rounding shrubbery, or simply scatter indiscriminately.” Lest too many prospective large donors cover in the greenery, Stone famously corralled them during private meetings at the New York Yacht Club. Thousands of alumni heard him report on the University's financial condition in general (which he monitored as a director of Harvard Management Company) and on the roll of increasingly astounding reunion-class gifts during the Commencement afternoon exercises each June.

As counselor and fundraiser extraordinaire, Stone provided a welcome mixture of calm and enthusiasm. “You had the sense that whatever events were swirling, whatever financial problems were tumbling around, he was there with perspective and steadiness,” said Jeremy R. Knowles, dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, after Stone’s announcement. Despite years of work on Harvard’s behalf, and thousands of hours of campaigning, “he never became jaded, he never became ‘accustomed,’” Knowles added. “That he retained his curiosity and freshness is really remarkable.”

Those traits were on display in a brief conversation at Loeb House after a mid-January Corporation meeting. Asked about Harvard’s priorities today, Stone pointed to the as-yet unplanned use of the land in Allston, perhaps for several professional schools: “It is a very, very exciting thing. It could be absolutely stimulating. It could have an impact on graduate education all over the world.”

He foresaw a real need to “improve the sciences.” He listed several ways to “improve the quality of undergraduate education and life” (“Larry is committed to that, and I think you’ll see a lot being done”), ranging from adding professors to reduce the student-faculty ratio, to possibly building another residential House to “relieve critical cramping.”

Contemplating that agenda, Stone admitted, “I wish I could be here another 10 years.” And in a sense, he will be. Even as he relinquishes his Corporation seat, he will remain chair of the Committee on University Resources, the advisory group of lead alumni donors; chair of the Asia Center, sustaining his contacts in and passion for the culture of China and other nations, built during wide travels throughout his shipping career; and his Harvard Management Company board membership.

Those engagements should allow Stone to sustain the personal Harvard connections he cares about most. William H. Boardman calls Stone “almost a consummate consultant,” not in the sense of a number-crunching analyst, but for his “unerring sense of quality of leadership, for his instinctual sense of people and how to proceed.” (As associate vice president for capital giving, Boardman has worked closely with Stone for the past quarter-century, using space in Stone’s Manhattan office suite as the base for Harvard’s development efforts in New York.)

First among those personal ties—Boardman calls it “the most important thing in terms of his heart”—is Stone’s contact with “his students.” For he practices what he preaches, soliciting contributions to Harvard while also making them, not simply by endowing the crew-coach slot and diverse academic initiatives, but also by establishing in 1979, at the beginning of that capital campaign, a financial-aid fund named for his late father, Robert G. Stone ’20, which this academic year supports 27 students (bringing the total number of beneficiaries to more than 200). Before each of the 15 or so Corporation meetings annually, Stone breakfasts with some of those students, whom he pumps for information about “what’s right and wrong with Harvard” and whom he encourages and later advises in their careers.

“That’s really the excitement of the place,” he said, citing the diversity of the student body as the most significant change in the institution since his own undergraduate days. “Need-blind admission,” he said, “has done more to change Harvard than anything, and that is what has attracted the best and brightest faculty. That is really what has kept Harvard up at the top.”

Speaking to classmates in a medium he obviously found comfortable, Stone wrote in 1995—for the class of 1945’s fiftieth anniversary report—that his “Harvard involvement, as a member of the Corporation, is probably the most worthwhile thing I have done in my lifetime.” Of “the people running Harvard—and teaching there,” he wrote, “the real privilege of being a Corporation member is getting to know so many of these outstanding individuals.” Or as he put it in January, once his retirement as a Fellow was announced, “I have a lot of friends here, a lot of people I admire fantastically.”

A search for Stone’s successor, care of the Secretary to the Corporation, is now under way. Upon his retirement, the longest-serving Corporation members will be D. Ronald Daniel, M.B.A. ’54, who was appointed Treasurer in 1989, and James R. Houghton ’58, M.B.A. ’62, who became a Fellow in 1995.

