

Register  
6th Dec 98.

Advertiser  
5th Dec - 1898.

Register  
6th Dec. 1898.

### THE MUSIC EXAMINATIONS.

The following petition is to be presented to the Council of the Adelaide University:—

Gentlemen—It is with great regret that we find it necessary to make several complaints regarding the mode in which the recent University public examinations in music were conducted. In the first place we emphatically protest against the reprehensible practice of appointing an Examiner who is directly interested in the success of a few of the candidates. Messrs. Gully and Ives state in their published report that "in cases where candidates were personally known to Professor Ives the allotment of marks was left to the other Examiner entirely." This statement is equivalent to an admission by the Examiners that the principle entered to is undesirable, while on our part we regard it as intolerable that such an arrangement should continue, and we repeat our earnest protest against it. Further, if our pupils and the students of the Conservatorium are to compare together we consider it eminently desirable that the examination should be conducted away from the University, and that the entire arrangements be carried out in such a way as to make secure the impartiality of the teachers.

In this connection we make our second complaint. The attendance at the room of the examination made a practice of interrogating the candidates as to who taught them, not in a few cases only, but in scores of ascertained instances, therefore presumably in all. Moreover, the enquiries were made most persistently when they were not at once replied to. For example, one candidate on being asked "Is Mr. — your teacher?" answered "No." After a lapse of a minute or two the attendant said, "You learn from Mr. — then?" "No," was the response. As soon as this candidate had entered the examination-room her companion was asked "Who is her teacher?" and replied "Miss —." In another instance, as the candidate was going away, the attendant, having omitted the usual enquiries before, followed her to secure this information. It will be evident from the foregoing that these questions formed no part of a casual, friendly chat in order to set the candidates at their ease, but that the names of the teachers were systematically obtained. We would suggest that the Council will summon the lady attendant and hear from herself a statement as to whether or not she acted under authority in this matter, and if so under whose; and further we request that the Council will ascertain for what purpose the information was required.

Our third objection is that the published synopsis of requirements for the examinations in music was not adhered to. In the Senior Practical Division, contrary to the express stipulation of the official pamphlet, scales in double octaves, both staccato and legato, were called for by the examiners, thus greatly adding to the difficulty of the examination. As one of the examiners was in a position to "direct" the Conservatorium students respecting the tests to be made at the examination it is obvious that all the other candidates were placed at an unfair disadvantage. Again, in a number of instances no questions whatever were asked in the "elements of music." Most of the candidates concerned were awarded "second-class" but in one or two cases a "first-class" was granted. We do not understand on what principle their marks were allotted. If an "average" was given to each, then in some cases the difference of a mark or two may have deprived well-prepared students of their deserved honours, while on the other hand a mark or two may have given a "first-class" to some one whose theoretical knowledge was below the average. The paper set for the senior theory examination was not altogether a fair one, judging by the papers of past years. Professor Ives made the statement to a private teacher early in the present year that the chromatic change of the Dominant 7th, also the Chords of the Augmented 6th, Dominant 12th, and Dominant 11th, were beyond the requisite standard, and that it was quite unnecessary to study them; yet questions 5 and 6 in this year's paper require a knowledge of all chords named except the 11th. Unfortunately the official pamphlet gives no particulars on this point, and it is conceivable that the harmony from a third year's Mus. Dec. paper might be set, if limited only to four or five parts. There is indeed room for very great improvement as to the published details, which are extremely meagre instead of being simple and complete, such as are supplied by the principal examining bodies of England, and we are of opinion that the syllabus should be more distinctly defined, and certainly more carefully adhered to.

In conclusion, we would greatly prefer to support the Adelaide University if we can do so with the requisite confidence, but we feel that this is shaken by the conditions that have existed recently, and we therefore bring our case before the Council with the earnest hope that its members will see that in future the public examinations in music are conducted in an altogether different manner, wholly out of the hands of any one that can have a personal interest in the results, and thus removed from every possibility of collusion. We suggest as advisable that the Board of Musical Students receive a deputation from our number to confer with them prior to the issue of the calendar for 1899.

