

UBC REPORTS

Vol. 15, No. 8 / Mar. 13, 1969 / Vancouver 8, B.C.

UBC REPORTS CAMPUS EDITION

New Arts I Program Gets Its First Assessment

UBC'S EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM CALLED NEW ARTS I HAS BEEN A CONTROVERSIAL SUBJECT ON THE CAMPUS SINCE IT WAS FIRST PROPOSED MORE THAN TWO YEARS AGO. NOW THAT THE PROGRAM HAS COMPLETED ITS FIRST YEAR OF OPERATION SOME TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS ABOUT IT HAVE BEEN SET OUT IN SEVERAL REPORTS SUMMARIZED BELOW. ON PAGES TWO AND THREE OF THIS ISSUE WE REPRODUCE A RECENT ARTS WEEK DEBATE WHICH FOCUSED ON THE NEW ARTS I PROGRAM AND BEGINNING ON PAGE THREE IS A SUMMARY OF A RECENT UBC ADDRESS BY PROF. JOSEPH TUSSMAN, WHO RUNS A SIMILAR PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY.



Dr. Douglas Kenny has resigned as head of the psychology department to become associate dean of arts at UBC. See story below.

Associate Arts Dean Appointed

Prof. Douglas T. Kenny has resigned as head of the department of psychology to become associate dean of arts at the University of B.C.

Dean of arts Dr. John Young said that as associate dean Prof. Kenny would assume direct responsibility for the management of the current budget of the faculty, take charge of the allocation of existing space and assist the dean in a variety of ways.

The appointment of Prof. Kenny, who will take up his new position on April 1, was made in consultation with the heads of departments in the arts faculty, Dean Young said.

Prof. Kenny will continue to hold his appointment as professor in the department of psychology and will continue to teach in the department.

Dean Young also announced that the appointment of Mr. Robert Harlow as acting associate dean of the arts faculty would terminate on June 30. Dean Young said Mr. Harlow had agreed to take the position for one year and was anxious to return to full-time duties as head of the department of creative writing in the arts faculty.

He said department heads in the faculty had approved a motion of appreciation for the work of Mr. Harlow during the past year.

Prof. Kenny, 45, has been a member of the UBC faculty since 1950 and was named head of

Please turn to page four
See KENNY

Judgment Reserved on New Program

UBC has begun to make some tentative assessments of the New Arts I program now that the experimental project has completed its first year of operation.

The reports caution that data resulting from the first year of operation of the program can hardly be regarded as representative and that it will be necessary to wait until the products of New Arts I have reached the third and fourth year levels before any definitive results emerge.

Here are some of the results which have emerged from the assessments:

Arts I students, who as a group scored somewhat higher mean totals in the UBC Freshman Test Battery than freshmen enrolling in the regular first-year program, also achieved higher grades in final standings.

Final standings obtained by Arts I students in the experimental part of their program were: first-class, 23.9 per cent; second-class, 43.6 per cent; pass, 24.7 per cent; fail, 2.9 per cent. In the experimental course plus the two regular courses Arts I students achieved these standings: first-class, 17.4 per cent; second-class, 35.9 per cent; pass, 38.5 per cent.

A report by the faculty of arts curriculum committee in January, 1969, quotes the following figures on standings achieved by all first-year students in Arts: first-class, 3.1 per cent; second-class, 24.2 per cent; pass, 17.7 per cent; fail, 13.5 per cent.

In its report to the faculty of arts, the curriculum committee said that any comprehensive assessment of the Arts I program should be made with the greatest caution. It noted that it would be hazardous to assume data based on the first year of an experimental program were representative. The committee added that it is not known how the 1967-68 Arts I students are doing in their second year or how they will perform in their third and fourth years.

The committee concluded: "It is at least open to debate that we can measure the effects — long-term and short-term — of such a program merely by grade point criteria. Even had our data revealed that Arts I students performed no better than their non-Arts I classmates, we doubt that we could reasonably have concluded on this basis that the program had been a failure."

In a report issued in January, 1969, Dr. Ross said that the results obtained in Arts I and in the regular courses bear out a contention that is now new; that given more opportunity for direct involvement in learning and more attention from faculty, students will respond with a sustained effort to raise the calibre of their work.