**Amending Advising**

*Harvard undergraduates remain dissatisfied with the quality of academic advising they receive in their concentrations. Harry R. Lewis, dean of the College, reported on December 4 that the third biennial survey of graduating seniors found “slightly unfavorable” views of overall satisfaction with academic advising. On a scale of 1 to 5 (the high score), members of the class of 2001 ranked advising at 2.83, up only modestly from the survey two years ago. Humanities concentrators were most satisfied with academic advice from their departments; students in the social sciences and natural sciences were less positive about their experiences, and essentially tied in their evaluations. Lewis noted that the range of opinions was quite wide among individual students and for different disciplines. That may be a promising point, as some departments’ performance is improving, and experiments are under way in others in an effort to better meet students’ intellectual needs.

Each department is being measured against standards developed five years ago by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences’ standing committee on advising and counseling. Accordingly, seniors are asked, among other questions, whether they received rationales for concentration requirements, guidance on courses appropriate for their interests and backgrounds, and counseling on possible summer and postgraduate plans, and also about the general availability of advice. Many of the answers remain disconcerting.*
ported that their concentration adviser is a faculty member. One-sixth of students said they did not meet with a concentration adviser all year, and half did so only once or twice. In some large concentrations—government, economics, psychology, and English among them—fewer than half the students said their advisers had information about them, such as their academic records.

Almost across the board, students found academic advice from fellow students, parents, and printed materials (in the Handbook for Students or from the concentration) more helpful than that offered by Harvard’s tutors and concentration advisers. One-sixth of seniors reported that no faculty members in their courses had gotten to know them during the past academic year, and another sixth said just one faculty member had done so. If personal contacts are not strong, departmental websites rose sharply in importance as a source of information, suggesting an opportunity for improving service when and as students want it.

Lewis characterized “overall progress in advising across the College” as “disappointingly slow.” At the same time, he observed that students’ satisfaction with their academic experience in their concentration was markedly higher than their appraisal of advising, and their satisfaction with their academic experience overall, and Harvard generally, was higher still. He also singled out the statistically large gains in satisfaction between 1999 and 2001 in psychology, environmental science and public policy, chemistry, history and literature, and literature—the latter two of which apparently already had in place an advising culture or system that worked well for students. He also signaled “optimism” about commitments to improve matters in economics, English, and psychology.

The latter two concentrations will make an interesting case study: each is pursuing new approaches to academic advising, using funds given by Paul Z. Josefowitz ’74, M.B.A. ’77. Their very different solutions suggest that more than one path may lead to advising heaven, at least as scored by seniors on their exit survey.

“Psychology is an experimental discipline,” says Stephen M. Kosslyn, “so we try new things.” From his office on the eighth floor of William James Hall, with a panoramic view of Harvard Yard and many of the Houses, Kosslyn—Lindsley professor of psychology and head tutor—is daily reminded of the need to experiment to improve advising in the department. During the past four years, the number of concentrators has risen by as much as one half (the current total is around 400), lured by developments in the field and by the new choices offered through the expanded mind/brain/behavior tracks. At the same time, retirements have reduced the ranks of full professors (although recent appointments brought the number of tenured faculty members to 15 at the beginning of this academic year), spreading the resources thinly. The “lion’s share” of advising, Kosslyn says, fell to Shawn C. Harriman, the undergraduate program administrator for psychology.

In response, the two men say, the department has recently deployed advisers in the Houses, closer to students; created distinct tiers of “advisers” and “mentors” for different needs; and enhanced the concentration information on its website to help undergraduates navigate the requirements of an unusually complex academic program, with six distinct options (see www.wjh.harvard.edu/psych/ug/).

Now, a concentration adviser—an advanced graduate student in psychology, paid equivalently to a teaching fellow—is assigned to each House, to assure that students understand and fulfill their requirements. For more detailed “tactical” advice on the intricacies of the departmental tracks (regular or honors, cognitive/brain/behavior, cognitive neuroscience, or joint concentrations), these House tutors can make prompt referrals so students can draw on Harriman’s expertise. Fi-

In English and American literature and language, Elisa New and Inge-Lise Ameer are building a departmental community for concentrators.
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Shawn Harriman and Stephen Kosslyn have distributed advising resources to psychology students in the residential Houses.

nally, for “strategic” guidance on questions about fundamental intellectual questions or preparation for graduate or professional study, students are joined with faculty “mentors.”

