

EPH (1949) Department.

MS SERIES.

G.O. NO. 892 Edn

Dated 28-3-49.

→ p 92 F

O for R S.

✓ 12-9-10 ef - Copy in
H. 111

12/11/49

[Despatch Abstract.]

Rules - Elementary Schools - Rules relating to aid -
Amendments issued.

~~12~~

Back Papers.

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

Further Papers.

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

R.O.C.No. 1496 B7/46.

Madras, 26th February 1948

From

Sri D.S. Reddi, M.A., (Oxon),
Director of Public Instruction,
MADRAS.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Edn & P.H. Department.

Sir,

Sub: Elementary Education- Aided schools - Amendment
to Rules for aid - Issue of executive instructions
Report submitted.

Ref: G.O.No. Ms 217 Edn., dated 29-1-1948.

Consequent on the issue of amendments for the Rules for aid in the G.O. referred to above, several questions have been raised by the District Edl.Officers and Inspectresses regarding actual interpretation of some of the rules and the scope of this application in working out the grant for 1947- as the amended rules which are a result of G.O.No. Ms 1495 Edn., dated 31-7-1946 take effect from 1-1-1947 according to Government Memorandum No. 65632-Cl/46-5 Edn., dated 26-2-1947. As definite instructions had to be urgently issued so as to enable the inspecting officers to work out the grant and issue bills without delay, I have issued in my Pros. R.O.C.No. 1496 B7/46, dated 26-2-1948 (Copy submitted for favour of information) executive instructions answering the queries raised so far and I request that my action may be approved I may also add that I propose to issue further instructions also as and when necessary of course, obtaining prior approval of Government whenever necessary.

P.R.K. 27/2/48.

For Director of Public Instruction.

27/2

Proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction, Madras.
Roc.No.1496 B7/46 Dated 26-2-1948.

Sub: Elementary Education - Aided Schools - Amendment to
Rules for aid - Clarification of certain doubts - further
instructions issued.

Read: (1) Director's Proceedings Roc.No.1496 B7/46 dated 2-2-1948.
(2) communicating G.O.No.317 Etn., dated 29-1-1948.
(3) Director's Proceedings Roc.No.1496 B7/46 dated 13-2-48.

In connection with the amendments to Rules for aid to
Elementary schools communicated in the G.O. referred to above,
several queries have been raised by the Inspecting officers
requesting clarification of certain doubts in regard to the
application of the amended Rules. The Director is pleased
to issue to the following further instructions in the matter
as replies to the queries raised.

queries.

Answers.

Rule 1.

Whether the grant of Rs.25/- p.m.
allowed for a Provocational Instruc-
tor with only the general edl.quali-
fication is a mistake for Rs.15/- p.m.
as he will get only Rs.15/- p.m. if
employed as a regular teacher.

The rule is correct.
Rs.25/- p.m. allowed for
the P.V.Instructor is not
a mistake for Rs.15/-

Whether the extension of time re-
ferred to in note (1) may be deemed
to have been granted up to 31-12-47.

Yes. Separate orders will
be issued in the matter.

Note (2) Increments:-

Whether service prior 1-1-47 counts
for increment; whether weightage is
to be allowed.

No; No.
First increment will have to
be given effect to from
1-1-48.

Who is the authority to sanction
increments to Teachers and
Teacher-managers.

Managements in the case of
teachers and Deputy Inspectors
or Sub-Asst. Inspectresses in the
case of Teacher-managers. Copies
of sanction orders should be
attached to the monthly returns
and Deputy Inspectors and Sub-
Asst. Inspectresses should check
the correctness during inspec-
tions and visits.

In case of difference of opinion
regarding teachers service and
his efficiency between two mana-
gers and the Inspecting officers.

In case of difference of opi-
nion regarding the teacher's
efficiency, between 2 manage-
ments wherein the teacher
served during the increment
year the Deputy Inspector
may give his ruling against
which an appeal may lie to the
pt.Edl.Officer or Inspectress.

Regarding difference of opinion
about the teacher's service between the
management and the D.I. or S.A.I. the
orders of the D.E.O. or Iss. will be
final.

