This is our thirteenth issue. Since we are not superstitious we have chosen this moment in the relatively short life of the magazine to give it a new-style cover and make some alterations in presentation. Why bother? One could argue that because Focus is distributed free it does not require the kind of visual 'selling' imperative to a commercial publication. We would disagree with this point of view. It is easy enough to get material into people's hands - indeed one of the problems of a University is that too much finds its way to too many with too little effect; that is the practical problem common to any organisation that attempts to involve the maximum number of its members in its business.

The 'how' of communication is as important as the 'what'. Design should draw attention to content, but in the last analysis it is the content that counts. On that score we are not complacent. We have been accused of being trivial, dull, too slick, too out-of-touch; you name it, we've got it. We never imagined that it would be possible to produce a magazine that would please all members of the University all the time, but while we hope that our 'style' has developed and will continue to develop, our aims remain unaltered. We can only repeat what we said in issue Number One; that as we see it our function is to produce a readable magazine that will inform, entertain, and provide members of the University with a platform from which they can put forward their ideas on any topic.

Since we have not said it for thirteen issues, we would also repeat that what our readers get out of Focus depends to a certain extent on what they put into it. We do more than our share of soliciting for contributions and receive fewer unsolicited articles than we would like. If we are sometimes out-of-touch, it may be because not enough people get in touch with us. By way of encouragement - and we trust it may serve as some kind of incentive - we will from the December issue be in a position to pay a small sum for all published contributions with the exception of letters and book reviews. We are starting in this issue what we hope will be a regular books page and reviewers will, of course, retain their copy of the book.

We wish that Focus could be published more frequently. Unfortunately given our present production facilities and budget that is not possible. Meanwhile we hope to go on making improvements in the light of your suggestions.

The Focus Consultative Group, as far as we are concerned concerned, has 6000 members.
files for all

The Senate has approved arrangements under which members of Faculty may have access to their personal files subject to certain conditions.

Personal papers concerning individual members of faculty may be kept in some or all of the following offices:

- Establishment Office (Essex House)
- Office of the Assistant Finance Officer (Essex House)
- Arts & Social Studies Office
- Science Office
- Library
- School Offices
- Unit and Centre Offices
- Subject Chairman's Offices
- Vice-Chancellor's Office

The procedure approved by Senate is as follows:

1. A member of faculty may apply to the officer in charge of any of the Offices listed above for permission to see such personal papers as are kept in that Office in relation to himself.
2. The officer will give him a list of these papers and inform him if any of them are confidential, and if so, from whom they originated.
3. The member of faculty will be entitled to see any non-confidential documents, but may see a confidential document only if he presents written permission from the originator releasing the officer from the obligation of confidence.
4. If permission to show a confidential document is refused, the member of faculty may require that document to be destroyed, in which case the officer will do so and make a note in the file to that effect.

These arrangements for access to personal files, which are already available to students, are also now extended to all members of University staffs.

PROF CHATT

Professor J. Chatt, director of the A.R.C. Unit of Nitrogen Fixation, and a Professor of the University, has been honoured by the American Chemical Society. He is to receive its 1971 Award for Distinguished Service in the advancement of Inorganic Chemistry, which carries with it an honorarium of $2000.

Professor Chatt becomes the first recipient of this award outside the USA. It will be made to him at a meeting of the American Chemical Society in Los Angeles next March.

HELP!

Volunteers are required to help with arrangements for this year's party for children of University staff. Anybody who is able to offer their assistance, (mothers or fathers) should contact Mrs. Rosemary Lewis, 52 Baronsdown Road, Lewes (Tel. Lewes 5708) or Mrs. S. Grimsdale, 21 Friar Road, Brighton, (Tel. B'ton 555833) before 16th November. The party will take place on Saturday, January 2nd, 1971.

TRAINING COURSES

Professional training courses for General Practitioners, Senior Social Workers and Clerks to the Justices are included in this year's programme by the University's Centre for Continuing Education. These courses are breaking new ground in co-operation between Universities and professional bodies by providing further vocational training in specialist fields.

Every Thursday throughout this academic year seminars are being held for newly-qualified G.P.'s in Contemporary Society and Aspects of Bio-Engineering, and a team of tutors from various disciplines is involved in the teaching. The course is organised in association with the British Post Graduate Medical Federation and the Mid-Sussex Post Graduate Medical Federation.

During this term a series of two-hour weekly seminars is being organised for Sussex Clerks to the Justices. These senior lawyers have responsibility for organising the training of magistrates, and the aim of these seminars is to assist them in fulfilling this role more effectively.

Senior Child Care and Probation Officers are attending a course on 'Group Behaviour Within Organisations' which is designed to explore the problems and issues arising out of the post-Seebohm re-organisation of the structure of the social services.
Who should run the university? The faculty? the students? or both? We ought to consider all the possibilities, but I have never seen it seriously argued that the university should be run by the students alone. The difficulties seem insuperable, but perhaps I should wait and see if anyone advocates this before I discuss them.

There are certainly people who advocate the other extreme view, that the university should be run by the faculty and the administration only. Indeed, up to ten years ago, everyone held it and it worked. It never occurred to me, as a student, that I wanted to (or had a right to) sit on the universities' committees. My way of dealing with regulations I disliked was to break them; my way of influencing the syllabus was to discuss with my tutor what my next essay should be on. I suppose I was as friendly with my tutors as (temporal differences aside) my students now are with me; when no-one is questioning the power structure, people on different levels have no trouble treating one another as equals. It is only because this system has been questioned that it has to be defended; and it is defensible.

There are two strong arguments for it: that the faculty are experts, and that they are permanent. The former, of course, is only valid in academic matters: if you are deciding which of two books to put on the syllabus, the man who has read them both is obviously in a better position than the man who has read neither. But on questions like how to handle guest-house proprietors, everyone becomes an expert by having to do it, and this can as easily happen to a student as to a lecturer. So the argument of expertise seems to me only partly valid; the other argument, that of permanence, is stronger. If you are to think carefully about what you are doing, then it takes a while to make changes in a university, as in any institution; and if you make your changes democratically, with an attempt to persuade as many people as possible that they are the best thing to do, then it will take even longer. By the time the changes are made, a new lot of students will have arrived who did not know the old system, for whom these fresh changes are 'the system', and who immediately see the virtues of something different. What many faculty fear is a situation of perpetual seesaw, in which they are always saying plaintively 'We tried that one five years ago and it was dreadful', and their students suspect them of dragging their feet. There is a sense in which the university is theirs more than the students', because they have no other career to escape into, but will be left carrying the baby each time a change is made. And if they have got to bear the burden, they want to make the decisions. I have tried to be fair to this view, because I believe a lot of faculty still hold it, even though it has grown unfashionable; and because I believe it is a perfectly tenable view. The reason I do not hold it any longer is because it has become unfashionable - or, if that sounds too undignified, because there has been a social change, and it is no longer acceptable to large numbers of students, who no longer want to be told, by their elders and betters, how things should be done, but want to be consulted, argued with, convinced, because it is, dammit, their education that is at stake.

This is a profound social change; it is the sense in
which our society is now more democratic than it was. Democracy is turbulent, and that is why it is now so much more trouble to run any institution. I fear this change, but I welcome it. I fear it, because above a certain age one is always nervous of change. But even more, I welcome it, because I want my students, and all my fellow citizens, to be alive and not dead, and I would rather have to convince them that what I say is right, than have them submissively assume I am infallible. The pleasure of being thought infallible is, luckily, one that eventually palls.