This petition bears the following signatures:—Ernest E. Mitchell, E. Harold Davis, Mrs. Bae, A.R.C.O., William B. Chinner, J. M. Dunn, W. R. Pybus, C. J. Stevens, W. B. Hills, G. M. and E. Thornber (Principals Unley Park School), J. A. and F. M. Tilly (Principals Hardwicke College), G. A. and R. Steinhorn (Principals Lothian House, Semaphore), Kathleen Kingston (Mrs. Kingston and Dow, Glenside), J. Williams.

### THE RECENT MUSIC EXAMINATIONS.

The complaints publicly made regarding the recent music examinations at the University are of such a character as to demand the careful attention of the proper authorities. There is no doubt, as Mr. E. E. Mitchell showed in a recent letter, that the present conditions are ill calculated to inspire confidence among teachers of music. On the ground of broad principle objection is rightly taken to the examination of candidates by the director of the Conservatorium. He is obviously interested in the success of those pupils who have received instruction at the institution. Suppose, for example, that candidates from the Conservatorium failed in a larger proportion than students educated by private teachers, would not that be taken to imply that the University teaching arrangements were in some vital particulars defective? And human nature being what it is, is it reasonable to look under any circumstances for confession of such a failure on examination where one of the examiners is the gentleman responsible for the direction of the studies? For the same reasons, the apparently brilliant success of Conservatorium candidates in comparison with others is hardly so impressive a proof of superior teaching as it would be if the examination were known to be perfectly disinterested. Fair as everything might conceivably be, the fact remains that such a system contradicts the maxim that no one should be a judge in his own cause, and the results, rightly or wrongly, will naturally be viewed with suspicion. Like Caesar's wife, the University should be above this. On other grounds the appointment of the director of the Conservatorium as an examiner is regarded as undesirable. The pupils are known to him; he may be aware of their powers in special directions, and be apt to take them more or less for granted, whereas candidates from private schools have painfully to demonstrate their knowledge and abilities to the satisfaction of an examiner who, if not actually unsympathetic, will view them with a cold, impartial eye as strangers. Bias, if any, must tell on the side of the Conservatorium student. More than that, the latter may have had the advantage of a course of study directed towards examination by a teacher who is going to examine, and who is therefore particularly well acquainted with the rocks to be avoided. The position is altogether unsound, and it is not surprising that a chorus of protests should have arisen. If the director of the Conservatorium examines for that institution, the private teacher is certain to consider himself unfairly handicapped. The published pass-lists show exceedingly disappointing results for a numbers of teachers who did remarkably well with their pupils in former years. Some of them obtained quite as good results as any of the teachers who have received appointments at the Conservatorium, but now have failure to record, while their old rivals have suddenly become extraordinarily successful. It is stated that the standard has been raised, but no such explanation will be accepted as adequate while arrangements continue that are so justly open to criticism. In connection with the raising of the standard it is also objected that departures from the prospectus were made without due notice to the teachers. Astonishment has been expressed that candidates have failed in what their instructors held to be their strongest points, while they have passed in branches where they were thought to be particularly weak. The methods adopted at the examination appear to have caused much dissatisfaction, and as the complaints are definite and explicit, and can hardly be explained away as the result of mere irritation in the presence of unexpected failure, the University authorities would do well to take the whole matter into consideration, with the view to the making of such changes as will create confidence in an institution that is still upon its trial.

Ambrose

### UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION.

#### EXAMINATION FOR THE DEGREE OF M.B. AND CH.B.

First Year.  
First Class (in order of merit).—Ethel Mary Murray, Francis Frederick Muecke, Lionel Joseph Robertson, Clive Newland.

Second Class.—None.  
Third Class (in alphabetical order).—Alexander Ruan Caw, Arthur Ross Clayton, Rupert Eric Magarey, Helen Mary Mayo.

\* Recommended for the Elder prize.  
Second Year.  
First Class.—Theodore Ambrose.

Second Class (in alphabetical order).—Phillip Sylvester Clarke, Oscar Sydney Flecker, Edward Woods Moncrieff.

Third Class (in alphabetical order).—Rosamond Agnes Benham, Percy Lewis Broadbent, Charles Digby Halcob, James Frederick Harris, William Ryton Kelly, Stanley Arthur Malin.

