

[]

1905-1906

D/b

Educational (1905) Department.

Ans. pub.

2

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 531.

DATED 5-8-05

(5)

N. P.

INDEXED

ORIGINAL

[Despatch Abstract.]

Hospital Assistant Students.

Making certain alterations in the rules for
the removal & dismissal of Hospital Asst
Students.

f

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 of Madras.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1905.

Enclosures

Spare copies

ORIGINAL

G.O., No. 531, 5th August 1905.

N. P.

Hospital Assistant Students.

Making certain alterations in the rules for the remand and dismissal of—.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

I

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 the publication of the same in the *Fort St. George Gazette*.

II

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

ABSTRACT.—Stating 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.

III

Letter—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—20th July 1905.

No.—Ref. on Cur. 3680.

I have the honour to request further orders in regard to my letter Ref. on Cur. No. 3680, dated 8th May 1905.

2. The Order No. 379, Educational, dated 5th June 1905, passed thereon explains the meaning of rule 6 of the rules for the remand and dismissal of hospital assistant students, but it does not, I submit, decide the question at issue, which is whether a student who fails in one subject and also fails to obtain the requisite total marks should be re-examined or remanded; in other words, should be dealt with under rule 1 or under rule 2. I have contended that rule 6 only becomes operative in the case of students unaffected by rule 1, 2 or 3 and that when it becomes operative the student should be dealt with as provided under rule 1.

Lieutenant-Colonel Browning contends that rule 6 may operate conjointly with rule 1 and a portion with rule 2 or 3.

3. If the latter view be taken, rule 2 would hardly ever operate as a student who fails in two subjects would almost certainly fail to obtain the requisite total and would have to be dismissed under rule 3. This can hardly have been the intention.

4. I may add that I am obliged to address Government again as I am informed by the Superintendent of the Ráyapuram Medical school that Colonel Browning refuses to re-examine certain students who failed in one subject only at the last examination because they also failed to obtain the requisite total marks. The Superintendent requests that they be re-examined now, whereas the President of the Board insists upon their remand for a year. I say that they should be re-examined now and remanded if they fail.

Order—No. 531, Educational, dated 5th August 1905.

The Director's interpretation is accepted and 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, will be inserted after rule 1 as rule 2 with the addition of the words "for the purposes of rule 1" at the beginning, the present rules 2, 3, 4 and 5 being renumbered as rules 3, 4, 5 and 6.

2. The rules, as thus altered, are printed as an appendix to this order.

(True Extract.)

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

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

APPENDIX.

RULES FOR THE REMAND AND DISMISSAL OF HOSPITAL ASSISTANT STUDENTS.

1. A student who fails in one subject only at the Board examinations held at the end of the session shall be re-examined by the Board in that subject at the beginning of the next session. Failure at the re-examination will entail a remand for one year. If the failure is by a student previously remanded, he shall be dismissed.
Board examinations—Failure in one subject.
2. For the purposes of rule 1, in the examinations conducted by the Board, failure to obtain the requisite total marks counts as failure in one subject. It shall be left to the Board of Examiners in consultation with the Superintendent to decide in what subjects students who fail to obtain the requisite total shall be re-examined.
3. A student who fails at the Board examinations in two subjects shall be remanded for one year. If the failure is by a student previously remanded, he shall be dismissed.
Board examinations—Failure in two subjects.
4. A student who fails at the Board examinations in more than two subjects shall be dismissed whether previously remanded or not.
Board examinations—Failure in more than two subjects.
5. When a stipendiary student is remanded he may be recommended for remand either with or without stipend.
Continuance of stipend to remanded stipendiaries.
6. A stipendiary student dismissed for failure at any of the Board examinations may rejoin the school as a private (paying) student at the option of the Superintendent.
7. If a student be disabled by illness during his course or fails in his attendance from causes which are beyond his control and which the Superintendent may consider sufficient to justify exemption from dismissal, the student may be permitted to intermit his studies (without stipend in the case of stipendiary students) till the beginning of the ensuing session.
Failure from illness.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 531, EDUCATIONAL,
DATED 5TH AUGUST 1905.

[SUBJECT.—Rules for the Remand and Dismissal of Hospital Assistant Students.]

From the Director of Public Instruction, R.C. No. 3680, dated 20th July 1905.

Please see the notes and orders in G.O., No. 379, Educational, dated 5th June 1905.

2. Rule 6 of the rules in G.O., No. 375, Educational, dated 8th August 1903, provides for the case of a student who fails only in the total marks and prescribes the course to be followed in case of failure in that case—that is a re-examination in one or more subjects at the option of the Board. It is, however, possible that a student may fail both in one or more subjects *and* also in the requisite total marks at one and the same examination. The question now raised by the Director is what should be done in such cases. For instance, if a student fails in one subject *and* total marks, should he be re-examined in that subject *and* in one or more *other* subjects as may be decided by the Board of Examiners. If he has to be so examined will his case fall under rule 2 or rule 3?

3. Submitted that under the Honourable Member's orders in G.O., No. 379, Educational, dated 5th June 1905, if a student fails in one subject *and* in total marks he should be re-examined in such subjects as may be decided by the Board. If he fails in two subjects *and* total marks he can be dealt with under rule 2 and if he fails in more than two subjects *and* total marks he comes under rule 3, and rule 6 need not be applied at all.

