

Use
min

Scott. II-27-39,004-24-10-44.

Education and Public Health (1945) Department.

His. SERIES.

G.O. No. 1448 Education.

1448

Dated 17th September, 1945.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Madras Educational Rules - Training Institutions - Non-stipendiary students failing to fulfil bond. - Modification of rule - Recovery of tuition fees - Considered unnecessary.

Back Papers.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
8.0.	927	Edn	19.6.45				
8.0	1212	Edn	24.7.24				
8.0	509	Edn	31.7.06				

Further Papers.

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

Education Department.

From

Dr. B.B.Dey, D.Sc.(Lond.), F.R.I.C.,
Offg. Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Department, Madras.

Ac.No.960-E/45 dated 17-7-1945.

Sir,

Madras Educational Rules - Rule 125 - Recovery of
tuition fees from stipendiary students when they fail
to fulfil the terms of the bond executed.

Under Sub-rule (ii) of Rule 125 Madras Educational Rules
if a stipendiary student fails to fulfil the terms of the
bond executed by him at the time of his admission to training,
he is required to refund the amount drawn by him from Provin-
cial, Local or Municipal funds on account of his stipends etc.
while in the case of a non-stipendiary student who has not -
already paid fees prescribed, he is required to refund the cost
of his training at the rate fixed in rule 115 Madras Educational
Rules.

2. It seems to be inequitable that a student who does
not get any stipends during his training course should be
asked to repay the tuition fees in case he fails to fulfil
the terms of the bond, while a stipendiary student is asked
to repay only the stipends but not the tuition fees. The
non-stipendiary has to undergo the course at his own expense
whereas a stipendiary gets at least a part of his expenses met
from Government funds which he receives by way of stipends.
It is not known why a distinction is made in regard to the
recovery of tuition fees. There is of course this to be said
that if non-stipendiaries are exempted from the repayment
of tuition fees and if they fail to fulfil the terms
of the bond, the department will have no hold on them at all
whereas in the case of stipendiaries the department will
have a hold even though they are exempted from re-payment
of tuition fees. However, on the other side it may
be argued that a non-stipendiary undergoes the training
course at his own expense with a genuine desire of becoming
a teacher, whereas stipendiaries very often come for training
merely for the sake of stipends. There were glaring examples
of this in the case of the Hobart Training School, Royapettah
and the Muhammadan training school for Masters, Madras, where a
majority of students trained did not take up service at all.

3. I therefore strongly feel that the rules should
be so modified as to put both stipendiaries and non-stipendiaries
on a par in regard to the question of the recovery of the
tuition fees if they fail to fulfil the terms of the bond.
If Government agree with my view I will submit necessary
draft amendments to the rules for approval of Government.

for Director of Public Instruction.

k.h.18-7.

sol
18/7

ADDITIONAL BOOK. no 1.

