

Education and Public Health

(194 9) Department.

Ms.

2
SERIES.

G.O. NO. 3406, Education,

Dated 7th November 1949.

[Despatch Abstract.]

EDUCATION - Secondary Municipal High School - Tiruvannamalai - Irregularities committed by the Headmaster in respect of promotions - Disciplinary action - 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.

C. No.

Department.

Sect. II-74.

List of records put up

Number.	Date.	Department.	Signature of Clerk putting up the paper.	Signature of Clerk removing the paper.

(P.T.O.)

Eng. Math. Tamil His.&Geo. Opt. Ele.Sc.

R. Sivaraman, V. Form	25	8	29	11	28	17
N. Ramanathan V Form	29	2	34	24	19	21
P. Mannangatty V. Form	6	a	28	30	32	45

I don't understand what principal has been followed when P. Mannangatty who got 6 marks in English has been promoted, whereas N. Ramanathan has been detained.

In going through all these marks, it is clear that the Headmaster has not followed any principle of promotion. In the same form some students have been promoted on condition that they should take T.C. and leave the institution. One A. Rathakrishnan has applied for T.C. on 17-5-49 before the results were announced i.e. on 25-5-49. The same thing has taken place with one S. Krishnamoorthi I like to point out that the Headmaster has struck off both the names intending to detain them on the basis of marks obtained by them, perhaps as an after thought or some other consideration has made him erase the pencil marks over their names in order to promote them.

	Engl.	Math.	Tamil	His.&Geo.	Sc.	Social
T.N. Rathakrishnan, IV Form	21	15	31		36	49
T. Rangabashyam	10	15	29		14	21

Among these two cases the Headmaster has promoted only T. Rangabashyam though Rathakrishnan has got better marks in all the subjects. I do not know why this sort of partiality has taken place.

	Eng.	Math.	Tamil	Sc.	Social	His.
V. Ranganathan Reddy, IV Form	6	3	24	15	22	41
B. Neelakantan	19	8	38	23	35	38
Abdul Malick	17	12	25	22	25	40
Abdul Kareem	21	1	26	21	35	41

Let me take into consideration the marks of these four candidates. The Headmaster has promoted V. Ranganatha Reddy and detained the others. This is a very glaring irregularity.

	21	36	32	21	42	16
K. Mahalingam	9	17	32	21	14	2
A. Subramniam	15	16	42	27	35	2
G. Kuppaswami	15	17	37	25	35	18
A. Kumaraswami						

Among this set of boys the Headmaster has showed partiality in promoting A. Subramniam alone. In comparing the marks of these four students with that of V. Ranganatha Reddy these four students ought to have been promoted. I have received a complaint from B. Neelakantan's father.

III Form	Tamil	Engl.	Math.	Sc.	His.
Joseph Wellington	8	1	12	23	21
	22	13	12	37	23

(4)

I request the Authority to enquire whether there were any principles or conditions of promotion at all and if there were any, why they were not followed.

P. U. Shanmugam
Chairman 23.6.69

Ss.23-6.

Copy to the District Educational Officer, North Arcot, Vellore.
Copy to the Divisional Inspector, Coimbatore.
Copy to the Hon'ble Minister for Education, Government of Madras, Madras.

✓ 29/0

Memo. No. 48558-92/49-3 Edn. dated 3-9-49.

Sub:- Education - Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai - Irregularities in promotions made by the Headmaster.

Ref:- From the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tiruvannamalai, dated 23rd June 1949.

A copy of the letter received from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tiruvannamalai, cited above is forwarded to the Commissioner, Tiruvannamalai Municipality, and he is requested to state whether the irregularities mentioned in the Chairman's letter came to his notice and if so what action he took thereon, and if not, why he has not taken action on the persons responsible for these irregularities.

