleled power and its elites seem determined to shape the world to suit America's interests?

There is no simple answer to this question, but I believe that you have an important role to play in helping the country avoid future foreign-policy disasters, and that Chicago has trained you well to play that role. Let me explain.

The best way to maximize the prospects of producing a sound foreign policy is to expose it early on to the marketplace of ideas, where well-informed and smart people can challenge it. A president's policies, in other words, should be vigorously debated in Congress, in the media, and in the broader public. Well-founded policies are likely to survive intact, while flawed ones are likely to be exposed, causing them either to be amended or junked.

The problem, however, is that the elites who make foreign policy do not like to have their ideas challenged. They invariably believe that they have the right formula or have made the right decision and that there is no need to expose their conclusions to serious debate. In essence, they think they know what is best for the country, thank you.

They also rely on claims of authority to limit criticism of their policies. Most of them think that their expertise and their position give them the right to decide policy. Critics and dissenters, as we saw in the run-up to the war in Iraq, get labeled as fools or appeasers, or even as unpatriotic. This kind of behavior, it should be emphasized, is not limited to Republicans or Democrats, or to American policy makers. It is a universal disposition among foreign-policy elites.

But the problem is that no decision maker is infallible. Everyone makes mistakes and sometimes those mistakes have catastrophic consequences. Nor is any group of policy makers collectively infallible. Therefore, it is imperative that we have serious debates about the broad contours of American foreign policy as well as the wisdom of the

specific decisions that flow from the reigning policy.

As graduates of this great institution, you are well positioned to engage in those debates and hopefully help the United States avoid potential foreign-policy debacles. The core aim of a Chicago education is to teach students to think critically. Specifically, we teach you to think for yourself and to be skeptical of received wisdom. We teach you to be especially distrustful of claims based on authority or assertion. We teach you to demand from others, as well as yourself, that arguments be based on facts and logic and thus able to stand up to reasoned criticism.

In addition to educating you to act like independent variables, we emphasize the virtues of a free and vigorous exchange of ideas, because we believe that free-floating debates produce the best answers to difficult questions. We—and that now means you as well as the faculty who educated you—believe that vigorous disagreement is a healthy sign of intellectual life.

We also believe, however, that debate should be conducted in a civil and respectful manner. Impugning motives and insulting adversaries not only pollutes the marketplace of ideas, but that kind of behavior is usually good evidence that the culprit cannot carry the day with facts and logic. When you see someone slinging mud and kicking up dust, you can bet that he or she has a weak case.

So, you see, the basic values that you have learned at Chicago have prepared you well to participate in foreign-policy debates and ask the tough-minded and probing questions that are essential for minimizing the chances that the United States will commit a major blunder in its dealings with the outside world.

The same basic logic applies to those of you who are not Americans and who will live elsewhere in the world. You have a responsibility, as well as the intellectual tools, to influence your country's foreign policy for the good. Furthermore, we here in the United States will always need sound advice from our smart friends abroad, who thankfully will include you.

Some might think that placing so much emphasis on challenging the policies of our leaders is contrary to the American experience. In fact, it might seem to be downright un-American. But that conclusion would be wrong. The behavior I am advocating is quintessentially American and it has been a key source of our past successes as a nation.

The Founding Fathers, as most of you know from reading *The Federalist Papers*, were deeply suspicious of arbitrary power, because they understood that policy makers are fallible and sometimes pursue foolish strategies. They especially worried that a strong president might lead the United States into a disastrous foreign adventure, which is why they invested the power to declare war in Congress. More generally, they established a government built around the concept of checks and balances, and they created the First Amendment, which protects free speech and freedom of the press. Dissent was not a dirty word in their vocabulary.

They also encouraged debate, which they practiced among themselves with vigor and—I might add—with rather sharp elbows. In

short, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, and the other Founding Fathers gave us a political system that fostered dissent and debate because they believed it held the most promise of producing wise policies.

But obviously that system by itself is not enough. Its success depends heavily on hav-

ing an educated citizenry that is willing to engage in the political process in a serious and intelligent manner. It requires citizens who are primed to ask tough questions and demand good answers. In other words, it needs people like you. This will be especially true in the decades ahead when the

United States has the capability to do much good around the world but also much harm to itself and to others. Because I know what a Chicago education is, and because I know what Chicago graduates are like, I am confident that you will rise to the occasion.

John J. Mearsheimer is the R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Political Science and the College.

Address: "Universities and Business Schools: The Right Fit?"

By Gary S. Becker

June 13, 2004

You graduates have spent two or more years studying at the University of Chicago. I want to remind you and your friends and families why you came here and what you hopefully will take with you after graduation.

The world of business is changing constantly, with new business practices and models, new competitors from all over the globe, changing regulations, new technologies that have been utilized and mastered, and still other changes. The challenge to business schools is to prepare students for such a rapidly changing world so that they are well prepared to be business leaders not only this year, or even next year, but five, ten, or even twenty years down the line.

Increasingly, the model in much of the world, especially in Europe, is one of business schools as independent institutions. That may be fine for short-term goals, but I believe that the "Chicago" model, where business schools are fully integrated into universities, is the most effective one to prepare leaders for the long term.

In any field of study, the best way to prepare for an uncertain future is to stress basic principles that can be adapted to new, and sometimes radically different, circumstances. Liberal arts education for undergraduates is one example: it recognizes the importance of broad education based on principles of knowledge in very different disciplines that can be built on to adjust to a dynamic and uncertain future.

The same philosophy guides a Chicago-style business education that is fully integrated into a university. Such an education has several characteristics:

1. Faculty appointments at the Graduate School of Business have to meet both University-wide high standards: they are good teachers and they have made (or are likely to make) significant contributions to knowledge. Students chosen for the business school also have to meet high standards of intellectual capacity and curiosity about the world.

2. Students and faculty of the business school can readily, and often do, draw on expertise from other parts of the University, be it economics, law, psychology, sociology, philosophy, statistics, or other areas. I spent most of my career in the Department of Economics and only recently joined the Graduate School of Business faculty. But even before this, I had close contact with many business school faculty and consider-

able numbers of business school students.

3. The interactions also occur in the opposite direction: other schools and departments of the University gain from access to business school students and faculty. Contributions to knowledge from the business school influence thinking elsewhere, such as business school advances in analyzing derivatives and options, in informational accounting, in understanding the effects of economic regulations, or in understanding decision making by boards and other committees.

4. Business practices and behavior, business regulations, new applied technologies, and often other aspects of business raise challenging questions that help stimulate the thinking of economists, psychologists, lawyers, and ethicists, and affect teaching in many courses.

5. One example of the broader approach to business education is the course at Chicago in economics and public policy taught by Dean Edward Snyder, Kevin Murphy, and myself. We emphasize how basic economic principles illuminate policy questions of interest to business executives as well as to the general public. To demonstrate this, students carry out quarter-long projects on different subjects. This past Winter Quarter, the projects included:

- The potential and risk of nuclear power: How cost-competitive is it? How big are the risks involving waste and accidents?
- How can we control spam? It is a nuisance to everyone, but very cheap to send, so hundreds of millions of messages are sent. How can we force senders to bear the costs to recipients?
- Outsourcing: Who gains and who loses, and by how much? Americans as a whole gain, but there are workers who lose. India gains even more. The study quantifies the gains and losses to different groups.
- Reimportation of drugs: the effects on drug companies, consumers, and prices. If drug reimports increase from Canada, this would reduce sales to Canadians and raise the prices charged per item. It would have little effect on U.S. prices. The project analyzes the social benefits and costs of these and other effects of greater drug reimports.

These projects are built around basic principles of economics that we present and discuss. These principles are so basic they are useful not only for such contemporary issues but also for those that will arise in the future.

So in conclusion, I believe that the Chicago model of basic knowledge-based education in a university is the right one to prepare business leaders for an economic, social, and political world that is likely to be very different in the future. I fully expect that as you enter again into the business world you will find the tools and knowledge you acquired here to be of enormous value not only immediately but also for many years to come.

I hope you let me know if this prediction turns out to be accurate. But in the meantime, congratulations on meeting the high standards set by this school and university, and good luck.

Gary S. Becker is University Professor in the Departments of Economics and Sociology, and the Graduate School of Business.

Remarks

By Christopher J. McGurk
June 13, 2004

It is a great honor to be here today—particularly being on the same podium with Professor Becker. Unfortunately, I did not study with Mr. Becker when I was here. However, since economic theory was never my strong suit and I still to this day have grad school exam nightmares that involve complex econometric modeling, *not studying* with Professor Becker was probably one of the reasons I managed to graduate from this place. In any event, returning here a couple of decades after I received my own M.B.A. to speak to the graduating class of the Graduate School of Business is a wonderful and deeply satisfying opportunity.

I understand this graduating class has had both bad news and good news this spring. The bad news is that you are leaving school just before they finish work on a brand new GSB facility. You are the last graduating class to have spent all your time at Chicago in hundred-year-old facilities—with hundred-year-old plumbing and heating.

