

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1909.

Enclosures

Spare copies

(A)

G.O., No. 182, 23rd March 1909.

Grants.

the utilisation of

Regarding papers relating to — to Elementary schools and to Missionary agencies in the supervision and inspection of such schools.

Government of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1909.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 182, 23rd March 1909.

Grants.

Recording papers relating to — to Elementary schools and to Missionary agencies in the supervision and inspection of such schools.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers :—

Notes and papers relating to grants to Elementary schools.

Order—No. 182, Educational, dated 23rd March 1909.

Recorded.

(True Extract.)

A. BUTTERWORTH,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 182, EDUCATIONAL,
DATED 23RD MARCH 1909.[SUBJECT.—*Teaching grants paid to Elementary schools—Ongole.*]

Previous papers.

G.O.,	No.	373,	Edl.,	dated	3rd June	1905.
"	"	356	"	"	21st May	1906.
"	"	190	"	"	16th March	1908.
"	"	451	"	"	10th June	"

The Rev. Mr. H. Huizinga, who is interested in Missionary educational work in Ongole, urged upon me that the grant now made in respect of teachers is Rs. 36 *per annum*, plus eight annas per pupil, and the result is that teachers only think of the number of pupils whom they can attract to their classes, that it is obviously easy to attract the more illiterate children and thus while there is a growth in the numbers in the lowest classes there is a falling off in the higher classes. He suggested that it might be practicable to introduce some sliding scale system, such as, for example, a grant of eight annas per pupil in the lowest classes, increasing as they go up. Of course there are manifest disadvantages such as, for one thing, that teachers would be prone to push their children up before they were fit for the higher classes, but it may be worth considering whether some such scheme is not a solution of the difficulty if it really exists.

2. Another thing which he urged was that this new scheme precludes a teacher from earning Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 *per annum* instead of as formerly from Rs. 100 to Rs. 120, and that consequently many schools are losing their teachers on account of the miserable salaries which are now obtainable.

I think there is a good deal in what he says on this point. I heard much the same complained when I was on tour in the Tinnevely district.

3. Again Mr. Huizinga asks whether we cannot utilise more than we do now the Missionary agencies in such matters as supervision and inspection of schools and whether the department cannot definitely recognize them either by letting them take part in the annual departmental conference of Inspectors for the allotment of grants or assigning them definite functions in the district.

4. I do not know whether this has ever been considered as within the range of practical politics. I pointed out to Mr. Huizinga the difficulty of enrolling a number of really irresponsible assistants. At the same time the Missionary agency is a very valuable one and we should, I think, utilise it to the fullest possible extent.

A. L[AWLEY]—5-1-09.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

In His Excellency the Governor's note above three points are raised, viz. :—

(1) whether in the matter of teaching grants paid to elementary schools, it might be practicable to introduce some sliding scale of capitation grant such, for example, as a grant of eight annas per pupil in the lowest classes, increasing as they go up ;

(2) whether it is a fact that the new rules regarding grants preclude a teacher

Paragraph 2 *ibid.* earning more than Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 *per annum*, while under the old rules he earned Rs. 100 to Rs. 120 a year and that consequently many schools are losing their teachers on account of the miserable salaries which are now obtainable; and

(3) whether the Missionary agencies can be utilized in supervision and inspection of schools and be allowed to take part in the conference of Inspecting officers for the allotment of grant.

2. *Sliding scale of capitation grants.*—Under rule 15 of the Grant-in-Aid Code relates to elementary schools only. A. BUTTERWORTH. Page 4 of the Code, 1906 edition.

3. In the Memorial submitted by the members of the Missionary Council on aided education in April 1907, the inadequacy of the rate of the capitation grant allowed by the Grant-in-Aid Code was raised. Paragraph 5 (c) of the memorial ran:

"Further the uniform grant of eight annas for each pupil in average attendance without reference to the class in which the pupil is reading will certainly have the effect of accentuating the disparity that already exists between the numbers of pupils in the lowest classes compared with those in the higher. In elementary schools it is much easier to get children to enter the infant standard than to retain them in the third and fourth standards."

