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Opening the debate

It’s my great pleasure to assume the editorship of FOCUS and I look forward to continuing the long and excellent tradition of quality reporting that has been the hallmark of this publication. My first official step is to invite you to participate directly in contributing to the culture of our campus society. The energy of a community lies in its members — people who choose to make a difference. During the coming year, FOCUS will introduce you to members of the CMU community from all areas of campus, visible leaders and unsung heroes — those who work in the spotlight and those who work behind the scenes. You already know and those you have never met. We hope to explore all areas of campus and to provide a forum for getting to know one another. And we hope to see FOCUS become more and more a vehicle for contributions from faculty and staff. So, polish up your keyboard and send us your ideas.

As Joseph Joubert once said: “It is better to debate a question without settling it than to settle a question without debating it.” I urge you to be a part of what I hope will be continuous healthy debates addressing the challenges, necessary changes and topical issues relevant to life on our campus. Our goal is to assist in providing information on important issues and to facilitate open and free dialogue. We encourage letters to the editor, ideas for feature articles, photos of campus life, written items from faculty and staff. In particular we would appreciate humorous and lighthearted contributions. Drop us an email or ring us up if you have a lead or idea for a story. We look forward to hearing from you.

LYNN BERNARD

Faculty titles changes: What’s in a new name?

On July 1, President Cohon officially changed the titles for research-track and lecturer-track faculty to reflect the recommendations of the Faculty Senate. But it wasn’t until August 4 that the seven deans received an electronic memo from the Office of the President announcing the change. When Karen Schnakenberg received the email from her department head, she realized that it had been a month since her title change. When she received the email from her department head, she realized that it had been a month since her title change. When she received the email from her department head, she realized that it had been a month since her title change. When she received the email from her department head, she realized that it had been a month since her title change.

FOCUS: How do we come to consider building a CMU program in Qatar?

THORPE: As with many innovative ideas around here, Raj Reddy was involved. Raj, who gets credit for starting the Robotics Institute and is past dean of SCS, gets a large amount of credit for starting our West Coast campus. Raj, in turn, is out of Carnegie Mellon campus in Qatar. FOCUS thanks him for taking time out to discuss the Qatar initiative with Lynn Bernard.

Why is there a contract currently being negotiated?

THORPE: There is a contract currently being negotiated, yes it’s finalized. There is a memorandum of understanding signed which just says let’s work together on a contract. There are legal discussions and financial discussions which are both going well.

FOCUS: Who is our representative for the negotiations?

THORPE: Well Mark Kamlet is really heading the negotiations team, and Stefano Falconi and Mary Jo Dively are working at the next level.

FOCUS: What do we bring to the Qataris? How did we come to consider building a CMU program in Qatar?

THORPE: We bring world-class education in the classrooms, out of the classrooms, and in extracurricular student life in computer science and business. So the CMU traditions in engaging in real hands-on education technology integrated into your education along with external concerns like ethics integrated into your technical education — all are very good things to bring to the Qataris.

FOCUS: How do you feel this program will affect Carnegie Mellon’s reputation?

THORPE: It helps our reputation in lots of ways. There was a group of us who visited Qatar in June and talked with some of the students. They said they had heard that CMU was coming but didn’t know who CMU is — tell us about yourselves. Just having a presence there does good things in that part of the world but more than that imagine students taking an international business course who can work in an international team. We can have students from Pittsburgh, tied in electronically with the students at Qatar and vice versa. So when they are working on an international program they can really think internationally. Imagine a CS student who would like to do something adventurous and live in another part of the world for a semester or the year but doesn’t want to fall behind their computer science classmates. If they can go live in the Middle East and take weekend trips to...
A Different Vision for Focus

How often does it happen that some unexpected event causes one to examine the basic foundations of an ongoing operation? So it was with the case of Focus, the newspaper of Carnegie Mellon University. Last year, Jim Davidson, the founding editor of Focus, a newspaper of Carnegie Mellon University. Many of the Carnegie Mellon students and faculty who have written and staff who have knowledge about those deep and sometimes controversial problems and choices which loom in our future. Ironically, it is faculty and staff who have not been significant participants in making Focus.

FOCUS Editor’s Note: In the spirit of the fairness doctrine, FOCUS seeks a variety of opinions. This issue’s content was selected to represent a variety of views. We do not endorse any of the views expressed in this issue.

FOCUS welcomes letters. E-mail focus-editors@andrew.cmu.edu

FOCUS — in seven issues a year — is a publication of the faculty and staff of Carnegie Mellon University. Manor of the articles in FOCUS express the opinions of individual members of the Carnegie Mellon community; unless stated otherwise, they should not be construed as reflecting university policies. In the spirit of the fairness doctrine, FOCUS seeks a variety of opinions.

