Educational (1895) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 220

DATED 13th Mar: 1895

[Despatch Abstract.]

PRIMARY EXAMINATION.

Passing orders on the question of levying fees from pupil-candidates for the ---, and raising the fee payable by private candidates from Rs 2 to Rs 2-8-0.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

ORDINARY, PRINTED.

Educational DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 13/3/95
No. 220.

INDEXED.

First copy sent to Press. 16/3.

Returned for signature. 28/3/95.

Despatched in ~~PRINT.~~ M's 14/3/95

[Despatch Abstract.]

Primary Examination.

Passing orders on the question of levying fees from pupil candidates for the —— and raising the fee payable by private candidates from Rs 2 to Rs 2½.

Back Paper, No.

Read again Order of Government, dated
[illegible] 18[illegible], No.

Further Paper, No.

Enclosures.

Current No.

As marked.

Statement with ditto.

Order, &c., of Government—A.

Papers kept out of File for despatch in original
(not paged).

Number of copies required.
- Order complete. 30
- Letter only.
- Order complete with Letter.

N.B.—
A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.
R = Print, but not for monthly volume.

for Edwd Black

The U.S, I am told, wants this to be printed - Print the letter only, or the D.O.? big letter No - 6 No. 1415 + Annual enclosure. G.

15/3

No 1415 should be printed in full without the enclosure. US says "print A+O."

15/3

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper :—

G.O., dated 22nd October 1894, Mis. No. 799, Educational.

Read—again G.O., dated 17th January 1894, No. 18, Educational.

Read—also the following papers :—

From the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, dated 7th August 1894, No. 7371.

From the Hon'ble Mr. A. MONRO, M.A., B.C.L., Acting Director of Public Instruction, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 7th August 1894, No. 7344.

In the concluding portion of my letter, No. 13240, dated 29th November 1893, printed in G.O., No. 18, dated 17th January 1894, I observed that the time had come when some fee might be levied from all pupil-candidates for the Primary examination, so as to make the examination pay a fair proportion of its cost. During the first two years (1889–90 and 1890–91) of its institution, the Primary School examination cost the State Rs. 10,728, besides some liabilities at the close of 1890–91, of which particulars are not available. The receipts and charges connected with the examination for the past three years are recorded in the margin, from which it will be seen that the net expenditure to the State has been steadily increasing. In his letter, dated 25th June 1890, recorded in G.O., dated 17th July 1890, No. 509, Educational, Mr. Grigg, while recommending the exemption of pupil candidates for this examination from payment of fees, remarked that "when the examination has been generally established" the fee might be re-imposed "if financial exigencies demand" this step. Financial exigency now seems to render it necessary that the examination should be made more self-supporting than at present, and I have the honour, accordingly, to recommend that a fee of As. 8 be levied from all pupil-candidates for the Primary examination. During the past two years 24,532 and 26,416 pupil-candidates respectively were registered for this examination, and, assuming that an average of 25,000 such candidates may safely be reckoned upon, the imposition of the fee would raise the annual income from fees by Rs. 12,500, which would reduce the net cost to one-half of the present figure. Pupil-candidates for the Lower Secondary or (Seventh Standard) examination pay a much higher fee, viz., Rs. 8, and considering the high value generally attached to certificates granted at public examinations, I do not think that the levy of a fee of As. 8, by way of registration, would be considered a hardship. Pupil-candidates will, of course, continue to pay the extra fees for the extra optional subjects they may choose to bring up.

Year.	Receipts.	Charges.	Net cost to the State.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1891–92	17,662	31,729	14,067
1892–93	20,595	42,615	22,020
1893–94	17,132	41,237	24,105

NOTE.—The figures relating to the fifth and sixth standards are included in the above statement.

2. In case my proposal is approved, I beg to recommend that the fee be levied from the examination to be held in December, January and February next, and to request that early orders may be passed on the subject, so that sufficient publicity may be given to the arrangements.

3. On receipt of the orders of Government, a draft notification regarding the necessary alterations in the Primary examination notification will be submitted for approval and publication in the *Fort St. George Gazette*.

Order—dated 22nd October 1894, Mis. No. 799, Educational.

* * * * *

2. Dr. Duncan will be requested to furnish Government with his views on Mr. Monro's proposal in his letter, dated 7th August 1894, No. 7344, to levy a fee on pupil-candidates for the Primary examination.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

READ—also the following papers :—

From the Hon'ble Mr. D. DUNCAN, M.A., D.Sc., Director of Public Instruction, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 13th December 1894, No. 12162.