4. The Director of Public Instruction (Mr. T. T. Logan), who was consulted in the matter, observed: "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., 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

This seems unanswerable.

A. BUTTERWORTH. "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."

He further stated that the rates of grants were only fixed tentatively and were based upon the total amount available and that if more money was available the rates would undoubtedly be raised, but that "with the funds at present available the raising of the rates in the higher grades would only necessitate the reduction of them in the lower."

5. In paragraph III of his note, dated 5th June 1907, on page 11 of K.W. G.O., No. 190, Educational, dated 16th March 1908, the Hon'ble Mr. Forbes noted:—

"I am inclined, as suggested by Mr. Taylor, to reduce the capitation for infants to annas four, 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."

6. In Memorandum Nos. 1290-2, dated 12th October 1907, the Director of Public Instruction was requested to report on the suggestion that the capitation grant for pupils in the infant standard should be reduced to four annas and that the grants for pupils in the higher standards should be increased proportionately; and he was also requested to submit an estimate of the additional cost which the adoption of such a proposal would involve.

7. The Director of Public Instruction (Mr. T. T. Logan) replied that he was not in favour of reducing the capitation grant for the pupils in the infant standard to four annas, that if any reduction was made, it should affect the four lower standards equally, as otherwise there would be continual attempts to promote pupils unduly for the sake of the higher standards only, and that therefore any reduction was unnecessary and undesirable. He further observed that the total number of schools with standards infant to 3rd was 10,000 out of a total of 13,000 elementary schools, and that any alteration in the rate of the capitation grant to the infant standard alone would affect prejudicially the finances of the majority of schools for the sake of a few. Mr. Logan also stated that the time was approaching for altering the scale of grants for elementary schools and that he intended to propose "higher rates of grant for elementary schools containing the higher standards."

This is the danger.

A. BUTTERWORTH. Vide Director of Public Instruction's letter on page 10 of G.O., No. 190, Educational, dated 16th March 1908. 8. No decision was, however, come to on this point at the time; and the Missionary Council on aided education was informed that their suggestions would receive due consideration when the rules were next revised.

9. In paragraph 74 of the Public Instruction Report for 1908-1909, the Director of Public Instruction (the Hon'ble Dr. Bourne) stated that he had under consideration "the question of increasing the scale of grants for complete elementary schools" with the view of encouraging their growth. No proposals have, however, yet been received from the Director of Public Instruction and it is for consideration whether the Director of Public Instruction may be asked u.o. to state when the proposals on the subject may be expected.

10. *Total amount of grant earned by a teacher.*—Under the old rules, the grants were paid on the results of the examination of schools conducted by the Inspecting officers and the amount of grant paid to a school depended on the number of pupils declared to have passed at such examination. In schools where a considerable number of pupils were declared to have passed the grants earned were large and each teacher received from Rs. 100 to Rs. 120 per annum or even more—while in schools where the number of pupils who passed in the examination was small, the grant earned was very low. Attention is also solicited to paragraphs 15 and 16 of the Director of Public Instruction's letter on page 4 of G.O., No. 373, Educational, dated 3rd June 1905.

11. The main object of the Grant-in-Aid Code was to do away with this inequality in the distribution of grants. Under rule 15 of the Grant-in-Aid Code

* Vide 1906 Edition page 4.

a teacher in an elementary school gets a teaching grant of Rs. 3 per mensem or Rs. 36 per annum and a capitation grant of As. 8 per year for each pupil in average daily attendance. Thus under the new rules a teacher is certain of getting a grant of at least Rs. 50 a year in addition to his salary, that is, a teaching grant of Rs. 36 plus a capitation grant of at least Rs. 14, and a total of say 28 pupils in average attendance.

12. *Participation of Missionary bodies in the administration of the Educational Department.*—As His Excellency has noted, this question does not appear to have

Paragraph 3 of His Excellency's note.
The matter is one on which we must consult the Director of Public Instruction. It is possible that some means may be found of utilizing mission agency without undue interference with the department.

A. BUTTERWORTH—30-1-09.

13. The Director of Public Instruction may, perhaps, be asked u.o. for his remarks on these points.

T.K.—25-1-09.

K. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR—26-1-09.

