



To Mr. [unclear]
in [unclear]

Educational (1904) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 764

DATED 26.12.04



INDEXED.

ORIGINAL

[Despatch Abstract.]

Fifth Standard Examination.

Approving with remarks the action of the Director in having collected the enhanced fee of Rs 1-8-0 from each of the candidates for the — held in November last & his proposal to pay fees to the examiners & to the Super for connection with that examination.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government {1904} of Madras. EDUCATIONAL.

2

Recd.

Enclosures


Regd.

} 1904.

Spare copies

ORIGINAL

G.O., No. 764, 26th December 1904.



DECEMBER.

Special Fifth Standard Examination.

Approving, with remarks, the action of the Director in having collected the enhanced fee of Rs. 1-8-0 from the candidates for the — held in November last and his proposal to pay fees to the examiners and the superintendents in connection with that examination.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper :—

G.O., No. 682, Educational, dated 18th November 1904.

ABSTRACT.—Sanctioning, with remarks, the proposals for conducting the Special Fifth Standard Examination.

READ—also the following paper :—

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 13th December 1904, Ref. on Cur. No. 7772.

I have the honour to address you with regard to G.O., No. 682, Educational, dated 18th November 1904.

2. The examination was conducted before the receipt of the order and the fee proposed, viz., Rs. 1-8-0, was collected in the absence of any orders to the contrary. The excess amounts should now under the order be refunded.

3. The fee of the 442 primary candidates amounted to Rs. 663, fees at As. 8 collected from upper and lower secondary candidates for examination in drawing only amounted to Rs. 70, the surplus stationery was sold by auction for Rs. 11, so that Rs. 744 were paid into the Treasuries.

4. Mr. Stone requests a reconsideration of the order prohibiting the payments proposed and as the circumstances may not have been fully realized I submit his request.

5. The work of examining was not spread among a number of individuals but was, in order to secure uniformity of marking, entrusted to five men not directly connected for the most part with the candidates they were examining, besides the Inspector, and was thus fairly heavy and outside the ordinary duties of the officers concerned.

6. The following statement shows the work which was done :—

	Papers set.	Papers translated.	Answer papers valued.
Inspector	2	..	581
M.R.Ry. S. Lakshmana Aiyar, B.A., L.T. ..	3	3	744
„ J. Visvanathayya	1	3	608
„ A. Rangaraja Sastri, B.A.	2	3	156
Muhammad Ibrahim Quarashi, B.A., L.T. ..	1	3	102
M.R.Ry. T. Mangesha Rau, B.A., L.T. ..	2	3	88
Total	11	15	2,279

7. For the superintendence Mr. Stone thought it desirable to appoint men outside the Training school staff, a few only were Government servants. They did three days' work and Mr. Stone proposed to pay them Rs. 6 each. The examination was held at a number of centres.

8. Mr. Stone proposes the following charges :—

	RS.
Examining fee to M.R.Ry. S. Lakshmana Aiyar	160
„ „ J. Visvanathayya	100
„ „ A. Rangaraja Sastri	30
„ „ T. Mangesha Rau	25
„ „ Muhammad Ibrahim Quarashi	25
„ „ A. Ramachandra Rau	20
Superintendents	140
Stamps and stationery	190
Railway parcel and other cooly charges	50
Total	740

9. I should like to add, upon the general question, that it is always difficult to get the best men to join the Educational Department as the pay and prospects are generally considered better elsewhere. The knowledge that they are likely to get examining fees acts as an inducement which I should be sorry to see taken away.

ORDER—No. 764, Educational, dated 26th December 1904.

In the circumstances now explained by the Director his action in having collected the enhanced fee of Rs. 1-8-0 from each candidate and his proposal to pay fees to the examiners and the superintendents are approved as a special case in respect of the examination held in November last.