FOCUS Reflects Its Times — Jim Davidson, head of the Science Libraries, recently emerged as the right person to edit FOCUS. Tom O’Byrne, a distinguished journalist, quickly emerged as the right person to replace Jim Davidson. While editing FOCUS and teaching journalism within the English department are no longer identical roles, they remain closely coupled. Through Karen Schenkenberg and the professional writing program, we will keep Lynn flush in writing interns (some trained by Tom O’Byrne).

Still, this new arrangement puts a greater premium to be earned (as there is in life itself) by developing critical thinking skills and to bring faculty into the paper. She will need the help not only of students who are writing stories — but also of faculty and staff who have knowledge about those deep and sometimes controversial problems and choices which loom in our future. Ironically, it is faculty and staff who have not been significant participants in making Focus.
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The Amen Corner:

A bit of history from our founding editor, Dave Demarest

Amen Corner: In the beginning...

By now most folks know that the pleasures and pains of creating FOCUS are passing this fall to a new editor, the tabloid’s third. Because it was the first — and thus in some sense the enterprise’s “founding” editor — Lynn Berard has asked me to write a bit of a history of FOCUS.

I have tried out this exercise two or three times before, most notably perhaps in my May 1994 “valedictory” — when I passed the baton to Jim Davidson (who in turn did the paper till this past spring). It is inevitable that I will repeat some of what I said in 1994 here.

To begin at the beginning . . .

FOCUS was started in 1971-72 by the Faculty Senate, as a publication that “would allow conversation among faculty, and between faculty and other members of the campus community, (in order to) contribute to the creation of a ‘real’ campus community.” Senate discussions at the time drew a sharp distinction between this new paper and the “Faculty Bulletin” that then was being published by the administration. Nonetheless, in its first year, FOCUS was prepared by CMU’s PR department (amidst much complaint from faculty about the dearth of faculty contributions).

In spring 1972 I wrote a piece for FOCUS that compared CMU’s tenure proceedings to Swift’s “Modest Proposal.” Shortly thereafter the Senate asked me if I would be editor for the next year. They felt that only a faculty editor could really make the paper work. I said yes. I naively thought that other faculty would be interested in taking over in a year or two, that the editorship might be a rotating thing. I was very naive, I must admit.

What was clear to me from the start, however, is that as a tenured faculty member I had a certain right to freedom of speech. As editor I could extend that right to faculty and staff who wanted to speak their minds — or who just wanted to write.

One campus that preaches entrepreneurship, editing FOCUS was an entrepreneurial effort. President Cyert — whose term began the same year that I started as editor — was sometimes annoyed with things I did with FOCUS, but he respected the paper’s independence.

FOCUS of course changed in various ways in the 20-plus years I was editor. For some 15 years I did a 2500-word interview in each issue with a different faculty or staff member, moving the subjects around the campus, from college to college. This seemed a way to show the university’s diversity, to body-out the Senate’s mandate of creating “conversation among faculty, and between faculty and other members of the campus community.” I think the interviews were a good feature, but in the mid 1980s (after some 120 of them) I phased them down.

The late ’70s and early ’80s were probably FOCUS’s tenure proceedings to Swift’s “Modest Proposal.” Shortly thereafter the Senate asked me if I would be editor for the next year. They felt that only a faculty editor could really make the paper work.

When I said yes, I naively thought that my time as editor. But it also recorded the changing scene on campus during the ’70s, ’80s and early ’90s. It has allowed some conversation between faculty, staff and administration. Carnegie Mellon is a good environment for a small newspaper — active, diverse, controversial. And FOCUS has stayed rather independent — restricted mostly by what its audience finds engaging and useful.

FOCUS, but he respected the paper’s independence.

FOCUS of course changed in various ways in the 20-plus years I was editor. For some 15 years I did a 2500-word interview in each issue with a different faculty or staff member, moving the subjects around the campus, from college to college. This seemed a way to show the university’s diversity, to body-out the Senate’s mandate of creating “conversation among faculty, and between faculty and other members of the campus community.” I think the interviews were a good feature, but in the mid 1980s (after some 120 of them) I phased them down.

