

University of London

SPECIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN NURSING STUDIES

There will be a meeting of the Special Advisory Committee in Nursing Studies on Friday 11 May 1984 at 2.30 pm in Senate House

AGENDA

1. MINUTES

TO CONFIRM: The Minutes of the meeting on 17 February 1984 (previously circulated).

2. MATTERS ARISING

Health Studies (Minutes 19, 20)

The comments of the SAC on the Working Party membership (as given in Appendix I to the Minutes of 17 February) have been communicated to the Working Party Chairman. In addition the Working Party have been asked to take into account in their discussions the particular importance of the Social and Behavioural Sciences to the various Health Studies.

Higher Education into the 1990s (Minutes 25, 26)

In view of the many detailed statements which a wide range of University bodies have made on the important issues raised in the UGC questionnaire, it was agreed that the University's federal response to Questions 1, 2, 8, 9, 10 and 13 should be comparatively brief, and should concentrate on those matters on which there was a strong measure of consensus. A copy of the University's response, with an annex containing some observations made by the University's Court on Questions 4 and 28 of the UGC questionnaire, is enclosed as Document A. In addition to this federal submission the Vice-Chancellor forwarded to the Chairman of the UGC all the responses which Schools, Institutes, Boards of Studies and other bodies sent to the University to assist in the formulation of the federal response, together with those responses to the remaining questions which have been channelled through the Senate House.

BSc Student Numbers (Minute 30)

In response to the Chairman's letter the Principal has replied as follows:

"Thankyou for your letter of 20 February. I have also had representations on this matter from the Secretary of Chelsea College, and it may be helpful if I enclose a copy of the reply that we have sent him. (Document B attached).

I fully appreciate the concern of the Special Advisory Committee in Nursing Studies that the recommendation of the Working Party on Nursing Studies for an increase in numbers at Chelsea should be implemented but, as is I hope clear from my reply to Mr Slade, this is now a matter for the College not for the Court.

I wish I could be more helpful, but I am sure you appreciate the constraints under which we are all working, some of which are referred to in the attached letter."

Department of Nursing, Chelsea College (Minute 32)

Dr Phelps has replied to the Chairman's letter as follows:

"Your own Committee's views exactly coincide with mine, wearing both hats as Chelsea Principal and as Chairman of the Academic Planning Group.

I will see that your paper is prominently before us when we discuss matters concerning where the activities of the new college are."

3. MEMBERSHIP AND OFFICERS

TO ELECT: A Chairman, Deputy Chairman and Secretary for the session 1984-85.

TO REPORT: (1) Officers have previously been elected at the autumn meeting but it is more customary for Boards of Studies and SACs to elect officers the previous term. Under the constitution "The Chairman shall be eligible for re-election up to a maximum period of service of three years and shall not be eligible for re-election in the following two years except with the approval of the Senate".

(2) The officers for 1983-84 are:

Chairman	Prof T E Oppé
Deputy-Chairman	Prof J H Green
Secretary	Mrs J M Longden

Professor Oppé has served since 1981-82 and is not therefore normally eligible for re-election.

Mrs Longden is retiring in July. If the SAC wish to continue with a Secretary from Senate House it is suggested that no named person is formally appointed for the time being, pending staff changes, but the Science Faculty Section will willingly continue to service the SAC.

(3) A current list of members is given in Document C.

4. PANEL OF VISITING EXAMINERS 1985

TO NOMINATE: A Chairman and Panel of Visiting Examiners for the BSc Course-Unit Examinations in 1985.

TO REPORT: The 1984 Panel is given in Document D. A Visiting Examiner should not normally serve for more than 3 years at one College, but the SAC have previously considered 4 years to be acceptable in order to provide some continuity over each year of the 4 year degree course.

5. CENTRAL RESEARCH FUND

TO NOTE: For 1984-85 the closing and notification dates are as follows:

Autumn Term - 8 September	- notification towards the end of November
Spring Term - 8 December	- notification at the beginning of March
Summer Term - 23 March	- notification at the end of May

Applications for travel during the long vacation should therefore be submitted by 23 March.