2. Any proposals the Director may wish to make for the next year's examination should be submitted in sufficient time for the consideration of Government. In the absence of any such further proposal and orders thereon the decision of Government in G.O., No. 682, Educational, dated 18th November 1904, should be adhered to.

(True Extract.)

H. D. TAYLOR,

Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

„ Accountant-General.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 764, EDUCATIONAL, DATED
26TH DECEMBER 1904.

[SUBJECT.—*Special Fifth Standard Examination.*]

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 13th December 1904, No. 7772.

Please see G.O., No. 682, Educational, dated 18th November 1904, and the notes connected with it. In his letter of the 30th September 1904 read in this Government order, the Director of Public Instruction recommended for approval the proposal of the Inspector of European and Training Schools that Rs. 1-8-0 be fixed as the admission fee for the Special Fifth Standard Examination, and that fees be paid for the conduct and superintendence of the examination to the examiners and the superintendents. The Government, however, disapproved of the latter proposal in so far as it related to the Educational staff; and in regard to the former, they stated that the fee levied from the candidates should merely suffice to cover the cost of stationery, postage and other contingent expenses and accordingly fixed the fee at annas 12.

2. The Director now requests a reconsideration of the above order. His reasons for so doing are contained in paragraphs 2, 5 and 9 of his letter read above. The amount realised in the shape of fees at Rs. 1-8-0 for each candidate including miscellaneous receipts was Rs. 744 and the proposed expenditure is given as Rs. 740. All the examiners but one, whom it is now proposed to remunerate, are Government servants belonging to the Educational Department, but there is no information as to how many of the superintendents are such. There is no doubt a general statement in the Director's letter (paragraph 7) that a few only of the latter were Government servants; the exact number of them is not, however, stated. It is also deducible from the Director's statement (paragraph 7) that some persons outside the pale of Government Educational Service were employed for superintending the examination in question. In that case payment of remuneration cannot but be helped; so also in the case of those belonging to other departments of Government if any had been employed, as the work done by them was outside their ordinary duties. It is, however, most unlikely that any such Government servants would have been employed. Orders are requested as to whether fuller information should be called for on these points.

3. Attention is, however, solicited to the Secretary's note of the 4th ultimo in the notes connected with G.O., No. 682, Educational, dated 18th November 1904, and the Honourable Member's orders thereon. It was decided that there should be no fees to examiners or superintendents. Orders are now requested as to whether the Government should stick to this decision or whether the order of the 18th idem should be modified in the circumstances explained by the Director.

N. LAKSHMANA RAO—19-12-04.

It is submitted that the enhanced rate of fee levied from the candidates may be

H. D. TAYLOR. approved in the current year, the reduced rate being brought into force from next year. In the absence of orders to the contrary the Director of Public Instruction will refund the excess fee levied.

V. KRISHNASWAMI—20-12-04.

A. GALLETTI—20-12-04.

In the circumstances stated the proposals may be accepted in respect of the examination now referred to. I understand from Mr. Stone that the remuneration was promised before the examination took place and before Government orders were obtained.

2. It does not, however, necessarily follow that members of the Educational staff are entitled to fees merely because they examine other than their own pupils. Their duties may be considered general and not specific. In fact it is not desirable that teachers should examine their own pupils: they cannot claim remuneration for examining other pupils, when their own pupils are examined by others of the staff. It is a give and take arrangement. Outside examiners and superintendents, if it be found necessary to employ them at all, may reasonably be given some remuneration.

3. The fees, which have been actually recovered, at Rs. 1-8-0, need not now be refunded. They are required to meet the cost of the examination if the present proposal be sanctioned.

4. Proposals for next year should be submitted in time or G.O., No. 682, dated 18th November 1904, adhered to.

H. D. TAYLOR—21-12-04.

I accept the Secretary's proposals.

J. T^[HOMSON]—22-12-04.

Draft please.

H. D. TAYLOR—23-12-04.

A draft is submitted below for approval.

