

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1908.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 451, 10th June 1908.

Capitation Grant.

Recording papers connected with the question of reducing the — for the pupils in the infant standard.

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1908.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 451, 10th June 1908.

Capitation Grant.

Recording papers connected with the question of reducing the — for the pupils in the infant standard.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

I

Memorandum No. 1290-2, Educational, dated 12th October 1907.

It has been suggested that the capitation grant for pupils in the infant standard should be reduced to 4 annas and the grants for pupils in the fourth and higher standards increased proportionately. The Director is requested to report on this suggestion and advise on the rates at which the grants for those classes should be fixed if effect is given to the suggestion, submitting an estimate of the additional cost, if any, which may be involved.

H. D. TAYLOR,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

II

Letter—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. BOURNE, D.Sc., F.R.S., Director of Public Instruction, Madras.
To—the Secretary to Government, Educational Department.
Dated—the 4th November 1907.
No.—Ref. on Cur. 7611.

In reply to Memorandum No. 1290-2, Educational, dated 12th October 1907, I have the honour to state that I am not in favour of reducing the capitation grant for the pupils in the infant standard to 4 annas. If any reduction had to be made, it should affect the four lowest standards equally. Otherwise there would be continual attempts to promote pupils unduly for the sake of the higher grant even in schools with these standards only. Any reduction, however, seems unnecessary and undesirable.

The schools aided under Chapter III of the Grant-in-Aid Code may be placed in four categories—

(i) Schools with standards infant to III. These number about 10,000 out of a total of about 13,000.

(ii) Schools with standards infant to IV in which standard IV has been added for the sake of a few pupils to whom the teacher (such schools have as a rule only one teacher) devotes most of his attention to the neglect of the lower standards. It would be in the true interests of education if such schools had no standard IV.

(iii) Schools with standards infant to IV more or less properly staffed and equipped—schools, in other words, which rightly have standard IV and may look forward to having higher standards. This and the previous group number together about 2,700, but it would be rash to apportion this total between them, group (ii) must, I fear, have by far the larger number.

(iv) Schools with standards higher than standard IV. It is not yet known how many of the existing schools with these higher standards will be classed as elementary schools, the number for the present is under 50.

A consideration of the above facts shows that Chapter III of the Grant-in-Aid Code deals primarily with schools of group (i) and to alter the grant for the infant standard would be to injuriously affect the finances of the majority of the schools for the sake of a few. I need hardly go further but it is certainly open to argument whether to reduce the grant to the infant standard is necessary for their sake even. I mean that funds can be found for these few without altering the grants of the others.

The time is approaching for the removal of the foot-notes from the Grant-in-Aid Code and for altering the scale of grants on behalf of elementary schools (Grant-in-Aid Code rule 15). These were all temporary provisions and in this connection I intend to propose higher rates of grant for elementary schools containing the higher standards.

III

Letter—from the Hon'ble Mr. A. G. BOURNE, D.Sc., F.R.S., Director of Public Instruction, Madras.
To—the Secretary to Government, Educational Department.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 1st June 1908.
No.—R.C. 3299.

With reference to your reminder, dated 3rd May 1908, regarding proposals on the question of reducing the capitation grant for pupils in the infant standard, I have the honour to state that your Memorandum No. 1290-2, dated 12th October 1907, was replied to in my R.C. No. 764, dated 4th November 1907. In that communication I expressed an intention of proposing higher rates of grant for elementary schools containing the higher standards, but after a full investigation of the position I came to the conclusion that the matter might and should lie over for the present, the provision made at the end of rule 16 of the Grant-in-Aid Code for the increase of the grant in special cases being utilized when necessary.

Order—No. 451, Educational, dated 10th June 1908.

Recorded.

(True Extract.)

H. D. TAYLOR,
Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 451, EDUCATIONAL, DATED
10TH JUNE 1908.

[SUBJECT.—*Alteration in the rate of capitation grants to aided elementary schools*].

In paragraph 5 (a) of their memorial, dated 11th April 1907, the Missionary Council on Aided Education observed :

" 5. *Elementary schools*.—One of the main features of the new Grant-in-Aid Code and of the revised Educational Rules is the distinction which they make between elementary and secondary education. Your memorialists approve of this distinction being clearly maintained, provided that no injury is done to the spread of education.

" According to the code, elementary schools are to receive aid on the principle that the amount of grant shall vary according to the number and qualifications of the masters and according to the number of scholars in attendance. This principle is well adapted to the conditions of elementary schools, but your memorialists would point out the following grave objections to the way in which practical effect has been given to it :—

" (a) The grant of Rs. 36 a year for each trained teacher of proved ability together with As. 8 for each pupil in average daily attendance is suited to the needs of schools only of the very lowest grade, that is, schools in villages in which the highest class is the second or third standard. In schools in which the highest class is the fourth standard and in which there are therefore five classes a better-paid staff is required and for such schools the grant of Rs. 36 a year towards the salary of each teacher is inadequate. In schools with a fifth, sixth or seventh standard class, which elementary schools in towns usually have, and for the teachers of which correspondingly higher salaries must be paid, this grant is wholly inadequate."