The Regulations and an Information Sheet are available from the Secretary of the Fund in Senate House.

6. DATES OF MEETINGS 1984-85

If meetings are to be held at similar times in the terms in 1984-85, 2.30 pm on the following dates is suggested:

Friday	12 October 1984
Friday	15 February 1985
Friday	10 May 1985

University of LondonHigher Education into the 1990s
Response to the University Grants Committee

In presenting this federal response to the questionnaire on the Development of a Strategy for Higher Education into the 1990s the University of London has responded to the six questions 1, 2, 8, 9, 10 and 13 as set by the UGC. However we must enter a strong protest about the assumptions on which the questionnaire has been based, not least the apparent failure to consider the fundamental nature and purpose of the university system, and about the possible frustration of our expectations of level funding which have been a principal guide to our planning over the last four years.

Question 1

This University has already experienced a period of severe financial constraint. In order to maintain its academic achievement in the face of diminishing resources, the University has been engaged since 1980 in a radical process of institutional and academic restructuring, aimed at achieving significant savings and greater effectiveness through concentration on fewer sites, particularly in science subjects. This policy was adopted on the premiss that it would result in fewer but stronger departments, and that the full academic benefits would be realised in a subsequent period of level funding. As a result of discussions and negotiations over the past four years plans have been devised for the following institutional mergers and associations:

(a) Non-Medical

- (i) the merger of Royal Holloway and Bedford Colleges at the Egham site
- (ii) the merger of King's, Queen Elizabeth and Chelsea Colleges
- (iii) the association of Queen Mary College and Westfield College
- (iv) increasing collaboration between University College and Birkbeck College

(b) Medical and Dental

- (i) the reunification of UCHMS with University College
- (ii) the impending merger of University College, the Middlesex Hospital Medical School, the Institute of Laryngology and Otology, the Institute of Orthopaedics and the Institute of Urology
- (iii) the merger of Guy's and St Thomas's Medical Schools and the Royal Dental School to form the United Medical and Dental Schools
- (iv) the reunification of KCHMS with King's College
- (v) the impending merger of the Charing Cross and Westminster Medical Schools
- (vi) the impending merger of the Royal Postgraduate Medical School and the Institute of Obstetrics and Gynaecology

- (vii) the impending merger of the United Medical and Dental Schools and the Institute of Dermatology
- (viii) the planned formation of a joint preclinical School for the London Hospital Medical College and St Bartholomew's Hospital Medical College at the Queen Mary College site.

To complement this institutional reorganisation the University has also promoted enquiries into the provision which should be made in specific academic fields. In addition to Medicine and Dentistry the following subject areas have been scrutinised and University policy agreed by the Senate and the Court:

Arts: Classics, Dutch, Italian, Philosophy

Science: Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics and Statistics, Nursing Studies, Nutrition and Food Science, Pharmacy, Physics.

In the case of the science subjects which have been reviewed, the University has reached decisions consistent with its policy of concentrating provision on five sites. We have encouraged the extension of the External System and the development of distance learning techniques. Library services in Bloomsbury and the University's Audio-Visual provision have also been subject to scrutiny by working parties, and further study is being given to provision for other Arts subjects. We look forward to participating in the urgently needed national discussions which we have sought on Oriental and other area studies.

Question 2

The volume cuts already suffered by the University during the period 1980-84, and the loss of income associated with the adoption of self-financing for overseas students, represent an overall loss of resource of some £34m, excluding Imperial College, or approximately 20 per cent. The 6 per cent grant reduction between 1984-85 and 1989-90 implied by Question 2(a) would entail a further loss of approximately £2m per annum at current prices for the University, excluding Imperial College. The loss entailed by the cut suggested in Question 2(b) would total twelve per cent, or approximately £4m per annum, over that six year period.

