cutting out the crystal-gazing?

It is becoming increasingly clear from the evidence of research that a student's performance at school and in 'A' level examinations is no predictor of performance at University. Any University employing 'A' level results as its principal criterion in selecting its students risks filling places with a majority which may well have a distinguished sixth-form record but which, by the same token, is not always best-equipped to meet the greatly different demands of a University environment.

The undergraduate is required to be academically self-disciplined; to read and research for himself; to select material and, at Sussex in particular, to approach his subject from the broadest of perspectives. Paradoxically, while Universities continue to lend emphasis to 'A' level qualifications, school sixth-forms teaching reinforces and encourages the altogether dissimilar qualities required to pass examinations such as memory, rote-learning and if you like 'cramming'. This works in favour of those students 'good at exams' but risks disadvantaging those who, by reason of personality, temperament and social background have little inclination or perhaps no opportunity for three years in the sixth-form.

The Sussex Admissions Review paper, which is discussed in this issue of Focus, contains a number of proposals for changing Admissions criteria which may well be regarded as controversial, but at the same time raise the most fundamental questions about the nature and composition of this University. It suggests, for a start, that we should pay less attention to 'A' level results, that the admissions interview as a means of selection be abandoned, and that we deliberately alter the 'mix' of the undergraduate population to make it more representative of society as a whole.

Sussex, at present, is a predominantly 'middle class' University. Over 40% of students come from professional or managerial family backgrounds. The Admissions paper argues that this is not only unfair to applicants but also to the University. It suggests that under the present admissions system 'examination ability' is equated with 'academic ability' but that the first takes no account of motivation. Social and psychological factors, which could help to determine more accurately how a student will perform here rather than how he has performed at school, are rarely considered.

As a result we are turning away applicants who could do very well in their social and academic contribution to the University, and are admitting applicants who find themselves in an environment in which they have difficulty in doing either. In short, the review paper makes proposals aimed at taking some of the crystal-gazing out of the selection process. As such it merits the most serious consideration.


Service Road closes

The road which runs between the science buildings and which up until now has carried the main flow of university traffic is to be closed this month and the new East ring road will take its place. This coincides with the commencement of the construction of the new Administration block which is to be built between Falmer House and the Biological Sciences building, a site which was previously used as a car park. The building is due for completion in eighteen months time.

New parking facilities have been planned to compensate for the loss of parking space. The main Science car park has been extended to take another hundred cars and an extension has also been made to the boilerhouse car park. The parking area behind the Sportcentre is being resurfaced and marked out. The new Institute of Development Studies building will also have its own car park, for about twenty cars.

The opening of the new ring road will be welcomed by the scientists who have for some time been concerned that the main traffic flow, with its accompaniment of noise, dust and vibrations, ran between the buildings where the work carried out was most likely to be hampered by these effects. The old road will now be used only by vehicles making deliveries and barriers will be erected at the Boiler House end. Large signs will be posted at the South end to warn motorists that there is no through way.

Motorists entering and leaving the University may find that the new road adds a little time to their journey. At least this will provide an opportunity of admiring the landscaping along the route. Several hundred trees have been planted.

ROARY QUINN

On Wednesday, February 25th a ceremony took place to plant a tree in memory of Mr. Rory Quinn, a Sussex graduate killed in a car accident.

Mr. Quinn, who attended the University from October 1964 until June 1967 read English in the School of English and American Studies. Before coming to the University he was at the Cardinal Vaughan School in Kensington.

The short ceremony at Fulton court where the tree, a Scotch Elm, was planted, was attended by the Vice-Chancellor and Mr. Reg Mutter, Dean of the School of English and American Studies, who said a few words before the planting took place. Mr. Quinn’s mother and Miss F. Naish, his former girl friend, came down from London to attend the ceremony as did several of Rory Quinn’s friends.

Dial-a-move

For the first time in its history Sussex University Chess Club has played and won a match by phone. The match was against Bradford and was the fourth round of the National Club Championship. Six players were involved on each side, and the match was arranged through a contact call and lasted for about six hours, starting at 2 p.m. and finishing at 8 p.m.

The decision to play the match by telephone was made because of the large travelling costs which would otherwise have been involved.

In the event the cost is estimated to have been about £6. The University team includes Professor D. B. Scott, Mr. R. T. Buckland, the Establishment Accountant, two post graduates and an undergraduate.

Spring

A new entertainment for children between the ages of seven and twelve is to be presented at the Arts Centre next month. Organised by Jenny Lucas and Della Venables who very successfully arranged a similar show at the Meeting House last year for five to twelve year olds, it takes the form of a mosaic of words and music, all the material being chosen with the particular age group in mind.

The theme of the show is ‘Springtime’ and Jenny Lucas has described some of the items they will be using. ‘We want to take one idea, birds in spring for instance, and show what a wide variety of ways there are of looking at one thing - from a nonsense rhyme by Ted Hughes about a grumpy cow, to the way a bit of Schubert Lieder has captured the ecstasy of a bird in flight.’

The show is called ‘It’s Spring Again’ and will take place on Saturday, April 4th at 2.30 and 7 p.m. at the Gardner Centre for the Arts. Tickets are 3/6d at the door and all proceeds will go to Shelter.
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Carry On, Briggs?

The Vice-Chancellor has been appointed Chairman of a new Independant Committee, set up by Mr. Richard Crossman, Minister of Health and Social Security, to investigate the working conditions of nurses.
UP THE JUNCTION OR UP THE CREEK?

The University and the Union have objected to a proposal for raising the Lewes Road speed limit from 40 m.p.h. to 50 m.p.h. Focus questions Mr. M.F. Snell, Brighton's Deputy Borough Surveyor, about the proposal.

On January 30th a meeting was held at Brighton Town Hall at which members of the public were given the chance to speak against the Corporation's proposed raising of speed limits in several areas of the town. The proposal to raise the limit on the Lewes road from 40 to 50 mph has been strongly opposed by many members of the University some of whom, including the Bursar, Mr. John Mangold, were at the meeting to argue the University's case. The final decision of the Corporation will not be known for some time but a few days before the meeting took place, Focus talked to Mr. M.F. Snell, Deputy Borough Surveyor of Brighton Corporation, about why the Corporation feel that the speed limit should be raised.

Q Did the suggestion for the increase in the speed limit come from within Brighton Corporation itself or were you approached by members of the local community?
A It came from a meeting that we had with representatives of the Ministry of Transport as they are considering speed limits in general within the country and they want to make them realistic. It's no good having a speed limit on the road that the motorist thinks ought not to be there and motorists are blatantly disregarding it. This is the whole point – you must get the confidence of the motorist on issues such as traffic orders because you can't have policemen on the roads all day enforcing speed limits. So this whole issue really arose when the Ministry asked us to look at various roads in the town and this was one of them.

Q You think that the increase in the speed limit is desirable?
A I don't think there's any doubt about it. The Ministry has made studies of effects on roads where the speed limit's been raised. On roads where motorists have blatantly been breaking the existing speed limit there's no evidence to show that because the limit is raised, say ten miles an hour, that this will push the average speed up ten miles an hour. It just means that the motorist is brought within a band which is more realistic.

Q There has been at least one letter in the local press objecting to the proposal. Have you received any other protests from the University or from the College of Education?
A Oh yes. From the University we've had objections from the Bursar, the Institute of Development Studies at Stanmer, the School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences and the Students' Union. We also had a letter from the Vicar of Stanmer in which he stated that he was anxious about danger to students if the speed limit is raised.