"Beyond this, it is hard to generalize about the students of the first session," he said.

"All of them had their ups and downs in the program: moments of insight and realization about themselves and what they were studying and periods when they floundered in Serbonian bogs of facts and theories."

New Arts I is now well into its second academic year with an enrolment of 319 students divided into three study groups. Group I is studying the theme of Freedom and Authority, the theme of Group B is The Forest and the City and Group C is studying the theme of Identity and Environment. In addition, a New Arts II group

with an enrolment of 21 students is studying the theme of The City.

Prof. G. F. McGuigan, chairman of the New Arts II group, has made some interim observations on learning problems encountered by his students, although he notes that any estimate of student accomplishment can only be made at the end of the year.

"Despite the experience of and the advances made in Arts I, the students in Arts II were still labouring during the first term to escape the habits of learning and attitudes toward intellectual life obtained in high school," he said.

"For example, a tendency to passivity in learning, a confusion between information gathering and education, and a naive faith in the teacher as a dispenser of authoritative information," he said.

"To a large extent the students are aware of

Program Interests Other Universities

New Arts I, an experimental approach to the education of first-year arts students, was begun in September, 1967, at UBC as a three-year pilot project.

Dr. Ian Ross, co-chairman of the program, described its objectives in the following terms: "Its chief aims are to introduce the student effectively to the intellectual life of the University, and to give him a less fragmented view of education than is normally offered to freshmen. The studies undertaken will encourage a broad, though disciplined approach, to the world within and without the University."

The program offered a clear departure both in content and methodology from normal first-year arts courses and was of considerable interest both to UBC faculty and to educators at other universities.

The main features of New Arts I include a thematic approach to curriculum, teaching through group discussions and tutorials with sparing use of lectures, special field trips, encouragement of individual study and the use of a variety of media as source materials.

Nine units of credit were given for successful completion of the new program and students took two regular first-year courses in addition. Two teaching groups were formed with six faculty members assigned to each group of approximately 120 students.

these disabilities, but the task remains to replace these attitudes with more positive ones."

Prof. McGuigan said some of the intellectual difficulties students encountered included an inability to formulate significant questions, a disaffection from or even a complete rejection of the use of specialized sciences as a basis for understanding the city, and a search for "total," simplistic solutions to the problem of the city based upon some sort of multi-dimensional psychedelic experience.

The work of the second term in New Arts II will be directed toward dealing with some of these problems.

In looking to the future of the Arts I concept, Dr. Ross and other faculty members involved have suggested that development of a college for such programs may be necessary to incorporate them as a part of the continuing life of the University.

DEBATE AIRS VIEWS ON RADIC

During UBC's recent Arts Week from February 10 to 14, three faculty members discussed the question of "Disciplines vs. Non-disciplines." The speakers, who used the Arts I and II programs as the focal point of their addresses, were: Dr. Richard Tees and Dr. Douglas Kenny, both of the psychology dept., and Dr. Gerald McGuigan, one of the founders of the experimental Arts I program and currently director of the Arts II program. What follows are excerpts from the addresses of Drs. Tees and McGuigan, and part of the question period in which Dr. Kenny participated.

DR. RICHARD TEES: There are things that we can do quite well and which we should try and do a little better. There are some other things which, no matter how valuable and necessary they might be, do not belong at the university, in terms of its curriculum at any rate. What I'm suggesting is that subdisciplinary general education programs do not belong at a university.

It seems to me that anybody who has looked at a particular discipline finds that the discipline is very broad banded, yet has absorbed methods and information from a great many sources. The only thing they have in common is a common language and some common methods. The idea that important and eternal truths are somehow lost in the cracks between departments is a difficult idea to come to grips with. Missionary general education people always suggest that since the world is not encompassed by the disciplines at a university therefore what is important must lie between or underneath them.

My feeling is that problems do lie across and between disciplines, but in order to study problems that do lie across these disciplines a person has to work twice as hard to be able to attack these problems. Workers with different back-



DR. RICHARD TEES

grounds who are concentrating on a problem in order to be stimulated by each other's ideas have to know something about the other person's discipline.

Now, the idea of trying to produce a good citizen who can use leisure appropriately, to state that general education courses overtly should have this goal is to my mind somewhat arrogant. The only thing I can ask is, show me some data to indicate that general education programs do serve this function, because I don't know of any such data.