The good news is that you are leaving school just when all the economic data finally—let me repeat *finally*—shows an upswing in hiring. I remember dealing with my own student loans—and also those of my wife who graduated here with me—and know that nothing warms the heart of a newly minted M.B.A. more than the prospect of a secure job. And, if you have been following the news of a possible buyout at MGM, you will understand why I might be just as happy as all of you to hear about an improving job climate.

But my sincere hope today is that you—my fellow Chicago M.B.A.'s—will go back out into the business world with much more than job security and huge salaries on your minds. I would hope that the same fire inside that enabled you to earn your M.B.A. from such a distinguished school will make you want to go out there and get yourself into a career that will help you *take the lead* in impacting the business world—and people's lives—in an enriching and positive way. And I would also hope that you will get yourself involved with a business or product or enterprise that you are truly passionate about—one that means much more to you than your bank account. And, I hope all of this because, if you don't approach the rest of your career and your life in this way, I believe you will be wasting much of the talent that a Chicago M.B.A. confirms you have.

Now, assuming that the majority of you are sympathetic to this point of view—although I know you investment bankers out there are a really tough sell on ideas like this—I would like to spend the next few minutes using my own experiences to underscore two important factors that I believe might help you during your own career to achieve an impactful leadership role in an enterprise that is doing something you really care about.

The first important factor is having the courage to face a tough, risky career decision and make a bold choice by going with your gut.

When I left Chicago with my M.B.A., I started out on John Scully's planning staff in the beverage division of PepsiCo. PepsiCo was and still is a remarkable company—very professional with an up-or-out mentality that challenged you to be "best in class." And I thrived there—I was on a very fast track with ten different jobs in six years. I had over eight hundred people working for me before I was thirty years old, and I was told I was being groomed for the very top tier of the company.

But, after about four years, I realized I had to look for a new career opportunity. I had found I really did not care in my heart about whether we won the latest version of the Pepsi Challenge or whether Michael Jackson's hair lighting on fire during the shoot of our latest TV ad would have a .05 percent positive sales impact—I fundamentally had just realized that I was not passionate about the beverage business. And something Steve Jobs said to my old boss John Scully, when he wooed him away to run Apple Computer in 1983, kept resonating in my mind: "Why sell sugared water to little kids for the rest of your life when you can come work with me and change the world?" That was pretty powerful.

I want to stress again that PepsiCo is a great company. I received incredible training there and had many wonderful mentors. Some of you will probably find very

rewarding careers there—but the beverage industry was just not right *for me*.

So, despite the fast track—and the security of a great pre-programmed career—I started looking for a new opportunity.

I first went down one blind alley in 1986 when Drexel Burnham Lambert came calling. They were offering me a huge increase in compensation and were relentless in their recruiting—even to the point of lobbying my wife at home with tales of jewelry and furs, benefits of the gigantic bonuses they all got at the end of every year. And that is when I started to get cold feet, because I could never get any executive at Drexel to talk about their business with any thoughtfulness or passion—it always came back to a soulless discussion of how much money everyone was making.

I finally ended up walking out of the New York office of a senior Drexel executive in the middle of one of my final interviews—telling him I just had a really bad, cold feeling about everything. I then flew back to Florida where we were vacationing to inform my very shocked wife—who had been absolutely convinced I was going to take the job—that the Harry Winston jewelry account was just going to have to wait.

Obviously it looked like I had a guardian angel up there when Drexel crashed and burned shortly thereafter. But I was still determined to leave PepsiCo.

That's when Disney came calling.

In 1988 I was recruited to be the CFO of the Walt Disney Studios. At that time there could not have been a business more different from the beverage industry than entertainment. Instead of a carefully regimented consumer products business where saving pennies on the bottling line was the key to winning, you had a rollicking group of crazies in Hollywood making one deal after another with relatively no business sophistication, placing huge bets on films and TV shows based on whatever their creative muse or psychiatrist was telling them at the moment. It was like the Wild West compared to PepsiCo. The media world was changing with the advent of home video and pay TV and the growth of foreign markets, and there was no disciplined planning going on to take full advantage of all those opportunities. Plus, there was a deep-seated suspicion in Hollywood of people with financial training and M.B.A. credentials. When I interviewed with Michael Eisner, on his desk was *Time* magazine with his picture next to Mickey Mouse on the cover with a headline about the great turnaround they had already executed in the last three years. So I asked Eisner why I should leave PepsiCo for such a problematic job opportunity when I would have to fight for respect and credibility to achieve his ambition of running the studio like a real business—particularly since, after he had now been on the cover of *Time* magazine, his company would probably head in only one direction: down. Eisner addressed my concerns with a baseball analogy. He said, “You should join my team because I am not interested in just winning the World Series one year. I want to create a dynasty like the New York Yankees and win again and again. And I need you on the team to do it. And, just as important, you'll also have a helluva lot more fun.”

That obviously was very seductive and

resonated with me because, despite all the craziness and the hurdles that needed to be overcome in bringing a business mentality to an out-of-control artistic enterprise, this was a business I knew I could be passionate about—a chance for me to help influence the popular culture and have a bigger impact on people's lives. It was also a business where it looked like I could have a larger leadership role if I managed to surmount all the obstacles in my path. And there was something else as well—it did look like a helluva lot of fun.

So, I gave up the secure career progression at PepsiCo where I had already completed two coast-to-coast job moves in the prior two years, and took my family on yet another coast-to-coast move with my wife eight months pregnant and a two-year-old in tow out to Hollywood. My new boss was Jeffrey Katzenberg—whose most famous quote at the time was, “If you don't come in on Saturday, don't bother coming in on Sunday.”

That was sixteen years ago. And looking back, I think I clearly followed my gut to take the risky path—but a path that got me involved in a business I love and am still passionate about. It is one in which I have been able to take a real leadership role for a number of years. And you know what? Instead of selling sugared water to little kids, I got the chance to help create and then sell them *The Lion King*, *Toy Story*, the Disney Channel, *Legally Blonde*, and many other films and TV shows that I believe have opened up the world for a lot of people—young and old—and enriched their lives. It is not at the Mother Teresa level, I know, but I feel pretty good about it.

Which brings me to the second key factor I think you should consider to help you open a path to an impactful leadership role in an enterprise that is doing something you really care about: Do not allow yourself to be limited by those who do not understand or are threatened by your skills.

This university's great reputation and training will open many doors for you in the years to come. But you may also find both colleagues and competitors who will try to *define* you and then *confine* you through those three letters after your name. Some may try to use your M.B.A. as an excuse to close doors and diminish your ability to have an impact because they believe you will be easier to deal with in a career box reserved for “the numbers guy or gal.”

That sort of career typecasting is something I have had to face in a particularly severe way in Hollywood, where the suspicion of “outsiders” and executives with business training has been raised to almost an art form in and of itself. That suspicion has not changed much in all the years I have been in the entertainment industry—even as the financial risk in the business has climbed at an alarming rate. The average film now costs more than \$100 million to create and market, raising the stakes on almost every release to company-breaking proportions. Strong business acumen and strategic vision are more vital than ever in Hollywood. But the creative community of executives, actors, directors, and screenwriters who comprise one part of Hollywood's curious and combustible mix of art and commerce still routinely tries to

override those with business training.

In my time in Hollywood, I have greenlit dozens of movies and made countless creative decisions. I have argued endlessly with directors and actors about script notes and even pursued the thankless task of casting Bond girls like Halle Berry. I have done well enough on that end that I am now pretty high up on Hollywood's dubious annual scorecard—the “premiere power” list—and I can get the best tables at all the hot restaurants in town. Given all that, part of me even believed I had finally fully escaped being confined to a “career box” in Hollywood. *Wrong*.

Let me read a passage from Peter Biskind's much-talked-about book *Down and Dirty Pictures*, which came out earlier this year. It chronicles the rise and (what he says is) the fall of the independent film business since the late eighties. Much of the book focuses on Miramax and its coheads Bob and Harvey Weinstein. I negotiated the deal that brought Miramax to Disney and then managed Miramax for three years after that. I later brought October Films to Universal and now oversee United Artists at MGM, where we have released some controversial films like *Bowling for Columbine*. So, Biskind mentions me in his book often as a Hollywood figure with long ties to the independent film business.

But here is how he introduces me—describing me back in the early nineties when I was the Disney Studios CFO about to buy Miramax: “McGurk had been an executive at PepsiCo before coming to Disney, and he was a numbers guy, almost the definition of a suit, with a Grant Wood face, long and narrow with thin lips. He looked like he belonged behind the counter of a dry goods store in Nebraska.” Talk about piling it on—all he left out was the green eyeshade!

One consolation is that Biskind's book puts everyone else in a box, too. He presents Hollywood as a never-ending war between “the suits” and “the creatives,” with nothing in between. What Biskind misses entirely is that the entertainment industry's truly successful players are the ones who bridge the gap between art and commerce. Bridging that gap has been one of the great challenges of my career, and—despite Biskind's characterization of me when I was Disney's CFO over ten years ago—I could not have progressed in Hollywood without moving far beyond his description. I was able to do that by aggressively fighting to stretch myself and expand my role. That first happened at Disney, when as CFO I began to take on operating and creative roles that no one else wanted—like managing Disney's tiny Hollywood Records label or building Disney's stage-play business from scratch. Around that time, I also turned down a chance to go to DreamWorks with Jeffrey Katzenberg because, despite the beginnings of the Eisner drama now being played out in the press, I saw an opportunity to expand my creative and operating horizons more at Disney than at DreamWorks—where they just needed me to build the business plan. But probably the biggest stretch was my ride with the Weinsteins and Miramax.