2. The Acting Director of Public Instruction (Mr. Logan), who was consulted in the matter, stated :

" Paragraph 5 (a).—Declares that the grant of Rs. 36 a year for each teacher plus As. 8 for each pupil is inadequate in the case of elementary schools maintaining standards above the third. This, no doubt, is true and unless altered will, I am afraid, result in a large decrease in the number of schools with standards above the third. I have had this point under consideration for some time and feel convinced that a graduated scale of grants to teachers is most desirable ;

" (c) complains of the uniform capitation grant for all standards. This should be considered along with paragraph 5 (a). Dr. Bourne in his letter submitting the revised code to Government says that the uniform rate was adopted ' to prevent premature promotions ', and if I remember rightly, many managers at the Conference supported this view. Memorialists assert that the uniform grant ' will certainly have the effect of accentuating the disparity that already exists, etc., etc. ' and ' that it is much easier to get children to enter the infant standard than to retain them in the third and fourth standards '. I must say that I fail to see this point here ; the continuance of the children at school is determined by the will of their parents or guardians and cannot be influenced in any way, as far as I can see, by a capitation grant, be it uniform or graduated, which goes entirely into the pockets of the managers.

"With regard to paragraph 5 (a), (b), (c).—I think memorialists may be informed that the amounts (i.e., rates of grants) were only fixed tentatively (see Dr. Bourne's letter to Government, dated 7th December 1905, paragraph 15) and were based upon the total amount available. There was no intention of reducing this total amount (see again Dr. Bourne's letter), and if more money is available the rates will undoubtedly be raised. But with the present amount available the raising of rates in the higher grades will only necessitate the reduction of them in the lower."

3. In paragraph 3 of his note, dated 16th May 1907, the Secretary (Mr. Taylor) noted—

"As to the uniform capitation grant of As. 8 per head for all pupils including infants there is something to be said on both sides. The higher the standard, the higher the qualifications of the master will be, and the higher also will be the master's pay. Perhaps a higher rate might be allowed for pupils in standards over the 4th, a reduction being made from As. 8 to As. 4 in the case of infants. Under rule 17 Inspecting officers have power to check promotions, and to reduce pupils to a lower class, though exception is taken by the memorialists later on (paragraph 7 of the memorial) to such interference on the part of Inspecting officers. If concessions are given so as to admit of the variation of the rate of grant for the different standards, it will be necessary to insist all the more strongly on the close exercise of this supervision by Inspecting officers."

4. In his demi-official, dated 31st May 1907, Mr. Logan who was asked to furnish a rough estimate stated as follows:—

"The total number of Public primary schools is 20,485; of these 2,706 are Government and Local Board Schools, the remainder 17,779 are public schools under mission or private management. Taking 28,019 as the total number of teachers in public Primary schools we get 1.3 as the average number of teachers for each school. Making allowance for the better staffing of Government and Board schools I calculate that 22,000 would roughly represent the number of teachers in public Primary schools other than Government and Board schools."

5. In his later note, dated 31st May 1907, the Secretary noted—

"The actual cost of such a sliding scale would depend upon the scale adopted."

"Taking as a reasonable standard the scale laid down for schools under public management in article 82 of the Educational Rules, it would seem that where there is 1 teacher on Rs. 8 the proportion of teaching grant would be Rs. 3/8. Adopting the scale generally and applying the proportion to the average salaries as worked out in paragraph 1 of my note the scale of grants would work out approximately as follows:—

	RS.
1 teacher	3
2 teachers each	3.375
3	3.75
4	4.22
5	4.875
6	5.625
7	6.41
8	7.5

"Perhaps for boys' schools the sliding scale, if adopted, might be fixed at Rs. 3 for each master where one master is employed."

"Rs. 3-8-0 for each master where two masters are employed."

"Rs. 4 where 3 or 4 masters are employed."

"Rs. 5 where 5 or 6 masters are employed."

"Rs. 6 where 7 or 8 masters are employed."

"There would probably be very few schools of the last two classes."

"Taking the Director of Public Instruction's figures of 22,000 teachers for 17,779 schools under mission or private management we get an excess of 4,221 masters over and above an allowance of one master per school."

"If we assume roughly that 3,000 of these are second masters and 1,221 masters of higher grades and allow Re. 1 per mensem extra for each of the 3,000 or Rs. 2 extra for each of the 1,221 we should get an increased grant of Rs. 65,304 per annum, to which a small amount would have to be added for increased allowances to girls' schools, say, Rs. 70,000 in all. But these figures are, at the best, pure guess work."