I welcome the change, but I want to say that it was not caused by the iniquities of the old system. I do not know, and no-one knows what caused it, for the main cause of social change is, after all, social change. All those students who believe in participation nowadays do so, not because they have weighed up and rejected the system their fathers knew, but mainly because participation is in the air. To look forward to the new system is not necessarily to condemn the old. And so to the new system: that faculty and students run things together. My main point in this article is that

dangerous, because it is often part of a move to politicize the university.

Grants
First, that is wrong. Let us look round the areas of discussion in a university, and ask how many of them show us a clear clash of interests. I can think of one, and it is one I have never seen mentioned. If student pressure to get grants increased were to suggest that the money might come out of academic salaries, so that the total cost of the universities stayed the same, then there would be a conflict of interests of the clearest kind, - though even here, some students might be given pause by the thought that they could become academicians themselves one day. But apart from this, as I survey the issues we argue about in the universities, none of them looks like a clash between student and faculty interests. Syllabuses? Perhaps there is a mild tendency for older people to study the past and younger people to prefer the present, but I have often had students who disapproved of my ignorance of the Middle Ages, and I presume we all believe, in the end, that neither past or present makes complete sense without the other. Exams? A complicated issue this, as we will know, but it has not been my impression that the divisions of opinion in our recent discussions have followed faculty/student lines. The separation of assessment from teaching (which is the university's official policy) seems accepted by most people, and its critics seem to come equally from both groups. The extreme suggestion that there should be no assessment at all (and thus presumably no degrees) has, I think, come only from students; yet if I ask whose interest it is in, the answer would seem to be, if anyone, the faculty's, since they have their degrees, and the proposal would save them a lot of trouble.

Teaching? Of course the hard-pressed student, unable to get through his reading, curses the deadline he cannot meet; and of course the conscientious tutor rebukes him for not meeting it. But the rebuke is obviously more in the student's interest than the tutor's, who is not (usually) bursting to read the essay. Indeed, some would claim that reading essays is actually against the interests of faculty, since what they really want to do is to get on with their own research. Teaching v. research. Of course there is a clash here; and I agree with those who claim that most universities give too much weight to research. I found in Germany that this point was part of the radical students' attack on how the universities are run. Yet even this I cannot see as a real clash of interests. If I were a student, I would not want to be taught only by those who had written no books or done no experiments; and as a university teacher, watching the five hundredth book on the Imagery of Millon or the private life of Lawrence roll from the press, there are times when I pray fervently that we all be forbidden to publish anything.

Political
None of the issues, controversial as they are, is a clash between student interests and faculty interests and knowledge is not a cake; if you acquire some, you do not take it away from anyone else. But I have now to go on and say that some radical students do believe in the clash of interests, and that this is usually advanced as part of a larger argument that universities are political bodies and must take up a political stance. Those who want student representation for the

"The issue is whether you believe that the two groups have naturally opposed interests....."
purposes of confrontation usually want to use it to press the university to make political pronouncements, to press seminars to take up ideological positions, and to press lecturers to deal only with material that is ‘relevant’. It is hard to treat briefly the now notorious question of whether universities can be non-political. I know it has become common to say that since a university is supported by society, since it supplies manpower to capitalist industries or does research on government contracts, it is inevitably drawn into social controversy, and so can - even has to - take up a political position.

In this general sense, a university is clearly political - but so is a church, a supermarket, even a football club. To say this is to say something, but not much; and in all the more particular senses I think it important to assert that the university is not political. A student can join the Monday Club or demonstrate against the Greek government; a lecturer can spend his holiday in Poland or in South Africa, his year off in Cuba or Nigeria or the United States, in Israel or in Egypt - none of this is relevant to his right to study or to teach at Sussex.

Causes
Of course this poses problems. As it happens I sympathise with most (not all) of the causes for which our students now demonstrate. I want to see Enoch Powell kept out of the government, I want us to abandon nuclear weapons, I want the Americans out of Vietnam. Is it not rather pedantic, then, to say that I personally support these causes, but do not want the university as a body to be made to support them? In the heat of fury against Enoch Powell, I too sometimes curse myself for this pedantry; but in cooler moments - as in writing this article - I not only defend it, I find it very important.

For to separate an opinion from the man who holds it, and from its political (or moral or religious) implications is part of intellectual integrity. When The Origin of Species was published, Darwin was attacked for the implications of his theory. Bishop Wilberforce claimed that it was incompatible with the word and the spirit of God, thus joining the long tradition that two centuries earlier had condemned Galileo’s hypothesis because there was a system of thought it did not fit. The Bishop Wilberforces of today tell us that Northrop Frye is a fascist or that the novels of Graham Greene are anti-
progressive. I refuse to subordinate the rich complexity of literary and scientific study to a litmus paper of religious and political tests; and I would regard a university where this happened as having lost its soul.

This article has no immediate or practical points to make. Since I am not - and do not wish to be - active in running the university, it is only meant as a statement of belief, not a call to action. But one preference does follow that I might as well make explicit. Participation is my preferred pattern for university government; but if participation were to turn into political confrontation I would see this as a disaster, and would rather see the university run by the faculty alone.

the 70s
A framework for expansion

The University’s Quinquennial Planning Assumptions which indicate the guidelines for expansion of all the University’s activities for 1972/77 envisage a University of 5,400 students by the late 1970’s.

It is stressed that the document is intended as a basis for discussion by all members of the University and that within the framework outlined there is considerable opportunity for imaginative and participative thinking about future lines of development.

The document, prepared by the Vice-Chancellor after detailed discussions with the Planning Committee, runs to 47 pages and has now been circulated to heads of Units, Services and Subject Chairmen and to the Union.

Its tentative conclusions on just how far Sussex can expand in the next Quinquennium are based on preliminary discussions with the University Grants Committee and on an interpretation of likely Government Policy which will call for a better education for more students at lower costs. The emphasis will be on the maximum utilisation of resources coupled with a minimum increase in capital expenditure. Although the UGC has not yet received any definite brief from the Government, it is providing for an overall expansion in University student numbers of 30% - from 240,000 to 320,000.

As far as plans for future development are concerned the University’s freedom of choice is limited and it must follow the advice of the UGC to a large extent. While at one time the University was thinking in terms of an...
the seventies cont.

expansion of up to 6,000 the UGC in May indicated to the University that it should set a target of 5,250, (3,150 Arts and Social Studies and 2,250 Science). This was an advance on the UGC's previous offer of 4,300. Since May further talks have taken place with the result that another 150 Science students have been added to the figure.

The UGC, in deciding on the allocation of Science students, has been guided by the amount of spare capacity within existing University buildings. Therefore Sussex, with a high utilisation of space, has been 'penalised' in terms of science expansion.

The Quinquennal Planning document assumes that there will be no UGC support in the next quinquennium for the construction of additional science buildings, and foresees that the one definite new building likely to be sanctioned is Arts Stage IV.

Bulge
The Pattern of expansion in Arts and Social Studies would therefore be geared to such a new building, which it is suggested would be completed in 1974/5. For the first two years of the quinquennium there would be little expansion, followed by a two-year 'bulge' after which the rate would again slow down.