Harvey and Bob Weinstein are titanic figures in the movie business—physically so in Harvey's case. The brothers are known

for their great taste in films, clever marketing campaigns, bad table manners, and almost reckless willingness to take big artistic and financial risks for projects they believe in. They are also known for a complete disdain of traditional Hollywood executives and business models. Because of that, they were universally reviled by the Disney management team. No one wanted to work with them after we bought Miramax. But I jumped at the challenge to be the Disney point person who managed the relationship with the Weinsteins. I saw it as a great opportunity to learn a few things and bust out of the mold.

Three years with Bob and Harvey led to some pretty spectacular achievements: *Pulp Fiction*, *Scream*, *The English Patient*, *Shakespeare in Love*, a bundle of Oscars, and an increase in Miramax's value over Disney's acquisition price of at least ten times. And for me, it was when Bob and Harvey started calling me their “third brother” (despite the fact that there have been several other third brothers over the years) that I definitely broke out of the mold for a lot of key people in both the artistic and executive ranks.

Since the Miramax experience, I have kept trying to reach out to Hollywood's independent and creative side, bringing October Films to Universal, transforming United Artists into MGM's art film division, and getting many unique and challenging film projects released (such as *The Apostle*, *Barbershop*, and *Osama*), while at the same time shepherding commercial bets with high-profile talent (such as the Bond movies, *The Mummy*, *Hannibal*, and *Legally Blonde*). All along the way, there were fights with “indie” and other filmmakers, as well as with Hollywood execs who wear as a badge of honor their beginnings in the mail room of William Morris. Many of these people continue to be suspicious of and threatened by someone they want to dismiss as “just a suit.” But I have steadfastly refused to let people limit me that way, and I refuse to do it to myself. In fact, I would give my creative notes to Steven Spielberg on a film—if we could ever get him to do a project with us. The best executives I have worked with in my career—be it Steve Jobs at Pixar, Alex Yamenidjian at MGM, Harvey Weinstein, or Jeffrey Katzenberg—are fearless idea generators—unafraid to take a risk, look foolish, and make mistakes in the process of taking an enterprise to a higher level.

And I ask that you, my fellow Chicago graduates, do the same thing in your careers. Be confident that you have the intelligence, the drive, the discipline, and the guts to offer an opinion on any subject, as long as it is done for the right reasons—trying to create value for the owners of your enterprise and to do something positive. Speak your mind and never let yourself be limited by people who are threatened by your skills.

You need to be fearless in expressing your ideas: listen to others and be a good team player, but at the right moment, if you have the right idea—whether it is backed up by numbers or not—go for it. Have confidence in your opinions. Use your M.B.A. training and full business perspective to your advantage.

When I was sitting out there with my cap

on twenty-two years ago, I never dreamed my career would take the twists and turns that it has and I would be doing what I am doing today. But I sincerely hope that I shared the same goals back then that many of you here have today—wherever you are starting out in the business world. I hope you will get involved in an enterprise that you believe in, are deeply passionate about, and will have fun working at every day. I hope that you will choose to enrich the world and positively impact people’s lives instead of taking the safe career route—or targeting the fat bank account. I hope that you will have the courage to follow your gut and make the bold choices that will help you attain an important leadership role. And I hope you will constantly stretch yourself, fight to expand your role whenever the opportunity arises, and proudly speak your mind—because those three letters from the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business are a confirmation of your talent and a signal of endless possibilities.

So thank you—and go get ‘em!

Christopher J. McGurk, M.B.A. ’82, is the vice-chairman and chief operating officer of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.

Bachelor’s Degree Candidates’ Remarks

Remarks

By Forest Timothy Gregg

I am going to warn you of hard times ahead, but I promise I will end with good news.

For many of us there will be a period between graduation and settling into a life of work or further study that will be marked by confusion, loneliness, and frustration. Some reasons for this are obvious, like the withdrawal of financial support by our parents and the state, separation from a large collection of like-minded peers, and the difficulties adjusting to a new place and colleagues.

Some reasons for the difficulties are less obvious, and I’ll touch on just one now. While we are in school, we usually have a pretty good sense of how well we are doing. We have a clear goal—graduation—and we know how far we are from that goal and what it will take to achieve it. Once we leave, however, our own success becomes much more difficult to gauge.

Goals are more diffuse, progress very difficult to measure. For the first time in sixteen years, we will not be receiving regular grades, and I think many of us will be surprised that we miss that.

However, I promised good news, so let me keep faith. While the time ahead may be difficult, it is also a time of unique promise. Before we find our feet, before we are committed to our work, before we figure it out, we might enjoy the freedom of low expectations. For a couple of years, we can mess up and do irrelevant things and it will not particularly affect our chances of achieving any greater ambition later on.

This is, of course, good for those of us who do not know what they want to do with their lives. It is an opportunity to find out. But, it might be even more useful for those who have a clear vision of their own futures. If there is already that ambition, it

is likely that work will narrow us. We will become experts and specialists, become like honed tools. This to the detriment of fuller human life. The next few years might be an opportunity to blunt some fine points, soften edges, and roughen smoothness. I’m going to start a circus. You don’t have to do that, but you should find your own endeavor that makes no sense in a twenty-year plan.

Seize this freedom, the freedom of low expectations.

Forest Timothy Gregg received a bachelor of arts degree during the convocation. His major area of study was Sociology.

Remarks

By Anne Therese Pretz

Does anyone have a watch I could borrow? Oh well, someone just tell me when it’s time. Now, in volume two, part three, chapter nine of *Democracy in America*, which is on page 591 in the edition we all had to buy for Soc, Alexis de Tocqueville writes:

I have been frequently surprised and almost frightened at the singular skill and happy boldness with which young women in America contrive to manage their thoughts and their language amid all the difficulties of free conversation; a philosopher would have stumbled at every step along the narrow path which they tread without accident and without effort.

Free conversation is the highlight of our experience of the University of Chicago. In generosity, I will also include young men in Tocqueville’s “singular skill and happy boldness,” though I am sorely tempted to exclude “that kid” from Hum and Soc, whose comments were usually limited to some variation of “Umm, like, so the meta-dichotomy in this thing is kind of, in a way, almost pseudo-socio-Foucaultian, you know?”

Truly, though, we have all had the invaluable gift of the diversity of ideas which our classmates and our professors brought to our free conversation with some of the most brilliant thinkers in human history. Particularly in the core, we have read, discussed, debated, and written about their works, and, more importantly, we have formed a community based entirely on the diversity of our ideas. This is the diversity our culture strives for. Other types of diversity—those based on skin color, income, etc.—contribute to the life of this intellectual environment only inasmuch as they contribute to the ideas of the individuals who inhabit it. This is the diversity of our class, our college, and our university.

Tocqueville writes elsewhere:

The taste for pleasures of the mind, moreover, is so natural to the heart of civilized man that even among those highly civilized nations least disposed to indulge in these pursuits there are always a certain number of people who will take to them. This intellectual craving, once felt, would very soon have been satisfied.

We have felt this craving and have had our cocktails and appetizers in the core and our concentrations. But our banquet will last a lifetime. We have learned how to indulge our intellectual appetites. And no matter what we move on to do, we carry our Chicago-style critical perspective with us; we will never be intellectually hungry. So, congrats all around. Champagne and bonbons to follow. Thank you.

Anne Therese Pretz received a bachelor of arts degree during the convocation. Her major area of study was Classical Studies.

Remarks

By Edward Tyrrell

Now before (and some time after) this university was built, Chicago was known more for its industry than its intellectualism. That’s why we have these Gothic buildings: so you can say, “Wow, there is no hog butchering here. This is a university, and I am here to learn.”

The architecture critics hate them but, as is often the case with those buildings they hate, we students love them. I can still remember arriving at this campus for Orientation and staring at these old buildings thinking: “I’m in a university; I’m here to learn.”

I also remember being a bit confused. Do you remember how we were told that we were such a great class for going to such a great school? I said to myself: “I think I’m great. My mother thinks I’m great. But why do they think this?” All I’d done so far was take the physical education test, and I flunked that.

But I withheld judgment for a bit and, still surrounded by these buildings, I went to classes. I took my first real test. This time I got a 28 percent, but the class average was a 31 percent so I didn’t feel so bad. I loved my classes and things seemed good. I was in a university and here to learn.

I also went on to make great friends. This was a surprise, too. My sister had told me not to go here because the students were too nerdy. A friend of hers had visited and witnessed an argument over whether a medium or a large pizza cost less per square inch. He heard one guy say, “Let’s assume pi equals three to make the calculations easier.” She expected me to say, “Okay, I’ll go elsewhere.” But instead I said, “Well, if you compare them by setting up a ratio, and in the ratio the pi’s cancelled, then you don’t need to assume pi equals anything.” Even she admitted I was right for this school. But, as I said, my friends were not the socially inept nerds I had been led to expect. They were social nerds.

