

Educational (1905) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 379

DATED 5-6-05



INDEXED.

ORIGINAL

[Despatch Abstract.]

Rules for the Remand & Dismissal of Hospital
and Students

Stating that rule 6 of the — approved in G.O.
375 of 8-8-03, is perfectly intelligible
and requires no modification.

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 {1905} of Madras. EDUCATIONAL.

Recd.

Enclosures

Regd.

1905.

Spure copies

ORIGINAL

G.O., No. 379, 5th June 1905.

N. P.

JUNE.

Rules for the remand and dismissal of Hospital Assistant students.

Stating that rule 6 of the — approved in G.O., No. 375, Educational, dated 8th August 1903, is perfectly intelligible and requires no modification.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper:—

G.O., No. 375, Educational, dated 8th August 1903.

ABSTRACT.—Approving as amended the draft rules for the remand and dismissal of students of the Hospital Assistant class and directing their publication in the *Fort St. George Gazette*.

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, Ref. on Cur. No. 3680, dated 8th May 1905.

In article 6 of the rules for the remand and dismissal of Hospital Assistant students sanctioned in G.O., No. 375, Educational, dated 8th August 1903, it is laid down that "in the examinations conducted by the Board failure to obtain the requisite total marks counts as failure in one subject." Last year in submitting recommendations under these rules on behalf of the students that failed at the Final examination, the Superintendent of the Rayapuram Medical School stated it as his opinion that article 6 should be held to apply only to those examinees who fail in "total marks" while passing in each individual subject: in other words if a student fails in one individual subject and in total marks he should be considered to have failed in one subject only and similarly if he fails in two individual subjects and in total marks he should be considered to have failed in two subjects only for purposes of the application of the rules relating to remand and dismissal. I concurred in this view and accordingly accepted the Superintendent's recommendations and the Board of Examiners then raised no objection to the re-examination of students who were regarded as having failed in only one subject in accordance with the above interpretation of article 6. In connection with the examinations of this year however Lieutenant-Colonel W. B. Browning who has since resumed charge as permanent President of the Board does not accept this view and considers that the recommendation contained in paragraph 11 of the "Concise statement of the recommendations of the Medical Reorganization Committee" embodied in G.O., No. 654, Educational, dated 22nd October 1896, viz., that "no candidate shall pass if he fail to obtain one-third of the marks in each subject and one-half of the total obtainable" read with article 6 of the rules for remand and dismissal implies that failure in total marks should by itself be considered to be failure in one subject whether the student passes or fails in individual subjects. As usually accepted the expression "failure in total marks" is only applicable to cases where a candidate has obtained all the separate minima required. The expression is used in this technical sense and to say that a candidate has failed in any subject or subjects and in total marks would be a misuse of the expression. I have the honour to request the early orders of Government as to the correct interpretation of the rule. At the same time I would suggest that the following note may be added to the rules so as to make them more definite in their application:—

If a candidate fails in any one subject the marks obtained by him in the subjects in which he has passed should be added to the minimum passing marks in the subject in which he has failed: if this gives the requisite total he fails in one subject only for the purposes of the above rules; if it does not he fails in two subjects. Similarly if he fails in two subjects this may or may not count as failure in three.

This system gives credit for excellence in any subjects and penalises general weakness, while it does not at the same time doubly penalise collapse in one or even two subjects provided there is excellence in the others.

ORDER—No. 379, Educational, dated 5th June 1905.

The Government consider that rule 6 of the rules for the remand and dismissal of Hospital Assistant students approved in G.O., No. 375, Educational, dated 8th August 1903, is perfectly intelligible and requires no modification. It means that when a student has failed to obtain the requisite total marks the Board should say in what subject or subjects he should be re-examined. The re-examination may be in one or more subjects as may be decided by the Board.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Director of Public Instruction,
„ Surgeon-General.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 379, EDUCATIONAL,
DATED 5TH JUNE 1905.

[SUBJECT.—*Rules for the remand and dismissal of Hospital Assistant students.*]

From the Director of Public Instruction, No. 3680, dated 8th May 1905.

Please see the last paragraph of recommendation 11 of the Medical College Reorganization Committee on page 14 of G.O., No. 654, Educational, dated 22nd October 1896, according to which "no candidate shall pass if he fail to obtain one-third of the marks in each subject and one half of the total obtainable".

Under rule 6 of the rules for the remand and dismissal of Hospital Assistant students on page 3 of G.O., No. 375, Educational, dated 8th August 1903, "failure to obtain the requisite total marks counts as failure in one subject."

2. The question now is whether a student who fails in one or more subjects and does not obtain the requisite total marks should be considered to have failed only in the number of subjects in which he actually failed or in one more subject. Dr. Browning, the President of the Board of Examiners for the Medical College, is of opinion that he should be considered to have failed in one more subject whereas the Director thinks that such an interpretation is against the usual acceptance of the expression "failure in total marks". In the note, however, which the Director proposes to add to the rule, he practically accepts Dr. Browning's interpretation.