Consequent on the introduction
of the grant of increments,
whether any registers have to be
maintained and if so in what
form.

Separate orders will issue
on this, in due course.

p.t.o.

Rule 4 (7) (b):

Whether schools which put in 90% of the prescribed number of working days can be assessed full Tg. ~~grant~~ grant and whether the wording in Note 2 requires alteration.

For schools which put in less than 90% of the total no. of working days, whether another cut in the maintenance grant is necessary under Rule 7.

The intention of the Rule is that though schools which should normally work for 220 working days, work only for 90% ~~xxxx~~ of this, the assessed grant for teachers need not be proportionately cut so that the teachers are not penalised for the shortage for which managers are responsible. But action may be taken against the management

for the shortage when Maintenance grant under Rule 7 is calculated. The note does not need any alteration.

Whether credit in lieu of the holidays for meetings is to be given for all schools or for schools for which Note 2 applies.

For all schools the meeting holiday is to be treated as a working day.

Whether the meeting day is to be counted as a full working day or half a working day as some schools work on Saturdays for full day and some for half-a-day.

Full day in the case of schools which work for full day on Saturdays and half day in the case of schools which work for half-a-day only on other Saturdays.

Whether teachers have to apply for Casual Leave ~~xxx~~ if they do not attend T.A. meetings or central classes?

Yes.

If the C.L. availed of by a teacher exceeds 15 days whether grant has to be cut off for the excess days if he is not eligible for any other kind of leave and whether exemptions can be granted for teachers from attending the meetings.

Excess over 15 days of Casual Leave should be debited to the leave for which a teacher will be eligible under Rule 4(5) of the Rules for aid. If there is no leave to the credit for the teacher under this rule grant should not be assessed unless specially exempted for any satisfactory reason.

Rule 6(a).

Whether all the inspection reports of schools that were given a cut in grants for 1947 have to be reviewed and grant recommendations modified in conformity to the Revised Rule 6(a).

This revision need be done only where very serious negligence has been specially brought to the notice of the B.E.O. A general revision is not necessary. The grant recommendations may be in conformity with the revised rule.

Whether the cuts in grants hitherto given under the old rules may be converted and called as fines for all teachers.

The 'cuts' in grants for teachers is now referred to as 'fines.'

Whether the term "Pay" referred to in this rule for purposes of fines may be taken as monthly pay actually received or the rate of grant.

The monthly pay actually received as per terms of the T.S.R. should be taken into account.

Rule 6(b):

Except under Rule 6(b) whether no school should be given cuts of more than 10% in the final assessed teaching grant in the form of "fines" as per Rule 6(a) on Teachers either individually or collectively.

Yes.

Rule 7(1)

What are the items of expenditure to be taken into account for purposes of "Maintenance grant" in working out the deficit in the expenditure that has been incurred by the school during the assessment year.

All expenditure that are reasonably necessary for the proper maintenance of the school may be admitted for purposes of considering the eligibility for maintenance grants. The Dt. Edl. Officers and Inspectresses may use their discretion in the matter.

Whether the extra payment of Rs. 5/- or Rs. 2/- as the case may be made by the managers to teachers from 1-7-47 can be an admitted item of expenditure for purposes of this Rule?

Yes.

Rule 7(2)

Whether schools that were ineligible for an increase under the old Rule 7 are to be deprived now of the "Maintenance grant".

The provisions that were hitherto applied generally for grant of increase to the assessed grant have now been made to apply for the

"Maintenance grant". Attention is also invited to Director's Proceedings Rec. No. 1479 B7/46 dated 13-2-48. Schools that do not either develop annually by opening higher standards/are not declared as "feeders" are not eligible for maintenance grants. In case of schools having more than one third of their staff as untrained teachers the rule may be followed as amended now. The question of allowing any relaxation of rules will be dealt with separately.

Whether a school that works for part of a year with 2 teachers and for the remaining part with a single teacher is eligible for Maintenance grant.

If the school is a two teacher school and if the post of the 2nd teacher falls vacant for short periods for any reason the school may be allowed Maintenance grant. The Dt. Edl. Officers may use their discretion and decide the matter whether the reasons are satisfactory and acceptable.

