Educational (1906) Department.

1

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 501

DATED 27-7-06

60

[Despatch Abstract.]

Sub. ordinate Educational Service - ~~Stating that the Govt~~ ~~Consider the proposals for the re-organisation of the in the Presidency, that~~ Consider it that it is necessary at present to group together the and grade separately only the Assistant Lecturers in the Colleges of the Presidency and requesting the D.P.I. to submit a proportion statement for giving effect to this decision.

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.

2

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Recd. } 1906. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 501, 27th July 1906.

Subordinate Educational Service.

Considering that it is necessary at present to group together and grade separately only the assistant lecturers in the colleges of the Presidency, and requesting the Director of Public Instruction to submit a proposition statement for giving effect to this decision.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

I

G.O., No. 108, Educational, dated 22nd February 1899.

Abstract.—Stating that the scheme for grading the Subordinate Educational Service should be abandoned.

II

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—the 11th September 1905.
No.—C. No. 7703.

I have the honour to submit for the favourable consideration and orders of Government a scheme for the reorganization of the Subordinate Educational Service in this Presidency.

2. The scheme submitted by Dr. Duncan in January 1898 was rejected by Government for the following reasons :—

(i) that its numerous provisos and restrictions deprived it of simplicity ;

(ii) that such a variety of heterogeneous appointments as were dealt with in the scheme could not suitably be thrown into one service ;

(iii) that the principle of grading had been carried too far, as many as 503 appointments from Rs. 15 upwards having been included in the scheme.

Dr. Duncan was therefore requested in G.O., No. 450, Educational, dated 23rd July 1898, to revise his proposals, limiting the scheme to appointments carrying a pay of Rs. 50 upwards and restricting it for the most part to masters, instructors or inspecting officers and such few clerical appointments as might require the services of persons with some educational experience. A revised scheme was accordingly submitted in November 1898, but this too was rejected in G.O., No. 108, Educational, dated 22nd February 1899, as it failed to meet the objections previously raised.

3. My chief reason for urging upon Government a reconsideration of the matter is that I find that the present system of independent appointments, some of which carry fixed pay and others progressive, leads to unavoidable inequalities of treatment, as it often happens that officers whom it is undesirable to transfer from their appointments have to forfeit their promotion by being retained in them. There is a disadvantage also in having some appointments progressive and others on fixed pay as a junior officer who, for special reasons, is placed in a progressive appointment after a few years is in a higher position as regards pay than a senior officer doing equally good work in an appointment carrying a salary less than the maximum of the progressive appointment. For these and other reasons it seems to me to be extremely desirable that the subordinate service should be graded. Dr. Duncan's scheme was rejected by Government on account of its complexity. Some attempt has been made in the accompanying proposals to present a simpler arrangement. The main features of this scheme are—

(1) The 170 appointments considered are those ranging in pay between Rs. 30 and Rs. 180, the lower limit being so chosen partly because, except in offices and institutions directly subordinate to the Director, all appointments on Rs. 30 and below are made by Inspectors or Inspectresses, and partly because it is not necessary in my opinion that appointments on less than Rs. 30 should be graded.

(2) All appointments in the Medical, Agricultural and Engineering Colleges have been omitted from consideration—those in the Medical College are filled by officers recruited from the Medical Department, the Agricultural College is likely to be separated from this Department, and most of the appointments in these Colleges are special and cannot be filled by men taken from the general cadre of the subordinate educational service.

(3) All special appointments, such as carpentry instructors, blacksmiths, mechanics, bandmasters, sergeants, librarians, etc., and those in the offices of the Registrar of Books and the Curator, Oriental Manuscripts Library, have been omitted.

(4) The Sub-Assistant Inspectors and Inspectresses have also been omitted as they had best form a separate graded branch of the service as they do now.

(5) The appointments considered include masters in general and training schools and in the school of commerce, superintendents of hill schools, supervisors of primary schools, drawing-masters, gymnastic instructors, mistresses in general and training schools and pandits. Clerical appointments have been excluded in deference to the orders issued on the previous schemes ; but I have made an exception in favour of the manager and the four highest clerks in the office of the Director of Public Instruction as they hold the highest clerical appointments in the Department and it is advisable that these appointments should be held by men of some educational experience.

(6) The 170 appointments included in the scheme have been classified into four groups :—

Class I with 16 *appointments* as shown below on salaries rising from Rs. 130 to Rs. 180.—

		Rs.			Rs.
Two on	.. ..	180	Four on	.. ..	150
Three on	.. ..	175	Three on	.. ..	140
Two on	.. ..	170	Two on	.. ..	130

Class II with 23 *appointments* as shown below on salaries rising from 80 to Rs. 125 :—

		Rs.			Rs.
Four on	.. ..	125	Five on	.. ..	90
Three on	.. ..	115	Two on	.. ..	85
Seven on	.. ..	100	Two on	.. ..	80

Class III with 30 *appointments* as shown below on salaries rising from Rs. 55 to Rs. 75 :—

		Rs.			Rs.
Nine on	.. ..	75	Nine on	.. ..	60
Seven on	.. ..	70	Five on	.. ..	55

Class IV with 101 *appointments* as shown below on salaries rising from Rs. 30 to Rs. 50 :—

		Rs.			Rs.
Thirty-six on	.. ..	50	Nineteen on	.. ..	35
Twenty-four on	.. ..	40	Twenty-two on	.. ..	30

In making this classification I have endeavoured to group together into one class appointments to which any salary ranging between the minimum and maximum salary of the class may reasonably be attached, *e.g.*, in class II the Second Assistant, Mangalore College, who now draws Rs. 90—6—120, may reasonably be permitted to draw from Rs. 80 to Rs. 125, and if he is qualified to hold any of the appointments in class I may, when he reaches the maximum in class II, be promoted to class I when a vacancy occurs. It will of course rest with the head of the department to decide whether a person who has reached the maximum in his class may be promoted to an appointment in the higher one.

(7) The advantage of grouping the appointments into *classes* is that it fixes the *value* of each appointment, and the incumbent of each appointment knows the maximum salary he may expect to rise to in that appointment. The *Gymnastic Instructor* (Presidency College), No. 17 in class III, will know, for instance, that his salary is fixed practically at Rs. 55 to Rs. 75, and he cannot expect to rise into the higher class unless he is considered qualified for one of the *appointments* in it. This would not be the case if all the 170 appointments formed one class. Thus the proposed classification, while fixing within reasonable limits the expectations of the incumbent of each appointment, retains the advantages of a progressive scale in each class.

(8) In fixing the grade equivalent of each appointment now carrying progressive salaries, I have generally taken the average; but, in a few cases, considering the nature of the appointments or the salaries now drawn by the incumbents, I have taken the minimum or the maximum. I have also considered how the pay fixed compares with the salaries of the other appointments on the same establishment.

(9) In class IV the number of appointments is comparatively large, but this cannot be helped the present number of appointments of the grades included in the class being large.

(10) The total of the salaries proposed is less than the average total of the present scale, but as personal allowances will have to be given in some cases, the actual expenditure involved in the introduction of this scheme will be Rs. 102 per mensem more than the average or Rs. 1,224 per annum. I expect that if the scheme is put into operation there will be considerable savings under travelling allowances as there will be no necessity for the frequent transfers that have now to be made when officers have to be promoted.

4. The constitution of the subordinate service in this scheme is on the lines of the Provincial Educational Service as each class comprises a number of appointments rising in pay. It is intended that a person holding an appointment in a class may rise to the maximum pay of the class without changing his appointment. There will be practically *four progressive scales of pay* in which men will draw their increments not by lapse of time, but on the occurrence of vacancies. The provisos and restrictions objected to by Government in the previous schemes are rendered unnecessary in the present one by the proposed grouping of appointments into suitable *classes*. The only condition to be observed is that an officer who has risen to the top of one class cannot for mere seniority claim to be admitted into the next.

As opportunities for permanent promotions will seldom occur, *acting* or sub. *pro tem.* promotions may, I think, be allowed; but as each class is in a way complete in itself, the acting promotions may be restricted, as a rule, to the men in the class in which the vacancy occurs. It may, however, be left to the discretion of the head of the department to promote to the last place in the class any person in the class next below who may be considered qualified to enter the higher class, and similarly the vacancy thus caused may be filled up by promoting a deserving person in the next lower class—so that, so far as the classes lower than the one in which the acting vacancy occurs are concerned, not more than *one in each class* will be benefited; while in the class in which the vacancy occurs the men below will each go a step higher. As a general rule, however, it would seem to be best to restrict the promotions to the class in which the vacancy occurs. It may also be desirable to make no promotions when a vacancy is not expected to last for more than three months.

5. A proposition statement in the prescribed form will be submitted through the Accountant-General if the scheme has the general approval of Government. In the statements submitted with this letter the appointments have been arranged mainly according to the average value of the present scale; but on receipt of the sanction of Government to these proposals, a separate statement fixing the rank of the officers in each class will be prepared for the guidance of the head of the department in making promotions or filling up acting vacancies and for the information of the Account Department.

6. I beg to add that in anticipation of the approval of Government I am making the necessary provision for the extra expenditure in the budget estimates for next year.

Enclosure.

Number.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Pay proposed.	Personal allowance, if any.
			Class I (Rs. 150 to 180).			
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	First Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	180	180	180	180	..
2	Third Assistant, Teachers' College ..	150—5—200	180⅔	180	180	..
3	Second Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	175	175	175	175	..
4	First Assistant, Kumbakónam College ..	175	175	175	175	..
5	Do. Rajahmundry College ..	175	175	175	175	..
6	Third Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	170	170	170	170	..
7	Manager, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	150—5—175	168¾	165	170	..
8	First Assistant, Mangalore College ..	125—10—175	155	135	150	..
9	Do. Madrasa-i-azam ..	125—5—175	155⅔	125	130	..
10	Fourth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	150	150	150	150	..
11	Second Assistant, Kumbakónam College.	150	150	150	150	..
12	Do. Rajahmundry College.	150	150	150	150	..
13	Headmaster, School of Commerce ..	140	140	140	140	..
14	First Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	125—5—150	141⅔	150	140	10
15	First Assistant, Training College, Rajahmundry.	125—5—150	141⅔	135	140	..
16	Fourth Assistant, Teachers' College ..	100—5—150	130⅔	105	130	..
	Total ..		2,538¾	2,460	2,505	10
			Class II (Rs. 80 to 125).			
1	Fifth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	125	125	125	125	..
2	Sixth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	125	125	125	125	..
3	Third Assistant, Kumbakónam College ..	125	125	125	125	..
4	Do. Rajahmundry College ..	125	125	125	125	..
5	Head Clerk, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	100—5—125	118¾	105	115	..
6	Second Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	100—5—125	116⅔	125	115	10
7	Headmistress, Hobart Training School ..	100—5—125	116⅔	105	115	..
8	Seventh Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	100	100	100	100	..
9	Eighth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	100	100	100	100	..
10	Latin Master, Presidency College ..	100	100	100	100	..
11	Fourth Assistant, Rajahmundry College.	100	100	100	100	..
12	Fifth Do. do. ..	100	100	100	100	..
13	Fourth Assistant, Kumbakónam College.	100	100	100	100	..
14	Second Assistant, Mangalore College ..	90—6—120	108	96	100	..
15	Second Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ..	85—4—125	109⅓	85	90	..
16	Third Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	80—4—100	93⅓	92	90	2
17	First Assistant, Rajahmundry Practising Section.	80—4—100	93⅓	88	90	..
18	Second Assistant, Rajahmundry Training Section.	80—4—100	93⅓	88	90	..
19	Headmistress, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	75—5—100	91⅔	75	85	..
20	Headmistress, Training school for Mistresses, Calicut.	75—5—100	91⅔	100 *plus* 20 personal allowance.	85	35
21	Fifth Assistant, Teachers' College ..	75—2½—100	90 5/12	100	90	10
22	Sixth Do. do. ..	75—2½—100	90 5/12	87½	80	1½
23	Second Clerk, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	80	80	80	80	..
	Total ..	..	2,393 5/12	2,346½	2,325	58½
			Class III (Rs. 55 to 75).			
1	Fifth Assistant, Kumbakónam College ..	75	75	75	75	..
2	Headmaster, Training School, Calicut ..	75	75	75	75	..
3	Third Clerk, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	75	75	75	75	..
4	Third Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ..	70—2—80	76⅔	72	75	..
5	Second Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry.	60—4—80	73⅓	68	75	..
6	Third Assistant, Training Section, Rajahmundry.	60—4—80	73⅓	68	75	..
7	Headmaster, Training School, Tanjore ..	60—4—80	73⅓	64	75	..
8	Do. Training School, Coimbatore.	60—4—80	73⅓	80	75	5

Number.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Pay proposed.	Personal allowance, if any.
	Class III. (*Rs.* 55 *to* 75)—cont.					
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
9	First Assistant, Hobart School	60—4—80	73⅓	64	70	..
10	Do. School of Commerce ..	70	70	70	70	..
11	Fourth Clerk, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	70	70	70	70	..
12	Third Assistant, Mangalore College ..	60—4—80	72	80	75	5
13	Fourth Assistant do. ..	60—4—80	72	64	70	..
14	Persian Munshi, Presidency College ..	60—2—80	72⅔	60	70	..
15	Malayalam Munshi, Presidency College.	60—2—80	72⅔	78	70	8
16	Tamil Munshi, Presidency College ..	60—2—80	72⅔	62	70	..
17	Gymnastic Instructor, Presidency College.	60—2—80	72⅔	60	60	..
18	Fourth Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ..	60—2—70	66⅔	60	60	..
19	Do. Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	50—5—75	66⅔	50	60	..
20	Headmaster, Reformatory School ..	60	60	60	60	..
21	Additional, Assistant Mangalore College.	60	60	60	60	..
22	Headmaster, Training School, Guntúr ..	40—4—60	53⅓	60	60	..
23	Do. do. Nellore ..	40—4—60	53⅓	60	60	..
24	Headmaster, Training School, Vizagapatam.	40—4—60	53⅓	48	55	..
25	Headmaster, Training School, Bellary ..	40—4—60	53⅓	56	55	1
26	Do. do. Chittoor.	40—4—60	53⅓	60	60	..
27	Headmaster, Training School, Villupuram.	40—4—60	53⅓	56	55	1
28	Headmaster, Training School, Trichinopoly.	40—4—60	53⅓	60	60	..
29	Headmaster, Training School, Salem ..	40—4—60	53⅓	60	55	5
30	Do do. Mangalore.	40—4—60	53⅓	60	55	5
	Total ..	..	1,974⅔	1,936	1,980	30
	Class IV (*Rs.* 30 *to* 50).					
1	Fifth Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam.. ..	50—2—60	56⅔	50	50	..
2	First Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	45—3—60	55	45	50	..
3	First Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Calicut.	45—3—60	55	45	50	..
4	Drawing Mistress, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	40—4—60	53⅓	60	50	10
5	Fourth Assistant, Training Section, Rajahmundry.	40—4—60	53⅓	48	50	..
6	Third Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry.	40—4—60	53⅓	48	50	..
7	Headmistress, Kumbakónam Girls' School.	50	50	60	50	10
8 to 14	Headmistresses of seven girls' schools ..	350	350	350	350	..
15	Headmaster, Training School, Russellkonda.	50	50	50	50	..
16	Headmaster, Muhammadan Training School.	50	50	50	50	..
17	Headmaster, Training School, Madura ..	50	50	50	50	..
18	Do. Training School, Tinnevelly.	50	50	50	50	..
19	Fifth Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	50	50	50	50	..
20	Additional English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	50	50	50	50	..
21	Headmaster, Training School, Saidapet ..	50	50	50	50	..
22	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Russellkonda.	50	50	50	50	..
23	Second Assistant, School of Commerce ..	50	50	50	50	..
24	Telugu Pandit, Presidency College ..	40—2—60	52⅔	40	50	..
25	Canarese do. do. do. ..	40—2—60	52⅔	60	50	..
26	Sanskrit do. do. do. ..	40—2—60	52⅔	60	50	10
27	Senior Pandit, Rajahmundry do. ..	40—2—60	52⅔	60	50	10
28	Persian Pandit do. do. ..	40—2—60	52⅔	40	50	10
29	Tamil Pandit, Kumbakónam do. ..	40—2—60	52⅔	42	50	..
30	Sanskrit do. do. do. ..	40—2—60	52⅔	54	50	..
31	Drawing Master, Teachers' College ..	40—2—60	52⅔	42	50	4
32	Persian Munshi, Madrasa-i-azam ..	40—2—60	52⅔	60	50	..
33	Arabic do. do. ..	40—2—60	52⅔	42	50	10
34	Drawing Master, Training College, Rajahmundry.	40—2—50	46⅔	50	50	..
35	Sixth Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam	40—2—50	46⅔	44	50	..
36	Second Assistant, Hobart Training School.	40—2—50	46⅔	44	50	..
37	Third do. do.	40—2—50	46⅔	40	40	..
38	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Parlákimedi.	40	40	40	40	..
39	Headmaster, Training School, Jeypore ..	40	40	40	40	..
40	Do. Panchama Training School.	40	40	40	40	..
41	First Assistant, Training School, Calicut.	40	40	40	40	..
42	Third Assistant, School of Commerce ..	40	40	40	40	..
43	Fourth do do. ..	40	40	40	40	..

