

Bulletin of the COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY CLASSICAL DEPARTMENTS



Bulletin 31 (2002)

Contents

On Waterfalls and Jugs

Gillian Clark

Chair's Report 2002

Stephen Mitchell

The British Schools and Institutes of Archaeology - a Short Guide

David Fitzpatrick *et al.*

The Cutting Edge of Classics: Debates and Dilemmas

Graham Shipley

Classics at British Universities 2001-2: Statistics

ON WATERFALLS AND JUGS

Education, it occurred to me, watching this summer's A level debacle, is like holding a jug under a waterfall. With luck, the jug catches some water. It may even fill right up. Most of the water goes anywhere but in the jug, which would be very frustrating for the waterfall if it did not like pouring out water for its own sake, which most teachers, happily, do. An uninformed observer might think that it would be more economical simply to fill another jug of the right size and pour it into the first jug. No mess, no waste, full jug. This, it seems to me, is the operating principle of GCSE and A level curricula in recent years, and these are also the qualities which are rewarded by exercises in teaching quality assessment in universities. The trouble is that education is not only about what you learn. It is also about everything all round what you learn: the near misses and the things you discover that you do not know, but of which you get some tantalizing sense - what they are and where to find them in the future. If your education consists of a limited, measured transfusion, three things are likely to follow. What you know, you will know so well that A level boards (or even, heaven forbid, university examiners) may feel obliged to tamper with the grading system to stop 'too many people' getting the top grades. Beyond what you know will lie an arid emptiness which will break the hearts of your university teachers (or research supervisors) when you begin your higher studies. And you will lose the sense that learning is a generally life-enhancing experience. A few months ago, a college friend observed to me that she could no longer see any point in the undergraduate degree she took: it was no use at all in her present life. Aside from my surprise, since she read music at Cambridge and is now a professional violinist, I was struck by how up-to-date her views were. She sees education as functional or nothing. So does the government, apparently. But at a time of increasing leisure, structural unemployment and a growing expectation that people will have several jobs or careers during their working lives, we need more than ever to see education as something generally life-enhancing, a resource for leisure as well as work, and a resource for many kinds of work. The jug-to-jug method does not do the job.

So this is a plea for fewer ewers and more falls in every area of education. Everything can be grist to the mill, and a little chaos is much less damaging than the absence of vision, enthusiasm and ideas. Giving people a sense of what they have not learned, that they could learn, is as important as giving them the basics. Not for nothing are the Muses associated with springs and streams, and mythical educators like Chiron with excursions into wild and unregulated places.

Chair's report, 2001-2002

GILLIAN CLARK

Last year's report, by the splendidly efficient Bob Sharples, began by observing that 2000-1 was the year of Subject Review and the Research Assessment Exercise. 2001-2 was the year when RAE ratings improved to the point that the Higher Education Funding Council failed to deliver the funding. There was a long delay between the publication of the ratings and the transmission of such feedback as HEFCE rules allow, and a further delay before Panel 57's overview report appeared on the RAE website. The Quality Assurance Agency attempted a 'light touch' version of Subject Review, and colleagues in Scotland found that it was just as

expensive as the previous version. Just before Results Day in August, research demonstrated yet again that A level results do not successfully predict final degree results. That was said in the early 1960s, and probably earlier: can readers of the *Bulletin* remember its first appearance? As this report goes to the Editor, serious concerns about A level marking are under investigation. Students are naturally indignant after years of hard work for school tests, culminating in the excessive workloads of AS and A2. University teachers are more than ever concerned about helping their students to progress from the 'dependency culture' that results from years of intensive teaching for exams. Media reports, and the Minister for Higher Education, said that admissions tutors rely too heavily on A level grades, should take other factors into account, and should seek out the brightest students. Admissions tutors were probably too busy to reply that they always do take other factors into account in making offers, and what did anyone think they were doing except to seek out the brightest students? (Apart, that is, from teaching those they already have, and fulfilling all the other duties of full-time academics.)

Global league tables were once again published in the broadsheets, all different, all making different mistakes. The *Times* table of Top Classics Departments differed from the table in the *Times Higher*, but both listed one department that was about to complete its three-year transfer to its neighbour, and another that its university was already proposing to close. There was a majority vote in Council for a proposal that the Chair should write to the *Guardian* opposing the principle of global league tables that produce a single ranking, and raising specific questions about the *Guardian* league table. There are divergent views on whether such protests have the desired (or any) effect, but please continue to note any inaccuracies about your department in future league tables. You will find several good questions about the validity of their methods and criteria in the *Guardian Good University Guide* (May 2002).

CUCD officers are used to the question 'What does CUCD actually do?' See, of course, our website. CUCD collects and transmits information and comment on our subject, and is the envy of many other subject-associations for its efficient and amicable networking. You can find out from the website where the classical departments are and (from the Classical Association link) who teaches in them; how many students have chosen our subjects; and who might agree to be your next external examiner. The *Bulletin* and the minutes of Standing Committee and Council are also on-line. CUCD statistics are available to help colleagues, and the Chair can join with the other classical associations when we are asked to support a department under threat. Thanks to CUCD consultations, the Chair can respond with confidence when, eventually, we are asked to comment on RAE, and with total confidence if anyone asks for our views on Teaching Quality Assessment. Peer review is fundamental for RAE and for Arts and Humanities Research Board funding, and our membership suggests for the relevant databases the names of colleagues who could do the job. We responded to the AHRB and British Academy reviews of graduate studies, which may well make a difference to the next generation of classicists. This year, we have also pooled information on how to place intensively taught language students in a higher funding band; but this, like so much else, awaits the funding allocations made in the government's Spending Review.

All this useful work depends on the departmental contacts who consult their colleagues and provide the information. Many thanks to all who respond. Thank you, especially, to Standing Committee and to its officers: the Webmaster (Nick Lowe), the Editor of this *Bulletin* (Teresa Morgan), the Statistics Officer (Graham Shipley) and the Media Officer (Roy Gibson), and to our representatives on the Learning and Teaching Support Network (Liz Pender, to be

succeeded by Diana Spencer). Liz Pender, George Boys-Stones and Nick Lowe have sorted out the CUCD archive and ensured that there are complete runs of the *Bulletin*, undaunted by one discovery that they were three *Bulletins* short of a full set. Two of our officers finish their terms this November: our calm and efficient Treasurer, Keith Rutter, and our Secretary, Liz Pender, whose energy and commitment is one more proof of the special affinity between CUCD and ancient philosophers. We are most grateful for all they have done, and look forward to welcoming their successors.

Chairs normally serve a three-year term: I take this opportunity to say that I intend to demit in November 2003, when the new Secretary and Treasurer have settled in, because I have taken on some AHRB responsibilities. Standing Committee does not see a conflict of interest, and previous Chairs have successfully combined several classical jobs, but there are advantages in having a range of people to do them. Please think about candidates, and assure them that CUCD work is both interesting and valuable.