Q There are cars trying to turn into and out of the University all day and the traffic builds up to a particularly high level at about 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Don't you think that allowing traffic on the main road to go faster will increase the likelihood of accidents?
A No. As I have said, the Ministry of Transport experiments have shown that when a speed limit is unrealistic (and it's felt that the limit on the Lewes Road is unrealistic) increasing it will not make cars go much faster than they are going already.
WHAT THE CRITICS SAID...  
'A DOLLS HOUSE' AT THE ARTS CENTRE

Despite the few late sniggers at the concluding melodramatics the old play still proves actably gripping as revelation succeeds revelation. Miss Fielding has not yet shrugged off all her mannerisms from revue... but she brings an arresting fluttery nervousness to the beginning - Daily Telegraph

Production designed to show that Sean Kenny's Cinerama stage and circular auditorium can accommodate intimate proscenium drama as well as epic. It fails......Nora... too possessed and intelligent to put up for a second with the charade of playing the fluffy kitten to Patrick Wymark's domestic bulldog - Observer

......The fluttering eyelashes, mouse and lip twitchings of Fenella Fielding are familiar to her admirers...... nervous jerky movements.....skips.....hops.....struggles with unmanageable hair......are all quite charming but what has this to do with Nora - Brighton and Hove Gazette

Fenella Fielding, mistress as she is of the sidelong glance, the pout, the pucker and the flirtatious gesture, is completely out of her depth with such a part and Nora's behaviour becomes even more incomprehensible than ever. As her husband Patrick Wymark sweats, fumes and frets but carries little conviction in either his blustering or gentler moods - Stage

Without being too effusive and in calm and deliberate fashion let me say that this production of an old classic is the finest I have ever seen - or hope to see. Fenella Fielding, whose lips are so eloquent even while saying nothing plays Nora, a dolly-bride growing into a mature woman. This subtly achieved emancipation must be ranked among her greatest roles - Evening News

Fenella Fielding's Nora could become very good; like the production if it has ideas. Patrick Wymark plays Torvald with complete directness, a gruff brain of a man who finds most of his money in business rather than at home. It is not a subtle performance but it contrasts well with Fenella Fielding's febrile Nora - The Times

LEWES ROAD cont from p 3

But some people do argue that if when the speed limit is 40 mph cars are going at 50, it is surely valid to conclude that if the limit is 50 cars will go at 60 mph?

No. Because when the limit is raised I'm quite sure that the police will enforce it more strictly than they are doing now. At the moment the police feel that the limit is unrealistic and is therefore difficult to enforce. When it's been brought up to a more realistic level they will enforce it more strictly. No, personally I feel that all evidence shows that you are suggesting doesn't happen. The speed might be raised by 2 or 3 miles an hour on some of the vehicles but I doubt it.

What students mainly seem to be worried about is the student hitchhikers on the road and other students trying to cross the road.

Well, they ought to use the subway. It isn't safe to cross a dual carriageway even when the traffic's only going at 40. With reference to the point about the faster traffic making it more difficult for vehicles going in and out of the University, I don't think that this will be affected very much. The answer here is improved access but heaven knows when that will come about.

There was a suggestion that the University should pay for a roundabout wasn't there? What happened to that?

Well, it never came to anything because I think that the University feels that it's either the Corporation's or the Ministry's problem. The Ministry feels that it's the University's problem as the whole issue arose because the University was there in the first place. So it's a bit of a stalemate.

I've also heard that there's a possibility of a fly-over being built. Is this likely to happen in the near future?

Well this of course is the ultimate solution. When the dual carriageway is continued through Falmer Village to have a fly-over there which will give vehicles access from both sides of the road without having to turn across the main traffic, I should think that this is likely to happen in the next three or four years. Or at least they should be extending the dual carriageway within that period. Whether or not they will find the money to build the fly-over at the same time I couldn't say. It is up to everyone concerned to bring pressure to bear to get it. You never get anything unless you shout for it in this world these days.

So who will make the final decision regarding the speed limit and when is this likely to be?

The final decision will be made by the Ministry of Transport. We shall submit the Committee's opinion after the objections to the scheme have been heard. Whatever may happen it is very unlikely that the increase would come about within a period of three months.
Brian Easton (left) Lecturer in Economics and Social Statistics continues the discussion initiated in the last issue of Focus, on new Schools for the Seventies. Below he puts the case for restructurising the present Arts-Science division of the University and replacing it with a tripartite system of areas in Natural Science, Social Science and Arts and Humanities.

Bridging the gap between Art and Science

Decisions being made now involving the introduction of new schools and the growth and structure of the University to 1978 are second only in academic importance to those which were made before this university began. Furthermore there may not be another opportunity to make similarly important decisions for another ten years. Thus it is vital that when discussing future academic developments there be no sacred cows - that all possible permutations of academic structure be considered.

It would seem therefore that now is the proper time to consider abandoning the present Science as against the Arts and Social Studies division of the University in favour of a tripartite structure of Natural Science, Social Science and Arts and Humanities, each responsible for a group of schools. Concomitant with this the School of Social Studies would be abolished and replaced by a number of 'sector' schools in the social science area.

The logic of academic structure is the fundamental and driving reason for this proposal but there is a further group which though less important are powerful enough reasons by themselves. They can be loosely grouped together as the problems of a large discipline based School of Social Studies within the Arts and Social Science area.

The social sciences are neither Arts nor Natural Science, though having fundamental links with each. However, the University's organisation ties the social sciences into the Arts area, so that the links with natural science are at best tenuous. Yet at present, some of the major and most exciting academic growth areas are the natural science-social science region - particularly the biological foundations of human behaviour, and scientific methodology and method including the contribution and application of quantitative techniques. Furthermore the growth problem would seem to be the impact of science and technology upon our societies. The effect of the University's dualistic structure has been to discourage developments in these fields. By ignoring its natural science link, the social sciences ignore a good proportion of their heritage, and future.

Within the present Arts and Social Studies area there is the uneasy alliance of a discipline based school, Social Studies, with the four sector schools. The tensions created are best exemplified by the failure of the School of European Studies to hold social science faculty, even though there are a number of faculty in the School of Social Studies with strong European research interests, (even if we exclude Britain from Europe). Social scientists are very profession-conscious and as such tend to give prime allegiance to a discipline based school. Hence any sector based school is at a distinct disadvantage in terms of academic prestige and all that goes with it. There is a good case for groups of sector based schools, and for groups of disciplined based schools, but not for a mixture of them.

Further, given present planning projections and assumptions about the academic structure of the
The case for three academic areas

University, it is possible that by 1978 the School of Social Studies could have as many as 650 undergraduates, an intake of 220 students per year. In 1969 the school claimed that 'the drawbacks associated with increasing size are more than compensated by advantages of retaining one centre within the University devoted mainly to the social sciences.' (Note the professor-consciousness in operation). At the time there was no proposal of a social science area, and no one really considered the problems of growth in detail. The overriding concern was that if the school did not grow then neither would the social sciences. Thus no consideration was given to such problems of running a compulsory third year course for 220 students - that is about 30 seminars and faculty - although already the course involving 100 students is criticised for lacking co-ordination and coherence. On the other hand without a compulsory course for the dozen or more disciplines the school would have no academic significance. If it had not been for the fear of no growth, my guess is that most social science faculty would judge the optimum social science school size to be about 150.

Implications

Having considered the main academic case for a tripartite structure, it is useful to sketch out the implications of the change more fully.

To compensate for the abolition of the School of Social Studies a set of sectoral schools would have to be set up. Initially there would be three or four but by 1978 there could be ten or more.

Some of these schools could come from the present areas. For instance, Afras and Cultural and Community Studies might think the Social Science area more appropriate. Similarly the proposed Cognitive Studies being sector based may fit in the Social Science area better than in the Natural Science area.

A second source of new schools, would be by the development of schools focussed upon particular subjects or institutions. Possible schools include:

Organisational and Bureaucratic Studies: this is a proposal distinct from that of Professor Rivett which is more concerned with management. The school would be built around the sociology of organisation, and include industrial relations, industrial economics, social psychology, politics and international relations.

Urban Studies: developed around the disciplines of geography, demography, sociology, politics and economics.