* Gunnairbeed, Suryarowpet, Nellore, Vellore, Cuddalore, Kanathur and Tellicherry.

Number.	Name of appointment.	Present scale	Average.	Actual.	Pay proposed.	Personal allowance, if any.
	Class IV (*Rs.* 30 *to* 50)—cont.					
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
44	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Suradá ..	40	40	40	40	..
45	Do. do. Narsapatnam.	40	40	40	40	1
46	Second Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	35—2—45	41⅔	41	40	..
47	Second Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Calicut.	35—2—45	41⅔	35	40	5
48	Fourth Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry	35—1—40	38⅓	40	35	5
49	Telugu and English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	30—3—45	40	45	40	10
50	Headmistress, Girls' School, Rajahmundry.	30—2—50	42⅔	50	40	..
51	Supervisor of Muhammadan Schools, Madras.	35	35	35	35	..
52	First Assistant, Training School, Madura.	35	35	35	35	..
53	Second Assistant, Training School, Calicut.	35	35	35	35	..
54	First Assistant, Training School, Guntúr.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
55	Do. Vizagapatam.	30—2—40	36⅔	36	35	1
56	Headmaster, Training School, Chicacole.	30—2—40	36⅔	36	40	..
57	Do. do. Berhampur.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
58	First Assistant, Training School, Nellore.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
59	Headmaster, Ongole	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
60	Do. Kurnool	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
61	First Assistant, Bellary	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
62	Headmaster, Anantapur	30—2—40	36⅔	32	40	..
63	Do. Ráyachóti	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
64	First Assistant, Chittoor	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
65	Headmaster, Ránipéttai	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
66	First Assistant, Villupuram	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
67	Headmaster, Cuddalore	30—2—40	36⅔	35	40	..
68	First Assistant, Tanjore	30—2—40	36⅔	32	35	..
69	Second Assistant, do.	30—2—40	36⅔	36	30	6
70	First Assistant, Trichinopoly	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
71	Do. Coimbatore	30—2—40	36⅔	30	35	..
72	Second Assistant, do.	30—2—40	36⅔	30	30	..
73	First Assistant, Salem	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
74	Headmaster, Badagara	30—2—40	36⅔	30	40	..
75	Do. Malappuram	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
76	First Assistant, Mangalore	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
77	Telugu and English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
78	Fourth Assistant, Hobart Girls' School.	30—2—40	36⅔	30	30	..
79	Fifth Assistant, Training School, Rajahmundry.	30—2—40	36⅔	34	35	..
80	Senior Pandit, Mangalore College ..	30—1—35	33⅓	32	35	..
81	Seventh Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ..	30—1—40	36⅔	30	35	..
82	Telugu Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	25—3—40	35	40	35	5
83	First Assistant, Russellkonda Training School.	30	30	30	30	..
84	First Assistant, Muhammadan Training School.	30	30	30	30	..
85	First Assistant, Tinnevelly Training School.	30	30	30	30	..
86	First Assistant, Training School, Saidapet.	30	30	30	30	..
87	Headmistress, Madura Girls' School ..	30	30	30	30	..
88	Do. Salem Girls' School ..	30	30	30	30	..
89	Do. Dindigul Girls' School ..	30	30	30	30	..
90	Do. Námakkal Girls' School ..	30	30	30	30	..
91	Seventh Assistant, Teachers' College ..	30	30	30	30	..
91	Fifth Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry.	25—2—35	31⅔	31	30	1
93	Third Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	25—2—35	31⅔	25	30	..
94	Third Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Calicut.	25—2—35	31⅔	25	30	..
95	Gymnastic Instructor, Kumbakónam College.	20—2—40	32⅔	34	30	4
96	Junior Pandit, Rajahmundry College ..	20—2—40	32⅔	26	30	..
97	Gymnastic Instructor, Rajahmundry College.	20—2—40	32⅔	40	30	10
98	Gymnastic Instructor, Teachers' College.	20—2—40	32⅔	40	30	10
99	Hindustani Munshi, Madrasa-i-azam ..	20—2—40	32⅔	20	30	..
100	Tamil Munshi, Madrasa-i-azam	20—2—40	32⅔	40	30	10
101	Drawingmaster, Madrasa-i-azam ..	20—2—40	32⅔	36	30	6
	Total ..	..	4,162⅓	4,121	4,085	178

Summary.

Class I (Rs. 130 to 180) — 16 appointments.

	Rs.		Rs.
2 on	180	4 on	150
3 on	175	3 on	140
2 on	170	2 on	130

Class II (Rs. 80 to 125) — 23 appointments.

	Rs.		Rs.
4 on	125	5 on	90
3 on	115	2 on	85
7 on	100	2 on	80

Class III (55 to 75) — 30 appointments.

	Rs.		Rs.
9 on	75	9 on	60
7 on	70	5 on	55

Class IV (30 to 50) — 101 appointments.

	Rs.		Rs.
36 on	50	19 on	35
24 on	40	22 on	30

	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	Personal Allowance.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
I (16)	2,538¾	2,460	2,505	10
II (23)	2,393$\frac{9}{12}$	2,346½	2,325	58½
III (30)	1,974$\frac{8}{9}$	1,935	1,980	30
IV (101)	4,162$\frac{7}{9}$	4,121	4,085	178
(170 appointments) ..	11,069½	10,862½	10,895	276½

Order—No. 501, Educational, dated 27th July 1906.

After a careful consideration of the proposals now submitted by the Director of Public Instruction for the reorganization of the subordinate Educational service in this Presidency, the Government consider that it is necessary at present to group together and grade separately only the assistant lecturers in colleges. The number of appointments to be included in the group will, it is understood, be 21 and the net extra cost involved Rs. 11 per mensem besides two temporary personal allowances aggregating Rs. 25 per mensem.

2. The Director is requested to submit a proposition statement for giving effect to this decision.

(True Extract.)

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

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

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 501, EDUCATIONAL, DATED 27th JULY 1906.

[Subject.—*Reorganization of the Subordinate Educational Service in the Madras Presidency.*]

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated 11th September 1905, *No.* 7703.

The proposal to reorganize the Subordinate Educational Service in the Madras Presidency is a long standing one. It was started by the late Mr. Grigg in May 1891. His scheme included 306 appointments on salaries ranging from even less than Rs. 15 (average) to Rs. 187½ (average) but excluded the subordinate inspecting officers. In G.O., No. 822, Educational, dated 26th October 1891, the scheme was referred to the Accountant-General for remarks. Before receipt of the Accountant-General's remarks, however, the report on Public Instruction for 1890–91 came in and in paragraph 198 of it Dr. Duncan, the Acting Director of Public Instruction, observed as follows :—

"Sanction was accorded by the Secretary of State towards the close of the year for bringing certain appointments into a graded service under the designation of 'the Upper Subordinate Educational Service—Scholastic Branch' and proposals for grading the lower subordinates are now before Government. Owing, however, to the Government of India having declined to treat each grade as a distinct class, the advantages contemplated by the gradation have been lost; and, though the scheme may probably benefit a few officers, the officers concerned have, as a class, lost much by being deprived of acting promotions from class to class. If the Lower Subordinate scheme be sanctioned and worked on the same lines, the inconvenience to the Department and the loss to individual officers in the several grades will be very great, because when an acting vacancy occurs in the highest class on Rs. 175—200, a new officer can be appointed in the lowest class only on Rs. 10—1—15, no acting promotion being allowed to any officer in the intermediate grades. I propose, however, to address the Government on the whole subject in a separate communication."

On receipt of the Accountant-General's remarks accordingly, the Director was informed that orders upon the scheme for grading the Lower Subordinate Educational Service would be deferred pending the receipt of the further communication promised by Dr. Duncan—G.O., No. 924, Educational, dated 15th December 1891.

2. This further communication will be found in G.O., No. 793, Educational, dated 3rd November 1893. Dr. Duncan took away twenty appointments from Mr. Grigg's list and added 202 more, chiefly by the inclusion of the subordinate inspecting agency. The main features of this scheme were—

(1) the petty incremental system was done away with as in the Provincial Educational Service;

(2) the 488 appointments included were divided into a large number of classes, viz., 27.

(3) acting promotions were to be given;

(4) promotion was to be regulated on the principle of seniority tempered be selection but a minima and maxima were to be fixed for certain appointments as follows :—

	Rs.
Minima for Sub-Assistant Inspectors	60
,, for assistants in colleges	50
,, for head clerks of Inspectors and Inspectresses	40
,, ,, of Assistant Inspectors	30
Maxima for pandits and munshis	80
,, for head clerks of Inspectors and Inspectresses	70
,, for drawing masters	60
,, for librarian, storekeeper and lower teachers of special subjects in the School of Arts	50

	Rs.
Maxima for head clerks of Assistant Inspectors, gymnastic instructors, munshis and assistant librarian, Oriental Manuscripts Library, and the Muhammadan Inspecting Schoolmaster, Madras ..	40
„ for teachers of special subjects in the Reformatory School ..	30
„ for clerks in Sub-Assistants' offices	25

The Government observed that the scheme could not be profitably considered until final orders had been passed in regard to the reorganization of the superior service and requested the Director to address them again when that matter was settled. It was also pointed out to the Director that the scheme required the sanction of the Government of India, that it was unlikely that that Government would accept the proposal about acting promotions from one grade to another and that the minimum pay of Rs. 50 for assistants in colleges seemed to be too high.

3. The proposal next came up in 1898. The number of appointments included then was 502 and it was proposed to divide these into twenty-seven classes as in 1893. The lowest pay was to be Rs. 15 and the highest, Rs. 190, the difference between each class up to Rs. 100 being Rs. 5 and between each class above Rs. 100 being Rs. 10. The scheme did not provide any "maxima or minima for specific classes of appointments." The objections which the Government had to this scheme were stated as follows in Mr. Forbes' demi-official to Dr. Duncan on pages 5 and 6 of the notes in G.O., No. 108, Educational, dated 22nd February 1899 :—

"It grades in one list a large number of persons whose duties are very dissimilar and not "comparable: and that a man once in the list may, either through seniority or otherwise, find "himself drawing grade pay quite unsuited to the actual work he is doing. No doubt examina- "tional requirements is some check on such a result, and your original proposal to prescribe "maxima and minima for specific classes of appointments would have been an additional safeguard, "but this latter arrangement has disappeared from the scheme apparently owing to a misappre- "hension of G.O., No. 793, dated 3rd November 1893.

"The limitation of the grading to appointments on Rs. 50 and over might remove some "objections but even then the list would remain too heterogeneous, for it would lump together "fifteen office clerks, 65 inspecting officers and 65 school teachers and the difficulty of distinguish- "ing personal claims and merits would render a fair adjudication a hard business.

"Moreover a limitation such as the above would still present anomalies, *e.g.*, the first six "clerks of your office would be on the list while the remaining fifteen would not be, the Ganjám "north range Superintendent on Rs. 50 would be on it, the south range Superintendent on Rs. 40 "would not be." . . . .

4. The Director, however, did not consider it necessary to revise his proposals but suggested certain rules and restrictions in regard to admissions to and promotions in the Subordinate Educational Service. As these are printed in clause (6) of his letter on page 4 of G.O., No. 108, Educational, dated 22nd February 1899, they are not reproduced here. They included the maxima and minima for specific classes of appointments referred to in paragraph 2 *supra*. In their Order No. 450, Educational, dated 23rd July 1898—printed in G.O., No. 108, Educational, dated 22nd February 1899—the Government refused to accept the revised scheme and observed that "its "numerous provisos and restrictions deprive it of simplicity, while it is very doubtful "whether such a variety of heterogeneous appointments as the Director deals with "can be thrown into one service." The Government, however, permitted the Director to revise the scheme again limiting it to appointments carrying pay of Rs. 50 per mensem and for the most part to masters, instructors or inspectors.

5. The further revised scheme was submitted with the Director's letter on pages 6—8 of G.O., No. 108, Educational, dated 22nd February 1899. This scheme took in 155 appointments arranged in 23 classes, the pay of the highest of which was Rs. 190 and of the lowest, Rs. 50. The Government, however, observed that the proposals failed to meet the objections raised by them, and that the scheme for grading the Subordinate Educational Service should be abandoned.

6. The scheme now submitted by the Director takes in 170 appointments, but excludes the subordinate inspecting agency and *most* of the clerical appointments. The 170 appointments are placed in four main classes each, having respectively 6, 6, 4 and 4 sub-classes—the highest pay in class I being Rs. 180 and the lowest pay in class IV, Rs. 30.

I think that, if the scheme be at all approved, all clerical appointments should be eliminated.

H. D. Taylor—22-9-05.

7. The orders of 1899 about the abandonment of the scheme for grading lower subordinates were definite. Orders are solicited whether the question should now be reopened. The one advantage of grading as proposed, is that constant transfers can be avoided. One often hears of complaints against such transfers in the reports on first-grade colleges. On the other hand, the objections to grading raised by Government from time to time still remain to a great extent. All special appointments, such as carpentry instructors, blacksmiths, mechanics, bandmasters, sergeants and librarians, have now been excluded [paragraph 3 (3) of the Director's letter], but drawing masters, gymnastic instructors, pandits and munshis still remain [paragraph 3 (5)]and these should never have a chance of rising to Rs. 180. To prevent this the Director has divided the appointments into classes and he considers that a person in a lower class should not be promoted to the higher class unless he is qualified, but at the same time he says : "It will rest with the head of the department "to decide whether a person who has reached the maximum in his class may be "promoted to an appointment in the higher one." In this connection attention is solicited to the remarks of the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel on pages 11 and 12 of the notes in G.O., No. 108, Educational, dated 22nd February 1899. He says: "The "Hon'ble Mr. Grose remarked that a carpenter on the graded list would never "rise to Rs. 190. Perhaps the same may now be said of the pandit who draws "Rs. 40—50: but all depends on the decision of the Director of Public Instruction. "The objection is that such a thing should not be *possible* . . . . . It seems "to me that under the system now advocated there would inevitably, and in spite "of the best intentions, be a vast amount of favouritism and that the officials in the "office of the Director of Public Instruction would become possessed of a dangerous "amount of influence."

H. D. Taylor.

8. If it is decided to have a graded Subordinate Educational Service, it is submitted that all appointments of pandits (including the Latin master, Presidency College), and munshis, gymnastic instructors and drawing masters, all appointments in Training schools, whether for masters or mistresses, except appointments in Training colleges and all appointments in Girls' schools may be removed from the list. We have a separate scale for Girls' schools and this ought to be sufficient. We are also going to have a separate scale for Training schools for masters. The reorganisation of Traisning schools being now under consideration, no master of a Training school for master should have been included in the present proposals. The residue that will remain will chiefly be Assistants in Colleges and High schools and it is constant transfers among these that it is desirable to avoid.

P. T. Tharyan—18-9-05.

If this Government's Training schools proposals are sanctioned, these proposals will be affected: the cadre in the current includes many Training school posts, of which the pay will be altered. I therefore do not see how the present scheme can be accepted till we know the Secretary of State's decision on the Training schools' scheme.

2. Copy out the cadre in the current omitting—

(1) posts in Training schools,
(2) posts in Girls' schools,
(3) pandits' posts,
(4) posts of drawing masters and gymnastic instructors,

and draw up separate cadres for the above four classes, the Training school cadre following the reorganization proposals.

3. The grading is to prevent too frequent transfers and make the Director's promotion and transfer work easier. But it would not appear to be necessary to jumble up all sorts of classes in one cadre. If there is a pandit's cadre, a pandit may stay, say, at Rajahmundry all his life and yet get regular promotion. But if pandits and headmistresses are in one cadre, it will be very difficult to weigh their respective merits.