"I have worked out the figures from a different stand-point, but practically arrive at the same amount of extra cost as worked out in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the office note, supra."

6. The Hon'ble Member noted—

"The inadequacy in Elementary schools of Rs. 36 a year per teacher plus As. 8 per head of pupils."

"The scale was admittedly tentative (vide paragraph 15 of the Director of Public Instruction's letter on page 4 of G.O., No. 356 M., dated 21st May 1906); but it was so calculated that on the whole the Missionary schools would not draw less than they were doing under the former code with its system of abolished results grants. The new code and rules, however, insist on a better and more numerous staff in Elementary schools in order that the reproach of inefficient education may be removed; and consequently where Elementary schools provide the higher standards the old staff of teachers has doubtless proved unsuitable and inadequate, and extra cost will have in some cases to be incurred to comply with the new code requirements. However, grants in aid are limited and the question is how far Government can go to give additional aid. Nor can Government in deciding the matter look at Missionary schools alone but must deal out the same treatment to all schools alike. Missionary schools feel the pinch more, I understand, because generally they have a more costly staff; but I am not sure how far this is the fact."

"I have, as will be seen above, endeavoured to get some estimate of the additional financial demand which a higher teachers' grant in the Elementary schools would involve."

Mr. Logan estimated it at Rs. 81,250 exclusive of girls' schools—page 14 of K.W. G.O., No. 190, Educational, dated 16th March 1908.

H. D. TAYLOR.

* Rule 81 of the Educational rules prescribes the numbers.

"We have not as yet got the Director of Public Instruction's estimate; but Mr. Taylor has roughly calculated, on the basis of graduating the grant with reference to the number of teachers employed* that an additional Rupees 70,000 would be required."

"I am not in favour of a complicated sliding scale such as suggested; but would be prepared to consider increasing the grant for teachers employed for the 4th standard and upwards. At the same time it is to be remembered that in the higher standards it must be assumed that higher fees are paid and the cost of these classes so proportionately met. It would probably suffice to raise the teachers' grant for such classes from Rs. 36 to Rs. 50. But until we get the Director of Public Instruction's estimates we should not make any definite promise except that we hope to do something to increase the grants."

"The uniform capitation grant.—This is fully discussed in the notes. I am inclined as suggested by Mr. Taylor to reduce the capitation for infants to As. 4, a proposal which he tells me he has ascertained that many would approve and distribute the saving in raising the capitation in the fourth and higher standards."

7. In his note, dated 15th June 1907, the Secretary directed that the Director of Public Instruction should be asked to submit an estimate of cost of increasing teaching grants on the lines indicated by the Honourable Member.

8. In a later demi-official, dated 25th June 1907, the Director of Public Instruction (Mr. Logan) wrote as follows:—

“Your demi-official of 30th May 1907 regarding the question of graduating the scale of grants to teachers.

“It may be taken for granted that the third standard schools will receive adequate grants under the present scale of Rs. 36 per teacher, and no graduation seems to be necessary in their case.

“As for schools containing the fourth and higher standards, I suggest that they should be graduated according to the number of teachers, and that the grant for each school should be 40 per cent. of the amount of the salaries calculated at the rates of rule 82 of the Madras Educational Rules. The scale of grants on this basis would be as follows:—

“*Staff grants to schools having the fourth and higher standards.*

Number of teachers.	Monthly salaries according to scale of rule 82.	Grant.	
		Per month.	Per annum.
	RS.	RS.	RS.
1	8	3	36
2	18	7	84
3	30	12	144
4	45	18	216
5	65	26	312
6	90	36	432
7	120	48	576
8	160	64	768

“Thus a school having standards Infant to IV and having a teacher for each would receive a staff grant of Rs. 312 *plus* the capitation grant of Re. $\frac{1}{2}$ per pupil.

“We have no tabulated information as to the number of schools of each class, and without this information a reliable estimate of the additional cost which this scheme will entail cannot be formed. In the manuscript lists of schools aided in 1906–1907, however, the standard of each aided school and the number of teachers were given and it would be possible from these lists to tabulate the various classes of aided elementary schools for the purpose of graduating the grant, but it would take at least a fortnight to make the tabulation. I have accordingly selected four districts in different parts of the Presidency as (Ganjām, Bellary, Trichinopoly and Tinnevely) samples and find that in these four districts there are 4,856 teachers in aided schools, who under the present scale would receive Rs. 14,568 per mensem and under the new scale Rs. 15,465, an increase of 6.2 per cent. The increase per cent. varies from 4 in Ganjām to 9.4 in Trichinopoly, and the average of the percentages is 6.4.