To

The Commissioner,
Ml. Council,
Tiruvannamalai. Thro'
(with enclosure) Be Ch^{or}
copy of pp. 1-5 c.f. Be Ch^{or}
copy to 279 (memo alone)

2/9/49. why not. 3/9

From
Sri K. Seshachari, B.A., L.T.,
Municipal Commissioner,
Tiruvannamalai.

To
The Secretary to Government in the
Education and Public Health Depart-
ment, Government of Madras.

Roc. B2-6964/49 dated 11-9-49.

Through

The Chairman, Municipal Council,
Tiruvannamalai.



Sir,

Sub:- Education - Municipal High School - Tiruvannamalai -
Irregularities in promotion made by the Head Master -
Report - Submitted.

Ref:- Memo No. 48558-92-49-3 Education dated 3-9-49 of the
Government.

With reference to the above cited memorandum of Government, I submit that no copy of the letter of the Chairman, Municipal Council dated 23-6-48 sent along with the Government's memorandum was received by me except a note dated 21-6-49 alleging almost the same irregularities and citing the same instances. On receipt of the confidential note of the Chairman, I examined the marks and promotion lists thoroughly with the principles of promotion framed by the Head Master and found that there were several cases of irregular promotions, not satisfying the principles framed by him.

2. In this office, memo dated 8-7-49 the Head Master was called upon to explain for all the irregularities mentioned in the Appendix to the memo. He submitted the explanation on 2-8-49 and in it, he also stated that he had offered his remarks to the District Educational Officer, North Arcot as called for by him on a copy of the chairman's petition which was also sent to the District Educational Officer by the Chairman. On knowing this I requested the Chairman, Municipal Council in my letter dated 24-8-49 to give me a copy of the letter addressed to the Educational Authority. He has not so far furnished me with the copy. As I have since received a copy of the letter of the Chairman, Municipal Council from the Government I am in a position to proceed further in the matter.

The explanation is being examined with reference to the lists once again and I shall be disposing of the charges observing the procedure prescribed shortly. I shall also submit my final report in the matter to Government.

[Signature]
Commissioner. 13/9

Copy to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

Forwarded.

[Signature]
Chairman.

[Signature]
13.9.49

R.O. C.No. 1717 E4/49

Office of the
Director of Public Instruction
Madras, dated, 15th Sep. 1949.

From
The Director of Public Instruction
Madras.



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

Rule 30 -

Subject:- MADRAS EDUCATIONAL RULES -- Annual
promotions -- Certain irregularities
in the -- Municipal High School,
Tiruvannamalai.

Reference:- Govt. Memo. No. 48558-G2/49-1 Education,
dated 29-6-1949.

I have the honour to submit herewith a copy of the
report Rc.No. 276 D2/49 dated 28-7-1949 of the District Educa-
tional Officer, North Arcot, and a copy of the remarks of the
Divisional Inspector of Schools, Coimbatore, Rc.No. 739 B/49
dated 29-8-1949 and to state that I am requesting the Commissioner
Municipal Council, Tiruvannamalai, to frame suitable charges
against the Headmaster and award him some punishment for the
irregularities committed by him, Under the appointment and
Services Rules of Local Boards Servants.

Action under rule 98 b or 154 of Madras Educational
Rules does not appear to be appropriate and hence ~~to make herein the~~
matter has been referred to the Commissioner for suitable action.

Yours faithfully

Thiruvannamalai

For Director of Public Instruction.

SD/15/9.

23/9/49

Copy of letter Rc.No.276/D2/49 dated 28.7.1949 of the District Educational Officer, North Arcot, Vellore to the Divisional Inspector of Schools, Coimbatore Division.

The letter dated 23.6.1949 of the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tiruvannamalai and the explanation of the Headmaster, Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai are submitted with the following remarks:-

- The Chairman cites in his letter the cases of
- (a) 11 pupils in Form V of whom 7 are promoted.
 - (b) 10 pupils in Form IV of whom 5 are promoted
 - (c) 2 pupils in Form III of whom 1 is promoted.

and states that the pupils detailed are more deserving of promotion than those who are promoted, that the promotions are therefore, irregular and constitute rank injustice to the pupils, that there is a number of anonymous petitions against the Headmaster, that there is much indiscipline in the school and that the Headmaster does not and cannot command any respect or loyalty and finally requests the authorities to enquire whether there were any principles or conditions of promotion at all and if there were any why they were not followed.