My chief CUCD-related memory of this highly charged year is the moment when I asked Standing Committee whether the time had come to consult our member departments about their experience of Subject Review. This question prompted an explosion - expressed with Standing Committee's usual courtesy, but still an explosion. Most of us have colleagues who trained as Subject Reviewers. A few idealists had hoped to improve the quality of teaching; others had been told by their university that someone had better learn the ropes, and had been too conscientious to say 'well, it won't be me'. The reviewers present on Standing Committee spoke with passion about the damage to collegiality and the waste of time and energy and money that could have gone to students. They had usually found something that could be improved or rethought, but nothing that would justify the time and expense of the exercise. Should we, then, have a consultation? Standing Committee thought that nobody wanted one. Later in this *Bulletin*, Jan Parker (one of the idealists) suggests that there is something we can rescue from the wreck and maybe even use to enhance the quality of teaching, as distinct from writing essays in Qaahili. (Note to future students: Qaahili is another name for QAA-speak.)

Standing Committee thought that CUCD should consult its members about RAE, as past experience suggested that HEFCE would ask for comment at short notice, probably in the middle of August or, alternatively, the busiest part of October. Departments were invited to make any comments they wished, with a guarantee that no respondent would be identified. Standing Committee was especially interested in the following questions:

- i. RAE criteria were formulated in consultation with subject-associations and their members. Would you now wish to make changes to the criteria that were agreed?
- ii. Panel 57 specified (RAE 5/99, 3.48.11) that it would formulate its judgement on the basis both of cited publications and of research culture. Do you think this is right, or do you think that panels should give more weight to one or the other?
- iii. Panel 57 also specified (RAE 5/99, 3.48.12) that outputs would be judged solely on research quality according to the criteria (3.48.16), and that no form of output would be regarded as intrinsically superior to any other. Do you think this is right?
- iv. Panel feedback was restricted by HEFCE rules. Could it be made more specific without (for instance) undermining those colleagues who are not singled out for praise? Do you wish to comment on responses in your own university?
- v. Have you any comments on Panel 57's overview report (available at <http://www.rae.ac.uk/>)? In particular, the panel notes that several relevant units were

returned to other panels (archaeology, history, history of art) - was this a problem for your department?

- vi. Do you think RAE should be abandoned? If government requires some form of research assessment to continue, are there ways of making it convincing but less burdensome?

Responses will be discussed at Council in November and reported in next year's *Bulletin*. At the time of writing this report, several responses are still awaited, and some colleagues want to raise the questions at a departmental or faculty meeting. It is too soon to generalise, but one concern is obvious: RAE and TQA, both as systems and as they are interpreted by university managers, pull in opposite directions. Colleagues are urged to apply for research funding because success is 'evidence of esteem' in RAE and because they will not otherwise have time to publish their research by the RAE deadline. Their success means heavier workloads for those who are not on leave, including the mentoring of new colleagues who are in temporary posts replacing those on research leave, and departments may have to rework their teaching programmes at short notice. The mass of information provided to RAE panels does not include staff-student ratios and average teaching loads, although UK universities are distinctive in that research-active academics teach undergraduate and graduate students and take responsibility for pastoral care.

AHRB and British Academy reviews of graduate studies are now published, and our contribution to them is recognisable. Both reviews concluded that it is not difficult to see why able students think twice before going into graduate work. They are already in debt from their undergraduate degrees, and they envisage more years in debt while they work under pressure to complete a doctorate. They can see that academic salaries are absurdly low for the years of training and the level of responsibility, and the more they understand about the working lives of their supervisors, the more they can see that the traditional compensations are being eroded. In the late 1960s beginning academics knew we would never be rich, but our pay was approximately the same as in the civil service, and the company was better and the work more interesting and more flexible than in most jobs. The company is still good, the work is still interesting, but underfunding and bureaucracy have had their effect. HEFCE recently employed a firm of consultants who characterised the Arts and Humanities ethos as 'excellence in poverty'. There are plenty of classical precedents for that: perhaps Research Skills Training should always include a module on the Cynics.

But aside from that, Mrs Lincoln . . . Perhaps this is the moment to state the obvious, namely that this report expresses my personal opinions, which are not necessarily those of CUCD or of my university. So first, a statistical point: you may be interested to know that, according to the CA lists, in March 2001 the UK had 12 women professors of classical subjects (including Byzantinists) and 72 men professors.

Useful classical organisations continued their quietly useful work. The Classics LTSN, which now has funding until 2004, continued its innovative policy of asking its subject-group what would be helpful and attempting to supply it. CUCD is collaborating with CA and the Joint Association of Classical Teachers on the brilliant idea originally known as Charlotte's Web. C-Web, suggested by Charlotte Roueché, will be hosted by King's College London. It will provide students, teachers, media, Minimus fans, Maximus fans and other interested parties with information on what Classics is, why schools and universities should teach classical subjects, where teaching is available, what graduates in classical subjects do next, and

anything else that is useful. Hyperlinks can take users to departmental webpages, on-line resources and other tendrils of the classical grapevine.

Schools and colleges continue to produce very able students who sign up for the range of classical degrees. Some of those students continue to postgraduate work, and others may be encouraged by proposals (under consideration by AHRB and the BA) for a PhD that allows a longer period of training in languages and other technical skills. There are well-qualified applicants for Classics PGCE, and applicants for university posts, even for short-term jobs, have an impressive range of skills and experience. Most university shortlists in our subject now include applicants from continental Europe, especially Germany and the Netherlands and Italy, where very well-trained young scholars emerge from their long preparation to find that there are no jobs. A government review of the arts and humanities has concluded that we need a research council, with favourable consequences for funding, rather than a research board. It is evident how good we are at research, they said, from those RAE ratings. AHRB already has an observer role at the joint meetings of the research councils of the United Kingdom. You will be pleased to know that their acronym is RCUK.

Gillian Clark
University of Bristol
September 2002

THE BRITISH SCHOOLS AND INSTITUTES OF ARCHAEOLOGY A SHORT GUIDE

Stephen Mitchell

The British Academy sponsors a group of overseas institutes and societies, which promote archaeology and related subjects in several countries and regions in the Mediterranean, the Near East, East Africa, and SE Asia. Their web-sites can all be accessed conveniently through the British Academy at <http://www.britac.ac.uk/institutes/index.html>. This digest of information most likely to be of direct interest to university-based Classicists (staff, postgraduates, undergraduates) has been compiled directly from the web-sites of the Institutes, where the details may be checked.

The schools sponsor lectures, colloquia and other activities in the UK, provide funding and logistical support for archaeological projects overseas, and offer a range of scholarships, grants and travel awards for researchers at levels ranging from undergraduates to senior and established scholars.

Each of the schools and institutes publishes its own journal and other publications, and offers reduced subscription rates for students. All of them offer some form of residential or hostel accommodation, although this is for the most part designed for their own scholars and award holders, and others engaged on specific research projects. Each has its own library, and the collections in Rome, Athens and Ankara are notably strong and designed to support advanced research needs. All the libraries have good coverage of local archaeological and historical

literature, which is not easily available outside the host country. The schools also house reference collections of archaeological and historical materials, which are accessible to researchers. Details of these are available on the web sites.

The Schools mount archaeological research projects (usually surveys or excavations) directed by their own staff. They also operate as the umbrella bodies, under which other UK-based research activity in Italy, Greece, Turkey and Jordan takes place. Any student or scholar who intends to undertake archaeological research in these countries should contact the schools at an early stage for guidance and advice.

Study courses

Although they are not formally part of the UK University system, the Schools at Athens and Rome offer courses designed for UK undergraduates and postgraduates. Participants on these programmes need to be sure that their home universities recognise the course and will allow appropriate credit to fulfil the requirements of their modular degree programmes.