A. Galletti—19-9-05.

The cadre in the current has been recast as follows :—

Number.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	Personal allowance, if any.
	[Cadre as proposed but omitting posts in Training schools and Girls' schools, pandits' posts and posts of drawing-masters and gymnastic instructors.]					
	Class I (From Rs. 130 to Rs. 180).					
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
1	First Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	180	180	180	180	..
2	Third Assistant, Teachers' College ..	150— 5—200	180$\frac{2}{3}$	180	180	..
3	Second Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	175	175	175	175	..
4	First Assistant, Kumbakónam College ..	175	175	175	175	..
5	,, Rajahmundry College ..	175	175	175	175	..
6	Third Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	170	170	170	170	..
7	Manager, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	150— 5—175	168$\frac{3}{4}$	165	170	..
8	First Assistant, Mangalore College ..	125—10—175	155	135	150	..
9	,, Madrasa-i-azam	125— 5—175	155$\frac{5}{9}$	125	130	..
10	Fourth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	150	150	150	150	..
11	Second Assistant, Kumbakónam College.	150	150	150	150	..
12	Do. Rajahmundry ,, ..	150	150	150	150	..
13	Headmaster, School of Commerce ..	140	140	140	140	..
14	First Assistant, Training College, Rajahmundry.	125— 5—150	141$\frac{2}{3}$	135	140	..
15	Fourth Assistant, Teachers' College ..	100— 5—150	130$\frac{6}{9}$	105	130	..
	Class II (Rs. 80 to Rs. 125).					
1	Fifth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	125	125	125	125	..
2	Sixth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	125	125	125	125	..
3	Third Assistant, Kumbakónam College ..	125	125	125	125	..
4	,, Rajahmundry College ..	125	125	125	125	..
5	Head Clerk, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	100—5 —125	118$\frac{3}{4}$	105	115	..
6	Seventh Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	100	100	100	100	..
7	Eighth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	100	100	100	100	..
8	Fourth Assistant, Rajahmundry College.	100	100	100	100	..
9	Fifth ,, ,,	100	100	100	100	..
10	Fourth ,, Kumbakónam College..	100	100	100	100	..
11	Second ,, Mangalore College ..	90—6 —120	108	96	100	..
12	,, ,, Madrasa-i-azam ..	85—4 —125	109$\frac{4}{9}$	85	90	..
13	First ,, Rajahmundry Practising Section.	80—4 —100	93$\frac{1}{3}$	88	90	..
14	Second Assistant, Rajahmundry Training Section.	80— 4—100	93$\frac{1}{3}$	88	90	..
15	Fifth Assistant, Teachers' College ..	75—2$\frac{1}{2}$—100	90$\frac{6}{15}$	100	90	10
16	Sixth ,, ,, ..	75—2$\frac{1}{2}$—100	90$\frac{6}{15}$	87$\frac{1}{2}$	80	7$\frac{1}{2}$
17	Second clerk, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	80	80	80	80	..
	Class III (Rs. 55 to Rs. 75).					
1	Fifth Assistant, Kumbakónam College ..	75	75	75	75	..
2	Third clerk, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	75	75	75	75	..
3	Third Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam	70—2—80	76$\frac{2}{3}$	72	75	..
4	Second Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry.	60—4—80	73$\frac{1}{3}$	68	75	..
5	Third Assistant, Training Section, Rajahmundry.	60—4—80	73$\frac{1}{3}$	68	75	..
6	First Assistant, School of Commerce ..	70	70	70	70	..
7	Fourth clerk, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	70	70	70	70	..
8	Third Assistant, Mangalore College ..	60—4—80	72	80	75	5
9	Fourth ,, ,, ..	60—4—80	72	64	70	..
10	,, ,, Madrasa-i-azam ..	60—2—70	66$\frac{2}{3}$	60	60	..
11	Headmaster, Reformatory School.. ..	60	60	60	60	..
12	Additional Assistant, Mangalore College.	60	60	60	60	..

Number.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	Personal allowance, if any.
	Class IV (Rs. 30 to Rs. 50).					
		Rs.	Rs	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Fifth Assistant, Madras-i-azam ..	50—2—60	56$\frac{2}{3}$	50	50	..
2	Fourth Assistant, Training Section, Rajahmundry	40—4—60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	48	50	..
3	Third Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry	40—4—60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	48	50	..
4	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Russellkonda	50	50	50	50	..
5	Second Assistant, School of Commerce ..	50	50	50	50	..
6	Sixth Assistant, Madrasa-i-Azam ..	40—2—60	46$\frac{2}{3}$	44	50	..
7	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Parlákimedi	40	40	40	40	..
8	Third Assistant, School of Commerce, Calicut	40	40	40	40	..
9	Fourth Assistant, School of Commerce, Calicut	40	40	40	40	..
10	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Surada ..	40	40	40	40	..
11	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Narasapatam	40	40	40	40	..
12	Fourth Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry	35—1—40	38$\frac{1}{2}$	40	35	5
13	Supervisor of Muhammadan Schools, Madras	35	35	35	35	..
14	Fifth Assistant, Training Section, Rajahmundry	30—2—40	36$\frac{2}{3}$	34	35	..
15	Seventh Assistant, Madrasa-i-Azam ..	30—1—40	36$\frac{1}{2}$	30	35	..
16	Seventh Assistant, Teacher's College ..	30	30	30	30	..
17	Fifth Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry	25—2—35	31$\frac{2}{3}$	31	30	1
	Posts in Training Schools.					
1	First Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	125—5—150	141$\frac{2}{3}$	150	140	10
2	Second Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	100—5—125	116$\frac{2}{3}$	125	115	10
3	Head Mistress, Hobart Training School ..	100—5—125	116$\frac{2}{3}$	105	115	..
4	Third Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	80—4—100	93$\frac{1}{3}$	92	90	2
5	Headmistress, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore	75—5—100	91$\frac{2}{3}$	75	85	..
6	Headmistress, Training School for Mistresses, Calicut	75—5—100	91$\frac{2}{3}$	100 *plus* 20 personal allowance.	85	35
7	Headmaster, Training School, Calicut ..	75	75	75	60—4—80	..
8	Do. do. Tanjore ..	60—4— 80	73$\frac{1}{3}$	64	60—4—80	..
9	Do. do. Coimbatore.	60—4— 80	73$\frac{1}{3}$	80	60—4—80	..
10	First Assistant, Hobart School	60—4— 80	73$\frac{1}{3}$	64	70	..
11	Fourth Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	50—5— 75	66$\frac{2}{3}$	50	60	..
12	Headmaster, Training School, Guntúr. ..	40—4— 60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	60	40—4—60	..
13	Do. do. Nellore ..	40—4— 60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	60	40—4—60	..
14	Headmaster, Training School, Vizagapatam	40—4— 60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	48	40—4—60	..
15	Headmaster, Training School, Bellary ..	40—4— 60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	56	40—4—60	..
16	Do. do. Chittoor ..	40—4— 60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	60	40—4—60	..
17	Headmaster, Training School, Villupuram	40—4— 60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	56	40—4—60	..
18	Headmaster, Training School, Trichinopoly	40—4— 60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	60	40—4—60	..
19	Headmaster, Training School, Salem ..	40—4— 60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	60	40—4—60	..
20	Do. do. Mangalore.	40—4— 60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	50	40—4—60	..
21	First Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	45—3— 60	55	45	50	..
22	First Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Calicut.	45—3—60	55	45	50	..
23	Drawing Mistress, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	40—4—60	53$\frac{1}{3}$	60	50	10
24	Headmaster, Training School, Russellkonda.	50	50	50	50	..
25	Headmaster, Muhammadan Training School.	50	50	50	50	..
26	Headmaster, Training School, Madura ..	50	50	50	40—4—60	..
27	Headmaster, Training School, Tinnevelly.	50	50	50	40—4—60	..
28	Fifth Assistant, Presidency Training Schoool for Mistresses.	50	50	50	50	..
29	Additional English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	50	50	50	50	..
30	Headmaster, Training School, Saidapet..	50	50	50	40—4—60	..

Number.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	Personal allowance, if any.
	Posts in Training Schools—cont.					
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
31	Second Assistant, Hobart Training School.	40—2—50	46⅔	44	50	..
32	Third Do. do. ..	40—2—50	46⅔	40	40	..
33	Headmaster, Training School, Jeypore ..	40	40	40	40	..
34	Headmaster, Panchama Training School..	40	40	40	40	..
35	First Assistant, Training School, Calicut.	40	40	40	30—2—40	..
36	Second Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	35—2—45	41⅔	41	40	1
37	Second Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Calicut.	35—2—45	41⅔	35	40	..
38	Telugu and English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	30—3—45	40	45	40	5
39	First Assistant, Training School, Madura.	35	35	35	30—2—40	..
40	Second Assistant, Training School, Calicut.	35	35	35	30—2—40	..
41	First Assistant, Training School, Guntúr.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
42	First Assistant, Training School, Vizagapatam.	30—2—40	36⅔	36	30—2—40	..
43	Headmaster, Training School, Chicacole.	30—2—40	36⅔	36	30—2—40	..
44	Do. do. Berhampur.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
45	First Assistant, Training School, Nellore.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
46	Headmaster, Ongole	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
47	Do. Kurnool	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
48	First Assistant, Bellary	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
49	Headmaster, Anantapur	30—2—40	36⅔	32	30—2—40	..
50	Do. Rayachóti	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
51	First Assistant, Chittoor	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
52	Headmaster, Ránipéttai	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
53	First Assistant, Villupuram	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
54	Headmaster, Cuddalore	30—2—40	36⅔	36	30—2—40	..
55	First Assistant, Tanjore	30—2—40	36⅔	32	30—2—40	..
56	Second do do.	30—2—40	36⅔	36	30—2—40	..
57	First Assistant, Trichinopoly	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
58	First Assistant, Coimbatore	30—2—40	36⅔	30	30—2—40	..
59	Second Assistant, do.	30—2—40	36⅔	30	30—2—40	..
60	First Assistant, Salem	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
61	Headmaster, Badagara	30—2—40	36⅔	30	30—2—40	..
62	Do. Malappuram	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
63	First Assistant, Mangalore	30—2—40	36⅔	40	30—2—40	..
64	Telugu and English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
65	Fourth Assistant, Hobart Girls' School ..	30—2—40	36⅔	30	30	..
66	Telugu Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	25—3—40	35	40	35	5
67	First Assistant, Russellkonda Training School.	30	30	30	30	..
68	First Assistant, Muhammadan Training School.	30	30	30	30—2—40	..
69	First Assistant, Tinnevelly Training School	30	30	30	30—2—40	..
70	First Assistant, Training School, Saidapet.	30	30	30	30—2—40	..
71	Third Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	25—2—35	31⅔	25	30	..
72	Third Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Calicut.	25—2—35	31⅔	25	30	..
	Posts in Girls' Schools.					
1	Headmistress, Kumbakónam Girls' School.	50	50	50	50	10
2	Do. Gunnairbeed do. ..	50	50	50	50	..
3	Do. Suryaraopet do. ..	50	50	50	50	..
4	Do. Nellore do. ..	50	50	50	50	..
5	Do. Vellore do. ..	50	50	50	50	..
6	Do. Cuddalore do. ..	50	50	50	50	..
7	Do. Kanathur do. ..	50	50	50	50	..
8	Do. Tellicherry do. ..	50	50	50	50	..
9	Do. Rajahmundry do. ..	30—2—50	42⅔	50	40	10
10	Do. Madura do. ..	30	30	30	30	..
11	Do. Salem do. ..	30	30	30	30	..
12	Do. Dindigul do. ..	30	30	30	30	..
13	Do. Námakkal do. ..	30	30	30	30	..
	Teachers of Optional Languages.					
1	Latin Master, Presidency College ..	100	100	100	100	..
2	Persian Munshi do. ..	60—2—80	72⅔	60	70	..
3	Malayalam Munshi do.	60—2—80	72⅔	78	70	8
4	Tamil Munshi do. ..	60—2—80	72⅔	62	70	8
5	Telugu Pandit do. ..	40—2—60	52⅔	40	50	..
6	Canarese Pandit do. ..	40—2—60	52⅔	60	50	10
7	Sanskrit Pandit do. ..	40—2—60	52⅔	60	50	10
8	Senior Pandit, Rajahmundry	40—2—60	52⅔	60	50	10
9	Persian Pandit do	40—2—60	52⅔	40	50	..

Number	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed	Pay allowance, if any.
	Teachers of Optional Languages—cont.					
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
10	Tamil Pandit, Kumbakónam	40—2—60	52⅔	42	50	..
11	Sanskrit Pandit, do.	40—2—60	52⅔	54	50	4
12	Persian Munshi, Madrasa-i-Azam ..	40—2—60	52⅔	60	50	10
13	Arabic Munshi do.	40—2—60	52⅔	42	50	..
14	Senior Pandit, Mangalore College ..	30—1—35	33½	32	35	..
15	Junior Pandit, Rajahmundry College ..	20—2—40	32⅔	26	30	..
16	Hindustani Munshi, Madrasa-i-Azam ..	20—2—40	32⅔	20	30	..
17	Tamil Munshi do. ..	20—2—40	32⅔	40	30	10
	Gymnastic Instructors and Drawing Masters.					
1	Gymnastic Instructor, Presidency College.	60—2—80	72⅔	60	60	..
2	Drawing Master, Teachers' College ..	40—2—60	52⅔	42	50	..
3	Do. Training College, Rajahmundry.	40—2—50	46⅔	50	50	..
4	Gymnastic Instructor, Kumbakónam College.	20—2—40	32⅔	34	30	4
5	Gymnastic Instructor, Rajahmundry College.	20—2—40	32⅔	40	30	10
6	Gymnastic Instructor, Teachers' College.	20—2—40	32⅔	40	30	10
7	Drawing Master, Madrasa-i-Azam ..	20—2—40	32⅔	36	30	6

P. T. THARYAN—20-9-05.

The proposal to grade the Subordinate Educational Service has been three times disapproved. But the present Director of Public Instruction agrees with his predecessors in thinking it a necessary reform. Grading brings order into a service, removes uncertainty, minimises transfers. The objections to the grading schemes that have come up before are summarised in Mr. Arundel's minute of 13th February 1899 on pages 11 and 12 of the notes in G.O., No. 108, Educational, dated 22nd February 1899.

2. The present scheme excludes Sub-Assistants who have been reorganized and graded separately.

However it appears to me that there are still too many classes of officers in the tables sent up by the Director of Public Instruction.

3. But I do not know what objection there is to grading male teachers of general subjects in Government colleges and schools together with the senior clerks in the Director of Public Instruction's office who, as he says, should have some teaching experience. I accordingly venture to submit revised tables which grade 61 members of the Subordinate Service in four classes. The 61 includes five inspecting officers who rank as Supervisors rather than Sub-Assistants. I have included them because the Director of Public Instruction did. But perhaps four of them, who are Superintendents of Hill Schools, might be transferred to the Sub-Assistants' list: or perhaps eventually Supervisors will be taken over from local bodies by Government and graded; and the Hill Superintendents and the Muhammadan Supervisor, Madras, could then be graded with other Supervisors, being left meanwhile on the Subordinate Graded list.

They should be omitted. The posts are special posts requiring a knowledge of Uriya.

H. D. TAYLOR.

I consider that this would be a most desirable arrangement.

H. D. TAYLOR.

I would not grade them at all for the present.

H. D. TAYLOR.

4. The 72 masters in Training schools may be added to the 61 other teachers, etc., when the Secretary of State sanctions the reorganization of Training schools. There is no reason, it is submitted, why Training school and other teachers should not be interchangeable. Perhaps it would be best to await the Secretary of State's orders on the pay of training school teachers before undertaking any grading; and then grade the 133.

5. The Director's tables include, besides the 133, (1) 13 posts of headmistresses in Government Girls' schools, (2) 17 pandit posts and (3) 7 gymnastic instructor and drawing master posts.

Submitted that these posts should not be included in the general list for the reasons given in the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's note of 1899: but, it is submitted, there is no objection to and much use in separate grading of the first two of the three classes proposed to be excluded from the general list. A headmistress should generally stay as long as possible in the same school: therefore, to reduce transfers, grade the 13 headmistresses in, say, 5 classes, Rs. $\frac{30}{2}$, $\frac{35}{2}$, $\frac{40}{2}$, $\frac{45}{2}$, $\frac{50}{2}$, total cost Rs. 560 as against present Rs. $562\frac{1}{2}$.