“I think that if we assume that the scheme will require 6.25 per cent. addition to the grants calculated on the Rs. 36 basis we shall be within the mark. Taking the total grant as Rs. 13,00,000 the additional cost will be Rs. 81,250.

“The note does not mention girls' schools, but their grants require enhancing. I suggest rates 33½ per cent. higher than for boys. This would bring them into the position they occupied before the new Code. It will not mean any extra expense as we have not yet reduced the grants to girls' schools in accordance with the Code.

“I have not mentioned Lower Secondary schools which will ultimately become elementary. At present they are nearly all receiving adequate grants under chapter IV and the proposed scale will not in their case cause additional expenditure.”

9. The Hon'ble Member observed: “Orders on the memorial must, as I mentioned to Secretary, be deferred until we decide finally on the report of the Director of Public Instruction which we have asked him to make, as to advisability of increasing the capitation grant to standards above the third, and cost of same.

“The memorandum below may go to the Director of Public Instruction.”

[Memorandum No. 1290–2, Educational, dated 12th October 1907.]

In reply to Memorandum No. 1290–2, Educational, dated 12th October 1907, the Director of Public Instruction (Dr. Bourne) now reports that he is not in favour of reducing the capitation grant for the pupils in the infant standards to four annas. He observes that if any reduction had to be made, it should affect the four lowest standards equally, as otherwise there would be continual attempts to promote pupils unduly for the sake of the higher grant even in schools with these standards only. He therefore considers that any reduction is unnecessary and undesirable.

2. Dr. Bourne classifies the schools aided under chapter III of the Grant-in-aid Code under the following heads:—

(i) Schools with standards Infant to III.

These number 10,000, out of a total of 13,000.

(ii) Schools with standards Infant to IV, in which standard IV has been added for the sake of a few pupils to whom the teacher devotes much attention to the neglect of lower standards.

(iii) Schools with standards Infant to IV more or less properly staffed and equipped and which may look forward to having higher standards. The number of schools in groups (ii) and (iii) is estimated at 2,700, but the Director of Public Instruction thinks that a larger number will fall under group (ii) than under group (iii).

(iv) Schools with standards higher than IV. It is not known how many of the existing schools of this class will be classed as elementary schools, but their present number is 50.

3. Dr. Bourne thinks that to alter the grant for the Infant standard would affect injuriously the finances of the majority of the schools for the sake of a few and that such reduction is not necessary for the sake of the other schools as funds can be found for them without altering the grant for classes in group (i). He also observes that the time has come for altering the scale of grants on behalf of elementary schools (article 15 of the Grant-in-aid Code) and that he intends proposing higher rates of grant for elementary schools containing the higher standards.

4. The subject is separately submitted for orders, as the main file regarding the memorial of the Council of Missionary Education is pending reply to another reference made to that Council.

K. RANGASWAMI AYYANGAR—10-12-07.

No change at present seems necessary and Dr. Bourne's proposals at A may be awaited.

C. A. SOUTER—16-12-07.

H. D. TAYLOR—21-12-07.

The proposals promised by the Director of Public Instruction have not yet been received.

May he be reminded please?

K. RANGASWAMI AYYANGAR—12-1-08.

The matter is one needing careful consideration, and it seems unnecessary to remind yet. Wait some time longer.

C. A. SOUTER—13-1-08.

I agree. The matter is, I know, under Director of Public Instruction's consideration and it is useless to worry him until the Estates Land Bill is through.

H. D. TAYLOR—14-1-08.

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 1st June 1908, No. 3299.

Dr. Bourne states that after a full investigation of the position, he has come to the conclusion that the matter * might and should lie over for the present, the provision made at the end of article 16 of the Grant-in-aid Code for the increase of the grant in special cases being utilized when necessary.

2. It is submitted that the papers may be "recorded."

K. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR—1-6-08.

C. A. SOUTER—2-6-08.

Yes, but I still consider that a sliding scale of staff or teaching grant as apart from capitation grants is necessary. The present uniform rate of Rs. 36 per teacher is unfair on the managers of schools of higher grades, who have to employ a larger number of masters on higher pay than that of a single elementary master, if their school is to receive recognition, as properly equipped, at the hands of the department.

H. D. TAYLOR—2-6-08.

The papers may be "recorded" for the present and the matter taken up later on if necessary.

M. H[AMMICK]—6-6-08.

Record.

H. D. TAYLOR—9-6-08.

The draft placed below is for approval.

T.K.—9-6-08.

C. A. SOUTER—10-6-08.

[G.O., No. 451, Educational, dated 10th June 1908.]



Received.....190 , Registered.....190 .

Subject.

Submitting report called for in Government Memorandum No. 1290-2 Educational dated 12th October 1907 in connection with the question of reducing the capitation grant for the pupils in the Infant standard.

ENCLOSURES.

No.....

Spare copies.....