Behavioural Studies: combining the behavioural social sciences, together with animal behaviour and experimental psychology.

Another source of new schools would be ones built about a particular approach. For instance, there could be a School of Historical Studies in which social science majors, and perhaps science majors, would study their subjects in an historical context including social and economic history. Similarly there could be a school of Quantitative Studies in the social sciences, for social science majors who want to specialise in quantitative techniques.

The final source of new schools would be new area schools. The failure of European Studies to develop a social science centre has been already mentioned in this article. Elsewhere a School of Contemporary European Studies has been proposed to meet this need, and it would no doubt wish to be in the social science area.

Typically each school should be related to a major academic interest of the University. Indeed if each focuses on a major interdisciplinary research area, the research work in the social sciences of the University will be substantially strengthened and the undergraduate teaching improved.

If an intake of 20 undergraduates each year is taken as an upper limit for a school in the Social Science Area, then there will have to be a continuing process of creation of new schools. This is not without its advantages for such creation ensures the social sciences will have an automatic mechanism for innovation and the meeting of such demands.

The most common ways new schools would develop would be from a school nearing its upper limits in student numbers, dividing into two related but distinctive schools, and from interests from different schools combining to form a new school. An example of the latter might be faculty interest in education as an organisation, in the School of Organisational and Bureaucratic Studies, and in socialisation, in the School of Behavioural Studies, combining into a School of Educational Studies where education is studied as one of the most important institutions of our society.

It is critical that the Social Science area should be capable of and responsive to change, for it is unlikely that the structure of the social sciences will be the same in the year 2000 as it is today, although the rigidity of departmental structure within Universities may prevent such a change being reflected in University teaching.

Boundaries

It is important that the boundaries between areas are not enforced in academic terms. If the majors in Sociology and Politics in the School of English and American Studies are thought academically worthwhile then they should be continued. Similarly there is no need for Afras to abandon its Literature majors if it should decide to switch areas. There will also be natural science majors in the social science area and presumably the social science minors will be maintained throughout the natural sciences. Further, the organisational boundary between areas can be ameliorated in academic terms, by giving schools in different areas cross boundary links - perhaps we can call this 'sister status'. Thus the present School of European Studies would want to have a special connection with Contemporary European Studies in a Social Science area, and vice-versa. Similarly the School of Organisational and Bureaucratic Studies might have a special relation with Professor Rivett's new School, which being disciplined based, might best fit into the Natural Science area.

It may be that the above proposal is unworkable or unacceptable, but at least it should be considered over the next six months. Otherwise that path which runs through the University from Palmer House to the Refectory with the Arts and Social Studies to its west and Science to its east will not only symbolise the organisation of the University, it will symbolise its academic spirit - and lost opportunities.
Dr. Willie Lamont is a member of the Vice-Chancellor’s Group on Undergraduate Teaching under the Chairmanship of Professor Blin-Stoyle, and his particular interest is to investigate ways in which teaching-skills within the University can be strengthened. Dr. Lamont, lecturer in History and Education with experience of teaching in Secondary Schools and in a College of Education, discusses below the argument for Faculty training.

(A) Should the University concern itself about the teaching skills of its faculty?
Yes, for three reasons: (1) The U.G.C. is expecting all Universities to make provision within the next year for all entrants to University teaching to be 'provided with systematic training in the early years of their appointment.' (2) The A.U.T., in arguing the case for increasing the salaries of the University teachers, proposes 'the development of a co-ordinated system of teacher-training for probationary lecturers.' (3) Many of us feel that we ought to be doing something to strengthen our teaching, even though at present we don't know how best to go about it.

(B) Should University teachers be trained in a similar way to teachers in schools?
No, for two reasons: (1) If training of teachers in schools is seen as the orthodox one-year postgraduate course in a University Department of Education, this is becoming increasingly seen as a wasteful and meaningless activity for teachers in schools. This is not the only way to train them, and it may be that some experiments along alternative lines for school teachers may also have implications for University teachers. But this is a very different thing from saying that University teachers should be trained on the conventional lines that most schoolteachers undergo today. (2) Even if conventional training methods for schoolteachers were more successful, it would not follow that they were applicable to University teachers. Norman Mailer, once described President Kennedy as being 'like a young professor whose manner was adequate for the classroom but whose mind was off in some intricacy of the Ph.D. thesis he was writing'. Mailer here was usefully underlining for us the double obligation of the University teacher to his Ph.D. thesis as well as to the classroom.

(C) In that case, should University teachers be left to play it by ear?
This does not follow from the answers to (A). (1) To reject the concept of a 'training course' - with all the rigidity that such a term connotes - is not to reject the concept that University teachers should be entitled to much more sustained help in improving teaching skills that they receive at present. (2) Once we have recognised the tension in the role of University teaching between research and teaching there remains still a large area - outside the intricacies of that Ph.D. thesis - where the University teacher's skills could be strengthened.

(D) How can a scheme for guiding University teachers be devised?
During the next few weeks all of you will be asked for suggestions about ways in which the Sussex commitment to teaching may be strengthened. Typical topics that may be discussed are: the value of a short induction conference before the opening of the academic year (Tony Bailey, in a previous article in FOCUS, pointed out the pitfalls of such a venture in his account of the Lancaster experiment); the ways in which a more continuous guidance for faculty can be provided throughout the year; the strengths and weaknesses of lecturing, tutorials, seminars in the present system; the value of termly reports: the burden of work on faculty and students. These, and other matters, will come up for discussion at School Subject Joint Committee groups and the like. They will be reported back to the Vice-Chancellor’s Group on undergraduate teaching, under Professor Blin-Stoyle. This is all on
Help

(E) How much help can we get from the experience of other Universities?
A limited help. We can draw to some extent upon the experiences of some Universities in Australia and the United States; in the United Kingdom, Aberdeen, Keele, Lancaster, Stirling and a few other Universities have some relevant information. And where that is relevant use can be made of it in the report. Yet the picture that emerges from consultation with other Universities is not of a spectrum that takes in, at one end, Universities with extensive training schemes and, at the other end, those with none; rather, at one end of the spectrum, those that are doing very little and have a bad conscience about it, and at the other end, those that are doing very little and have a good conscience about it. The research in this field is also pretty unhelpful: little more than the blind leading the blind. The onus clearly is on us to devise something worthwhile for ourselves.

(F) Should students grade their teachers at University?
In that crude sense, no. It is in that crude sense that attempts to obtain feedback from students about the success of teaching courses was first envisaged: when it was linked with salary structure by the Prices and Incomes Board. In that crude sense it deserves the hostile reception that it got, and for the same reason that a 'training course' for teachers was earlier rejected. The concepts of 'training' and of 'grading' both introduce connotations of a superior bringing pressure on an inferior to reach a given standard of competence. Ironic indeed if we succeed - to a greater extent than ever before - in taking some of this burdensome pressure off students only to transfer it to their tutors!

Fallacy

(G) Should student views be ignored in assessing the success of teaching courses?
The would be an equally grave fallacy. The perils of discounting student opinion are wittily underlined in a recent book on history teaching in schools: Martin Booth, HISTORY BETRAYED?, (Longman's Curriculum Reform Series, 1969). The author discussed with six teachers their aims and methods of history teaching. But he then discussed with their pupils the aims and methods of the courses which they had been taught. He sets both groups of answers side-by-side in statistical form; their lack of correlation is awesome in its scope. If we can devise for ourselves a scheme which guides, but does not 'train', university teachers and which is informed, not dominated, by student response, we will have done a pretty useful exercise. That should be our aim during the next few months.

Is Sussex selecting the right kind of students?