Rule 13.

Whether the final assigned teaching grant received by a school has to be paid to all the teachers employed inclusive of those who were not assessed fully or partly in proportion to the scale.

Final assigned teaching grant is intended only in respect of teachers for whom grants were assessed. Other teachers if any, have to get their salaries from the management only.

Rule 7 and 20.

Whether the following schools can be granted "Maintenance grant" if they satisfy rule 20 proportion after rounding off the fraction of the untrained teacher.

1. 5 Tr. school with 3 Trd. & 2 Untrd. Trs.
2. 8 Tr. school with 5 Trd & 3 Untrd. Trs.

Yes. Vide also dated 5(f) in page 41 of the Madras E.L. Man. Manual.

p.t.o.

YES.

(True Copy) Forwarded/By Order,

Superintendent.

To all Pt. Edl. Officers and Inspectresses of Girls' Schools.
To all Divisional Inspectors of Schools.
B3 Section - 5 copies.
Record. 20 copies.

k. h. 26-2.

100 copies

Draft 1

Issue
by
26/3/69

48-47

46

47

45CF

para 3, p 8 NF

(1) If maintenance grant is paid to all schools whether they levy fees or not;

(2) if maintenance grant is paid only to schools which have a deficit budget whether they levy fees or not;

To

The D.P.I.

Am ~~and~~ 3/13

E. & P. H. Dept.

Memorandum No. 14809-C/48-4 *Σm*, dated 26-3-49

Sub:- ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS - Rules relating to aid -
Interpretation of amendments.

Ref:- From the D.P.I., No.1496-B7/46, dated 26-2-48
and 22-9-1948.

The D.P.I. is informed that that the interpretation in his proceedings No.1496-B7/46, dated 26-2-48, of the rules issued with G.O.No.217-Edn., dated 29-1-48, except in regard to item 18 of the proceedings is approved and that amendments to the rules, where necessary, are being issued separately.

2. It has been suggested that all managements ~~whether they levy fees or not, may be treated alike for~~ purposes of the maintenance grant. The D.P.I. is requested to formulate definite proposals in this regard and forward them to Govt. together with ~~an estimate~~ of the addl. expenditure involved ~~in the proposals.~~

3. If the suggestion made in paragraph 2 is finally approved, the question whether the expenditure on the payment of the contribution of Rs.5 and 2 towards the pay of teachers should be admitted as item of expenditure for purposes of calculation of the deficit for payment of the maintenance grant in the case of schools, levying fees, ~~remains~~ - item 18 of the Director's proceedings - will not arise. The Director is therefore requested to hold in abeyance his orders in regard to item 18 until orders are passed on the proposals called for in paragraph 2 above.

AM
25/2/169

57 mg.

Sub:- RULES - Elementary Schools - Rules relating to aid Amendments issued.

Read again:- G.O. No.217, Education, dated 29--1--1948.
Read also :- From the D.P.I., Rec.No.1496-B7/46, dated 26--2--1948 and 22--9--1948.

ORDER (P.H.S) No. 892 Education, dated 28.3.49

The following amendments to the rules relating to the grant of recognition and aid to elementary schools, published with Education Department Notification No.243, dated the 21st August 1939, at pages 556 to 568 of Part I-B of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated the 29th August 1939, as subsequently amended:--

Amendments

Chapter II - Rules for Aid

Note 2 to rule 1:- For the words "District Educational Officer" occurring in this note, substitute the words "Deputy Inspector".

Add the following at the end of the note:--

" In case of a difference of opinion regarding a teacher's efficiency between two managements under whom the teacher served during the increment year, the Deputy Inspector shall give his ruling against which an appeal shall lie to the District Educational Officer. Regarding differences of opinion about a teacher's efficiency between a management and a Deputy Inspector, the orders of the District Educational Officer shall be final."

Insert the following after Note 2:-

"Note 3:-The authority competent to grant increments in the time scale of grants shall be the managements in the case of teachers and Deputy Inspectors in the case of teacher-managers".

