

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
COMMITTEE ON THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

The Committee on the Undergraduate Program (CUP) licenses an experimental governance model for some interdisciplinary minors for a period of three years ending in May 2012. During the period of the experiment, proposals for interdisciplinary minors are expected to meet all of the criteria specified in the current policies and outlined by the guidelines of the Committee on Curricula (CoC). In individual cases, the CUP will allow an exception to one aspect of these policies and authorize the Inter-School Education Council to provide administrative and academic oversight for specific minor programs. The Council will be charged by the Provost and have a membership that includes one Associate Dean from each of the five Schools, the Dean for Undergraduate Education, and one Associate Provost.

During the experiment, the Inter-School Education Council should provide annual progress reports in writing to the CUP, the Faculty Policy Committee (FPC), and the CoC. The reports and evaluation of the viability of the Council as an appropriate governance model should respond to questions of administrative and academic oversight and allocation of educational resources. In addition, the evaluation should consider how successfully the Council has addressed the perceived shortcomings of the governance model authorized by current Faculty policy. In particular, the assessment should address these questions:

- How is the Council working? Has its role evolved since it was charged, and if so, how? Has its membership remained stable, and what are the formal roles of the members? Has it been able to address the needs of additional minor programs that may have been added to the experiment? Is this model capable of scaling up further, *e.g.*, could it serve as the governance model for additional minors and/or other interdisciplinary educational programs? Are there aspects of the administration of a minor program that are better served by oversight within an academic unit, and conversely, are there aspects that are better served by this model?
- What are the academic or administrative challenges and/or benefits of this experimental governance structure from the perspectives of the Council members, the program(s) overseen, and the academic units involved in delivering the program(s)? Does this governance structure disadvantage minors that are housed in academic units?
- How successful has the Council been in supporting the health and evolution of its minor program(s) and in managing the effective and equitable allocation of resources and mediation of conflicts if they arise? Have the program(s) changed over time, and if so how? How has the Council been involved in facilitating and overseeing these changes?

-
- What are the resource contributions of the relevant academic and administrative departments associated with minor(s) covered by this experiment, *e.g.*, teaching, advising, and curriculum support? Have these allocations shifted over time and, if so, how and for what reasons? Has there been continuity in the faculty and instructors involved with the development and delivery of subjects in the minor(s), and how is teaching credit attributed?
 - What is the student experience in minor programs that are overseen by the Council? To address this question, the CUP would expect to see information similar to what is collected for departmental Visiting Committees concerning other undergraduate programs.

At the end of the three-year CUP license, the participants as well as the three Faculty committees will evaluate the experiment. The Chair of the Faculty will present the findings to the Faculty and make recommendations regarding permanent policies for governance of such programs going forward.

Approved April 1, 2009