I have the honour to submit my remarks on the question of levying a fee from pupil-candidates for the Primary examination, which was referred to me under G.O., dated 22nd October 1894, No. 799, Educational.

2. Were I to look at this question solely from the point of view of the Commissioner for Government Examinations, my course would be quite clear. As Commissioner it is my duty to see that the several examinations under my control are conducted so as to combine the highest efficiency with the least possible cost to Government, and year after year accordingly it has been the endeavour to balance the expenditure by the income. Writing as Commissioner, therefore, I would say: impose a fee on pupil-candidates for the Primary examination and raise and adjust the fees for other candidates until income covers expenditure.

3. Unfortunately for this easy solution of the question, I must look at it from the point of view of Director of Public Instruction. Seen from this stand-point, the imposition of a fee on pupil-candidates appears to be neither just nor practicable. It must be borne in mind that the scope and purpose of the examination, as now conducted, are somewhat different from what they were when it was first introduced. When the institution of a Primary examination was first proposed in 1886 (see G.O., dated 28th July 1886, No. 482, Educational), the leading idea was the good of the public service; although it was also recognized that, in improving the public service by demanding a certain standard of scholastic attainments, the cause of education would be promoted. That the interest of the public service continued for a time to be the fundamental idea seems clear from the opening paragraphs of Mr. Grigg's letter, dated 6th July 1887, read in G.O., dated 9th February 1888, No. 100, Educational. At the same time Mr. Grigg was fully aware (see paragraph 7 of his letter) of the beneficial effects which the examination would have in raising and settling the standard of primary education; and accordingly, he proposed that the examination should "be utilised ordinarily for examination for results under the fourth standard by all results schools;" but pupil-candidates were to be admitted at a lower fee than non-pupil candidates. In his letter read in G.O., dated 15th January 1889, No. 17, Educational, he proposed that pupil-candidates should pay a fee of 1 rupee only, foreseeing, at the same time, that the examination with such a low fee might not for

a year or two be self-supporting. The preamble to the notification as sanctioned in the Government order last cited, shows that service interests were the first consideration, to which the promotion of education was secondary. It is to be noted that down to the middle of 1889 the examination was not regarded as compulsory on all fourth standard classes of results schools (see papers read in Director's proceedings, No. 7308, dated 27th August 1889), but owing probably to official pressure having been brought to bear on them, the managers of results schools seem in many parts of the country to have been of opinion that they were compelled by the rules to send their fourth standard pupils up for the examination. In his endorsement submitting to Government a petition from certain results schoolmasters in the Gódávari district, Mr. Grigg intimated that the attention of all inspecting officers had been drawn to the voluntary character of the examination. On this Government remarked (reference on Nos. 569 and 753 of 1889, dated 18th September 1889), that Mr. Grigg's interpretation constituted a distinct departure from the intention of Government and was one on which His Excellency the Governor in Council must receive a much fuller expression of the Director's views before a decision could be arrived at. It was the intention of Government (so runs the order) that all fourth standard boys should be examined for results under the new notification. In submitting the fuller expression of his views called for, Mr. Grigg pointed out that Government had not up till then raised any objection to the optional character of the examination, though this optional character was implied in the original draft notification submitted by him. As to the real question, whether the examination should be optional or compulsory on male pupils coming up for results grants in the fourth standard, Mr. Grigg said, "the examination may be made compulsory on condition that admission of fourth standard pupils to the examination is made free, and not otherwise." As regards girls, he held that the examination must continue optional. He pointed out that hitherto fourth standard pupils had been examined free and that the imposition of a fee might be looked upon as a sort of Sirkar tax on education. Mr. Grigg added that, in the event of Government agreeing to make the examination of fourth standard pupils compulsory and free, it would hardly be necessary to say anything regarding the compulsory character of the examination in the notification, as he would issue a circular order to the effect that, except in the cases noted by him, all fourth standard pupils must be presented for this examination. Thereupon Government expressed the opinion (see G.O., dated 25th October 1889, No. 664, Educational), that the examination should be compulsory on all male pupils desirous of being examined for results grants, and intimated that it would be prepared, if necessary, to abandon the requirement of a fee altogether. It postponed the passing of final orders, however, until the results of the first examination (which it assumed was to be conducted on a purely voluntary basis) were known. In furnishing this information in his letter read in G.O., dated 17th July 1890, No. 509, Educational, Mr. Grigg also submitted copy of a notification which he had issued, the effect of which was, he said, practically to make the examination compulsory on all male pupils; one reason given for this step being the necessity to economise, as much as possible, the time of Assistant Inspectors whose duty it was to examine Upper Primary schools. He accordingly requested Government to cancel the provision requiring pupils to pay a fee, but added that "by and by, when the examination has been generally established, if financial exigencies demand the imposition of a fee, the rule can be re-enacted."