On the question of new Schools the document records the recommendation of the Planning Committee that there should be one new Science School, combining the sciences and social sciences, containing elements of both the proposed School of Science and Society and of Environmental Studies. It considers it unlikely that the UGC will favour the significant developments at Sussex of Linguistics and Computer Science as contained in the proposal for a School of Cognitive Studies but in view of its academic merit the case for the School is to be put to the UGC during their Visitation to the University later this month.

The document makes no recommendations on new Schools in Arts and Social Studies where discussions are continuing on the possible division of existing schools and new schools.

No great increase in the number of Major Subjects over the next quinquennium is suggested. The document proposes that the majority of additional places be allotted to existing majors, and that some of the smaller subjects should be regrouped to allow faculty to teach more than one subject.

It has not been possible to send every member of the University a copy of the document, but reference copies are available in every School Office, In the Library, the S.C.R. and the Union.

---

Books

SHAKESPEARE By Anthony Burgess

Jonathan Cape: £3, 15s.

This is Mr. Burgess's third encounter with the Bard. His contribution to the quatercentenary celebrations was a racy novel called Nothing Like The Sun and the blurb to this book tells us that he has been involved in the script of a Hollywood epic on Shakespeare's life. A good deal of this handsomely produced volume reads as if it was made up of material excluded from the novel because it was not good enough and from the film script because it was not bad enough. (I am of course making the usual assumption that any Hollywood film script is execrable unless the contrary has been demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt.)

"This is not a book about Shakespeare's plays and poems" the Foreword declares roundly, "It is yet another attempt to set down the main facts about the life and society from which the plays and poems arose". I must assert equally roundly that the first statement is largely untrue and that the second requires a good deal of qualification. Criticism of Shakespeare's poems and plays abounds throughout the book, which would have been much duller without it. The critical comments range from the stimulating ("The Comedy of Errors is a work that had its origins less in professional dramaturgy than in amateur pedagogy") and the perceptive (the parallel between the disillusionment of lust and political disintegration in Troilus and Cressida to the downright silly (Love's Labour's Lost is dismissed as a "suety comedy")."

Quaint too is his solemn refusal to speculate on the identity of the dedicatee of the Sonnets on the sole grounds that so many others have done it before - a
consideration equally applicable to almost any aspect of Shakespeare's life and work but one which does not inhibit the author elsewhere. Nothing Mr. Burgess writes can be dull and the book makes very easy reading. For a more reliable guide to the main facts and one which is as interesting to read, there is still Halliday's Shakespeare Companion (not mentioned in Mr. Burgess's very selective bibliography). But there are splendid chapters on Elizabethan London, the plague, vivid pen pictures of Shakespeare's contemporaries and a bravura piece towards the end, a reconstruction of the first performance of Hamlet. The illustrations are splendidly chosen and produced and strengthen the book's claim to a place on the Shakespeare lover's shelf, especially if it is large and of sound construction. If I had not received a review copy of this book I might well have been tempted to buy it. I might even have yielded to the temptation.

Gámini Salgado

The New Left, a documentary history

ed. Massimo Teodori: Jonathan Cape: 75s.

For British political activists who came into politics via the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and for whom the impact of books like Raymond Williams' Culture and Society 1780-1950 (1958) and events like Suez (1956) were personal milestones in political consciousness 'the New Left' means something very different from what it means to Massimo Teodori. For that generation in Britain 'the New Left' meant the still important early numbers of New Left Review, books like Out of Apathy, anti-NATO concepts such as 'positive neutralism', awareness of the third world, understanding of the less formal power bases of British capitalism (e.g. in communications and advertising), and the beginnings of thinking about alternative ways of conducting radical politics. The search of this 'New Left' for a movement which is neither a machine nor a sect, for a politics which is active within, at the same time as being studious of, the capitalism it wishes to replace by socialism, continues into the thinking and action generated by the May Day Manifesto (1968). One of its most important contributions has been its concern to integrate tactics and goals, its concern that the methods of struggle, the forms of pre-revolutionary politics, should not contradict the equal and democratic society being struggled for. This 'New Left' continues, and needs recruits.

Massimo Teodori has put together 'a documentary history' of another but closely related 'New Left', that of the young white radicals in the U.S.A. from the early 1960's onwards. Three quarters of the book consists of valuable documents from the Civil Rights, Peace, Community Organisation, Free Speech, Student Power, Anti-draft, and other movements. Inevitably the excerpts are not long enough, but to have them at all is invaluable for non-American students. A brave effort is made to impose some coherence on a diverse scene with chapter divisions like 'Analysis and Proposals for American Society', 'The Politics of the Movement: Coalition, Autonomy and Organisational Structures', 'New Left Methodology: Non-exclusionism, participatory Democracy and Direct Action'. The book is what it sets out to be - an interim collection of sources with some preliminary arrangement.

The chronology of the movement is much easier to fix than its overall nature and prospects since more than with most movements its stages of development have depended upon what provocation the rulers of the United States make year by year. In societies like that it is the rulers who make revolutions. Perhaps we can rely on them to make it less damaging to revolutionary prospects that 'there is very little unity between the various organisations, programs and ideological statements which form the phenomena usually referred to as "the Movement"'.

Stephen Yeo.

union council

KEITH SUTER WHO RESIGNED AS CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL LAST MONTH, DISCUSSSES ITS FUTURE AND THE PRESIDENT'S PLANS TO ABOLISH IT

Union Council was one of the main issues raised during the Presidential election. I was glad that Council was discussed because it is helpful to get some idea of the feelings of the student body on Council and what they expect of Council. No doubt in the coming weeks of this term, Council will continue to be a contentious issue. As a prelude to that discussion, in this article I shall describe the duties of Council, its disadvantages and
advantages and conclude by making some suggestions for changes.

Council has three duties. Firstly, Council is the watchdog of the Union constitution and has to oversee all the day-to-day workings of the Union. (Because it is so bound up with the day-to-day activities of the Union, Council cannot be easily scrapped and to do so will require the complete revision of the Union Constitution). Secondly, Council ensures that the Executive Committee is doing its job properly in carrying out the policies formulated by both Union General Meetings and Council, and this is mainly done by Council going over the Executive Committee minutes each fortnight at Council Meetings and by quizzing Executive Committee members at those meetings. Finally, Council makes policy. This is done within the framework of the rationale of Union General Meetings and is done because UGMs cannot make policies on all issues concerning the Union—especially some of the smaller issues.

Concern

Council has its critics. This pleases me because it at least shows that people are still concerned about Council— if Council were simply ignored, then it would show that students had given up with it. Council has been accused of being 'unrepresentative'. This is a relative and emotive term and cannot be defined to the satisfaction of everyone. Are we to say that Council should contain, based on the numbers of students at Sussex, a proportional number of students of each of the years, of each sex, of each School, of each major subject, of each age group, of each social class? Clearly, that is impossible. However, I would certainly admit that I am disappointed that not all the places on Council are taken up. Traditions are beginning to grow up among Schools, so that one can almost predict which School will have competition for Council places and which places will go by default to candidates and even some schools who remain entirely unrepresented.

Another disadvantage is that not all students are aware of Council and that some people are not working hard enough to ensure that students are made aware of Council. This may be in part due to the type of work that Council does. While dealing with large policy issues, Council is mainly concerned with the minutiae of the Union and consequently Council members get bored and fail to do their job properly.