The late ’70s and early ’80s were probably the paper’s ‘golden era.’ I want to remember by name some of the people who wrote often in FOCUS. In those years, Jack Sandberg (psychology) and Jim Rosenberg (drama) — in his regular column, “Assays of Bias” — were doing funny, satiric pieces on the state of education at CMU. Micki Nugent, an of-}
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FOCUS: Tell us why Chuck Thorpe. THORPE: It’s an enormous honor and the tough part is leaving the Robotics Insti- tute where I have been for 24 years and which has really been home to me. I found out about this actually when I was on a trip in China and in the middle of the night in China I phoned and I was after two years. "Chuck are you interested in going to Qatar?" I said, "When?" and he said "Oh, next month." I ask, "Why?" and he said "You know that level in a number of ways and it is clear that Qatar is a much more open society than anywhere else. We have gone into the infrastructure already even though we have not signed on the dotted line yet. THORPE: That’s a right — a lot of thought has gone into it already. In fact there are a series of trips going on right now. Next week Bill Elliott will be traveling there with Mike Murphy. In October, Jared Cohon and Mark Kamlet will be back for the dedication ceremonies and we will continue to have trips like that going back and forth.

Qatar

THORPE: In the Iranian Soup in Doha, “a tasty little mish-mash of passers.” Thorpe says, “with spices and gold ... and all kinds of cool things.” Photo: Chuck Thorpe
Marija Illic: Shedding some light on the blackout

After 15 years of being a senior research scientist at MIT, Marija Illic was drawn to Carnegie Mellon in September 2002 by the link between engineering and public policy in her field of work: electric power con-

struction. This semester, she is teaching “Challenges and Opportunities in Technol-
gy,” a 4-credit course. The two objectives of the course are to review the modeling of com-
explex systems and to assess how to commo-
date emerging Information Technologies (IT).

Illic has become the first female faculty member to obtain tenure at Carnegie Mellon in a field dominated by men. She also has three children and a husband who teaches at MIT in Boston, so Illic travels to Carnegie Mellon once a week. Usually she still finds time to hike and jog, hobbies she enjoys, but not as much as her years playing volleyball is in her routine.

She recently gave an ECE seminar en-
titled Improving Electric Power System Re-
liaibility. Understanding Causes of Black-

douts and the Role of IT in Preventing Them.

The seminar addressed investing in IT to overcome similar energy problems and pre-

vent blackouts. Ilic also talked about how energy increases. She suggested an Internet-like grid in which users will be able to adjust the conditions under which customers can communicate their short and long-term demand for power. The electronic grid could be used to measure the performance of users and monitor and control power exchanges between all utilities and consumers.

The blackout on August 14 affected more than 60 million people in the United States and Canada. Thankfully we were able to respond to it just in time, but we may have forgotten the blackout too quickly. If we don’t take this opportunity to improve the current system, another blackout could be turning the lights off in Pittsburgh. The FOCUS interviewer is Kristen Ronomovitch.

FOCUS: What caused the blackout? ILIC: I think they are still searching for the cause. But there are indications that one power plant failed in an unpredictable way, which created a shortage. The plant then asked for more power to be delivered on the same wire so that created an overload of the wire. And then the protective devices started discon-
necting the wires creating an even worse situation.

Some other people were thinking that maybe there was a high temperature on the line because the line touched a tree, burned it, and the protection device discon-
nects it and the customers are still experiencing the same amount of power, and the power plants are still producing the same amount of power, it has to go somewhere. It goes to other lines and overloads those lines.

And so it’s a mix of things. I think it’s fair to say that we still don’t know what trig-
gered it, but we know the basic mechanism of it.

FOCUS: Could the high temperature have affected the line? ILIC: Yeah, you know, you have a high temperature, it can overheat the line and cause a problem. But the line is carrying more power than what it is de-
signed for, it can sag and possibly touch a tree.

FOCUS: How much was the economy affected by the blackout? ILIC: I think that someone mentioned the cost of the system is about $40 billion, and the cost to our economy being unproductive was $30 billion, that’s a very rough estimate. However, there is a difference between lost time and lost goods and users. For some end users, this costs them a lot. Yes it’s a service a computer and not having it at work means you lose much more than some other facility.

The idea is to move forward in the future from cost-based to value-based. In other words, we need to get information that is very value based under provisions which we
don’t have now such as at what rate people will pay for uninterrupted service and for what length of time. Then there will be more of a link be-
tween the real cost of the system, be-
cause consumers aren’t buying electric-

ty for the sake of the free market.
Their thinking is, ‘they’re buying it to do some-
thing, and it has dif-
ferent values to dif-
ferent endusers. This isn’t something that’s needed in order to systematically cut
supply to people during a shortage.

FOCUS: Why haven’t we heard more about the blackout since its occurrence? ILIC: There are different institutions that view themselves as being responsible for consumers to communicate their short and long-term demand for power. The electronic grid could be used to measure the performance of users and monitor and control power exchanges between all utilities and consumers.