Ref on Cur No. 7 6 1 1 /07 2P

Station Madras , Dated the 4 November 1907.

From (Name) The Hon'ble Mr. A.G. Bourne, D.Sc., F.R.S.,

(Designation) Director of Public Instruction,

Madras.

To the Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Educational Department

Su,

In reply to Memorandum No. 1290-2 Educational dated 12th October 1907, I have the honour to state that I am not in favour of reducing the capitation grant for the pupils in the Infant standard to 4 annas. If any reduction had to be made it should affect the four lowest standards equally. Otherwise there would be continual attempts to promote pupils unduly for the sake of the higher grant even in schools with these standards only. Any reduction, however, seems unnecessary and undesirable.

The schools aided under Chapter III of the Grant-in-Aid Code may be placed in four categories.

(i) Schools with standards Infant to III. These number about 10,000 out of a total of about 13,000.

(ii) Schools with standards Infant to IV in which standard IV has been added for the sake of a few pupils to whom the teacher (such schools have as a rule only one teacher) devotes most of his

Tu
10
7.11.07

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Received



190

Registered

1908

Subject.
Capitation grant for pupils in Infant Standards :
Replying to Reminders from Govt. in connection with the
question of reducing

ENCLOSURES.

No.

Spare copies

Re No. 3299/08

Station Cotacmunda, Dated the 1st June 1908.

From (Name) The Honble Dr. A. G. Bourne, F.R.S.,
(Designation) Director of Public Instruction.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Educational Department.

Sir,

With reference to your reminder, dated 3rd May 1908, regarding proposals on the question of reducing the Capitation grant for pupils in the Infant Standard, I have the honour to state that your Memo. No. 1290-2, dated 12th October 1907 was replied to in my R.C. No. 764/07, dated 4th November 1907. In that Communication I expressed an intention of proposing higher rates of grant for elementary Schools containing the higher Standards; but after a full investigation of the position

p-1 of 2

5
I came to the Conclusion that the ^{matter} might and should lie
over for the present, the provision made ^{at} the end of Rule
16 of the Grant-in-Aid Code for the increase of the grant
in special cases being utilized when necessary.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

80/9992
Your most obedient Servant,

A. G. Sawers

Director of Public Instruction



EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT,

FORT ST. GEORGE,

5-12-1907

My dear Borne

Herewith send
abstract for 1907 in the
"sliding scale" of grants.

Please see page 5. 9-10. 9th
vol. The is, I think what
you wanted for.

Please retain the 1907
when no longer required.

Yours sincerely
A. G. Sawers P.S.O.

NOTES.

Handwritten notes on a piece of paper pasted onto the left page. The text is mostly illegible due to fading and the torn edge of the paper, but appears to be a list or series of entries.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.
NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. EDUCATIONAL, DATED
MAY 1907.

[SUBJECT.—

Telegram from the Government of Madras, Educational Department, dated
10th May 1907.

Send current 981. Council aided Education. Memorial immediately.

Submitted. The note in the two files is being written up from a spare copy of the petition and Director of Public Instruction's remarks.

C.R.V.—10-5-07.

Will the Assistant Secretary please note on this very urgently?

2. The memorial was received on 16th April and referred by me to Director of Public Instruction on the same date. The Director of Public Instruction's remarks were received on 25th April and the current was marked by me "early". It should have been dealt with here and not have left Coty office without orders. All references are readily available, e.g., the old Educational rules, IV. "Education" and the Government Orders with notes with which the revised Grant-in-aid Code and rules issued 18 days have been wasted and no action whatever taken, which is entirely due to the supineness of clerk T. Kanakasundram Pillai, who has been more than once warned.

3. There is little to add to the Director of Public Instruction's note, but the Report of the Commission of 1882 and the speeches of the Honourable Member and Director of Public Instruction at last Legislative Council meeting, and the Government Orders regarding Grant-in-Aid Code and Rules, with notes should be put up and the various points explained with reference to those notes.

H. D. TAYLOR—11-5-07.

Please reference urgently.

C. A. SOUTER—13-5-07.

Referenced and resubmitted.

T.K.—13-5-07.

In their memorial dated 11th April 1907, the members of a Council on aided education submit for the consideration of Government certain criticisms of the

Cf. the Summary in paragraph 497 of the report.

Grant-in-Aid Code and the Educational rules published last year. The memorial was forwarded to the Director of Public Instruction whose remarks thereon will be found at pages 658.