Advantages

While recognising that Council has these disadvantages, I support the concept of Council because I believe that it performs its duties in the main satisfactorily. It has three other advantages. It provides an opportunity for students to participate in Union affairs in that students can represent their School on Council. Secondly, the atmosphere at Council is more relaxed than at UGMs and so people who may not have the courage to address UGMs, have less fears about addressing Council. Also, the relaxed atmosphere means that issues can be discussed in depth and more people can speak at Council than at UGMs. Thirdly, students can use Council as a way of knowing what is going on, on the campus for nearly every issue that concerns the Union is discussed at Council.

Council, then, performs its duties satisfactorily and has certain other advantages, which easily outweigh its disadvantages. But like any part of the Union, it could be revised in some ways. Firstly, I suggest that Council ceases to elect officers of the Union and that these officers be elected by the student body, for I can see no reason why students should not elect all their officers. Included here would be Chairman and Secretary of the Council, since it is by having these officers elected by the student body that students would take a greater interest in Council. By the same token, Sussex delegates for NUS, should be elected by the student body (and not by Council) and the policies that the delegation would support at the NUS Conference should be decided at a UGM and not by Council.

Publicity

Secondly, Council members ought to do far more to make Council activities known to students. This would entail, for example, holding regular meetings in School Common Rooms at which Council members would discuss Council matters with students and would find out what problems are uppermost in the minds of students. Finally, members of the Executive Committee should treat Council with more respect. During last term, a habit developed whereby some of the Executive Committee regarded Council as a farce, treated it as a stage for banalities and jokes and at other times did not even bother to attend. If members of the Executive Committee treat Council as a circus, then Council members will be tempted to act no better than performing seals. Consequently, I would hope that this year's Executive Committee would treat Council better and undoubtedly Council members will carry out their duties better.

To conclude, Council this term has much work to do, for not only has it to get its own house in order but it also has to help the rest of the Union out of its present plight. As for future terms, I do not believe that the current discussions over Council will lead to its abolition. What may happen is that the institution of 'Council' itself will go but I am sure that whatever replaces Council, for example, an enlarged Union Executive Committee, will contain many of Council's features because Council's three main duties must be carried out by someone.
If genius as either Confucius or Chairman Mao has so sanely said is 99 per cent perspiration and one per cent inspiration, then The Who, are indubitably four raving, roaring, screeching, psychedelic genii, because nobody, but nobody, sweats like they do. Unless perhaps it’s their audience.

And last month the audience who sweated it out at a pound a head were fifteen hundred Sussex University students gathered reverently as near as they could get to the four lime, purple, scarlet and puce lit figures who for the marginal cost of twelve hundred pounds pummelled electric guitars till the rising decibels made deafness a positive relief, pounded five drums as viciously as if each was the hated head of a rival pop star, and bellowed such niceties as ‘Touch me, touch me’ into mikes swung frenziedly first as lassos then more and more frighteningly as last note nooses.

To me the whole experience, my first I must admit at a Pop Ritual, felt like an atheist might feel if he took a sauna in Westminster Cathedral. This respectful sweaty church was a long way from the orgasmic experience a pop concert, self-titled the ‘throb disco with uma lights’ sets out to be. The humble fifteen hundred packed in a way that made sardines in a tin envy their professionalism, stood silent and clammy, and worshipped. And outside Falmer House where the concert took place, the hundreds of students who had not been to buy or beg tickets lay spread on rather damp concrete and listened quietly to the mass hysteria two floors and a lot of status above them. For them it seemed to be enough.

For me, inside, it was enough when the men nearby began coolly... sorry not coolly, but calmly to strip to the waist. Not in joy, or lust, just in mild discomfort. The drummer stripped to his underpants by the time the recital reached the end and the big new number ‘Water, Water’. But then the drummer had room to move about in and water within reach, which none of the rest of us did. After surviving Roger Ruskin Spear’s Giant Kinetic Wardrobe (of course you know Roger Ruskin Spear, the amazing zany comedian founder member of the Bonzo Dog Doo Dah band, currently accompanied by his collection of electrified friends) then the James Gang (billed I assure you as that ‘incredibly tight American 3-piece group on their first ever British tour’) the remaining minutes (hours?) of The Who became less a question of Who but of What, then of Why, then of How long. Oh lord, how long? Midnight did eventually come and with it the incredibly well-organised late transport, coaches for all and none turned into pumpkins down the Lewes Road, and as I left the disco still throbbing I naturally wouldn’t have missed it for the world!
Decimalisation: will the University score on points?

On February 15th, 1971, 10p will equal £1. While both old currency and the new decimal currency will continue to circulate for a period after that date, the University itself will be going decimal on the 15th.

This means, in effect, that all prices will be marked in the new coinage; that all wages, salaries and grants will be paid in decimal; and that, while the Refectory, Bookshop and bars will continue to accept old currency, or even a mixture of old and new currency, change will be given in New Pennies only.

Such a situation is bound to make considerable demands on the patience of customers and staff alike. The hard pressed cashiers in the Refectory, for example, will have to work out whether the customer who produces a 5p coin and six old pennies for a 7p purchase is right in demanding 1p change; or conversely the customer will have to worry over whether he is, or is not being 'robbed' - perish the thought - when that copper coin is pressed into his hand. Incidentally the 1p coin is being introduced only as a temporary measure to prevent 'inordinate price-increases'.

The banks, however, will be accounting in whole new pennies only, and furthermore will be closing down from the evening of February 10th to Monday, February 15th, during which time they will, among other things, be converting your overdraft to £p.

Meanwhile the University accountants will be struggling with the conversion of wage rates running at figures ending in 5/8 penny and fervently hoping that in future negotiators will settle for fractions somewhat less vulgar.

There is a possibility that part of wages in the week prior to D-day will be paid out in the new coinage to provide money for bus fares etc and a further announcement on that will be made later.

Scattered around the University are a few of the country's five million cash registers, and these will be converted by D-day, though of course converting machines is less of a problem than converting those who have to use them.

The Deputy Finance Officer, Colin Brummitt, has already delivered one lecture to University staff, and further 'indoctrination' will be undertaken between now and February.

In order to establish just how much people do know about decimal coinage we dispatched Sally Cline on a campus-wide investigation.

Here with her report:

SALLY MARRIOT - SPACE ADMINISTRATION OFFICER.
Q. 'What's 18/3 in new pennies?'
A. 'Eighteen and three.' Let me see, I should say about eighteen pennies because, its going to be under a hundred. If there are going to be a hundred pennies to the pound, and this is slightly under....or is it....I mean I haven't just got the exact table at all.'
Q. 'Are you going to learn it before February?'
A. '(Long Pause) Well, yes at least I guess so. Well no actually I've bought a converter so I don't think I will bother to learn it after all. What happens if I leave my converter behind? Help, I'll be desperate, I'll just have to buy in pounds.'
Q. 'But who will sell to you in pounds?'
A. 'Um yes, well in point of fact we've had a talk in admin about this but I didn't go. I don't think anyone's going to go till much nearer the time.'

AT THE BOOKSHOP
I bought a 6/- University Diary and asked how much it was in decimal currency.
A. 'Oh golly, I don't know, five fives are twenty five, is that relevant? One hundred and twenty... one hundred and twenty what... Oh dear, I don't know. I mean I've got a converter thing somewhere but I don't quite know where. You know they haven't bothered to do anything to help us with this problem at the bookshop. They haven't done anything for us so far. And they'll have to. They really will. You know the banks are closing for three days to learn. I think they'll have to do the same here, I mean they'll be constantly having trouble.'