Note 1 to Rule 4(7):- Renumber the existing note as 1(a) and add the following at the end of the note:-

"The meeting day shall be treated as a full working day in the case of schools which work full-day on other Saturdays and as half-working day in the case of schools which work for half a day only on other Saturdays."

Insert the following after as Note 1(b):-

"Note 1(b):- Absence of a teacher from the

p 106
p 115-7NF
27

V/p 110

'A' on p 5NF

'A' on p 6NF

whose decision shall be final

'B' on p 6NF

'C' on p 6NF

Teachers' Association meetings shall be debited to his casual leave account or if there is no casual leave to the teacher's credit, to the leave admissible to him under rule 4(5). In case there is no leave to the credit of the teacher even under rule 4(5), grant should not be assessed for the teacher unless specially exempted by the Deputy Inspector for any satisfactory reason".

55M
30/11/68
20/2/69

To

The S.G.P. (for publication in the F.S.G.G.)
The D.P.I.
The A.G.
2 s.cs.

Seco. 14802 c1 (p8) From the D.P.S. Room. 1496 B7p
b1g1212 26-2-68
referred to Aided Elementary Schools -
rules relating to aid - Issue of
interventions.

I have seen the proceedings of the D.P.S. at pp 3-6 cf. and the letter of the D.P.S. at p1 cf. The proceedings call for the following remarks: -

2. Item 4 at p3 cf. These scales of grants were introduced for the first time with effect from 1-1-67. But in the amendment issued with Go. 217 dated 29-1-68, the authorities of the D.P.S. in this regard, that managements in the case of teachers and Deputy Inspectors or Sub-Asst. Inspectors in the case of teacher-managers shall sanction the increments may be incorporated in the rules.

3. Item 5 at p3 cf. The D.P.S.'s interventions may be approved and incorporated in the rules. Attention is in this connection invited to rule 2 to rule 1 of the rules for aid, which says that increments in the scale of grants for service in different schools may be sanctioned only if the management, and the D.E.O. recommended that change was made for proper reasons. But it does not appear that as provided in the rules, the matter should go up to the D.E.O. at all, since it is either the management or the subordinate inspecting

Officers who have to sanction increments, and it will be enough if they are satisfied that the charge was made for proper reasons. The D.P.G. may be asked to consider whether any modification of the rule is necessary.

Item 10 at p. 11. This may go into the rules.

Item 12 at p. 11. The D.P.G. may be asked to specify the authority who would grant the exemptions contemplated by him and the instructions then incorporated in the rules.

Item 18 at p. 11. In the case of schools levying fees, the maintenance grant is to be paid only if the management is unable to meet the additional expenditure on the schools even with the additional fee income and it is to be restricted to the balance actually required to cover a deficit in the accounts. The D.P.G. has now issued instructions that for purposes of calculation of the deficit, the contributions of Rs. 5 and Rs. 2/- which managements are expected to make towards the pay of their teachers, should be admitted as an item of expenditure. *Provis- facie* it seems no exception can be taken to the instructions, for it is only reasonable that any item of expenditure excepting of course extravagant items should be taken into account for purposes of calculation of the deficit. But in the circumstances noted below, it seems

necessary to consider whether specifically whether the managements' contributions of Rs. 5 and the 2/- should be taken into account for purposes of calculation of the deficit.

When in 1947, the Govt. revised the scale of grants payable to aided elementary school teachers, they considered that managements also should contribute something substantial towards the pay of the teachers. They accordingly issued orders that teachers of the lower elementary, higher elementary and secondary grades should be given a minimum pay of Rs. 20, 30 and 40 respectively. The managements supplementing the grants allowed to the extent necessary from their own resources. They also authorized the D.P.G. to exempt managements from the payment of this contribution, in suitable and deserving cases or to give extensions of time to managements to make the contribution. But as practical difficulties arose in enforcing this provision for a contribution by the managements, the Govt. considered whether they might pay out of the provincial funds, the managements' contribution also. But as this meant an additional expenditure, they thought it best to issue orders that the provision for a contribution by the managements need be enforced only in cases where managements were in a position to make the contribution and not in other cases.