The University has pursued its restructuring plans on the understanding, implicit in the UGC letter of 20 May 1982 and the Secretary of State's letter of 14 July 1982, that universities could reasonably expect a period of level funding after the cuts entailed by the removal of the subsidy for overseas students and the further cuts announced in the UGC letter of 1 July 1981 had taken their full effect. The maintenance of momentum in the University's radical restructuring initiatives and in its plans to create more robust and adaptable academic units requires the promise of a stable financial base for the future. A significant period of level funding is called for if the University's present plans are to achieve their full academic and financial potential.

The deep concern of this University about the effect of further cuts in the unit of resource has already been expressed in our response to the UGC invitation to accept additional "unfunded" students in 1984-85 and 1985-86 in vocational and technological subjects. In that response we voiced anxiety about the effects which substantial increases in admissions without additional grant would have on staff/student ratios, on quality of teaching and learning, and upon scholarship and research. Similar considerations apply in our response to this question. Severe damage has already been caused by the earlier cut-backs. Further retrenchment would lead to more reductions in academic scope and academic quality, a marked diminution in the volume of research, and the inhibition of academic initiatives. It would also bring about further cuts in building maintenance, student facilities, libraries and other support services, with serious consequences for the effectiveness of the University and of student life. There would be an unavoidable deterioration in staff/student ratios, and possibly the closure of departments and the elimination of subjects. Such consequences are already occurring. If further

funding reductions take place their effects will become increasingly evident in the results of research, in the less efficient dissemination of findings and in the diminished effectiveness of teaching and supervision.

There is a particular threat to those Schools and activities of the University whose main concern is with courses leading to professional or vocational qualifications. The University must be able to continue to secure professional accreditation for its courses in fields such as Law, Engineering, Architecture, and Education. Further reductions in resources will make it difficult for the Schools concerned to maintain their standards at the levels expected by the professional bodies.

The University faces special problems in those areas such as Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary Science and Pharmacy where the range of subjects to be covered is prescribed by national statutory bodies and is increasingly influenced by EEC directives. In these areas significant cuts in resources can only be accommodated by a reduction in staff/student ratios, with a concomitant fall in standards.

The problems are particularly acute in Clinical Medicine, where NHS duties perforce take priority over other academic staff commitments, and where staff numbers in England and Wales have already suffered severe reductions. At a time when the four Thames Regions of the NHS have been singled out for especially heavy cuts in real terms, any further reductions on the academic side of medicine within London would gravely weaken the vital links between Health Service work on the one hand and clinical teaching and research on the other.

In this federal submission we have not attempted to differentiate between the effects of a one per cent and a two per cent cut over the whole University. Cuts of the latter magnitude would, frankly, be disastrous. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of ensuring that this fact is fully appreciated by the UGC and by Government.

Question 8

There is strong support within this University for the view that recent cuts have had a more serious effect on research, especially fundamental research, than on teaching. Indeed the erosion of the dual support system has already damaged research capacity, especially in respect of the weakening of the research "floor" provided by the UGC. There is no doubt that this deterioration, accompanied by a swing from basic research to project research, will have detrimental consequences. It may take some time for the effect of the cuts in UGC provision on research to become fully manifest (for example, in reduced publications), but we would point to the decline in the numbers of research staff funded from UGC recurrent grant: these have fallen sharply from 232 in 1979-80 to 215 in 1980-81, 205 in 1981-82 and to 166 in 1982-83.

Specific points to be made with regard to the effect on research capacity of the cuts in UGC funding include:

- (i) cuts in academic and support staff; there has also been a reduction in external funding for post-doctoral research fellowships and postgraduate studentships;
- (ii) cuts in provision for other support services, including research materials, equipment, books and library facilities;
- (iii) reduced travel provision, to the detriment of the international academic standing of the United Kingdom; it has become increasingly difficult to send representatives to conferences and other activities abroad;
- (iv) increased time and effort required to secure external funds, which are increasingly limited to short-term projects within vocational and technological fields; research councils and universities are now in competition for the same external resources.