AT THE BOOKSTALL
I asked Mr. Hill, the newsagent the price of a 'Bounty' in decimal coinage.
A. 'Ninepence, ninepence, surely it'll be four new pence?'
Q. (to his assistant) 'What about 4/- 3s. 11d.?'
A. 'Oooh wait a minute, wait a minute. Ah, there it is.' (She had a converter. First person to have one.)
'Could you tell me without a converter?'

A. 'No I can't honestly. I haven't got a clue: Ah, here we are, I've got nine pence - that's four new pence.'

Mr. Hill: 'I've just done that. AND WITHOUT a converter. We're on to the next sum now. Now three and eleven, that must come out at, at, at, well forty is twenty new pence of course, so it must be four point ten. I think you'd better buy a converter too, only half a crown. (We did) 'Of course I have been to an odd lecture on it, my assistant missed the last one, but there's another at the end of the month.'

---

'Could you tell me without a converter?'

A. 'Twenty-five new pennies... no... oh no, wait a minute, you're getting me up the wall.'

---

MRS. PHILLIPS, IN REFECTORY BAR

Q. 'How much will 3/11 be in decimal coinage?'

A. 'Ooh, I haven't got that far yet. Thirty pence, no um, ah it'll be almost forty pence won't it? No it won't be. No, I am right, it will be.'

---

JOHN CARTER - HEAD OF THE PHOTOGRAPHIC UNIT

'I couldn't translate anything into decimals. I haven't been to any lectures. Didn't even know there were any. I'm waiting for my childred to teach it to me. If I have to buy film before that with decimals that may be the end of my career.'

---

STUDENT, SONIA GAZAN (A Canadian)

A. 'Eleven and tenpence? Well, er seven times twelve is er let's see 94 cents.'

Q. 'Are you sure that's decimal coinage?'

A. 'Sure, that's the dollars and cents decimal coinage. Well I guess it is. That's our way anyway.'

---

MR. A.E. SHIELDS - REGISTRAR

Q. 'Do you happen to know what £1.13s.10d. is in decimal coinage?'

A. 'Is this a test? Ahaha, is the whole University being tested? Ah well. One sixty, er, one sixty-nine I should say.'

---

AT BARCLAYS BANK

I gave an assistant a cheque for two pounds three and seven and asked what it would be in decimal coinage.

A. 'I haven't the foggiest idea. None of us have. We've had one talk which wasn't compulsory so I didn't go. Or maybe I wasn't

---

WAITRESS IN SENIOR COMMON ROOM.

Q. 'How much is 4/- in New Pennies?'

---

LAST WORD FROM A POSTGRADUATE IN THE REFECTORY:

'Decimalisation or not? I don't think it matters. The one thing people always find out about is money.'
When we are asked what we do in the Reginald M. Phillips Research Unit we find it hard to give a concise answer. After all we have a link with the Atomic Energy Authority, we recently worked on an electronic, two-way, induction-loop communication system as well as on a course to improve the reading efficiency of undergraduates. We are doing experimental work on the cognitive development of deaf children, of a system to improve teaching performance by means of television playback and we have worked on the composition of groups in comprehensive schools. We are setting out to help neurologically-handicapped children to learn better and we made a contribution to the work of the World Meteorological Organisation. How do we explain that we are on Committees of the Council of Europe and the Commonwealth Society for the Deaf, the Home Office and the Ministry of Overseas Development, and give advice on Communications, Psychology, Teaching and Systems Analysis? And, come to that, why is our secretary Swedish?

Benfactor
All (or most) of this is a consequence of the interest of the University's benefactor, Reginald M. Phillips, in the amelioration of learning handicaps - particularly, though not exclusively, those of deaf and mentally retarded children. What we have to do is to investigate empirically those aspects of educational sciences which will help to improve learning and to devise and test practical ways of applying the results. In effect, we are in the business of designing and evaluating learning systems and, in particular, those systems which will make a difference in a range of situations from those of multiply-handicapped children (who may be unable to coordinate muscular movements, have defective hearing and be partially blind) to those of undergraduates who have difficulty in making proper use of the language laboratory or who are prevented from learning effectively because they are somewhat over-anxious (though not sufficiently to need psychiatric treatment), in the light of this general statement of our interests and aims the associations and activities we have entered on can be made clear.

Our links
For example, our link with the Atomic Energy Authority is far from sinister. A local authority and a branch of the A.E.A. have asked us to join them in working out methods of teaching oral communication to deaf children by means of computer-monitored visual displays and tactile signals. The problem is to guide and give feedback about their utterances to people who cannot hear their own voices and who must be cued and guided to make the right sequence of sounds, with appropriate speech melody, through other senses. To be in a position to do this we have to be involved in developments in psycholinguistics, programmed learning, computer-aided instruction and other fields. We also have, incidentally, a project on teaching lip-reading by programmed television tapes.

Microteaching has a similar background. In schools for deaf and partially hearing children close-circuit television is beginning to be used, partly to show children what they do when they pronounce words and sentences and partly for more general teaching. Some teachers are beginning to get used to handling television equipment in their everyday work - to the extent that they are eager to make use of video-tape recordings to look at how they carried out a piece of teaching in order to improve what they do next time. This is one feature of microteaching. Others involve working out a job analysis of teaching and of the effects of different kinds of classroom interactions. Ideally, teachers can select an aspect of their jobs which can be improved and practise it (with playback to give immediate inspection of performance) until the skill (e.g. questioning) is nearer perfection. To help with this task an experiment has been set up in collaboration with a college of
education. The point is that schools for the deaf are relatively small and have such special problems that the general principles of how to improve teaching need to be worked out first in normal conditions. As details of tasks are distinguished and formulated into guidelines, they will be applied to special-school teaching. In the same way measures of teaching capabilities will be developed and tested and immediately used in schools for handicapped children.

Comparisons
In other words, we find it is necessary for our work with handicapped learners to investigate also the whole range of learning. Because there is retardation in some aspects of the achievement and aptitudes of children with impaired hearing, where, and how, they differ from hearing children requires us to make comparisons.

As convenors of an inter-university committee on curriculum development, evaluation and teaching methods we are using exactly the same techniques of learning systems design and innovation in special education as in normal education.

Again, in some work completed last year, to find the best conditions for cooperative group work in schools - whether children of mixed ability or of similar ability learn best together - it needed 800 children to establish that temperamental differences were also important and exactly what these are. It is now possible to investigate the place of these newly worked-out factors, in the numerically, much more restricted fields of hearing and mental handicap.

In the same line of research it is now becoming clear that different approaches to teaching (e.g., discovery and didactic presentation) succeed or fail with different kinds of children and older students. It is especially important that every impediment to learning which adds to already existing physical or mental handicap should be eliminated from the teaching situation. This is another case where research with normal learners contributes to work with the handicapped.