I know now that what unites our class is that we were allowed to ponder useless things. Sure, some take it too far and argue about pizza. But most of the time, we call this pondering *learning*. When you are among these buildings, the concerns of the outside world—like traffic or hog butchering—don’t matter as much. You are in a university; you are here to learn.

Now it is our time to take the concerns of the world inside these buildings to the outside world. Hopefully, with all its distractions, we will still find time to ponder. Except, of course, when we are eating pizza.

Edward Tyrrell received a bachelor of arts degree during the convocation. His major area of study was Mathematics.

Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching

The University’s Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching were presented during the 477th convocation on June 12, 2004.

Upon the recommendation of John W. Boyer, Dean of the College, and Richard P. Saller, Provost, Don Michael Randel, President, designated the following winners.

Nadine Di Vito

Senior Lecturer and French Coordinator, Department of Romance Languages & Literatures and the College; Director of Language Programs

The candidate was presented by Thomas Pavel, the Helen B. and Frank L. Sulzberger Professor, Departments of Romance Languages & Literatures and Comparative Literature, Committee on Social Thought, and the College.

Nadine Di Vito, as so many of you know, is the director of our language program, which she guides with legendary energy and dedication on the path of success. Few other universities have been as adept in enticing their students to learn foreign languages as the University of Chicago. Our enrollments show a constant increase, as more and more of our students take advantage of the wide choices of languages offered here at Chicago. And a great, a crucial part of this success story is owed to Nadine.

She is one of the best and most dependable organizers I have ever seen—always present, always on top of things, knowing before anyone else where the problems are or may appear. She knows how to train and motivate our language teachers, how to trigger in them the desire to invent and apply the most innovative methods. And indeed, under Nadine’s leadership, our language program is now at the cutting edge of teaching methodology in this country.

She is a superb trainer of graduate students. Her course on the methodology of language teaching introduces our Romance languages graduates to an array of ideas and approaches in applied linguistics. These students are lucky enough to be allowed to leave for a while the rarefied atmosphere of literary speculation in order to deal, under Nadine’s guidance, with the rough, practical techniques of language instruction.

Nadine knows how to train them because she is a fantastic language teacher herself. I attended some of her classes in French. The ideal number of students in a language class is, as everyone knows, about 10 to 12. Given the success of our language offerings, she had nineteen students. I thought she would never manage. But miraculously, Nadine made everyone in the class speak, read, think, answer questions, interact with each other and with the teacher. It was an incredible sight: nineteen young people on their toes for a full fifty-

minutes of intense exchanges in French, with Nadine in their midst—relaxed; smiling; easily moving from one assignment to the other; energizing those who, for a second, had a lapse of attention; graciously answering every single question; and, most of all, putting everyone at ease. It was the most impressive language class I ever attended. No wonder Nadine's students adore her. The Quantrell Award is a token of our community's admiration and praise for her splendid achievement.

Citation: Dedicated and demanding teacher of French, inspiring teacher of teachers, you give life to the teaching of French at Chicago.

Martin E. Feder

Professor, Department of Organismal Biology & Anatomy, Committees on Genetics, Molecular Medicine, and Evolutionary Biology, and the College

The candidate was presented by Lorna Puttkammer Straus, Professor Emeritus, Department of Organismal Biology & Anatomy and the College; University Marshal.

Martin Feder joined the faculty in 1979, prepared to teach students committed to the biological sciences. He came to a place where every undergraduate needs to take some course work in biology and where there is ongoing interest in what to teach the physics student and the economics or English major, as well as the student whose goal is further study in biology. And he listened and learned, becoming a participant in those discussions. As Master of the Biological Sciences Collegiate Division, he helped introduce significant curricular changes that are with us today and he played a major role in the planning and building of our wonderful Donnelley Center, which has space for both teaching and research in the biological sciences. He recognizes their relationship, and his own research informs his teaching.

In the laboratory, Feder is defining a new approach to answering fundamental questions in the life sciences. Until recently, the study of biology has been fragmented by different tools, different levels of analysis, and different scientific cultures. Unfortunately, answers to some of the most basic questions of biology are not confined to a single approach or field. To understand how organisms adapt to their environments, Feder has developed a research program using genetics, ecology, computational science, evolutionary biology, and molecular biology. In so doing, he has made major strides in understanding how adaptations arise and are maintained in evolution. This approach has been widely influential in recent years—spawning books, symposia, and conferences dedicated to his approach.

Martin Feder strives to find new techniques and ideas to use, rejecting those that don't work and rapidly assimilating successful ones. This intellectual athleticism also underlies his success as a teacher and a mentor. Students in his undergraduate courses are exposed to a whole new way of thinking about science taught by one of the founders of this approach. Feder's teaching style blends intellectual rigor, metaphor, and analogy to make the complex interac-

tions of physiology come alive to students from diverse backgrounds. It is no coincidence that a substantial fraction of his students go on to higher degrees in biology and medicine.

Citation: Your multidisciplinary approach to research has given new explanatory power to biology, has infused your classes with intellectual vitality, and has provided your students with tools to understand the workings of nature.

Michael Green

Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy and the College

The candidate was presented by Michael Forster, Professor, Department of Philosophy and the College.

Since coming to the University in 1999, Michael Green has contributed greatly to the intellectual life of not just one but two academic units in the University to which he belongs, the Department of Philosophy and the Human Rights Program, coping graciously and effectively with the double burden that this imposes.

He arrived at the University already in possession of an enviable reputation as an outstanding teacher, and that reputation has been richly borne out by his performance here. In particular, his undergraduate students express enormous appreciation for his devotion to teaching, his skill at it, his adept application of computer technology to the classroom (for example, in creating Web pages for individual courses), his ready availability outside the classroom, and his genuine interest in what the students have to say (reflected, for example, in the care with which he collects, reflects on, and adjusts his teaching in response to student evaluations). Michael Green has also generously helped students (at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels) in many other ways, for example, by serving for several years as the director of the course Philosophical Perspectives on the Humanities (the contribution of the Department of Philosophy to the core), by taking charge of the Web page of the Department of Philosophy for several years, and by assisting each year in the placement of graduate students.

In addition, Michael Green has earned himself a reputation as an invaluable colleague in administrative tasks requiring unusual levels of fairness and discretion (for example, soliciting and synthesizing faculty opinions when selecting a new chairman). In short, Michael Green is a model of conscientious and effective teaching and administration.

Citation: An inspired and caring teacher, you have helped your students and won their gratitude both in the classroom and beyond it, while also bearing the unusual burden of exemplary service to two academic units in the University.

David Jablonski

The William R. Kenan, Jr., Professor, Department of Geophysical Sciences, Committee on Evolutionary Biology, and the College

The candidate was presented by David B. Rowley, Professor, Department of Geophysical Sciences and the College; Chairman, Department of Geophysical Sciences.

David Jablonski is a passionate teacher and passionate researcher. Life, as far as we know, only exists on Earth. There is almost certainly life elsewhere in the universe, but our understanding of the origin and evolution of life is restricted to this single minute planet that we call home. What evolutionary processes are responsible for all of the diversity of life that surrounds us today? What evolutionary mechanisms were responsible for determining which of all of the new organisms that have originated over the course of the last four-billion or so years are still present today? What causes are responsible for the extinction of the vast majority of organisms that have ever existed on this planet? When mass extinctions wipe up to 95 percent of the invertebrate life from the face of the Earth are there spatial or temporal patterns of the recovery of the taxa that survive or in the origination of new taxa? These are not simple questions that can be answered by being lucky with a Google search—unless, of course, the search turns up the collected works of David Jablonski—but require painstakingly careful collection and analysis of diverse data from the fossil record. David Jablonski is passionate about digging deeply, understanding the fundamentals, and arriving at conclusions supported by observation and theory—no matter where that may take him.

We are here today not to recognize David's research acumen, great as it may be; instead, we are here to acknowledge another passion of his—teaching, and particularly undergraduate teaching. From Hox genes and symbiosis to viruses and gene swapping, David Jablonski is passionate about conveying to students the spectacular panoply of mechanisms and processes that have given rise to the evolution and diversity of life on Earth.

Citation: David Jablonski, paleobiologist extraordinaire whose passion for teaching and the evolution of life inspire students and colleagues alike with excitement for pursuing new knowledge and greater understanding of the world around us.

James A. Leitzel

Senior Lecturer and Co-chair, Public Policy Studies in the College

The candidate was presented by Richard P. Taub, the Paul Klapper Professor of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology, Committee on Human Development, and the College; Chairman, Committee on Human Development.

James Leitzel is an internationally renowned scholar in two fields of economics. The first involves the regulation and control of such phenomena as gun use and vice activities. The second is the study of economic transition—the movement of the former Soviet Union and eastern block countries from socialism to some form of market-based economy. As a scholar, Professor Leitzel's style is to apply important economic theories to unusual problems in surprising ways.