The blackout on August 14 affected more than 60 million people in the United States and Canada. Thankfully we were able to respond to it just in time, but we may have forgotten the blackout too quickly. If we don’t take this opportunity to improve the current system, another blackout could be turning the lights off in Pittsburgh. The FOCUS interviewer is Kristen Ronomovitch.
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Faculty title changes: What’s in a new name?

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Title changes during summer 2002 members with an interest in the process as a way to bring the issues surfaced, so we felt we had strong enough support for change of those titles with 60 percent of CIT faculty members are reflective of the roles faculty who responded, 91 percent favored a change in titles. The strongest support for each title came from the colleges with the greatest percentage of tenure-track titles. The strongest support for each title came from the colleges with the greatest percentage of tenure-track titles. Of respondents favored change in titles for tenure-track titles, 40 percent of tenure-track faculty favored a change in the research-track titles. Overall, 77 percent of respondents favored change in titles for researchers. On the other hand, only 57 percent of all respondents favored change in titles for lecturers, which included 95 percent of lecturers, 65 percent of research scientists and 40 percent of tenure-track faculty. The strongest support for each title came from the campuses with the greatest percentage of those titles: Eighty-five percent of respondents and 78 percent of the CIT respondents favored change regarding research-track titles, presumably because 39 percent of SCS Faculty members and 14 percent of CIT faculty members are research-track, GSIA, of which only 1 percent is research-track faculty, had the lowest support for change of those titles with 60 percent. CIT faculty, which 25 percent of faculty members are lecturers-track, had the highest support for change of titles with 75 percent. Of respondents, had the highest overall favor for change: CIT and MDC both had the lowest percentage of favor for change in research-track titles. Of respondents, had the lowest overall favor for change in research-track titles.
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Talking ‘bout a dance, dance, revolution

Forget ballroom dancing or salsa lessons — the new modern way to shake your groove comes in the local arcade. Dance Dance Revolution (DDR) is an interactive video game whose popularity started in Asia and quickly made its way to the United States. In most arcades and a lot of malls including the new own Scotland Yard, the DDR machine stand where people can learn dance moves, sweat their last meal away and shake their booty.

The concept of the game is simple. There is a platform (where you stand) with four arrows: up, down, left, right. On the screen, the same arrows sit stationary at the top of the screen. When the game starts, more of the same arrows start to scroll up the screen and when they overlap the stationary arrows, the player is to stomp on the corresponding arrow on the platform. The arrows will direct you to dances that range from beginner to advanced.

The performance can use just the listing, but it can also go into stunts ranging from knee dips to doing handplants.

The popularity of this new game is shown by the massive amount of websites written just for fans of DDR, telling tips on how to freestyle, tips and even how to buy your own personal DDR machine.

Will this obsession take Carnegie Mellon’s population over? There’s a good possibility. The DDR machine in Scotland Yard (in the basement of one main entry to the student center) is being used by frequent participants can be found sweating and pounding almost every day.

Elsie Laniyi

The food and wine collective presents: The Cultural Corner

(Note: the Food and Wine Collective is a no-ideological, free association of some people who like food and wine and related knowledge. Not a single campus site has been made around what of a movable feast you might say. At the core of the movable feast, for the present, are some wags that the perfect combination of some knowledgeable [English] and Mark Prekop [CFA Deum].)

The history of the FOCUS is marked by many many journalistic achievements. Its pages are literally littered with excellent prose, profound insights and useful pieces of information. There is, regrettably, one area of information that has been neglected, needlessly we believe, in these pages. Culture itself has been, in a sense, the topic of the columns of past issues. Never to our knowl-edge, though, has there been the kind of regular cultural coverage to be found in most major newspapers. We mean of course, the food and wine columns. Attempting to fill that void, FOCUS has decided to send out, on an irregular basis, columnists to explore the nature of culture in general, and food and wine in particular. We would like at the end of the day to have contributed something to the general culture on campus, so that at the very least when a visitor to campus asks the inevitable question: “Is there any place around here to get a drink?” we’ll all know what to say.

So this is not just a place to look for a recommendation for what wine to buy, or what restaurant to try out, although it hopes to be that as well. No, we have in view a broader task: the attempt to influence the very culture of Carnegie Mellon itself. We all know that our community is subject to infrequent fluxes of dialogue about the ‘cul-ture’ of our university. We are given every five or ten years to soul-searching exercises about how about we should change and grow, and those exercises inevitably turn on the need to change the culture. Those conversations themselves are inclined to lead to some form of resolution that can be summarized as: “Change is good, as long as we don’t throw the baby out with the bathwater!!” The col-lective wisdom of this university is perhaps best witnessed in the restraint we have shown in the matter of banning bathing babies. To our lim-itied knowledge, not a single campus site has been littered with even a single discarded bathing baby!!