2. The Council begin by sketching the history of the system of grants-in-aid. Adopted in 1854, it received the strong recommendation of the Education Commission of 1882. This recommendation will be found on pages 414 to 411 of the Commission's report. The Commission's views were accepted by the Government of India. In the words of the report the policy adopted was this: "The main attention of the Department should be given to evoking and strengthening private effort, and its success must be largely judged by the increase in the number and efficiency of aided or self-supporting institutions under private management". Up till last year the policy of the Madras Government has been to follow the recommendations of the Commission and while this was the case private enterprise increased greatly. In paragraph 3 of the memorial the Council give figures which, if correct, show that 83 per cent. of the schools in the Presidency were maintained wholly or in part by private individuals and that 82 per cent. of the scholars were taught in private institutions. In paragraph 4 of their memorial the Committee go on to say that the Code and Rules introduced in 1906 contain such radical changes that they imply a change of policy on the part of the Madras Government.

As the Director of Public Instruction says in paragraph 1 of his letter the position and treatment of aided schools up to the publication of the Code of 1906 as sketched in the memorial needs no comment and may be accepted.

3. The main objections of the Council to the new Code and Rules are enumerated and discussed below. The Council agree that elementary schools should be clearly distinguished from secondary but they raise certain objections to the method according to which aid is given to them. These are:—

(a) The grant of Rs. 36 per teacher and of As. 8 per pupil is suited to the needs of schools only of the lowest grades. For schools containing five classes, i.e.,

Paragraph 5 of memorial on page 3.

infant and up to 4th standard, the rate of aid is inadequate, and for schools containing a 5th, 6th or 7th standard is wholly inadequate.

The Director of Public Instruction agrees with the Council and says that a graduated scale of grants to teachers is most desirable. The discussion on article 15 of the code will be found on pages 15 to 18 K.W. G.O., No. 356, Educational, dated 21st May 1906. In the result the Government accepted for the present the rates proposed by Dr. Bourne who refers to the matter in paragraph 18 of his letter given on page 4 of that Government order. It is for orders whether there should be any change now. The code has been working for just a year and perhaps enough experience of its effects has as yet not been obtained.

(b) In the present code no favourable rates are given to girls' schools. Mr. Logan is of opinion that these schools should be treated in the same manner as schools for backward classes, i.e., that they should get 25 per cent. more than other schools. Dr. Bourne was of opinion that girls' schools should not be treated separately and his opinion was accepted tentatively. It is submitted that in view of the representations of the Council and the opinion of Mr. Logan girls' schools may get the same privilege as schools for backward classes.

Cf. paragraph 17 of his letter quoted above.

(c) The uniform grant of As. 8 per pupil makes no reference to the standard. In consequence the numbers of pupils in the higher standards will always be less than those in the lower.

This objection is really a part of that raised in (a) above. Mr. Logan discusses it on page 12 and his views seem to be sound. In paragraph 18 of his letter in page 4 G.O., No. 356, dated 21st May 1906, Dr. Bourne also gives a cogent reason for not giving a higher grant to the higher standards for by doing so managers will be tempted to force up as many pupils as they can in order to earn the larger grant.

But inspecting officers can always put them back if found necessary—rule 17.

H. D. TAYLOR.

In paragraph 3 of his letter on page 13 Mr. Logan suggests an answer to the three objections raised above.

(d) That the rates given to public Elementary schools seem to suggest that Government are unduly favouring them at the expense of aided schools.

H. D. TAYLOR.

Mr. Logan discusses the question adequately in paragraph 4 of his letter.

(e) That the system of transferring scholars from Elementary to Secondary schools by insisting on their entering the 4th class militates against the interests of all Elementary schools.

This question was fully discussed in pages 21-23, K.W. G.O., No. 356 and Honourable Member spoke about it at the last Legislative Council meeting as also did Mr. Logan. The answer suggested by Mr. Logan at the end of paragraph 5 of his letter seems suitable.

4. The next article which the Council attack is 33 which they say is opposed to the Education Commission's recommendation as contained in paragraph 476 of their report. I can add nothing to Mr. Logan's criticism in paragraph 6 of his letter.

5. The Council further object to the exacting requirements of the rules for secondary schools, and refer specially to rules 28 and 29 of the rules. Mr. Logan's criticism will be found in paragraph 7 of his letter. I have nothing to add. Please see the discussion on pages 15 and 16 K.W. G.O., No. 509, Educational, dated 31st July 1906.

6. In paragraph 7 of their memorial the Council object to the control by the Inspector in details over the Private Manager. Mr. Logan criticizes this view in paragraph 8 of his letter. As he says control must be either rigid or not. Previous complaints were that Inspectors had no discretion under the rules; now they are that too much is left to Inspectors' discretion. I have nothing to add to what Mr. Logan says.

7. The memorialists next object to the control exercised by the Director of Public Instruction and Government over colleges. In especial they object to articles 40 and 41 of the Code. The discussion on these articles will be found on pages 28 and 29, K.W. G.O., No. 356, dated 21st May 1906, also on page 71 thereof. The memorialists refer to paragraph 491 of the Commission's report. As Mr. Logan says it is hard to see where the grievance arises. Dr. Bourne certainly suggested that the amount of aid should be fixed by Government, but in the discussion noted above, it was decided to let the Director of Public Instruction do so.