2. The cases cited by the Chairman are tabulated below:-

S.No.	Name of the pupil.	Eng.	Tamil	Ely. Math.	Science	History & Geog.	Opt.
1.	C. Sathya Fern- Form V	17	35	12	40	17	26 D
2.	K. Shanmugam "	15	31	0	35	9	3 P
3.	V. Perumal "	14	39	48	40	46	11 D
4.	V. Kuppuswamy "	9	32	2	63	1	19 P
5.	D. V. Narayanan "	26	30	7	27	9	52 P
6.	A. S. Muthuswami "	26	31	8	31	24	20 D
7.	R. Sivafaman "	25	29	8	17	11	28 P
8.	N. Ramanathan "	29	34	2	21	24	19 D
9.	M. Mannangatty "	6	28	a	45	30	32 P
10.	A. Rathakrishnan "	-	-	-	-	-	- P
11.	S. Krishnamoorthy "	-	-	-	-	-	- P
Sec. Stud.							
12.	T. N. Radhakrishnan, Form IV	21	31	15	36	-	49 D
13.	T. Rangabashyam "	10	29	15	14	-	21 P
14.	V. Ranganatha Reddi "	6	24	3	15	41	22 P
15.	B. Neelakantan "	19	38	8	23	38	35 D
16.	Abdul Malik "	17	25	12	22	40	25 D
17.	Abdul Kareem "	21	26	1	21	41	35 D
18.	K. Mahalingam "	21	32	36	21	16	42 D
19.	A. Subramaniam "	9	32	17	21	2	14 P
20.	G. Kuppuswami "	15	42	16	27	2	35 P
21.	A. Kumaraswami "	15	37	17	25	18	35 P
22.	Joseph Wellington Form III	1	8	12	23	21	- P
23.	D. Winson "	13	22	12	37	23	- D

P.. .. Promotion
D.. .. Detained.

Copy of letter No. 228/2 dated 18.7.1949 of the District
Inspector of Schools, Coimbatore, to the District
Inspector of Schools, Coimbatore, regarding the
The letter dated 18.7.1949 of the Chairman, Municipal
Council, Coimbatore, and the explanation of the Headmaster
School, Coimbatore, are submitted with the following remarks:-
The Chairman states in his letter the names of
(a) 1 pupil in Form V of whom 5 are promoted.
(b) 1 pupil in Form VI of whom 5 are promoted.
(c) 1 pupil in Form VII of whom 1 is promoted.
and states that the pupils detailed are more deserving of promotion
than those who are promoted. That the Headmaster has therefore, in
accordance with the instructions of the Municipal Council, promoted
the pupils detailed. The Headmaster has not stated in his
explanation any reason for the promotion of the pupils detailed.
and it is stated in the letter of the Chairman that the Headmaster
has acted in his discretion as mentioned below:-

3. The names of the pupils promoted are as follows:-

Sl. No.	Name of the pupil	Form	English	Tamil	Maths	Science	History	Art	Music	Physical Education	Total
1	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
2	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
3	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
4	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
5	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
6	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
7	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
8	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
9	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
10	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
11	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
12	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
13	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
14	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
15	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
16	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
17	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
18	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
19	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
20	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
21	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
22	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
23	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
24	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
25	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
26	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
27	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
28	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
29	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
30	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
31	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
32	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
33	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
34	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
35	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
36	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
37	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
38	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
39	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
40	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
41	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
42	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
43	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
44	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
45	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
46	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
47	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
48	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
49	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
50	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
51	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
52	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
53	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
54	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
55	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
56	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
57	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
58	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
59	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
60	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
61	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
62	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
63	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
64	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
65	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
66	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
67	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
68	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
69	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
70	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
71	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
72	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
73	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
74	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
75	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
76	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
77	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
78	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
79	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
80	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
81	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
82	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
83	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
84	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
85	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
86	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
87	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
88	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
89	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
90	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
91	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
92	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
93	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
94	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
95	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
96	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
97	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
98	S. S. Srinivasan	VI	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
99	S. S. Srinivasan	VII	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17
100	S. S. Srinivasan	V	35	15	12	40	17	17	17	17	17

Promotion
.. ..