Questions
On the other side, there is much about human learners in general that can only be discovered from the special education field. To find out whether learning language is essential for some aspects of mental development cannot be done by rearing children so that they are deprived of language - but deaf subjects can be arranged on a dimension of language deficit. There are questions about which part of the brain is used for short-term memory which can be explored by finding the kinds -
of mistakes made by deaf people who have different backgrounds of communication. Since there are still relatively few empirical research workers in the field of educational technology who have had the opportunity to direct and participate in large scale, systematic projects, and they are scattered over several countries, it is natural that we should be working in cooperation with colleagues abroad. Collaboration has begun with centres in Canada, Germany, Japan, Spain and Sweden and we have close working relationship with research centres in Eastern Europe and in the U.S.A. - many of them sharing our dual interest in normal and special education. We still haven’t explained what we were doing in conjunction with the World Meteorological Organisation (testing methods of instructional design such as Mathetics, cross-culturally - handicaps are international). The Council of Europe is to do with international cooperation in the development of special teaching materials. The Home Office? The tie-up with Fire-Service training is a bit more remote but you can see that we are both interested in serving outposts which are widely spread out and decentralised. Swedish secretary? Well can you translate "begavnings-structuren hos en grupp döva ungdomar"?

Reginald M Phillips

Mr. Reginald M. Phillips of Brighton is one of the University’s most generous benefactors. The Reginald M. Phillips Research Unit was founded as the result of his own concern for handicapped children. He donated £132,000 for research into the education of deaf children and £50,000 for the foundation of a professorial chair to promote research and teaching in the education of blind and partially blind children. Further gifts by Mr. Phillips to the University include £150,000 to establishing a professorship in Science Policy. Over the last few years he has given away more than £700,000 in gifts and charitable donations. Founder of the National Postal Museum, he recently presented the University with 46 albums of colour photographs of his unique collection of 19th century postage stamps of Great Britain. These will form the centre-piece of the Philatelic Unit being set up in the University.

George Leith

George Leith is director of the Reginald M. Phillips Research Unit in the Centre for Educational Technology. Last year he was given an honorary appointment as Professor of Psychology and of Education at Memorial University, Newfoundland. As well as being a consultant for Unesco on educational technology, teacher-training and the psychology of learning, he is a member of the National Council for Educational Technology, the U.K. National Commission for Unesco, and an Advisory Committee on Communications and several other national and international committees.

Bill Watts

Bill Watts, Research Fellow in the Unit was County Adviser for Deaf Children (East Sussex) and has worked in a number of other branches of special and remedial education. His work on programmed learning in deaf education won him the Braidwood Gold Medal in 1966. An Executive Member of the National College of Teachers of the Deaf as well as Vice-Chairman of its Southern Branch he is also Assistant Editor of 'The Teacher of the Deaf'.
GETTING PEOPLE TOGETHER

FOCUS profile on Roger Blin-Stoyle, the University’s first Deputy Vice Chancellor

There are two rooms in the working life of the University’s new Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Roger Blin-Stoyle. One, much smaller than he used to have, is in Physics. The other, very much larger, is new to him. It is on the second floor of Essex House, with a rather splendid view of the site works now going on around the new Educational Development building across the way.

The two rooms are, in a sense, the symbols of a barrier that Roger Blin-Stoyle hopes to break down. Inevitably, as the University has grown so has the gulf between administrators and academics, between students and administrators and academics and students. Intimacy and communication have to be worked at; they are no longer the natural by-products of an institution where everybody knew everybody else. So the room without a telephone that he retains in Physics, and to which he retires for two days a week in his role of scientist and Professor of Theoretical Physics, is not just a handy pied-a-terre, nor even a kind of think-tank for contemplating the University’s administrative navel, but a place where he continues to work as an academic. Quite apart from the fact that he would be reluctant to give up altogether his work as a scientist, he believes that only by continuing with it can he hope to avoid the traps of the ‘them’ and ‘us’ situation that tends often to colour the relationships between teachers and administrators - a situation, let it be said, that is not unique to Sussex.

It is, he says, a particular gap that he wants to bridge. As an academic he is sensitive to the feelings of frustration that can build up against an administration that may seem too distant, too powerful and too anonymous. "Connection is the cornerstone of my job, as I see it," he says. "I think people should talk to each other. I want to bring people together both socially and functionally."

It is in order than he can link and connect the many strands of University administration that he now sits on more committees than any previous member of the University. Already a member of Senate, he now adds to this membership of Council, Court, Social Policy, Buildings and Equipment, chairmanship of the Admissions and Computing committees, and deputy-chairmanship of Planning Committee. Also he is now a member of the Arts and Social Studies and Science Committees. His role is unique in the nine-year history of Sussex, and it is clearly a powerful one. Quite apart from the fact that it crowds his time-table it gives him access to the lines of most communication "and that's important."

He regards his membership of the Arts and Science
Committees as particularly important. As he sees it, it is here in these two areas that hopes, ambitions and sometimes conflicting interests of Deans, Subject Chairmen and elected representatives from the Schools come together in a concentration that represents what the University is about: teaching, research and development.

"I prefer to be in on things," he says. "Feedback is not the same as experiencing somebody's anger or bitterness. And having the same person on both committees means you can see where the problems lie at the arts and science boundaries. There must be access to these boundaries."

Access, communication, people talking to each other; these are the foundation stones upon which the Blin-Stoyle philosophy is built. He believes that knowledge and communication should cut straight across the inevitable University power structure. If the University structure were like a wheel, and its spokes were the lines of communication, Roger Blin-Stoyle would like to make it easier for those on its circumference to get at those clustered in the hub of things.

Certainly those who know him would say he is immensely 'accessible' himself. In Physics technicians, students and academics testify to his no-nonsense approach. Of course he can be tough, and on occasions he may have to be; but its a face-to-face let's have it out kind of toughness that rarely leaves room for the harbouring of grudges. He has no time for the cap-doffing bit, and is healthily suspicious of authority based on sense of inflated status.

He finds talking to people easy, seemingly able to establish contact without effort, and in his first few weeks as Deputy Vice-Chancellor has been making contact with a great number of new people, particularly those scattered about the labyrinth of Essex House. The University is full of barriers; barriers between areas, between one building and another, between people in the same building. Essex House has its share of isolated cells, its quota of disconnected cogs at the administrative hub of the wheel. Charged, on the Vice-Chancellor's behalf, to review the central administration, he is applying to that review his concept of fusing people together across the very barriers that separate them. It is not a concept aimed particularly at the administration, or created for it, but something Roger Blin-Stoyle has always advocated. In that almost legendary and now somewhat out-of-date book 'The Idea of a New University', Blin-Stoyle, writing about the freshly-formed School of Physical Sciences, now MAPS, which he helped to pattern, makes a firm case for a variant on the traditional tutorial system, and dismisses the impersonal lecture and class system as resulting in "a consequent loss of contact between undergraduates and members of the Faculty, so regrettable as to be inexcusable.

Surely one of the major features of a University education should be the continual exchange of ideas between the young and the established, and this can only happen effectively within the informality of the tutorial."

**Diplomacy**

What's good enough for students ought to be good enough for administrators. Early indications suggest that the Blin-Stoyle combination of diplomacy, charm and firmness, allied to a readiness by the occupants of Essex House themselves to move towards a more unified administration with Roger Blin-Stoyle co-ordinating not only their work, but also that of other University services ranging from Computers to Health, will achieve results.