Once he has made the connections, arcane matters—otherwise difficult to understand—become illuminated.

His teaching reflects many of the same characteristics. He is not only able to make economic theories clear to his students but, with a skill that is rare in his profession, he is also able to demonstrate how those theories apply to policy in a real and imperfect world.

He does all of this with a light touch and a sense of humor. In his hands, the dismal science becomes, instead, bright and clear. As one student reported about Professor Lietzel's course on the regulation of vice: “[This is] my favorite course—the most fun, interesting, and rewarding one taken at the University of Chicago.”

Mr. Leitzel teaches others beyond the College. He has been for several years a “resource scholar” in Russia, where he has served as a mentor to local researchers by assisting their production of high-quality work on Russian economic problems. And his book *Russian Economic Reform* is used as a text in other universities.

His widely ranging activities do not interfere with his commitments as a teacher. Students report with deep gratitude on the time and care with which he reviews their work and the way he encourages them to strive for the highest level of performance.

Citation: James Leitzel, you make the dismal science shine brightly as you connect abstract theories to practical problems and teach your students how to make and consider policy in an imperfect world.

Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching

Four Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching were presented during the 477th convocation on June 11, 2004. These awards, established in 1986, recognize and honor faculty members for their effective graduate teaching, including leadership in the development of programs and a special ability to encourage, influence, and work with graduate students.

Nominations and recommendations for the Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching are made by faculty and graduate students; selection is by a faculty committee appointed by the Provost.

Carl C. Correll

Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology

The candidate was presented by Anthony A. Kossiakoff, the Otho S. A. Sprague Professor, Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology; Chairman, Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology.

It was clear from the start that Carl Correll possesses a gift for communicating science to students and colleagues alike. He not only educates his students but also inspires them to learn and to grow, to be creative, and to think critically and independently. Carl's influence has helped to shape the research goals and career paths of those he educates.

His exceptionally high personal standards have inspired his students to raise their own. Carl's impact extends beyond

the classroom as he generously guides those who ask for technical help, tutoring, or personal advice. While there is no doubt that Carl is an exceptional role model for his students, he is no less a role model for his colleagues as well. In all these ways, the Correll standard is the gold standard.

Citation: Through his extraordinary scholarship, energy, and skills, Carl Correll has had a transforming impact on his students—both as a teacher and a mentor. He has not only expanded their scientific horizons but also inspired them through his enthusiasm and regard for science and for those around him.

Franklin I. Gamwell

The Shailer Mathews Professor, Divinity School

The candidate was presented by Richard A. Rosengarten, Associate Professor, Divinity School and the College; Dean, Divinity School.

Franklin I. “Chris” Gamwell’s remarkable skills in the exposition and analysis of ethical and political theory in their relations to Christian theology and to the philosophy of religion has as its sole equal his very considerable capacities for sympathetic listening. Students of Gamwell thus enjoy the double benison of a mentor whose own mind is eminently knowable, yet whose disposition toward their independent thinking is engaged and irenic. His insistent quest for thesis and argument has as its complement the capacity to go very far indeed to their discovery; and there is no greater shared pleasure in the academic life than the occasion when Gamwell and the student have reached the point when the student’s own idea has been, to use a favorite Gamwell phrase, “thought through from the ground up.”

No teacher takes greater pleasure in the full expression of truly independent and creative inquiry, and I will venture that none lavishes greater commentary on student’s written work or more time in consultation toward the writing. Each one or the many students who wrote to support Chris Gamwell’s nomination spoke feelingly of her or his aspiration to emulate this professor’s exemplary teaching and advising; they were confident that such would represent truly exemplary professional accomplishment. For their part, Chris’s counterparts on the faculty are equally enthusiastic about this award and applaud the students’ initiative for its recognition of a colleague whose power of intellect and generosity of spirit so thoroughly enhance our understanding of the role religion plays in the human adventure with ideas.

Citation: Incisive of mind and generous of heart, extraordinary teacher in all venues, his trenchancy of insight, utter fairness of mind, and personal humility exemplify comprehensively what the life of the mind can be.

Wadad Kadi

The Avalon Foundation Distinguished Service Professor, Department of Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations and the College

The candidate was presented by Peter F. Dorman, Associate Professor, Oriental Institute, Department of Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations, and the College; Chairman, Department of Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations.

Wadad Kadi is the embodiment of academic challenge and intellectual reward. Her erudition in Islamic literature and poetics is legendary, touching on the Qur’an and its relationship to Arabic prose, Islamic theology and sectarianism, and administrative history. Out of an extraordinarily rich field of writings she generously offers her wisdom, criticism, and advice to a new generation of young scholars of Islamic thought. Fervently committed to excellence in the classroom, she founds her pedagogical approach on the enlightened conviction that the full scholarly life begins in earnest in the classroom and that the process of teaching enriches her as much as it does her students.

Her devotion to her field is passionate, and her students respond with an equal measure of passion. They have described her classes as a life-changing experience and her mentorship as having altered the course of their academic careers. Her soaring expectations for her students are balanced by an innate concern for their well-being, a realization that students have fully rounded lives that can impinge on the formal demands of academia. Her personal accessibility and open-handed encouragement are fundamental—and virtually unconscious—aspects of her commitment to graduate instruction. In this she combines the highest standards of her field with the very core of humanistic principles.

Citation: Through her unsurpassed erudition and her abiding concern for the mentoring and well-being of her students, Wadad Kadi combines the highest standards of her field with the core of humanistic principles.

Richard P. Taub

The Paul Klapper Professor of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology, Committee on Human Development, and the College; Chairman, Committee on Human Development.

The candidate was presented by John A. Lucy, the William Benton Professor, Committee on Human Development, Department of Psychology, and the College.

Richard Taub’s blend of engaged scholarship, professional mentorship, and program development has endeared him to several generations of students in the Division of the Social Sciences. He is a mainstay on our campus for training in qualitative sociological methods and research on policy issues, especially micro-enterprise initiatives here in the United States as well as abroad in India. Students testify to the impact of his research on their careers both for its intellectual breadth and for its firm commitment to advancing social research for the public good. He not only supervises large numbers of individual graduate students in the Department of Sociology and the Committee on Human Development but has also worked to rebuild the graduate

training program in human development, which he currently chairs even as he has continued to run our popular undergraduate major in public policy.

Through these efforts at program development, he has enhanced the training of many more students than he supervises directly and has helped to create an environment that continues to draw the best students to Chicago. Finally, he regularly reaches out to help students encountering difficult times in their training, whether the difficulty be disruptions in their personal lives or simply setbacks in their programs from loss of advisers or momentum. Through his timely interventions, many students have found the personal or professional help they have needed to complete their programs and move on to productive careers. In short, Richard Taub’s contributions to our students extend beyond classroom instruction and research supervision to encompass the overall structure of their graduate training and the place of that training in our society and in their lives. In this he truly represents what we mean when we speak of outstanding teaching.

Citation: Through deeply engaged teaching on issues of social importance, strong mentoring of students’ professional and personal development, and tireless building of effective training programs, Richard Taub has made a truly outstanding contribution to graduate education at this university.

Honorary Degrees

Doctor of Humane Letters

Mogens Trolle Larsen

Professor in Assyriology, Carsten Niebuhr Department of Near Eastern Studies, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

The candidate was presented by Matthew W. Stolper, the John A. Wilson Professor, Oriental Institute, Department of Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations, Committee on the Ancient Mediterranean World, and the College; Chairman, Committee on the Ancient Mediterranean World.

Mogens Trolle Larsen’s work on ancient Assyrian texts explores the borderlands shared by the humanities and the social sciences. Combining the fine point of philology and the broad edge of theory, he has revived a world of ancient merchants and their state. He has cast light at once on the work and temperament of ancient men and women, on the articulation between their families and their societies, and on the broadest economic and historical dynamics of their era in western Asia.

Larsen’s studies of Mesopotamian literacy expound the role of intellectual achievement in ancient societies. His studies of the rediscovery of the Mesopotamian record reveal the role of these modern achievements in the development of the academy.

He has been a powerful force in bringing together the untidy troves of Assyriologists’ knowledge and the ambitious methods of historians and anthropologists. Assyriologists have changed how they conceive

the data of Mesopotamian history and how they undertake interdisciplinary collaboration because of the example and opportunities that Larsen has offered.

No historian of the ancient Near East has sparked the ambition of more students and colleagues than Larsen. None has set a more challenging standard of intellectual reach and clarity. None has done more to make the unique record of the ancient Near East a vital element in the present effort to understand history, culture, and society.

Citation: With tender care and deep respect, Mogens Trolle Larsen reads the words of the most ancient Assyrians to reveal lost patterns of thought and behavior and the relationships of a whole society in a vanished larger world. He poses themes in the study of Mesopotamian history, society, and culture that pass across conventional boundaries of scholarship. He inspires countless students and colleagues to see the unique experience of ancient Mesopotamia as a foundation of both the long tradition of humane letters and the continuous study of social complexity.

Hilary Putnam

Cogan University Professor Emeritus, Department of Philosophy, Harvard University

The candidate was presented by Michael Forster, Professor, Department of Philosophy and the College.