The School at Athens organises a three-week course for undergraduates on 'The Archaeology and Topography of Greece'. The programme includes lectures, excursions to major sites in the Peloponnese and central Greece and visits to museums. Limited financial assistance is available to participants in cases of need.

In alternate years the Athens School offers a two-week course for teachers of classics and classical civilisation in British schools in association with JACT. This comprises a series of lectures, seminars and excursions to major sites and museums relating to a specific topic of classical antiquity. The next course is scheduled for 2003.

In the other alternate years the School offers a 10-week course for postgraduate students. The subject is the history and archaeology of Athens and Attica. This is next due to run in 2004. Most universities will recognise the tuition for this course as equivalent to part of an MA programme in ancient history or classical archaeology.

The School at Rome offers an 'Ancient Rome' Undergraduate Summer School. This annual 12-day course is intended for undergraduates studying classics, ancient history, classical archaeology and related subjects. It offers an intensive programme of visits to the sites, monuments and museums of ancient Rome and its vicinity, with a series of evening lectures. The aim is to provide a stimulating introduction to the topography of the city, its architecture and art, the latest discoveries and new developments in archaeological approaches. Course fee (excluding travel to Rome): £500. Bursaries are available.

The Rome School also runs the 'City of Rome' Postgraduate Programme. This is an annual 8-week course for postgraduates at Masters or early Doctoral level studying classical archaeology, art history, ancient history (both Greek and Roman) and the transformation of antiquity in the middle ages and the modern period. It is designed to be equivalent to one quarter of one year's full-time postgraduate MA course. The course tutorial fee (normally paid via fee transfer from student's university) is £701.25. Course residential fee: approx. £850 for shared room. Fees exclude travel to Rome.

The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara hosts an undergraduate field course for students of prehistoric archaeology from the Institute of Archaeology at University College London, run by the BIAA's former director, Dr Roger Matthews. Similar programmes at

postgraduate level are under discussion between the current director, Dr Hugh Elton, and departments at the universities of Bristol, Exeter, and Liverpool.

Travel and study grants for students

The School at Athens has an extensive range of bursary schemes aimed at postgraduate and postdoctoral funding, including two specifically designed for Greek nationals. Most of these are aimed to support designated research projects, and are not appropriate for general archaeological travel.

The School at Rome administers a scheme of Rome Awards and Scholarships for research on the archaeology, art history, history and literature of Italy, from prehistory to the modern period. These are designed both for established scholars and researchers without an academic post. Applicants will normally have begun a programme of research in the general field for which the Award is being sought, whether or not registered for a higher degree.

The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara offers a number of annual travel and study grants for postgraduate (and in some cases final-year undergraduate students) to enable them to visit sites and museums in the country, undertake small-scale research projects and use the Institute's excellent library and study collections. A new project, located in the Institute, is the British Academy Black Sea Initiative. If funding continues this may be able to support small and medium scale proposals for work in the entire Black Sea region.

The Council for British Research in the Levant, based in Amman but covering work in the whole Near East, supports individual scholars as well as projects. Travel grants are also available to help students conduct smaller research projects in the region. Applications are invited from either British citizens or those ordinarily resident in the United Kingdom.

Contact addresses

- **THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ATHENS** (<http://www.bsa.gla.ac.uk>)
All general enquiries to the Secretary, British School at Athens, Senate House, Malet Street, London, WC1E 7HU (email bsa@sas.ac.uk).
- **THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME** (<http://www.bsr.ac.uk>)
The administrator of the BSR London Office is Gillian Clark (bsr@britac.ac.uk): c/o The British Academy, 10 Carlton House Terrace, London, SW1Y 5AH; tel. 020 7969 5202; fax 020 7969 5401. In Rome enquiries should be made to the director's assistant, Katherine Wallis (k.wallis@bsrome.it).
- **THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AT ANKARA**
(<http://www.biaa.ac.uk>)
All enquiries to Gina Coulthard (London Secretary), BIAA, 10 Carlton House Terrace, London, SW1Y 5AH. Telephone: 020 7969 5204; fax: 020 7969 5401. Email: biaa@britac.ac.uk.
- **THE COUNCIL FOR BRITISH RESEARCH IN THE LEVANT**
(<http://www.britac.ac.uk/institutes/cbri>)
London Secretary Penny McParlin, CBRL Secretary, British Academy, 10 Carlton House Terrace, London, SW1Y 5AH. Email: cbri@britac.ac.uk.

In addition to the Schools and Institutes based in Rome, Athens, Ankara and Amman, the British Academy also oversees the activities of several other societies whose work may be direct or indirect interest to Classicists, Ancient Historians and Classical Archaeologists.

These include the Egypt Exploration Society, the Society for Libyan Studies, and the British Institute of Persian Studies. Details are available through the British Academy web-site.

Stephen Mitchell

University of Exeter

THE CUTTING EDGE OF CLASSICS: DEBATES AND DILEMMAS

David Fitzpatrick et al.

This article contains four pieces which have been written by people involved in the teaching of Classics in Great Britain and Ireland. Its objective is to provide a forum to air views and highlight debates about the future priorities and developments of Classics teaching at university. Classics is here used generically to describe the range of subject types which are offered by departments and not just the teaching of the classical languages.

The idea for the piece came out of a meeting of the Advisory Panel for Classics in the Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN) which discussed various aspects of concern to the subject. Two members of the Panel agreed to contribute and several others were subsequently approached. The contributors are, in the order their contribution appears hereafter, Trevor Dean and Charlotte Behr (University of Surrey Roehampton), Bob Lister (Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge), Noreen Humble (University College Cork), and Vanda Zajko (University of Bristol).[1] It must be noted at the outset that the opinions expressed in each section are those of its author alone. The article has not been conceived as a tightly choreographed piece to push a particular agenda or theme. Its aim is to promote debate on key issues. It hardly needs restating, but the teaching environment of Classics at university has changed. While Classical Studies and Civilisation courses were introduced with great success to counteract the effects of ever decreasing numbers studying classical languages at school and in Classics departments, the position of the language teaching still remains as precarious as ever. Its position and its relationship with other aspects of classical study open a plethora of questions, problems and dilemmas. The subsequent article merely touches on some of the issues involved. Nevertheless, questions about the future development of the curriculum of Classics teaching at university and the interaction between its various elements are very pressing.

1. Student demand: increasing classical provision in HE[2]

The new programme in Classical Civilisation at University of Surrey Roehampton took its first intake of students in September 2001 (Combined Hons only, as yet). Though not a 'new' university in the sense of being an ex-polytechnic, Roehampton has only recently received its university title. In terms of its subject mix and its good reputation for research in the humanities, Roehampton does not quite fit the stereotype of a 'new' university. Our reasons for setting up a Classical Civilisation degree were threefold. First, we knew from our experience of teaching some classical history within the History BA that interest in the classical world could be aroused - beyond our resources to satisfy it - among History students, who usually have little or no previous experience of it. Secondly, we could also see,

looking across other programmes in the University and at University of Surrey at Guildford, that there were a number of staff with teaching interests that included some aspect of the ancient world. Thirdly, we noticed that there were few possibilities of studying Classics at any of the new universities in UK. We assume that this fact narrows participation in terms of the students' school origins, parental background and ethnic identity. So widening participation was certainly one of the intentions with which we approached the creation of a Classical Civilisation degree, and this is reflected in our entry requirements: A-Level in Classical Studies, Ancient History, Latin or Greek preferable but not essential.