The culinary scene has perhaps been more than a little dampened by dis-carded bathwater. Our thoughts on this are simple to summarize: we can’t undertake cultural change and development without first giving some thought to the foundations of culture. So, what we like to think of as the culinary collective” will attempt to provide some information about just where the hell you can get a decent drink and a bite to eat.

It seemed clear to your correspondents that the first thing to do would be to get off campus as far as possible to conduct this search—further even than the Panther Hollow lim-jin, where some members of the faculty and alumni community (English) and Mark Prekop [CFA Deum].

Since there is nothing on campus, then, nothing like what you might find at cultural univer-sities in other places (not only in bars but even a wine cellar in some cases), the idea of traveling to a distance beckoned. To be fair, there is occasionally an opportu-nity to get a drink on campus, at one or an other restaurant or café. The occasional recep-tions that punctuate the year (an ex-ample of inadequate punctuation) there are, too, the poorly at-tended ‘social hours’ several times a semes-ter. All of these events have yet to find out about wine—the one exception being a not under-standable miscalculation. There is, perhaps mistakenly found its way into so-cial hour offerings.

Perhaps one reason there is no bar on campus. We invite readers to submit their choice for the excellentest reason that there is no bar on campus, and will reward the winner with a bottle of potable if non-de-script and not very cheaply Chardonnay.

We hope that our readers might ask, are our credentials?? We’ll, we eat and drink, and enjoy doing it. We pay attention. We can write, or at least try to. It was thought by some that the perfect combination of talents for a student such as this would be to put somebody with creative, anarchic, and all but incomprehensible vision (an artist), together with somebody else, totally lacking in cre-ativity but gifted with incomprehensible concepts of cultural analysis. On the one hand, the artist could mangle and wave, throwing out scraps of commentary in the manner of the Cumanian-Sylph. On the other hand the cultural analyst could take those utterances from the Jewell in our Crown and turn them into a proce perhaps and a critique of late capitalism at the same time. Fortunately for us all, FOCUS in its wisdom has avoided this strategy. So without further ado, let’s all go to Cranberry.

The drive to Cranberry was marked by the usual kind of conversation that character-izes academic males out on their own. We all remarked on how badly we missed being on campus, but bravely faced the rigors of a long trip to keep our spirits up. To be fair, there is certainly some entertaining company to be found. No apologies, nothing. After a while a pleasant but not well-informed young man came up to us and did his best, and a while later a not so pleasant and not well-informed young woman tried the same. They know little about wines, however, and we were left to ourselves. We all know surprisingly small and none of us thought it up to the standards of stores closer in town. The Fox Chapel store is at least its equivalent, and the wine guy at the Center Avenue store, Ron, has given us all excellent advice in the past, and has been readily available, although that store is not as well stocked. As to Cranberry, it sadly confirmed what we were sure we knew already: the state stores just won’t do, or do one’s. We won’t bother going back there, and wait even more anxi-ously for privately run stores.

We bought a couple of things, in spite of our dismAY. We got many bottles of the inexpensive French wine, Cuvee de Poela, which year goes for $5.99 and some of last year’s is still available at $5.45. Last year’s is at least as good and may be margin-ally better. Three thumbs up for that one. At the higher end we went for a dessert wine, a Riesusce Grand Cru Classé Sauternes at $63.19 (our view being that dessert wines are worth the expense and much neglected—three thumbs up, maybe six). We bought whatever they had in Italian reds dated ’97 because Martin has never had a bad Italian red dated ’97 (in this case an Angelo Negro e Filiero Roero ’97). We will try out the recom-mendation of the not-well-informed young people as well: a Williamette Valley Vine-yards Pinot Noir at $17.97 and report. We also went for the state store’s current recom-mendations, a Landmark Demmaris Chardonnay 2000 at $19.99 and a Guigal Chateau Neuf du Pape at $29.99 and will report on the results in the near future. The state stores were also tempted by the Lagavulin Malt Scotch (and succumbed to the temptation). Probably the best single malt available in town, maybe anywhere.

Since there is little other choice, we’ll report on the results to the staff and service at other state stores in upcoming columns and we’ll make another journey afield to test the waters on grants to go on to the unexpectedly rich wine State of Washington. And next time we’ll review a restaurant and report on the Kindness of the Almighty and how great steak in town. And of course, we’ll have more culinary analysis and commentary.
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