Hilary Putnam is one of the world’s leading philosophers, many would argue simply its leading philosopher. The range of his contributions has been vast, including symbolic logic, philosophy of mathematics, metaphysics, philosophy of the natural and social sciences, epistemology, philosophy of mind, philosophy of language, history of philosophy, ethics, and political philosophy. At one end of this spectrum, Putnam has made important contributions to logic (his first, short book, titled *Philosophy of Logic*, is still considered by many to be the best overview of the subject), to mathematics (he contributed toward the solution of Hilbert’s tenth problem), to philosophy of science (his famous early defense of quantum logic still has many adherents), and to cognitive science and the philosophy of mind (in particular, as the originator of the functionalist program for explaining the nature of mental states). At the other end of the spectrum, he has done important and influential work in ethics (especially his critique of the fact/value distinction, his vindication of thick ethical concepts, and his refutations of various forms of proceduralism in ethics), in political philosophy (his defense of Dewey’s conception of democracy, his critique of Habermas’s account of norms of validity, and his criticisms of traditional welfare economics), and in history of philosophy (his proto-functionalist reading of Aristotle’s *De Anima*, his partial defense of Kantian epistemology, and his interpretation of William James as a common-sense realist). Wide-ranging, original, subtle, and always self-critical, Putnam’s work is a model of what work in philosophy should be.

Citation: Hilary Putnam’s remarkable

range of inquiry sets the highest standard for the practice of philosophy in the modern world. His original contributions have proved influential in a nearly unequalled number of areas of thought, from symbolic logic to metaphysics to political philosophy. He has brought clear understanding of philosophical topics to a wide public in highly accessible general works.

Craig M. Wright

Professor of Music History, Department of Music, Yale University

The candidate was presented by Anne Walters Robertson, the Claire Dux Swift Distinguished Service Professor, Department of Music and the College; Deputy Provost for Research and Education.

The preeminent voice in early music scholarship, Craig Wright ranges in his work from the history of musical performance; to the sociology of the composer; to the relationship of music to art, architecture, theology, and place; to the use of symbol and myth in music.

Through archival explorations of the powerful Burgundian dukes of the late Middle Ages, Wright reshaped our view of the decline of late medieval musical style and the birth of a new art. Inherently musical considerations and, as he showed, dynamic sociological ones combined to create these repertoires.

For Wright, the great Cathedral of Notre Dame in twelfth-century Paris offered a site for a new kind of scholarship of place. Here he set in context a body of avant-garde and, for the first time, clearly rhythmical polyphonic music, while charting the career of its brilliant composer, the elusive Leoninus. In many other churches, deep secrets of construction and enduring symbols of medieval theology lay hidden for centuries in the music of their consecrations and their floor mazes. Wright illuminated these pieces, demonstrating that Guillaume Dufay's monumental motet *Nuper rosarum flores* for Florence Cathedral symbolizes the proportions of the church universal, exemplified in King Solomon's Temple. So, too, Wright's *Maze and the Warrior* displays the power of the labyrinth as metaphor in an astonishing array of mythic, ritual, and vernacular contexts. He traces songs commemorating the journey of the ancient warrior in and out of the maze; unravels fifteenth-century masses using retrograde musical motion and embodying the medieval pilgrim's theology; and explains music by Bach, Mozart, and others that posed and solved musical problems through use of labyrinthine musical procedures.

Citation: Explorer of the archives and musical records of courts of powerful figures in late medieval Europe, refiner of our understanding of the genesis of Renaissance musical style, biographer of composers of decisive influence, illuminator of connections between the movement of music through time and movement around the endless path of the maze, Craig Wright has created lasting models of scholarship for many generations of music historians, charting music's course from functional to autonomous art.

Doctor of Laws

Edgar D. Jannotta

Chairman, Board of Trustees, 1999–2003

The candidate was presented by Richard P. Saller, the Edward L. Ryerson Distinguished Service Professor, Departments of History, Classical Languages & Literatures, and New Testament & Early Christian Literature, Committee on the Ancient Mediterranean World, and the College; Provost of the University.

Edgar D. Jannotta has brought intelligence, grace, good humor, and tireless dedication to his role as Chairman of the Board of Trustees. His public service and personal contributions have made a significant difference to both the University and the city of Chicago. He is universally admired for the enthusiasm, sincerity, and commitment he brings to all of his endeavors, both business and philanthropic.

Mr. Jannotta received his A.B. from Princeton and subsequently served as a naval aviator; following his military service, he received an M.B.A. from Harvard Business School. He joined William Blair & Company in 1959 as an associate, becoming a partner in 1965, Managing Partner in 1977, and Senior Director in 1996. In March 2001, he was named Chairman of the firm.

Elected a member of the Board of Trustees in 1984, Mr. Jannotta was named Chairman of the Investment Committee in 1985 and Vice-Chairman of the Board in 1986. He became Chairman of the Nominating Committee in 1993. In 1999, he succeeded Howard Krane as Chairman of the Board. One of Mr. Jannotta's first acts as Chairman was to chair the search committee that was instrumental in bringing President Don M. Randel to the University. Even after stepping down as Chairman of the Board, he continues to make profound contributions to the success of the University, serving as Chair of the Chicago Initiative, the University's \$2-billion, five-year capital campaign.

The Board of Trustees at Chicago has a long and distinguished history, beginning with the work of men such as Martin A. Ryerson and Charles L. Hutchinson, and continuing with leaders like Harold H. Swift and Laird Bell. All of these men loved the University, and they devoted much of their careers to advancing its cause and to defending its intellectual aspirations, its academic freedom, and its challenging educational programs. Above all, they respected and cherished the unique values and ambitions of the place, even in the (many) times when those values and those ambitions seemed at thorny cross-purposes with balanced budgets.

Mr. Jannotta has provided enlightened leadership for the University community at a crucial time of transition for the University. He has understood the responsibility of the Trustees, both in vigorously advocating the material interests of the University as an institution and as a community and in courageously defending the long-standing Chicago tradition that the academic policies of the University are the sole responsibility of the faculty. He has been a strong advocate of academic free-

dom, of civility in discourse on campus, and of the importance of high-quality undergraduate education as a central and a core mission of the University. He has also understood that the University is Chicago's university, and, in his person and his leadership, he has provided a wonderful symbol of the close bonds that have linked this city and this university for over one hundred years.

Ernest Burton once said of Charles Hutchinson's extraordinary service as a Trustee, "He built for a long future." Mr. Jannotta has helped to secure a lustrous future for the second century of the University's history. He has served the University and the community with great distinction, and in honoring him we honor a great Chicagoan, a man who is equally proud of his hometown and of that hometown's most distinguished university.

Citation: Devoted supporter of the University and citizen of Chicago, as Chairman of the Board of Trustees Edgar D. Jannotta protected the fundamental academic values of the University and nurtured it through a time of transition by enlightened leadership. He continues to strengthen its resources today through tireless work on the Chicago Initiative.

Doctor of Science

Elizabeth Helen Blackburn

Professor, Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of California, San Francisco

The candidate was presented by Dr. Janet D. Rowley, the Blum-Riese Distinguished Service Professor, Departments of Medicine, Molecular Genetics & Cell Biology, and Human Genetics; and Committees on Genetics and Cancer Biology.

It is rare that an area of modern biological research can trace its roots so directly and unambiguously to the work of a single individual, but it is fair to say that Elizabeth Blackburn was the founder of such an area. She began her groundbreaking work as a postdoctoral fellow with Professor Joseph Gall at Yale University in 1975. A major unresolved question then was what distinguishes the ends of normal chromosomes from the ends of broken chromosomes, which are very "sticky" and tend to fuse together. She discovered that the ends of chromosomes, called telomeres, are capped by a complex of a unique DNA sequence consisting of six base pairs that are repeated many times, proteins, and RNA, which protect them from fusion. These repetitive sequences are conserved in cells from man to yeast to protozoa. In a tour de force in 1985, Elizabeth Blackburn discovered telomerase, the enzyme responsible for this process. Moreover, she showed that the template, or pattern, for the specific six-base pair DNA sequence was provided by RNA. Professor Blackburn has remained the leader in this exploding field that touches all of biology and medicine. Normal cells turn off the telomerase enzyme as they mature; therefore telomere length acts as a biological clock. Chromosome ends in normal cells shorten with each

cell division so that the cells mature, stop dividing, and in some instances die. Cancer cells, on the other hand, reactivate the telomerase gene; they maintain their telomeres and therefore are able to grow and divide indefinitely.

Thus, Elizabeth Blackburn's elucidation of telomere structure, function, and maintenance was a landmark in biology. Its implications for understanding cancer and for highlighting a potential target for new therapy have provided the foundation for remarkable advances in biology and in medicine. The end of these discoveries is not yet in sight.

Citation: Elizabeth Blackburn has been a leader for thirty years in the new field of biomedical research that was opened by her groundbreaking analyses of chromosome structure. Her discoveries have set the stage for highly significant advances in understanding of the mechanisms of cancer, creating great potential for new treatments of the disease.