The Admissions Review Paper suggests that there is:

- TOO MUCH emphasis on academic ability in selection
- TOO MANY students from Independent Schools
- TOO LITTLE guidance before Course Study begins
- TOO MUCH emphasis on interviews

The Admissions Review paper, for discussion during this session, has now been issued by the Admissions Office. Admissions Officer, Mr. Ted Cox has said that the paper has been issued early - some weeks before final decisions must be arrived at - in order to encourage wide and serious discussions throughout the University, "but what we should avoid if possible is the adoption of doctrinaire or otherwise rigid views before Senate finally discusses the matter on May 13th. I would prefer that that discussion should be completely open and free, with members of Senate not having been either mandated or gagged by small interest-groups beforehand. To that extent either I or George Kiloh will be ready to receive either written or oral views from any member of the University, and will undertake to ensure that those views are presented to the Senate."

The paper itself covers a wide range of issues, and its proposals, if accepted, could be far-reaching. The underlying assumptions in the paper are two-fold: first, that although present admissions criteria are faulty, and do not produce the results which are intended, the introduction of new criteria holds real hope of success; and second that the objectives of an admissions policy should not be concerned solely with what class of degree a student is likely to obtain.
In discussing the incidence of failure and under-achievement, the paper claims, and backs its claims with research findings, that the causes of such failure are unlikely to be 'academic' in the narrow sense of that word; "those entering higher education, are now so highly selected that differences in ability, as measured by performance at school, can hardly even begin to account for differences in performance at University," and implies that lack of academic ability can scarcely even be validly used as an explanation of failure in British higher education. The paper cites studies conducted in the U.K. and elsewhere which suggest that a student's personality make-up, accommodation, parental attitudes, social background, motivation for higher education and other factors all contribute to underachievement and failure, and that several of these acting together can easily lead to crippling underachievement.

On selection, the paper is initially concerned with objectives. It quotes research findings, for example, which show strong correlations between success in a degree course and neurosis and introversion. The paper argues that the traditional test of success - degree class - can hardly be the urgent criterion, since this would mean that universities should select solely neurotic introverts, whereas it is easily arguable that at least some graduates ought to be sociable. The paper further argues in this connection that the obtaining of a particular class of degree generally determines the final occupational status of the graduate, and that if what the university offers is worthwhile, it might well be desirable to give something of ourselves to more than one level of our society.

In discussing selection criteria, the paper lays stress on the helpfulness of improving selection by the use of criteria which are at present considered 'non-academic'. It claims that some success could reasonably be expected of tests of creativity, of aptitude, of persistence and motivation; and also points to the necessity of developing good work habits at school, in order to ease the transition to university work. The paper is particularly severe on the third-year sixth form, and on cramming for university entrance, and is not too happy about too many of our students coming from independent schools.

The paper also claims great importance in success or underachievement for the way the University is itself organised, and the way in which students are treated by the faculty. It proposes that much more importance should be accorded to counselling or guidance services, and quotes evidence that these services are more effective when divorced from the teaching and learning situation. It would appear that a substantial proportion of students who drop out for non-academic reasons, do so because of faulty course-choice, or a gradual realisation that their courses are incompatible with their vocational aspirations. This argues not only for the availability of counselling and guidance supports for students who need them, but also for flexible policies in relation to course-changes or changes between institutions; and there is clear evidence for the provision of such services before a student embarks on a course of study.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations arising from the paper concern a range of topics. In particular, it is recommended that much less stress should be placed on grades as criteria of selection, and much more emphasis placed on 'non-academic' factors - though the report points out that the term 'non-academic' is a misnomer, since such criteria have a considerable effect on university performance. The paper recommends that the university should make serious attempts to achieve a more diverse intake in terms of social background, type of school last attended and geographical distribution, as well as looking more kindly on the second-year sixth former, all four of these being to some extent mutually supporting. There are recommendations affecting relations with schools, and a proposal that selection interviews should be replaced by a freer system of consultation and guidance, which would be designed to give the potential student information rather than to select.

It is expected that copies will be sent to members of the Senate and Admissions Committee in early March; copies will also be placed in School offices and the Union for consultation. The cost of producing copies of the report precludes the possibility of producing personal copies for every member of the University. Comments from members of the University should be made to the Admissions Officer by 30th April at the latest, if they are to be incorporated in the Senate's discussions on 13th May.
The Admissions Officer answers 20 questions on the Review Paper summarised on p9

Q Can you briefly outline the present admission procedures?
A We have been using three criteria. First there is the preliminary assessment which is a paper assessment. At that stage we have to decide whether or not to call the candidate for interview. If we do not he is rejected. The second stage is the interview and if the student gets beyond the interview he will be offered a place. If the interview is poor the candidate will not be offered a place. In the majority of cases when a place is offered it is conditional on A level results, which are the final criterion. One of the problems is that each of these three criteria is subject to considerable doubt.

Q Why are the procedures being reviewed at this particular point?
A Admissions procedures are, of course, reviewed every year but every three years or so there’s been a much more major review. I think it is appropriate that the review should be at this stage as we are at the beginning of planning a new quinquennium where admissions procedures are going to figure very largely in the planning process. Simply because of the tremendous expansion in the 18-plus age group which will be seeking entrance to universities during the mid-70’s.

Q It could be argued that judging by the academic record of the University our admissions procedures do not require reviewing. Are you suggesting that we should not solely be concerned with students’ performance and the class of degree they are likely to get as a basic criterion?
A Well I think that if you suggest to any member of the teaching faculty that his object as a teacher is to ensure that the student gets the best degree, and only that, he would say that universities are concerned with much more than this - and that’s what I’m saying. Ultimately, whether a student gets a first or a third is not the only criterion of whether he has been a successful student. Universities should give undergraduates qualities other than the ability to write good three hour papers after three years study. So simply to have a final degree classification is not enough. Equally, if you do look at final degree classification, we have one of the highest quality intakes in the country and yet our number of firsts is just about the national average. If you select students simply on the likelihood of their getting firsts, for one thing you find that immediately the quality of the student body. In academic terms, goes up, so do examination standards to cater for it; so the 5% (the percentage of who get firsts) does tend to be a very stable figure. The other point is that this selection procedure automatically deprives of a university education students from a disadvantaged group or environment. I think that if a university education is worthwhile then it is worthwhile for a wide section of the population, not just for a narrow elitist sector.

Admissions Officer Edwin Cox: a hard look at 20 questions

Q What is the present class structure of our students?
A Sussex is heavily weighted towards the professional/managerial group. Universities nationally are on the whole heavily weighted towards that end of the spectrum but we are relatively more so. For example, nationally 28% of students are from working class backgrounds but the figure at Sussex is considerably less than this, and very much less in the case of women.

Q How would the new admissions procedures help us to extend the social backgrounds from which we draw our students?
A Two suggestions have been made which will, I think, help to brighten this about. First of all we are saying that it should be a deliberate aim of policy to select a diversity of students. Secondly, It is proposed to abolish the interview as a tool of selection. This should help because it is fairly obvious both empirically and in terms of statistical information that the interview discriminates in favour of the rather wellbred cultured girl from the West End of London and against the rather dragged-up product of some East End of Liverpool Roman Catholic boys’ school.

Q Does this discrimination arise perhaps from unconscious prejudice on the part of interviewers?
A This is inevitable. After all, if you or I had to choose between selecting either a boy with a rather thick accent from the back end of Liverpool or a girl in a mini-skirt from the West End of London, we would tend to choose the girl, not just because we were impressed by her looks but because she is safe and she’s going to get a degree and it’s you who is taking the risk.
for ‘working-class’ students

Q You say in your Admissions Review that you would like to see the University have more of what you call 'sociable' students as opposed to solely academically-orientated students. But wouldn't this kind of procedure make it more difficult to spot the sociable kind of student if you don't even see him or her face to face?

A No, this is not quite what I'm saying. What I am saying is that if the likelihood of the student getting a good honours degree is to be the sole criterion and if you follow that argument to its logical conclusion, then we shall be selecting the most neurotic and introverted student because he is in fact most likely to get a good degree. We want a good mix of students and therefore need a diversity of criteria, not just so-called academic ability.