I think that if you're dealing with material at a subdisciplinary level the student has no information on which to base his later choice. In other words, I don't think he can choose to go into psychology or any other discipline on the basis of his experiences in a subdisciplinary general education course.

2/UBC Reports/March 13, 1969

Now there are some very real problems in teaching general education courses. They're the hardest courses that a university should try and teach. There are problems in terms of trying to recruit staff. But there is another problem, and that is the problem of a historian trying to talk about behaviour or psychology. In my very brief reading of others' views on general education courses, the suggestion is always made that a historian or somebody from another discipline is bound to be superficial in his treatment of, say, psychology. The historians simply do not have the information with which to evaluate Freud or whatever it might be.

By dealing with information at almost an opinion level in a subdisciplinary course, it seems to me that both faculty and students are inculcating one another and they're getting the idea that they should have a perhaps over-zealous faith in their own opinions and a disrespect for informed opinion, because no one in the situation has the expertise, has the information, to evaluate whatever they're reading unless it happens to be in his particular discipline. So I think that students get an over-inflated idea of how much they know about something and it probably is a very bad model of intellectual enquiry at a university.

Now, let's look at some of the less ambitious goals of general education programs. The student who goes through a general education course should be able to think critically, to evaluate, should be able to communicate orally, in writing and so on, and think broadly and get some enthusiasm for learning. Now let's assume for a minute that students going through a general education program do achieve this result, and I'm not sure that that's so clear.

STUDENT PROBLEMS

After nine units of Arts I, which is an optimum, and a very expensive environment, students were said to have some of the following problems according to their instructors: an inability to formulate significant questions; a lack of appreciation for the role of premises in an argument; they completely rejected or at least disavowed the use of specialized disciplines as an approach to their topic, which happened to be The City, and they searched for a very simple solution for their problems.

My feeling is that these objectives can be accomplished in the framework of disciplines. At Stanford and Harvard small seminars in disciplines and very specialized areas are put on for freshmen in their first year. It's a very expensive form of education, but probably no more expensive than Arts I. Senior faculty are dealing with specific topics and it appears to turn the kids on, they seem to get excited about it. I'm not suggesting that this is the sort of data on which to base any conclusion, but I think that it has been tried. In other words the ability to communicate, to think, to have some enthusiasm for learning has been tried in a disciplined way and it seems to have the same kind of success that a general education program has.

Let's say that Arts I is successful. What has its success to do with disciplines or non-disciplines? The faculty-student ratio, the special building and so on, may have a great deal to do with how successful a non-disciplinary program could be. I think that control groups should be set up in a disciplined framework in order to evaluate what the effect of a non-disciplined versus a disciplined program is, and what effect the low faculty-student ratio and other factors have?

Let's compare a student who's had nine units of psychology in three years — a student who has, say, reached the level of psychology 306, a laboratory course. Most of the good students are able to do quasi-independent research. They are able to find out new information for themselves, to test their opinions and ideas. You could say that if the person in 306 does turn out a good project they have met the objectives that a non-disciplinary program was supposed to have and they also have something else going for them.

They have the ability not only to generate opinions, but to test them. So in a sense they've



DR. GERALD MCGUIGAN

reached, in a very limited but a very real way, frontiers of psychological knowledge in this particular area. They are able to help design an experiment, to extend knowledge, and they have the information and the skill to do it. And I don't think in a non-disciplinary program anybody has this kind of skill or that one develops it in a non-disciplinary program.

What I'm saying is that people, to learn to think critically, must be deeply immersed in the substance of their discipline. I would like to see general education programs put on in fourth year where students are coming from a discipline, and have an awareness of how complicated big issues such as war and peace or freedom and authority are, and bring to this kind of general education course some skills, some information with which to enrich the program.

I think the non-disciplinary course has a place, in the larger picture, but it probably should be at a liberal arts college, not at the university. And I think, most importantly, that research has to be done to test some of the notions that general education people and discipline people have about how successful they are at educating students. This just has not been done.

