PERKINS, MR W. - Senior Lecturer in Education Mr R. Chappell contributing

1925 Intermediate examination.

1927 Leaving and Matriculation; both exams then conducted by the University.

1928 teaching for six months at Blackwood Creek, as a bonded Education Dept. student.

Mid-1928 to Philip Smith Training College.

1929 began Arts degree.

Very little connection between above institution and university - separate sporting and social organisations. Not aware of any sense of being 2nd class citizens - just no common ground. Completed half his degree, five subjects, in one year.

050 "A" and "B" courses.

1930-32 appointed as Senior English master at Queenstown High which then had matriculation classes for a few years before the inevitable cuts occurred.

Did Colonial History as external student.

1933-36 teaching at Hobart High, completing degree and Dip.Ed.
1934 HARDEST YEAR IN LIFE. Examination results of students in school influenced teaching mark of teachers, hence need not to neglect. $1 \times H.D.$, $3 \times D.$ in final degree exams.

- Teaching at Tech, High School, with internal examining, which started in Tasmania in 1938. First act on being allowed to change courses was to abolish formal grammar and introduce functional grammar.
- After war, Schools Board developed, with external examining?? (some confusion here) The Intermediate still internal for (old) High Schools: Hobart, Ogilvie, Launceston, Dev., Burnie, Scottsdale; and Hob. L'ton and Q'town Junior Techs.
- 1946 appointment at Univ. Guidance officer.
 1946 establishment of Educ. Faculty. Prof. Hardie 1947.
 1948 appointed as lecturer in English method. Other staff: Tom Doe in Science method, Hills, Tom Collins, Lottie Wilmot. Training College closed down end of 1947. Faculty occupied same building and took over all teacher-training in Tas. In 1950s L'ton T.C. established because Hobart could not cope with numbers regd.

PERKINS, Mr W. - Senior Lecturer in Education Mr R. Chappell contributing (contd.)

Difference between earlier T.C. course and later Educ. Faculty course:
less practical and more philosophical. Professor Hardie's influence;
criticism of him for "never" going into schools. But appealed to elite
of students. Ordinary and esp. certificate students "never saw him."
Good feature of change was reduction in segregation of trainee teachers
from univ. students. Likewise, ed. staff met univ. staff.
W. Hills and Lottie Wilmot only two of "Old" T.C. staff who went over
to univ. staff (cf. Tech. and TCAE staff in 1971; and threat of job
loss to TCAE staff on similar grounds in 1978..)

Vast majority of students in early Ed. Faculty years destined for primary schools. High schools largely staffed by non-graduates. (Some uncertainty here).

Comparison of older and newer systems of teacher training: concurrent and overworked; or end-on and lacking in practical experience.

CHAPPELL, Roy Senior Lecturer in Education 1952-Arrived in Tasmania 1949? Cambridge graduate: taught in schools for 3 years.

350 Bill Perkins continuing:

Two prominent people on English staff: J.A. Johnson, Principal of Teachers' College: and Professor A.B. Taylor - "the exact opposite of Johnson" -former a Tennyson, latter a Browning man. Often in conflict (details). Taylor anti-religious, anti-Catholic especially - In 1930s Catholic nuns and priests forbidden to attend his lectures. See Togatus - then edited by Geoffrey Redding (?)

Taylor's method of lecturing, and some distinguished students V. entertaining final year in English.

PERKINS, Mr W. - Senior Lecturer in Education Mr R. Chappell contributing (contd.)

Roy Chappell continuing:

Financial stringency: salary of a thousand pounds inadequate for growing family, so worked at Jones jam factory in Christmas vacation for two years - "strictly illegal of course". Transferred from H. School to primary teaching in order to get quick promotion, which would otherwise have been impeded by Teachers' Federation.

Became lecturer in Primary Method in Ed. Faculty in 1952. Found immediate interest in wider university rather than in own Department.

immediate interest in wider university rather than in own Department Became Secretary of Staff Assn. in a vital period, owing to growing dissatisfaction of staff with Univ. Council as executive body. "No desire to move ahead" on part of Council.

Demand for Royal Commission - a key point in Univ. history. Univ. staff completely united at time of R.C. Prof. Taylor was president of Staff Assn. at that time - had a terrible time in witness box. In spite of bitterness, much achieved by Royal Commission - curbed domination of Council over academic staff. After that the Professorial Board became chief policy maker.

Orr case set a united university into a new state of division.

Vindictiveness on part of establishment in not accepting Orr's resignation, but insisting on "administering justice".

Side B

Chappell was only member of Education Faculty to support Orr. James McAuley changed attitude re Orr - at first pro, then anti, says Perkins (opinion only).

(Sir) John Kerr initially pro, then anti Orr.

Main reason Perkins was against Orr was Orr's treatment of Jugoslav called Milanov (?)

Side B Division in Education Faculty re ORR. Chappell was the only member of of Education Faculty who supported ORR. Upset the University for 10 years Perkins 1956-1966.

tape Has anyone changed his/her mind about the ORR case? Perkins, James McA. ("I'm not certain about this").

Also Mr John Kerr, who started off pro-ORR.

The case of the Jugoslav MILANOV, victimised by ORR. This was the reason K. DALLAS was anti-ORR.

This section illustrative of the division still existing on the subject of ORR. - Perkins and Chappell still disagree.

O53 Continuation of Chappell interview some time later.

1966 - The state of the Education Faculty - a confrontation between two parties.

O60 Student opinions of various faculties undertaken by student body.

