Concourse proposes to become part of EE

By Bob Wasserman

The Concourse program has submitted a proposal to become a permanent program under the jurisdiction of the Electrical Engineering Department.

Concourse was created as a temporary program in 1971 as an alternative to the traditional freshman curriculum with the stipulation that after five years the program would be reviewed to negotiate its future status. This spring a subcommittee of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) evaluated Concourse along with the Experimental Study Group. The CEP concluded that Concourse must remain a temporary program administered by CEP during the 1976-77 academic year. CEP reported that Concourse must find an appropriate administrative department by the end of the 1976 fall semester or it will not gain permanency.

Professor of Electrical Engineering David Adler said he was “optimistic” about the possibility of Concourse gaining permanent status, possibly by the spring term. Adler and Professor of Electrical Engineering Jerome Letvin are the new directors of Concourse for 1976-77. Adler has taught for several years in the Concourse program. Letvin also is experienced in Concourse and currently is on the program’s faculty.

Concourse did not find a department interested in overseeing the program until the summer, when the Electrical Engineering Department expressed an interest. The EE Department at first planned to replace much of the teaching staff with its own faculty. According to Assistant Provost Harlute Rogers, Jr. He further noted that EE later agreed to leave the Concourse program unchanged after discussion with the CEP.

Both the Provost’s office, which had been working with Concourse to find a permanent home for the program, and the CEP took favorably upon EE as a home for Concourse due to the size and quality of its department.

Lund named new Lobby 7 coordinator

By Stephen Rosen

“There will be no big apples and no more rain in Lobby 7,” according to John Lund, the new coordinator of the lobby’s activities. Lund, successor to the controversial Suzanne Weinberg, promises to bring many new ideas to the lobby.

One of the most significant changes will be the disappearance of the large three exhibits which were Weinberg’s trademark, because the budget will be “nowhere near what has been spent previously,” explained Lund.

A major difference between Weinberg and Lund is the spirit of cooperation and enthusiasm for Lund and her ideas, as opposed to a lack of concerted effort mentioned by Weinberg’s co-workers.

Sharing Lund’s enthusiasm is Mary Morrissey, head of the Information Office and a Lobby 7 Committee member. She favors smaller, more practical exhibits, Lund’s present interest.

To add diversity, Lund will look toward the Institute’s resources. She feels that “MIT has a lot to offer at little cost.”

Morrissey would like to “see a potpourri of exhibits,” many of which will be contributed to various MIT community groups. She would also like to see the lobby clear once in a while so that passersby may enjoy the beauty of the lobby itself.

Morrissey, one of the most outspoken committee members, said that more attention should be paid to safety and noise levels of the exhibits. She concluded by saying, “The lobby activities are fantastic and I love being a part of them.”

Weinberg left MIT last June when the Lobby 7 Committee, chaired by John Wynne, Vice President in charge of Administration, failed to renew her contract. Wynne’s assistant, James Callion, said that eliminating the “normal budget reductions,” opposed to some of Weinberg’s projects and exhibits. Lund’s appointment on a part-time basis has slashed the committee budget by $3,000.

The LSC-SACC conflict: reviewing the first week

By Kent Piinam

Members of the Social Action Coordinating Committee (SACC) have revised their plans to appeal a decision made last week by an Executive Committee meeting of the Association of Student Activities (ASA).

Weinberg originally planned to appeal to the General Assembly; however, after further consideration, they have decided to follow the more traditional procedure for appeal, bringing the question first before a general meeting of the ASA.

Last Friday (Sept. 17) was the first of three evenings on which LSC and SACC have scheduled competitive filmings for identical admission charges. Each group has made its propositions about the potential impact of a competitive film series running on campus, and the attendance figures from these movies are expected to provide a prime source of information to support the arguments of both groups when the issue goes before the ASA.

Representatives of SACC seemed very pleased by the first evening’s outcome. According to member Kathleen Williams ‘79, “Catch-22” drew full houses to both showings. In fact, she reported that SACC was forced to turn away nearly 100 people due to lack of seating space.

Alfred Geller ‘79, also speaking for the SACC movie committee, said that he felt the attention