4. The foregoing sketch seems to show that the giving up of the admission fee in the case of fourth standard pupils was the natural outcome of the policy by which the examination was changed from an optional to a compulsory examination. And the inference I draw from it is this, that the fee ought not to be re-imposed so long as the examination retains that compulsory character which was the reason for the levy of a fee being waived. I fully agree with Mr. Grigg when he says "the examination may be made compulsory on condition that admission of fourth standard pupils to the examination is made free, and not otherwise." I take this to be an emphatic statement of the truth that managers of results schools have as good a right to have their fourth standard pupils examined for grant free of charge as to have the pupils of all the other standards examined free; and it seems to me that when he said

existing boards, the lack of uniformity in the standard of the examination throughout the presidency would probably not be more marked than it is under present arrangements.

I would also point out that the notification would require no alteration if the examination were to cease to be compulsory on fourth standard male pupils, its compulsory character resting not on the provisions of the notification but on special orders of Government. If managers of schools were to be guided merely by the terms of the present notification, they might decline to send up their fourth standard pupils to the examination.

(ii) Some additional income might be got by raising the fee for teacher and private candidates. Of the former there were registered at the last examination 1,834, and of the latter 3,550. The fee from private candidates might be raised from Rs. 2 to Rs. 2-8-0. As for teacher-candidates I do not recommend any increase, it being of the very greatest importance to encourage elementary teachers to qualify for admission into training schools. Up till now I have been allowing teachers who have been attending sessional schools to come up free as pupil-candidates; but considering that they receive stipends, I think they may be required to pay the same admission fee as teacher-candidates. Last year the total strength of sessional schools was 1,135. If a fee of Rs. 1-8-0 were levied from this class of candidates, it would yield about Rs. 1,700, which, added to the additional income from private candidates of about the same amount, would yield over Rs. 3,000.

(iii) The cost of the examination might be reduced to some extent, though it is doubtful whether really good men would care to join the boards if the remuneration was much less. One direction in which economy might be effected I am most reluctant to mention, for it seems ungenerous to deprive the not over-highly paid members of the Educational department of any additional emoluments they can earn; but on principle it has always seemed to me indefensible that inspecting officers, as members of Primary Examination Boards, should receive remuneration for examining fourth standard pupils, the examination of whom was part of their legitimate duties prior to the advent of the Primary examination. The only defence that can be urged for it is that other than fourth standard pupils appear for examination — the proportion being about 16 per cent. The payment of remuneration to inspecting officers has received only the temporary approval of Government (G.O., dated 14th December 1892, No. 868, Educational). I promised to address Government on the whole question (see letter read in Government order just referred to). As far as the Lower Secondary examination was concerned the question was settled by the revised notification regulating that examination; but, owing to the very heavy work I had between January and September 1893, revising the notifications dealing with the examinations under the Commissioner and the Grant-in-aid Code, I was unable to take the matter up before going on furlough, and Mr. Monro thought it expedient to let the matter lie over till my return. It will be taken up now and disposed of before new boards are appointed in April next.

The amount paid to inspecting officers last year for services as members or chairmen of Primary Examination Boards was Rs. 3,936. Considering that their position on the examination boards throws on them work additional to what they had to do before the Primary examination was instituted, they should be remunerated for such additional work; but the remuneration should be so fixed as to be proportionate not to the total amount of their work on the board, but to that part of it which constitutes a distinct addition to their former recognized duties as inspecting officers. The term of the present boards expires on the 31st March next. Before appointing new boards I should take measures to reduce the expenditure in this and in other respects and submit proposals for the approval of Government.

(iv) I have already pointed out how public service considerations and educational considerations have been from the outset mixed up in the scheme of this examination. Were the former to disappear, the question of imposing an admission fee on pupil candidates would, I presume, disappear with it. It may be taken for granted that teacher and private candidates present themselves for examination with

that the fee may, at some future time, be re-imposed if financial exigencies demand it, Mr. Grigg had lost sight of the full significance of his previous statement.