Gilbert Vassart

Professor of Medical Genetics, Director of the Institut de Recherche Interdisciplinaire en Biologie Humaine et Moléculaire, and Head of the Department of Medical Genetics, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

The candidate was presented by Dr. Samuel Refetoff, the Frederick H. Rawson Professor Emeritus, Departments of Medicine and Pediatrics, and Committee on Genetics.

The central theme of Gilbert Vassart's work has been the brilliant and creative application of modern biological methods to the study of hormones, their molecular mechanisms of action, and their defects leading to inherited diseases. His groundbreaking use of molecular genetics in endocrinology has also had a profound impact on the fields of signal transduction and molecular pharmacology. In fact, Dr. Vassart's contributions span the full range of medical research, from basic conceptual and structural biology to applied diagnostic medicine, thus epitomizing the physician-scientist of today. Through an innovative approach of genetic cloning by structure similarity, he identified novel members of a cell membrane receptor family, including one that confers resistance to HIV in humans. His study of active molecules of overlapping structure has helped explain the successful resolution of an evolutionary conflict important in the preservation of the human species.

Gilbert Vassart is a dedicated researcher who, in spite of his great success and outspokenness in matters of science, remains unpretentious. Internationally renowned for both his work and mentorship, he collaborates equally enthusiastically with both the young and the established researcher. His generosity in science is exemplary in today's intensely competitive world.

Citation: By applying the principles and methods of modern molecular biology and genetics to the study of hormones, Gilbert Vassart has dramatically advanced our understanding of the fundamental processes of human disease. His dedicated and collegial work is an outstanding demonstration

of how the combination of basic scientific research with the diagnostic insights of a practicing physician can lead to crucial discoveries.

Trevor C. Weekes

Senior Astrophysicist, Fred Lawrence Whipple Observatory, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics

The candidate was presented by Dietrich Müller, Professor, Department of Physics, Enrico Fermi Institute, and the College.

Trevor Weekes is known as the creator of a new branch of astronomy and astrophysics called TeV gamma ray astronomy. The energies of radiations in this region are larger by many orders of magnitude than those encountered in classical astronomy and even those of X-ray and gamma ray observations in space. These radiations often demonstrate the previously unknown violent side of the universe: cosmic explosions in supernovae, stellar collisions, and accretion of matter by black holes leading to the acceleration of particles in galactic or extragalactic jets of fast-moving plasma. Trevor Weekes ingeniously employed the entire depth of the Earth's atmosphere as a detector by observing, from the ground, the faint signals of Cherenkov light that are generated when a TeV gamma ray photon enters the atmosphere and produces a shower of secondary electrons and positrons. After years of tenacious effort, observational finesse, and the development of advanced image reconstruction techniques, he finally was able to detect TeV gamma ray emission from the Crab Nebula in our galaxy and, shortly thereafter, spectacular gamma ray outbursts from distant active galactic nuclei. These discoveries marked the beginning of TeV gamma ray astronomy, which is now firmly established at the frontier of astrophysical research. A number of telescope facilities similar to that developed by Trevor Weekes are currently in operation or under construction worldwide, and the number of reported

sources of TeV gamma rays, both inside our galaxy and beyond, is steadily increasing and providing a world of new knowledge about the universe.

Citation: Trevor Weekes' efforts, persistent and determined over many years, have provided us with an ingenious new "air-Cherenkov telescope" and have led to the first observations of gamma rays of galactic or cosmic origin at energies that are enormously larger than those of all previous observations in astronomy. These discoveries have opened a new branch of astrophysics and are leading to a better understanding of the violent processes that characterize the development of the universe at the highest energies.

Summary

The 477th convocation was held on Friday, June 11, Saturday June 12, and Sunday, June 13, 2004, in the Harper Quadrangle. Don Michael Randel, President of the University, presided.

A total of 2,707 degrees were awarded: 855 Bachelor of Arts in the College, 47 Bachelor of Science in the College and the Division of the Physical Sciences, 5 Master of Science in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 115 Master of Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 8 Master of Fine Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 89 Master of Science in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 100 Master of Arts in the Division of the Social Sciences, 649 Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 61 International Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 33 Master of Arts in the Divinity School, 5 Master of Divinity in the Divinity School, 6 Master of Liberal Arts in the William B. and Catherine V. Graham School of General Studies, 165 Master of Arts the School of Social Service Administration, 5 Master of Arts in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 112 Master of Public Policy in the

Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 47 Master of Law in the Law School, 102 Doctor of Medicine in the Pritzker School of Medicine, 21 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 19 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Humanities, 19 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 39 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Social Sciences, 3 Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Business, 8 Doctor of Philosophy in the Divinity School, 191 Doctor of Law in the Law School, and 3 Doctor of Philosophy in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies.

Seven honorary degrees were conferred during the 477th convocation. The recipients of the Doctor of Science were Elizabeth Helen Blackburn, Professor, Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of California, San Francisco; Gilbert Vassart, Professor of Medical Genetics, Director of the Institut de Recherche Interdisciplinaire en Biologie Humaine et Moléculaire, and Head of the Department of Medical Genetics, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium; and Trevor C. Weekes, Senior Astrophysicist, Fred Lawrence Whipple Observatory, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics. The recipients of the Doctor of Humane Letters were Mogens Trolle Larsen, Professor in Assyriology, Carsten Niebuhr Department of Near Eastern Studies, University of Copenhagen, Denmark; Hilary Putnam, Cogan University Professor Emeritus, Department of Philosophy, Harvard University; and Craig M. Wright, Professor of Music History, Department of Music, Yale University. The recipient of the Doctor of Laws was Edgar D. Jannotta, Chairman, Board of Trustees, 1999-2003.

Five Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching were given, to Nadine Di Vito, Senior Lecturer and French Coordinator, Department of Romance Languages & Literatures and the

College, and Director of Language Programs; Martin E. Feder, Professor, Department of Organismal Biology & Anatomy, Committees on Genetics, Molecular Medicine, and Evolutionary Biology, and the College; Michael Green, Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy and the College; David Jablonski, the William R. Kenan, Jr., Professor, Department of the Geophysical Sciences, Committee on Evolutionary Biology, and the College; and James Leitzel, Senior Lecturer and Co-chair, Public Policy Studies in the College.

Four Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching were given, to Carl C. Correll, Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology; Franklin I. Gamwell, the Shailer Mathews Professor, Divinity School; Wadad Kadi, the Avalon Foundation Distinguished Service Professor, Department of Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations and the College; and Richard P. Taub, the Paul Klapper Professor of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology, Committee on Human Development, and the College, and Chair, Committee on Human Development.

John J. Mearsheimer, the R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Political Science and the College, delivered the principal convocation address at the first, second, and third sessions, "The United States and the World in the Twenty-first Century."

Gary S. Becker, University Professor in the Departments of Economics and Sociology, and the Graduate School of Business, delivered the principal convocation address at the fourth session, "Business Schools within Universities: The Right Mix."

Christopher J. McGurk, M.B.A.'82, Vice-Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc., delivered remarks at the fourth session.

Bachelor's degree candidates Forest Timothy Gregg, Anne Therese Pretz, and Edward Tyrrell delivered remarks at the third session.

The 478th Convocation

Address: "Nature's Puzzling Answers"

By Angela V. Olinto

August 27, 2004

Let me first congratulate the graduating class for all the efforts and accomplishments that brought you here today. This is a moment of celebration and a moment of reflection. You have had the great privilege of attending one of the top schools in the country, and with this privilege came a great deal of hard work. Think of all those books, papers, labs, midterms, and finals; and those debates, discoveries, disappointments, victories, and parties (well, maybe not so many parties). And for some of you, that dear thesis! You experienced "the best overall academic experience" of all schools in this country, according to the *Princeton Review*. I hope you agree.

I had the honor of teaching some of you, and I know how excellent you are. If you hadn't been so busy graduating, I would have hired you to help me with this address. Those I did not have the pleasure to meet, I'm sure you are also brilliant—even if you did not choose my class as one of your electives. I believe my fellow faculty will join me in thanking you for asking so many questions and for making us keep learning as we teach.

Now I ask you to join me in congratulating yourselves and in thanking your friends and family, who supported you through these trying years. Let's give those who are here in spirit or sitting just behind you a great round of applause!

You already have your degree in your mind and spirit, under these funny hats. But before you get called up here to receive a symbol of your accomplishments, let me share a few more thoughts with you.

What an interesting time to be graduating! You are graduating during the world Olympics and the Iraq War: two opposite pictures of international relationships. We all wish the world had more interactions like the Olympic Games than wars. In my field of science, we have a great tradition of international cooperation and respectful competition, much like the Olympics. However, in the recent past our nation's leadership has alienated many outside of our borders, and it has become harder for my foreign colleagues to appreciate the greatness of this nation.

I just returned from a series of scientific meetings in different countries in Europe and Asia, and my colleagues abroad are acutely aware of the consequences that this country's decisions have for the world. Since they are seriously impacted by our choices, they would like to have a voice in the debate. The path that this super-powerful country takes moves the whole world. And engaging the world in a constructive manner is in our own self-interest. In my field, for example, the policy of unilateralism and the closing of our borders have started to erode our own scientific leadership.