3. Submitted that failure in total marks comes into play only when a candidate passes in all the subjects, but does not get the required minimum in the total. When, however, he fails in, say, one subject, there is no meaning in saying that he failed in one subject and total marks or two subjects. The Director may therefore be asked to stick to the ordinary interpretation.

But the question of total minimum arises even on re-examination.

H. D. TAYLOR.

4. Under rule 1, however, a student who fails in one subject only will be re-examined by the Board in that subject at the beginning of the next session. If he then passes in the subject, he will be considered to have passed the examination. He should not, however, be considered to have so passed unless he gets the requisite total marks—that is, the marks in the subjects originally passed added to those in the subject subsequently passed should not be less than half the total marks. A note to this effect may perhaps be added to rule 1 if it is thought that such a note may be put into these rules which only regulate the remand and dismissal of pupils. If not, the Director may be asked to put it in in its appropriate place.

The Director of Public Instruction proposes that this question of "total minimum" should be settled at the original examination by adopting minimum marks in one subject. His proposal makes things clearer and more definite.

H. D. TAYLOR.

Don't think there is any other appropriate place. Since transfer of Hospital Assistant class from Medical College, there is nothing in the College Calendar about them; and the Medical schools have no calendars.

A. GALLETTI.

But it is submitted there is G.O., Nos. 171, 172, dated 11th March 1904, page 15.

P. T. THARYAN.

P. T. THARYAN—16-5-05.

Concrete Instances.

Maximum.							A's marks.	B's.	O's.
100	..	..	..	..	..	..	70	57	70
100	..	..	..	..	..	..	40	60	60
100	..	..	..	..	..	..	50	50	50
100	..	..	..	..	..	..	30	30	30
—	..	..	..	..	..	..	—	—	—
400	..	..	..	..	..	..	190	197	210
—	..	..	..	..	..	..	—	—	—

Rules.

- A "No candidate shall pass if he fail to obtain one-third of the marks in each subject and one half of the total obtainable."
- B "Failure to obtain the requisite total marks counts as failure in one subject."
- I. Dr. Bourne's interpretation. { A fails in one subject.
B fails in one subject.
C fails in one subject.
- II. Dr. Browning's interpretation. { A fails in two subjects.
B fails in two subjects.
C fails in one subject.
- III. Dr. Bourne's proposal. { A fails in two subjects.
B fails in one subject (add on $3\frac{1}{2}$ to total).
C fails in one subject.

Dr. Bourne's interpretation is in accordance with the views of the University as exhibited in their failure lists. See list put up, f=deficiency in total marks, is not entered in combinations, but only singly.

2. It is not clear whether Dr. Browning is interested in the matter from a practical point of view, whether he wants to exclude students who have failed in one subject and the total marks because he thinks this would be desirable. The Director might perhaps be asked whether he has invited the remarks of the Principal, Medical College, on his proposed alteration of the rules, and, if so, to let us know what the Principal thinks.

A. GALLETTI—17-5-05.

I do not think that rule 6 can be held to apply except to students who have passed by the individual minima in *all* subjects, but who have failed to obtain the prescribed *total* minimum.

When a student has failed to reach the prescribed minimum in any one subject or any two subjects, rules (1) and (2) apply. But in case of students who have failed to obtain the minimum in one subject only, and who are re-examined at the commencement of next session under rule 1, the question of the total minimum will again arise. He may pass in that subject on re-examination and yet not reach the prescribed *total* minimum. This would be a further disqualification under rule 6.

2. Again in rule 6 I do not understand the reference to *subjects*. Should it not be "subject", inasmuch as failure to obtain total qualifying marks counts as failure in *one* subject? Perhaps "subjects" is used with reference to "students". I think the rule should run "in what subject any student who fails", etc.

3. The note proposed to be added by Director of Public Instruction will provide for the case in paragraph 1. If a student fails in one subject and in total marks (including the minimum in the subject in which he has failed), he will come under rule 2 and be remanded for a year. But a pass by the minimum of the subject of re-examination will count as a pass.

H. D. TAYLOR. I would not go further than this. When a candidate fails in two subjects, he must be remanded without reference to the total minimum. The last clause of the Director of Public Instruction's proposed note may be omitted.

The file will be returned to the Director of Public Instruction u.o. with the request that he will state what the views of the Principal are from a practical point of view.

H. D. TAYLOR—18-5-05.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Clause 2 of my note, which the Secretary proposes to omit, affects remand, only by introducing the possibility of dismissal.

2. The President of the Board thinks that my proposal may be adopted. He wishes, however, that more discretionary power be left to the Board. I enclose his letter for perusal and kind return. He also wants a distinction made between the conditions at the final examination and those previous to it.

3. The rules may be completely altered, but if not it seems unnecessary to tinker with them further. There is no necessity for a small Board dealing with a few candidates to be the slave of any mark system.

4. You can't give marks at a medical examination as you can at one in spelling—so many words right and so many wrong—or at a rifle-shooting competition—so many marks for a "bull" and so many for an "inner".

5. Marks may be given and altered and re-altered upon a consideration of all the circumstances and no one be any the wiser until they are finally agreed upon and published.