Whether Essex House will finally aspire to the kind of professional and social unity that Roger Blin-Stoyle has in mind still remains to be seen. Whether the easy atmosphere of the Physics Common Room can come to flourish amid the pressures and preoccupations of the administration will depend not so much on the Deputy Vice-Chancellor - after all he would be the first to recognise that you can't persuade people to have coffee together if they find it either more congenial or practicable to have it in their rooms - but on how far administrators themselves are prepared not merely to accept change, but to change a way of working.

"What I would like," says Roger Blin-Stoyle "is to get all those inside Essex House into one real meeting room, and then get them outside into Arts and Sciences, and make opportunities to get faculty into Essex House." Certainly the need exists for more personal contact, and it will increase rather than diminish as the University continues to expand in the next Quinquennium. So, at 45 years of age - and a fairly young-looking 45 at that - the challenge facing the Deputy Vice-Chancellor is a considerable one.

**Administration**

He is of course no newcomer to the world of administration. From the inception of the University he has, in his words 'been in on things.' The first Dean of the old School of Physical Sciences, he was later Chairman of Science. Lord Fulton, the University's first Vice-Chancellor, made Roger Blin-Stoyle Pro-Vice-Chancellor, partly to emphasise to the world at large that Sussex, which had started on the Arts side "had a scientist at the top".

Then last year he became chairman of a study group set up by the Planning Committee to review undergraduate teaching methods and costs, and is co-ordinating the work of fourteen different project groups. (A progress report on the group's work is contained in the following pages).

The flexibility afforded by this kind of project group
approach is one which he favours, and would like to see extended. As he sees it, this is a mode of operation that enables the University to make the maximum use of skilled people in a way that breaks out of sectional interests and 'power groups'. "I do not want to see any really powerful sections," he says. "I don't always want the key figures in each office to be the mouthpieces. I'd like the skilled man in that office to be able to talk about what in practice he is doing. I'd like to see younger men and women brought more into the life of the community. I'd like to see their skills being used when the relevant situation occurs."

As an example of the kind of problem that could be tackled by the project group approach - a method suggested by Planning Officer Geoff Lockwood - he cites the Admissions Policy. "We have an Admissions Officer, but Admissions is something which should be determined by the University as a whole. It is an issue that has academic implications, financial implications, it touches on lodgings, on students, on a whole number of issues." Roger Blin-Stoyle's appointment as Deputy Vice-Chancellor comes at a time when the administrative burdens on the Vice-Chancellor continue to increase, and will increase further with the expansion of the University in the Seventies. In the days to come he will find himself more and more involved in the running of the University and that small room in Physics may at times seem a long way from Essex House. But it is important to him, and to the University, that he should remain an academic at heart, and show the Sussex world that the man who is Deputy Vice-Chancellor is also a Scientist.

---

**TEACHING**

**a progress report**

by Prof. Blin-Stoyle on the work of the study group reviewing undergraduate teaching methods

On the 26th November 1969 the Planning Committee set up a study group under my chairmanship to review undergraduate teaching methods and costs throughout the University. The other members of the group were (and are - we are still working!) Dr. Peter J. Ambrose (School of Social Sciences), Professor Richard Andrew (School of Biological Sciences), Mr. Hywel C. Jones (Vice-Chancellor's Office), Dr. Willie M. Lamont (School of Cultural and Community Studies) and Dr. Peter Lindon (School of Applied Sciences).

At an early stage Hywel Jones suggested that in order to make progress in the broad field encompassed by our terms of reference it might be a good idea to establish a number of projects on different aspects of our brief. As a group, we welcomed and accepted this proposal. The advantages of this approach are threefold. Firstly, it has enabled us to involve a large number of faculty and students in the work of the group. Secondly, by specifying well defined and restricted areas of study it has brought order and tidiness into our work and enabled us to make speedy progress (some have said too fast!). Thirdly, it has allowed the main group to concentrate on a range of broad considerations and topics which fall outside work of specific projects and also, more importantly, to sift and pull together the work of the various project teams.

The detailed objectives of each project have been listed in two Planning Committee and Senate documents (P/108/3, P/QP7) and will not be repeated here. Suffice it to say that to date fourteen projects have been set up dealing with such fields as guidance of university teachers, the use of postgraduates and research fellows as teachers, the 'role' of faculty members, small group teaching, lectures, counselling, learning resource units, library problems, self-instruction, laboratory teaching, teaching space, educational development. A leader was designated for each project and getting on for one hundred faculty and students have been directly involved in the work of one or other of them. A great many more have been consulted either by questionnaire or in some cases by specially arranged meetings of interested and relevant people. Two projects have also been referred to Schools of Study and the Science and the Arts and Social Studies Committees for their comments.

In all of this work and consultation our overwhelming experience has been of considerable interest on the part of the people concerned together with active support and enthusiasm for the activities of the group. Where there has been scepticism or criticism it has almost invariably been informed and healthy. The exercise so far has certainly been a rewarding and stimulating experience for the members of the main group.

**Study**

We started our work by making some study of the available literature on teaching and learning in higher
teaching methods cont.

education as well as seeking as much information as possible about procedures being used within Sussex at the present time. We also consulted with a few people active in this field in other institutions, in particular Dr. Ruth Beard, Director of the University of London Teaching Methods Research Unit. It very soon became clear to us that although there are a very large number of opinions about methods of teaching and learning there are very few validated conclusions of general application. From our studies within the University we also became aware of the fact that problems in teaching and learning can vary considerably from Subject to Subject and School to School. This is particularly striking and not unexpected in comparing the Arts and Sciences but is also quite apparent within these two areas.

Pragmatic

In the light of this situation we decided to approach our task pragmatically. We did not have the financial or manpower resources to set in being large scale research projects which might in the end enable us to make firm and detailed recommendations about the precise way in which different teaching and learning processes should be carried on in the University. In any case, given the necessary resources it would still have taken many years before valid conclusions could be drawn. We therefore set a time limit on our work and propose to present our final report to the Planning Committee early in the Spring Term of 1971. For the reasons just given many of our recommendations will consist of suggesting structures within the University which will enable teaching and learning to be the subject of continual investigation, assessment and improvement. The two project reports already approved by Senate on guidance of university teachers and the use of postgraduates in the teaching programme both reflect this approach.

It has also become apparent to us that the actual work of the group must in some respects be institutionalised in order to act as a focus for the recommended continual review of our teaching methods. Here, we are proposing that the University should establish an Educational Development Programme (EDP) backed by a special budget which would be used to finance research into and development of the teaching and learning methods used in the University. The idea would be to use these finds to strengthen and evaluate our existing practices as well as to investigate new approaches. It is after all surprising that in an institution which spends over £3 million each year, no money is set aside to enable members of the University to evaluate and to improve what they are doing. It is particularly surprising that this should be the case in an educational institution which puts such an emphasis on rigorous evaluation and research when applied to academic studies.

Perhaps the most important use of an EDP fund would be to finance or partially finance faculty release time and associated support so that, relieved from regular teaching duties for a period (e.g. a term), faculty can review existing courses and curricula, develop new courses and so forth. Here our view should be stressed that we see improvements in teaching and learning almost invariably being initiated and carried out at the 'grass-root' level. Although professionals working in the field of education in the University have much to contribute to these improvements, there is no question in our minds but that the initiative must come from students and faculty in the different Subjects and Schools and that it is they, albeit assisted and advised by professionals, who must do the development work. The necessity for release time then follows at once.