(v) increased teaching and administrative loads; since students have to be taught for the duration of their course, cuts in teaching provision cannot be applied instantly, and research therefore is usually the first victim of financial reductions.

(vi) diversion of staff time to the massive problems of relocation and reorganisation.

The circumstances outlined in (v) and (vi) above have had an especially detrimental effect on research, and will continue to do so.

The importance of a strong research base was one of the primary considerations of the committees and working parties whose recommendations formed the basis for the University's present restructuring policy. In a report of April 1982 the University stated:

"The object of promoting 'research and the advancement of science and learning' is clearly stated in Statute 4. Innovative and distinguished research is a crucial function of the University and is fundamental to the academic excellence already mentioned. The JPC are deeply concerned at the damage and potential damage arising from the erosion of the 'dual support' system and they are in no doubt of the vital importance of finding ways to sustain activities so palpably essential to the cultural, scientific and economic health of the nation."

The Court have made provision for a research factor in their allocation of recurrent grants for 1982-83 and 1983-84, and in allocating a proportion of equipment grant. This research factor has so far been applied to the physical sciences, biological sciences and engineering. The Court are maintaining a continuing review of the research factor in their grant allocation process, and may consider the possibility of its extension. The University has already allocated funds for 'pump-priming' to foster new academic initiatives, including areas which have a significant research component.

Although the preamble to this question shows that it is concerned primarily with scientific research, we would emphasise that the financial cuts of recent years have fallen on both the humanities and the scientific disciplines. To some extent the effect of the cuts on scientific research has been cushioned by the availability of research council funding, although this has distorted the balance of the dual support system. In the case of the humanities, on the other hand, where there is no analogous research council, there is no possibility of analogous 'cushioning' to offset the grave effect of reduced UGC support for research.

Question 9

The University reiterates the view expressed in its response to the Merrison Report:

"The University of London shares the UGC's concern to ensure the preservation of the dual support system of research as expressed in circular letters 10/82 and more recently on 16 February 1983 in 3/83. This need was also highlighted in the Merrison Report. This University considers, however, that serious damage to research has already occurred through a deterioration in the effectiveness of the dual support system over a number of years. What is urgently required at the present time is not merely the preservation of the dual support system but its proper restoration."

Funds will be attracted from outside bodies only to well-found research units which are manifestly not in decline. The dual support system can therefore survive and prosper only as long as adequate funds are made available by the UGC.

Question 10

In order to achieve their objectives, academic departments and members of staff must engage in both teaching and research. The same human and material resources are applied to both these branches of academic activity. It is neither easy, nor, in the view of many members of the University, desirable, to attempt to identify the particular resources devoted to research or to separate them from those applied to teaching. In some areas, especially in the Arts, the principal research resource is staff time. The notion that it might be possible to earmark, or even to indicate, elements of UGC grant to be devoted to research is not readily reconciled with the belief, deeply held within this University, in the fundamental nature of the relationship between research and teaching activity.

The University also firmly believes that the principle of institutional autonomy should be maintained, particularly in the context of determining the deployment of recurrent grants. Academic departments pursue research within an institutional setting and under institutional management; they are subject to the restraints imposed by the policy and ethos of the institutions of which they are part. Academic institutions are in the best position to determine their own priorities with regard to the application of resources to teaching and research. We would not welcome any change which undermined such institutional responsibility. On the other hand we would support the proposal that universities should prepare plans for their future research activity and present these to the UGC to assist the Committee in their assessment of universities' requirements on a triennial, or better still a quinquennial, basis.

Question 13

The University sees no advantage in any radical change in its traditional relationship with the UGC and Government. The UGC must continue to act as a buffer between Government and the universities, and we would encourage the UGC to impress upon Government its desire to defend university autonomy.

We appreciate the responsibilities of the Secretary of State and the DES in formulating a national policy for higher education. However, we view with some concern increasing evidence of direct DES involvement in detailed issues of university management and planning. This applies, for example, to the restraints imposed on the admission of overseas Medical and Dental students. We also believe that the policy of charging overseas students fees which exceed marginal costs has prevented universities from maximising their income from this source.