Passed in Anatomy, Physiology, and Materia Medica, thereby completing the second year.—Francis Seavington Stuckey.

\* Recommended for the Elder prize.  
Third Year.  
First Class (in order of merit).—Henry Harper Formby, Francis Josiah Bonnin.

Second Class (in alphabetical order).—Rupert Dufty Heggston, William Allen Hunter.

Third Class (in alphabetical order).—Harry Charles Rikard Bell, Thomas Mitchell Drew, William Charles Grey, James Brook Lewis, Clement Armour Verco, Sydney Manton Verco.

Passed in Anatomy.—Elizabeth Eleanor Weld.  
\* Recommended for the Dr. Davison Thomas Scholarship.

#### ORDINARY EXAMINATION FOR THE DEGREE OF B.Sc.

First Year.—Harold Chapple, \*1, \*2, 3, 4; Archie Septimus Clark, \*1, \*2, 3, 5; Cameron Hilder Coventry, 1, 2, 3, 4; Walter Geoffrey Duffield, \*1, \*2, 3, 4, 5; Stanley Victor Easter, \*1, \*2, 3, 5; Gertrude Josephine Jude, 1, 2, 3, 4; Charles Leonard Wainwright, 1, \*2, 3, 5.

1. Pure Mathematics. 2. Physics. 3. Inorganic Chemistry. 4. Biology. 5. Applied Mathematics.  
Passed in Applied Mathematics.

First Year of Mining Course.—Isaac Herbert Boas.  
Second Year.—Isaac Herbert Boas, 2, 3, \*6; Julian Dove Connor, 2, \*5, 6; Cuthbert Lillywhite, \*1, 5; Bertram Whittington, 2, \*5, 6.

1. Physics. 2. Inorganic Chemistry and Assaying. 3. Mathematics. 4. Geology.  
\* An asterisk denotes credit.

#### HONOURS AND SEPARATE SUBJECT LIST.

Third Year.  
Mathematics.—Alfred Maurice Paton, second-class honours; Phoebe Chapple, third-class honours.

Physics.—Alfred Maurice Paton, second-class honours; William Reynolds Bayly, pass; Phoebe Chapple, pass.

Geology and Mineralogy.—Cyril Beaumont Marryat, second-class honours; William John McBride, third-class honours.

Advanced Organic and Inorganic Chemistry.—William Reynolds Bayly, second-class honours.

Metallurgy and Assaying.—William John McBride, first-class honours; Cyril Beaumont Marryat, second-class honours.

#### HIGHER PUBLIC EXAMINATION.

Physics.—Part I.—William Baker, Thomas William Blakie, Mary Home Brown, Hubert Mitchell Dingle, Norman Holthouse Edwards, Hans Hassler, Laura Olga Hedwig Heyne, Francis Alexander Jennings, Alfred Herbert Kingsborough, Robert John Morgan, Harry Edward Noltenius, Wilfred G. R. P. Nordmann, Dora Isabel Paton, Edgar Maurice Ralph, Percy James Rofe, Ernest de Whalley Wingham, Frederick August Wittber.

Physics.—Part II.—William Ternent Cooke, James Howard Phillips.

Chemistry.—Part I.—Louis George Edmunds, Joseph Ellis, Ernest Oliver Trease, James Tulloch.

Chemistry.—Part IIa.—William Ternent Cooke, George Frederic Dodwell, James Simpson Thomson.

Chemistry.—Part IIb.—Percy Walter Jones, Mary Emma Patchell, \*Walter Trudinger.

Botany.—William James Adey, \*Edith Collison, Louis George Edmunds, Hans Hassler, Charles John Woodroffe Mundy, \*Olive Gertrude Newman, Mary Emma Patchell.

Geology.—Edith Collison, George Frederic Dodwell, Andrew Ferguson, William Henry Frick, \*Nigel Stuart Giles, Olive Gertrude Newman, \*Frederick William Reid, Thomas Lionel Searle, \*Walter Trudinger.

Biology.—George Alfred Hancock, Ernest Gladstone Mitton, Charles Stanley Newman, Mary Emma Patchell.  
Physiology.—\*May Burgess.  
\* An asterisk denotes credit.