H. D. Taylor.

I see no objection to this proposal.

H. D. Taylor.

The 17 teachers of optional languages might also well be graded. A Telugu pandit, however learned, can now never get more than Rs. 60. Merit could be rewarded better if all pandits were placed on a graded list in which salaries rise from Rs. 30 to Rs. 100. It would not be particularly difficult to compare the merits of teachers of different languages? General reputation, general culture, published works, would be a guide. At any rate it would be easier to compare teachers of languages with one another than to compare them with, say, headmistresses; and better to place them on a separate scale with a maximum of Rs. 100 instead of a general scale where the maximum is Rs. 180, a salary which is not at present given to any teacher of an optional language. The scale might be something of this sort—

e.g., case of Swaminatha Aiyar, Tamil Munshi, Presidency College, to whom a special subvention is being made through the University.

Class	I, pay	Rs.	100	..	..	.. 1
,,	II	,,	80	..	..	.. 3
,,	III	,,	60	..	..	.. 4
,,	IV	,,	40	..	..	.. 5
,,	V	,,	30	..	..	.. 4

I would leave these as they are—ungraded. There is variation in language and the object of grading—viz., to avoid frequent transfers—would not apply largely in these cases.

H. D. Taylor.

The cost would be Rs. 900 against present cost Rs. $916\frac{2}{3}$.

Gymnastic Instructors and Drawingmasters might also be graded in a separate class by themselves in a scale of Rs. 30—40—50—60. But there are so few of them and transfers are, I suppose, so infrequent and the pay in the different colleges is at present so nearly equal, that it would seem to be unnecessary to grade them.

I would let them be.

H. D. Taylor.

6. If the same view is now taken by Government as was taken in 1899, there is nothing to be done but express it.

But if it is considered that the scheme is or may be made workable, perhaps the best plan will be to tell the Director to resubmit it when the Secretary of State's orders on the salaries to be paid in future in Training schools reach him; and if it is thought that the scheme requires revision, he may be told on what lines Government want him to revise it.

I don't see how the scheme could be approved as submitted by the Director of Public Instruction before it is settled what the pay of masters in Training schools is to be.

A. Galletti—21-9-05.

The first question for decision is whether Government will reconsider the orders already passed declining to approve of the grading of the Subordinate Educational Establishment. If the orders are to be reconsidered, the extent to which the grading system is to take effect, and the classes of appointments to be included is for consideration.

2. The Director's proposals certainly appear to go too far. He includes 101 appointments on a pay of Rs. 30 to Rs. 50 and it is submitted that this carries unnecessary refinement into the grading system. It seems unnecessary and undesirable to include any post the pay of which is below Rs. 50.

Another objection to the Director of Public Instruction's scheme is that he includes a large number of appointments involving heterogeneous duties which cannot, for purposes of grading or promotion be fairly compared.

3. I see no serious objection to the acceptance of the proposals in a modified form as suggested by Mr. Galletti.

We cannot include appointments in Training institutions until it is known what orders the Secretary of State may pass on our present proposals for the reorganization of Training schools—nor if those proposals be approved—could we at once propose to depart from the sanctioned scheme, and revise the salaries attached to the various teachers in those institutions. I would therefore exclude all teachers' posts in Training schools from the operation of the scheme.

4. Similarly drawing masters, gymnastic instructors, pandits and teachers of languages should be excluded. I would also exclude the Superintendents of Hill schools, and Muhammadan supervisor, Madras.

Whether or no the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th clerks in Director of Public Instruction's office should be included is for consideration. An interchange of officers between the teaching and higher clerical staffs may be desirable.

5. Schoolmistresses may be graded in a separate class as proposed by Mr. Galletti on page 8 *supra*.

6. Subject to orders which may be passed as to the inclusion of the four clerical appointments in Director of Public Instruction's office, I would accept the scheme for classes I, II and III as shown on page 4 *supra* and include also the appointments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 in class IV (page 5 *supra*). This would give 47 or 43 graded appointments according to the inclusion or exclusion of the four clerical posts referred to—and 13 schoolmistresses separately graded.

Further refinement in this respect seems undesirable.

H. D. Taylor—21-9-05.

This matter cannot be handled now. When it can be touched it should proceed on a personal conference and discussion with the Director. I see no use in spending time over it on paper. It should lie over till Madras is reached in any case.

J. T[homson]—23-9-05.

G. S[tokes]—23-9-05.

To lie over pending orders on the scheme for reorganization of Training schools. Meanwhile print notes.

H. D. Taylor—25-9-05.

Also notes in old papers.

A. Galletti—26-9-05.

Please see letter from the Government of India, No. 378, dated 30th May 1906, on the proposals of this Government for the reorganization of Training schools for masters in this Presidency. The Government of India say that the proposals will be submitted for the sanction of the Secretary of State only if the Madras Government can give an assurance that they will find Rs. 69,000 for the reorganization of Training schools for upper primary teachers. This means that there will be a considerable further delay before the matter is finally settled, but even then it does not appear that Government will alter the pay of the masters so soon to fit in with the Director's grading scheme. May not this scheme be considered independently of the Training school scheme omitting all teachers in such schools?

P. T. Tharyan—22-6-06.

I see that Sir J. Thomson when Honourable Member ordered that the matter should be settled by personal conference with the Director. The scheme as set forth on page 4 *supra* seems crude at present. Several of the appointments in each class overlap which should not be in a strictly graded service. May the question be now taken up?

C. A. Souter—23-6-06.

In paragraph 3 of my note of 21st September 1905, I suggested that the question should be taken up independently of Training schools, and limited to posts the pay of which is Rs. 50 and over.

2. No specific orders were passed on this point, but the matter was ordered to lie over. If, as seems desirable, Training schools are to be excluded from the scheme, there seems no objection to considering the proposals at once, and the Director may be consulted before he leaves Ootacamund.

H. D. TAYLOR—25-6-06.

Send file first unofficially to the Director of Public Instruction.

G. S. F[ORBES]—26-6-06.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

After more experience and after having seen what has been said about similar proposals in the past, I see more clearly what is wanted and what I hope is feasible.

2. The essential thing is to group together officers who would ordinarily be recruited from the same source, all fit for any appointment in the group and each one of whom may expect to go from the lowest to the highest pay irrespective of the appointment, provided they do good work.

The possible groups are—

(*a*) Assistant lecturers in colleges.
(*b*) Schoolmasters.
(*c*) Graduate masters in Training institutions.
(*d*) Munshis and pandits.
(*e*) Gymnastic instructors.
(*f*) Drawing masters.

3. I have left out—

(1) *Women.*—They will hardly go into one group and to make more than one results in groups too small to be worth while.

(2) *Graduate clerks in the Director's office.*—They may come from, or go to, the inspecting agency.

(3) *Superintendents of Hill schools.*—They belong to the inspecting agency.

(4) *School of Commerce staff.*—They are specialists and cannot come into any group.

The last two of my possible groups are too small to be worth making.

We have left four groups.

4. What is most wanted is to form the assistant lecturers in colleges into a graded service.

A The service should be recruited with the best young graduates in the subject in which there is a vacancy and to put an officer into one of these posts because he had done good work as a schoolmaster should be out of the question. Any one of them should be a person fitted to rise to the top of the service and become a lecturer in the Provincial Service. This should do much to improve our colleges. The teacher of Latin in the Presidency College belongs and always would belong to a different class from the pandits and munshis. When not teaching Latin, he teaches English and should be included. There would be nine appointments in the Presidency College, five each in Kumbakónam and Rajahmundry, two in Mangalore.

5. They would *cost* on the following scale, Rs. 2,775 a month against a present average of Rs. 2,764—

Four	appointments	on Rs. 175.
Five	,,	on ,, 150.
Five	,,	on ,, 125.
Seven	,,	on ,, 100.

To fit in with the existing staff a personal allowance of Rs. 5 and another of Rs. 20 would be required for the present.

6. In the TRAINING INSTITUTIONS we may well distinguish between appointments on Rs. 30—40 and above, and those below.

The former can be recruited with "B.A., L.Ts."; they are willing to enter Government service on Rs. 30 as they have prospects of rising to the higher training school appointments or of becoming sub-assistant inspectors.

B Changing one existing appointment on Rs. 100—150 into Rs. 125—150 and two on Rs. 75—100 into Rs. 80—100, we get—

One	on Rs.	150—200.
Two	on ,,	125—150.
Three	on ,,	80—100.
Four	on ,,	60—80.
Fourteen	on ,,	40—60.
Eleven	on ,,	30–40.

7. This omits an appointment on Rs. 50 at Russellkonda and one on Rs. 40 at Jeypore. The conditions at both places are peculiar and the appointments may be omitted or the proposals now before the Government of India may be changed in respect of these schools:—

In Russellkonda—	
Headmaster	Rs. 40—60
First Assistant	,, 25—35
Second Assistant	,, 20—25

may be substituted for Rs. 50—30—20 and

In Jeypore—	
Headmaster	Rs. 40—60
Assistant	,, 20—25

may be substituted for Rs. 40—20 and the headmasterships of both schools included in the cadre.

8. The present scale for MUNSHIS and PANDITS is —

Three on Rs. 60—80.
Nine on ,, 40—60.
One on ,, 30—35.
Three on ,, 20—40.

and might be arranged—

Three on Rs. 60—80.
Nine on ,, 40—60.
Four on ,, 30—40.

9. If my modified scheme is entertained, I presume new proposals will be called for officially; so I defer the question of the schoolmasters for the present. There are one or two matters to be specially considered in connection with them and I require more information. Also all the Saidapet staff is classed above as "training" whereas some should be counted as schoolmasters.

10. May I repeat that I consider the separation and grading of the assistant lecturers as quite the most important matter and well worth doing even if nothing else be done.

A. G. BOURNE—29-6-06.

B The present proposal of the Director of Public Instruction to grade separately —

(1) Assistant lecturers in colleges	21
(2) Schoolmasters	number not yet settled.
(3) Graduate masters in Training institutions	35
(4) Munshis and pandits	16

may be approved, but the proposal regarding Training schoolmasters will have to wait till the reorganization of Training schools is sanctioned and then the progressive

scale of pay now proposed will have apparently to be given up as there can hardly be a grade in a grade. So also the progressive scale for munshis and pandits will have apparently to be given up.

2. The Director omits from the lists originally submitted—

(1) Women.
(2) Graduate clerks in the Director's office.
(3) Superintendents of Hill schools.
(4) The staff of the School of Commerce.
(5) Gymnastic instructors.
(6) Drawing masters.

This may be approved.

3. May the Director be requested to submit proposals officially?

P. T. THARYAN—2-7-06.

C. A. SOUTER—2-7-06.

The Director of Public Instruction may be asked to submit proposals in respect of Assistant Lecturers in Colleges only. He informs me that this is the most pressing measure of reform.

H. D. TAYLOR—3-7-06.

I think the Director of Public Instruction's principle that all persons in a graded group should be fit to take any work *in that group* is not at all essential.

It seems to me that if the value of the services in the graded department can be fairly equated they can all be graded together with regard to length of service. For instance if groups * (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) or (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) perform duties which require fairly equivalent capacities or entail fairly equivalent responsibilities they might all be graded in the same list with reference to length of service, whether they are interchangeable or not.

* Page 10 *supra*.

How would this work out?

G. S. F[ORBES]—4-7-06.

The above proposal would practically mean a reversion to the original proposals of the Director of Public Instruction, *i.e.*, to grade all appointments in the educational service carrying a salary of Rs. 30 and upwards into four classes.

2. It seems open to question whether the duties of the various classes can be equated or considered interchangeable. Certainly those of pandits and of lecturers cannot, and it would be almost impossible to grade these with reference to length of service.

3. The lowest pay of a lecturer is Rs. 100 and the highest pay of a pandit is Rs. 80. Again from the Director of Public Instruction's remarks at "**A**" on page 10 *supra*, it appears that his intention is that the staff of assistant lecturers should be specially recruited for eventual promotion to the Provincial Educational service, whereas it is not proposed that schoolmasters should rise beyond the rank of Sub-Assistant Inspector or a higher training school appointment—*vide* **B**, page 11 *supra*.

4. There would be no objection to grading schoolmasters and Training school teachers together on the principle suggested, but any such grading would have to be deferred until final orders are received on the subject of revision of Training school establishments.

5. But the cases of assistant lecturers and of pandits seem to require separate treatment; they will be separately recruited and their capacities will be different. Mere grading by length of service would result in the recruitment of men of inferior ability for the assistant lecturer's post, while pandits might get a salary to which men of their capacity could ordinarily not aspire. Should the further opinion of the Director of Public Instruction be invited?

H. D. TAYLOR—6-7-06.

I think Mr. Taylor's note makes it clear enough that my suggestion would not be applicable to the various educational grades under consideration to any great extent; and that at any rate *assistant lecturers* should be graded separately in view of their duties and of their selection for eventual promotion to the Provincial Educational service.

2. I accept the Director of Public Instruction's proposal for the grading of *assistant lecturers* as set out in paragraph 5 of his note of 29th June *supra*. The extra permanent cost is only Rs. 11 a month and to this the Financial Department will, I presume, not object. There will be *temporarily* personal allowances of Rs. 25.

3. I would not grade the other classes at present.

G. S. F[ORBES]—9-7-06.

Please draft for approval.

H. D. TAYLOR—11-7-06.

The draft placed below is submitted for approval. If approved, it may be forwarded to the Financial Department for acceptance.

2. Under article 76 (iii) of the Civil Service Regulations the sanction of the Government of India seems to be necessary to the proposition statement as the proposal involves the creation of a grade of officers, but the Accountant-General will report on the matter when forwarding the proposition statement with his verification certificate.

This seems to be correct.
H. D. TAYLOR—12-7-06.

P. T. THARYAN—11-7-06.

H. D. TAYLOR—12-7-06.

To the Financial Department for acceptance.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

The scheme which it is proposed to sanction is the grouping together and the grading separately of 21* Assistant Lecturers in Government colleges apart from the General Subordinate Educational Service. The extra cost involved in the scheme is Rs. 11 per mensem or Rs. 132 per annum besides two temporary personal allowances aggregating Rs. 25 *per mensem*.

* 9 in the Presidency College.
5 in the Kumbakónam College.
5 in the Rajahmundry College.
2 in the Mangalore College.
—
21
—

Vide paragraph 5 of Director of Public Instruction's note, dated 29th June 1906.

2. With reference to the point raised in paragraph 2 of the Educational office-note, dated 11th July 1906, it is submitted that the sanction of the Government of India should apparently be obtained to the proposed creation of a new grade of lecturers, inasmuch as teachers not being ministerial officers, the rules in article 76 (iii) of the Civil Service Regulations according to which "without the authority of the Government of India, no class or grade of officers may be created or abolished and the pay of no class or grade of officers may be raised or reduced", are applicable to them. The Accountant-General may, it is submitted, be left to note on the point while forwarding the proposition statement to Government.

Article 36 of the Civil Service Regulations (example).

3. The draft may, it is submitted, be accepted.

V.G.K.—17-7-06.

C. M. SCHMIDT—21-7-06.

The proposal may, I submit, be accepted.

M. HAMMICK—23-7-06.

I agree that the proposal to grade the assistant lecturers as proposed by the Director of Public Instruction and approved by Mr. Forbes, may be accepted.

G. S[TOKES]—24-7-06.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Issue.

H. D. TAYLOR—26-7-06.

[G.O., No. 501, Educational, dated 27th July 1906.]

[E.]
1,500—12-12.

12

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

From	Number.	Date.	Pages.
The Director of Public Instruction	7703	11-9-05	1-7

[P. T. O. FOR PUT UP PAPERS.

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No. 1818

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, &c., should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department.
84-85	27-3-05	S.C.		
642-43	22-10-04	do.		
108	22-2-99	do.		
249	7-4-96	do.		
945-46	31-12-95	do.		
793	3-11-93	do.		
924	15-12-91	do.		
822	26-10-91	do.		
337	6-5-91	do.		

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.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

I

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—the 11th September 1905.
No.—C. 7703.

I have the honour to submit for the favourable consideration and orders of Government a scheme for the reorganization of the Subordinate Educational Service in this Presidency.