3. In his explanation dated 12-7-49 the Headmaster states that there were general principles of promotion and in a very few cases the Headmaster has used his discretion.

The general principles of promotion are the following

Form V:- 30% in the 1st and 2nd languages and 25% on the average (i.e. a total of 100) in the other 4 subjects. 2nd year students promoted.
In English 5 marks were added.

Forms II to IV:- 30% in Tamil, 25% in English and 25% in the other subjects failure in a single subject is allowed.

4. In the cases cited by the Chairman, Municipal Council, the detentions are all in accordance with the general principles stated above. But the promoted pupils do not satisfy the general principles of promotion as communicated by the Headmaster to this office in the 2nd week of June has acted in his discretion as mentioned below:-

Form V (S.Nos. 4 and 10)
(S. No.5.)
(S.No.2)
2 are undesirable elements.
1 deficiency of 5 marks condoned ~~and~~ (for no ostensible reason)
1 is considered desirable to be eliminated.
4

Form IV (S.Nos.13, 19 and 20)
(S.No.14).
3 are undesirable elements.
1 is stated to have been ill at the time of annual examination and promotion is based on half yearly examination marks which are as follows:-
Tamil 33%
English 33%
Ele. Math. 28%
Ele. Sc. 32%
Social studies 46%

(S.No.21)
1
5 .. is said to be a poor cobbler.

Form III:- Or the two pupils the boy promoted is far below the standard prescribed for promotion but he has been promoted because he is a poor overaged and has left.

It is for consideration whether these promotions for the reasons stated by the Headmaster are justifiable and the Headmaster can be considered to have discharged his responsibility properly.

5. It does not appear, nor has it been made out that the responsibility of the Headmaster in the matter of promotions has been abused in such a manner as to lay him open to the charges of nepotism, ill-will and bribes. The promotions made in the Headmaster's discretion are however, wrong and injudicious. In the case of the 6 undesirable elements the Headmaster could have considered the provisions under M.E.R. 49-A or 97. In the case of the other 3, the considerations stated need not have been given weight. It is, therefore, recommended that, if it would be in order, these promotions, which do not conform to the general principles may be ordered to be cancelled and the Headmaster severely warned.

Submitted:

The principles of promotion have already been submitted to the Dt. Educational Officer on 8-6-49.

The general principles of promotion are:

V Form 30% in the first and second languages and 25% on the average in the other subjects.

IV, III and II Forms: 30% in Tamil 25% in English, and 25% in the other subjects. Failure in a single subject is allowed.

I Form and V Class: 30% in each subject, Failure in a single subject has been allowed.

Second year pupils in V Form have been promoted in view of the fact that they are grown up and to avoid stagnation in that form; In Form V as the results in English were unsatisfactory, 5 marks were added to the marks obtained by each pupil.

In Forms having a strength ranging from 110 to 150 it may not be possible to expect all promoted cases to strictly conform to the rules which are only general. Hence the cases of a few students coming under the rules as nearly as possible though not fully have been leniently considered.

The strength of V form last year was 112. Hence it was decided at a meeting of the members of the staff that the best 80 of the 112 should be promoted to fill up the two sections in VI Form. Hence the principle of promotion (which is indeed low) was framed so as to include the best 80.

In a very few cases the Headmaster has used his discretion in promoting certain students after examining each case dispassionately and satisfying himself that such discretion will serve the best interests of the school. In a school having a strength of about 1000 pupils the Headmaster has used his discretion in the cases of very few only.