With regard to alternative funding, the University and its Schools have constantly sought to attract donations and benefactions from outside sources, even before the present funding restraints were imposed. Many benefactions have been obtained over the years, especially for capital projects. The University has been very fortunate, for example, in the number and size of the gifts which it has received from the 'Anonymous Donor' towards the provision of residential places. In our experience donors prefer to support specific projects rather than general running costs. It is difficult to attract external funds towards the costs of teaching and non-vocational subjects, and for work in the Arts field in general. Even in applied science, research and development work is unlikely to attract outside funding unless it has a firm basis of support in the UGC recurrent grant.

Minor changes in taxation and related administrative arrangements would have no more than a marginal effect on the success of fund-raising initiatives. Nevertheless, we would welcome further tax concessions which might help to generate additional resources: for instance, the easing of the present rules regarding VAT, a relaxation of the regulations governing gifts of equipment, and further changes in the laws relating to deeds of covenant and to the taxation of gifts made to universities from income. We suggest in particular that one-off gifts of £1,000 or more from companies and individuals should be treated for tax purposes in the same way as are covenanted gifts.

It must be questioned whether the University would be likely to secure from external sources the enormous sums necessary to fund academic activities at their present level if a substantial portion of the UGC recurrent grant were to be withdrawn, especially in the present economic and financial climate. In the USA, where great efforts and heavy promotional investment are applied to raising external support, the yield from such sources is much less than is sometimes believed, and reports of massive support from private industry appear to be exaggerated. Even at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the proportion of support for on-campus research derived from industrial sponsors in the fiscal year 1983 was only ten per cent, and the USA average for that year was four per cent (Physics Today, February 1984, p.26). To raise external finance on a large scale not only demands special expertise and, in all probability, substantial tax incentives, but a fundamental change of social attitudes on the part of potential donors, including commercial and industrial organisations, alumni, and the country at large. It is doubtful whether the possible benefits of such a change in approach in this country, particularly in the short term, could be calculated with any degree of certainty.

It is evident that the points raised in this document and in answer to the other questions posed by the UGC reflect the depth of the concern within this University about the problems addressed in your letter of 1 November. We have deliberately kept this document short because the issues are dealt with definitively in the separate detailed responses from Schools, Institutes, Boards of Studies and other bodies. We also append to this paper some points which have been raised specifically by the University Court on Questions 4 and 28 of the 1 November questionnaire.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

Response of the Court to
Questions 4 and 28 of the letter of
1 November 1983 from the University Grants Committee

In view of their special position in the allocation of resources and their close concern with the financial aspects of the University's restructuring programme, the University Court wish to make particular comments on two further questions, namely Questions 4 and 28, of the University Grants Committee questionnaire.

Question 4

The Court wish to remind the University Grants Committee of the six parameters which they would hope to see applied to the capital financing of institutional mergers and associated restructuring schemes within the University of London:

(i) Each group or consortium should be regarded as an entity so far as capital financing is concerned.

(ii) In most circumstances all net proceeds of sale attributable to the public interest should be made available for the group's capital schemes on the basis either of the experimental rules in Section 6.5 of the UGC's 'Notes on Control and Guidance' or by means of off-ration grants. The corollary is that the Schools in each group will normally plough back net proceeds of sale from the group's proportion into capital projects associated with the merger.

(iii) Net proceeds of sale, either of public or institutional interest, should be applied on a like-for-like basis in respect of academic, residential or amenity schemes, where off-ration grants are required.

(iv) Bridging finance for capital projects, other than enabling schemes funded from the University's capital-in-recurrent allocations, should be made available by the UGC in principle for the gross estimated cost of approved schemes. Project approval, probably on a phased basis, would be monitored in the light of actual or estimated net proceeds and bridging finance adjusted accordingly.

(v) For each group an overall target by time and amount for the realisation of the 'public interest' in net proceeds of sale of surplus land and buildings should be established, such targets to include an incentive element for the Schools and merger groups.