8010:297201
11-2-48
CE 11/51st

11/50st

11/52st

U/1(a)(1)

p5cp

A

exemptions should be given. It becomes
 clear from this that the Govt's intention
 is, not to meet any portion of the
 management's contribution from the
 provincial funds. While this is the case,
 the D.P.S. has now issued instructions
 which have the effect, virtually of
 making the Govt. pay the management's
 contribution from the provincial funds. The
 following example makes this clear:-
 Take the case of a school which
 makes a contribution towards the pay of
 its teachers and which has a deficit
 in its accounts. Let 'y' be the management's
 total contribution, and 'x' be the deficit
 in its accounts, calculated without
 taking into account the management's
 contribution 'y'. According to the D.P.S.
 instructions 'y' also should be taken into
 account in calculating the deficit. If
 this is done, the deficit will be $(x+y)$ which
 will be paid by the Govt. as maintenance
 grant. So what happens actually is, that
 the Govt. pay out of the provincial funds
 the management's contribution 'y' which
 is far from being their intention. It is therefore
 for consideration whether this may be pointed
 out to the D.P.S. and he may be asked
 to issue revised instructions in the matter.
 A note may also be added to the rules for
 purposes of calculation of the deficit
 in the accounts for payment of the maintenance
 grant, the management's contribution should
 not be taken into account. If however it



is considered that there is sufficient
 justification for the management's
 contribution also being taken into
 account for purposes of calculation
 of the deficit. The D.P.S. ~~should~~ it
 is submitted, should be asked to
 formulate definite proposals in this
 regard and put them up to Govt. for
 orders with an estimate of cost.
 7. 2f. The D.P.S. may see the
 note u.o. and offer his remarks on
 the suggestions contained therein and
 where necessary forward draft
 amendments to the rules.

Edms. 118090.1/28-1
 31-2-48.

Resubmitted to the Secretary to Government,
 Edn. & P.H. Department, Madras with the following
 remarks:-
 2. Items 4 and 5: The suggestions made in the
 U.O. note are agreed to and the following additions
 may be made to the rules regarding aid. In item
 5 as suggested in the U.O. note it would be enough
 in cases of services of teachers in different schools,
 if the management and the Deputy Inspector recommend
 that the change of service was made for proper
 reasons. To this extent, the existing note 2 under
 rule 1 may be modified.
Amendments: Rules for aid:
 In note 2 under rule 1 as modified by G.O.Ms.
 217, Education, dated 29-1-48 for the words "District
 Educational officer" substitute the word "Deputy
 Inspector" and add the following at the end of this
 note:

In case of difference of opinion regarding the teacher's efficiency between two managements wherein the teacher served during the increment year, the Deputy Inspector may give his ruling against which an appeal may lie to the District Educational Officer. Regarding difference of opinion about the teacher's service between the management and the Deputy Inspector, the orders of the District Educational Officer will be final.

Add the following as note 3:-

"The authority competent to grant increments in the time-scale of grants will be the managements in the case of teachers and Deputy Inspectors in the case of teacher-managers."

3. Items 10 and 12:- The suggestions are agreed to and the following amendments to rules are suggested. The authority referred to in the item 12 will be the Deputy Inspector:

Amendments:

Add the following at the end of note (1) under Rule 4 (7):-

"For the purpose of treating the meeting day as a working day, it shall be treated as a full working day in schools which work for full-day on other Saturdays and as half working day if the schools work for half a day only on other Saturdays."

Insert the following as note 1 (b) under Rule 4 (7) the existing note (1) being renumbered as 1 (a):

"Absence of a teacher from the Teachers' Association meetings shall be debited to his casual leave account or if there is no casual leave to the teacher's credit, to the leave admissible to him under Rule 4 (5) above. In case there is no leave to the credit of the teacher even under Rule 4 (5) grant should not be assessed for the teacher unless specially

specially exempted by the Deputy Inspector for any satisfactory reason."