C. A. SOUTER—27-1-09.

Submitted to Honourable Member and His Excellency the Governor.

It will be seen from the office-note that of the points urged by Mr. Huizinga the first has already been discussed a good deal and all that need be done now is (as recommended on page 3 of the note) to ask the Director of Public Instruction when his promised proposals about the scale of grants for elementary schools may be expected. He may be asked at the same time to reconsider the question of a sliding scale of grants.

I do not think Mr. Huizinga's second point has been established. I have had figures taken out which show that in 1905-1906 (the last year under the old Code) the average Grant-in-Aid to each primary school came to Rs. 59, whereas in last year it came to Rs. 66. The figures may not be quite correct because the recent change in classification renders comparison difficult but they are probably approximately accurate and, if so, then the average grant has risen and not fallen. Mr. Huizinga is probably thinking of his own school where the grants may have fallen but that may be due to his having previously had an inadequate staff of teachers in which case of course the individual earnings of the teachers would be higher. Or he may have had particularly good teachers who got a large number of boys through the standards. As to the third point about allowing Missionaries a certain voice in departmental matters, the proposal seems to be a new one. The Director of Public Instruction might be consulted on the subject either officially or unofficially.

A. BUTTERWORTH—2-2-09.

Director of Public Instruction u.o. for remarks.

C. A. SOUTER—4-2-09.

Send the office-notes (not His Excellency's) to the Director of Public Instruction u.o.

G. S. F[ORBES]—5-2-09.

Do this please.

A. BUTTERWORTH—3-2-09.

Send office-note and Secretary's without the orders as to circulation.

C. A. SOUTER—3-2-09.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

(1) In his R. C. No. 3299, dated 1st June 1908, Dr. Bourne informed Government that, after full investigation of the position he had decided that the question of higher rates of grant for elementary schools containing the higher standards might and should lie over for the present, the provision at the end of Rule 16 of the Grant-in-Aid Code for the increase of grant in special cases being utilised where necessary. This was in reply to a reminder of 3rd May 1908 asking when proposals for reducing the capitation grant for pupils in the infant standards might be expected. I cannot find that Dr. Bourne ever entertained the idea of such reduction. In fact I think I can safely say that his view is that the present rules should be tried for a longer time before the question of a sliding scale need be reopened.

I do not think that the remark in paragraph 74 of the last Public Instruction report is relevant to the matters under discussion. It refers to complete elementary schools, i.e., schools having all the standards from the infant to the seventh. The great mass of elementary schools only go up to the third or fourth standard. I presume that Dr. Bourne will take up the question of special encouragement of complete elementary schools on his return.

(2) *Total amount of grant earned.*—I think that the gist of the Missionary Societies' contention is that under the results grant system they earned large grants because their schools were particularly efficient, but that the new system does not give sufficient weight to efficiency. How far grants were really determined under the results grant system is discussed by Dr. Bourne in his letter No. 3460 of 12th April 1905.

Of course a particular Missionary Society may now draw less grant for its schools although the average grant per teacher has risen. This must be because the department's view of the superior efficiency of the Society's schools is not the same as the Society's. The difference between the grant drawn by a very efficient school and an inefficient one may now be as much as 50 per cent. of the normal grant of Rs. 3 per teacher and As. 8 per pupil. So that of two schools of the same average attendance one may get a grant of Rs. 37-8-0 and the other of Rs. 62-8-0.

(3) *Allowing Missionaries a voice in departmental matters.*—This does not seem to me practicable if only because no man can be a proper judge in his own cause. A main business of the department's inspecting officers and of their conferences is the assessment of grants and incidentally between Missionary and non-Missionary institutions. I do not see how missionaries could usefully share in the work.

J. H. STONE—10-2-09.

Please see the remarks of the Acting Director of Public Instruction above. A typewritten copy of the Director of Public Instruction's u.o. note is also submitted for facility of perusal.

K. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR—12-2-09.

Attention is invited to the discussion on pages 3 and 4 of G.O., No. 373, Educational, dated 3rd June 1905.

C. A. SOUTER—12-2-09.

Submitted to Honourable Member and His Excellency the Governor. The Director of Public Instruction has been consulted u.o. as ordered by Honourable Member on page 4 *supra*.