Q But if you are going to start taking into account factors like social background, what kind of families students come from and regional differences surely we are in danger of falling into the trap of having quotas which is a kind of discrimination against certain kinds of students?

A I don't agree that quotas are a trap. We already have quotas albeit not 'academic' ones.

Q These are all quotas that are solely decided on academic qualifications?

A Yes, but it is not true to say that the only academic qualification is one that can be tested by examinations. The experience of universities which have gone out of their way to select a diversity of students in the terms in which we have been talking has been that the academic quality of their intake has risen despite the fact that the paper qualifications of the their students may have fallen. This kind of admissions procedure has been known for some time at institutions in the United States, for example, Harvard and Wellesley, both of which are highly prestigious and academic institutions using this kind of technique.

Q Has it been tried at any English university?

A Not as far as I know. But what I want to point out is that by saying that by selecting on these criteria you will be getting worse students academically is a misnomer in terms of what is academic and what is not, and also even in traditional academic terms it isn't necessarily true. The Franks report, for example, showed quite clearly that the student from a background which was in some way educationally deprived caught up with, passed and stayed in the lead of his contemporaries from wealthy families who'd been to independent public schools, even though on paper at the point of admission the former student was probably very much worse than the latter.

Q Wouldn't this kind of admissions procedure mean that the University would need more information about students' backgrounds than at present?

A No, I think that we already have enough information on social background, and we are given hard information on the type of schools students have attended. What we would probably want to do would be to supplement this information with tests of a student's psychological make-up. There is a limited amount of new information needed but I don't think that this will infringe on a student's privacy even to as great an extent as the present system does.

Q Isn't there something abhorrent in the idea that one is deliberately selecting students on the basis of their background and the school they have attended?

A No, I don't think so. Like it or not, these are academic criteria. A student's background is an important factor in his school performance and a student from a home where there is no work-space or the parents are unsupporting in educational terms is likely to have a relatively bad school performance. But at university he will have a much higher degree of equal opportunity and is likely to overtake those who had advantages in schooling and had better paper qualifications when applying to university.

Q How much attention will you pay to A level results in these new proposed criteria?

A We are saying that A levels should remain as one criterion but not the dominant one. It should be seen in the context of the students' background. The A level is a goodish test of ability but it was never designed to predict.
Surely many faculty will be opposed to admitting any student whom they have not seen face to face? Do you feel that this could be a major obstacle to the acceptance of these proposals?

Yes; this is one of my fears but I think that we have shown that this kind of reaction will be irrational. After all it has been pointed out that when a departmental head selects his students he is using the criterion of whether or not they will get a good honours degree, and yet only about a third of British students do get a good honours degree, so the present system doesn't work anyway. Also the question of admission of students and the guidance of students is an important one in which there is now a large amount of expertise and should be regarded as a specialist function.

But it could be argued that academics will have to teach these students for three or four years and therefore ought to have some say in whom they teach.

Do you think that these proposals would increase applications and enlarge our choice?

Paradoxically I think that it will not increase applications to any extent but it will enlarge our choice. I think that we shall tend to get fewer applications from places where we get them at the moment - that is, from the Company director's daughter in S.W.1. - and more applications from the ballroom's son in Hull. And in that sense it will enlarge our choice considerably.

Talking about altering the 'mix' of the University, what in your view would be the ideal quotas under this system?

Ideally the intake should mirror the 18+ population but I don't think we shall manage that because there are too many inequalities in our society as a whole. But I think that the more we progress towards that the better, because if the University can become a society which mirrors the outside world it is much less likely to be an artificial society and therefore to be more relevant to the needs of students.

But surely very few working class students are in the position of getting to a sixth form so that they can apply to university?

This is true and there is little or nothing we can do about this. What we can do is to ensure that those who do get that far have an equal chance of entry with the rest, which is not true at the moment. Research has shown that the few working class students who do get to university on the whole do very well. Because they tend not to look good on paper they tend not to be accepted.

What are your hopes, looking at it realistically, of the chances of any or all of these proposals being approved, and when would they be implemented if they were?

Well, the report has been issued and copies are available in school offices and in the Union. Either myself or George Kilooh will be receiving comments on the contents of the report up to April 30th. There will be a debate in Senate on May 13th at which hopefully the final decision will be taken. Whether or not the report will be accepted is ultimately, I feel, a question of academic honesty. I think there are traditions and feelings amongst faculty which will, initially anyway, react against any proposal like this. But provided members of faculty in particular read the paper and take note of the research which is contained in it I don't see how one can rationally say that a continuation of our present procedure is in either the University's or the students' interest. Hopefully, most or all of the proposals in the paper will be implemented by next October for students who will be entering the University in 1971. Certainly if the principles are agreed, I can see no argument for delaying implementation.

'I don't see how a continuation of our present procedure is in either the University's or the students' interest'

There's obviously something which is psychologically satisfactory about being able to select one's own students but if it is agreed that with our present system we are educating too many of the wrong kind of student, that is a product of selection by academics. I would suggest that we should implement these proposals, let them run for three years, and then if the academic faculty honestly believe and can show the students they are teaching are in some way worse than those they taught previously, I should be very surprised, but would be agreeable to returning to the other system.

Another point you raise in the paper is that of counselling services. You suggest that there should be more counselling, particularly on the kind of course the student might be best fitted for before he actually undertakes it. How would this work out in practice?

What I want is to get members of the teaching faculty thinking about problems facing sixth formers. We want a system of interviewing which will allow a completely free exchange of views, a real guidance interview where the student is not under pressure. The students will gain by learning about the University and talking to other sixth formers and the faculty should gain by learning about the problems facing the people they will soon be teaching. These interviews should take place after the student knows he has been accepted. This system should also save vast amounts of time as six or eight students can be interviewed at once instead of just one at a time as at present. Financially speaking this will cost the University less although it will be marginally more expensive for the student as he would have to spend a full day down here. But in most cases of hardship the local authorities pay the cost.
Suddenly conservation is news; concern with the deteriorating quality of man's environment, once restricted to a few scientists and cranks, is now widespread. The developed countries are preoccupied with the environmental impact of their growing populations, which with increasing incomes are ever more greedy of land for homes, for work, for leisure or for scientific farming, ever more liable to upset the delicate ecological balance of the so-called 'natural' surroundings in which we live. Meanwhile the developing countries are concerned with problems of ever more rapid population growth without a corresponding development of resources. Is there a possibility here for a new School of Studies, focused on man in his environmental relations?

Many of the elements from which such a School might have been created are already to hand in the University. Ecology is already taught on a small scale to biologists and physical geographers in the School of Biological Sciences, but in so far as it is concerned with conservation and land utilization would benefit from an economic and political context. Biologists could also contribute the study of human population biology, including such aspects as human population genetics and the biology of human fertility. There is an obvious outreach here towards demography, which would become a key central element in the new School, linking the biological and social sciences.

**DEMOGRAPHY**

Demography leads to a group of subjects dealing in this context with man in relation to the heavily urbanised environment of the modern world. The human geographers would bring in their concerns with locational analysis and urban ecology. Economists and sociologists interested in urban and regional problems would no doubt also be drawn in. Applied science and behavioural psychology are other possible contributing disciplines. The new School would also subsume the University's present commitment to regional planning, as represented by the postgraduate regional studies area.

There is already a suggestion in all of this of the form the School would take. Essentially its concern with the environment would be man-centred but informed by the biological and applied sciences, not just concerned with conservation or ecology but with man in environment. Major subjects in such a School could include demography, economics, sociology, human geography, ecology and human biology. The preliminary course would have as one of its aims the enabling of social and biological scientists to talk each other's language; urban history might also figure at this stage. Among contextual subjects certainly population study, human biology, mathematics and quantitative methods would be represented.