4. Item 18: The present maintenance grant has taken the place of the former increases in the teaching grant which the managements used to get for efficiently conducting the school. But under the new rules the negative or penal provisions of the old rules only have been retained but not the positive provision which enabled the managements to get a bonus over the 15 per cent in the past. Further though Government authorised the Director to grant exemption to managements which are financially not sound and are unable to pay the extra amount, it is not stated anywhere what penalty will be imposed on any management which though able to pay refuses to pay. The Department can only refuse to pay the 15 per cent maintenance grant in such cases. This will not in any way help the teachers. The real object, viz., the teachers should be helped to get the extra Rs.5/- or Rs.2/- from the management is not achieved, though the management may be punished. It is true that if the extra payment is insisted upon, many managements will close their schools. The aim should be to help the management to pay the extra amount which they may not do if Government do not show any encouragement.

After all the number of schools that collect fees is small and the number of managements that have a surplus will be even smaller. Moreover, in view of the fact that even after the instructions of the Director, only a very small percentage of schools would be in a position to pay the teachers anything from their funds, the incentive that a few managements may have, to get an increased income from fees would disappear if the expenditure on this extra payment of salaries is not taken into account for calculation of "Maintenance grant." It is, therefore, submitted that the interpretation of the rule as noted in my instructions under reference may be accepted.

Joint D.P.I.

Please see the notes of this Deptt. at pages 1-5 ante and the remarks of the D.P.I. thereon at pages 5-7 ante. The Director has accepted the suggestions of this Deptt. in paras 2 to 5 at pp.1-2 ante and has suggested necessary draft amendments to the rules. These amendments may be approved, subject to some verbal alterations.

2. Taking into account for purposes of grant the extra payment to teachers:- With regard to para 6 on pp.2-5 ante on item 18 at p.5 c.f., the Director has pleaded in para 4 overleaf that his interpretation against this item may be accepted. It has been clearly shown at pp.2-5 ante that the Director's interpretation is wrong and there is, therefore, no question of accepting it. The Director should, it seems, be asked to issue revised instructions in the matter immediately stating that the extra payment of Rs.5 or Rs.2 by the managers should not be taken as an expenditure under rule 7(1). For orders.

As noted at 'P' on page 5 ante, the Director may be asked to submit definite proposals with an estimate of cost, if he still thinks that there is sufficient justification for giving effect to his interpretation of the rule. For orders.

3. Payment of maintenance grant to schools which levy fees:-

Attention is also, in this connection, invited to the minutes of H.M.(Edn.) in para 8 on page 3 n.f. of 'V', the notes at 'B' on page 4 n.f. of 'V', in para 3 and at 'P' on pp.5-6 n.f. of 'V' and at 'A' on p.8 n.f. of 'V'. These relate to treating all managements of aided schools alike for purposes of maintenance grant. Before examining this suggestion further in consultation with Finance, the D.P.I. may be asked to consider it and submit necessary proposals with an estimate of cost. For orders.

4. Subject to orders, a draft memo and a draft order are submitted below for approval. The file may be circulated to H.M. (edu) for orders whether the drafts may issue.

I think the note above, i.e., at X on page 8 is not the correct point of view. In the whole province in about 32,000 schools, just a very few no. of schools charge fees and the main purpose for charging the fees is to pay Rs.5/- more to the teachers. In a previous order, we agreed that when fees are charged, the 15% for management may be given off only to the extent of deficit in the school. Now, the question is whether this Rs.5/- that the management is paying is to be counted among the expenditure in the schools. Of course, it must be counted as an expenditure in the school. If they don't charge fees, we are bound to give them the 15% for expenditure. Only very efficient schools charge fees and simply because by their very efficiency they are able to charge a little fee and maintain the school better, that is no reason for saying that the Rs.5/- should not be taken into account., and after all they are very few. And so, the D.P.I.'s view ~~that the Rs.5/- and Rs.2/- given by the managers may be accepted.~~

If this position is not accepted, the result will be that the fees will be collected privately as private tuition and we will pay our 15% management grant also. I don't think we should, by our rules, create circumstances for corruption and not acting fairly. The recommendation of the D.P.I. may be accepted.

The matter in ^{para} 3 may be referred to the D.P.I. as suggested.

