

952 (19/3) Department.

See SERIES.

G.O., No. 1032

DATED 10 11 1913

[Despatch Abstract.]

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No. _____

Papers of the department to which the current belongs.

Number.	Date	Original (=O.) or spare copy (=S. C.)	Remarks. (In this column such of the papers as have been removed for copying, printing, etc., should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department.

Papers of other departments.

Department.	Number.	Date.	Original (=O.) or spare copy (=S. C.)	Despatcher to note the return of the papers to the departments concerned.

T. V. SESHAGIRI AIYAR.



C. 268684

8/9/13

PAMMAL HOUSE,
VEPERY, MADRAS, N.C.

5th September 1913

From

The Hon'ble Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Aiyar Avl., B. A., B. L.,
Member, Legislative Council,
M A D R A S.

To

The Secretary to the Government,
Educational Department,
Ootacamund.

Sir,

I have received communications to the effect that the results of the late Government Technical Examinations have been very unsatisfactory. Naturally enough the candidates attribute this to the vagaries of the Examiners. I am not suggesting that the results should be revised this year. But I do want to draw attention to the note at the head of the published results in the Fort St George Gazettee which is in these terms - "Applications from unsuccessful Candidates asking for the cause of their failure or for a Re-valuation of their Answer Papers will not be attended to". I do not think it right that applications for re-valuation should be thus summarily refused. Under limitations and on the payment of a prescribed fee, such concessions may be granted. In the best conducted examinations, mistakes of this kind are likely to occur; Candidates should be given in rare cases an opportunity of satisfying themselves that their papers have been properly valued. I hope you will consider the desirability of striking out the note I have referred to.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

T. V. Seshagiri Aiyar

acknowledged
8/9/13

[E. & L.]
500-15-3-11.



Eol DEPARTMENT.

2 def
2686-1 *Eol*
9.9.13

Sp 11/9
From

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Eol DEPARTMENT,

To

The Hon'ble Mr. V. V. Sahagiri aiyar

Sp 11/9
DATED FORT ST. GEORGE, September 1913,
OOTACAMUND.

SIR,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter _____, dated
5th September 1913, which will receive due attention

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

SK
8/9/13.

CA
8.9.13

2
9/9/13

W
9.9.13

P. J. O.

Menu 2686-2 of 9.9.13

Referred to the C. G. E.
for remarks.

8K
8/9/13.

Ca
8.9.13

9.9.13

Noted in CB
9.9.13

To

The C. G. E. with CM-2686
(in original to be ref.)

9/9/13

Sept 11
11.9.13

Educational
LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

E.F.D.—80-4.

CURRENT No. 3001 85

Received 191 , Registered 9-10-1913.

Subject.

Submitting, with reference to Memorandum No. 2686-2 Educational, dated 9th September 1913, that the suggestion of the Hon'ble Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar that candidates' answer papers should be re-valued on payment of a fee is quite impracticable.

ENCLOSURES.

No. one

No. 3103.

Spare copies Nil

Station Madras, Dated the 6th October 1913.

From (Name) The Hon'ble Sir Alfred Gibbs Bourne,
(Designation) Commissioner for Government Examinations

To the Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Educational Local and Municipal Department.

Sir,

With reference to Memorandum No. 2686-2 Educational, dated 9th September 1913, referring to me for remarks a letter from the Hon'ble Mr. F. V. Seshagiri Ayyar re-valuation (herewith returned) I have the honour to state that taking into account subjects and

and grades, Seventy-five distinct examinations were held under the head of Government Technical Examinations in April last. The Hon'ble Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar presumably refers to these.

I do not know exactly what he means in saying that the results were unsatisfactory, perhaps that a smaller proportion passed than in previous years. This was certainly not the case for all the examinations and Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar has not given any indication of where the unsatisfactoriness lies. I am therefore unable to offer any opinion on this point.