For many students, the mentoring relationship grows naturally out of their laboratory experiences working with faculty members and doctoral candidates as part of their undergraduate honors work. In fact, Kosslyn attributes the department’s increased 2001 advising satisfaction score—which predates parts of the new advising structure—to the rising number of students writing theses (now about 60 each year). Their work naturally makes them “feel connected, advised.”

That is of a piece with Lewis’s observation: “I’d say that advising is most successful where it is tied to some ongoing matter of intellectual substance—and indeed a small tutorial with a faculty member can be such a positive experience that students think of themselves as being advised even if the professor doesn’t realize that is what he or she is doing!” He also notes that advising “is least successful in programs where it amounts to checking degree requirements and course sequencing, something that can be done just by looking at the paper record and requires knowing nothing about the student as an individual or indeed about the substance of the matter he or she is studying.”

One way the department has stretched to build those connections is its “board of honors tutors.” When the surge in enrollments began, Kosslyn says, there were too few faculty members to cover each thesis candidate. So they reached out to other Harvard affiliates—Ph.D.s and M.D.s, principally from the medical school—who agreed to take undergraduates into their research programs, and to serve as co-advisers and ultimately advisers on the students’ work. “We’ve not done a very good job of using all the talent at Harvard for undergraduate teaching,” Kosslyn says. In this instance, a little creative outreach appears to have overcome the temporary imbalance between student demand and faculty supply, creating appropriate, and satisfactory, intellectual relationships.

“Students these days are extremely busy souls,” Harriman says, and they “don’t seek us out as often as we would like.” By placing advisers closer to the students and making better information available on demand through the Internet, the department has created what it believes is a simplified, more transparent way through a complex academic program. Will the experiment work? Kosslyn, the scholar, is careful not to declare victory ahead of the data. But, he allows, “the initial news is pretty encouraging.”

In the English department, Elisa New this year inaugurated an advising strategy that is, in many respects, the exact opposite of psychology’s. Its central aim is to draw concentrators—80 per class, on average—close to the department, in a community focused around the offices in Barker Center and supplemented by e-mail and the Internet.

New, professor of English and American literature and language and the department’s director of undergraduate studies, defines a “very wide spectrum of activities that we call ‘advising.’” On “the sublime end” are the close intellectual collaborations that lead from class discussion to office hours to working relationships that shape an intellectual agenda for a lifetime. “That is what students really live for, and what faculty at the end of the day feel makes their lives worth living,” she says, citing two students with whom she is currently pursuing independent studies of William Carlos Williams.

At the other end of the spectrum, “students need information.” What courses should they take? What is the best sequence to pursue? There, New’s aim is to “be canny about getting them in” for advice. Accordingly, during the weeks early in the semester when students are shopping for classes, New has assembled a group of faculty members “who are not so allergic to the rules they have voted for.” They are personally available to meet with students in the department office on demand—what she calls “the doctor’s-office model of advising.” For complicated issues, Inge-Lise Ameer, undergraduate administrative coordinator, is always available there, too. During the first run-through last fall, New says, the structure seems to have met student demand. Now her hope is “to create more need through it,” so that students will seek advising throughout the semester, not just when they must have study cards signed.

In the meantime, the department’s electronic advising presence has been transformed (and richly illustrated with appropriate Hogarth prints). New imagines students in their dorm rooms, thumbing through the course catalog and “thinking about what they want to become.” To seize that moment, she persuaded her colleagues to create enhanced on-line course descriptions. New was dismayed, she said, that Lewis’s survey data showed students unaware of the rationale for the
Virtual Mass. Hall

Having brought his office in Massachusetts Hall into the personal-computer age (see “July 2, Day 1,” September-October 2001, page 57), Lawrence H. Summers has now projected the Harvard presidency into cyberspace. The website for the office of the president (www_president.harvard.edu) offers users e-mail links to Summers, contact information for his immediate staff, and texts of statements on subjects such as the report of the committee on employment and contracting policies (released December 19—see page 58) and on diversity (released January 2—see page 60).