I believe we have lost an opportunity to use our unique power to export to the world—in an intelligent, planned, non-violent way—the great values of this nation: our tradition of democratic institutions, of civil liberties, of respect for the rule of law and for a diversity of cultures, and most of all the value of accumulated knowledge and experience that is passed from one generation to the next, as exemplified by today's celebration of the 478th convocation!

Instead of dwelling on a lost chance, I am inspired to see the new leadership emerging in your generation. You seem to be following the advice of the last convocation speaker and engaging in the nation's debate over the consequences of our foreign policy decisions. You are part of the intellectual elite of this country and the planet needs you more than ever. It may be a lot to ask of you, but if you were averse to challenges you wouldn't be here today.

Although appalling acts by fellow humans fill newspapers everywhere, our complex civilization is also capable of creating art, music, architecture, science, and masterpieces in almost any human activity (maybe with the exception of spam!). I hope you had a chance to learn about many of humanity's brilliant works during your tenure here, and that this knowledge brings you hope and helps you transcend any difficulties you may encounter.

One of my favorites among human activities is our dialogue with Nature and Nature's surprising answers. Nature does not speak English. But, fortunately for us, she seems to speak very good mathematics (actually better than we do!). And while we learn the necessary mathematics to describe natural phenomena on Earth and in the Universe, we keep asking questions that guide us to the next ones. With this long tradition of creating good questions through theory and getting the answers through great experiments, we have built an impressive view of the Universe. However, a number of intriguing answers lead us to questions that remain open. Let me mention a couple of examples.

At this moment, this beautiful chapel is filled with joy as we gather to celebrate your achievements. This chapel is also filled with many particles, some of them coming from exploding stars very far away. If you open your hands, a couple of cosmic particles will cross your palm every second. These particles move very close to the speed of light and are called cosmic rays. Cosmic rays can reach incredibly high energies, ten million times higher than any particle we can accelerate on Earth, and their origin is an almost century-old puzzle.

There is reason to believe that the more common cosmic rays come from shocks produced by the explosive death of stars, while the highest-energy rays originate in supermassive black holes at the center of faraway galaxies. Others believe that relics of the early Universe, created just after the Big Bang, produced these particles. It has been hard to verify these ideas directly, because these charged particles do not point back to where they were created. Disturbed by cosmic magnetic fields, they follow contorted paths on their way here.

Fortunately, at ultrahigh energies, cosmic particles should point back to their birthplace. So, if we can observe them well, we will finally resolve the mystery of their origin. However, the highest-energy particles are rare and notoriously hard to detect. They hit our campus only once a century. But when they do, a tiny particle can light up an area from here to the Loop with a shower of low-energy particles.

Scientists from all over the world have joined a project started here at the University of Chicago by Professor James Cronin, a Nobel laureate. The goal of the project is

to decipher the riddle of these ultra-energetic messengers that may come from outside our galaxy. In the Argentinean pampas, we are now building a 1,000-square-mile detector (the size of Cook County), named the Auger Observatory. As part of this international effort, I am particularly pleased to have just visited our collaborators in Vietnam. During my lifetime the Vietnamese have suffered a devastating war, and now they are looking forward—engaging in a curiosity that unifies our planet: the quest for understanding how Nature works. Previous theories predicted that these ultrahigh-energy cosmic messengers wouldn't be there at all. Nature surprised us! Such surprises are the joys of working in science.

Another set of Nature's puzzling answers comes from studies of the evolution of the Universe. Asking questions about the beginning of the Universe is equivalent to understanding Nature at the highest energies. The late University of Chicago Professor David Schramm, who lived centuries in his very short lifetime, was a pioneer in exploring the interconnections between cosmology, astrophysics, and high-energy particles. Under his leadership, Chicago built a top team of faculty members who are now studying the Universe by using a variety of techniques. Starting with a sound theoretical base, we use telescopes on mountaintops, at the South Pole, and in balloons, as well as in satellites, large arrays in the Argentinean pampas, and even a new detector in a basement a few blocks north of here (on 56th Street).

With observations in all different frequencies, a symphony of data can be translated into a detailed account of the evolution of the Universe from its very early stages to the present. One of the techniques involves detecting very low-frequency waves or microwave radiation left over from when the Universe was only about 400,000 years old. A fistful of space has about one quarter of a million of these low-energy photons zipping through. They have traveled for about thirteen billion years and bring a message from an early phase of the Universe when radiation particles were dominant. The spatial, spectral, and polarization structure of this radiation (some of it discovered by our faculty) tells us about a blueprint of what later became galaxies and clusters of galaxies.

To complete the orchestration, higher-frequency waves (i.e., optical photons) are used to study the position and motion of a large number of galaxies and clusters of galaxies—such as in the Sloan Digital Sky Survey, a large project to map the Universe originated by our faculty. Together they tell us that the Universe began 13.8 billion years ago in a very hot, high-energy state. (Even hotter than it is today here in this chapel!)

During an early stage of exponential growth, called inflation, the blueprint for galaxies and larger structures was generated by quantum fluctuations. Today, we only observe quantum fluctuations in the smallest systems, such as in the realm of particle interactions. In my opinion, the possibility that the largest structures we see today came from effects only present in the smallest systems is one of those masterpieces worth remembering!

Inflation also flattened the geometry of the Universe, which is lucky for us because

all the geometry and trigonometry we learned in high school still applies. After inflation, the Universe expanded more leisurely, going through well-understood phases in which nuclei and then atoms formed, then radiation decoupled from matter, and finally galaxies began to form.

There are some unanswered questions in this picture. We still don't know what most of the matter in the Universe is made of. The dynamics of galaxies and of the Universe as a whole point to the existence of large quantities of dark matter, matter different from you and me and from all the things we see. Ordinary matter is made of atoms, which are made of quarks and electrons. Dark matter is not made of the same particles, and special detectors (like the new one in the basement on 56th Street) are being built to try to detect it.

There is an even more puzzling question about the overall constituents of the Universe. In 1998, we learned that not only is the Universe expanding but it is also accelerating. This acceleration is likely caused by some energy that we cannot see, that we cannot observe directly—a dark energy. The dark energy may be associated with the energy of the vacuum, of emptiness, of nothingness.

Nature has again sent us puzzling answers: a Universe with only 4 percent ordinary matter, 23 percent dark matter, and 73 percent dark energy. The mysteries behind the dark matter and the dark energy lead us to new questions and to new experiments that may answer them.

I hope you will keep your curiosity alive and that you will follow the next round of answers that may solve many of our present puzzles (and probably bring new ones to challenge us further). Of the puzzles I mentioned, I believe that the origin of the highest-energy particles and the nature of the dark matter can be resolved in the next decade. The first are particles that we observe when we expected not to, and the second are particles we do not observe but should be there. Some of you may want to join me in looking for the answers, and others may prefer to stay tuned!

When I graduated from college, my mother asked me what I would do next. I answered: graduate school. She asked again after my Ph.D. I answered: postdoctoral studies. Finally she asked in somewhat of a desperate tone: But when will you ever finish your studies? Well, she is still waiting, but now she understands that, if I can, I will study until I am no more.

With all your talents and expertise, I hope you feel ready to create your own masterpiece in the world outside these walls. I wish you the good fortune of a long, healthy life full of challenges that drive you further and enrich your existence and that of those around you. I'm sure that each one of you has a lot to teach us and that this University's tradition as the "teacher of teachers" will continue.

Let me close by paraphrasing one of our distinguished alumni, Professor Carl Sagan: In the vastness of space and the immensity of time, it has been a great joy to share a planet and a few minutes with you.

Thank you, Mr. President, honored colleagues, and guests, and most of all, congratulations to the newest alumnae and alumni of this great University.

Angela V. Olinto is Associate Professor in the Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, Enrico Fermi Institute, and Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics.

Summary

The 478th convocation was held on Friday, August 27, 2004, in Rockefeller Memorial Chapel. Don Michael Randel, President of the University, presided.

A total of 424 degrees were awarded: 30 Bachelor of Arts in the College, 4 Master of Science in the Division of the Biological

Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 17 Master of Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 56 Master of Science in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 117 Master of Arts in the Division of the Social Sciences, 80 Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 3 International Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 5 Master of Arts in the Divinity School, 3 Master of Divinity in the Divinity School, 10 Master of Liberal Arts in the William B. and Catherine V. Graham School of General Studies, 5 Master of Arts in the School

of Social Service Administration, 2 Master of Arts in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 12 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 17 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Humanities, 21 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 31 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Social Sciences, 7 Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Business, 2 Doctor of Philosophy in the Divinity School, 1 Doctor of Law in the Law School, and 1 Doctor of Philosophy in the Irving

B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies.

Angela V. Olinto, Associate Professor, Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, Enrico Fermi Institute, and Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics, delivered the convocation address, "Nature's Puzzling Answers."

© 2005 The University of Chicago
ISSN 0362-4706

The University of Chicago Record
5710 South Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
773/702-8352

www.uchicago.edu/docs/education/record/