In its 23-year history, the Chancellor’s Scholarship has been awarded to more than 315 students representing virtually every major field of study. This highly competitive scholarship of $12,000 per year will be awarded to 15 students. This would be a revised scholarship offer and will supersede any other offer that was provided by the Admissions Office. The Chancellor’s Scholarship is a four-year package renewable with a cumulative grade point average of 3.25.

TO QUALIFY

Eligibility Requirements

- Be in the upper 10% of your high school graduating class after six semesters or have a GPA of 3.75 or better
- Take the ACT (or SAT) test by Oct. 27, 2012, and receive an ACT score of 30 or better to be eligible. (If taking the SAT, a CR+M score of 1340 is needed)
- Apply for admission by scholarship deadline. (Online at apply.mst.edu)
- Have strong leadership skills through school and community activities
- Be a resident of the state of Missouri
- Be a 2013 high school graduate

The following items must be submitted to a school counselor, teacher or administrator:

- Completed Chancellor’s Scholarship Application Form (on reverse side of this form)
- A 750-word essay based on the editorial on the reverse side of this form

Your high school counselor, teacher or administrator must then submit to Missouri S&T all items listed above, along with the following documents postmarked by Nov. 1, 2012:

- An official high school transcript
- One sealed letter of recommendation
- Completed Chancellor’s Scholarship Referral Form

Required Essay & Campus Visit

Because of the outstanding credentials of all applicants, the scholarship essay is the most critical part of the early evaluation process. The article on the other side of this form appeared in the Star Tribune. Assume that the editor of the Star Tribune has asked you to write a response to the article, which will appear on the editorial page. Begin your response with a paragraph of at least 100 words that objectively summarizes the content of the article and its principal arguments.

Use the succeeding paragraphs to evaluate the arguments and support your own position (beyond anecdotal evidence). Essay should be 750 words maximum, (excluding separate reference page) and typed double-spaced.

THE SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE WILL JUDGE ESSAYS ON:

1) stated clear position that exhibits thoughtful analysis
2) supporting details – outside source material is required and should be appropriately cited using MLA style
3) structure
4) clarity, style and audience awareness
5) usage and mechanics
6) overall quality of summary

The committee’s evaluation does NOT depend on whether or not you agree with the commentary. Each finalist will receive an invitation to discuss his/her essay on campus, Saturday, Dec. 1, 2012.
Politics is driving U.S. gas price angst

Cable news fans already know that gas prices have never been higher and that the blame falls squarely on the shoulders of either President Obama or "Big Oil" speculators, depending on your political slant.

But, in relative terms, today's prices aren't as high as they seem, and any blame has more to do with election-year politics than with reality.

Let's start with the price at the pump. This week's national average for regular was about $3.90 per gallon, still below the peak of $4.35 (in today's dollars) recorded in July 2008. Twin Cities drivers paid about $3.75 this week. That doesn't seem so high if you take a wider view.

In proportion to other expenses, Americans today are paying about the same — or a little less — for transportation than their parents and grandparents paid in decades past. April's Atlantic magazine examined shifts in household expenses since the modern consumer economy began in the late 1940s and discovered that, as a share of spending, health care and education have gone through the roof while the relative costs of food and clothing have declined considerably.

Spending on transportation hasn't changed much, dropping from about 10 percent of consumer spending in 1947 to about 8 percent in 2007. Because gasoline is a global product, the U.S. price should also be measured against prices around the world, and that's where our advantage is most apparent.

Western Europeans pay $8 to $10 per gallon, while drivers in China, Japan and Brazil pay $4 to $7. Shipping and refining costs explain some of the variation, but taxes account for nearly all of the difference.

High fuel taxes aren't without benefits, of course. Europeans plow them back into roads, bridges, rails and transit systems that allow for cleaner air, more-efficient lifestyles and greater choices for travel.

In contrast, our brand of freedom weds us to the auto, but allows us to deliver products at lower cost and to drive cheaply as far and as often as we like.

Our quandary now is that we've tied our economy and roomy lifestyles to cheap gas, and we've failed to face up to the fact that low gas taxes can't fix or modernize our crumbling infrastructure. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates our unfunded need for roads, rails and waterways at $1.8 trillion.

Congress, mired in ideological fights, offers no help on those or other transportation and energy problems. Indeed, with the presidential campaign in full throat, it's hard to separate political dialogue from comedy monologue as both parties search for a villain on gas prices.

Republicans blame Obama for failing to maximize domestic drilling. Democrats propose a crackdown on "excessive speculation" in the oil market. Neither bullet hits the mark.

More domestic drilling won't change gas prices anytime soon, if ever.

And a crackdown on speculation, as Democratic Sens. Amy Klobuchar and Al Franken of Minnesota propose, is nearly as absurd. Oil is a globally traded commodity. How do you measure "excessive" speculation in a market that no nation controls?

As for prices, there's every reason to expect them to keep rising over time. Oil supplies are finite.

Even with impressive new technologies, each new drop will probably cost more than the last as demand accelerates in developing countries. Political instability in the Middle East and elsewhere only adds to the volatility of supply and price.

How best to cope? More-efficient cars, less driving, more public transit, better-designed cities and a greater variety of energy sources should be part of the picture.

Reducing reliance on foreign sources is also a welcome step. It's encouraging that domestic oil fields are now producing 750,000 more barrels per day than four years ago, helping to reduce OPEC's share of U.S. consumption from 65 percent in 2005 to 40 percent today.

True energy independence cannot be achieved, however, merely by shifting our addiction from foreign oil to domestic oil, as the industry would have us believe. As costs will allow, a gradual shift away from carbon fuels and toward cleaner sources is still the way of the future.
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