

Home(1919) Department.
(Education)

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 733

DATED 12-6-1918

[Despatch Abstract.]

Legislative Council Resolution.

Recording papers relating to a resolution proposed to be moved by the Honourable Mr. K. Rama Ayyangar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 11th March 1919 regarding a reconsideration of the recommendations of the Educational Conference of 1918.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH A RESOLUTION ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

[For the meeting of the 11th March 1919.]

[SUBJECT.—*Recommendations of the Educational Conference held in 1916 regarding fee concessions in secondary schools and teaching grants to those schools.*]

The Hon'ble Mr. K. RAMA AYYANGAR :—

XI ~~XIV~~—This Council recommends to the Governor in Council that the orders passed by the Government on the recommendation of the Educational Conference be reconsidered and that fresh orders be issued

(a) in respect of the fee concessions to secondary schools by allowing a 10 per cent deduction on fee collections to give free scholarships to deserving poor students, to be selected after taking proper safeguards,

(b) allowing grants to aided secondary schools which work very well and are outside the provisions of the Grant-in-Aid Code.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Free scholarships to deserving poor students in secondary schools [clause (a) of the resolution].—Under rule 32 of the Grant-in-Aid Code teaching grant to a secondary school is fixed with reference to the expenditure incurred by the management from its own funds over and above the fee receipts of the school and, for the purpose of the calculation of the fee receipts, the *standard rate* laid down in rule 99 of the Educational Rules is taken as the basis. Prior to 1906, the code allowed a reduction of 10 per cent of the standard rate when fee receipts were taken into account for fixing the grant. When the Grant-in-Aid Code was revised in 1906, this concession of reduction of 10 per cent was abolished, as the Director of Public Instruction then stated that sufficient provision had otherwise been made for the award of scholarships from public funds to brilliant but impecunious pupils and that it was better that the department should control the selection and not individual managers.

2. At the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 21st May 1914 the Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri proposed to move a resolution urging the restoration of the old rule regarding 10 per cent reduction in fee income for the purpose of calculating the grant (G.O. No. 1582, dated 20th July 1914, page 15). He was informed that the question would be referred to a committee of officials and non-officials which it was proposed to appoint to consider certain matters relating to the revision of the Grant-in-Aid Code and the Educational Rules. This committee met in the beginning of 1916. One of its recommendations was as follows :—

“That for the purpose of granting fee concessions to indigent pupils of marked ability, expenditure by managing bodies on scholarships up to a limit of 10 per cent of the fee income reckoned at standard rates be considered as legitimate expenditure for the purpose of assessing the grant that might be paid to a school, provided that the scheme for the award of scholarships or fee concessions has received the approval of the Director of Public Instruction.”

This recommendation was *not* accepted by Government on the grounds explained in the extract below :—

“The resolution is intended to benefit indigent pupils of marked ability. The Government observe that under the existing rules, about 85.5 per cent of the possible pupils are already eligible for half fee concessions. They apprehend that,

if effect were given to the resolution, this proportion would be enhanced. Pressure would be exercised on each school to utilize to the full the suggested maximum limit of 10 per cent and, regardless of the original intention, the concessions would tend to be granted irrespective of the poverty of the parents or the capacity of the pupils. While fee concessions are a legitimate form of inducement in the case of elementary education until compulsion is introduced, in the case of secondary schools much greater regard must be had to the selection principle. Effect can most suitably be given to it by a system of scholarships which will attract the best material into secondary schools. But the Government are unable to accept the view that a uniform ratio applied to each school irrespective of varying conditions and requirements is the most appropriate method. They are inclined to think that an increase in the number of Government scholarships now awarded, combined with a system of distribution with reference to the needs of particular schools and areas and communities, would be more suitable. The Director is requested to re-examine the question in the light of these remarks and to submit further proposals" [Paragraph 7 (1) of G.O. No. 112, dated 25th January 1919].