Generally discretion has been used in the following cases in favour of pupils:

1. Certain girls students. In a mixed school girls students have no chance of full development and they have been suffering under many handicaps.
2. Students coming very near the minimum fixed.
3. In the cases of some students of the scheduled castes.
4. In the case of certain students whose promotion will in no way affect the efficiency of the school but will be advantageous to the school in more ways than one.

In the larger interests of the school, such students have to be weeded out. Even last year the same procedure was successfully followed and it is with this intention that I have flatly refused admission to supplementary students this year in VI Form, in spite of many pressing factors.

Applying these general principles mentioned above Nos. 1 C. Sammathy. 6. A.S. Muthuswami 8. N. Ramanathan. 12. T.N. Radhakrishnan 15. B. Neelakantan 16. Abdul Malic 17. Abdul Karim 18. K. Mahalingam and 23. D. Winson pointed out in the list of Chairman, Municipal Council, cannot claim promotion.

No. 3 V. Perumal was detained because he is very weak in English. As he is fairly well up in the other subjects he has been given an opportunity to improve his knowledge in the subject so that he may be sure of his pass next year in the S.S.L.C. This has been done in the interests of the boy himself. The Half yearly examination mark obtained by the pupil is 11%.

No. 5 D.V. Narayanan: This student has secured the minimum in the languages. The marks in the other subjects come to 95 i.e. (5 marks below the required 100. This want of 5 marks was condoned. But No. 6 A.S. Muthuswami does not satisfy the rules.

No. 7 R. Sivaraman and No. 9 P. Mannangatti and No. 11 S. Krishna-moorthi are second year pupils and as per the principles of promotion they were promoted.

No. 21 A. Kumaraswami is a student belonging to the cobbler community and he is the only student in the school from this community. If he is detained he may stop away from the school. Hence he was promoted. But if he does not improve, the axe is always there next year.

No. 4 V. Kuppuswami No. 10 A. Radhakrishnan No. 13 T. Rangabashyam No. 19 A. Subramaniam and No. 20 G. Kuppuswami are undesirable elements in the school spoiling the discipline of the school. If they had been detained they would never leave the school and will become worse, spoiling the new boys in the class who may join them in disturbing the discipline of the class. Hence they were promoted. Fortunately, most of them have left the school.

No. 14 V. Ranganatha Reddi: It was represented to me by the Class teacher that the student was sick at the time of the examination. The parent of the boy an educated gentleman holding a responsible office, has assured me that he will take steps to improve the boy next year. Hence on the recommendation of the class teacher and on the basis of his half yearly marks (shown below) the student was promoted.

Tamil 33% Eng. 33% E. Maths. 28% E. Science 32% Soc. Stu. 46%

I have every reason to believe that the parent will keep up his promise and that the boy will fare well next year.

No. 22 Joseph Wellington is a very poor student. The boy is overaged and it was represented to me that the student proposed to discontinue his studies and enter some trade or calling. Hence he was promoted and the student has now left the school.

The only case that now remains for me to explain is that of No. 2 K. Shanmugam. Regarding this particular boy I have consultations with my assistants and they were all unanimously of the opinion that in the larger interests of the school the student should be promoted so as to facilitate him to leave the school at the earliest possible opportunity; I agreed with their view and the student was promoted.

Again something has been said regarding transfer certificates. It is totally untrue to say that I went about canvassing for T.Cs and promising promotions to such of those who apply. When parents themselves present applications for transfer certificates, there is no other alternative but to take them.

In order to raise the standard and efficiency of the school, the percentage of detention has been rather high this year. No wonder it has displeased the affected parties who wish to do me as much harm as possible.

The marks list sent to the Chairman from which he has taken down notes is the rough marks list. This rough list has necessarily to contain erasures, ticks and cross-ticks, while considering the case of each pupil and while adjusting the varying principles of promotion until the principles are definitely fixed. This therefore, should not be considered as in the way in which the Chairman has done attributing motives.