It is probably too early to report on how successful we have been in widening participation, however. Our first cohort of students was recruited through clearing: so, by definition, they were already intending to study something somewhere. Nevertheless, we would like to feel that the first cohort has widened participation in Classics, if not in HE: it contains several mature students and some from ethnic minorities. And we are confident that Classical Civilisation can be a good vehicle for including groups in society that were previously not considering HE as an option. It offers good opportunities to explore issues of current concern in contemporary Britain: issues of integration and confrontation of different cultures in society, changing notions of identity, changing values in many areas of social life. The relation between past and present forms an important part of the curriculum design and will be explored in a variety of ways, such as political philosophy and film studies.

What we can say is that, at the end of the first year, nearly all of our first intake would like to transfer to Single Honours in Classical Civilisation - something that we currently cannot deliver! How do we explain this? We believe the design of our curriculum might offer an answer. From the outset, the curriculum was made up of multi- and interdisciplinary elements. The multidisciplinary comes from existing modules in History, Philosophy, Anthropology, Archaeology, English, Drama and Religious Studies. The interdisciplinarity comes from specific, new modules or attachments to existing ones. We believe that this structure allows students from a variety of backgrounds - often not having been exposed to the classical world before - to use their previous experiences in modern literature, drama or history to find an entry into that world.

Two other aspects of the curriculum design may also offer explanation for good retention of students: ancient languages and work placements. We took seriously the Benchmarking Statement's recommendation that there should be opportunities at each level to start an ancient language. Existing classes in New Testament Greek (for Theology students) were refocused, and new classes in Latin were started and opened up to History students and outsiders. Half the Classical Civilisation students started Greek (though less than half are continuing with it); and the other half intend to start Latin in the second year. In other words, for half of our students, an interest in learning an ancient language is aroused only during the course of the first year. So having an *ab initio* entry point in year two is vital. Secondly, the inclusion of a work placement has proved surprisingly popular: it perhaps attracts by allowing students to relate their studies directly to activities outside academe.

Finally, some thoughts on possible future developments. As an institution, Roehampton developed out of the union of four teacher-training colleges. Though most of its students are now outside the Education Faculty, it retains a strong tradition in teacher-training. A good number of our graduates in the humanities go on to do the PGCE, either here or in other universities. We are aware that there are very few PGCE courses in Classics in the country, and that there are concerns in the Classics community about renewal of the subject and its

teachers at the school level. This conjunction would seem to suggest an opening that we might well be able to explore.

2. *The decline of Latin in maintained schools: implications for Higher Education*[3]

Over the last 25 years there has been a clear shift in the nature of university Classics courses, with the emphasis less on mastery of the classical languages and more on the history and culture of the ancient world (though *ab initio* language courses are available for students wishing to start Latin and Greek at university). This shift has in part been forced on universities by the sharp decline in numbers taking Latin and Greek A level: between 1965 and 1995 Latin entries fell from 7,901 to 1,625, and Greek entries from 1,322 to 283.

A closer look at Latin entries between 1990 and 2000 reveals a worrying pattern in the statistics. During that period A level Latin entries fell from 1,921 to 1,540 candidates, a drop of nearly 20 percent.[4] The drop has been uneven across different school types: 17.3 percent in independent schools, 37.3 percent in grammar schools and 69.5 percent in comprehensive schools (which provided only 90 candidates in 2000). A level Greek entries for the same period are even more stark, with an overall fall of more than 40 percent - even the independent school entry fell by 35 percent - and only 5 entries from comprehensive schools, and 11 from grammar schools, in 2000.

It is not difficult to identify the main reasons for this decline. Since the introduction of the National Curriculum under the 1988 Education Reform Act the compulsory curriculum has filled almost all of the timetable at Key Stage 3 (pupils aged 11-14). As a result it is now the norm for Latin to be offered as a three year course to GCSE, often limited to one lesson a week in year 9 (and that is likely to be off timetable). That in turn makes it hard to recruit sufficient pupils to run a GCSE class. When they do have sufficient numbers, because of shortage of time and because Latin is substantially more difficult than any modern language GCSE, it is very hard for pupils to achieve the A or A* grades that they, their parents and the school expect, and this then puts them off choosing the subject for AS level. Furthermore many schools are unable to fund small groups at AS level (10 is not an uncommon minimum class size), making Latin no longer viable in almost all maintained schools (how many independent schools regularly have more than 10 pupils taking A level Latin?).

The A level entry figures confirm what every Classics lecturer involved in admissions knows, that there is a diminishing pool of UK students eligible to take undergraduate courses which assume significant knowledge of the classical languages. Secondly, this pool is becoming increasingly unrepresentative of the school population: in simple terms, access to courses dependent on prior knowledge of the classical languages is becoming restricted almost entirely to pupils attending fee-paying schools and selective state schools.

No classicist can be comfortable with such a situation, particularly at a time when the government is pressing for much greater participation in higher education by students from disadvantaged communities. In a recent interview with the *Guardian* newspaper,[5] Margaret Hodge, the minister for higher education, said that she had never come across a part of the public sector that was 'so strongly influenced by class,' and she made it clear that universities needed to be much more proactive in redressing the balance: 'they've got to be rather more innovative about who they recruit; it's a matter of really hunting out the brightest kids.'

Many universities already have flourishing programmes to help forge links with local schools. In Leeds, for instance, Classics students go out into primary schools and teach Latin

using Minimus; in Cambridge, PGCE students can act as e-tutors on the Cambridge Online Latin Project,[6] which enables schools with no classics specialist to offer Latin using the Cambridge Latin Course and a supporting web site.

But effective recruitment depends not only on reaching out to new learners in communities with little or no exposure to Latin in school, but also on providing stimulating and rewarding introductory Latin courses to attract, and retain, healthy numbers through to degree level. Although David Raeburn did a great deal in the mid-1990s to stimulate discussion about *ab initio* language teaching, little has been done to build on the questionnaire carried out by CUCD in 1995, whose findings highlighted the wide variation in courses currently available.[7] While there was some consensus on course aims - when respondents were invited to rank a number of possible aims for an elementary introduction to a classical language (with five suggested aims printed on the questionnaire), introducing students to literary texts and/or other documents in the original was ranked a clear first - every sort of text book, from Kennedy's *Latin Primer* to *Reading Latin*, was being used (though Kennedy hardly counts as a text book). The evidence suggested that too many *ab initio* courses were being taught to classes too large for effective language learning, using text books likely to overwhelm the students with grammatical terminology rather than enable them to read Latin in the original.[8]

It is not in the interests of the Classics community to have a diminishing pool of students, from a narrow social background, from which to draw its future researchers.[9] With the position of Classics in maintained schools now so critical, university Classics departments need to make a concerted effort to increase the number of *ab initio* language students who complete their undergraduate studies with sufficient competence in Latin (and/or Greek) to be confident independent readers of texts in the original. A sensible first step would be to establish an accredited training programme for all *ab initio* language teachers: this could provide both an overview of available resources and an opportunity to explore the wide range of teaching styles needed to meet the diverse needs of the wide range of students one would hope to attract.[10]

3. Fast track language learning in Latin and Greek[11]

It is well acknowledged that Classics departments are faced with decreasing numbers of students entering university with knowledge of Latin and/or ancient Greek. The task of trying to bring students up to scratch in one or both of the languages in a three-year undergraduate degree is problematic enough, but there is the additional and more troublesome issue of what to do with students who wish to do graduate work in Classics, Ancient History or Archaeology but whose knowledge of the languages is minimal or non-existent.[12] There are no easy solutions and certainly no short cuts but intensive language courses have been shown to be remarkably effective.