N. LAKSHMANA RAO—23-12-04.

The extra charge may be met from the savings under stipends pointed out in the Director's letter R.C. No. 7772, dated 30th September 1904, read in G.O., No. 682, Educational, dated 18th November 1904.

V. KRISHNASWAMI—23-12-04.

A. GALLETTI—23-12-04.

Issue.

H. D. TAYLOR—24-12-04.

[G.O., No. 764, Educational, dated 26th December 1904.]

Local & Muni. (190) Department.

CURRENT No. 2161.

From

[Name] The Hon'ble Mr. A.G. Bourne, D.Sc., F.R.S.,

[Designation] Director of public instruction,

[Station] Madras

Ref No. Cur No. 1772 of 04

Dated 13 December 1904

Enclosures

Received 1904

Registered 1904

SUBJECT.

Requesting to reconsider the orders passed in G.O. No. 682 Educational d/18th November 1904 in regard to the reduction of fees from candidates for the Fifth Standard Examination.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Local and Municipal Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to address you with regard to G.O. No. 682 Educational dated 18th November 1904.

2. The examination was conducted before the receipt of the order and the fee proposed viz 1-8-0 was collected in the absence of any orders to the contrary. The excess amounts should now under the order be refunded.

3. The fee of the 442 Primary candidates amounted to Rs 663/- fees at annas eight collected from Upper and Lower Secondary candidates for examination in Drawing only amounted to Rs 70/- the surplus stationery was sold by auction for Rs 11 so that Rs 744/- were paid into the Treasuries.

4. Mr. Stone requests a reconsideration of the order prohibiting the payments proposed and as the circumstances may not have been fully realized I submit his request.

5. The work of examining was not spread among a number of individuals but was in order to secure uniformity of marking entrusted to 5 men not directly connected for the most part with the candidates they were examining besides the Inspector and was thus fairly heavy and outside the ordinary duties of the officers concerned.

6. The following statement shows the work which was done:-

	Papers set	Papers translated	Answer papers valued
Inspector	2	"	581
M.R.Ry S. Lakshmana Aiyar B.A. L.T.	3	3	744
" J. Visvanathayya	1	3	608
" A. Rangaraja Sastri B.A.	2	3	156
Muhammad Ibrahim Qurashi B.A. L.T.	1	3	102
M.R.Ry T. Mangesha Rau B.A. L.T.	2	3	88
	11	15	2279

TELEPHONIC MESSAGE.

Date. 16-12-1904

Hours Minutes.

From

To

Manager
of Mangra S.P.

H.E.
95!

The first two are Govt. Servants - Mangra Rao is H.D. master, Govt. Training School, Anantapur and Ibrahim Qurashi is an Govt. in the madrasa azam. Ramachandra Rao is, I believe not a Govt. Servant.

16/12
5.20 PM

P.

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 2161, From the D.P.D., No 7772, dated 13-12-1904.

ORDER No. 764, dated 26. 12. 1904

In the circumstances now explained by the Director his action in having collected the enhanced fee of Rs. 1-8-0 from each candidate ~~dated~~ ^{to} and his proposal to pay fees for the examiners and the Superintendents as a special case are approved, in respect of the examination held in November last.

2. Any proposals the Director may wish to make for the next year ^{Examⁿ} should be ^{sufficient} submitted in time for the consideration of Govt. In the absence of any ^{order} ~~such~~ ^{written} proposals ^{or other} the decision of Govt. in G.O. no. 682 Edl, of 18th November 1904 should be

adhered to. H
hab ok. 23.12.02 H
23/1/4 23-12-02 micro

S. C. 1000 26/1/5

To the D.P.D (Pro)
" A.S. (Loo)

3/1/05

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
190 .

, DATBI

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DATTO.

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

N.B.—

A = Print in full.

B = Not to be printed.

P = Print abstract only.

Q ~~was~~ Print heading only.

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED.

Order complete.

Letter only.

Order complete with Letter.