DR. GERALD MCGUIGAN: I think the non-disciplinary idea prejudices the argument in favour of the implication that the opposite of the disciplines is somehow fuzzy, inexact, the giant sort of bull session which apparently gets nowhere. That is not what I have in mind if I must use the word non-disciplinary.

I think we're confronted with the task in the university of making up for a number of lacks which exist in the high school. What we are doing in Arts I and Arts II is something that should have been done much earlier. I am not against specialization. Specialization must come, but I think it's largely a question of when it comes and the context in which it must appear.

SENSES NEGLECTED

I think specialization is better understood in a larger context than the one we have so far considered. The notion of specialization can be seen in several senses. First of all, with respect to its subject matter. There we speak of economics or psychology or anthropology, etc. I think it also can be seen from the point of view of the types or the numbers of senses that are involved in the learning process. I suspect that in the social and the physical sciences the process of learning concentrates especially on the sense of sight and its ability to tabulate things that have been reduced to a quantitative measure.

The educational process as it has become concentrated in the university leaves out our valid reference to reality through touch and taste and hearing. It tends to downgrade these as a valuable part of the education of the whole person.

I think also we must look at the notion of specialization in terms of the role that one plays in society once one has mastered a certain body

AL UBC PROGRAMS

of information. Then, too, we must look at specialization in the notion that the university is by definition, at least in our present time, a specialized way of learning.

I'd like to consider this from the point of view of decision-making in our present day society. And this must be seen in the light of the tremendous increase in information that has become available in our society through specialization, the multiplication and the increasing division of specialities.

I think that part of our problem is control of information in the service of human decision-making in society. While the subjects are becoming more and more specialized, the types of problems that we must deal with in society are becoming broader and broader and cutting across disciplines. To take the example of pollution; this is an economic problem, it's a health problem, it's a political problem, it's a social problem at one and the same time. Now, given the need for some kind of specialization, what do we do about the problem of decision-making in these areas which go beyond the particular capacity of any one discipline to exercise moral, political, and social control over the consequences of individual actions within our society?

RECOGNIZE BIASES

One way to do this is through the notion of interdisciplinary subjects. When I speak of a general education I'm not referring to interdisciplinary subjects. I'm speaking of learning how to learn, and this includes the recognition of the biases, of the packages of information that we receive, whether in the news media, on TV, on radio, in economic history, in psychology. What are the assumptions under which the conclusions of these particular sciences are valid?

What I would ask my students to do is to step back, to step out of the environment of the learning in which they have been brought up in high school, and say, what are we doing, what are the assumptions under which I have been confronting reality? This is not to deny the validity of these ways of looking at things, but to know their limitations.

I think this is necessary simply because of the tremendous amount of information that is being poured in on us. In my own subject, Canadian economic history, I can't possibly keep up with it or master it, and I have no desire to destroy its unity by having half a dozen people study it for particular periods of time. We'd just multiply our problems that way.

We are faced with the very difficult problem in our society of the information overload that comes from increasing specialization, and the inability to focus these specialized ways of looking at things in a total decision and those things that affect our society. The way that I approach it is to speak in terms of metaphor; that our approach to reality, even perhaps our own language, is a metaphorical approach to reality, an indirect way of looking at reality by seeing similarities and differences so that the novel is a sort of metaphorical concept within certain sets of assumptions. The front page of the newspaper is precisely that sort of thing, so is the TV program, and so is a social science model.

Now, if we see that I think one has made a great intellectual advance. He may not have mastered the particular content of a particular subject, which is the sort of on-going criteria by which we judge that a person is educated. Not that content isn't important, but there is a priority in knowing what the biases of the given content are. I think that a student becomes much more capable of absorbing relevant content once he knows what the biases are.

DR. DOUGLAS KENNY: I can certainly appreciate the difficulties of obtaining data, hard data from a program like Arts I but I would certainly agree that we do have the techniques available today to obtain that data.

If you take a significant problem, say treatment of people who are neurotic or psychotically disturbed, society is spending a tremendous amount of money trying to find out whether various forms of treatment are effective or not. And

similarly education is spending a tremendous amount of money on various forms of instruction. And I think it is incumbent upon education to find out whether the claims being made for these forms of instruction are really the case. And we do have the technique.