8. Lastly as to paragraph 9 of the memorial, Mr. Logan says that remarks (1) and (2) are true and that remark (3) is far too sweeping. These remarks relate to the manner in which managers were consulted previously to the framing of the Code and rules.

Cf. pages 81 and 91-2 of the printed proceedings.

H. D. TAYLOR.

Paragraph 6 of memorial.

Pages 23-71, K.W. G.O., No. 356, dated 21st May 1906.

9. Finally the Director of Public Instruction thinks that without in any way departing from the principles of the code, Government can safely assure the memorialists that they in no manner desire to alter their policy in encouraging private effort. As a general remark it may be suggested that Government will carefully consider representations on the code and rules, but would prefer, before taking definite steps, to have more experience as to how the rules work. Such experience can hardly be gained in the course of the first year when matters are still unsettled.

C. A. SOUTER—14-5-07.

I. Elementary Schools.—(1) Rule 15 of the Grant-in Aid Code provides for a uniform teaching grant of Rs. 36 per annum for each master, and As. 8 a year for each pupil in daily average attendance.

Article 82 of the revised Educational Rules provides for a standard scale of establishment recommended for adoption in schools under public management, the scale being based under article 81 partly on the number of standards, and partly on the number of pupils.

The total and average of the scale is as follows :—

				Total pay.	Average pay.
				Rs.	Rs.
1 teacher ..	..	..	..	8	8
2 teachers ..	..	..	..	18	9
3 " ..	..	..	..	30	10
4 " ..	..	..	..	45	11.25
5 " ..	..	..	..	65	13
6 " ..	..	..	..	90	15
7 " ..	..	..	..	120	17.1
8 " ..	..	..	..	160	20

The average pay of the teachers thus gradually increases with the number of teachers, but it is recognised that where a single standard is divided into two sections owing to the number of pupils in that standard being in excess of 35, the higher scale of pay need not necessarily be adopted.

As pointed out above the standard scale is recommended only for schools under public management, i.e., Board and Municipal schools, though it is a standard for private schools also. The actual rule relating to schools under private management is rule 12 which prescribes as a minimum one teacher for every 50 pupils, and recommends one teacher for each 30 pupils. In schools containing standards above the fourth, the headmaster should ordinarily hold a secondary trained teachers' certificate. The Council evidently are afraid that Board schools will obtain more qualified teachers, and that in order to compete with such schools they will themselves be compelled to raise the scale of establishment in their own schools. There is some

Page 4 of code.

Page 16 of the rules.

Page 14, rule.

16
force in this argument, and it is not desired that Board schools should be created to *compete* with private schools provided that the latter are *efficient*.

It does not necessarily follow that schools, with a large number of masters will necessarily obtain in proportion either a larger fee income on a larger capitation grant. Thus where one master might be provided for a school with 50 pupils, two masters would be required for 60 pupils, and if Rs. X represents the fee income, the first school would get Rs. 36 teaching grant + Rs. 25 capitation grant + Rs. X, while the latter would get Rs. 72 teaching grant + Rs. 30 capitation grant + Rs. $\frac{6}{5}$ X. In the matter of *aid* therefore the second school would, pecuniarily be in a far worse position ~~and~~ in comparison with necessary expenditure, than the first.

I therefore think that a sliding scale of teaching grants might be adopted, as suggested by the Director of Public Instruction or at any rate the grant might be increased in case of schools containing more than four standards, which require a more highly trained headmaster.

2. The proposal of the Director of Public Instruction to bring *girls' schools* under the same rules as *backward classes* may be accepted.

3. As to the uniform capitation grant of As. 8 per head for all pupils *including* infants there is something to be said on both sides. The higher the standard, the higher the qualifications of the master will be, and the higher also will be the master's pay. Perhaps a higher rate might be allowed for pupils in standards over the 4th, a reduction being made from As. 8 to As. 4 in the case of *infants*. Under rule 17 Inspecting officers have power to check promotions, and to reduce pupils to a lower class, though exception is taken by the memorialists later on (paragraph 7 of the memorial) to such interference on the part of Inspecting officers. If concessions are given to as to admit of the variation of the rate of grant for the different standards, it will be necessary to insist all the more strongly on the close exercise of this supervision by Inspecting officers.]

As to objections (d) and (e) referred to on page 7 *supra* in Mr. Souter's note the answers suggested by Director of Public Instruction seem sufficient. There is no intention to *reduce* the grant to Aided schools under private management, which will remain for the present based on the average of the past three years, subject to

pages 3 & 4 *Supra*

such variations or modifications as are admissible under the rules. Nor is the money given to public schools taken away, as the memorialists seem to think, from private schools. It is supplied in the first instance from the special grant of 6 lakhs. Apparently the Council desires to get a larger share in this grant. It may, however, be noted that, but for this grant, it would, in some districts, have been found necessary, owing to financial consideration, to close many of the existing schools even without raising the scale of establishment.