Organizational the proposed School would be of orthodox Sussex type, not specifically vocational, but providing a broad educational foundation on which graduates could build their subsequent professional careers. The possibility of introducing such professional elements as civil engineering, architecture and planning (whether urban, regional or environmental) can be regarded as a subsequent question. Clearly there would be much to be gained if architects and planners could contribute to teaching, and if the undergraduate course could be structured so as to lead for some students to a period of postgraduate study resulting in a professional qualification in one of these disciplines. The difficulties attendant on such a development would no doubt be considerable.

**REQUIREMENTS**

Experience with law and psychology has shown that the requirements of outside professional bodies are not easily reconciled with Sussex notions of appropriate undergraduate education. Even more difficult to overcome is the evident UGC reluctance to countenance the creation of new centres of architectural teaching. Co-operation with an existing School of Architecture would seem to be the only way ahead here, but the obstacles in the way of an agreement are not to be underestimated.

A School of Environmental Studies would appear to meet all the criteria suggested in the Vice-Chancellor's contribution to the last issue of Focus. First, it would combine both undergraduate teaching and research activity in a field where the degree of public concern ought to make possible the attraction of outside funds for additional research support. Second, it would offer a wide spread of disciplines, and there should be no difficulty in reaching the proposed minimum size for a School. As has been seen, most disciplines involved are already taught in the University. Third, the introduction of subjects such as architecture that might not meet UGC approval is not essential, although desirable. Fourth, there is no reason to anticipate that the new School would result in a drop in quality of undergraduate applicants, while it would have the great advantage of being able to attract participation from the biological science, social science and conceivably engineering science areas. More important a School of Environmental Studies would reflect an expanding area of present-day concern, where academics have a real chance of contributing to the amelioration of the surroundings in which we must all live. This area of intellectual and practical activity should surely find a place at the next stage of the University's development.
Following the Union decision to bar Patrick Wall M.P., from addressing a meeting on the Campus of the Conservative Association, the Brighton Evening Argus suggested that the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Asa Briggs (left) should intervene in the interests of 'free speech'. We print below the statement issued by the Vice-Chancellor in reply.

It is in any way incumbent on me to invite political speakers to the Campus on my own account or on the account of any political society affiliated to the Union if the Union decides it does not want them. I also have the obligation, which I try to fulfill, of maintaining law and order on an isolated and unpolitical campus and as events in other universities have shown the law itself is not always a very effective instrument to fall back upon.

I said last year that a Vice-Chancellor is not a headmaster, and it must be said again since the view still persists in some circles outside the university that students can and should be treated like children. I would now add that a Vice-Chancellor cannot and should not be a policeman. We have provosts at the University, who are directly responsible for dealing with breaches of university rules, but in the last resort we rely upon the good sense of the many to curb the excesses of the few who care little about the effects of their actions on other people. Like all other universities, we draw a distinction between university lectures, seminars and tutorials and political meetings. The former are the essential elements in the life of a university and, as an educational institution, its primary purpose. There is, in my view, no qualified right to hold political meetings in universities whatever the likely consequences.

I believe profoundly in the need for a close understanding between the university as a community and the bigger community outside, but I maintain that this understanding must rest on common recognition of our mutual interests over a long period of time. While I of course share the often publicly-expressed concern at events in the world of higher education, little is to be gained by a Vice-Chancellor making a statement on every issue that hits the headlines in a modern university. Yet surely there should be no reason for mixing up the issues of Brighton's annual grant to the University, an issue which is not being raised for the first time, with the Patrick Wall case as your leader suggested. As Vice-Chancellor I deeply resent, as much as any member of the University faculty or any student in the University would resent, the argument that Brighton's annual grant should be dependent upon assessments of the good behaviour of students of the University. It is my responsibility as Vice-Chancellor, along with my colleagues, to deal as best I can with the extremely complicated issues, which society as a whole is certainly not solving, involved in educating the present generation for a very different kind of future. It is the responsibility of Brighton Corporation, having asked to have a University here to decide whether or not it wants to go on being associated with the development of an institution which will outlive us all. The Patrick Wall case has nothing at all to do with this.
THE NEW MUSIC MAJOR: will finals be a public performance?

Mr. Eric Roseberry, Radcliffe lecturer in Music, took up his appointment at the University last October when, for the first time, Music was being offered as a major subject for undergraduates. This year there are five students reading Music in the School of Educational Studies - to be renamed the School of Cultural and Community Studies from next October. Prospective students for the course next year are being interviewed and Mr. Roseberry hopes that places can be offered to eight or nine of this year's applicants. What kind of students is the course expected to attract? "We are looking for people who will fit in to the general Sussex context," says Mr. Roseberry, "but they must also have a specific musical talent - this may be for performance, composition or criticism. And, naturally a high level of intelligence is essential. Luckily, we seem to be attracting the kind of students we want. Applicants for the course so far have been generally up to standard."

What about the course itself. How does he think music should be studied in a University environment? "Most of all we want to avoid having our students spend all their time studying theory. They must be encouraged to be creative and urged to 'make' something. I am anxious that students following this course should have a practical bent in Music, for example, each year's students should be able to demonstrate their skills in concerts. I also hope that the students will contribute to the communal life of the University."

CO-OPERATION

How close a relationship does he want with the Arts Centre? "We want to co-operate with them, of course, but we do not wish to restrict our activities to any one institution. The one great drawback of the Arts Centre, at the moment anyway is the acoustics. At the moment I feel that the Meeting House and the Chemistry Lecture Theatre ought to go on being used. I do, however, hope that the Music faculty will become involved more administratively with the Arts Centre." Eric Roseberry feels that it is artificial to separate teaching from the stimulus of the arts.

"Our students are here to study and practice their art but there is a difference between the music students here and those studying art at Sussex. Our students will actually perform and write music, becoming involved in their subject within the context of the University - not just theorise and philosophise. There is always a danger of musicians becoming too 'locked up' - becoming introvert and avoiding contact with the community outside. Luckily, I think that this pitfall is fairly easy to avoid at Sussex. We must ensure that the students are literate as well as develop their musical talent. They must develop their capacity to think and write. This is the whole justification of having music and musicians here at Sussex."

Eric Roseberry takes a tutorial

"The course will be a preparation for all branches of professional music, and will, I hope, help to make the students better musicians. Having graduated, they may go on to teach, compose or perform." The Music majors go to the Guildhall School of Music in London once a fortnight in order to take lessons on their instruments and the students' progress under this tuition may well become an integral part of the final degree assessment.

Mr. Roseberry does not want final degree candidates to be assessed by simply an examination condition performance. Ideally he would like to see a public recital to a larger audience which is not performed just as an academic exercise. "The whole University should be invited and the assessment made partly in terms of the success of the recital as a public exhibition."

Of course Music as a subject is still very much in its infancy at Sussex but Mr. Roseberry is by no means short of ideas for expansion. At the moment he is being assisted by three visiting fellows and he envisages the appointment of two other full time lecturers in the not too distant future. He would also like to see Music being offered as a major subject in other Schools - perhaps English and American Studies and European Studies.

How does Mr. Roseberry feel that the existence of the music students will influence or affect the rest of the University? "I hope that it will enliven University music generally. There could be far more musical activity here than there is at the moment. When we have three years of undergraduates going we should be able to give some focus to University music."

"At the moment there seems to be far more administrative interest in Music than activity. For example, there should be far more going on in the field of chamber music. The University Orchestra is very good but there should be more than one orchestra performing. I would like to see a Chamber Orchestra offering Twentieth Century music."
One of the strongest candidates for a new School in the next quinquennium must surely be Russian and East European Studies. The idea has been 'kept on ice' for the quinquen1al discussions since it was first mooted several years ago (by the late Isaac Deutscher among others). Meanwhile a new major subject in Russian Studies - almost a 'School in miniature', with its wide range of options - was added to the long-established Russian (chiefly literature) major in the European School.