8. At the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 5th February last the Hon'ble Mr. P. Siva Rao moved a resolution recommending that a sum of Rs. 40,000 be provided in the next year's budget towards the grant of scholarships to indigent pupils in secondary schools up to 10 per cent on the rolls in accordance with the recommendations of the Educational Conference of 1916. The Hon'ble Mr. Littlehailes explained that the matter had been referred back to him for further consideration and that no fruitful purpose would be served by discussion at that stage. The resolution was withdrawn. The position still remains the same so far as this question is concerned and the present recommendation of the Additional Member cannot therefore, it is submitted, be accepted.

4. *Teaching grants to aided secondary schools [Clause (b) of the Resolution].*—The wording of this portion of the resolution is not clear. Apparently the Additional Member is referring to the orders of Government in regard to the payment of discretionary grants issued in paragraph 7 of G.O. No. 112, Home (Education), dated the 25th January 1919.

Prior to 1906 secondary schools were aided on salary grant system, i.e., the grants depended upon the salary and qualifications of the teachers employed, subject to the limitation that the maximum grant did not exceed the actual net cost of the institution, all special charges and receipts being excluded. In 1906 a new departure was made and the grant was made to depend upon the income guaranteed by the management. Under rule 32 of the Code, grants should be considered as supplementing the income guaranteed by the management from endowments, subscriptions, donations, and other private sources, the expenditure incurred on scholarships and on the levy of reduced rates of fees being left out of account; and under rule 3, the grant allotted to an institution should ordinarily be equal in amount to the income guaranteed by the management under rule 32. These rules have been subject to criticism ever since their inception in one respect or other. Immediately after the promulgation of the rule, the Missionary Council on aided education pointed out that the application of the rule limiting the grant to half the amount of net expenditure was very hard on schools in backward localities and for girls. It was then thought that in special cases advantage could be taken of the existence of the word 'ordinarily' in the rule.

5. In connexion with the protest of the Missionary Council on aided education against the establishment of model high schools, the Government of India drew the attention of the Local Government to the comparatively low expenditure incurred on secondary education. In reply this Government, while justifying the policy pursued in this Presidency that subject to certain limitations secondary education should normally be self-supporting and that the principles underlying rules 32 and 33 of the Grant-in-aid Code were eminently sound, stated that, if more funds were available, they would be prepared to consider whether the amount of teaching grants might not be substantially increased and whether a system of salary grants might not be instituted for masters possessing special qualifications.

6. At the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 15th February 1912, the Hon'ble Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar moved a resolution to the effect that the maximum teaching grant allowable to a school should be the difference between the total annual expenditure and the fee income which should be calculated at 85 per cent of the standard rates and that the management should be at liberty to set apart funds towards meeting unforeseen losses or erecting necessary buildings. In this connexion he pointed out that the number of secondary schools had been going down, that the amount of expenditure on secondary education from Provincial funds had been decreasing steadily and that some of the most important schools in the Presidency had not been receiving any grants at all. Sir Alfred Bourne and the Hon'ble Sir Murray Hammick, while admitting that the rules were defective in some respects, were not prepared to admit the resolution as it would throw the entire burden of secondary education on the Government. Though the resolution was carried, the Government refused to give effect to it.

7. In paragraph 9 of his despatch No. 106, Public, dated the 28th June 1912, on model schools, the Secretary of State observed that the policy adopted by this Government, that the Government grant should only be made when managers were in a position to increase to the same extent the expenditure from their own resources, would render the standard set by the proposed model schools unattainable by aided schools and expressed the view that a greater degree of elasticity might with advantage be allowed in the administration of the Grant-in-Aid Code. He also pointed out that it was undesirable to impose any rigid limits to the grant which an aided institution might earn by improved efficiency.

8. In paragraph 13 of his letter No. 5536, dated 9th March 1915, Mr. (now Sir) Henry Stone fully discussed the effect of the present policy in respect of grants-in-aid on the various classes of secondary schools. He pointed out that under the existing system it was impossible to treat schools according to their larger needs and that the distribution of grants as actually made was very little in proportion to the amount of the work done by schools, some of the larger schools going without grants. Non-mission schools, which had for the most part no funds at all behind them, suffered much in this respect, while missionary schools, which are supported by funds from home, fared much better. The result was that secondary education was being carried on a decidedly low level of efficiency and the quality of instruction particularly in the lower classes was often deplorably poor.