A. BUTTERWORTH—14-2-09.

G. S. F[ORBES]—15-2-09.

I append a copy of a letter which I have written to Mr. Huizinga.

A. Y. G. CAMPBELL—21-2-09.

Demi-official—from A. Y. G. CAMPBELL, Esq., I.C.S., Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor.

To—Mr. Huizinga.

Dated—Guindy, the 20th February 1909.

I am desired to inform you that His Excellency has had under consideration the questions which you raised in your interview with him at Ongole regarding the grants to teachers and the utilisation of Missionary Agency in such matters as supervision and inspection of schools.

You urged that as the grant now made in respect of teachers is Rs. 36 per annum *plus* eight annas per pupil the teachers only think of the number of pupils whom they can attract to their classes, that it is obviously easy to attract the more illiterate children and that therefore while there is a growth in the numbers in the lowest classes there is a falling off in the highest classes; you suggested that it might be practicable to introduce some sliding scale, the grant per pupil increasing in the highest classes. The Government adopted a uniform rate for every pupil in order to prevent premature promotions. It is not clear to His Excellency why a sliding scale should increase the number of pupils in the higher classes unless that increase is caused by such premature promotions; for the continuance of children in school is determined by the will of the parents or guardians who of course are not affected by the capitation grant which goes entirely into the pockets of the managers. You will no doubt observe that the rates are fixed by rule 15 of the Grant-in-Aid Code "for the present". They were based upon the amount of money available for distribution and unless and until more money is available it is not possible to raise the rates.

You urged further that under the new scheme a teacher was precluded from earning more than Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 per annum instead of as formerly Rs. 100 to Rs. 120 and that consequently many schools were losing their teachers because their salaries were insufficient. It must not be forgotten that it is an element of the grant-in-aid system that part of the expenses of an aided institution should be provided by its managers from their own resources. In certain particular cases the grant now earned by a school may be less than under the old system, but it appears that as a matter of fact the average grant for a Primary school was higher last year than in 1905-1906—the last year in which grants were given under the old Code. In rule 16 a certain latitude is allowed to the Inspecting officers in fixing the amount of grant so that the grant for a school with one teacher and an average attendance of 28 pupils may vary from Rs. 37-8-0 to Rs. 62-8-0. After careful consideration His Excellency does not think it desirable to alter now the system under which the grants are fixed or the rates at which they are calculated.

You further suggested that Government should utilise more than they do now Missionary Agencies in such matters as supervision and inspection of schools and should recognise them by allowing them to take part in the annual departmental conference of Inspectors for the allotment of grants or by assigning them definite functions in the district. His Excellency is doubtful if this is practicable if only because no man can be a proper judge in his own cause. One important part of the work of the department's inspecting officers and of their conferences is the assessment of grants and incidentally deciding between the claims of Missionary and non-Missionary institutions. While His Excellency regards the Missionary bodies as most valuable allies of Government in the work of spreading education and would gladly avail himself of their experience and knowledge he has to confess that he sees some difficulty in carrying out this suggestion of yours without putting the Missionaries in a false position.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Submitted to the Honourable Member for perusal.

A. BUTTERWORTH—23-2-09.

Seen.

G. S. F[ORBES].

Record.

A. BUTTERWORTH—23-3-09.

The draft placed below is for approval.

K. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR—23-3-09.

C. A. SOUTER—23-3-09.

[G.O., No. 182, Educational, dated 23rd March 1909.]

[E. & L.]
76.
2,500-25-2-08.

PRESS SLIP.

Col DEPARTMENT.

7

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

READ ALSO:-

C. No., From the No., dated 190 .
" " " " 190 .
" " " " 190 .

18

ORDER.

No. 182, dated 23-3-1909.

AS
W
misc

Recorded

to be printed)
yes

20
23.3.09

Cal
23.3.9.

ORDINARY.

PRESS SLIP.

PREFERENCE.

EDUCATIONAL
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.



Current No....., dated.....190 ..

G.O., No...189, dated 23.3.1909.

