Student 1954. Honours in Political Science. Teacher education part-time, which was "less than satisfactory".
Influence of Professor Charles Hardie.
Supervisor of Practice Teaching - ? Hills - Principal from Hobart Teachers' College (which was part of the Education Department) when merged into Education Faculty.

No divisions apparent in the Education Faculty in 1954 when G.J. was a student - or at least not a division between C. Hardie as educational theorist - and others. C.H. always saw role of Faculty in curriculum development - an applied field of study - counter to generally held view of Hardie? H. did not involve himself in day-to-day areas of teacher preparation probably because he did not regard himself as very able in that area.

Staff. Very heavy Tasmanian staff membership essentially - Lottie Wilmot, Perkins, Doe, Collins, Hills etc. Hardie the only person appointed from outside Tasmania. Significance of this. Faculty now more outward-looking e.g. postgraduate work.

Why did Hardie not introduce postgraduate work? He was opposed to postgraduate B.Ed. because he thought it would preclude undergraduate B.Ed. which he had set his sights on. He made a couple of attempts to get undergraduate B.Ed. approved - but this was rejected till 1971 by Professorial Board, when Faculty was investigated and working committee set up (by Professorial Board). Split between Education Department and Faculty - some of Faculty on each side, plus student unrest - led to enquiry.

Special problems of Education Faculties. "The element of performance" in an ageing Faculty?

Other difficulties: vocational preparation being sought by students, criticism because course is not practical enough; on other hand there is also criticism of less-than-academic respectability because of practical aims. Should there, therefore, be Faculties of Education?
If teacher training and curriculum method in C.A.E.s there would be reduced pressure to be "academically respectable".

Anti-university teacher training sentiments have been voiced mainly by infant and primary school teachers. University training has not given these people the broad range of subjects these people need. C.A.E. has not been constrained by traditions.

Has the University "bent" much because such a large percentage of its undergraduates have been engaged in teacher training? Reduced standards? Nonsensical because:-

1) Ed. students have had to be matriculated
2) Ed. students have to pass the subjects the same as anyone else.

(Is this convincing?)

Accusations against Education Faculties. A defence. Comparison with other vocational areas such as Medicine, Engineering and Social Work and Accountancy. The test of academic excellence not enough.


Differences (not personal) between the two (almost the reverse of the commonly-held view of the two men).

The influence and significance of Selby Smith as Dean of Education.

Any change since R. Selby Smith retired and Prof. Kevin Collis took over?

B.Ed. has gone -

Unsatisfactory aspects of B.Ed.: geared for infant and primary teachers, but forced them to specialise too much at expense of broad curriculum studies needs (??).
New developments if amalgamation occurs as proposed:
  Dip.Ed. (Uni.)
  B.Ed. (TCAE)
  M.Ed. - course work (at present TCAE course)
  M.Ed. by thesis (at present University course)
  Ph.D. postgraduate Special Education courses.

Staff and student numbers in the 1980s.

Important changes in students taking Education. Standards raised, people weeded out, as demand for teachers was reduced. Students now are more serious vocationally than they have "ever been" (than they were in the sixties anyway). Students are much better prepared - partly because teaching in universities is much better organised.

Relationship between the Faculty and the Education Dept. surveyed. Continuing not very happy.

Tape finishes in mid-sentence. Dr Johnston felt he had said all he needed to say, so

THE END