Sir Henry Stone also pointed out that the proportion of public expenditure on secondary education in Madras when compared with other provinces was very low and pleaded for larger expenditure under this head of education. He was strongly of opinion that grants should be made payable in aid of education, and not merely supplementary of the resources of private managers.

9. The Educational Conference of 1916 recommended "that a portion not exceeding 15 per cent of the total funds available for teaching grants to secondary schools be reserved for distribution by the Director of Public Instruction to such schools as, under rules 32 and 33 of the Grant-in-Aid Code, received little or no teaching grant."

10. In recommending the acceptance of the recommendation Sir Henry Stone wrote as follows:—

"The basis of distribution of aid in Madras to secondary schools is a purely local effort basis. The larger the amount collected by local effort the larger the grants awarded; the smaller the amounts collected the smaller the grants awarded. The system lays special stress upon private local effort thereby minimising the importance of public local effort. It indeed does not take into consideration 'public' local effort at all, such effort being aided by subsidies to local bodies, these subsidies being awarded under no specific rules. It does not in general suffice, as a practical code, to meet the needs of the poorer areas nor even in all cases to provide efficient schools in richer areas, and it has thus no equalising effect in the distribution of the burdens and advantages of education."

"The resolution contemplates the reserve fund being at the unconditional disposal of the Director. It is clear that either Government or the department would have to impose some restrictions on its use. No school should share in it that did not levy fees at standard rates. Grants from it should be given for a definite purpose, e.g., improving the staff in a specific way such as the appointment of a L.T. Headmaster for an incomplete secondary school or increasing the proportion of secondary teachers for the lower classes. The grant should also be allotted in advance, and care would have to be taken to see that it was not devoted to diminishing the schools' expenditure in some other direction."

The recommendation of the Conference was not accepted by Government and the following orders were passed thereon:—

"The suggestion underlying this recommendation appears to be that any school irrespective of its needs ought to receive some teaching grant. This might result in schools, already run at a profit and therefore requiring no state aid receiving grants from Government to swell their profits. This would affect the poorer schools which would as a result get proportionately less. There seems to be no justification for this and the Government are unable to accept the resolution as it stands. They accordingly remit the question to the Director of Public Instruction for further examination and report."

The matter is thus under the consideration of the Director and the Additional Member's suggestion cannot now be accepted pending receipt of the Director of Public Instruction's report and the issue of orders thereon.

12. It may however be stated in this connexion that the Director of Public Instruction proposed last year that a sum of Rs. 41,000 should be reserved out of the Imperial recurring grant of 4 lakhs for distribution, at his discretion, to schools that received little or no teaching grant under the Code rules and which were considered by him to stand in need of some or of additional aid. Of this amount, Rs. 11,000 is for schools under local bodies, while the rest is for aided schools. The question of the utilization of the sum reserved for aided schools is separately under consideration. The Director of Public Instruction has proposed to utilize it in the payment of grants to secondary schools towards the enhancement of the pay of teachers, when such enhancement cannot be effected without aid from Government. The file is in circulation.

13. The following statement shows the expenditure incurred from Provincial funds on teaching grants to secondary schools for boys in the years 1912-13 and 1917-18 and the provision made for the purpose in the budget estimates of 1918-19 and 1919-20:—

Teaching grants to Secondary Schools.

	RS.
1912-13 (Actuals)	2,32,152
1917-18 (")	2,50,999
1918-19 (Revised)	2,88,000
1919-20 (Budget)	3,05,000

The percentages of the total direct expenditure on secondary education met from public funds (Provincial, Local and Municipal) in the three Presidencies in 1916-17 were as follows:—

Madras	16.8
Bengal	18.2
Bombay	29.4

14. The file may be sent to the Director of Public Instruction u.o. for remarks.

S.K.—26-2-19.