5. Financial exigencies are, no doubt, very pressing at the present moment; but this notwithstanding, I do not see my way to recommend the re-imposition of a fee. Managers may justly claim to have their fourth standard classes examined for grant without the payment of a fee. This standard, they might argue, was formerly examined along with other standards by the inspecting officers at the cost of the State; and while it may be quite true, as Mr. Grigg says, that it was necessary to relieve inspecting officers of a portion of their duties owing to the great extension of primary education, managers might fairly demur to a part of the cost of maintaining the relieving agency being charged to them. Managers constantly complain of the smallness of their results grant earnings; they would have cause to complain still more if they found these earnings diminished by the amount of the admission fees paid for their pupils. For it is idle to expect the parents of the pupils, who receive no share of the results earnings, to pay the admission fee. It is even supposable that, with a large number of pupils presented and a small number of pupils passed, a manager might find himself with hardly anything left to carry on his school. As long as the examination was optional, the imposition of an admission fee was unobjectionable, seeing that success in the examination was the passport to the public service, and it might be presumed that parents would, as a rule, send up their children to the examination only if they valued the certificate. The moment the examination became compulsory the levy of a fee became unjustifiable. A manager might well say that his fourth standard pupils did not wish at this stage to be declared eligible for appointments in the public service, some because they were destined for other walks of life, others because they meant to go through the full upper secondary course of instruction, if not through the full university course terminating in graduation. "What return," he might ask, "do I or my pupils get for this fee which is now charged?"

6. It seems to me that Government must continue to bear the cost of the agency employed in examining pupils of all classes and forms for results grants. I know of no country in which the maintenance of this agency is charged to the managers of grant-in-aid schools or to the parents of the pupils. And I would respectfully suggest to Government whether it would not be best to make up its mind to incur some loss in carrying on the Primary examination, and to look upon the expenditure which is not covered by fees as a part of the cost of inspection. There can be no doubt that the staff of subordinate inspecting officers would have had to be increased, at considerable cost to Government, if the relief afforded by the Primary examination had not been available; but, while I think that Government should be prepared to put up with some loss in carrying on this examination, I feel it incumbent on me to scrutinize the receipts and charges most carefully so as to see whether the former can be in any way increased and the latter diminished, so that the examination might be rendered, if not self-supporting, at any rate less costly. With this end in view, I beg leave to make the following proposals:—

(i) The examination might be made optional as it was originally, and as the Lower Secondary examination is now. In such a case, Government would be quite justified in imposing an admission fee on pupils, for it might be assumed that no one would come up for the examination who had not an end to gain by passing it. This would almost certainly reduce the number of candidates, but it would also reduce the cost of conducting the examination. It would, at the same time, throw back on the inspecting officers some portion of the work of which they were relieved when the examination was made compulsory. To have upper primary instruction tested partly by the inspecting officers and partly by Primary Examination boards might perhaps be thought fatal to uniformity of standard which Government regarded as an important matter in testing the final stage of primary education. (See reference, dated 18th September, on current Nos. 569 and 753 of 1889); but seeing that every Primary Examination board contains inspecting officers as *ex-officio* members, and seeing also the great diversity in the status and the attainments of the twenty-nine

a view to secure a certificate qualifying them for admission, the former to a training school and probably also to the public service, and the latter to the public service. The certificate is therefore a valuable document for which payment may reasonably be demanded. I would therefore suggest that the possession of this certificate, and not the mere appearance of the candidate's name in a District Gazette, be a *sine qua non* for admission to the public service. The certificate should distinctly state that the holder of it has, by passing the Primary examination, qualified for admission to the public service. The certificate now granted does not do this. The District Gazette list should merely show who has passed the examination; the certificate should declare that the candidate has qualified for service. Teacher and private candidates who pass should receive the certificate without further payment; but successful pupil candidates, if they wish to have it, should be made to pay for it; and in their case I would charge for the certificate the amount now paid as admission fee by teacher-candidates namely, Rs. 1-8-0. A large number of successful pupil-candidates would, of course, not care for the certificate, and would, consequently, not be prepared to spend money on it; but a considerable number of them would desire to possess it and, therefore, could not reasonably object to pay for it. Taking the average number of pupil-candidates at 25,000, Mr. Monro calculates that a revenue of Rs. 12,500 would be secured by his proposal to levy a fee of eight annas for admission. If my proposal were adopted, 8,334 successful pupil-candidates would have to apply for certificates to yield the same income. This number of successful pupil-candidates might be expected to apply for certificates of qualification for admission to the public service. Besides the revenue which this would yield, the procedure now recommended would have the further and, to my mind, important advantage that it would keep the public service considerations distinct from the educational. The names of successful candidates would continue to be published in the District Gazettes, but this would be a purely educational notification. It would be distinctly laid down that mere publication in the Gazette would not entitle a person to seek admission into the public service.