II. Secondary Education.—The Director of Public Instruction seems to have disposed of the objections raised to rules 32 and 33, the language of which might however be made clearer. At present to the casual reader rule 32 almost unintelligible, the force being in the word "supplementing". The Regulation 33 is not as stated by the memorialists, necessarily one of *rigid* application. The same reply can be given to the objection as to the "exacting requirements" of the rules.

As to the control to be exercised by the department over private managers, it is essential that this power should remain. The Inspectorate has been specially strengthened in order that adequate supervision may be exercised, and it is proposed to strengthen the Inspectorate still further. If private managers conform to the rules, they have nothing to fear from such inspection and control.

III. Colleges.—I have no further remarks to add.

H. D. TAYLOR—16-5-07.

*Vide note on pages 28—71 of K.W., G.O.,
No. 356, dated 21st May 1906.*

Copy 2 of 8 copies

S. J. H. H.

Extract from Office note dated 30th May
1907.

x x x

6. According to the rate of grants prescribed in Article 15 of the Grant-in-Aid Code namely Rs.36, teaching grant and As.8 capitation grant, the total cost on account of grants in the case of all these primary schools will be Rs.7,09,118 as shown below:--

		Rs.
Teaching grant	14,881 x 36	= 5,35,716
Capitation grant	3,46,803 x $\frac{1}{2}$	= 1,73,402
Total		7,09,118

7. If the rate of the teaching grant were increased to Rs.60 in case of upper primary class teachers, the rate for lower primary teachers being retained as at present, the cost will work out as follows:-

		Rs.
Upper primary class teachers	3,152 x 60	1,89,120
Lower primary class teachers	11,729 x 36	4,22,244
Capitation grant at the existing rate	346,803 x $\frac{1}{2}$	1,73,402
Total		7,84,766

x x x x x

* It is assumed that at least one of the two teachers in the upper primary schools is for the fourth & higher standards.

M V S.

Extract from the Secretary's note dated
31st May 1907:-

* * * * *

The actual cost of such a sliding scale
would depend upon the scale adopted.

Taking as a reasonable standard the scale
laid down for schools under public management
in Article 82 of the Educational Rules, it would
seem that where there is 1 teacher on Rs.8 the
proportion of teaching grant would be ~~3-0-0~~ ³⁻⁸.
Adopting the scale generally ^{and} applying the
proportion to the average salaries as worked
out in para.1* of my note, the scale of grants
would work out approximately as follows.

1 teacher	Rs.3
2 teachers	" 3.375
3 "	" 3.75
4 "	" 4.22
5 "	" 4.875
6 "	" 5.625
7 "	" 6.41
8 "	" 7.5

Perhaps for boys' schools the sliding scale,
if adopted, might be fixed at Rs.3 for each
master where one master is employed.

Rs.3-8-0 for each master where two masters
are employed.

Rs.4-0-0 where 3 or 4 masters are employed

Rs.5-0-0 where 5 or 6 masters are employed

Rs.6-0-0 where 7 or 8 masters are employed

there would probably be very few schools of the
last

pages of printed notes.

the total number is 18 +
out of 1000000
of the total
of the total
of the total

last two classes.

Taking the D.P.I.'s figures of 22,000 teachers for 17,779 schools under mission or private management we get an excess of 4,221 masters over and above an allowance of 1 master per school.

If we assume roughly that 3,000 of these are second masters and 1221 masters of higher grades and allow Re.1 per mensem extra for each of the 3,000 ~~Rs.2/-~~ extra for each of the 1,221 we should get an increased grant of Rs.65,304 per annum to which a small amount would have to be added for increased allowances to girls' schools - say Rs.70,000 in all. But these figures are, at the best, pure guess work.

I have worked out the figures from a different stand point, but practically arrive at the same amount of extra cost ^x as worked out in paragraph 6.7 of the office note page 4 supra.

* Rs 75,000

[E.]
12
1,000-2-3-00.

Edd.

DEPARTMENT.

21

READ AGAIN G.O., No. , dated 190 .

" " " " " " 190 .

READ ALSO:-

C. No. 2689 , From the D.P.J. , No. 7611 , dated 4 - 11 - 1907 .

" " 1258 , " " D.P.J. , " 3299 , " 1 - 6 - 1908

" " " " " " " " " " 190 .

ORDER.

P. S.

No. 457 , dated 10. 6. 1908

Recorded.

714.
9-6-08

Chs
1068.

DESPATCHED
10 JUN 1908

9A

To

The D.P.J.