DR. McGUIGAN: In a sense I agree perfectly with what Doug is saying. I think our claim would be that there are other criteria which are just as legitimate as the empirical data which might be searched out in psychology. This is an assistance to it. But should this be the final judgment, the final step as to whether or not it is valuable that psychology is able to test it in this way? I don't think that it's reasonable because ordinary human experience coming from many directions simply cannot be reduced to the sort of testing that Mr. Kenny would ask.

DR. KENNY: I would basically say that, in terms of my own value system, a person can get the best kind of liberal education by being trained in a specific discipline. However, I would be prepared to see other approaches to it for the simple reason I don't think we are in a position today to state what is the best way of structuring a person's mind within a liberal education tradition.

DR. McGUIGAN: Well, I'm inclined to let people do what they want in this respect. If somebody wants one kind of education that's fine, if somebody wants another education that's good too, but I think they should be given the privilege of choosing which sort of education they are seeking out.

The university is a human community trying to uncover the great mystery of reality and there's as much variety as there are individuals approaching it — and this is no argument against disciplines or for disciplines — there is just



DR. DOUGLAS KENNY

simply this variety of ways that we can go about things. I don't know why we should be so hard-lined, that it must be either/or, if one person's going to do it then everybody must do it.

DR. KENNY: All that I would say, if you wish to understand human behaviour certainly you can take psychology, and that's one way of understanding it. You can also study religion, that's another way. You can study poetry, you can study the contemporary novel, and I would take my hat off to anyone who wants to understand human behaviour through studying anecdotes, by studying novels and so on. I would simply say that in terms of my own temperament and I'd answer it at a temperament level, that doesn't make too much sense to me. But there's no one God-given way of accumulating information about human behaviour. However, each of those avenues does make different assumptions about behaviour. I don't think that Prof. McGuigan is entirely correct when he seems to assume that the Arts I approach is the only way of getting at the underlying assumptions in each discipline.

TUSSMAN TALKS OF TEACHING POWER

Professor Joseph Tussman is the head of an experimental two-year arts program at the University of California at Berkeley, which is similar in its philosophical approach to learning to the Arts I and Arts II programs at the University of B.C. The following article, based on a lecture which Prof. Tussman gave recently at UBC, explains the underlying concept of the Berkeley program.

The adventure of attempting to institutionalize and carry on a rather unique educational program has led me increasingly to try to grapple with a notion that I'd like to explore informally in several directions.

The central notion is that of the teaching power. I put it that way because I want to develop, among other things, the conception of the teaching power as the great fundamental inherent power of government which needs to be placed alongside the judicial, legislative and executive powers, and the implication of seeing teaching in all its forms as stemming from and constituting an exercise of a fundamental governmental power.

Let me begin with the idea of man as a political animal. I don't know how many of you remember the myth of the metals in Plato's *Republic*. Most of us remember that part in which Plato argues that people are different and conform to different types. Some are reflective and deliberative and their strong suit is understanding; some are heroic, ambitious or administrative. On the basis of this difference in character he develops the theory of classes in society operating co-operatively.

That is the part of the myth that I have always noted. I've skipped over the early part of that myth in which Plato apologizes for a monstrous story that he is going to tell, which goes something like this: he says we must try to get all the rulers, everybody in society, and especially those who are admitted to full membership in the community upon adulthood, to believe that everything they remember up to this point has been a dream. Instead of being here, where they think they have been, they have all been underground and what has been happening to them is that their equipment has been fashioned.

Now, for the first time, they are born into the world and the womb which they have been in is the community. It was with considerable shock that I realized that that first part of the myth is true and is the secret of everything. It is a way of saying that a human being is an artifact.

A person is the product of the art exercised on a biological, psychological organism by a community. Childhood, or whatever we want to call the stage before adulthood or full membership in the community, is a period in which a person is being born. Birth in its significant sense for a human being is not a biological fact. It is what happens when there emerges from the systematic, careful nurturing operation of the community a mature human being who has been equipped by the operation of the community with everything we think is characteristic of an individual. It is no exaggeration to say that he is born quite late after he appears as a physical organism on the earth and he is given birth or created by the community or the polis or the polity. Man is a political animal. He is an animal who has been turned into a human being through the operation of a polis or a community.