Intensive Latin and Greek courses were first developed in the USA and were based on techniques pioneered at the Monterey Language School by the US army for teaching its soldiers the languages of countries in which they were going to be based. Research done by the military showed that five hours a day for ten weeks was the optimal set-up which provided the greatest retention levels.[13] The University of Berkeley, California was the first to apply the principle to Greek and Latin and a number of similar courses now exist in North America. Total and intense immersion has proved very successful. At Cork we have set up the first European version of this model. At present the constraints of our own university

system and the pressure on teaching resources mean that we can run the course for only eight weeks and with fewer classroom hours (though we are increasing these to four hours a day next year).[14] Six weeks are spent completing *Reading Latin* and *Reading Greek* and a further two weeks in reading a text and learning about all the tools available for use in this activity. We have found that under these conditions the grammatical foundation of the languages is well retained but, as might be expected, vocabulary retention is not as high unless the students are able to follow up the course with more formal training.

For courses of this type to work most effectively, the support of those who can benefit from it is essential. While our course itself is successful, it is being availed of more by students outside Classics than inside. Yet the lack of acquisition of Latin and Greek is a recognisable problem in UK Classics departments. There is a need for various provisions to be put in place to help students who must acquire extra language training at the graduate level. First, there must be a positive and open attitude to this method of teaching the languages - it has been proven to work; and active encouragement must be given to students who wish to avail of it. Secondly, intensive courses do not come cheaply and if a student has to devote a summer to them they are not only paying for the course but also giving up the opportunity to make money at the same time. Some provision must be made at some level to provide sources of funding to ease the financial burden on students who are in need of an intensive course.[15] Thirdly, the pressure now put on students to finish graduate work in three years if they are receiving funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Board (AHRB), for example, is unacceptable if they are also under pressure to learn one of the languages first. Nor should they be denied funding from such bodies if their need to learn a language will inhibit finishing within three years. Fourthly, there should be some provision made by Classics departments to encourage and provide opportunities for students returning from intensive courses to continue some sort of formal or guided training. Graduate reading classes would benefit not only students coming from an intensive course but also students who start languages only at the BA level.[16] And it is important to remember that the problem of students lacking training in the languages is not one exclusive to Classics. Such classes could be made available also to students in other disciplines looking for a way to keep up formal training after an intensive course.[17] Finally, the Summer School is an ideal training ground for graduate students with an aptitude and enthusiasm for language teaching to get formal and valuable experience teaching Latin and Greek (and indeed thus improving their own understanding of the languages).

There is no reason why students starting the languages late cannot attain mastery of them but they need encouragement and real support on all levels.

4. The rhetoric of symbiosis: teaching and research in the contemporary academy[18]

We are all familiar with the rhetoric of symbiosis that assures subject review teams, university quality assurance committees and potential students of the intimate relationship between our teaching and research. It has become a commonplace that each area of our practice is enhanced by involvement with the other and we assert this with confidence in our public documents. We also use it as an argument for continuing to employ people in universities who are skilled in the two areas and for promoting people on the basis of their excellence in both. Within our institutions, however, it is often the case that far from existing in a state of creative inter-dependency, teaching and research compete in a way that enforces the development of a hierarchy between them. People become categorised as either good teachers or prolific researchers and the latter grouping, in practice, is valued more highly.

This can cause demoralisation amongst those who feel that genuine pre-eminence in teaching is not rewarded sufficiently and it can lead to a culture of complaint wherein anything which distracts attention from an individual's own work is regarded as a nuisance. It may have a particularly pernicious effect on those entering the profession who are likely to be encouraged to prioritise publication at the expense of all else and who will have known nothing other than an academy driven by output.

The hierarchy that has developed can be demonstrated by the differing attitudes within the academy to the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and the Teaching Quality Assessments (TQA or 'Subject Review'). The former is for the most part tolerated as a necessary evil that does its job adequately in an imperfect world, whereas the latter is almost without exception viewed as ideology-driven and coercive to an unacceptable degree. At a time when the future of both of these institutions is unclear it is worth challenging our complacency in attitude to both of them. There are certainly huge problems with the Subject Review, not least the lack of an appeals procedure once a judgement has been made. But we can also criticise the RAE for its homogenising impact upon our intellectual life and for its imposition of the criteria by means of which our work is valued. My point here is not simply that there are significant flaws in both the RAE and the Subject Review, nor is it that each process cannot help but enforce a particular ideological agenda. It is rather that our higher degree of tolerance towards the RAE reflects a collective attitude that research is what we as academics do and research is what we should be judged by. Our teaching practices, in comparison, are lower down on our list of priorities and we resent to a much greater degree the time we have to spend preparing for their evaluation.

There are practical ways in which teaching and research operate in competition with one another rather than in harmony. Everyone now is encouraged to apply for research grants in order that their department can buy in teaching to replace them whilst they complete their projects. It increases a department's prestige if it receives a number of AHRB or Leverhulme grants in any given period and receipt of these awards contributes towards its rating in the RAE. The process of completing the paperwork involved in such applications is intensely time-consuming but practice is making perfect and many institutions now employ professionals to help academics in this area. But if a grant application is successful it has an obvious effect on the teaching in the department.

Anyone who has been involved in the planning of a teaching programme will be familiar with the difficulties involved in replacing members of staff at very short notice and in ensuring coverage and coherence for the year ahead. Here, as so often, the demands of the two areas are in conflict: in terms of quality assurance it is important that our curricula are designed with a combination of core and optional units whose rationale can be clearly explained, and that students are provided with any information they need in plenty of time to make their choices; in practice too often these days, because of a research strategy that depends upon individuals soliciting funding from external bodies, departments are unsure who will be doing their teaching until the very last minute and the units which are offered have more to do with who is available to teach them than with the requirements of the curriculum. This may be a source of resentment in departments both amongst students and amongst the staff who must continue to ensure delivery of the programme whilst their colleagues are on leave. But it is a lack of a consistent strategy at the highest level that is to blame here. We cannot criticise those who have been encouraged to apply for research grants for being successful at obtaining them.

It is not only traditional research projects that take people out of the mainstream of departmental life. There is more money in the system than ever before to free people up to take on teaching-related projects, and many universities and the LTSN are actively promoting the use of their funds for this purpose. The fact remains, however, that the competition for teaching and learning grants is conspicuously less than for research grants, and that young academics are much less likely to apply for them if they are thinking in terms of advancing their careers. There is only a limited amount of time available, and it is clear that at the moment research publication is the route that leads to the quickest success. But it is not clear quite where the profession thinks it is heading if its investment in the future consists solely in training researchers. There are very few research-only posts, and we are all highly aware that our survival in the institutions of the academy depends on our ability to communicate the fascination and significance of classics to a wider world. We must continue to inspire people with our teaching or our subject will die. In this regard the opposition between teaching and research can only damage our interests as a community. At national level in terms of funding strategy, at institutional level in terms of planning and promotion policies, and in the classroom in terms of the way we devise and deliver our units, symbiosis must not be allowed to remain an otiose trope. In order to resist effectively the lazy formulae of the QAA's 'best practice' and to ensure that our thinking is continually challenged and renewed, we must rediscover its vitality: teaching and research can and should mutually enhance each other. We should be thinking about how we can re-organise in order to manage this relationship more creatively.

