Faculty opinions differ on student involvement
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...ating the issue of graduate student participation, and claims that faculty has been reluctant to seek student input.

She cites "seven months worth of lack of student involvement" up to and following the Woodstock, VT, meeting in May which initiated the curriculum reform. Another example, which Moser noted, was a New York Times article on MIT's curriculum reform published on Sept. 29 - before MIT announced the review to students.

The issue of graduate student participation in undergraduate educational policy decisions is seen as an example of a larger problem. Wagner characterized the difficulty as a "lack of student input."

Moser's thoughts are similar: "Graduate students need to be understood a lot better around here."

Chairmen's opinions vary:

Jack L. Kerrebrock, head of the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, and Dean of Engineering Gerald L. Wilson co-chair a committee reviewing engineering education. That committee is likely to include only faculty members, Kerrebrock said. Students would participate in smaller meetings in each of the eight engineering departments.

Leo Katz, professor of urban, technology and society, heads a committee studying an integrated liberal arts and technology program. While "certainly close to the idea," he said, it is concerned that new students may have difficulty catching up with eight weeks of activities.

Robert J. Silbey, professor of chemistry, chairs a committee studying mathematics and science requirements. The members would welcome the counsel of students, Kerrebrock said. Students would participate in smaller meetings in each of the eight engineering departments.

Lack of student involvement cited:

Warned once that the student member of the former Committee on Educational Policy is also co-chair of MIT Student Papers, she has been active in rad-