

Advertiser
24th Dec. 1898.

"The Register"
27th December, 1898

Copy of letter received from Herr Heinicke.
Re the correspondence in the daily papers on the recent examinations, may I request that you will inform the Board of Musical Studies and the public, if you think fit, that as far as my students are concerned, the assertion that the teachers should have been given hints by the director as to the tests which probably would be applied at the examination, is simply untrue, and more unjust to my students than to myself, as casting reflections upon their capability of passing the tests required of them.

(Signed) H. HEINICKE,
Supervisor of music examination.

Copy of letter from Miss Galbraith, supervisor of music examination.
Charles-street, Norwood, December 7, 1898.
Dear Sir—In reply to yours of the 5th instant, I wish respectfully to repeat my verbal offer to you to appear before the Council of the University, or the Board of Musical Studies, and explain all that I did in connection with the examination. I have absolutely nothing to conceal. My reply to the charges in the petition is as follows:—

1. That I was not instructed to ask the pupils by whom they were taught, and that I did not in any single case tell the examiners or anybody else who taught them.
2. That I did not ask many of the pupils who was their teacher, and that my motive for asking any of them that question was my desire to prevent the candidate from being over-nervous, and to save the registrar or examiners the trouble of writing to them if they should have left the University before the examiners had quite finished the consideration of their case, as some of them were in haste to depart by train.
3. That neither before nor after the examination had I the slightest communication with any of the examiners. I shall be only too glad to enter fully into the whole matter, if it is deemed necessary by the council. But in the meantime I beg to say, without any reserve, that what I did was done on my own authority, and that as I held my peace about it all, it could not affect the examination either way.

I remain, &c.,
(Signed) A. GALBRAITH,
Supervisor of the Musical Exam.
To C. R. Hodge, Esq., Registrar, University.
The report was adopted by the council at a meeting on December 22.

"The Register"
27th Dec. 1898

ADELAIDE: TUESDAY, DEC. 27, 1898.

THE UNIVERSITY MUSICAL EXAMINATIONS.

In a very leisurely manner the University Council has replied to the protest sent to it by leading teachers of music on account of alleged irregularities in connection with the recent examinations of the Adelaide University. We cannot congratulate the compilers of the reply upon its character, or upon the decision which it records. Considering the nature of the charges made, it is not at all satisfactory. Apparently the Council has yet to be acquainted with the real nature of the position, which may be indicated in a free paraphrase of an admonitory sentence in the report to which we are now alluding:—"It is idle for this University to expect that the average mortal will feel confidence in the University examinations so long as pupils of competing teachers are examined by a competing teacher," and if this confidence should be lacking the University certificate of competency may become a mere source of amusement. In opening its reply the Board of Musical Studies appears to assume that the Professor of Music cannot make mistakes, and that practically everything in connection with the recent examinations was quite in order. So far as the first point is concerned no question affecting the efficiency of the Professor was raised by the petitioners, and there was not any need to affirm what was not challenged. The public may resemble the Board in its admiration of Professor Ives as a teacher of music or as an examiner, but he ought not to ask them to accept him in both capacities, unless he can assure them that his human nature is of an uncommon variety. On the second point we are bound to say that the report is unconvincing, and contains nothing in any way justifying Professor Ives in occupying the dual position of Principal of the Elder Conservatorium and examiner in music while students of the Conservatorium compete at the University examinations. If they were intended as a fair and impartial enquiry into the charges made by the local teachers of music the proceedings of the University authorities were highly injudicious. The Board of Musical Studies is a very small body, Professor Ives is its Chairman, and its chief other musical member is one of the Professor's subordinates. In the absence of any statement to the contrary, we assume that these two gentlemen took part in the investigation of the accusations; and if they did the fact will naturally affect the popular judgment concerning the Board's report.

However, the public are told that after full consideration the Council has accepted the explanations and adopted the report of the Board, and evidently in the pleasant antepast of Christmas the Council

pillors passed over some rather obvious contradictions. "The Board," says the report, "has thorough confidence in Professor Ives, and is satisfied that he was not interested directly or indirectly in the success of any of the candidates except so far as any Professor in any Faculty is interested in the success of students under his care." Surely this is an admission that Professor Ives was necessarily interested in the Conservatorium students. The Board very considerably recommends that in future the Professor shall be relieved from teaching those students—doubtless in theory—who may be candidates at the public examinations in music; and that gentleman, naturally not wishing to risk the strain of overwork, has given his full concurrence to the arrangement. So that the result of a complaint against a system of examinations is a determination to reduce the strength of the teaching staff of the Conservatorium! Yet logic is taught at that institution! The trifling alteration proposed cannot affect Professor Ives's real interest in the Conservatorium students while he is the head of that institution. Is not the Principal of St. Peter's or Prince Alfred or Way College as much interested in the success of his students at the University Examinations as the masters who directly prepare the boys? He must be even more so, for the success or otherwise of an establishment invariably reflects first of all upon the man at its head. The foregoing comparison suggests the real sardonic humour of the position. Fancy the Principal of Prince Alfred being examiner of the pupils of all three Colleges!