Concluding Note

As the preparation of this article was entering its final stages, it was announced that the Queen's University of Belfast had voted to close its Classics Department. This perverse decision, which leaves an entire region without any teaching provision in Classics and its languages at university, appears to be irreversible. It is an unfortunate reminder that position of Classics cannot be taken for granted. Nonetheless, as the contribution by Dean and Behr highlights, interest in the Classical world still remains strong among students. But there is a need to debate how best to create teaching provision for Classics at university which is both diverse and coherent. There is a need for a frank discussion about the reality of the different types of student taking Classics courses and their objectives and ambitions.

Most contributions in the piece bear on the issue of language teaching. Two sections in particular have shown that the provision of language teaching at university is not merely an 'academic' topic. It has profound implications for two reasons. First, there is a need to provide adequately qualified graduates who could go on to teach the languages at school. This may ultimately lead to a more positive profile for Classical subjects at school. Second, there are many able Classical Civilisation/Studies and Ancient History students who wish to proceed to postgraduate work. As they are the potential researchers and academics of the future, it is important that they have the opportunity to grapple with the language at as an early stage as possible. Their research potential will be severely challenged if they must spend significant time improving their language ability. In many respects, it seems that language teaching and Classical Studies/Civilisation have been considered mutually exclusive subjects. However, there are currently a number of important teaching initiatives which bring together language teaching and Ancient History/Classical Civilisation so that they enhance one another.[19] There is, perhaps, a great need to organise a coherent debate on how best to organise language provision to meet the needs of the students. It may no longer be 'best practice' to coerce students to take one or both of the languages for a specified period, no matter how

much one thinks that every student 'ought' to work on the languages. But equally it is surely not 'best practice' to exclude promising students from the possibility of a teaching career in school or university by restricting their language learning opportunities. In this connection, it would be worth trying to put pressure on the AHRB to follow the practice of the ESRC (Economic & Social Research Council), which allows funded research students both extra time and financial resources if they have to learn a 'difficult' language. Furthermore, it is necessary to build on the growing evidence that students without previous experience of classical subjects respond positively when they meet classical material in other university courses. How can these opportunities be increased and can they be developed to include exposure to classical languages?

This article has been organised by the Classics team from the LTSN Subject Centre for History, Classics and Archaeology and facilitated by generous assistance of the editor of the CUCD Bulletin. The LTSN is an initiative which has been funded by the HE funding bodies in the UK to promote good teaching and learning practices at university and to encourage its dissemination. Recently, the funding councils announced that support for the LTSN would be extended until the end of 2004. The work in Classics in the LTSN is currently hosted by the Department of Classical Studies at the Open University. As this article, together with several references throughout the various pieces, indicates, the Classics team are committed to facilitating the continued discussion on the Classics curriculum. In this spirit, an open seminar on curriculum development in classical subjects will be held in collaboration with the Arts and Humanities Higher Education Research Group in autumn 2002. At the Classical Association AGM in 2003 (University of Warwick, 11-14 April), there will be a specific panel which will provide an opportunity to discuss these issues. The Classics team always welcomes suggestions and advice from the subject community on how best to further this debate. The contact details for Classics are available on the web-site, <http://hca.ltsn.ac.uk/classics>.

The Open University

[1] The introductory and concluding notes to this multi-authored article have been written by Dr David Fitzpatrick and Dr Lorna Hardwick, who are the Project Officer and Subject Director respectively for Classics in the LTSN Subject Centre for History, Classics and Archaeology.

[2] This piece has been written jointly by Professor Trevor Dean and Dr Charlotte Behr from the School of Humanities and Cultural Studies at the University of Surrey Roehampton.

[3] This piece was contributed by Mr Bob Lister, who is based at the Education Faculty at the University of Cambridge.

[4] Figures from the AQA Research and Statistics Group, Guildford.

[5] Interview with Jackie Ashley and Patrick Wintour, *The Guardian*, 24 June 2002.

[6] Information about the Cambridge Online Latin Project can be found at <http://www.CambridgeSCP.com>.

[7] See *CUCD Bulletin* 24 (1995), also available online at bulletin.html#1995.

[8] Some of the issues in this area are addressed in the proceedings of the LTSN HCA-Classics conference 'Teaching and Learning with Texts, Commentaries and Translations' which was held at De Montfort University Milton Keynes on 26 January 2002. The proceedings will be made available in hard copy and online at <http://ltsn.hca.ac.uk/classics> by early autumn 2002. Hard copies will be distributed to Departments and copyright libraries, and some other copies may be obtained from Dr David Fitzpatrick, The Subject Centre for History, Classics and Archaeology, Department of Classical Studies, The Open University, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA.

[9] See G. Shipley, 'UCAS data on applications in Classical studies, 1998-2000', *CUCD Bulletin* 30 (2001) 14-31. Shipley's analysis shows that applications for Classics are more dominated by those from independent schools and the South-East than are those for Classical Civilisation and, especially, Ancient History. At the time of completing this piece, *CUCD Bulletin* 30 was not yet available online.

[10] Some of the issues involved here were addresses in the first national conference hosted by LTSN HCA-Classics in January 2001. The proceedings of this conference, 'Practical strategies in the changing environment of Classical language teaching at university', are available online at <http://www.hca.ltsn.ac.uk/classics>. A limited number of hard copies remain. Please contact Dr David Fitzpatrick (see n. 8 above) for availability.

[11] This piece was written by Dr Noreen Humble from the Department of Ancient Classics at University College Cork.

[12] The problem is not limited to Classics but is of concern in the wider academic community, as a recent discussion on the Ficino email list (devoted to all aspects of the Renaissance and Reformation) showed. The problem is apparent even in places where we might not expect it to be, e.g. in Germany.

[13] I am grateful to Professor John Dillon for enlightenment on the principle behind the North American summer schools.

[14] Details of the set up of the Cork Summer School can be found at http://www.ucc.ie/acad/classics/summ_sch.html.

[15] In the way that this year the Classical Association has generously provided bursary money for British graduate students to attend the Cork Summer School.

[16] Again the North American system makes provisions for this. Most postgraduate programmes involve some course work and a system of comprehensive exams which help to consolidate knowledge of the languages gained, in most cases, only from a BA degree or an extra year between BA and MA or PhD.

[17] See Elizabeth Irwin's comments on her experience in this regard as a graduate student in Cambridge ('Three ways of learning: student, postgraduate and teacher' in D. G. Fitzpatrick &

L. P. Hardwick, (eds.), *Practical Strategies in the Changing Environment of Classical Language Teaching at University* (Milton Keynes, The Open University), 5-11). She notes the positive benefits of reading classes and the lack of provision for more formal consolidation of language skills.

[18] The section has been written by Dr Vanda Zajko from the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Bristol.