7. The several proposals made above [paragraph 6 (ii), (iii) and (iv)] would probably, if carried out, reduce the cost of the examination by from Rs. 12,000 to Rs. 17,000.

8. On receipt of the orders of Government on this letter, I shall submit a revised draft of the notification.

From the Director of Public Instruction, dated Madras, 21st January 1895, No. 524.

From the Hon'ble Mr. D. DUNCAN, M.A., D.Sc., Director of Public Instruction, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 27th February 1895, No. 2280.

The period of three years for which the present Primary Examination Boards were appointed expires on 31st March next. New boards will have to be constituted as soon as possible after that date, but the chairmen should be appointed before the close of the official year, so that they may be in a position to take over the records from the chairmen of the present boards. I have the honour, therefore, to request that you will be good enough to favour me with the early orders of Government on my letter dated 13th December 1894, No. 12162.

ORDER—dated 13th March 1895, No. 220, Educational.

In reply to the Government Order read above the Director of Public Instruction submits proposals for reducing the present high cost of the Primary examination.

2. His first suggestion is that the examination should be made optional in which case Government could equitably levy admission fees from pupil-candidates and thus raise sufficient funds to reduce the net cost to a reasonable amount. This would involve the restoration of the obsolescent Fourth Standard Results Grant examination

and thus throw considerable additional labour on inspecting officers who would be obliged to examine for results grants all pupils who did not choose to appear at the Primary examination. Dr. Duncan admits that this "might be thought fatal to uniformity of standard", but contends that the lack of uniformity would not be more marked than under existing arrangements. The Government is, however, unable to attach much importance to this argument, the want of uniformity in the present system is no reason for approving arrangements which would probably involve a change for the worse. Moreover, it appears highly desirable, to avoid the inconvenience and waste of labour which must necessarily be caused by the existence of two co-ordinate examinations, both calculated to test the standard of Upper Primary instruction, though instituted with different objects, viz., in the one case, merely to regulate the payment of results grants to school-managers, in the other to test the qualifications of candidates for admission to the public service. Where one examination can serve both these purposes, it is on every ground undesirable to establish two. For these reasons the Government considers that Dr. Duncan's first suggestion must be rejected.

3. His second proposal is to raise from Rs. 2 to Rs. 2–8–0, the admission fee for private candidates, and levy a fee of Rs. 1–8–0 from teacher candidates who have been attending sessional schools. This measure commends itself to Government and will be approved.

4. The Director's third suggestion is that steps should be taken to reduce examiners' stipends, particularly those paid to inspecting officers.

The consideration of this proposal will be deferred pending the receipt of the further report which the Director promises to submit in connection with the appointment of the new Primary Examination Boards.

5. The fourth proposal is that admission to the public service should be made conditional on the possession of a formal certificate that the applicant has passed the Primary examination, and that a fee of Rs. 1–8–0 should be levied for the grant of such a certificate to a pupil candidate. Teacher-candidates and private candidates who will have to pay Rs. 1–8–0 and Rs. 2–8–0, respectively, for admission to the examination will receive pass-certificates without further payment.

Dr. Duncan's letter shows very clearly that the examination has developed from what Mr. Grigg called "essentially a service examination" into an Educational examination, and that it is therefore unfair to demand admission fees from pupil-candidates who appear solely for the purpose of securing fourth standard results grants for their school-managers. If, however, any of these pupil-candidates wish at the same time to qualify themselves for admission to the public service, they may equitably be required to pay for certificates which evidence their fitness. The sum fixed, Rs. 1–8–0, is the same as that levied as an admission fee from teacher-candidates, and does not appear to Government to be excessive. Before carrying this proposal into effect it will however be necessary to decide within what period of time the fee for the grant of the certificate should be paid. It seems inexpedient to insist on its payment at the time that admission to the examination is applied for for this would make it on appearance an admission fee. On the other hand, to allow the grant of these certificates years after the examination hardly appears practicable. The Government is therefore disposed to think that successful candidates should be required to pay the fee within a fixed and limited period—of say, six months—from the date of the publication of the results of the examination. This is a point, however, on which the Government would desire to be placed in possession of the Director's views. He will accordingly be requested to report specially on the matter.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Public Instruction.

