DEREK PHILLIPS - SENIOR LECTURER IN HISTORY T.C.A.E. 1972 -

In 1971 what interested me about TCAE - A College very much of a university pattern, with similar patterns to Univ. governments - with a broad Faculty base (8 faculties) "giving awards in areas which had not hitherto been given in Tasmania".

Integrated Education course also very attractive.

- What gave you the idea of similarity to the University?

 Greater similarity to University than to technical education, because of concept of giving degrees. But practical work emphasis as well.
- O40 Difference / University integrated course and TCAE integrated course in Education.
- No original misgivings about closeness of two tertiary institutions in small state. In June 1972 the Principal's proposed departure at end of year was cause for alarm.

Reason for Principal's resignation seen as mainly financial.

Suggestion that the College expanded too quickly (1973-74). New courses, such as Paramedical and Public Health studies.

No uneasiness among staff - high excitement - euphoria - funds were easy to come by - many new institutions felt they had a golden future. Also a feeling that the College would be making a very solid contribution to the educational future of the children of the State and the State itself. Tasmania and Canberra CAEs were 2 of the most interesting and highly regarded in Australia - because highly experimental?

Close association / staff and students at TCAE.

- Impact of buildings and site of TCAE. Part of master plan was to take no account of distinctions / staff and students e.g. one cafeteria.

 In physical sense the buildings were a constant source of complaint.
- 155 The School of Education.

What innovative things were going on?

Details of subjects mainly - four-year courses.

Staff were integrated across academic and professional areas - i.e. participated in both academic studies and curriculum studies.

- A good staff though not a "paper-qualified" academic staff.

 Comparisons of students emanating from TCAE and University favoured

 TCAE students [cf. R.S. Smith views on this].
- Are there academic disadvantages in the integrated course? i.e. do trainee teachers have less grounding in their area of specialisation?

 Details. Advocate of TCAE course for English-History students.
- The calibre of the TCAE student how did they compare with Univ. students?

"One of our weaknesses from the beginning was on the Science side".

"Very much of a muchness" in quality, except "we didn't have the top".

TCAE remained first choice for many intending teachers, even in last 5 years of uncertainty about future.

In formal hours College students had to work much harder than university students - 18 or 20 hours per week: 2 x 4 hours of each elective; the "cores" another 5, the other 7 or 8 curriculum studies.

- 330 Science weakness "we never recovered from".

 (Difficulties of having 2 campuses).
 - Growth rate in early years was 10%+; and work load for staff therefore very great, and little research done. Was research expected? No or not a 'magnum opus' possibly short papers.
- Other weaknesses: not all members of staff took a full part in life of College.
- Dr Wisch left in 1976 and "there is a real sense in which Mt Nelson has been leaderless since that time".
- Views on Council in early days i.e. 72, 73, 74 "the halcyon times" before Karmel report. I took them to be ... able and interesting ...
- Any feeling of rivalry on the part of the Council with the University.?

 Not in the early days. This suggested later by Mr Neil Batt.

 Views on the two principals: Selby Smith and Wisch. Of latter: "I believe he had a very firm view of the work a CAE should do there were very great problems: financial, and two campuses. Question of autonomy for Newnham Campus.

Endless discussions with staff under Dr Wisch on questions of tenure etc etc.

A very democratic process instituted by Dr Wisch.

1975. Divisions at the College at time of Karmel report. - Suggestion that Division of Teacher Education should combine with Faculty of Education i.e. leave the College. This now seen as a mistake, very divisive.

College's role in the State of Tasmania. Dr Wisch's term: "OUTPOST AGE" - external teaching in many centres, even quite small towns, serviced from College - a kind of open university idea. This idea unfortunately didn't win wide support. [see WISCH on this] Lukewarm support from Education. Yet this was perhaps a function which the College should have carried out.

Side B

Document distributed to the staff (by Wisch) in early 1973. An attempt to resolve the problems of education in Tasmania in a way strikingly similar to the recommendations of the Karmel report.

Nothing ever came of the General Studies area in Education. It was never developed as much as Wisch wanted, even in Engineering etc.

TCAE Education School has had a large part in in-service training in Centre for Continuing Education for Teachers.

Was Newnham an "outpost"? Yes, could not have range of subjects etc. Newnham only "joined" in 1973, was not equipped adequately. Details of crazy proposal to set up 4 separate engineering schools [see Selby Smith].

Did not in 72-73 believe view that there were not enough potential students in Tasmania to support 2 tertiary institutions.

- Did not believe the two institutions were competing in spite of decision on part of TCAE to give degrees.
- The next few years "the cold winds of change" described.

 Recognition that redirection of post-secondary education in State was in hands of the politicians.

The first inkling ... was when we read the University's submission in 1975: one possibility being that the TCAE should be absorbed by the University.

- The intentions of Mr Batt. A comprehensive University reaching out into the community on N. American model.
- "It was widely understood that the Karmel Report was not written by Karmel was "rewritten" by Neil Batt.

A description of the political aspects of the problem follows.

310 Anecdote involving Neil Batt.

New members of Council at this time - northerners put in to replace southerners.

[Tape:

- 350 Reactions of staff to recommendations of Karmel Report.
- 475 His view of University's role in this period and the divisions within the University.

Notion of "inferiority" of College staff discussed.

Side 3

- "The point at which resistance became futile " Feb. 1980, when findings of Ministers' Committee became known.

 Detailed account of gradual dissolution of College mainly 1979-80.

 Role of the Minister of Education.
- Belief in late 1979 that the College particularly the School of Education would remain, and perhaps be the dominant form of teacher education in the south.
- Heard in Melbourne however that "Mr Byers had fixed it all". Role of Peter Byers.
 - Did you believe the University could survive without a Faculty of Education? No. But -
- The outcome (i.e. now, and 1980) very sad. Opportunity for the two schools to get together and look at Teacher Education. Instead some not necessarily best of colleagues have been taken on by University, and (good) others not.

[The account of someone not offered a tenured appointment at the University].

"I do hope that a number of members of staff of this University come to see that to remain in the British mould of university life and endeavours is no longer suitable".

"Newnham is the sad story". Very unfairly treated in early 1970s by Mt Nelson. Hence Newnham people joined with University to bring about destruction of Mt Nelson. We told Newnham people repeatedly that they would not survive unless we did".

Will it come under the University umbrella? Its life will probably be short.

Suggestion that TCAE was never a viable institution right from the beginning (RSS doesn't quite say this, but almost).

Phillips does not - naturally - agree.

Does he make a convincing case?

"The fundamental problem with the College was not the fact that it was built in the first place, or that it developed degree-giving courses - the fundamental problem in which both the University and the College were trapped (overlooking that the Univ. has come out with greater numbers) - the trap we fell into was that a politician, Mr Batt, had a view of education which he enforced ... by creating a committee. The real findings of that committee were not made public - and thus the Univ. and College were immediately thrown at each other's throat and therefore not able to look at the problem and resolve it between the two of us".

A history of the College is needed - it would be a celebrated case study.

By someone objective!

337 END