2. The scheme submitted by Dr. Duncan in January 1898 was rejected by Government for the following reasons:—

(i) that its numerous provisons and restrictions deprived it of simplicity;

(ii) that such a variety of heterogeneous appointments as were dealt with in the scheme could not suitably be thrown into one service;

(iii) that the principle of grading had been carried too far, as many as 503 appointments from Rs. 15 upwards having been included in the scheme.

Dr. Duncan was therefore requested in G.O., No. 450, Educational, dated 23rd July 1898, to revise his proposals, limiting the scheme to appointments carrying a pay of Rs. 50 upwards and restricting it for the most part to masters, instructors or inspecting officers and such few clerical appointments as might require the services of persons with some educational experience. A revised scheme was accordingly submitted in November 1898, but this too was rejected in G.O., No. 108, Educational, dated 22nd February 1899, as it failed to meet the objections previously raised.

3. My chief reason for urging upon Government a reconsideration of the matter is that I find that the present system of independent appointments some, of which carry fixed pay and others progressive, leads to unavoidable inequalities of treatment, as it often happens that officers whom it is undesirable to transfer from their appointments have to forfeit their promotion by being retained in them. There is a disadvantage also in having some appointments progressive and others on fixed pay as a junior officer who, for special reasons, is placed in a progressive appointment after a few years is in a higher position as regards pay than a senior officer doing equally good work in an appointment carrying a salary less than the maximum of the progressive appointment. For these and other reasons it seems to me to be extremely desirable that the subordinate service should be graded. Dr. Duncan's scheme was rejected by Government on account of its complexity. Some attempt has been made in the accompanying proposals to present a simpler arrangement. The main features of this scheme are—

(1) The 170 appointments considered are those ranging in pay between Rs. 30 and Rs. 180, the lower limit being so chosen partly because, except in offices and institutions directly subordinate to the Director, all appointments on Rs. 30 and below are made by Inspectors or Inspectresses, and partly because it is not necessary in my opinion that appointments on less than Rs. 30 should be graded.

(2) All appointments in the Medical, Agricultural and Engineering Colleges have been omitted from consideration—those in the Medical College are filled by officers recruited from the Medical department, the Agricultural College is likely to be separated from this Department, and most of the appointments in these Colleges are special and cannot be filled by men taken from the general cadre of the subordinate educational service.

(3) All special appointments, such as carpentry instructors, blacksmiths, mechanics, bandmasters, sergeants, librarians, etc., and those in the offices of the Registrar of Books and the Curator, Oriental Manuscripts Library, have been omitted.

(4) The Sub-Assistant Inspectors and Inspectresses have also been omitted as they had best form a separate graded branch of the service as they do now.

(5) The appointments considered include masters in general and training schools and in the school of commerce, Superintendents of hill schools, supervisors of primary schools, drawing-masters, gymnastic instructors, mistresses in general and training schools and pandits. Clerical appointments have been excluded in deference to the orders issued on the previous schemes; but I have made an exception in favour of the manager and the four highest clerks in the office of the Director of Public Instruction as they hold the highest clerical appointments in the department and it is advisable that these appointments should be held by men of some educational experience.

(6) The 170 appointments included in the scheme have been classified into four groups :—

Class I with 16 *appointments* as shown below on salaries rising from Rs. 130 to Rs. 180.—

	Rs.		Rs.
Two on	180	Four on	150
Three on	175	Three on	140
Two on	170	Two on	130

Class II with 23 *appointmentes* as shown below on salaries rising from 80 to Rs. 125 :—

	Rs.		Rs.
Four on	125	Five on	90
Three on	115	Two on	85
Seven on	100	Two on	80

Class III with 30 *appointments* as shown below on salaries rising from Rs. 55 to Rs. 75 :—

	Rs.		Rs.
Nine on	75	Nine on	60
Seven on	70	Five on	55

Class IV with 101 *appointments* as shown below on salaries rising from Rs. 30 to Rs. 50 :—

	Rs.		Rs.
Thirty-six on	50	Nineteen on	35
Twenty-four on	40	Twenty-two on	30

In making this classification I have endeavoured to group together into one class appointments to which any salary ranging between the minimum and maximum salary of the class may reasonably be attached, *e.g.*, in class II the Second Assistant Mangalore College, who now draws Rs. 90—6—120, may reasonably be permitted to draw from Rs. 80 to Rs. 125, and if he is qualified to hold any of the appointmentn in class I may, when he reaches the maximum in class II, be promoted to class I when a vacancy occurs. It will of course rest with the head of the department to decide whether a person who has reached the maximum in his class may be promoted to an appointment in the higher one.

(7) The advantage of grouping the appointments into *classes* is that it fixes the *value* of each appointment, and the incumbent of each appointment knows the maximum salary he may expect to rise to in that appointment. The *Gymnastic Instructor* (Presidency College), No. 17 in class III, will know, for instance, that his salary is fixed practically at Rs. 55 to Rs. 75, and he cannot expect to rise into the higher class unless he is considered qualified for one of the *appointments* in it. This would not be the case if all the 170 appointments formed one class. Thus the proposed classification, while fixing within reasonable limits the expectations of the incumbent of each appointment, retains the advantages of a progressive scale in each class.

(8) In fixing the grade equivalent of each appointment now carrying progressive salaries, I have generally taken the average; but, in a few cases, considering the nature of the appointments or the salaries now drawn by the incumbents, I have taken the minimum or the maximum. I have also considered how the pay fixed compares with the salaries of the other appointments on the same establishment.

(9) In class IV the number of appointments is comparatively large, but this cannot be helped the present number of appointments of the grades included in the class being large.

(10) The total of the salaries proposed is less than the average total of the present scale, but as personal allowances will have to be given in some cases, the actual expenditure involved in the introduction of this scheme will be Rs. 102 per mensem more than the average or Rs. 1,224 per annum. I expect that if the scheme is put into operation there will be considerable savings under travelling allowances as there will be no necessity for the frequent transfers that have now to be made when officers have to be promoted.

4. The constitution of the subordinate service in this scheme is on the lines of the Provincial Educational Service as each class comprises a number of appointments rising in pay. It is intended that a person holding an appointment in a class may rise to the maximum pay of the class without changing his appointment. There will be practically *four progressive scales of pay* in which men will draw their increments not by lapse of time, but on the occurrence of vacancies. The provisos and restrictions objected to by Government in the previous schemes are rendered unnecessary in the present one by the proposed grouping of appointments into suitable *classes*. The only condition to be observed is that an officer who has risen to the top of one class cannot for mere seniority claim to be admitted into the next.

As opportunities for permanent promotions will seldom occur, *acting* or sub. *pro tem.* promotions may, I think, be allowed; but as each class is in a way complete in itself, the acting promotions may be restricted, as a rule, to the men in the class in which the vacancy occurs. It may, however, be left to the discretion of the head of the department to promote to the last place in the class any person in the class next below who may be considered qualified to enter the higher class, and similarly the vacancy thus caused may be filled up by promoting a deserving person in the next lower class—so that, so far as the classes lower than the one in which the acting vacancy occurs are concerned, not more than *one in each class* will be benefited; while in the class in which the vacancy occurs the men below will each go a step higher. As a general rule, however, it would seem to be best to restrict the promotions to the class in which the vacancy occurs. It may also be desirable to make no promotions when a vacancy is not expected to last for more than three months.

5. A proposition statement in the prescribed form will be submitted through the Accountant-General if the scheme has the general approval of Government. In the statements submitted with this letter the appointments have been arranged mainly according to the average value of the present scale; but on receipt of the sanction of Government to these proposals, a separate statement fixing the rank of the officers in each class will be prepared for the guidance of the head of the department in making promotions or filling up acting vacancies and for the information of the Account Department.

6. I beg to add that in anticipation of the approval of Government I am making the necessary provision for the extra expenditure in the budget estimates for next year.

No. 501 EDUCATIONAL, 27th July 1905.

Number.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Pay proposed.	Personal allowance, if any.
	Class I. (*Rs.* 150 *to* 180).					
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	First Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	180	180	180	180	..
2	Third Assistant, Teachers' College ..	150—5—200	180⅔	180	180	..
3	Second Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	175	175	175	175	..
4	First Assistant, Kumbakónam College ..	175	175	175	175	..
5	Do. Rajahmundry College ..	175	175	175	175	..
6	Third Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	170	170	170	170	..
7	Manager, Office of the Director of Public Instruction.	150—5—175	168¾	165	170	..
8	First Assistant, Mangalore College ..	125—10—175	155	135	150	..
9	Do. Madrasa-i-azam ..	125—5—175	155⅔	125	130	..
10	Fourth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	150	150	150	150	..
11	Second Assistant, Kumbakónam College.	150	150	150	150	..
12	Do. Rajahmundry College.	150	150	150	150	..
13	Headmaster, School of Commerce ..	140	140	140	140	..
14	First Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	125—5—150	141⅔	150	140	10
15	First Assistant, Training College, Rajahmundry.	125—5—150	141⅔	135	140	..
16	Fourth Assistant, Teachers' College ..	100—5—150	130⅔	105	130	..
	Total ..		*2,538¾	2,460	2,505	10
	Class II. (*Rs.* 80 *to* 125).					
1	Fifth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	125	125	125	125	..
2	Sixth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	125	125	125	125	..
3	Third Assistant, Kumbakónam College ..	125	125	125	125	..
4	Do. Rajahmundry College ..	125	125	125	125	..
5	Head Clerk, Office of Director of Public Instruction.	100—5—125	118¾	105	115	..
6	Second Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	100—5—125	116⅔	125	115	10
7	Headmistress, Hobart Training School ..	100—5—125	116⅔	105	115	..
8	Seventh Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	100	100	100	100	..
9	Eighth Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College.	100	100	100	100	..
10	Latin Master, Presidency College ..	100	100	100	100	..
11	Fourth Assistant, Rajahmundry College.	100	100	100	100	..
12	Fifth Do. do. ..	100	100	100	100	..
13	Fourth Assistant, Kumbakónam College.	100	100	100	100	..
14	Second Assistant, Mangalore College ..	90—6—120	108	96	100	..
15	Second Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ..	85—4—125	109⅘	85	90	..
16	Third Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	80—4—100	93⅓	92	90	2
17	First Assistant, Rajahmundry Practising Section.	80—4—100	93⅓	88	90	..
18	Second Assistant, Rajahmundry Training Section.	80—4—100	93⅓	88	90	..
19	Headmistress, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	75—5—100	91⅔	75	85	..
20	Headmistress, Training school for Mistresses, Calicut.	75—5—100	91⅔	100 *plus* 20 P.A.	85	35
21	Fifth Assistant, Teachers' College ..	75—2½—100	90⅘	100	90	10
22	Sixth Do. do. ..	75—2½—100	90⅘	87½	80	1½
23	Second Clerk, Office of Director of Public Instruction.	80	80	80	80	..
	Total ..	..	2,393⅘	2,346½	2,325	58½
	Class III. (*Rs.* 55 *to* 75).					
1	Fifth Assistant, Kumbakónam College ..	75	75	75	75	..
2	Headmaster, Training School, Calicut ..	75	75	75	75	..
3	Third Clerk, Office of Director of Public Instruction.	75	75	75	75	..
4	Third Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ..	70—2—80	76⅔	72	75	..
5	Second Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry.	60—4—80	73½	68	75	..
6	Third Assistant, Training Section, Rajahmundry.	60—4—80	73½	68	75	..
7	Headmaster, Training School, Tanjore ..	60—4—80	73½	64	75	..
8	Do. Training School, Coimbatore.	60—4—80	73½	80	75	5

P.A. = Personal allowance.

Number.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Pay proposed.	Personal allowance if any.
	Class III. (*Rs.* 55 *to* 75)—cont.					
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
9	First Assistant, Hobart School	60—4—80	73½	64	70	..
10	Do. School of Commerce ..	70	70	70	70	..
11	Fourth Clerk, Office of Director of Public Instruction.	70	70	70	70	..
12	Third Assistant, Mangalore College ..	60—4—80	72	80	75	5
13	Fourth Assistant do. ..	60—4—80	72	64	70	..
14	Persian Munshi, Presidency College ..	60—2—80	72	60	70	..
15	Malayalam Munshi, Presidency College.	60—2—80	72	78	70	8
16	Tamil Munshi, Presidency College ..	60—2—80	72	62	70	..
17	Gymnastic Instructor, Presidency College.	60—2—80	72	60	60	..
18	Fourth Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ..	60—2—70	66⅔	60	60	..
19	Do. Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	50—5—75	66⅔	50	60	..
20	Headmaster, Reformatory School ..	60	60	60	60	..
21	Additional Assistant Mangalore College.	60	60	60	60	..
22	Headmaster, Training School, Guntúr ..	40—4—60	53⅓	60	60	..
23	Do. do. Nellore ..	40—4—60	53⅓	60	60	..
24	Headmaster, Training School, Vizagapatam.	40—4—60	53⅓	48	55	..
25	Headmaster, Training School, Bellary ..	40—4—60	53⅓	56	55	1
26	Do. do. Chittoor.	46—4—60	53⅓	60	60	..
27	Headmaster, Training School, Villupuram.	40—4—60	53⅓	56	55	1
28	Headmaster, Training School, Trichinopoly.	40—4—60	53⅓	60	60	..
29	Headmaster, Training School, Salem ..	40—4—60	53⅓	60	55	5
30	Do do. Mangalore.	40—4—60	53⅓	60	55	5
	Total ..	..	1,974⅔	1,935	1,980	30
	Class IV (*Rs.* 30 to 50).					
1	Fifth Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam.. ..	50—2—60	56⅔	50	50	..
2	First Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	45—3—60	55	45	50	..
3	First Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Calicut.	45—3—60	55	45	50	..
4	Drawing Mistress, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	40—4—60	53⅓	60	50	10
5	Fourth Assistant, Training Section, Rajahmundry.	40—4—60	53⅓	48	50	..
6	Third Assistant, Practising, Section, Rajahmundry.	40—4—60	53⅓	48	50	..
7	Headmistress, Kumbakónam Girls' School.	50	50	60	50	10
*8 to 14	Headmistresses of seven girls' schools ..	350	350	350	350	..
15	Headmaster, Training School, Russellkonda.	50	50	50	50	..
16	Headmaster, Muhammadan Training School.	50	50	50	50	..
17	Headmaster, Training School, Madura ..	50	50	50	50	..
18	Do. Training School, Tinnevelly.	50	50	50	50	..
19	Fifth Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	50	50	50	50	..
20	Additional English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	50	50	50	50	..
21	Headmaster, Training School, Saidapet ..	50	50	50	50	..
22	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Russellkonda.	50	50	50	50	..
23	Second Assistant, School of Commerce ..	50	50	50	50	..
24	Telugu Pandit, Presidency College ..	40—2—60	52	40	50	..
25	Canarese do. do. ..	40—2—60	52	60	50	10
26	Sanskrit do. do. ..	40—2—60	52	60	50	10
27	Senior Pandit, Rajahmundry	40—2—60	52	60	50	10
28	Persian Pandit do.	40—2—60	52	40	50	..
29	Tamil Pandit, Kumbakónam	40—2—60	52	42	50	..
30	Sanskrit do.	40—2—60	52	54	50	4
31	Drawing Master, Teachers' College ..	40—2—60	52	42	50	..
32	Persian Munshi, Madrasa-i-azam ..	40—2—60	52	60	50	10
33	Arabic do. do.	40—2—60	52	42	50	..
34	Drawing Master, Training College, Rajahmundry.	40—2—50	46⅔	50	50	..
35	Sixth Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam	40—2—50	46⅔	44	50	..
36	Second Assistant, Hobart Training School.	40—2—50	46⅔	44	50	..
37	Third do. do.	40—2—50	46⅔	40	40	..
38	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Parlákimedi.	40	40	40	40	..
39	Headmaster, Training School, Jeypore ..	40	40	40	40	..
40	Do. Panchama Training School.	40	40	40	40	..
41	First Assistant, Training School, Calicut.	40	40	40	40	..
42	Third Assistant, School of Commerce ..	40	40	40	40	..
43	Fourth do do. ..	40	40	40	40	..

* Gunnairbeed, Suryarowpet, Nellore, Vellore, Cuddalore, Kanathur, and Tellicherry.