(vi) Where appropriate, a budgeted capital gap, ie the shortfall between estimated total net proceeds and gross building, fees and furniture costs, should be determined for the group, based on the agreed development option and the District Valuer's assessment of the likely proceeds of sale.

While the initial negotiations relating to the University's major restructuring projects are proving complex, the Court wish to express their appreciation of the Committee's positive encouragement and the painstaking and constructive assistance of the Committee's officers. Much has been achieved, but far more remains to be done. The Court welcome the willingness of the UGC, DES and Treasury to agree in principle to apply off-ration grant procedures as a vital step. In large and complex capital schemes for mergers, however, a serious problem arises from the need to finance new buildings before existing premises can be realised in part or full. The Court would wish to see greater flexibility in off-ration or similar procedures to permit

retention of all net 'public interest' proceeds over £100,000 where their application to agreed building projects on a like-for-like basis is imminent. This would eliminate some difficulties over large-scale bridging finance. The Court would also propose that, in cases where replacement buildings have already been constructed, the whole 'public interest' portion of sale proceeds in excess of £100,000 might be retained towards the cost, on a like-for-like basis, of such buildings and that these proceeds should not be subject to the off-ration grant procedure.

The Court hope that the University Grants Committee would agree in principle to underwrite all legitimate restructuring costs. These costs include the direct costs of mergers and transfers, enabling moneys, and interest on bridging capital, in addition to unfunded capital costs. The Court are very grateful to the UGC for the assistance already received from the Committee towards the direct costs of restructuring, such as professional, legal and other fees. Nevertheless it is the Court's belief that the University's willingness to undergo radical structural reform should not bring with it a distortion of the University's recurrent funding.

Question 28

The Court would wish to emphasise four points relating to the role of the UGC to which they attach particular importance:

- (i) The block grant principle: Recurrent grants from the UGC are announced to the University in the form of block grants, and similarly the Court make block grants to Schools. This places the responsibility for the effective use of recurrent resources at the institutional level and so ensures the maximum flexibility and responsiveness by the University and its Schools in the management of their affairs. It is most important, for efficiency and autonomy, that the block grant principle be maintained.
- (ii) The dual support system: The Court endorse the points made in the University response to Questions 8, 9, and 10 on research funding, and underline the need for adequate resources to be provided both by the UGC and by the research councils to ensure the effective operation of the dual support system.
- (iii) Long-term planning: For some years now, definitive recurrent grants have been announced to the University only on an annual basis. University planning, particularly planning for the radical restructuring now taking place within the University of London, is severely hampered through the lack of a longer-term planning profile. Sound academic development demands greater resource stability and certainty than the University has experienced in recent years, not least in view of the 'lead time' required to launch or curtail three-year undergraduate courses and research programmes. The Court would warmly welcome a return to a system which enabled definitive recurrent grants to be announced and firm plans to be made on a longer-term basis, possibly a triennial or, preferably, a quinquennial system.
- (iv) The capital programme: In parallel with their wish to see a return to a longer-term planning system for recurrent resources, the Court hope that the University Grants Committee will be able to reinstate a longer-term horizon for their capital programmes.

2 March 1984

Dear Bill,

Thank you for setting out the College's approach to the provision of FT student numbers for Nursing Studies.

I am sure you will appreciate that now that the Court have announced their overall student targets, which took account of the Senate's decisions on the recommendations of subject working parties, it is for Schools (and, in your case, the Consortium) to decide upon detailed subject breakdowns. The Court Department has done everything possible in recent years to obtain increases in our UGC numbers, and with some success, but it is now clear that there is no prospect of any further adjustment in the near future. Yet our calculations show that in order to respond positively to all the well argued cases for additional student numbers at subject level, the Court would need approximately one thousand extra places to distribute. Thus the answer to your specific query is that the Consortium must decide within its own overall Science FT student number target the places to be allocated to Nursing Studies. Now that the overall targets have been announced, the issue of a specific Court allocation for such a purpose no longer arises.

