**Faculty has got to Make a solid move**

The faculty will vote tomorrow on a watered-down proposal to change MIT's admission policy. The original proposal represented an important change in the admissions process; the modified proposal simply an exercise in semantics, and its passage is irrelevant since it would have no impact on the admissions process.

At last month's faculty meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy submitted a proposal to modify the freshman admissions requirements. It would have changed the current science requirement from one class each in physics and chemistry to two classes from either physics, chemistry or biology.

The CEP proposal was withdrawn because of objections from several faculty members and it was replaced with another proposal which would simply have amended the wording of the current policy. Under this new proposal, which the faculty will consider tomorrow, physics would still be required, but the policy would state that the admissions office should consider making exceptions for well qualified candidates lacking high school physics.

The motive behind the proposal — to broaden the applicant pool — is admirable, but the action itself is meaningless. If the faculty really wants to do something constructive about the admissions situation, it should have adopted the stronger changes in the original CEP proposal.

The faculty's failure to enact constructive changes is an alarming sign of its weakness. If the faculty cannot take action to increase the applicant pool with a minor change in admission requirements, how will they be able to address bigger, broader questions concerning the nature of the MIT student body and changing patterns of departmental enrollment?

Modification of the admissions requirement is a minor issue when compared to the problem of obtaining a more balanced student body. Massive overenrollment in the fields of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science demonstrates the homogeneity of the current student body and changing patterns of departmental enrollment. If the faculty wants to broaden the pool of applicants, it should consider making exceptions for well qualified candidates lacking high school physics.

The faculty, more than any agent, is responsible for defining what MIT is and what it should be. The faculty must shed its inaction and define MIT's role and purpose. Recent events seem to indicate the faculty is reluctant to move in any direction. A stagnant faculty leads to a stagnated institute.