Number.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Pay proposed.	Pay allowance if any.
	Class IV (Rs. 30 to 50)—cont.					
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
44	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Suradá ..	40	40	40	40	..
45	Do. do. Narsapatnam.	40	40	40	40	..
46	Second Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	35—2—45	41⅔	41	40	1
47	Second Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Calicut.	35—2—45	41⅔	35	40	..
48	Fourth Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry	35—1—40	38½	40	35	5
49	Telugu and English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	30—3—45	40	45	40	5
50	Headmistress, Girls' Schools, Rajahmundry.	30—2—50	42⅔	50	40	10
51	Supervisor of Muhammadan Schools, Madras.	35	35	35	35	..
52	First Assistant, Training School, Madura.	35	35	35	35	..
53	Second Assistant, Training School, Calicut.	35	35	35	35	..
54	First Assistant, Training School, Guntúr.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
55	Do. Vizagapatam.	30—2—40	36⅔	36	35	1
56	Headmaster, Training School, Chicacole.	30—2—40	36⅔	36	40	..
57	Do. do. Berhampur.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
58	First Assistant, Training School, Nellore.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
59	Headmaster, Ongole	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
60	Do. Kurnool	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
61	First Assistant, Bellary	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
62	Headmaster, Anantapur	30—2—40	36⅔	32	40	..
63	Do. Kárvetinagar	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
64	First Assistant, Chittoor	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
65	Headmaster, Ránipéttai	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
66	First Assistant, Villupuram	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
67	Headmaster, Cuddalore	30—2—40	36⅔	36	40	..
68	First Assistant, Tanjore	30—2—40	36⅔	32	35	..
69	Second Assistant, do.	30—2—40	36⅔	36	30	6
70	First Assistant, Trichinopoly	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
71	Do. Coimbatore	30—2—40	36⅔	30	35	..
72	Second Assistant, do.	30—2—40	36⅔	30	30	..
73	First Assistant, Salem	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
74	Headmaster, Badagara	30—2—40	36⅔	30	40	..
75	Do. Malappuram	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
76	First Assistant, Mangalore	30—2—40	36⅔	40	35	5
77	Telugu and English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	30—2—40	36⅔	40	40	..
78	Fourth Assistant, Hobart Girls' School.	30—2—40	36⅔	30	30	..
79	Fifth Assistant, Training School, Rajahmundry.	30—2—40	36⅔	34	35	..
80	Senior Pandit, Mangalore College ..	30—1—35	33½	32	35	..
81	Seventh Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ..	30—1—40	36⅔	30	35	..
82	Telugu Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses.	25—3—40	35	40	35	5
83	First Assistant, Russellkonda Training School.	30	30	30	30	..
84	First Assistant, Muhammadan Training School.	30	30	30	30	..
85	First Assistant, Tinnevelly Training School.	30	30	30	30	..
86	First Assistant, Training School, Saidapet.	30	30	30	30	..
87	Headmistress, Madura Girls' School ..	30	30	30	30	..
88	Do. Salem Girls' School ..	30	30	30	30	..
89	Do. Dindigul Girls' School ..	30	30	30	30	..
90	Do. Namakkal Girls' School ..	30	30	30	30	..
91	Seventh Assistant, Teachers' College ..	30	30	30	30	..
91	Fifth Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry.	25—2—35	31⅔	31	30	1
93	Third Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore.	25—2—35	31⅔	25	30	..
94	Third Assistant Training School for mistresses, Calicut.	25—2—35	31⅔	25	30	..
95	Gymnastic Instructor, Kumbakónam College.	20—2—40	32⅔	34	30	4
96	Junior Pandit, Rajahmundry College ..	20—2—40	32⅔	26	30	..
97	Gymnastic Instructor, Rajahmundry College.	20—2—40	32⅔	40	30	10
98	Gymnastic Instructor, Teachers' College.	20—2—40	32⅔	40	30	10
99	Hindustani Munshi, Madrasa-i-azam ..	20—2—40	32⅔	20	30	..
100	Tamil Munshi, Madrasa-i-azam	20—2—40	32⅔	40	30	10
101	Drawingmaster, Madrasa-i-azam ..	20—3—40	32⅔	36	30	6
	Total ..	..	4,162⅔	4,121	4,085	178

No. 501 EDUCATIONAL, 27th July ~~OCTOBER~~ 1905.

Summary.

Class I (Rs. 130 to 180) — 16 appointments.

	Rs.		Rs.
2 on	180	4 on	150
3 on	175	3 on	147
2 on	170	2 on	130

Class II (Rs. 80 to 125) — 23 appointments.

	Rs.		Rs.
4 on	125	5 on	90
3 on	115	2 on	85
7 on	100	2 on	80

Class III (55 to 75) — 30 appointments.

	Rs.		Rs.
9 on	75	9 on	60
7 on	70	5 on	55

Class IV (30 to 50) — 101 appointments.

	Rs.		Rs.
36 on	50	19 on	35
24 on	40	22 on	30

—	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	Personal Allowance.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
I (16)	2,538½	2,460	2,505	10
II (23)	2,393 6/12	2,346½	2,325	58½
III (30)	1,974½	1,935	1,980	30
IV (101)	4,162 7/9	4,121	4,085	178
(170 appointments) ..	11,069½	10,862½	10,895	276½

Read.

680-81 501 / 29-7-06 18

[F.D.]
1,500—3-12-04

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

[Note connected with G.O. No. Edl. d 23-10-05(6)] 20

C. No. 1610 From the D.P.I. No. 7703, dated 11-9-1905.

SUBJECT.

Reorganization of the Subordinate Educational Service in the Madras Presidency.

The proposal to re-organize the Subordinate Educational service in the Madras Presidency is a longstanding one. It was started by the late Mr. Grigg in May 1891. His scheme included 306 appointments on salaries ranging from even less than Rs 15 (average) to Rs 187½ (average) but excluded the Subordinate Inspecting Officers. In G.O. No 822 Edl dt 26th October 1891 the Scheme was referred to the Accountant General for remarks. Before receipt of the Accountant General's remarks, however, the report on Public Instruction for 1890-91 came in and in para: 198 of it ~~the~~ Dr. Duncan the acting Director of Public Instruction observed as follows:—

G.O. No 822 Edl dt 26-10-91.
E.

"Sanction was accorded by the Secretary of State towards the close of the "year for bringing certain appointments into a graded service under the "designation of "the Upper Subordinate Educational Service – Scholastic "Branch' and proposals for grading the lower Subordinates are now "before Govt. Owing however to the Govt. of India having declined to treat "each grade as a distinct class, the advantages contemplated by the "gradation have been lost; and, though the scheme may probably benefit "a few Officers, the Officers concerned have, as a class, lost much by "being deprived of acting promotions from class to class. If the Lower "Subordinate Scheme be sanctioned and worked on the same lines

the

21 2P

Read

"the inconvenience to the Depart^t and the loss to individual
"officers in the several grades will be very great, because when
"an acting vacancy occurs in the highest class on Rs175-200, a
"new officer can be appointed in the lowest class only on Rs10-1-15
"no acting promotion being allowed to any officer in the
"intermediate grades. I propose however to address the Govt
"on the whole subject in a separate communication".

On receipt of the Accountant General's remarks accordingly, the Director was informed that orders on the scheme for grading the Lower Subordinate Educational service would be deferred pending the receipt of the further communication promised by Dr Duncan - G.O.No 926 Edl dt 15th December 1891.

C.

2. This further communication will be found in G.O.No 793 Edl dt 3rd November 1893. Dr Duncan took away 20 appointments from Mr. Griggs's list and added 202 more, chiefly by the inclusion of the Subordinate inspecting agency. The main features of this Scheme were —

D.

(1) the petty incremental system was done away with as in the Provincial Educational Service,

(2) ~~the large number of classes — 27 — into which~~ the 488 appointments (included) were divided into a large number of classes, viz,

(3) ~~the grant of~~ selection promotions were to be given.

(4) ~~to regulate~~ Promotion was to be regulated in the principle of seniority tempered ~~with~~ by selection but a minima & maxima were to be fixed for certain appointments as follows:—

minima for Sub-assistant Inspectors. Rs60

22 3 P

minima for Assistants in Colleges. Rs 60

" for Head Clerks of Inspectors & Inspectresses " 40

" " " " Assistant Inspectors " 30

maxima " Pandits & munshis " 80

" " Head Clerks of Inspectors & Inspectresses " 70

" " Drawing masters " 60

" " for Librarian, Store Keeper, Lower teachers of special subjects in the School of Art " 50.

" for Head Clerks of Assistant Inspectors, Gymnastic Instructors, Munshis & Assistant Librarian, Oriental MSS Library & the Muhammadan Inspecting School master, Madras. " 40

" for teachers of special subjects in the Reformatory School. " 30

" " Clerks in Dub Assistants offices " 25.

The Govt. ~~[illegible]~~ observed that the scheme could not be profitably considered until final orders had been passed in regard to the re-organization of the Superior Service & requested the Director to address them again when that matter was settled. It was also pointed out to the Director that the scheme required the sanction of the Govt of India, that it was unlikely that that Govt would accept the proposal about doing promotions from one grade to another & that the minimum pay of Rs 50 for Assistants in Colleges seemed to be too high.

3. The proposal next came up in 1896. The number of appointments included then was 502 and it was proposed to divide these into 27 classes as in 1893. The

Dent

23 48

Lowest pay was to be Rs15 & the highest Rs150; the difference between each class up to Rs100 being Rs5 and between each class above Rs100 being Rs10. The objection which the Govt. had to this scheme were stated as follows in Mr. Forbes D.O. to Mr. Duncan on pages 27–29 of G.O. No 400 Pol dy 23rd July 1898 :–

The scheme do not provide any maxima or minima for specific classes of appointments. A.

"It grades in one list a large number of persons
" whose duties are very dissimilar and not comparable;
" and that a man once in the list, may either through
" seniority or otherwise, find himself drawing grade
" pay quite unsuited to the actual work he is doing.
" No doubt examinational requirements is some check on
" such a result: and your original proposal to prescribe
" maxima & minima for specific classes of appointments
" would have been an additional safeguard, but this latter
" arrangement has disappeared from the Scheme apparently
" owing to a misapprehension of G.O. No 793 dt 3rd Nov. 1903.
" The limitation of the grading to appointments on Rs150
" & over might remove some objections but even then the
" list would remain too heterogenous first would
" lump together 15 office clerks, 65 inspecting officers and
" 65 school teachers and the difficulty of distinguishing
" personal claims and merits would render a fair
" adjudication a hard business.

" Moreover a limitation such as the above would
" still present anomalies – e.g. the first six clerks of
" your office would be on the list while the remaining 15
" would not be, the Ganjam south range Superintendent
" on Rs50 would be on it, the South range Superintendent on Rs40 would
" not be".

× × × × × × × × × ×

4. The Director however did not consider it necessary to revise his proposals but suggested certain rules and restrictions in regard to admissions to and promotions in the subordinate Educational Service. As these are printed in clause b) of his letter on page 4 of Govt. no 108 Edl dt 22nd February 1899 they are not re-produced here. They included the maxima + minima for specific classes of appointments referred to in para: 2 supra. In their order no 450 Edl dt 23rd July 1898 - printed in Govt. no 108 Edl dt 22nd February 1899 - the Govt. refused to accept the revised scheme + observed that "its numerous "provisos + restrictions deprive it of simplicity, while "it is very doubtful whether such a variety of heterogeneous "appointments as the Director deals with can be thrown "into one Service." The Govt. however permitted the Directors revise the scheme again limiting it to appointments carrying pay of Rs 50 per mensem and further to masters, instructors or inspectors.

5. The further revised scheme was submitted with the Directors letter on pages 6-8 of Govt. no 108 dt 22nd February 1899. This scheme took in 135 appointments arranged in 23 classes the pay of the highest of which was Rs 190 & of the lowest Rs 50. The Govt. however observed that the proposals failed to meet the objections raised by them, and that the scheme for grading the Subordinate Educational Service should be abandoned.

6. The present scheme now submitted by the

Read

I think that, if the scheme be at all approves, all clerical appointments sh^d be eliminated

HSL 22/9/0

Director takes in 170 appointments but includes the subordinate inspecting agency and most of the clerical appointments. The 170 appointments are placed in 4 main classes each having respectively 6. 6. 4 & 4 sub classes; the highest pay in class I being Rs 180 & the lowest pay in class IV, Rs 30.

7. The orders of 1899 about the abandonment of the scheme for grading lower subordinates were definite. Orders are solicited whether the question should now be re-opened. The one advantage of grading as proposed is that constant transfers can be avoided. One often hears of complaints against such transfers in ~~connection with~~ the reports on First grade Colleges. On the other hand the objections to grading raised by Gov^t. from time to time still remain to a great extent. All special appointments, such as Carpentry instructors, blacksmiths, mechanics, bandmasters, sergeants & librarians have now been excluded — para: 3 (3) of the Director's letter, but drawing masters, gymnastic instructors, pandits & munshis still remain [para. 3(5)] and these should never have a chance of rising to Rs 180. To prevent this the Director has divided the appointments into classes and he considers that a person in a lower class should not be promoted to the higher class unless he is qualified but at the same time he says "It will rest with the Head of the Dep^artt to decide whether a person "who has reached the maximum in his class may be promoted "to an appointment in the higher one". In this connection attention is solicited to the remarks of the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel

HSL

B.

in pages 23, 24 & 25 of P.P. No 108 of 22nd February 1899 - he says "The Hon'ble Mr. Grose remarked that "a carpenter on the graded list would never rise to Rs 150 "Perhaps the same may now be said of the Pandit who "draws Rs 40 - 50: but all depends on the decision of the "D.P.I. The objection is that such a thing should not be "possible. × × × × × × × × × It seems to me that "under the system now advocated there would inevitably, "and in spite of the best intentions, be a vast amount of "favouritism and that the officials in the office of the D.P.I "would become possessed of a dangerous amount of influence".

8. If it is decided to have a graded subordinate Educational service it is submitted that all appointments of Pandits (including the Latin masters, Presidency College), and Munshis, Gymnastic Instructors & Drawing masters, and all appointments in Training Schools, whether for masters or mistresses except appointments in Training Colleges (and all appointments in Girls schools) may be removed from the list. We have a separate scale for Girls schools and this ought to be sufficient. We are also going to have a separate scale for (The reorganization of Training Schools being now under consideration no master's a Training School for masters should have been included in the present proposals.) Training Schools for masters & the residue that will remain will chiefly be assistants in Colleges and High schools and it is constant transfers among these that it is desirable to avoid.

PH 18/9/15

9. If this Govt's training schools proposals are sanctioned, these proposals will be affected: the cadre in the current includes many

27 8 P

9

Typed
Flag H.
15/

training school posts, of which the pay will be altered. I therefore do not see how the present scheme can be accepted till we know the Secretary of State's decision on the Training Schools' Scheme.

The notes of 1898 and 1899 should have been printed. Type and flag the Hon^ble Mr Arundel's minute of 1899.

Also copy out the cadre in the current omitting

(1) posts in training schools
(2) posts in girls' schools
(3) pundits' posts
(4) posts of drawing master and gymnastic instructors

and draw up separate cadres for the above 4 classes, the training school cadre following the re-organisation proposals.

The grading is to prevent too frequent transfers and make the Director's promotion and transfer work easier. But it would not appear to be necessary to jumble up all sorts of classes in one cadre. If there is a pundit's cadre, a pundit may stay, say, at Rajahmundry all his life and yet get regular promotion. But if pundits and headmistresses are

in one cadre, it will be very difficult to weigh their respective merits. AG 19/9/05

Are Sup[t]s Off[ic]e Schools paid from the Ed[ucationa]l budget?

#

They are.
PJ
20/9/5

The note of the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel has been typed (*flagged.) [notes in 1898 & 1899 were not printed - they are now printed one by one as occasion arises. The notes in these cases also would have similarly been printed as soon as the files were available.]

The Cadre in the current has been typed as desired.

PJ
20/9/5

The proposal to grade the Subordinate Educational Service has been three times disapproved. But the present D.P.I. agrees with his predecessors in thinking it a necessary reform. Grading brings order into a service, removes uncertainty, minimises transfers. The objections to the grading schemes that have come up before are summarised in Mr. Arundel's minute of 22.2.1899 flagged #.

2. The present scheme excludes Sub. Assistants who have been re-organised and graded separately.

However it appears to me that there are still too many classes of officers in

29 10 P

the tables sent up by the D.P.I.