The explanation submitted above will prove that I have followed the principles of promotion strictly. Certain students have been promoted only in the larger interests of the school. I have absolutely no malice against or partiality for anybody.

...contd.

I repudiate the suggestion with all the vehemence at my command.

In this connection, I may be permitted to point out that the school examination is not a public examination wherein marks and marks alone form the basis of getting a pass. Herein a public school we have to consider each case on its merits always keeping in mind the interest of the institution. I claim I have done my duty by the school and my conscience is quite clear on the point. I have so far put in a service of 27 years as a teacher.

I humbly request the Dt. Educational Officer to accept my explanation remembering that in institutions of this kind, no body could have done better.

Sd. P.N. Swaminathan,
Headmaster.

/True copy/

-for-Director-of-Public-Instruction

Vk 19.9

Copy of letter No. 739 B/49 dated 29.8.49 from the Divl. Inspector of Schools, Coimbatore Division to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

Sub: Education - Secondary - Municipal High School -
Tiruvannamalai - Annual Promotion - 1949 - Irregularities -
complaint against the Headmaster - Remarks on the letter
Roc No. 276-D2/49 dated 28-7-49, of the Dt. Educational
Officer, North Arcot

Ref: Your Proceedings Rc. No. 2234-E4/49 dt. 17.8.49

As per the principles of promotion originally framed for the purpose there is no provision made for the use of discretion by the Headmaster. Further, there is also deviation from the general principles as may be seen from a copy of the principles now furnished by the Dt. Educational Officer. Even according to these principles, the promotion of the 5 pupils pointed out by the Dt. Educational Officer in his remarks is irregular. But, it does not appear now has it been made out that the responsibility of the Headmaster in this matter has been abused in such a manner as to warrant the punishment contemplated in Director's proceedings 1016-E1/49 dated 30-4-49. It clearly shows that the Headmaster has not acted judiciously and according to the principles formulated by him. He should have taken action against the undesirable pupils as per rule 49-A or 97 of the M.E.R. He may therefore be severely warned that repetition of such an irregularity will be severely dealt with under Rule 98(b) of the M.E.R.

2. A copy of the principles of promotion now submitted by the Dt. Educational Officer is submitted herewith for favour of perusal.

/True copies/

Sheikhan

for Director of Public Instruction

Xm 20/9

26

From
Sri K. Seshachari, B.A., L.T.,
Municipal Commissioner,
Tiruvannamalai.

To
The Secretary to Government,
of Madras, Education and Public
Health Department, M a d r a s.



B. 4. 6964 /49 dated 21--10--49.

Sir

Sub.:- EDUCATION - Municipal High School - Tiruvannamalai -
Irregularities in promotions made by the Head Master
Report submitted.

83527

Ref:- Government memo No. 48558/G2/49-4 dated 13-10-49. *p. 25 anti*

I submit that I have ordered the stoppage of the increment
of the Head Master, Municipal High School for 6 months without
cumulative effect, as a result of the disciplinary action taken
against him.

C. S. Seshachari
24/10/49
Commissioner.
S. S. Seshachari

Forwarded.

P. S. Shanmugam
26.10.49
Chairman.

Copy to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras with reference
to his R.O.C. No. 1717-E4-49 dated 15-9-49.

E.S.P. 1
E.S. 2

685-58/9/49

Secondary (7)

Education. Municipal High School - Tiruvannamalai
Irregularities in promotions committed
by the Headmaster - Disciplinary action against
Papers recorded.

J.V.
S. 11

85/8-11

From the Mr. Commissioner, Tiruvannamalai

Ret. Rec Br - 6964/49 d 11-9-49

From the D.P.I. Rec. 1717 & 4/49 d 15-9-49

From the Mr. Comm. Tiruvannamalai Br - 6964/49 d 21/10/49

Order. No. 3406

Edu. d. 7-11-49.