The site also offers a selection of presidential speeches—in effect a real-time window, courtesy of the Internet, into Harvard’s emerging agenda early in the twenty-first century, at the outset of the twenty-seventh president’s term.

In a talk on primary healthcare at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center last November, for example, Summers not only spoke personally about his experience as a Hodgkin’s disease patient at the beginning of his professorial career, but also gave high priority to sustaining biomedical research. Calling Boston the world leader in the field, he said, “It is…more important than any other trust that I hold to ensure that this excellence is retained and strengthened in the years ahead.” Indeed, his emerging vision apparently extends well beyond Harvard: “I am convinced that the next Silicon Valley…will happen in the biomedical area,” Summers said, “extending and improving the quality of human life. And it will happen where the most knowledge resides and where the best systems for its application exist…here in the Boston area.”

In a nuts-and-bolts address at the Graduate School of Education, Summers—who is engaged in selecting a new dean—ticked off a list of four priorities he hoped scholars there would address: identifying, measuring, and disseminating educational “best practices”; applying new knowledge about cognition and neuroscience to the classroom; helping to make education the honored profession it needs to be; and designing incentives and systems of management and accountability to ensure that education operates effectively. That is an intriguing self-supplied account of how Summers—a formidable social scientist—analyzes problems and perceives the academic mission of one of the University’s schools.

Not every presidential statement finds its way into the new medium. The winter edition of Colloquy, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences alumni quarterly, excerpts a Summers talk on graduate education. In that speech, the president, who refers frequently to expanding Harvard’s faculty ranks and accelerating recruiting, expressed an eagerness to “have more of the best [professors] before they have done everything that will make them the best”—in other words, taking risks to appoint professors earlier in their scholarly careers. (Here Summers spoke from personal experience, having been tenured at age 28.) He also raised the prospect that there will be “more new hiring at Harvard in the next decade than in any decade of the last century. We will shape the Harvard faculty for the first half of the twenty-first century.” (In keeping with the tenor of the new century, Colloquy itself is on line, at www.gsas.harvard.edu/colloquy, so audiences far beyond the limited circulation of the printed publication can access those remarks electronically.)

required courses in their disciplines.

Thus, compared to the catalog’s bland “An introduction to the study of British literature from the Middle Ages through the 18th century. Emphasis on lyric and narrative poetry; four plays are also read,” for English 10a, the fundamental requirement for the concentration, students can now read a rich, enticing essay by the teacher, Cogan University Professor Stephen J. Greenblatt. He writes, among other things, that it is an introduction to “some of the most powerful literary works in the English language,” offering experiences of interest both “aesthetic and historical,” in a course that “is or should be about pleasure,” tackling “works of astonishing scope, attempts to take in all of society, the moral life of humanity, the whole meaning of existence.” (See www.fas.harvard.edu/~english/courses/course-listing_fall.html.) These enhanced course descriptions, some linked to sample readings, in effect begin the teaching, and make advising inherent to the department’s academic program itself.

That program is being enriched by a series of “Readings in the Parlor,” in which senior faculty members host a lunch for concentrators and share their close analyses of a treasured text—a discussion then extended on-line for students through chat rooms using software to mark up
After the Boom

After a decade of explosive expansion for Harvard’s two fastest-growing schools, one faces a deficit and is cutting costs, while the other has hired a consulting firm to analyze its finances.

The Kennedy School of Government (KSG), whose revenues grew at a 9.4 percent annual rate from 1991 through 2001, began trimming its budget for the 2001-2002 fiscal year to avoid a projected $2.9-million shortfall—an amount equal to 2.6 percent of its planned spending. In the last five years, the KSG has increased the size of its faculty by 38 percent, and the number of citations of faculty members’ work in scholarly journals—a common measure of academic excellence—tripled: both achievements that Dean Joseph S. Nye Jr. cites proudly. He has nevertheless had to institute a number of “belt-tightening measures,” including the closing of the school’s Washington, D.C., offices, which had been used for research by students and faculty, for alumni gatherings, and as a “way to get our ideas into Washington policy circles,” says Nye. “This was too expensive. We are going to have to find other ways to accomplish the same goal.”