3. But I do not know what objection there is to grading male teachers of general subjects in Govt Colleges and Schools together with the senior clerks in the D.P.I's office who, as he says, should have some teaching experience. I accordingly venture to submit revised tables which grade 61 members of the Subordinate Service in 4 classes. The 61 includes 5 inspecting officers, who rank as supervisors rather than Sub-Assistants. I have included them because the D.P.I. did. But perhaps four of them, who are Superintendents of Hill Schools, might be transferred to the Sub-Assistants' list: or perhaps eventually supervisors will be taken over from local bodies by Govt and graded; and the Hill Superintendents and the Muhammedan Supervisor, Madras, could then be graded with other supervisors, being left meanwhile on the Subordinate Graded list.

4. The 42 masters in training schools may be added to the 61 other teachers etc when the Secy of State sanctions the reorganisation of training schools. There is no reason, it is submitted, why training school and other teachers should

I Leg Roles be omitted. The post are special post requiring a knowledge of Urdu. HZ.

I consider that this would be a most desirable arrangement HZ.

I would not grade them at all for the present. HZ

30 11P

not be interchangeable. Perhaps it would be best to await the Secy of State's orders on the pay of training school teachers before undertaking any grading; and then grade the 133.

5. The Director's tables include, besides the 133, (1) 13 posts of headmistresses in Govt girls' schools, (2) 17 pundit posts and (3) 7 gymnastic instructor and drawing master posts.

Submitted that these posts should not be included in the general list for the reasons given in the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's note of 1899: but, it is submitted, there is no objection to and much use in separate grading of the first two of the three classes proposed to be excluded from the general list. A headmistress should generally stay as long as possible in the same school: therefore, to reduce transfers, grade the 13 headmistresses in, say, 5 classes, Rs $\frac{30}{2}$, $\frac{35}{2}$, $\frac{40}{2}$, $\frac{45}{3}$, $\frac{50}{5}$, total cost Rs 560 as against present Rs 562 2/9.

I see no objection to this proposal
BG

The 17 teachers of optional languages might also well be graded. A Telugu pundit, however learned, can now never get more than Rs 60. Merit could be rewarded better if all

e.g. case of Swaminada Aiyar, Tamil Munshi, Presy Coll., to whom a special subvention is being made thro' the University.

pandits were placed on a graded list in which salaries rise from Rs 30 to 100. It would not be particularly difficult to compare the merits of teachers of different languages? General reputation, general culture, published works would be a guide. At any rate it would be easier to compare teachers of languages with one another than to compare them with, say, headmistresses, and better to place them on a separate scale with a maximum of Rs 100 instead of a general scale where the maximum is Rs 180, a salary which is not at present given to any teacher of an optional language. The scale might be something of this sort

Class I. Pay Rs 100
1

Class II Pay Rs 80
3

Class III Pay. Rs 60
4

Class IV Pay Rs 40 ... 5

Class V Pay Rs 30 ... 4

The cost would be Rs 900 against present cost Rs 916 2/3.

I would leave these as they are - ungraded. There is variation in Language and the object of grading - to avoid frequent transfers - would not apply largely in these cases [initials]

Gymnastic Instructors and Drawing Masters might also be graded in a separate class by themselves in a scale of Rs 30-40-50-60. But there are so few of them and transfers are, I

I would let them be. [initials]

32 138

suppose, so infrequent and the pay in the different Colleges is at present so nearly equal, that it would seem to be unnecessary to grade them.

6. If the same view is now taken by Government as was taken in 1899, there is nothing to be done but express it.

But if it is considered that the scheme is or may be made workable, perhaps the best plan will be to tell the Director to re-submit it when the Secy of State's orders on the salaries to be paid in future in Training Schools reach him; and if it is thought that the scheme requires revision, he may be told on what lines Govt want him to revise it.

I don't see how the scheme as submitted by the D.P.S. could be approved before it is settled what the pay of masters in training schools is to be.

H 21/9/04

Secy

33 14 B

CLASS I.

(From Rs.130 to Rs.180)

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1.	1st Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College	180	180	180	180	...
2.	3rd Assistant, Teachers College	150-5-200	180 5/9	180	180	...
3.	2nd Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College	175	175	175	175	...
4.	1st Assistant, Kumbakonam College ...	175	175	175	175	...
5.	1st Assistant, Rajahmundry College ...	175	175	175	175	...
6.	3rd Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College	170	170	170	170	...
7.	Manager, Office of the D.P.I.	150-5-175	168 3/4	165	170	...
8.	1st Assistant, Mangalore College	125-10-175	155	135	150	...
9.	1st Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam	125-5-175	155 5/9	125	130	...
10.	4th Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College	150	150	150	150	...
11.	2nd Assistant, Kumbakonam College ...	150	150	150	150	...
12.	2nd Assistant, Rajahmundry College ...	150	150	150	150	...
13.	Headmaster, School of Commerce	140	140	140	140	...
14.	1st Assistant, Training College, Rajahmundry ...	125-5-150	141 2/3	135	140	...
15.	4th Assistant, Teachers College ...	100-5-150	130 5/9	105	130	...

11-

34 15P

CLASS II.

(Rs.80 to 125)

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1.	5th Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College	125	125	125	125	...
2.	6th -do.- -do.- ...	125	125	125	125	...
3.	3rd Assistant, Kumbakonam College ...	125	125	125	125	...
4.	3rd Assistant, Rajahmundry College ...	125	125	125	125	...
X 5.	Head Clerk, Office of the D.P.I.	100-5-125	118¾	105	115	...
6.	7th Junior Assistant Professor, Presidency College	100	100	100	100	...
7.	8th -do.- -do.- ...	100	100	100	100	...
8.	4th Assistant, Rajahmundry College ...	100	100	100	100	...
9.	5th -do.- -do.- ...	100	100	100	100	...
10.	4th Assistant, Kumbakonam College ...	100	100	100	100	...
11.	2nd Assistant, Mangalore College ...	90-6-120	108	96	100	...
12.	2nd Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ...	85-4-125	109 4/9	85	90	...
13.	1st Assistant, Rajahmundry Practising Section	80-4-100	93 1/3	88	90	...
14.	2nd Assistant, Rajahmundry Training Section	80-4-100	93 1/3	88	90	...
15.	5th Assistant, Teachers College ...	75-2½-100	90 5/18	100	90	10
16.	6th -do.- -do.- ...	75-2½-100	90 5/18	87½	80	7½
X 17.	2nd clerk, Office of the D.P.I.	80	80	80	80	

16

35 16 B

CLASS III.

(Rs.55 to 75).

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1.	5th Assistant, Kumbakonam College ...	75	75	75	75	...
2.	3rd clerk, Office of the D.P.I.	75	75	75	75	...
3.	3rd Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ...	70-2-80	76 2/3	72	75	...
4.	2nd Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry	60-4-80	73 1/3	68	75	...
5.	3rd Assistant, Training Section, Rajahmundry	60-4-80	73 1/3	68	75	...
6.	1st Assistant, School of Commerce ...	70	70	70	70	...
7.	4th clerk, Office of the D.P.I.	70	70	70	70	...
8.	3rd Assistant, Mangalore College	60-4-80	72	80	75	5
9.	4th Assistant, Mangalore College	60-4-80	72	64	70	
10.	4th Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ...	60-2-70	66 2/3	60	60	...
11.	Headmaster, Reformatory School ...	60	60	60	60	...
12.	Additional Assistant, Mangalore College ...	60	60	60	60	...

7 36 17.B.

CLASS IV.

(Rs.30--50)

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1.	5th Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ...	50-2-60	56 2/3	50	50	...
2.	4th Assistant, Training section, Rajahmundry	40-4-60	53 1/3	48	50	...
3.	3rd Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry	40-4-60	53 1/3	48	50	...
4.	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Russelkonda	50	50	50	50	...
5.	2nd Assistant, School of Commerce	50	50	50	50	...
6.	6th Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ...	40-2-50	46 2/3	44	50	...
7.	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Parlakimedi	40	40	40	40	...
8.	3rd Assistant, School of Commerce, Calicut.	40	40	40	40	...
9.	4th -do.- -do.-	40	40	40	40	...
10.	Superintendent of Hill Schools, Surada ...	40	40	40	40	...
11.	Do. Narsapatam	40	40	40	40	...
12.	4th Assistant, Practising Section Rajahmundry	35-1-40	38 1/3	40	35	5
13.	Supervisor of Muhammadan Schools, Madras	35	35	35	35	...
14.	5th Assistant, Training Section, Rajahmundry	30-2-40	36 2/3	34	35	...
15.	7th Assistant, Madrasa-i-azam ...	30-1-40	36 1/9	30	35	...
16.	7th Assistant, Teachers College ...	30	30	30	30	...
17.	5th Assistant, Practising Section, Rajahmundry	25-2-35	31 2/3	31	30	1

Revd

Posts in Training Schools

~~CLASS I.~~

(~~From Rs.150 to 180~~)

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1.	1st Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	125-5-150	141 2/3	150	140	10
2.	2nd Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	100-5-125	116 2/3	125	115	10
3.	Head Mistress, Hobart Training School	100-5-125	116 2/3	105	115	
4.	3rd Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	80-4-100	93 1/3	92	90	2
5.	Head Mistress, Training School for Mistresses Coimbatore ...	75-5-100	91 2/3	75	85	
6.	Do. do. Calicut	75-5-100	91 2/3	100 plus 20 p.a.	85	35
7.	Headmaster, Training School, Calicut ...	75	75	75	60-4-80	...
8.	Do. Tanjore	60-4-80	73 1/3	64	60-4-80	
9.	Do. Coimbatore	60-4-80	73 1/3	80	60-4-80	
10.	1st Assistant, Hobart School ...	60-4-80	73 1/3	64	70	
11.	4th Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	50-5-75	66 2/3	50	60	
12.	Headmaster, Training School, Guntur ...	40-4-60	53 1/3	60	40-4-60	
13.	Do. Nellore ...	40-4-60	53 1/3	60	40-4-60	
14.	Do. Vizagapatam	40-4-60	53 1/3	48	40-4-60	
15.	Do. Bellary ...	40-4-60	53 1/3	56	40-4-60	
16.	Do. Chittoor	40-4-60	53 1/3	60	40-4-60	
17.	Do. Villupuram	40-4-60	53 1/3	56	40-4-60	
18.	Do. Trichinopoly	40-4-60	53 1/3	60	40-4-60	
19.	Do. Salem	40-4-60	53 1/3	60	40-4-60	
20.	Do. Mangalore	40-4-60	53 1/3	60	40-4-60	

Appd/

19

38 1913

~~CLASS IV~~
~~(Rs. 30 to 50).~~

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
21.	1st Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore	45-3-60	55	45	50	
22.	Do. Calicut	45-3-60	55	45	50	
23.	Drawing Mistress, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	40-4-60	53⅓	60	50	10
24.	Headmaster, Training School, Russelkonda	50	50	50	50	
25.	Headmaster, Muhammadan Training School	50	50	50	50	
26.	Headmaster, Training School, Madura	50	50	50	40-4-60	
27.	Do. Tinnevelly	50	50	50	40-4-60	
28.	5th Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	50	50	50	50	
29.	Additional English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	50	50	50	50	
30.	Headmaster, Training School, Saidapet	50	50	50	40-4-60	
31.	2nd Assistant, Hobart Training School	40-2-50	46⅔	44	50	
32.	3rd do. do.	40-2-50	46⅔	40	40	
33.	Headmaster, Training School, Jeypore	40	40	40	40	
34.	Headmaster, Panchama Training School	40	40	40	30-2-40	
35.	1st Assistant, Training School, Calicut	40	40	40	30-2-40	
36.	2nd Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore	35-2-45	41⅔	41	40	1
37.	Do. Calicut	35-2-45	41⅔	35	40	
38.	Telugu and English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	30-3-45	40	45	40	5
39.	1st Assistant, Training School, Madura	35	35	35	30-2-40	

18 + 4 + 2 lead 6 6 6 6 6

~~CLASS IV~~
~~(continued).~~

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
40	2nd Assistant, Training School, Calicut	35	35	35	30-2-40	
41.	1st Assistant, Training School, Guntur	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
42.	Do. Vizagapatam ...	30-2-40	36 2/5	36	30-2-40	
43.	Headmaster, Training School, Chicacole ...	30-2-40	36 2/5	36	30-2-40	
44.	Do. Berhampur ...	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
45.	1st Assistant, Training School, Nellore	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
46.	Headmaster, Ongole ...	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
47.	Do. do. Kurnool ...	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
48.	1st Assistant, Bellary	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
49.	Headmaster, Anantapur	30-2-40	36 2/5	32	30-2-40	
50.	Do. do. Rayachoti	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
51.	1st Assistant, Chittoor	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
52.	Headmaster, Ranipet	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
53.	1st Assistant, Villupuram	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
54.	Headmaster, Cuddalore	30-2-40	36 2/5	36	30-2-40	
55.	1st Assistant, Tanjore	30-2-40	36 2/5	32	30-2-40	
56.	2nd do. do.	30-2-40	36 2/5	36	30-2-40	
57.	1st Assistant, Trichinopoly	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
58.	1st Assistant, Coimbatore	30-2-40	36 2/5	30	30-2-40	
59.	2nd do.	30-2-40	36 2/5	30	30-2-40	
60.	1st Assistant, Salem	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
61.	Headmaster, Badagara	30-2-40	36 2/5	30	30-2-40	
62.	Do. do. Malapuram	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
63.	1st Assistant, Mangalore	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	30-2-40	
64.	Telugu and English Assistant, Presidency Training School for Mistresses	30-2-40	36 2/5	40	40	
65.	4th Assistant, Hobart Girls' School ...	30-2-40	36 2/5	30	30	

~~CLASS II.~~
~~(continued).~~

21 HO. 21 R

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs
66.	Telugu Assistant Presidency Training School for Mistresses	25-3-40	35	40	35	5
67.	1st Assistant, Russelkonda Training School	30	30	30	30	
68.	1st Assistant, Muhammadan Training School	30	30	30	30-2-40	
69.	1st Assistant, Tinnevelly Training School ...	30	30	30	30-2-40	
70.	Do. do. Saidapet	30	30	30	30-2-40	
71.	3rd Assistant, Training School for Mistresses, Coimbatore	25-2-35	31½	25	30	
72.	Do. do. Calicut	25-2-35	31⅔	25	30	

Posts in Girls Schools ~~[illegible]~~ 22 H/ 22B

~~CLASS II~~

~~(Rs.50 to Rs.60)~~

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1.	Headmistress, Kumbakonam Girls' School ...	50	50	60	50	10
2.	Do. Gunnairbeed do.	50	50	50	50	
3.	Do. Suryaraopet do.	50	50	50	50	
4.	Do. Nellore do.	50	50	50	50	
5.	Do. Vellore do.	50	50	50	50	
6.	Do. Cuddalore do.	50	50	50	50	
7.	Do. Kanathur do.	50	50	50	50	
8.	Do. Tellicherry do.	50	50	50	50	
9.	Do. Rajahmundry do.	30-2-50	42 2/9	50	40	10
10.	Do. Madura do.	30	30	30	30	
11.	Do. Salem do.	30	30	30	30	
12.	Do. Dindigul do.	30	30	30	30	
13.	Do. Namakkal do.	30	30	30	30	

Teachers of Oriental Languages

~~CLASS II.~~

~~(Rs.80 to Rs.125)~~

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1.	Latin Master, Presidency College ...	100	100	100	100	
2.	Persian Munshi, Presidency College	60-2-80	72 2/9	60	70	
3.	Malayalam Munshi, Presidency College	60-2-80	72 2/9	78	70	8
4.	Tamil Munshi, Presidency College	60-2-80	72 2/9	62	70	
5.	Telugu Pandit, Presidency College	40-2-60	52 2/9	40	50	
6.	Canarese do. do.	40-2-60	52 2/9	60	50	10
7.	Sanskrit do. do.	40-2-60	52 2/9	60	50	10
8.	Senior Pandit, Rajah-mundry	40-2-60	52 2/9	60	50	10
9.	Persian Pandit, do.	40-2-60	52 2/9	40	50	
10.	Tamil Pandit, Kumbakonam	40-2-60	52 2/9	42	50	
11.	Sanskrit do. do.	40-2-60	52 2/9	54	50	4
12.	Persian Munshi, Madrasa-i-azam	40-2-60	52 2/9	60	50	10
13.	Arabic do.	40-2-60	52 2/9	42	50	
14.	Senior Pandit, Mangalore College	30-1-35	33 1/3	32	35	
15.	Junior Pandit, Rajahmundry College	20-2-40	32 2/9	26	30	
16.	Hindustani Munshi, Madrasa-i-azam	20-2-40	32 2/9	20	30	
17.	Tamil do.	20-2-40	32 2/9	40	30	10

Gymnastic Instructors & Drawing masters.