The amendment to the rules may also be corrected and put up.



It has been explained in the notes on pages 2 - 5 ante how the instructions of the D.P.I. under item 18 on 5 c. f. do not quite represent the intentions of Government as expressed in the

20
decision of the Standing Finance Committee on U/11 N.F.,
viz., that the expenditure on the payment of the extra
Rs.5 and Rs.2 to teachers should be met by the managements
from their own funds. For the reasons stated on 7-9 ~~note~~ rule,
it may be desirable to reconsider this decision and
approve the proposal of the Director. But this can be
done only after an estimate of the expenditure involved
is known and the matter again considered by the ~~Standing~~
Standing Finance Committee and the Cabinet. Finance may
see for remarks before recirculation.

Finance (Exp.-A).

Please see the notes of E & P.H. and the
D.P.I. and the minute of H.M. (Edn.) on pp.1-10
above.

In para.6 of the note on pp.2-5 above, E & P.H.
have clearly explained that the D.P.I.'s interpreta-
tion of the rule is against the decision of the Govt.
in (u) - p.11 n.f. In the note in para.4 on p.7 above,
the D.P.I. has pressed that his view may be accepted.
H.M. (Edn.) agrees with the D.P.I.

It is submitted that the previous decision of
the Government referred to above was to the effect
that contributions by the managements need be enforced
only in cases where the managements were able to pay
the contributions (Rs.2 or Rs.5 as the case may be).

In view of this, the D.P.I. considers that the proposal
in this case will affect only schools that collect fees
and have a surplus. According to the order referred

Edn & P.H. no.
14809 C/48-2. Edn
17-12-48



p. 9 above

A on p. 9 above

60 297 Edn 3/14/48

Y on p. 7 above

Rule 70 on pp. 10-11
16 of V
G.O. 217 Edn 2/1/48

to at 'X' on p.9 above, 15% management grant will be given
only in cases where institutions work at a deficit. If the
surplus shown in the ~~accounts~~ ^{accounts} of institutions of the kind
referred to at 'Y' ^{on p.10 above} is sufficient to meet the contribu-
tion of Rs. 2 or 5 per teacher, they will be ineligible for
any grant. What the D.P.I. probably means is that though
the institutions of the kind mentioned at 'Y' have a surplus
and decide to pay the contribution, the surplus will not
be sufficient to meet the contribution, that they will show
a deficit as a result of payment of the contribution, and that
in calculating the grant for these institutions, the contri-
bution should also be included as expenditure of the manage-
ment. If this is the correct position, the extra cost
involved in the proposal may not be large, as the number of
institutions benefiting from the proposal will be only a
few.

A on p.10 above

As pointed out by the E & P.H. Deptt, the proposal
will have to be referred to the S.F.C. and the Cabinet and
an estimate of the extra cost involved will have to be ~~obtained~~
obtained from the D.P.I. before the proposal is referred
to the S.F.C. The D.P.I. may be asked to indicate clearly
the class of institutions that will benefit from the pro-
posal, their number and the extra cost involved.

B on p. 10 above

(Note revised)

16/8.1.49

16/8.1.49

16/8.1.49

5.6.48

A on p. 10

Jun. - w. o.
108061/Edn/48-1

8.1.49. P5



With reference to the remarks of Finance at B
above the D.P.I. may be addressed.

With reference to the minute of H.M. (Edn) at
A on P.9 rule, a draft order and a draft-
memo are submitted.

B
18/2/49

18/2/49

p. 20

12
Please see para 6 at pp.2-5 ante, para 4 at p.7 ante, para 2 at p.8 ante and minutes and notes from p.9 ante. It seems necessary to re-examine the whole question. Aided ele. schools may be classified as follows:-

A. Schools not levying fees

- (1) Surplus budget schools
- (2) Deficit budget schools

B. Schools levying fees

- (1) Surplus budget schools
 - (a) Surplus budget schools after paying contribution
 - (b) Deficit budget schools after paying contribution
- (2) Deficit budget schools.