N.K.—27-2-19.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—27-2-19.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—27-2-19.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

It is presumably the intention of Government to reconsider the orders passed on the recommendation of the Educational Conference on receipt of the Director of Public Instruction's further report. What fresh or further orders will be issued is dependent upon the results of the re-examination of the questions involved. Neither Government nor the Director of Public Instruction can prejudge these questions by the expression of definite opinions thereon at the present stage. I may state here, however, with regard to (a) of the resolution that the reasons against the award of scholarships by the school authorities are contained in pages 9 and 10 of my note on Grants-in-Aid written for the Educational Conference, while with regard to (b) of the resolution, no recognised school under private management is outside the provisions of the Grant-in-Aid Code.

R. LITTLEHAILES—2-3-19.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

For orders as to whether the resolution may be opposed and the Director of Public Instruction asked to take charge of it.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—4-3-19.

Clause (b) is wrongly worded. The reference to "outside the provisions of the Grant-in-Aid Code" is not to schools but to grants.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—4-3-19.

DO

(Fentland)

5-3-19



Edn 1360 A
5-6-19

Local and Municipal (Legislative) Department.
submitted that copies of extracts relating to the resolutions and the marginally noted bill discussed at the The Madras City Municipal Bill, 1918 meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 11th, 12th, 13th and 14th March 1919 may be forwarded u.o. to the departments concerned.

2. The Home (Education) department may be informed that Resolution XI (To give effect to the recommendations of the Educational Conference) was not moved and that Resolution XIX (Grant for the Hostel of Mrs. A. V. N. College, Vizagapatam) was withdrawn without being moved.

Lib cont 2
separately

T.S.R.
30-5-19
C.S.
26 2-6-19.
L.A.C.
4-6-19.

L & M u.o. No.1388-1 Legve, dated 4th June 1919.

To

- The Revenue (special) department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions I, IX, XII, XV, XVII, XXI, XXXII and XXXIII.
- The Home (Judicial) department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions III, X and XXII.
- The Home (Education) department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions IV, XIII and XVI.
- The Revenue Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions V, XXXIV and XXXV.
- The Home (Miscellaneous) department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions VI, XXIII and XXIV.
- The public department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolution VII.
- The Local and Municipal Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions VIII, XIV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXX, XXXI and the Madras City Municipal Bill.
- The public works (Irrigation) Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions XVIII and XXV.
- The public works (Railway) Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolution XX.

481

Department (Legislative) and Municipal Department.



Submitted Chief copies of extracts relating to the resolutions and the marginally noted bill discussed at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 11th.

12th, 13th and 14th March 1919 may be forwarded to the department concerned.

3. The Home (Education) Department may be informed that Resolution XI (to give effect to the recommendations of the Educational Conference) was not moved and that Resolution XIX (Grant for the Hostel of Mrs. A. V. M. College, Vinnagapattam) was withdrawn without being moved.

T.S.M.
30-5-19

O.S.
4-6-19

L.S.M. No. 138-1 Leges, dated 4th June 1919.

To

The Revenue (Special) Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions I, IX, XII, XV, XVII, XXI, XXII and XXIII.

The Home (Local) Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions III, X and XXII.

The Home (Education) Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions IV, XIII and XVI.

The Revenue Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions V, XXIV and XXV.

The Home (Miscellaneous) Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions VI, XXII and XXIV.

The Public Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolution VII.

The Local and Municipal Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions VIII, XIV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXX, XXXI and the Madras City Municipal Bill.

The Public Works (Engineering) Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolutions XXIX and XXX.

The Public Works (Medical) Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolution XXX.

The Public Works Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to ~~XXXXXX~~ Resolution XXVI.

The Local and Municipal (Medical) Department with 2 copies of extracts relating to Resolution XXIX.

M.A. 4/6/19.

The Police Department has 2 copies of extracts
relating to Exhibit Resolution XXVI.
The Local and Municipal (Municipal) Department has 2
copies of extracts relating to Resolution
XXVI.

8
Home (Edn) Dept

Please see para 2
of exp. note on page
6 supra.

The resolution on page 1 supra
was not moved. These papers may be

Recorded

order N-7338/12.6.19. SA
mis 7.6.19.
N/A
5/6/19

CR
11.6.19
12/6/19

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

191

READ AGAIN G.O. No. _____ DATED _____
 191

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO C. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH LITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

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