Education students, possibly under leadership of Patti Warn. Produced a document of 25 points of dispute about the Ed. Faculty. This shown by the professor to other staff. Chappell backed 18 out of the 25 points. Professor H. very critical of Chappell for seeing validity of 18 points. [and agreement on this matter with B. Perkins]

Main points:

Lack of encouragement to experiment Lack of funds for excursions Disbelief in the tutorial system Lack of money for research.

C. thinks he was about the only one at the time trying to do any research.

In 1968 C. obtained a grant (against the wishes of his professor) from the Research Committee (under the chairmanship at that time of Professor Bloom).

There were no degrees except Cert. for Primary Education and Diploma for Sec. Education - nothing to go on to, though Faculty had been going since 1946.

There was no staff agitation for any of these improvements before the students raised matters.

R.C. himself not critical until in 1958-59 he went to lively Educ. Dept. of University of Chicago. Did not realise "how backward we were". Conversation in staff room was lively and vital. On return everyone friendly but no one wished to discuss educational matters. 1966 study leave at Institute of Education in London led to re-charging of energies. Perkins and I tried to disturb things, to make professor and fellow staff members aware of need for change and of doing more. This led to formation in 1970 of a committee by the Vice-Chancellor Sir George Cartland to look into affairs of Education Faculty.

Details of campaign initiated in 1970. e.g. prepared papers on visits to other universities. Contrast with Faculty in Univ. of Newcastle, which had been going for roughly same time as Tasuni, dept. about the same size. But variety of courses. "A severe criticism of our own Faculty". Need for Bachelor of Education frequently raised by Perkins and Chappell, and put down by rest of Faculty. Some help from outside members e.g. Athol Gough, Director of Education; and from members of University appointed to Ed. Faculty e.g. Profs. Grant and Joske, and rep. from Catholic schools.

Students in general didn't concern themselves - only one year to endure.

Very great confrontation needed to lead to such a drastic effect as this V-C's Committee. Prof. Hardie resigned as Dean, and Prof. Joske appointed by Professorial Board as Acting-Dean. "A series of very unpleasant Faculty meetings at which the sides drew battle lines".

Was there any effort to come to terms with your criticism?

Only efforts were setting up of sub-committee to provide new courses for a B.Ed. degree. Sub-committee: the Professor, Mr Doe, and who else? But it didn't succeed in passing the Faculty. The dissension grew, and V-C and Professorial Board well aware of it, leading to the formation of V-C's committee.

Another factor at time was new TCAE with teacher-training courses. View grew up in University among other departments: Why not send all trainee teachers to TCAE?

So Faculty had to change and develop: or slow death; or taken away from University and put up "on the hill".

This was not, it appears, a simple division between the activists, who wanted better teacher training, and the others who wanted a quiet life in order to get on with their research. The activists i.e. Perkins and Chappell wanted opportunities for research. What then did the oppositions want? Just a quiet life?

C: I was the only one from 69 to 71 engaged in research, and with a grant. So they must have been quite satisfied with their own lecturing programmes; they were not engaged in research to the best of my knowledge. There was no encouragement to go ahead with research: there was a definite disbelief in the value of research. Professor Hardie has written on this subject and has shown there are so many variables in educational research that it is very difficult to reach any satisfactory conclusion. This is so, but I felt that research was valuable, esp. on e.g. dislike for school, (which was C's area). What was Professor Hardie doing then?

C: No comment. Except he continued to run a socially pleasant department, for the ones who were his friends. As a result of the V-Cs committee, Prof. Selby Smith was appointed as 2nd professor. Perkins and I put this forward as a recommendation, and gave evidence to the V-Cs committee.

Perkins Perkins at this point confirms and supports the above. Particularly conts. needed was a professor who was good at administration. Prof. Selby Smith took over shortly as head of the department, revolutionised it and it has now become very successful, with more students than all other vocational faculties put together. This from a point where the previous administration was prepared to hand over all teacher-training to TCAE. Now the University Education Faculty is the dominant force in teacher training in Tasmania.

Tribute to Hardie's personal charm and humour by Perkins. And regret at giving evidence against him.

How did RSS revolutionise?

By adding new subjects, introduced B.Ed., attracted new staff - gave respect to the Faculty. M.Ed. added.

Hardie hated change of any kind: "chopping and changing".

Perkins failed to get the Readership he applied for in 1972. Decisions on readerships are made by Prof. Committee - all others said they supported him, but own professor did not support him.

Perkins' main achievement as he sees it was introducing film education into Australia: a pioneer, has written two text books. Hardie did not unfortunately think this important; a classicist, not in touch with contemporary society, never went into the schools to see what was going on; didn't believe in comprehensive high schools and tried to pretend they didn't exist. After first year or two he never went into the schools: Chappell and I believed in visiting the schools, and that our chief role was the practical training of teachers for the Tas. Ed. system.

Hardie was appointed in 1947, a year before the Faculty was formed, with a very good reputation as an educational philosopher (based on one slim volume - <u>Truth and Fallacy in Education</u>). Wrote numerous articles for esoteric journals. [Query: Why not known by Prof. A.K. STOUT q.v.]

490

W: Would Prof. Hardie have been more at home in a philosophy department?

P: After Orr case, the University invited Hardie to take Chair of Philosophy, and he accepted. Ask IAN SMITH what happened - I forget.

C: The appointment of Hardie was opposed by the philosophers.

W: Because they were blackballing the appointment of anybody?, or specifically Hardie?

C: Yes, partly that, but also they weren't in favour ... [of Hardie] END

Mr R. Chappell has copy of University Education: a survey of student opinion. MAY 1966

Recommends interview Patti WARN