His suggestion that candidates' papers should be re-valued on payment of a fee I consider quite impracticable. I do not know of any examining body that follows this practice. Certainly no local authority does so and the reasons are obvious. If any fee less than a prohibitive one were charged, the majority of failures would demand a re-valuation. This would throw

an

In the results
of the first section
of the exam please
see p. 127-128
27-8-13. (J)

an intolerable amount of work on the examiners, most of whom with difficulty spare time for the work as it is. Moreover many of the examinations and some of those most numerously attended, e.g. that in type-writing, are practical and I certainly cannot undertake to make the complicated arrangements necessary for re-examination in these.

I submit that no valid reason has been shown for departing from the general practice of examining bodies, a practice which is evidently dictated by the very nature of the case.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

G. W. Madan

for Commissioner.

6.4.13

C. No. 2686 From the Honble Mr. T. V. Sankaralingam, dated 5-9-1913.
" 3001. " C. G. E. 3103 " 6-10-13.

SUBJECT.

Revaluation of papers in
Govt. Technical Examinations

For the note referred to by the Additional Member, please see page 1 of the Supplements to the Part I-B of the Supplement to the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 18th February and 29th July 1913. The University does not publish any such declaration nor does there appear to be any provision in the University regulation ~~to that effect~~ authorizing such a course. ~~Probably~~ The need for publishing the note in the case of the Govt. Technical Examinations is obviously due to the inconvenience of a large number of applications for revaluation that might have been received in the past. ~~But~~ If so, the effect of omitting the note, ^{now} may be the flooding of the Commissioner's office with applications for revaluation. Individual disposal of them is sure to cause inconvenience and increase of unnecessary work. If the actual

portions marked
with white tape
in the file below

Vice Ship XIII
in the file

This is a
guess, I gather
N.B.

page 9 of

p. 19 of
 kindly agree Mr.
 p. 5 of

A

practice with the University and other examining bodies is to disregard these applications, there seems to be no objection to the same course being adopted at the foot. technical examinations also and to the announcement of that practice. ~~on the~~ The case of University examinations ~~maybe~~ is different as a better class of candidates present themselves for examination and fewer number of applications for revaluation are likely to be put in. Though the principle underlying the additional member's suggestion seems unobjectionable, the practical difficulties pointed out by the Commission appear to be weighty. If real cases of mistake occur, they will surely be pressed in spite of the notification. It is for consideration whether the paper may be recorded, the addl. member being informed that the foot. has considered the proposal, ~~and~~ but are unable to adopt it in view of the practical difficulties of giving effect to it.

Ch
 10/10/13

Lth Box No. 8
29. X. 13.

Page 3

A.E. De Forester.

The course at (A) on the preceding page may be followed. I have never heard of any examⁿ. at which revaluation of papers on application was allowed.

AF 21/10

"The Govt. regret that they are unable to adopt
the course proposed etc. etc. "
learn out "in view of etc."

F

31. 10. 13

The ~~draft~~^{reply} ~~order~~ to be the part
underlined above. The max. D.O.
form will be best. Show me draft. —
M.E. 1/2

A draft order v.d.o. are sub^d for approval.

CA
6-11-13

aff^d. Dec 8/11

10
10
A.D. 3001-1 Edl 27/4/13

Dear Sir

With reference to your letter, dated 5th Sept. 1913, suggesting the omission of from the notifications published the results of foot. technical examinations the usual note declaring that applications for revaluation of answer papers would remain unnoticed, I am to state that the Govt. regret that they are unable to adopt the course proposed.

Yours sincerely

18/8/11

Ca
6.11.13

4.

The Honble Mr. T. B. Seshagiri
Ayyar.

Ans
27/4
6.11.13

27/4/11
Ans
27/4
6.11.13
on the
next page

9. (1)

” ” ” ” ” ” 19

C. No. 2686; From the Honble W. L. Schagen, No. 26, dated 5-9. 1913

3007 Com. for foot. Exam 3103 6.10.1913

” ” ” ” ” ” ” ” 19

ORDER.

~~VA~~
mis

No. 1032^{Vol}^{he}, dated 10. 11. 1913

Recorded

Ca
6-11-17

May 11

Copy to C.E.E.

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

19

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____ DATED _____
 19 _____

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO C. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED UP, BRING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.