(1) Copy to D.P.I.

D.P.I.

(2) Copy to Mr.
Commissioner
Tiruvannamalai
The C.M.C.

Recorded.

57/11/49

41141

Municipal High School,
Tiruvannamalai -
Allegations against the
Headmaster.

Minutes of the Hon'ble Minister for Education & Law
on the Current, dated 25-6-49.

" Ask the D.P.I. to enquire into this pl. Was it not open to the Commissioner of the Municipality to ask the Headmaster to explain and dispose of this?"

25-6-49.

H.M. (Education & Law).

Please see the extract of the minutes of H.M.
(Edn. & Law) above. A draft Memo. to the D.P.I. is
submitted for approval.

2. With reference to Mr. S's query, it is observed that there have been complaints against the Headmaster, some of which would certainly have reached the Commission of the Municipality. It was the Comm. who would have been in order if he had caused enquiries to be made and after consultation with the Educational Authorities initiated disciplinary proceedings against them. If there was a prima facie case against him - If L.A. have no objection the Comm. may be asked to state why no action was taken against the H.M. - 3. L.A. may see the case, after issue of the Draft Memo.



E. 42P. H. 2. 6. No. 48558
- 92/49-2 Edm. 41-19-8-49

27.648

28/11/20

$$S \mid \frac{29}{26} \mid \frac{LA}{L.i}$$

[Memo. No. 48558-2244-1 Edm. 4/29-64]

L. A. Dept.

A draft Memo to the Commr is put up,
26.8.49. W.R.C.A. at p. 1 ante

This Dept has no objn to
the Commr being asked to state whether
the irregularities mentioned in the
Chairman's letter came to his notice and
if so what action he took thereon.

26.8.49 1/1/sep/EPH

29.8.49. F

EPH (EPH)

A draft memo to the Commissioner, Tiruvannamalai Municipality, is submitted for approval.

2/9/49. In (Edu) may see the
Case, with ref. to his
minute on page 14.

2.9.49. 3/9/49

(Signed as Memo. No. 48558-92/49-3 Edu. dt. 3-9-49) p. 9 c.f.

From the Commissioner, Tiruvannamalai Mty.
Roc. B2-6964/49 dated 11-9-49.

Please see the interim reply of the Commr.,
Tiruvannamalai, at p. 11 c.f. His final
report in the matter may be awaited
till 30-9-49.

15/9/49 16/9/49
15.9.49.

EPH

266346
-49-1
31.8.49



p. 11 c.f.

ACB

48558/92/49
113-230.f From the D.P.G., R.C. No. 177 E4/49. dated 15.9.49.

Please see the reply from the D.P.G. at p. 13 c.f.
The Municipal Commissioner's final report
in the matter has not yet been received. A draft
Memo. reminder to the M.C. Commissioner,
Tiruvannamalai, is submitted below for
approval.

2/10/49 12/10/49
12/10/49

per sec - (Signed as Memo 48558/92/49-4 Edu. dt. 13.10.49)
p. 27 c.f. (C. No. 83527/49. From the M.C. Commissioner, Tiruvannamalai
B2-6964/49 dated 21.10.49)

26.10.49

From the letter of the Municipal
Commissioner, Tiruvannamalai, it may be
seen that as a result of ~~not~~ taking
necessary disciplinary action against
the Head Master, of the Municipal High
School, regarding irregularities in
promotion and other complaints, the increment
of the Headmaster has been stopped for
6 months without cumulative effect.
In view of the ~~action~~ ^{punishment} taken
by the Municipal Commissioner, no further
action seems necessary in the ~~paper~~ ^{matter}.



10/1/49

29/10/49

29.10.49

31-10-49

H. 7 (E & L)

31/10/49

2/11

P.T.O.

eg 2

20

Chas
E. M. Lee

571169

but

4.1145

the most important
part of the system

... in

100

$$(2+3) \cdot 4$$

23. 10. 19

1/12/19