Register Number 169

அனாதா அபிவிருத்தி கமிட்டி

~~அனாதா அபிவிருத்தி கமிட்டி~~

அனாதா அபிவிருத்தி கமிட்டி கமிட்டி

அனாதா அபிவிருத்தி கமிட்டி கமிட்டி

அனாதா அபிவிருத்தி கமிட்டி கமிட்டி

அனாதா அபிவிருத்தி கமிட்டி கமிட்டி

அனாதா அபிவிருத்தி கமிட்டி கமிட்டி

~~~~~

57/12/9

p1 cf.

12/12/9  
18-4-45

The D.P. 9.

E.P. 14 (C)

Madras Educational Rules - Rule 125 (ii)

- Recovery of <sup>tuition fees</sup> from non-Scholarship students for failure to fulfil the terms of the bond executed by them -Modification - <sup>Recovery of tuition fees</sup> Not Considered necessary.Read: - From the D.P. 9, Rc. no. 960E/45  
dt 17.7.45.Order No 1448 Edu 17-5-45  
Hs

The Govt. do not consider it necessary to modify rule 125(ii) of the Madras Edl. Rules as proposed by the D.P. 9.

TNS  
12/9

14.5.45

E.P. 14 (C)

From the D.P.I., Re.No.960E/45 dated 17th July 1945.

Madras Educational Rules - Rule 125 - Failure to fulfil terms of the bond executed by training students.- Recovery of fees.

The Madras Educational Rule relating to the agreement to be entered into by students for teachers' training, as it stood prior to 1906, required both the stipendiary students and the non-stipendiary students (who ~~have~~ had not paid the prescribed fees already) to refund or defray the cost of their training for failure to fulfil the terms of the bond. When the educational rules were revised in the year 1906 the clause compelling refund of tuition fees by the stipendiary students for default was omitted as it was rarely practicable to get more than the ~~xxx~~ stipend amount out of the defaulters. Please see notes on pages 65-66<sup>n.f.</sup> of G.O.No.509 Ed. dated 31-7-1906. The condition binding non-stipendiary students to defray the cost of training at the prescribed rate was however left unchanged, and it continues to be the same since then.

For the reasons stated in his letter in the C.F., the D.P.I. recommends that the ~~xxx~~ stipendiary and non-stipendiary students <sup>in the matter of defraying the cost of their training</sup> should be placed on the same footing. Evidently the Director wants that the non-stipendiary students also should be exempted from the obligation to defray their cost of training.

It is submitted that the ~~xxx~~ condition compelling non-stipendiary students to defray their cost of training for failure to fulfil their terms of the bond has been in the M.E.R. for quite a long time now. ~~if the non-stipendiaries are exempted~~ As the D.P.I. himself ~~is~~ has stated, there may be no hold on the non-stipendiary students for the Dept. if these students are exempted from payment of tuition fees. ~~For orders whether the D.P.I.'s proposal will be accepted.~~

<sup>TMS 15-8-45</sup> The establishment of training schools involving expenditure from Provincial funds and Govt. have a right to ask persons who are given free training in these schools to serve as teachers for a specified period. Further the Govt. have ~~been~~ launched the scheme of compulsory

①  
vide page 65 n.f.  
G.O.509 Ed.  
31.7.06

①  
P

(payment of training fee.)

9/3/52

Edn. & P.H. Dept (C)  
Madras Ed. Rules - Rule 125 -  
Failure to fulfil terms of the bond  
executed by training students -

education which requires thousands of teachers and any relaxation of the existing rules would only tend to decrease the number of trained teachers available for the scheme. For orders whether the D.P.'s proposal will be accepted.

When in the 1906 Edition of the M.E.R., there was a rule which limited the number of provincial stipendiaries in each department of a training institution and the number was so fixed as to leave an almost equal provision in most cases for non-stipendiaries also. Rules 112 & 117 (1) / 22-23 of the Act apparently thought that teachers who were trained at state cost but who did not subsequently justify the expenditure on the training by serving a minimum period could with reason be required to refund the tuition fee which might have been but was not actually collected from them.

2. The same provision was kept up when the stipends were abolished in 1933 and the Director took the opportunity for making consequential amendments in M.E.R. to suggest the execution of agreements even by teachers trained in institutions by private management, albeit the arrangements were not receiving stipendary grants from Provincial funds. p. 2 of Go 520 Edu dated 25.3.33.

3. We are now in a stage where the maximum output of trained teachers is necessary for the expanding needs of compulsory education etc. and stipends also stand renewed for the present. There are very few now, who get trained without stipends in secondary and training schools so that the Director's proposal will have particular effect only in relation to teachers who were being trained without stipends during the period from 1933 up to the recent revival of stipends.

Pl. see below  
29/8  
There was number of proposal to amend M.E.R. 115  
18/8  
Go No. 927 Edu  
3/9.6.45 is put up  
1/9  
2/9/45

A

and who have defaulted in complying with the agreements. It is better to keep up the existing position on the general grounds at A on the previous page. Pl. see below case.

E.P.H. no.

32740/45-1  
3/9/45



fin 39620  
2/9/45  
7.9.45



This department may agree with the view at B above and the file may be returned to E.P.H.

5/9/45

6.9.45

7.9.45

May be circulated to appl. of the suggestion at B above.

8.9.45

Approved  
14.9.45

A draft order is subd.

Ins.  
12/9

14.9.45

for 3000  
1-10-10  
2-1-10  
p/1/10

will be done by

1-1-10  
2-1-10