4. It follows therefore that Colonel Browning should *examine* the students mentioned in such subjects as he thinks necessary and should not order their remand.

P. T. THARYAN—25-7-05.

Submitted that rule 6 was probably meant to be part of rule 1, but got misplaced. Failure to get the minimum total does not equal to failure to pass in one subject out of There is no adding of dissimilars: it is the two for the purposes of rule 2 or one creation of a special subject of failure. subject out of more than two for the purposes of rule 3, because you cannot add dissimilars together. The reference was intended to be to the term "failure-to-pass-in-one-subject" in rule 1, and I do not believe that any reference was intended to any term used in rules 2 and 3: the reference to rule 1 is made by a simple reproduction of a term used in rule 1: the term "failure-in-one-subject" is not used in rules 2 and 3; the terms used are the equivalents of "failure-in-two-subjects," "failure-in-more-than-two-subjects" and you have to analyse these terms, *i.e.*, split the concepts into two, before you can make rule 6 apply to them and this amounts to a reference which it requires deduction, and not mere comparison, to discover, and so is probably too remote to have been intended. It is, it is submitted, only the position of rule 6 after rules 2 and 3 instead of directly after or as part of rule 1 that lends any plausibility to Dr. Browning's interpretation.

2. Further submitted that the question should not be decided with reference to quibblings about verbal interpretation; but that as Dr. Bourne's proposal accords with the practice of the University and as Dr. This is not the University. J. [THOMSON]. Browning has stated that he has, from a practical point of view, no objection to the rules being amended so as to admit only of interpretation in accordance with Dr. Bourne's views, Dr. Browning may be over-ruled and told that the student should be re-examined, not remanded.

A. GALLETTI—26-7-05.

The Director of Public Instruction's interpretation may be accepted and the rules renumbered so that No. 6 becomes No. 2, so as to make it clear that it is applicable to No. 1 only and not to 2 and 3.

H. D. TAYLOR—27-7-05.

I do not think that any question of quibbling arises. When the matter came to me last I could not see how there could be any difference of opinion over the question: viz., that failure to obtain the requisite total marks was failure in one subject and that a subject by itself, different from any single subject of examination in which there had been failure. A student may fail in one subject and yet have secured the total minimum for passing, and he may also not have secured that total. So it appeared to me that the rule was specially designed to meet the particular case of a poor general preparation. This is, I believe, far too common among these students, and I gathered that Dr. Browning was glad to be able to apply it so as to remand.

Verify this please.

2. These rules came up in 1903 from the Director. If they are his rules I am ready to accept his interpretation of them: if he got them from the Board I think he should consult the Board and find what it meant or wishes.

J. T[HOMSON]—28-7-05.

The rules for the remand and dismissal of students of the Hospital Assistant class were originally drawn up in the Director's office and referred for remarks to the Superintendents of the Medical schools at Rayapuram and Vizagapatam and to Dr. Maitland—paragraph 2 of the Director's letter in G.O., No. 374, Educational, dated 8th August 1903. It is not known whether on receipt of these remarks the rules were subsequently altered, but those submitted to Government may be said to be the Director's rules and not those of the Board of Examiners who had nothing to do with them.

P. T. THARYAN—31-7-05.

A. GALLETTI—1-8-05.

The rules may be renumbered and the Director's interpretation accepted.

H. D. TAYLOR—2-8-05.

Very well, do so. I shall be glad to have done with the matter.

J. T[HOMSON]—2-8-05.

Draft please.

H. D. TAYLOR—3-8-05.

The draft placed below is submitted for approval.

R. N.—3-8-05.

P. T. THARYAN—4-8-05.

A. GALLETTI—4-8-05.

H. D. TAYLOR—5-8-05.

[G.O., No. 531, Educational, dated 5th August 1905.]

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 375 Est., dated 8th August 1903.

" " " " 379 Est., " 5th June 1905.

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 1334, From the S.P.D., No. 3680, dated 20th July 1905.

" " " " " " " " 190

" " " " " " " " 190

ORDER

No. 531, dated 5-8-1905.

P. S.

The Director's interpretation is accepted and rule 6 of the rules for the remand and dismissal of hospital assistant students approved in G.O. no. 375 Est. of 8th August 1903 will be inserted after rule 1 as rule 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ and the present rules 2, 3, 4 and 5, being renumbered as rules 3, 4, 5 and 6.

2. The rules as thus altered will be printed as an appendix to this order, and published in the East of India

with the addition of the words "for the purposes of rule 1" at the beginning

3 copies left 29/8/05

2. The S.P.D. Surgeon General
Gazette. 29/8/05

Gazette.

hi

3/8/05

PH

4/8/05

5-8-05.

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.]

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

NUMERICAL COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete. 50
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 190

DATED

P.

CURRENT No.

A

Notes 1-5. P

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

[Signature]

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DILLO.

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

N.F.—

- A = Print in full.
- B = Not to be printed.
- F = Print abstract only.
- C = Print heading only.

Print the rules

*in 80 no 3754-8.
to be remembered; Print with note
May 1903, as appearing
to the present 70*