Like the Kennedy School, the School of Public Health (SPH) has more than doubled in size in the last decade, with 78 percent annual revenue growth. But the school relies on outside revenue for most of its income, and so, given the high probability of a funding slowdown, SPH has hired Boston Consulting Group (BCG) to develop strategies for handling such an event.

Both schools have relatively small endowments, and must therefore lean heavily on so-called “soft money”—sponsored revenue and gifts—to support their research activities (SPH relies on sponsored revenue for a staggering 73 percent of its income). Beyond the unpredictability of such funds lies a further risk: soft money that comes from nonfederal sources often restricts recovery of “indirect costs”—the price of laboratory or office space and administrative overhead. Whenever a school accepts a gift that doesn’t allow full recovery of indirect costs, that drains other sources of income, such as endowment.

Federalement sponsored research, on the other hand, allows recovery of most indirect costs. Of every federal dollar, says vice president for finance Elizabeth C. Huidekoper, “about 70 cents goes to direct research, 20 cents pays for space (laboratories or offices), and 10 percent pays for administrative costs.”

The volume of nonfederal sponsored research has almost quintupled at the KSG, rising from $5 million in 1991 to $23 million in 2001, while federally sponsored research has little more than doubled, from $3.1 million to $7 million. “We have two missions,” says Nye. “One is to train public leaders, and the other is to do research that contributes to the solution of public problems. Since we are in the business of providing public goods, if somebody offers us a grant for research that is directly on the mission, we feel a strong desire to do it—but we can only subsidize what fits within our budget.” He cites as an example accepting a gift that brought Russian generals to the school. “Getting these people to have a broader view of the world was very much in accordance with our mission,” says Nye, “and we decided we would do it even if we couldn’t fully recover all the overheads from the foundation grant.”

But such subsidization must slow, because growth in Harvard’s distributions of endowment income will soon drop dramatically. University-wide, the payout has risen as much as 28 percent in a recent year, but for the fiscal year beginning July 1, it will increase a mere 2 percent.

Because the School of Public Health receives a smaller proportion of its revenue from endowment distribution than any other school (12 percent versus 41 percent for Arts and Sciences and up to 62 percent for the Divinity School), it has real concerns about covering the actual costs, including overhead, of carrying out its expansive research activities. Incredibly, until last year, SPH had no endowed professorships in either of its two core disciplines, epidemiology and biostatistics. (There is now the newly endowed Robin and Mitchell Dong chair in epidemiology) Any limits on its already meager discretionary funds have a tremendous impact on the ability to take on new initiatives and meet new health needs, says Dean Barry R. Bloom. He credits the large volume of grants secured by SPH—which are awarded on a competitive basis—to the “entrepreneurship of the faculty” and “their excellence in their fields.”

But Bloom is concerned because most of the funds comes from the National Institutes of Health (NIH)—and a period of bipartisan congressional support for doubling the NIH budget may be coming to an end. The Office of Management and Budget’s recommended increase for 2004 itself is just 2 percent—less than inflation. BCG’s analysis of the school’s finances showed that income from endowed gifts and gifts was vital to the research and teaching mission, and critical for keeping its budget in balance, but confirmed that the school actually loses money on gifts that don’t pay the full cost of research.

Noting the excellence of its students, and the fact that the director-general of the World Health Organization and four of the last five directors of the Centers for Disease Control are alumni, Bloom is nevertheless concerned about the school’s inability to compete for some students due to limited financial-aid funds. “It may come as a surprise to those who take pride in need-blind admissions at Harvard College to learn that fewer than 50 percent of the school’s students get scholarships, and those scholarships pay for only 55 percent of tuition costs on average, and nothing for living expenses in Boston,” he notes. “If we want to attract the best students, particularly from disadvantaged backgrounds and developing countries where the needs are enormous, raising more endowment will be a high priority.” Bloom is blunt about the challenge. “Without resources for retaining our best young faculty and training future leaders in international health, we will not fulfill our goal of being the public health school to the nation and the world.”