A. (1) and (2):- According to rule 7 of the rules relating to aid, 15 per cent. maintenance grant is to be paid to these schools irrespective of whether they are surplus or deficit budget schools.

B. (1) (a):- The 15 per cent. grant is not payable.

B. (1) (b):- These will become eligible for the maintenance grant only if the management's contribution is admitted as an item of expenditure. If the management's contribution is also admitted as an item of expenditure and maintenance grant is paid accordingly, it will result in the Govt. indirectly paying a part of it from the provincial funds.

B. (2):- These schools are already eligible for the maintenance grant but if the managements' contribution is also admitted as an item of expenditure the deficit will be increased and to that extent they will get more as maintenance ~~allowance~~ grant subject of course to the limit of 15 per cent. As pointed out at p.4 ante this will result in the Govt. paying the managements' contribution from out of the provincial funds.

The S.F.C. has decided ~~that~~ at 4/11 N.F. that the expenditure on the payment of the managements' contribution should be met from the managements' own funds and not from the provincial funds unless and until this decision is changed after following the usual financial procedure the D.P.I.'s interpretation of rule 7 of the rules for aid which goes counter to this decision is inadmissible. At 'E' on page 7 ante and at 'F' on p.9 ante reasons have

been given why the decision at 4/11 N.F. should be reconsidered and the expenditure on the managements' contribution admitted as an item of expenditure for payment of the maintenance grant. It is proposed ~~to that~~ ^{may be called for from} call for detailed proposals from the D.P.I. in this regard together with an estimate of cost.

2. The whole question arises because a differentiation is made between schools which levy fees and schools who do not levy fees. If as in the case of schools which do not levy fees the maintenance grant is paid without reference to the fact whether the schools which levy fees have got surplus budgets and or deficit budgets, there will be no question of the expenditure on the managements' contribution being admitted or rejected. The question whether all managements should be treated alike for purposes of payment of the maintenance grant has already been taken up and it is proposed to call for detailed proposals from the D.P.I. A decision in this question may be awaited before proceeding with the question of admitting the expenditure on the managements' contribution as an item of expenditure for purposes of calculation of the deficit for payment of the maintenance grant in the case of schools levying fees. The D.P.I. may be informed accordingly. Revised draft I is for approval.

The draft order does not require any amendment. It was issued. Finance may see before C.M.

14809-C/48-3 Edu
5-3-49.



Finance (Exp.-A) Deptt.

(Previous Finance note on pp.10-11 above).

The further note of the E & P.H. Deptt. on pp.12-13 above may be perused.

2. E & P.H. now propose to keep in abeyance the question of admitting the management's contribution as

pto.

cf p 8a 3 mp 8
above

X

4

700
12/2/69

51813

ASST. SECRETARY TO PRESIDENT
10 MAY 1964
2
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND PUBLIC HEALTH

20022

~~BM~~
~~18/3/149~~

S. by
H. & S. (see...)

 ~~$\frac{2}{22/3}$~~

25
ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
18 JUL 4 1941
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPT.

25

13

Sir,

36556

ne ~~A~~ / pp3-6er

Yours faithfully,

44
 Maybe ~~25~~ 25 4.0 to 842 Edm
 dated 28-3 - reg
 18/5/84
 for D
 18/5/84
 18/5/84

for DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

10.5.49.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

From

The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras.

To

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

Doc No. 1336/46 dated 12-3-1947

Sir,

Sub:- Elementary schools--Rules relating to aid--
Interpretation of amendments.

Ref:- Govt. Memo. No. 1336/46-4 sub. dated 12-3-1947.

2/22/47

With reference to para 3 of the Government Memo. cited
above, I am issuing instructions to the officers concerned the
orders issued in item 18 of my proceedings No. 1336/46-4
dated 26-7-1946. In view of the fact that for the year
1946 has already been paid in February 1947, I have informed them
that the revised instructions will take effect from 1-1-1948 in
the assessment year of 1947.

2. The proposals called for in para 2 of the Memo. will
be submitted separately.

Yours faithfully,

2/22/47

1/11/47
1/11/47
1/11/47

AND : 10-5

1/11/47
1/11/47
1/11/47