

E. & P. H.

(194 7 ) Department.

Mr. SERIES.

G.O. NO. Ms.2261 Education.

Dated the 27th October 1947.

[Despatch Abstract.]

MADRAS EDUCATIONAL SERVICE - Age limit for appointment as Principals  
of Colleges - Suggestion to fix the upper limit at 50 years - Papers  
recorded.

# Back Papers.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

# Further Papers.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

33/88

Memo. No. 60870 A-1, dt-2.8.47 <sup>(N)</sup> E.O. + (A) ✓  
Age-limit for appt. as Principals of Colleges.

A suggestion has been made that the Spl. Rules for the M.E.S. be amended so as to prescribe that for promotion to posts of Principals of Govt. Colleges, the names of only such of the officers as have not exceeded the age of 50 years should be considered. Rule 5(B) of the Spl. Rules already contains such a provision in the case of appt. by transfer to the Admn. Secn. of the Service. The reason given in support of the suggestion is that one cannot devote himself with sufficient interest to the service of the institution concerned and that for the work

if he is expecting to retire shortly

Education Department.

From Dr. S.R.U. Savor, M.A., D.Sc., I.E.S.,  
Director of Public Instruction, Madras.  
To The Secretary to Government,  
Education and Public Health Department

Dis.No.5520 /47, dated 1-10-47.

78914  
Sir, @f@  
Sub:- Madras Educational Service - Age limit for appointment  
as Principals of Colleges - Fixing at 50 years - Not  
favoured - Remarks submitted to Government.

Ref:- Govt. Memo.No.60810 A.1 Edn., dated 7-8-47.

With reference to the suggestion contained in the Memo.  
cited above I may submit that it is not correct to say that a  
person who is to retire shortly will be inefficient or indifferent  
to the interests of the College. Experience has shown that  
Professors or Lecturers appointed as Principals after they reached  
50 years of age have been quite efficient and devoted to their  
work. The fact that they were due to retire within a short period  
has not so far affected the quality of their work if their record  
as lecturers was satisfactory. I feel that the existence of an  
age-limit for promotion even in the case of posts in the  
Administrative section of the Madras Educational Service is not  
quite justified and the case for introducing such an age  
restriction in regard to promotion to posts of principals is  
therefore, even justifiable.

2. The suggestion, if implemented will result in senior  
and experienced officers serving under comparatively junior  
officers who may be by no means more efficient than those whose  
promotion is prevented by the proposed age-rule. This position  
will give room for unnecessary friction in the day-to-day  
administration of the College and will probably undermine  
discipline in the institution.

3. Moreover, the posts of principals are all in the "selection  
category" and there is nothing to prevent an inefficient  
or lethargic officer over 50 years of age, being superseded by  
a young and suitable officer, and the object with which the  
prescription of an age-limit is proposed ~~is~~ would be served  
equally well if greater care is exercised in promoting lecturers.

4. In the above circumstances I do not support the suggestion  
contained in the Government Memorandum referred to above.

for Director of Public Instruction.

pkf.3/10

Secretary, E. & P.H.

As it stands at present under the rules all Principals of Colleges are promoted according to their seniority. There are cases in which they retire after 6 months or one year after they become principals. The result, in many cases, is that the principals are not able to <sup>work</sup> sufficiently long in their places to appreciate the administrative difficulties in the Colleges and attend <sup>to</sup> them properly. One must have at least 5 years normally to understand the position. *+ take interest in the work*

I understand that there is a rule in the administrative section that nobody after 50 years should be promoted as a D.E.O. The reason for the rule is that there is no use of promoting a man as D.E.O. when he is about to retire. A man who is retiring will not take much interest in his work and

p.t.o.

that rule is very <sup>salutary</sup> ~~successful~~. I think the same rule should be applied also in the case of promotion as principals. If the work in our colleges is to be done efficiently and with interest, the man posted as principal should look forward to a continuous period about 5 years to do his work well. If he is expecting retirement within a year, he will not take much interest in the work.

So I propose that the rule which is followed in the administrative section may also be applied to the Colleges for promotion of administrative heads such as principals.

#### H.M. Education.

With refce. to S on p.1 ante, it may be pointed out that, under the existing rule - rule 2(b)(ii) of the Special Rules for the Madras Edl. Service - the posts of Principals of all Colleges <sup>(Govt.)</sup> are "selection posts" - i.e., appointments.

to them should be made ~~on~~ on the basis of merit and ability, seniority being considered only where merit and ability are approximately equal.

Rule 5(B),  
M.E.S. Rules

The reason for framing the rule which says that no officer is eligible for "promotion" to the Admn. Section of the M.E.S. if he has attained the age of 50, was that administrative work for an officer promoted from the Subordinate Edl. Service involved a more marked increase of responsibility and a need for a flexibility of mind in dealing with a new environment of people and of situations - which would not be usually found in persons over 50.

The ~~rule~~ may first be considered on the suggestion to frame a similar rule in regard to promotion to Principals' posts.

It may however be noted that conditions <sup>in the Collegiate line</sup> are entirely different from those in the Administrative line. The Principals and Professors have no touring work and even a man above 50 can do his work well. In fact, age is considered to carry with it increased knowledge, an essential part of a Prof.'s equipment and ripened expce. Some of the Principals and Profs. in the past were at their best when they were above 50. A draft memo to the D.P.S. is ~~sent~~ <sup>sent</sup>. The draft ~~may~~ <sup>may</sup> however be sent to the D.P.E. to ascertain his views before further consideration.

It is only occasionally that major problems arise which will require a long period of time to put through & under review a little has to be seen to me. I doubt whether it is really necessary to have a term limit of 5 years. As with the term limit of 5 years, it seems desirable to have a term limit of 5 years, but I think it is really a hardship on them. D.P.S. views may be obtained. Prop. ~~done~~.

[Issued as memo. no. 60810 A-1 dt 7.8.47]  
From the D.P.9. To 5520/47 dt 1.10.47.

Please see the ~~minutes of~~  
Contained in H.M. (Edn.)'s ~~note~~ minutes  
on pages 1-2 ante. The D.P.9. is not  
in favour of the proposal for the reasons  
stated in his letter on page 3 of ~~the~~  
~~see also Dept. note on page 3 ante.~~  
~~Office note on pages 2-3 ante may also~~  
~~be pursued.~~ In the circumstances, it  
is for orders whether the proposal ~~may~~ <sup>need</sup> be  
~~turned down.~~ Maybe circulated to H.M. (Edn.).

THS  
6.10.47 / M  
7/10/47 S / M (W) / M (W)  
8/10/47

SA  
10.10.47



It is presumed that the matter  
need not be pursued. In this case  
the papers may be "Recorded"

10/10/47  
12/10/47 S / M (W) / M (W)

Lpo(MS) no. 2261 Edn dt 27.10.47

M.E.S - Age limit  
for appointment as  
Principals of Colleges  
- Suggestion for to  
fixing the upper  
limit at 50 years.  
Papers recorded.

5/11/47