6. After all marks only form a means of expressing an opinion as to what should be done with each candidate and the rules might just as well run—

(1) The Board shall have the power to order the re-examination of any candidate in any particular subject at the beginning of the next session or to remand him for a year with or without stipend or to dismiss him.

(2) Present rule 5.

(3) Present rule 7.

This would not give the Board any more power than it virtually has at present and would save much discussion.

A. G. BOURNE—30-5-05.

From Lieut.-Colonel W. B. BROWNING, C.I.E., I.M.S., President, Medical College Board of Examiners, Madras, to the Director of Public Instruction, dated Royapettah, 25th May 1905, No. 109.

With reference to your proceedings No. 3680, dated 22nd May 1905, I have the honour to inform you that the Board consider that in cases of hospital assistant students up for their *final* examination the half marks system and one-third in each subject should be retained, but that the Board should have discretion to deal with each case on its merits and to give, whenever they consider it necessary, grace marks. In the hypothetical case you give, the Board would at once add 3 marks to D, and thus bring the half marks up to the required minimum and at the same time pass the student in D, in which case the student would pass entirely instead of being re-examined. To take another hypothetical case on the same lines as you give, a student obtains in A, B, C, D respectively 40, 35, 40 and 30; this student is distinctly bad, and although he obtains the required minimum in A, B and C and only fails by 3 marks in D, he should not be given any concession whatever, and should be remanded or, if previously remanded, dismissed. It will thus be seen that there is a necessity for discretion being vested in the Board. Your paragraph 2, which practically consists in giving grace marks on a fixed basis, might be adopted; the Board however would prefer that the discretionary power above mentioned be left in their hands. Reverting to my letter No. 56, dated 6th April 1905, and taking the marks of the five students therein mentioned, it will be seen that four out of five would fail if the suggestion in paragraph 2 were applied to their cases as follows:—

Names.	Marks obtained in subjects passed.	Passing marks in subjects failed.	Half total marks, 210.
Maung Shive Shin	160	17	177
Maung Kin U	188	17	205
Abdul Aziz	135	13	168
Kumaraswami Mudali	172	17	189
Miss Jacobs	198	17	215

Another side of the subject not covered by your suggestions is that of a student up for his final obtaining the required minimum in each subject, but failing to obtain the half total. In a case of this kind the Board will again require to use their discretion; one student may require but a few marks to obtain half marks, this the Board would at their discretion add at once. Another student similarly situated might be somewhat worse in his half total; when, the Board would recommend his being examined in one subject, the subject to be chosen by the Board; whilst a third student might have still lower marks and would be recommended by the Board for a remand or, if previously remanded, dismissal.

I am to add that the Board are unanimously of opinion that the rules should not be applied to the students in their three annual examinations preceding the final. In the case of these students the half total should be entirely disregarded, a student being only required to make one-third in each subject; failure in one subject would entail re-examination in that subject; failure in two, remand or, if previously remanded, dismissal.

Please put up a copy of the notes in G.O., No. 375, dated 8th August 1903.

H. D. TAYLOR—30-5-05.

Put up.

T. KANAKASUNDARAM PILLAI—30-5-05.

A. GALLETTI—30-5-05.

It is observed from the notes in G.O., No. 375, dated 8th August, that the rules when last recast were made precise and were published in order to discourage petitioning.

2. The Director of Public Instruction's proposal above would leave full discretion with the Board of Examiners, Medical College. May his proposal be accepted?

H. D. TAYLOR—31-5-05.

Rule 6 as it stands is perfectly intelligible and workable to whoever wants to do work and not split hairs. It means that, when there is a failure in the total minimum required, the Board shall say in what subjects there should be re-examination. It may be in one or in more: if the prescribed minimum had been obtained in each, the Board would say in which the pupil should come up again. If he failed in one it would ordinarily be in that one and he would on re-examination have to obtain the minimum in that one. But the Board could make him come up in two or in them all.

2. I do not see any use in the Director's proposed emendation. It is a matter for the discretion of the Board—not a matter of manipulation of marks.

J. T[homson]—1-6-05.

For draft.

H. D. TAYLOR—2-6-05.

A draft is placed below for approval.

T. KANAKASUNDARAM PILLAI—2-6-05.

A. GALLETTI—3-6-05.

Issue.

H. D. TAYLOR—3-6-05.

[G.O., No. 379, Educational, dated 5th June 1905.]

Educational (190⁵) Department.

CURRENT No. 870

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. 3680/05

Dated 8th May 190⁵

Enclosures

Received 11 MAY 1905 190⁵

Registered 11-5-1905

SUBJECT.

Requesting orders of Government as to the correct interpretation of article 6 of the Rules for the Remand and Dismissal of Hospital assistant students sanctioned in G.O. No. 375 Bd d/ 8th August 1903.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

170

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 378
1903

, DATED 8-8-1

CURRENT No. 870 — A

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. A ..

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

APERS 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 = Print heading only.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete. 50
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

Press
Print with notes
show for
Kaly
7/6/03

570
Notes 1-8P