

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION.

STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The following Statement of Policy is reprinted, with permission, from the Minutes of the Meeting of the Senate held on January 20th 1932.

1. At its meeting on 15 July 1931 the Senate adopted, subject to the Court's approval of the financial arrangements implied therein, a report from the Academic Council recommending the appointment of a Provisional Delegacy to consider the policy to be followed in respect of the projected Institute of Education. (For the constitution of the Delegacy see Appendix A.) In accordance with that report the Senate further decided that the Institute should be one of its "central activities" and that the full title should be "University of London, Institute of Education (incorporating London Day Training College)." The present document indicates in outline the policy which the Provisional Delegacy recommends.

2. The essence of the scheme is that London Day Training College shall be transferred from the control of the London County Council to the control of the University, shall be housed eventually in a new building to be provided by the generosity of the Council on the Bloomsbury site, and shall there become the nucleus of an Institute which will be, as London Day Training College now is, an inter-collegiate centre for work connected with the training of teachers and also a centre for educational teaching, enquiry and research outside the field of professional training. As thus conceived, the Institute will have a lower and a higher range of functions. On the lower level, that of the ordinary training of teachers for secondary and elementary schools in this country, the institution now called London Day Training College and the Education department at King's College will, as they do at present, maintain a separate identity, while co-operating in the provision of teaching both for their own students and for the graduate students of other colleges who attend the intercollegiate courses. On the higher level the Institute will include the senior teachers of London Day Training College and the King's College Department working together as a single corps. It will sometimes be convenient to distinguish between these two levels by speaking of the former as the "training college" and the latter as "the Institute proper."

3. But although there will be within the Institute a differentiation between groups of functions, it is to be conceived as a single organisation whose departments work in close relation with one another. Experience in London Day Training College shows that even mature students from oversea (e.g. inspectors and colonial directors of education) often find it profitable to attend the lectures and discussions on modern teaching methods and other subjects included in the training course, as well as the seminary classes arranged for advanced students. It is important, therefore, to preserve in the Institute a plasticity which will make it easy to adjust courses to the widely varying needs of different kinds of students without losing the unity of purpose and plan that is essential to the success of educational studies. It follows that although, as the Institute develops, it may be necessary to appoint departmental heads with a considerable measure of delegated responsibility, the organisation as a whole should have a single Principal or Director whose duty would be to keep in full touch with all the departments and to maintain the necessary co-operation between them. A further important part of his functions would be to secure co-operation between the Institute and other departments of the University whose activities bear upon its special purposes: for instance, the departments of psychology and anthropology, of tropical hygiene, of phonetics and linguistics, and the School of Oriental Studies.

4. The work of the Institute on the training college level is already well developed in its main lines, and no important changes are contemplated. It consists of the training of students who have graduated in this or some other approved university and are being prepared for the teaching profession in accordance with the Regulations of the Board of Education for the Training of Teachers and the requirements of the University for the Teacher's Diploma. There are two branches or aspects of this work, which may be distinguished as (a) the domestic and (b) the intercollegiate.

(a) On the domestic side London Day Training College is wholly responsible for a group of students who are registered with it. It has, under the Regulations of the Board of Education, a "recognised accommodation" of 600, which means that it may include in its roll a maximum of 600 students upon whose account grants are paid by the Board. Most of these are four-year students attending degree courses in other Schools of the University for whom the College has only a general responsibility. The "recognised students" actually taking the course of training in any given year consist mainly of the four-year students who have graduated, together with other graduates admitted (and subsidised) for the course of training only. There are also the students admitted originally to the four-year course, who may, for different reasons, have been compelled to abandon work for the degree or have failed to pass the Final examination. To these are to be added a number of students (necessarily graduates) on whose account the Board pays no grants. Some intend to teach in this country but wish to be free from the obligations incurred by accepting the Board's financial help: others are ineligible for grant because they are preparing for educational work abroad; others again are not, strictly speaking, students in training, but are senior persons, generally from oversea, who are taking "refresher courses" or wish to add the Teacher's Diploma to their qualifications, or are primarily engaged upon some higher course but include in their programme the lectures and classes provided with a view to preparation for the Diploma.

Appendix B gives a statistical classification of the "domestic" students actually attending the college during the present session (1931-32). Appendix C is added to show the width of the field from which they are drawn. It will be observed that the present total of the full-time "domestic" students is 226. When it is considered that each of these is assigned to a tutor who is expected to assist him at