[19] Professor Graham Shipley and Dr Eva Parisinou from the School of Archaeology and Ancient History at the University of Leicester have received some funding from LTSN Teaching Development Grants for a project on developing a flexible structure for teaching Greek to archaeologists and ancient historians. The project assesses a flexible structure for effective delivery of language-based teaching in ancient Greek to students taking courses in which classical languages are a secondary component (e.g. ancient history, archaeology, classical archaeology) and where a high level of expertise in language is not required. This structure also serves as a resource to impart transferable linguistic skills to students who will typically have little experience of foreign languages, and who may have been deterred from traditional classics courses by the language requirements.

CLASSICS AT BRITISH UNIVERSITIES, 2001-2: STATISTICS

Graham Shipley

I have a number of acknowledgements to start with. First, to Geoffrey Eatough for helping to make the handover of the statistics portfolio an easy transition, and above all for setting an example of accuracy and professionalism that is hard to follow. Second, to those colleagues who contributed to the design of the new data entry form and helped clarify what data we need and how best we should gather them. Third, to all member departments, including our two new Hamptons (Roe and South), for enabling me to start my innings with a gratifying 100 per cent return. Even one, sadly, closing department made its final submission with a happy flourish.

By way of introduction, I remind readers that the data are divided into (a) 'straight' classics degrees such as BA Classics, Greek, and Latin, (b) 'modern' variants such as classical civilization, classical studies, ancient history, and classical art and archaeology, and (c) various important but disparate groups such as combined honours, supplementary, and non-honours students, all subsumed under the traditionally enlightening rubric 'Other'. Within (a) and (b) a further distinction is made between single and joint honours degrees.

Recent changes in the presentation of the data result from the integration of statistics from the Open University, which patently works with a rather different kind of programme from most of us. With Geoffrey's encouragement I have made minor adjustments to the collection of the data, such as subsuming the former 'non-classical' category into Other, emphasizing the levels of courses rather than the year in which they are taken, calculating separate figures for beginners' languages without asking departments to remove them from the main totals (though with no significant impact on the final presentation of the data), and asking for more

detail of staff and postgraduates. Readers will notice, in the tables, that certain figures include OU data; as time passes, it will probably be a good idea to integrate these into the general dataset as far as possible.

The millennial dip in registrations for single and joint honours degrees does not now look like the start of a trend (see Table A). Student numbers in these programmes have oscillated contentedly either side of 5,600 head of students and 4,000 FTE for half a decade now, and ever since 1993 they have been sitting at about 30 per cent above the 1991 figure. These figures are almost exactly paralleled by those for first-year honours students in the last four columns. One may wonder whether a steady state is the optimal picture in the current climate.

The figures for classical degrees conceal contradictory tendencies (Table B, especially italicized columns). On the one hand, single and joint honours degrees in the 'modern' varieties of classics (as defined above) forge ahead, showing an increase in most years since 1991. The lean years were 1994, 1998, and 2000, while 1999 was, perhaps not coincidentally, a thinnish year for applications (*CUCD Bulletin* 30 (2001), 24). These degrees now stand some 70 per cent higher than a decade ago, and anecdotal evidence suggests that applications have been running even more strongly in 2001-2. On the other hand, the more traditional courses undeniably remain under pressure, showing a more or less steady erosion of numbers. If, for an archaeologist, three stones in line (which from another viewpoint means one stone and two in line with it) make a wall, can the same be said of recruitment figures across three years? At the most recent end of the process there are, it is true, only two successive years of decline, and both 1997 and 1999 were good years in some respects. Joint classics degrees, though a small part of the total, sometimes do better than single honours, and they recruited well in 2001. The broader pattern since the early 1990s, however, is undeniably in one direction. The real worry is single honours classics, Greek, and Latin, where the cohort of around 1,200 a decade ago has declined more than it has risen, has now fallen in three successive years, and has dipped below 1,000.

This pattern, of course, is not new news. The figures for UCAS applications, discussed in last year's *Bulletin*, showed particular strength in joint degrees in which ancient history partners a non-classical subject. Those degrees also appear to recruit from a wider social and geographical range, and would seem to offer some hope of increasing the numbers of people who partake of classics somehow at university level. It almost goes without saying, for it has been said often and bears repetition, that the Open University data (hinted at in Table A, despite our standard practice of not identifying specific universities) are phenomenally encouraging in the latter regard.

Equally important, as they have been for some time since, especially in certain departments, are the numbers of students who read for degrees that do not have classical titles, but who take a greater or smaller element of classical study. (Incidentally, some of the data come from non-classical departments in which classicists are lodged. Despite its title, CUCD's members are universities, not departments; our remit extends beyond classical departments as such.) Even allowing for the large OU contingent (again hinted at, this time in Table C), it is worth stressing that whichever way you view the dataset a large part of it is made up, both individually and in terms of teaching loads (and hence funding), by these most welcome participants. Several departments have groups of over a hundred, or even two hundred, students tackling first-year classical civilization or ancient history, albeit at one-sixth or one-third of full-time. This cohort, however, may be fickle. If we discount the OU, there has been serious erosion in this area since 1999: the reported FTE is around 600, a 40% drop since

1999. That is why the figures for 'All including Other' (Table A) show a downturn in each of the past two years, despite the strong recruitment in the 'modern' degrees noted above; not even the substantial OU data are enough to offset it. Possibly it reflects tuition fees and their claimed deterrent effect on certain groups of applicants, though this was mitigated for mature students in 2001-2. It may, perhaps, also reflect a tendency for departments (I have in mind non-classical ones) to corral students into doing only their own modules in order to make their income stream more predictable. Although the 'leaking' of students into other budget centres may be reciprocal, classics might suffer more than many from any such tendency, having always been a welcoming community. Colleagues may be able to offer further possible explanations. Whatever the reasons for the change, it should not go unnoticed, as these non-specialist 'customers' could help make the difference between steady-state recruitment overall and a situation in which classics, including staff numbers and hence research, benefits from a long-term increase in the take-up of higher education.

Although most departments find it difficult to state accurately how many mature students they have, the available estimate for mature students at non-distance learning universities is *c.*494, some 6 per cent of all undergraduates in classical courses.

Staff numbers continue to hold up well (Table A). Changes in the recording method have elicited details of sub-categories (Table D). Full-time permanent staff (335.4) represent 57 per cent of individuals and 76 per cent of FTE staff (ignoring the matter of staff on leave). Full-time temporary staff, presumably mainly holding fixed-term lecturerships, amount to 7 per cent of personnel (9 per cent FTE). The dataset offers no evidence of trends, for example towards or away from casualization; they may emerge in future surveys.

The figure used in calculating the student-staff ratio was the 'effective total', i.e. the FTE of those staff not on leave last session. The SSR improves, inevitably, as student FTEs decline while staffing remains more or less constant. It is higher than it was in 1991, however, and it varies (where it can reasonably be calculated) from below 10 in a very small number of places to over 20 in three.

Beginners' languages continue to show strongly (Table E). (Note that the undergraduate figures are not additional to those in the main tables, but are a subset of them.) A new question on the form elicited the heartening discovery that over a hundred taught and research postgraduates were starting Latin or Greek last session.