Russian Studies has proved popular with students, many of whom have spontaneously mentioned that no other university in the country provides a course with similar range of choice. Meanwhile an unobtrusive but growing interest in East European countries other than Russia has been noticed in the University, and has been reflected in the introduction of certain new courses into the Russian Studies syllabus, and by 'unofficial' classes in Czech. Many of our undergraduates spend their third year abroad in East European countries, and the new interests this often arouses in them deserve to be recognised in their course-work.

options

The growing variety of options within the Russian Studies major has led to certain unorthodoxy, and proposals recently approved by the Arts and Social Studies Committee mean that for the next generation of students the present two majors will be fused into one (to be known as Russian Studies), within which the student can choose to follow one of three streams; these concentrate on (a) Russian literature; (b) Russian history and (c) modern Russian and East European studies. Within this rationalized framework there will continue to be a wide variety of 'special subjects' and other options available, involving many more faculty members than the present four language and literature specialists. At the same time a new School Paper for those taking Russian (major or minor) has been proposed which will take the place of 'Critical Reading: European Tragedy and Fiction' at Prelims.

Russian, in fact, enjoys an unusually independent position within the European School - an independence which already extends to aspects of its contextual pattern. Evidently the embryo of a new School is already in being. The question is: should it be allowed to grow? Our answer will in the first instance be bound up with the future of the European School within which we are at present situated. This is, and will doubtless continue to be, much debated; but one thing is already clear. If any expansion of numbers does take place, the European School - already large, with a vast range of major subjects - will soon reach an undesirable size. Some of the subdivision would seem the natural solution; and a separate Eastern unit is the most obvious that presents itself. This would not, of course, preclude subjects that 'bridge the gap' (they at present hardly exist) being devised and taught in either of the subdivided Schools.

Desirable

Would our proposed School attract enough members to make it viable, and would it cater for a national need? After all, only a few hundred people take A-level Russian each year, and Russian departments in universities throughout the country are not exactly overstocked at present. It is, however, precisely this state of affairs that makes a development such as we have in mind the more nationally desirable. Though the 'Hater Report' several years ago drew attention to the urgent need for expansion in Russian studies, school teaching has responded disappointingly; and some blame for this may well attach to the small and non-innovating departments of Russian still characteristic of many universities. At Sussex we have a splendid opportunity to cut through a cramped 'Language-and-Literature' or 'Sovietological' approach. Our faculty already has a uniquely wide range of interests in both the cultural and social-science fields of Russian studies, and experience in teaching them; for a small School of, say, 120 members, not many new appointments would need to be made. We already have reason to believe that we should attract a remarkably promising, and at present frustrated body of graduate students; there already exists - independently of the European School - a research centre for Contemporary European Studies, some of whose members are actively involved in the East European field. We are by now in a position to give intensive instruction in Russian, and some East European languages, both to transferring graduates and new undergraduates who have not been able to take A or O level. A School which taught (for example) major subjects in Linguistics, Geography or History - as well as specifically Russian and Soviet topics - within an East European context, would be unlikely to lack for students; and if they were anywhere near as enthusiastic and intelligent as most of those in the Russian field at Sussex already, no-one could have much cause for complaint.
Sussex stakes a claim for a bigger computer

BY PROF JOHN WEST

The Computing Centre, under the directorship of Alan Kirk, started in 1967 with an I.C.L. 1905 digital computer housed in Physics Stage II temporarily. Before this faculty and research students begged, borrowed and sometimes bought computing time on a wide variety of machines external to the University. Although habits die hard, the Computing Centre was coping with 300 hours per month computing time within the first six months. The demand has steadily increased and in spite of additional equipment and machine organisation which halved the computing time we are currently around the 400 hours per month rate (i.e. 800 hours per month at the earlier speed). The forecast obtained by questionnaire from the major users is a rate of 550 hours/month by the middle of this year, rising to about 1200 by August 1972. Since there are only 720 hours in a month, some changes will soon have to be made.

MOVED

The Computing Centre has now been moved to its permanent home in the north east wing of the Mathematical and Physical Sciences Stage III building. Apart from Monday morning when the computer undergoes weekly routine maintenance, the system is operated by Computing Centre staff from 8.30 a.m. to 9.30 p.m. each weekday but not on Saturdays and Sundays. In addition, trained postgraduates and faculty are authorised to operate the machine overnight for their own or colleagues' projects. Currently about 30 hours per week operation in this manner supplements the professional time.

The Centre also has six console terminals which it is hoping to commission soon to give direct multi-access to the main computer. In 1968 a report was submitted to the Computer Board; the government body responsible for university computers. It was asked to provide Sussex with a bigger and faster machine which might serve us satisfactorily for the next ten years. As we all know, the economic position is tight and we have as yet no indication of how generous the Computing Board can be towards us. We have, however, just heard from the Secretary that the Board will most probably be visiting the university towards the end of March (much earlier than anticipated) to consider our position. It is necessary to give the visiting members an impression of the University future plans as possible and of the activity of faculty in their own thinking for the next quinquennium. It would be helpful to me if anyone in the University, in the Schools, research centres or units, who has computing plans for 1973 onwards (no matter how tentative or vague), would mention them to me or any other member of the Computing Committee whom they know better. This is important even if those plans are for arrangements completely independent of the Computing Centre. The membership of the committee is appended below.

The Computing Committee Membership
Professor J.C. West, Chairman
Mr. A. Kirk, Director Computing Centre
Mr. R.A. Howard, Secretary (University Finance Officer)
Mr. A.D. Chalmers
Dr. B.J. Enright
Mr. D.G.H. Harman
Professor M. Jahoda
Mr. H.C. Jones
Dr. P.J.M McEwan
Professor J.N. Murrell
Professor J.F. Scott
Professor K.F. Smith
Dear Sir,

I will shortly be leaving the University having completed only half of a one year M.Sc. course in Elementary Particle Physics. Most Universities do not offer a one year course in this subject, feeling that this length of course is too short. So when I came to this University I expected to be one of several students taking a carefully chosen, and supervised, selection of course and project work. Instead I found that I was the only M.Sc. student and that the courses were those for the first year of a Ph.D. degree. The advanced courses therefore consist mainly of very complicated Mathematical techniques; essential to a Ph.D. student but almost useless to an M.Sc. student who is never going to apply them. The faculty are very reluctant to supervise the work of M.Sc. students. They already have to supervise Ph.D. students, and in addition some feel that little of any use can be learnt in a year. In these circumstances is it fair to both students and faculty to have an M.Sc. course in this subject?

Yours sincerely,
Annabel Sainsbury.
Physics.

---

Dr. Martin Black, of the School of Applied Sciences, and Dr. David Melcher, a consultant pathologist with the Brighton and Lewes Hospital Group, are developing a valve that could help to alleviate the problem of incontinence in the aged and that of patients suffering from a disease of the oesophagus or gullet - the tube through which food is carried from the mouth to the stomach.

A crucial part of the oesophagus is a two-way valve at its lower end. This allows food to pass into the stomach but normally prevents it from spilling back up the gullet. The valve will, however, open 'backwards' in the case of vomiting or burping. The function of this particular valve is difficult to reproduce, and although some work is being done in Japan, none has actually been manufactured anywhere in the world as far as can be established. But now both Dr. Black and Dr. Melcher are hopeful that the prototype they have produced is a step towards solving the problem. While perhaps not as dramatic as heart or kidneys, a valve that is tolerated in the body and which could be connected efficiently to living tissue would have considerable potential in various problems requiring artificial implants.

Nevertheless, before either Dr. Black or Dr. Melcher can be sure of heralding in the 'age of the artificial burp' a great deal of further research will be needed. For example, one of the problems still to be solved is that of connecting the valve to live tissue. Meanwhile the silicone rubber valve which could soon join the growing list of available 'spare-parts' is being subjected to tests in the laboratory by blowing air through it at high pressure in alternate directions, thus creating the movements of many years 'wear' in a short time. A similar series of tests using fluid will also be carried out.