That is one wing of the argument and, I think, the most fundamental one. Then the community, acting on its potential members, is exercising what I call the teaching power. The teaching power of the community is the power it exercises in shaping into humanity a potential human being.

When we think of government we tend to think of the law and the police and the courts and perhaps the legislature. I want to suggest that the community acts at least as politically and directly through the schools as it does through

*Please turn to page four
See TUSSMAN*

Student Power Misguided

the other institutions and, in fact, the model of the public official of the modern era is not a policeman, or a legislator, or a judge, but a school teacher.

A school teacher is in every sense a public official, an agent of the community doing the work of the community. The theory of the teaching power as an inherent power of government really says that the community has first crack at the minds of the young. Teaching power is the power and the right of the community to provide for its own life and continuity by the initiation of successive generations into its own enterprise. If a community did not have that power, did not have that authority, it would die very quickly.

The notion that the teaching power is a hitherto unnamed constitutional power means that most of our difficulties with the problem of academic freedom seem capable of some intelligible solution. Academic freedom is an extremely difficult doctrine to make sense out of. There's one notion that a university, college or school should be free in its activities from external control but no one has ever given any good reasons for this. The conception that I am suggesting makes that extremely easy to handle, I think.

The theory of academic freedom, which is the theory of the authority of an educational institution to control its own life, is simply the principle of the separation of powers applied to the teaching power. The teaching power of the community is vested in its teaching institutions and its structure of authority. The theory of academic freedom is simply the application of the separation of powers doctrine which precludes legislative and executive or other public agents from interfering with the proper work of the teaching power.

PROGRAM EXPLAINED

That doesn't solve questions such as, should the university be free from control in this or that respect? But it does provide a clearly intelligible basis for objecting to a legislature laying down rules about what should or should not be taught, for example.

The standard liberal doctrine we have inherited is that the mind is private and the body is subject to state control. This makes it utterly impossible to make sense out of a public school system within the framework of a doctrine which says the state is supposed to leave the mind alone. There is no reasonable basis for arguing that anything we call the mind is private at all. If I am correct in saying that the school teacher is a public official this poses some obvious problems about the intelligibility of the educational enterprise.

Turning from theoretical to concrete problems of education I will tell you a few things about how these concepts are incarnated in the experimental program at Berkeley. We are operating as a part of the College of Letters and Science at the University of California.

We have a lower division program which takes students for the first two years and satisfies virtually all their requirements except science. It occupies all of the student's educational time except for one course. We have roughly 150 students and six full-time faculty members. We have no grades, no courses, no examinations. We have instead a required course of work over a two-year period for which the faculty has put together a fundamental, coherent series of readings which in their judgment constitutes initiation into, and understanding of, the contemporary community as a moral enterprise.

We do nothing but read a number of books which systematically develop these themes and write an enormous amount of not very good literature. We work at writing, we have a few tutorials and seminars and that's it. The aspect of the program most often criticized is that the students has no choice at all about anything. As a collective body they do not take part politically in the determination of the curriculum or methodology of instruction.

The problem is to create possible members of

a significant enterprise, an enterprise which is in deep trouble. In its outward activity at this stage of its development it is failing at almost every point in ways which are so drastic that it is threatening the possibility of induction of another generation into its enterprise. The state, acting through its educational institutions, is trying to save itself by creating or developing human beings who are capable of committing themselves to the deepest and neglected values implicit in that culture. That is the justification for the intrusion of the state or the schools onto the scene at all. We do not accept the notion that civilization is an accident, that people arrive God knows how, that they are here complete and the problem is to let them go their own way. We think the community has a claim, a prior claim, and the expression, "It is my life," is false. Nobody's life is his.

READING PROBLEM

There is also a practical justification for the program. It turns out that most of us don't know how to read very well.

We don't know how to pick up a book and say, here is a human mind desperately trying to convey something to me. The art of coming into communication with a mind that is grappling with important and complicated problems is extremely difficult and we learn to read so fast that we have lost the art. And so the task of learning how to read again is almost a fundamental task of education. The art of talking to other people is also highly undeveloped. The analysis of what happens when seven people get together to discuss something they have read in a seminar — there's hardly an analysis to it. Every time somebody says something in that discussion he is making a claim on the attention of half a dozen other human beings' minds. You should not do that lightly.