Number of MS. pages sent { Correspondence including order or orders (b)
Notes. (b¹)

Docket.....

Number (c) of copies required when struck off (not including copies for volumes and editors' table which are retained in the Press).

FOR RECORD.*			Complete Correspondence and orders.	Notes
Madras Records	...	...	30	15
Ooty Records	...	...	3	
For filing with original	...	...	1	
Total			34	15

FOR ISSUE.†

Signature copies.....						
India Office.....	Govt. of India.....	Dept.				
	Public Department.....					
	Judicial Department.....					
	Financial Department.....					
	Revenue Department.....					
	Public Works Department.....					
	Local and Municipal Department.....					
		Dept.				

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SECRETARIAT.

(a) If a paper is marked to be printed urgently, the Superintendent of the section concerned should sign the Press slip. The Superintendent should exercise a careful discretion in the matter.

(b) Each letter, memorandum, or order, or set of orders, in the file of correspondence should be headed in succession with the Roman numeral I, II, III, etc., the number being written in red ink or blue chalk above the item. The particular papers to be printed in the special issue-copies should be indicated by the Roman numeral (I, II, etc.) by which that item has been headed in the correspondence file. All matter, including marginal remarks or references, to be printed should be written in ink and matter which should not be printed should be encircled. Initials and signatures that are not quite legible should be re-written distinctly.

(b¹) For rules regarding printing of notes, see the rules in G.O., No. 1220, Public, dated 30th November 1900.

(c) The number of copies and the details of distribution should be filled in by the Superintendent or Referencer concerned.

(d) In the absence of special instructions to the Press to keep matter standing for a specified period, ordinary papers of 8 pages and under will be kept standing for one week, and larger papers for two weeks only. The type of notes and of all confidential papers is distributed immediately after striking.

(e) This slip, properly and completely filled in, should accompany every paper sent to Press; it will be returned by the Press when proofs are furnished; it should be sent to the Press when a call is made for revised proofs or when a corrected proof is sent for striking. When finally returned by Press it should be filed with the original order or letter.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRESS.

(a) If, in the opinion of the Superintendent of the Press, a paper has been marked urgent unnecessarily, he should send the Press slip to the Deputy Registrar with a remark to that effect.

(b) Unless a note to the contrary is made against the matter, pencil entries should not be printed. The Superintendent of the Press may bring to the notice of the Deputy Registrar any instance of incomplete or careless editing.

(c) Signature copies of letters to the Secretary of State or to the Government of India should be printed on hand-made paper.

(d) This slip should be returned by the Press to the Secretariat when proofs are furnished; it will be sent back to the Press when proofs are returned corrected and should be finally returned to the Secretariat when struck-off copies are supplied.

(e) The names of the Secretary and Members should be printed in full when they occur on the right hand side, but only the first time when they appear on the left side, the initials alone being printed later.

* Copies distributed on..... (Press Clerk.)
† Copies distributed on..... (Despatcher.)

TO PRESS, MADRAS.
OOTY.

A

id proof in triplicate. The
have been carefully edited.

B

Proof returned corrected. Please strike
off and send number of copies as indicated.

Type may be released after usual interval
at once.

C

As the matter is clear manuscript and
has been carefully edited, (b) proof need
not be sent. Please print and supply
number of copies as indicated.

Type may be released after usual interval.

.....Clerk.

.....Clerk.

.....Clerk.

.....Supdt.

.....Supdt.

.....Supdt.

(b) Three copies of proof of all notes should be sent for approval, except when instructions are given to the contrary.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

TO BE FILLED IN BY THE PRESS.

Diary.	Initials of Press official.
Received in Press on.....	24/3/09. <i>[Signature]</i>
First proof furnished on.....	26/3/09. <i>[Signature]</i>
Call for revised proof received on.....	
Revised proof furnished on.....	
Corrected proof received for striking on.....	30/3/09. <i>[Signature]</i>
Final copies supplied on.....	3/4/09. <i>[Signature]</i>

Account of copies.	Complete copies.	Notes.	Issue copies.
Supplied to Secretariat for Record.....	34	16	
" " " Issue.....			
For Volumes.....	16		
For E. T.			
Total	50	16	