In addition, in order to gain further knowledge of the properties of the oesophagus as a whole, tissue is being subjected to stress tests in a controlled strain-rate machine - developed originally for the U.S. space programme for testing the strength of metals. So far the development of the valve has cost under £100. But it is estimated that some £2,000 will be required to carry on the next stages of the project which, at the moment, is not supported by any official funds.
LECTURE THEATRES: NOT PLACES FOR STAYING AWAKE

Dear Sir,

At the beginning of each new term, one cannot help being impressed by the range and content of the lecture-list for the term, and as a rule, most people work out elaborate timetables for all the lectures they wish to attend. But almost invariably, these timetables are forgotten and discarded after a week or two, and the reason for this is not difficult to find. It is really infuriating that when the University goes to great lengths to arrange an interesting and comprehensive programme of lectures, these lectures are delivered in conditions which could not be more unsuitable to the task of concentrating on the actual subject-matter. In lecture theatres A1, A2, A5, and especially C133, the ventilation and lighting are so bad as to make attention to the lecturer virtually impossible. Instead all one’s powers of concentration are devoted to the single end of staying awake. Admittedly, the extent of this problem is not quite so acute at Sussex as it would be at an institution which relied mainly on the lecture as a teaching method, but even so, the amount of information which is lost to students due to the inadequacies of the lecture-rooms must be very great. And lecturers them- selves must also be painfully aware of this situation. It can surely not be very satisfying to have to deliver a well-planned lecture to a collection of students struggling to stay awake.

Can nothing be done to improve conditions in lecture theatres and make the lecture a means for the communication of knowledge, and not, as it is now, an exercise in will-power?

Yours faithfully,

David Crowther,
School of European Studies

Dear Sir,

A precedent was established on Monday, 16th February in the banning by the Union of a prominent Member of Parliament from the University after he had been invited by Members of the Union.

Thus, a minority group within the University and the Union were forbidden, without the chance to appeal or even to state a case before the final decision was taken, from listening to a parliamentarian who had been invited to address that minority group, on an item of party politics. The reason for the ban, as stated by the Union, is itself a matter for debate. To accuse Patrick Wall of being a racist relies solely on one’s definition of a racist. There can be no absolute decision on this point.

The Conservative Association then put the matter before the Vice-Chancellor, who refused absolutely to involve himself in a dispute within student politics. However, this is not the only reason. The Vice-Chancellor cannot ensure that any meeting on the campus can be conducted with any degree of safety. He is incapable of ensuring the right of free speech to any guest, as was seen by the violence at the High Commissioner for India’s address last Monday.

This must have been in his mind even if the Conservative Association disassociated themselves from the Union and then requested the use of a lecture hall.

The precedent is this: Freedom of speech is intended as the fundamental, indisputable right of every individual more especially within a University. This concept has been violated, and it appears that the Vice-Chancellor is not prepared to risk any form of confrontation over this issue since he is not capable as things stand of backing up any of his actions. He is abrogating his responsibility in the face of a neo-anarchistic situation, thus violating the very charter of the University.

It is the job and duty of the Authorities to have the necessary machinery available to ensure free action within the campus. To step down is fatal if they wish to maintain any respect or influence, for any rationality on the campus to prevail.

Yours faithfully,

J. W. Cutts,
Chairman,
Sussex University
Conservative Association

Dear Sir,

Although this University will soon be celebrating a decade devoted to the advancement of learning might I suggest a return on someone’s part to one of the 3 ‘r’s – namely arithmetic. Tankard Beer previously cost 2/5d per pint, then the government allowed the price to be increased by 2d. But I find that this self same brew now costs 2/8d per pint, everything else having gone up by only 2d. Was this due perhaps to the inevitable computer getting in rather too much at the old price in an effort to beat Mr. Jenkins and the brewers?

Yours faithfully,

J. C. R. Bar
The following have taken up appointments at the University:-

G. N. Abbey,
Library Assistant

Mrs. J. Allen,
Secretary (Biology)

Miss Z. F. Allen, B.A., M.Sc.,
M. Phil.,
Research Assistant, Institute of Development Studies

R. J. Belcher, B.Sc.,
Research Assistant, Biology

H. A. Bernstein B.A., M.Sc.,
Research Assistant, Institute of Development Studies

Mrs. S. Biggs, B.Sc., M.Sc.,
Research Assistant, Institute of Development Studies

S. A. Bishop,
Clerk of Works (Services)

M. D. Bradford,
Programmer (Biology)

Miss S. A. Clements,
Secretary (Appointments Advisory Service)

Mrs. M. E. Cobbett,
Senior Clerical Assistant Institute of Manpower Studies.

D. N. Copsey, B.Sc., D. Phil.,
Research Fellow, Chemistry

G. S. Cross,
Technician (Chemistry)

Miss P. J. Deane,
Secretary (English & American Studies)

Miss J. de Cramer,
Secretary (Bursar's Office)

L. E. Deedman,
Technician (Applied Sciences)

F. J. A. des Tombe, M.Sc., Ph.D.,
Research Fellow, Chemistry

H. T. Dodd,
Technician (Chemistry)

L. J. Fade,
Technician (Applied Sciences)

M. Farrand, M.A.,
Project Leader, Institute of Manpower Studies

N. P. Farrell, B.Sc.,
Research Assistant, Chemistry

Mrs. P. F. Fellows,
Assistant Catering Manager

Miss M. E. Gardner,
Accounts Clerk (Finance)

Miss H. S. Goodall,
Secretary (Experimental Psychology)

R. N. Green,
Junior Technician (Biology)

A. L. Hamilton, B.Sc.,
Research Assistant, Chemistry

Mrs. P. A. Langridge,
Receptionist, Computing Centre

Mrs. A. H. Lawson-Smith
Secretary (Vice-Chancellor's Office)

Miss V. Lefkovitova,
Technician (Chemistry)

Miss D. Legge,
Secretary (Applied Sciences)

C. D. Newstead,
Technician (Applied Sciences)

Mrs. A. Overend,
Junior Technician, Chemistry

Miss M. Penfold,
Typist (Sportcentre)

J. Petts,
Deputy Catering Manager

C. W. T. Pilcher, B.Sc., Ph.D.,
Research Fellow, Experimental Psychology

M. D. Rowe, M.Sc.,
Research Assistant, Chemistry

Mrs. P. M. Simpson, B.Sc.,
Research Assistant, Biology

C. Sty.
Machine Operator, Institute of Development Studies

M. T. Smith, B.A., F.C.I. I.,
Research Fellow, Centre for Insurance Studies

Mrs. J. S. Tapp, B.Sc., M.A.,
Research Fellow, Science Policy Research Unit

Miss M. F. Topper,
Secretary (Centre for Labour Studies)

G. Walker, B.Sc.,
Director, Centre for Labour Studies

Miss M. E. Young,
Secretary (Science Policy Research Unit)

The following have left the University:-

J. S. Bailey, B.A.,
Research Assistant, Experimental Psychology

P. R. Baldwin,
Technician (Chemistry)

Miss L. Balshaw,
Library Assistant

J. S. Beal,
Computer Operator, Computing Centre

Mrs. R. F. Cook,
Secretary, Computing Centre

Mrs. M. Dvorakova,
Technician (Applied Sciences)

Mrs. L. L. Hill,
Research Assistant, Science Policy Research Unit

K. Howland,
Technician (Chemistry)

Mrs. H. A. Jarvis,
Secretary (M.A.P.S.)

A. L. McLean,
Clerk of Works

Mrs. A. M. Moghabghab,
Secretary (School of Education)

C. R. Oates,
Computer Operator, Computing Centre

Miss M. E. Welfare,
Clerk/Typist

Mrs. W. Williams,
Secretary (Appointments Advisory Service)

FOCUS welcomes contributions from all members of the University.