We have a program which runs for two years in which a handful of faculty members and a relatively small number of students are trying to teach each other how to do these things with the greatest of freedom and with no holds barred intellectually. To do this it is necessary to create an intellectual environment and a pedagogic environment conducive to the development of human minds.

I have tried to suggest two wings of the theoretical argument which would explain why an educational program which addresses itself importantly and relevantly to our fundamental concerns requires a retention of certain principles of government. The school, I think it has been said, is not a democracy. This does not mean that it is not vitally concerned with preparing people for life in a democracy. The operating principles, so far as the educational reforms that we are involved with, set us up squarely on the basis of control of educational life by the faculty. This puts us quite clearly out of step with most of the educational reform agitation which is rampant on campuses.

STUDENT PROTEST

The general tendency is an assertion of the legitimacy of student power. Student power with respect to determination of the educational life of the student is thoroughly misguided — a premature rebellion which is self-defeating. The education scene will be saved, if at all, by the assumption of faculty of greater responsibility for the shaping of education. If students want to protest they should insist that the faculty come up with completely required programs that they have to take.

Students tend to be doing just the opposite. Their pressures are all in the direction of getting people to relinquish responsibility for education. So my terminal advice is if you want to bother the faculty about education don't ask them to abolish requirements but insist on their development of more — a new requirement every semester.

That will give them something to think about.

KENNY *Continued from Page One*

the psychology department in 1965. Born in Victoria, he attended Victoria College before enrolling at UBC, where he received his bachelor and master of arts degrees in 1945 and 1947.

He held a graduate fellowship and was a teaching associate at the University of Washington, where he received the degree of doctor of philosophy, from 1947 to 1950.

He is a former president of the UBC Faculty Association and the B.C. Psychological Association. He is a member of the UBC Senate and chairs the Senate Committee on Academic Building Needs.

Dean Resigns

Professor William M. Armstrong has resigned as dean of the University of B.C.'s faculty of applied science to devote more time to his duties as UBC's deputy president.

Prof. Armstrong, who has been a member of the UBC faculty since 1946 and dean of applied science since 1966, was named secretary to UBC's Board of Governors and deputy acting president in 1967.

He was appointed deputy president last year and has continued to act as Board secretary.

Dean Armstrong said his decision to resign as dean resulted from the increasing pressure of duties in the field of general University administration.

"The faculty of applied science," he said, "should be administered by a dean who can devote his energies to incorporating into the engineering curriculum new concepts to meet the needs of students in a rapidly-changing world.

"At the same time, the University as a whole is in a period of rapid transition and is facing major changes in administrative policy which will have to be implemented in the near future," Prof. Armstrong said.

He added that to attempt to do both jobs would be to fail to do justice to either of them.

Prof. Armstrong will continue to teach a course in the department of metallurgy.

Prof. Armstrong is noted for his research in the field of metallurgy and for his involvement in national organizations on science policy.

Summer Housing Rates Increased

An increase in campus residence rates for room and board during the Summer Session has been approved by the University of B.C. Board of Governors.

It is the first increase in residence rates at the University since September, 1966, despite higher maintenance and operating costs due to wage increases and rising material costs.

Leslie Rohringer, UBC director of residences, said the rate increase is necessary because of an increased debt repayment obligation in connection with completion of new residence towers at the Place Vanier and Totem Park residence complexes.

Present rates are \$3.30 per day for a single room and \$3.10 per day for a double room.

The new Summer Session rates effective July 1, 1969, are \$4.00 per day for a single room and \$3.80 per day for a double room.

Reasons for the Summer Session rate increase and the University's financial position in relation to debt repayment on residences were discussed in a series of meetings between Mr. Rohringer and student residence representatives prior to approval of the rate increase.

Mr. Rohringer said Winter Session residence rates are also under review but no decision has been made in this area.

The director of residences said Summer Session rates in the past have been on the same level as regular daily rates for Winter students.

UBC

REPORTS

Volume 15, Number 8 — March 13, 1969. Authorized as second class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Vancouver, B.C. Published by the University of British Columbia and distributed free. J. A. Banham, Editor; Barbara Claghorn, Production Supervisor. Letters to the Editor should be addressed to the Information Office, UBC, Vancouver 8, B.C.