~~CLASS III.~~

~~(Rs. 50 to Rs. 75).~~

43 24B

No.	Name of appointment.	Present scale.	Average.	Actual.	Proposed.	P.A. if any.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1.	Gymnastic Instructor, Presidency College	60-2-80	72 2/9	60	60	
2.	Drawing Master, Teachers College	40-2-60	52 2/9	42	50	
3.	Drawing Master, Training College, Rajahmundry ...	40-2-50	46 2/3	50	50	
4.	Gymnastic Instructor, Kumbakonam College	20-2-40	32 2/9	34	30	4
5.	Gymnastic Instructor, Rajahmundry College	20-2-40	32 2/9	40	30	10
6.	Gymnastic Instructor, Teachers College	20-2-40	32 2/9	40	30	10
7.	Drawing Master, Madrasa-i-azam	20-2-40	32 2/9	36	30	6

44 25P

The first question for decision is whether Govt. will reconsider the orders already passed declining to approve of the grading of the Subordinate Educational Estab.- If the orders are to be reconsidered, the esclent to which the grading system is to take effect, and the classes of appointments to be included is for consideration.

2. The Director's proposals certainly appear to go too far. He includes 101 appointments on pay (R30 to 50/- & it is submitted that this carries unnecessary refinements into the grading system. it seems unnecessary and undesirable to include any post the pay of which is below R. 50.

p16 of file.

Another objection to the DPI's scheme is that he includes a large number of appointments ~~carry~~ involving heterogeneous duties which cannot, for purposes of grading & promotion be fairly compared.

3. I see no serious objection to the acceptance of the proposals in a modified form as suggested by Mr Gallette.

We cannot include appointments in training institutions until it is known what orders the Secretary of State may pass on our present proposals for the

Pg 11..

reorganisation of training Schools - now if these proposals be approved - could we at once propose to depart from the sanctioned scheme, and revise the salaries attached to the various teachers in those institutions. I would therefore exclude all teachers post in training Colleges from the operation of the scheme.

4. Similarly drawing masters, gymnastic instructors, pandits and teachers of Languages should be excluded. I would also exclude the Superintendent of Native Schools, and Muhammadan Supervisors in Madras.

Whether or no the 1st 2nd 3rd & 4th clerks in D.P.I.'s office should be included is for consideration. An interchange of officers between the teaching and higher clerical staffs may be desirable.

5. School mistresses may be graded in a separate class as proposed by Mr Sallett at page 11. supra.

6. Subject to views which may be passed as to the inclusion of the 4 clerical appointments in D.P.I. office I would accept the scheme for classes I. II. III as shewn at pages 14-16 supra.

and include also the appointments Nos 1. 2. 3 - 5 - 6 in Class IV (page 17 notes). This would give 47 or 43 graded appointments according to the inclusion or exclusion of the 4 clerical posts referred to, - and 13 school mistresses separately graded.

Further refinement in this respect seems undesirable.

HD[illegible]
21-9-05

AM.

~~H.E. the Governor~~ Hon'ble Mr. Stokes CSI

(vide Secretary's orders on separate slip)

US
[illegible]

This matter cannot be handled now. When it can be touched it should proceed in a personal conference & discussion with the Director. I see no use in spending time over it on paper. It should lie over till Madras is reached in any case.

[illegible]
23 9 05

[illegible]
[illegible]/9/15

Put up with Print notes
[illegible]

Also notes in old papers. [illegible]

US

To lie over pending orders on the scheme for reorganization of training schools

[illegible]
25 9 05

47 10 8

B. Please see letter ~~no 378~~ from the Govt. of India no 378 dt 30th May 1906 on the proposals of this Govt. for the reorganization of Training schools for masters in this Presidency. The Govt. of India say that the proposals will be submitted for the sanction of the Govt. of India only if the Madras Govt. can give an assurance that there will find Rs 60,000 for the re-organization of ~~upper~~ Training schools for upper primary teachers. This means that there will be considerable further delay before the matter is finally settled but even then it does not appear that Govt. will alter the pay of the masters so soon to fit in with the Director's grading scheme. May not this scheme be considered independently of the Training School scheme omitting all teachers in ~~Training~~ such schools?

PH Kaliyan
22/5/06

Re

I see that Sir J. Thomson when H.E. orders that the matter should be settled by personal conference with the Director. The scheme as set forth in p. 4 supra seems crude at present. Several of the appointments in each class overlap which should not be in a strictly graded service. When the question be next taken up?

Chesonter
28/5/06

48 118

Page 9.

In para 3 of my note of 24-9-05, I suggested that the question should be taken up independently of training schools, and limited to posts the pay of which is Rs 50 & over.

2. No specific orders were passed on this point, but the matter was ordered to lie over.

If – as seems desirable, Training schools are to be excluded from the scheme, there seems no objection to considering the proposals at once, and the Director may be consulted before he leaves Ootacamund

H D Taylor
25.6.06

H.M.

Send file [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [orbes]

J.P.T. no.

HB
26.6.06

asp
26/6/6.

Eol no. 469 D
26. 6. 06

Office of the D.P.I

After more experience and after having seen what has been said about similar proposals in the past I see more clearly what is wanted and what I hope is feasible.

2. The essential thing is to group together officers who would ordinarily be recruited from the same source, all fit for any appointment in the group and each one of whom may expect to go from the lowest to the highest pay irrespective of the appointment provided they do good work.

The possible groups are

(a) Assistant lecturers in Colleges

(b) Schoolmasters

(c) Graduate masters in Training Institutions

(d) Munshis and Pandits

(e) Gymnastic Instructors

(f) Drawing masters

3. I have left out:-

(1) Women. They will hardly go into one group and to make more than one results in groups too small to be worth while

(2) Graduate clerks in the Director's office. They may come from or go to the inspecting agency.

(3) Superintendents of Hill Schools. They belong to the Inspecting agency

(4) School of Commerce staff. They are specialists and cannot come into any group.

The last two of my possible groups are too small to be worth making.

We have left four groups.

4. What is most wanted is to form the assistant lecturers in colleges into a graded service.

The service should be recruited with the best young graduates in the subject in which there is a vacancy and to put an officer into one of these posts because he had

done good work as a schoolmaster should be out of the question. Any one of them should be a person fitted to rise to the top of the service and become a lecturer in the Provincial service. This should do much to improve our colleges. The teacher of Latin in the Presidency College belongs and always would belong to a different class from the pundits and munshis. When not teaching Latin he teaches English and should be included.

There would be 9 appointments in the Presidency College, 5 each in Kumbakonam and Rajahmundry, 2 in Mangalore.

They would cost on the following scale, Rs 2775 a month against a present average of Rs2764.

4	appointments on	Rs 175
5	"	150
5	"	125
7	"	100

To fit in with the existing staff a personal allowance of Rs 5 and another of Rs 20 would be required for the present.

In the training institutions we may well distinguish between appointments on 30-40 and above, and those below.

The former can be recruited with "B.A., L.T.s", they are willing to enter Government service on Rs 30 as they have prospects of rising to the higher training school appointments or of becoming sub-assistant inspectors.

Changing one existing appointment on 100-150 into 125-150 and two on 75-100 into 80-100 we get:-

1	on	150-200
2	"	125-150
3	"	80-100
4	"	80-80
14	"	40-80
11	"	30-40

This omits an appointment on 50 at Russellkonda and one on 40 at Jeypore. The conditions at both places are peculiar and the appointments may be omitted or the proposals

Edl. R. 21. 3,000—1-7-94.

Notes.

now before the Govt. of India may be changed in respect of these schools.

In Russellkonda Headmaster 40–60

First Asst. 25–35

Second " 20–25

may be substituted for 50, 30, 20

and in Jeypore Headmaster 40–60

Asst. 20–25

may be substituted for 40, 20 and the headmasterships of both schools included in the cadre.

The present scale for munshis and pandits is

3 on 60–80

9 on 40–60

1 on 30–35

8 on 20–40

and might be arranged

3 on 60–80

9 on 40–60

4 on 30–40

If my modified scheme is entertained I presume new proposals will be called for officially so I defer the question of the schoolmasters for the present. There are one or two matters to be specially considered in connection with them and I require more information. Also all the Saidapet staff is classed above as "training" whereas some should be counted as schoolmasters.

May I repeat that I consider the separation and grading of the assistant lecturers as quite the most important matter and well worth doing even if nothing else be done.

1-7-98

29.6.8

52/15P

The present proposal of the D.P.I. to grade separately

(1). Assistant Lecturers in Colleges 21

(2). School masters — no not yet settled

(3). Graduate masters in Training institutions 35.

(4). Munshis and pandits 16.

may be approved, but the proposal regarding Training school masters will have to wait till the re-organization of Training schools is sanctioned and then the progressive scale of pay now proposed will have apparently to be given up as there can hardly be a grade in a grade. So also the progressive scale for munshis and Pandits will have apparently to be given up.

2. The Director omits from the lists originally submitted

(1) Women

(2) Graduate Clerks in the Director's office

(3) Superintendents of Hill schools

(4) The staff of the School of Commerce

(5) Gymnastic Instructors

(6) Drawing masters.

This may be approved.

3. May the Director be requested to submit proposals officially?

[signature] 2/7/6

(Lee.) [signature] 2 7 06

~~[initials] 3.7.06~~

The D.P.I. may be asked to submit proposals in respect of item (1) Asst Lecturers in Colleges only. He informs me that this is the most pressing measure of reform

(AM) H. D. [signature] 3-7-06

I think the D.P.'s principle that all persons in a graded group ought be fit to take any work in that group is not at all essential.

It seems to me that if the value of the services in the graded dept can be fairly equated, they can all be graded together with regard to length of service. For instance if groups (a) (b) (c) (d) or (a) (b) (c) perform duties which require equivalent capacities or entail fairly equivalent responsibilities they might all be graded in the same list with reference to length of service, whether they are interchangeable or not.

How wd. this work out?

[Forbes]
4/7

see p. 12 supra

see W.S. 517

The above proposal would practically mean a reversion to the original proposals of the D.P.I. - ie to place all appointments with Ed. service carrying a salary of

Rev 54 17 P

Rs 30 & upwards into 4 classes.

2. It seems open to question whether the duties ~~[illegible]~~ of the various classes can be equated or considered interchangeable. Certainly those of Pundits & of Lecturers cannot, & it would be almost impossible to grade them with reference to length of service.

3. The lowest pay of a lecturer is R 100 and the highest pay of a pandit is R 80. Again from D.P.I.'s remarks at "A" on page 12 supra, it appears that his intention is that the staff of Asst. Lecturers sh. be specially recruited, for eventual promotion to the Provincial Edl. service – whereas it is not proposed that school masters should rise beyond the rank of Sub Asst. Inspr. or a higher training school appointment.

B — p 13 supra.

4 There would be no objection to grading school masters and training school teachers together on the principle suggested, but any such grading would have to be deferred until final orders are received on the subject of revision of training school establishments.

5 But the case of Asst. Lecturers, and

of pandits seem to require separate treatment: they will be separately recruited, and their capacities will be different. Mere grading by length of service would result in the recruitment of ~~inferior~~ men of inferior ability for the Asst. Lecturer's posts — while pandits might get a salary to which men of their capacity could ordinarily not aspire. Should the further opinion of D.P.I. be invited?

H. D. Taylor
8-7-08

(WM)

I think Mr. Taylor's note makes it clear enough that my suggestion Wd. not be applicable to the various educational grades under consideration to any great extent; & that at any rate Asst. Lecturers shd. be graded separately in view of their duties & of their selection for eventual promotion to the Provincial Educl. service.

I accept the D.P.I.'s proposal for the grading of Asst. Lecturers as set out in para. 5 of his note of 29th June supra (p. 13). The extra permanent cost is only R11 a

Rev

months & to this the Finl. Dt. will I presume not object. There will be temporarily personal allce. of R 25.

I would not grade the other classes at present.

G. F. [Forbes]
9/7

(To be accepted in Dn.)

Please draft for approval.

H. D. Taylor
11-7-06

The draft placed below is submitted for approval. If approved it may be forwarded to Financial for acceptance.

2. Under article 96(iii) of the Civil ~~Account Code~~ Service Regulations the sanction of the Govt. of India seems to be necessary to the proposition stated (as the proposal involves the creation of a grade of officers) but the A.G. will report on the matter when forwarding the proposition statement with his verification certificate.

This seems to be correct. H. Taylor 12-7-06

H. Taylor
12-7-06

By Chengam [?]
11/7/06 Fd. to F. D. for acceptance

Desp. 12/7/06

Ed. no. 508 D. Rds. 13.7.06

CHIEF SECRETARIAT. 13 JUL. 1906 OOTACAMUND.

CURRENT NO. 3077 FINANCIAL
Regd 13. 7. 06

P.T.O.

BOX No. 47
C. 24.7.06
R 25/7.06

57 208 20

Financial dept

(Draft)

The scheme which it is proposed to sanction is the grouping together and the grading separately of 21(*) Assistant lecturers in Govt Colleges apart from the General Subordinate Education Service [illegible]. The extra cost involved in the scheme is Rs. 11 p.m. or Rs. 132 p.a. besides two temporary personal allowances aggregating Rs. 25 per mensem.

(*) 9 in the Presy College
5 in the Kumbakonam College
5 in the Rajahmundry College
2 in the Mangalore College
21 vide para: 5 of D.P.I.'s note dd 29.6.06 at page 13 of notes

2. With refce to the point raised in para: 2 of the Educl office note dd 11.7.06, it is subd that the sanction of the Govt of India should apparently be obtained to the proposed creation of a new grade of lecturers, inasmuch as teachers ~~are~~ not being ministerial officers ~~and~~ ~~as~~ the rules in art. 76 (iii) of the C.S.R. according to which "without the authority of the Govt of India, no class or grade of officers may be created or abolished and the pay of no class or grade of officers may be raised or reduced" ~~not~~ are applicable to them.

Page 19 supra

art 36 of the CSR (example)

The A.G. may, it is subd, be left to note on the point while forwarding the prop. stat. to Govt.

3. The draft may, it is subd, be accepted.

V.G.K.
17.7.06.

HM
Chief Secretary.

[signature]
21.7.06

Proposal may I submit be accepted
[signature]
23/7

Recd.

I agree that the proposal to grade the Asst. Lecturers as proposed by the D.P.I. and approved by Mr. Forbes may be accepted.

[Stokes]
24/7/06.

Fin. Note 3077-1
25-7-6

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL
26 JUL 1906
SECRETARIAT.

To Edn. as

Us
25. vii. 06

Educational Dept.

Israel
H D Clayton
26-7-06

[G.O. No. 501 Edl. dt. 27-7-06]

R

[E. / 3]

1,000—5-12-02.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

59 9 P

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 108, dated 22 - 2 - 1899

" " " " , " 190 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 1610, From the D.P.I., No. 7703, dated 11 - 9 - 1905.

" " , " " , " , " 190 .

" " , " " , " , " 190 .

Despatch first as usual
[illegible] 27/7/06

Give clear instructions for copying.
I think the D.P.I's note of 29.6.06 on p. 12 to 14 of the note file should be read as a memorandum at the head of the proceedings

Not necessary [illegible] 26/7

Now printed please at madras
31/7/6

Note
Para: 5 of D.P.I's note of 29.6.06 on page 13 of notes

ORDER P.I. No. 501, dated 27 - 7 - 1906.

After a careful consideration of the proposals now submitted by the D.P.I. for the re-organization of the Subordinate Educational Service in this Presidency, the Govt. ~~have arrived at the conclusion that~~ consider that it is necessary at present to group together and grade separately only the Assistant lecturers in Colleges. The number of appointments to be included in the group will, it is understood, be 21 and the net extra cost involved Rs 11 per mensem besides two temporary personal allowances aggregating Rs 25 per mensem.

2. The Director is requested to submit ~~the usual~~ a proposition statement for giving

effect to this decision.

PH
11/7/16

NSD 60
12-7-16

S. copies despd
18/7/16

To the DPP Q+O despd 27/7/16
" AG. Q+O

Printed copy will follow.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

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

Read again G.O., No. I 108 Edl. 190 , dated 22-2-99 — P

II already in type — A

11 P / 1-21 P

No.

Press
Please print & show proof
3/8/05

Enclosures to G. No.

Order of Government.

Letter to Government.

Statement with ditto.

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.