Active

From our enquiries about current practice within the University it is clear that a few Subject Groups are already active in this way. We discovered several examples of assessments being made of teaching effectiveness, of experiments with novel teaching techniques particularly in the area of small group teaching and of continual critical review of curricula and courses. Indeed, on learning of this work we realised how bad the communication system within the University is with respect to activities of this kind and how much we could all profit from a knowledge of one another's experiences. This suggested the need for and importance of an effective communication system which could also be financed from the EDP and be focussed around the teaching coordinators already accepted in principle by the University.

Although it is encouraging to note the already intense interest, concern and effort going into the development of undergraduate teaching and learning in some subjects it is by no means universal and should not be left entirely to the whim of the different teaching units. Further, in some cases, it is clear that individual members of faculty are giving up a great deal of their personal and research time in order to foster these developments. Others, on the other hand, are contributing little or nothing in this field. Of course some faculty have special skills and enthusiasm for this sort of work and to expect a uniform contribution from all members of faculty would be ridiculous. Indeed, the recognition that faculty vary in the extent to which they have enthusiasm and skills in different areas of academic life and its implications for a career structure is the subject of one of our projects.

The advantage of an EDP, however, is that it will make it easier for educational development work to be carried out and should encourage a spread of this work among more faculty and throughout all Subjects and Schools.

Comments

Our thinking has by no means crystallised on issues of this kind and during the coming Autumn term we shall be considering, for example, how an EDP can be organised and integrated within the present Subject/School system. At the same time we shall be particularly concerned with some of the less developed projects e.g. library problems, lectures and space usage. No doubt some of you will be asked to express opinions about these issues and we ask for your forbearance to help, any unsolicited comments will also be very welcome. To the very many academic and administrative faculty who already have so patiently given their time and help we as a group give our warmest thanks. For my part I would like to thank the other members of the main group for the immense amount of time and enthusiasm they have already put into our work. They have met with me each week in term and parts of the vacations for several hours quite apart from the projects with which they have all been concerned. Release time for them has on the other hand been very small if at all.
Dear Sir,

As a result of comments made by the President of the Union, this year’s socio-educational research data collection exercise has covered only 10% of new students compared with an average response rate over the past six years of over 90%.

Six years ago a committee of Sussex University faculty and administrators, together with a panel of external consultants, designed the first sociological questionnaire and selected the original battery of tests. Their objectives were primarily to investigate the ways in which the various family, social and education background factors, together with intelligence and personality within the individual, affected students’ academic performance at the University. It was realized that a number of secondary objectives could also be attained with the same test instruments. For example: how personality variables relate to subject choice, career sought, and motivation throughout the course; also whether the students potentially at risk of failing could be predicted early enough in their course for remedial teaching etc., to be effective; also in evaluating this University’s practice of allowing students to transfer courses by comparing the degree results of transferees with the degree results of a matched sample of non-transferees, who were of similar intelligence.

The data collection exercises is also useful to both the Health Centre and the Appointment Service in enabling them to gain an additional overall view of such things as referral rates (which are obviously very important to understand since they can only help the people who go to them), but also in providing them with detailed background knowledge about virtually the whole student population, so that an individual can be better helped by their knowing his (or her) intelligence and personality profile relative to the student population.

I thought that my letter to new students briefly explained the above history and uses. It also, categorically stated that the data on any individual student would not be released to anyone, other than those few researchers directly concerned with the project and the Health and Appointments Services. No results of the tests of ability, nor answers to the sociological questionnaire have ever been made available to any members of faculty teaching students. The scores are kept by me, and any student who wishes can be told his own test results. Over the past six years over 4,000 students have voluntarily completed the tests and questionnaires and, to the best of my knowledge, no students has subsequently had any cause to complain that the information has been mis-used in any way. Had such mis-use occurred the President of the Union’s concern would have been understandable.

I will be making arrangements for the tests to be repeated and I hope that many of the students who didn’t attend the sessions in October will feel able to contribute this time. Participation is entirely voluntary, but it is important that the respository rate for the 1970 entry should move up nearer to the 90% of previous years from its present 10%.

It is hoped that during 1970-1, the results of the analysis of the data so far collected will become available; and that those results will enable the University to improve the decisions which affect future generations of students.

Yours sincerely,
Brian Smith,
Socio-Educational Research Fellow.

From the Director of the University Health Service:

Dear Sir,

It is a pity that the President of the Union felt a need to exercise his eloquence against the freshers’ ‘Intake Tests’ as the resulting abomemions will lead to a waste of research time and resources and the various doubts he raised could have been allayed in advance. The President, indeed, was present when I spoke to freshers and I specifically mentioned the Health Service tests which are part of the intake tests and stressed their confidentiality. He did not then or previously raise any questions with me and he has not replied to an invitation to discuss the matter since. I am sure that all those involved in the testing programme would have been prepared, as we were, to specify how the data obtained would be stored and precisely who would have had access to it.

In future the rights of experimental subjects to this information should be underlined by making it routinely available to all those invited to participate in advance and it should be made clear that further questions, for example on the aims of research, would always be answered by those administering
the tests. Meanwhile, the President's apparent need to maximise mistrust in the first week of term is unfortunate, quite apart from its interference with the Investigations.

Yours sincerely,
Anthony Ryle.

---

**Student Housing**

**Dear Sir,**

You asked for ideas about living accommodation in Focus, September, '70.

I think that there ought to be cheap housing on campus for the students who don't mind a few discomforts if it means a cheap rent. I am thinking in terms of terrapins put up for a few years and maybe a rent of 30s. to £2 a week. I know many students who would prefer to live in a terrapin at that sort of rent rather than a Kier house and its rent of over £4 per week.

The lecturers who work in them can get them very comfortable and after all the sick-bay manages to get along!

Yours sincerely,
A.G. Falla,
Technician (Ex-student)

---

**Patrick Wymark**

The sudden death of Patrick Wymark has deprived the theatre of one of its best known and admired actors. It is a loss which all those connected with the Gardner Centre will feel perhaps even more deeply, for his presence both as an actor and as a person has done much to make the Centre's first year such a success.

Not only did he star in the two most successful productions of the Centre's winter season, "A Doll's House" with Fenella Fielding and "The Nuns" with Dudley Foster, but he also became so committed to the concept and ideas of the Centre that he was invited to become a member of the Arts Centre Board. He also accepted the invitation to become president of the Friends of the Gardner Centre, an indication that his interest and concern was much more than a superficial one.

Although a busy man with many commitments, he accepted these invitations fully prepared to take part in the activities of the two bodies. His interests were not confined merely to the theatre side of the Centre's activities for he was a great lover of music and one of the most delightful memories of him was his introduction to one of last year's Allegri Quartet Children's concerts. The Centre has had many offers of assistance from many sources during its initial year, but few can claim to have done more or have devoted more of his own time to the Centre than Patrick Wymark. His presence, as an actor and as a friend, will be sorely missed.

Alan Dalches
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We’ve just opened an incredibly convenient new branch right on the campus.

It’s temporarily sited at the Main Entrance Car Park.

And it’s open Monday to Friday, 9.30 a.m. to 2.30 p.m. Just drop in if you’re passing. It’s under the control of Mr. G. E. P. Root, Manager of North Street, Brighton branch. Telephone: Brighton 26291.

After all, now you’re a student, you’re going to need a bank account. We won’t charge you for it (as long as you keep out of the red). And we’ll always be glad to see you.