Finally, departments were most helpful in providing detailed breakdowns of postgraduate numbers (Table F), which as time goes by will give a firm basis for identifying trends and developing recruitment strategies. In view of previous worries about under-recording, it would be unwise to base too much on the apparent increase in taught postgraduate numbers. Yet it is worth noting that no fewer than eleven universities have an active MA student community of ten or more. Research students, too, are more widely distributed than one might have expected (numbering in double figures in half of member institutions). If, however, there was (as has been suspected) some under-reporting of PGRs in recent years and if, at the same time, the new figures are sound, then the downward trend is even steeper than the figures in this year's table suggest.

Graham Shipley

University of Leicester

TABLE A: OVERVIEW

	Honours (SH + JH)				ALL (including Other)								Staff	SSR	1st yr honours (SH + JH)			
	no.	FTE	% change FTE	index 1991 = 100	excluding OU				including OU				excluding OU		no.	FTE	% change FTE	index 1991 = 100
no.					FTE	% change FTE	index 1991 = 100	no.	FTE	% change FTE	index 1997 = 100							
1991	3,998	2,971		100	8,206	4,306		100					348	12.4	1,437	1,012		100
1992	4,649	3,446	16.0	116	8,911	4,925	14.4	114					347	14.2	1,692	1,195	18.1	118
1993	5,214	3,848	11.7	130	9,549	5,316	7.9	123					352	15.1	1,939	1,339	12.0	132
1994	5,731	4,011	4.2	135	9,731	5,445	2.4	126					379	14.4	2,168	1,340	0.1	132
1995	5,606	3,804	-5.1	128	9,356	5,317	-2.4	123					361	14.7	2,152	1,288	-3.9	127
1996	5,647	3,812	0.2	128	9,269	5,095	-4.2	118					365	14.0	2,122	1,272	-1.3	126
1997	5,762	4,006	5.1	135	9,219	5,289	3.8	123	16,616	6,252		100	356	14.9	2,109	1,351	6.2	134
1998	5,610	3,898	-2.7	131	9,878	5,148	-2.7	120	16,610	6,119	-2.1	98	351	14.7	2,071	1,291	-4.4	128
1999	5,869	4,121	5.7	139	8,882	5,233	1.7	122	18,922	6,961	13.8	111	343	15.3	2,275	1,405	8.9	139
2000	5,499	3,803	-7.7	128	8,665	4,996	-4.5	116	16,634	6,475	-7.0	104	360	13.9	2,125	1,362	-3.1	135
2001	5,673	3,858	1.4	130	8,244	4,549	-8.9	106	18,786	6,195	-4.3	99	361	12.6	2,293	1,399	2.7	138

TABLE B: SINGLE AND JOINT HONOURS

	Classics, Greek, Latin								Class. Studs, Anc. Hist., Art/Arch.							
	SH				JH				SH				JH			
	no.	FTE	% change FTE	index 1991 = 100	no.	FTE	% change FTE	index 1991 = 100	no.	FTE	% change FTE	index 1991 = 100	no.	FTE	% change FTE	index 1991 = 100
1991	1,278	1,200		100	288	135		100	1,416	1,163		100	1,016	473		100
1992	1,294	1,210	0.9	101	328	154	13.6	114	1,648	1,473	26.6	127	1,379	609	28.9	129
1993	1,345	1,264	4.4	105	269	139	-9.4	103	1,813	1,630	10.7	140	1,787	816	33.9	173
1994	1,335	1,198	-5.2	100	307	148	6.3	109	2,370	1,889	15.9	162	1,719	776	-4.8	164
1995	1,234	1,162	-3.0	97	323	139	-6.1	103	2,099	1,661	-12.0	143	1,950	842	8.4	178
1996	1,165	1,098	-5.5	92	299	130	-6.7	96	2,011	1,704	2.6	147	2,172	881	4.6	186
1997	1,243	1,159	5.5	97	263	118	-9.2	87	2,207	1,822	6.9	157	2,049	908	3.1	192
1998	1,241	1,181	2.0	98	333	155	31.6	115	2,001	1,711	-6.1	147	2,035	851	-6.2	180
1999	1,178	1,074	-9.1	89	298	120	-22.9	88	2,375	2,036	19.0	175	2,018	892	4.7	189
2000	1,109	1,019	-5.1	85	219	97	-19.0	72	2,068	1,824	-10.4	157	2,103	863	-3.2	183
2001	1,082	968	-5.0	81	265	127	31.3	94	2,363	1,958	7.4	168	1,963	805	-6.7	170

TABLE C: ALL STUDENTS

	Classics		Greek		Latin		CICiv/St		AH		CIArt/Ar	
	No.	FTE	No.	FTE	No.	FTE	No.	FTE	No.	FTE	No.	FTE
	SINGLE HONOURS											
1998	1,078	1,031	54	49	109	101	1,038	898	807	713	156	100
1999	1,072	1,001	24	15	82	58	1,353	1,108	933	844	89	84
2000	1,039	953	17	17	53	49	1,179	1,067	791	685	98	72
2001	1,011	920	19	13	52	35	1,235	1,094	1,006	781	122	83
	JOINT HONOURS											
1998	93	48	67	32	173	75	890	401	1,022	405	123	45
1999	54	27	84	21	160	71	729	353	1,159	488	70	51
2000	53	26	30	12	136	59	627	292	1,180	498	216	72
2001	11	7	43	19	211	101	694	306	913	403	357	95
	OTHER											
1998	46	19	45	10	84	19	2,568	945	296	79	63	17
1999	41	18	98	23	109	27	8,865	1,432	249	76	121	32
2000	9	7	48	20	105	33	7,449	1,355	318	75	140	38
2001	3	2	538	139	946	244	12,092	1,570	1,168	287	244	73
	ALL											
1998	1,217	1,098	166	91	366	195	4,496	2,244	2,125	1,197	342	162
1999	1,167	1,046	206	60	351	156	10,163	2,893	2,341	1,408	280	167
2000	1,101	986	95	49	294	141	9,255	2,714	2,289	1,258	454	182
2001	1,025	928	600	171	1,209	381	12,092	2,971	3,086	1,471	723	251

TABLE D: STAFF

Full-time				Part-time				Other		Totals			
perm.		temp.		perm.		temp.							
no.	FTE	no.	FTE	no.	FTE	no.	FTE	no.	FTE	no.	FTE	FTE on leave	Effective total
335.4	315.5	39.0	36.8	5.0	2.8	84.0	24.5	122.0	33.6	585.4	413.2	52.6	360.6

Figures for 1991-2001

	no.	% change
1991	348.3	
1992	347.4	-0.3
1993	351.8	1.3
1994	378.6	7.6
1995	361.2	-4.6
1996	364.5	0.9
1997	356.0	-2.3
1998	350.7	-1.5
1999	342.7	-2.3
2000	360.3	5.1
2001	360.6	0.1

Figures exclude the Open University.

TABLE E: BEGINNERS' LANGUAGES

		Greek		Latin	
		no.	FTE	no.	FTE
Undergraduates	1998	773	181	314	83
	1999	665	148	1,211	287
	2000	626	134	1,206	270
	2001	1,052	350	1,398	386
Postgraduates	2001	44	13	72	20

Figures include the Open University.

TABLE F: POSTGRADUATES

		Full-time	Part-time	Other (FTE = 0)	Total no.	FTE
TAUGHT	1998				246	186
	1999				168	146
	2000				319	245
	2001	240	183	11	434	331
RESEARCH	1998				555	465
	1999				534	450
	2000				420	363
	2001	339	126	41	506	393

Figures include the Open University.