With regard to the various departures from the published synopsis, the report states that—"We are satisfied, too, that every requirement of the examination was complied with, and that none of the regulations was contravened." Yet, taking the one question of the scales, it is admitted that these were called for in double octaves; and, as the last syllabus and all its predecessors distinctly specify "single notes," the paragraph which we have quoted seems somewhat mystifying as a specimen of accuracy. In attempted justification of what cannot be justified the report states that "these tests (the double octaves) have always been applied since the examinations were instituted, and teachers who have sent up candidates in former years have been quite aware of it." Evidently those who signed the protest did not know of this requirement, and they represent the great majority of the best-known local teachers of music who have passed a fair number of pupils in the first class at most of the examinations hitherto held by the University. Besides, is it not true that a student obtained a first-class pass in the senior piano-playing even so recently as the examination held in November, 1897, without being asked to play scales in double octaves? The chief cause of complaint, however, lies in the fact that without warning the standard was raised all around. Doubtless this was arranged with the worthy motive of securing the co-operation of the Associated Board and the practical assistance of its examiner, but it should not have been done so hastily. As the University had an experimental year of this arrangement with the Associated Board in 1897 there is no excuse for its having left the final adjustments until the eleventh hour, thus inducing some students to prepare for ordinary tests only to find themselves confronted with the most exacting English standard. At least the University authorities should have informed the public directly the change was made, and then private teachers could have followed the methods of the Conservatorium and sent up only the very best of their pupils. A letter from Mr. Frederick Cliffe is quoted to show that that gentleman did not know the name or teacher of a single candidate, and that he was "jointly responsible" for every mark allotted. It seems difficult for Mr. Cliffe and Professor Ives to reconcile this statement with the following paragraph which appeared in the examiners' report signed by both of them:—"In cases where candidates were personally known to Professor Ives the allotment of marks was left to the other Examiner entirely." This indicates a queer notion of "jointly;" and, apart from that, surely Conservatorium students could not be more plainly distinguished than by such a course as that adopted. Many more points in the report might be readily answered, but sufficient has been

written to show that the University authorities are not willing to provide a musical examination in which outside teachers shall have unquestioning confidence, and the fundamental mistake which they made in founding the institution proves that they do not appreciate the responsibilities of their position relatively to the public to whom Sir Thomas Elder left his bequest and the Conservatorium which is spending it—spending it, too, in a way which the donor would probably never have countenanced.

Advertiser
28th Dec. 1898.

THE MUSIC EXAMINATIONS.

To the Editor.

Sir—The protest forwarded to the University Council has at last drawn a report from the Board of Musical Studies. Reference is made therein to me as "some one whose name is not communicated," so that it may be appropriate that I should answer it. En passant, it may be mentioned that the following gentlemen are among the members of this board:—Chairman, Professor Ives, director of the Conservatorium; and Mr. J. G. Reimann, pianoforte teacher, Conservatorium. First, their report states that "The board have thorough confidence in Professor Ives, and are satisfied that he was not interested directly or indirectly in the success of any of the candidates except so far as any professor in any faculty is interested in the success of students under his care." Your readers are not likely to accept this statement. Not one of the professors of other faculties occupies an anomalous position similar to that held by Professor Ives. It is futile to maintain that he, as director of the Elder Conservatorium, is not specially interested in the success of candidates sent up by the institution for which he is responsible. It is mere trifling for the board to affirm, in effect, that he would not prefer his own students to pass "first-class." The pupils of private teachers would, at the best, be regarded by him without anxiety for or against; bias, if any, must tell in favor of Conservatorium students. We teachers would, perhaps, be content if an archangel were appointed to a position so delicate, but Professor Ives is not an archangel, and we are not content. The report continues:—"We think it wise that in future the professor of music shall not teach any of the students of the Conservatorium who may be candidates at the public examinations in music." What does this mean? That if Professor Ives imparts any instruction to Conservatorium students they shall be debarred from competing at any future examination in music, or does it mean only that as soon as any student's name is entered for an examination the professor will then cease to teach them? The first interpretation is not likely to be the true one, while if the latter is correct the recommendation is perfectly useless—indeed it may mean much—little or nothing at all—according to circumstances. In the third clause of the report the board profess themselves satisfied with the attendant's letter. The lady states that her motive for asking candidates who was their teacher was her desire to prevent them "from being over nervous and to save the registrar or examiners the trouble of writing to them if they should have left the University," &c. The board commends "the kindly motive," but it is only right to point out that occasionally such pains were taken to elicit the names that some of the candidates were rather worried than set at ease. Further, as the registrar possesses a complete list of the names of teachers and candidates, to which he can refer by number, it will be seen that the enquiries were quite superfluous so far as he was concerned. Lastly in this connection on the lady's own admission quoted above, the names were obtained to save the examiners trouble. Accepting this as true, would she not naturally make her list as complete as possible? In clause 4 the board do not in any sense meet the teachers' objection—"that the published synopsis of requirements for the examinations in music was not adhered to." In direct contradiction to the board's report I repeat the words of the protest, that "in a number of instances no questions whatever were asked in the 'elements of music.'" Some of the candidates were especially dissatisfied in this respect. One of them states that during almost the whole of the time she was playing her test piece neither of the examiners came near the pianoforte—one was having his afternoon tea, and the other stood near the window. In this case the candidate was not asked a single question of any kind, but was merely instructed what to play. "With reference to scales in double octaves," the report says, "these tests have always been applied since these examinations were instituted, and teachers who have sent up candidates in former years have been quite aware of it." In other words, because Professor Ives without authority had previously exceeded the stipulated requirements of the University, therefore (the board would maintain) he is right in continuing an unfair procedure. Because wrong has been done in the past they imply that there should be no objection to it now. It may be true that some teachers who have sent up candidates in former years have been quite aware of the despotically added requirements, but how did the knowledge come to them? Probably by the lamentations of some plucked pupil. It is manifestly unfair that a candidate who is well prepared up to the published standard should fail or miss her credit because she cannot satisfactorily accomplish something beyond that standard.

Sir, Reimann says:—"It passes my comprehension utterly how pieces of the required standard can be studied without a deeper knowledge of chromatic as well as double-octave scales." He knows as well as I do that many works can be selected from the senseless that require no legato octave-playing whatever, so that his little pal at the poor ignorant private teachers of this colony is quite harmless. We made not the least objection to the standard being raised. By all