Yours sincerely,

Mr W C Slade
Secretary
Chelsea College

SPECIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN NURSING STUDIES - MEMBERSHIPAppointed and Recognised Teachers in Nursing Studies

Prof J C Hayward	Chelsea College
The Rt Hon Baroness Cox	Chelsea College
Mrs M Ferguson	Bedford College
Mrs E M Fordham	Chelsea College
Dr S J Redfern	Chelsea College
Dr J Wilson-Barnett	Chelsea College
Miss A While	Chelsea College

Representatives of Boards of Studies and Special Advisory Committees

Prof H Baum (ChelC)	Biochemistry (1)
Dr T R Cullinan (St Bart's HMS)	Biometry and Medical Statistics (1)
Dr H R Anderson (St G's HMS)	Community Medicine (1)
Dr J R W Ross (ChXHMS)	Human Anatomy and Morphology (1)
Prof J L H O'Riordan (MiddxHMS)	Medicine (4) to include Geriatrics (1)
Dr E R Beck (UCL)	
Prof T E Oppé (St My'sHMS)	Paediatrics (1)
Dr H Zeitlin (WestMS)	Psychiatry (1)
Mr W L Whitehouse (WestMS)	Obstetrics and Gynaecology (1)
Prof M Ginsberg (ChelC)	Pharmacology (1)
Prof J H Green (MiddxHMS)	Physiology (1)
Prof A Summerfield (BkC)	Psychology (2)
Dr J A Weinman (Guy'sHMS)	
Prof R A Pinker (LSE)	Social Administration (1)
Prof Margot Jefferys (BfdC)	Sociology (1)
Prof J P Payne (LHMC)	Surgery (2) to include Anaesthetics (1)
(Vacant)	

Other Persons (to a maximum of 10)

Miss S M Collins Princess Alexandra's School of Nursing, Philpot St, London E1.	Extra-Mural Diploma Advisory Council
Mr B Finn English National Board for Nursing Midwifery and Health Visiting, Victory House, 170 Tottenham Ct Rd, London W1P 0HA	Joint Board of Clinical Nursing Studies
Mr S J Holder St Mary's School of Nursing St Mary's Hospital, London W2	Director of Nurse Education
Miss I M Speight Professional Officer (Same address as Mr Finn)	General Nursing Council

Other Teachers of the University (to a maximum of 6)

Prof I F Burton	Bedford College
Prof R Goldsmith	Chelsea College

PANEL OF VISITING EXAMINERS IN NURSING STUDIES
FOR COURSE-UNIT EXAMINATIONS 1984

Chairman: Prof J H Green, Middx HMS (1978)

- (C 84) +Battersby Mrs Joan L., Nursing Studies Unit, Un of Liverpool
- (B 82) (C 82) +Boore Dr Jennifer, Inst of Nursing Studies, Un of Hull
- (B 84) (C 84) Carrier J W, LSE
- (C 84) D'Mello Dr A, LHMC
- (C 84) +Davis B D, Nursing Research Unit, Un of Edinburgh
- (C 83) +Faulkner Mrs Ann, Dept of Nursing, Un of Manchester
- (B 84) +Hildebrand Dr H E, Adult Dept, Tavistock Centre, London NW3
- (C 84) +Hockey Dr Lisbeth, Dept of Nursing, Un of Edinburgh
- (B 82) (C 82) +Luker Dr Karen A, Dept of Nursing, Un of Manchester
- (B 84) MacDonald Prof J S, ChelC
- (C 81) +McFarlane Prof Baroness, Dept of Nursing, Un of Manchester
- (B 82) +Mitchell Prof G D, Inst of Population Studies, Un of Exeter
- (C 84) Oppé Prof T E, St My's HMS
- (B 84) (C 81) Segal Dr M B, UMS(T)
- (C 82) Stockdale Dr Janet E, LSE

Dr. Karl Helic ?

B = Bedford

C = Chelsea

+ = External Examiner