Exd. S. J. Pereira.

Govt. of {1895} Madras.

EDUCATIONAL.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 13th March 1895, No. 220.

MARCH.

Primary Examination.

Passing orders on the question of levying fees from pupil candidates for the — and raising the fee payable by private candidates from Rs. 2 to Rs. 2-8-0.

Ed. Cor.
15 (b) 1,500—17-11-93.

Ed. Cor. 17. 2,000—29-3-94.

Current No. 873 Ed C

189 .

Educational Department.

From

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,

Madras,

To

THE HONORABLE THE CHIEF SECRETARY

TO GOVERNMENT,

Fort St. George.

DESPATCHED 7 AUG 1894

No. 7371

Dated 7th
Despatched do } August 1894.
Received 8th

No.

ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

Submitting explanation with reference to G.O. No. 18, dated the 17th January 1894, Educl., sanctioning the Primary Examination Notification

C.V. 875

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madras, 7 August 1894

No. 7344

20

From

Mr.
THE HONOURABLE A. MONRO, M.A., B.C.L.,
ACTING DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madras,

To

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

SIR,

In the concluding portion of my letter
R.P. 13,240, dated 29 November 1893, printed
G.O. R.P. 18, dated 17 January 1894, I observed
that the time had come when some fee
might be levied from all pupil-candidates
for the Primary Examination, so as to
make the examination pay a fair pro-
portion of its cost. During the first two
years (1889-90 and 1890-91) of its institution
the Primary School Examination cost
the State Rs 10,728, besides some
liabilities at the close of 1890-91, of
which particulars are not available.
The receipts and charges proper

Concerned

Ed. Cor.
15 (b) 1,500—17-11-93.

ected with the examination for the
t three years are recorded in the

year.	Receipts Rs.	Charges Rs	Net cost to the State. Rs
1891-92.	17,662	31,729	14,067
1892-93	20,595	42,615	22,020
1893-94	17,132	41,237	24,105

Note The figures relating to the fifth and sixth standards are included in the above statement

jin, from which it will be
that the net expenditure
he State has been
adily increasing. In his
er dated 25 June 1890,
orded in G. O. No. 17 July
o, No. 509, Educational,
r Grigg while recommending the exemption
pupil candidates for this examination
rom payment of fees, remarked that
when the examination has been generally
established" the fee might be re-imposed
if financial exigencies demand" this
step. Financial exigency now seems to
render it necessary that the examination
should be made more self-supporting
than at present, and I have the honour,
accordingly, to recommend that a
fee of 8 Annas be levied from
all pupil-candidates for the Primary
Examination. During the past two
years, 24,532 and 26,416 pupil candidates
respectively

respectively were registered for this examin
and, assuming that an average of 25,
such candidates may safely be reckoned u
the imposition of the fee would raise
annual income from fees by Rs 12500, W
would reduce the net cost to one half of
present figure. Pupil-candidates for the
Lower Secondary or (Seventh Standard)
examination pay a much higher fee viz
Rs 8, and considering the high value gen
attached to certificates granted at the
public examinations, I do not think tha
the levy of a fee of 8 annas, by way of
registration, would be considered a hard
-ship. Pupil-candidates will, of course,
continue to pay the extra fees for the
extra optional subjects they may
choose to bring up.

2. In case my proposal is approved
I beg to recommend that the fee
be levied, from the examination to be
held in December, January and
February

nary next and to request that early
s may lee passed on the subject,
that sufficient publicity may lee
given to the arrangements.

. On receipt of the orders of Government,
draft notification regarding the
ecessary alterations in the Primary
amination Notification will lee
ubmitted for approval and publication
the Fort St George Gazette.

I have the honour to lee,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant,
Illegible
Ag: Director of Public Instn

42

Ed. Cor. 17. 2,000—29-3-94.

Ed. Cor. 17. 2,000—29-3-94.

Esl

Esl 18 : 17-1-94 Sc
-u- 509 : 17-7-90 Mis

1894.

Educational Department.

From

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,

Madras,

To

THE HONORABLE THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT,

Fort St. George.

DESPATCHED
7 AUG 1894

No. 7344

Dated 7th
Despatched do
Received 8th
} August 1894

No.

ENCLOSURES. —

Subject.

Recommending for reasons stated that a fee of 8 annas be levied from all pupil-candidates for the Primary School Exam^n

1415

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madras, 13 Dec^r 1894

No. 12162

From

THE HONORABLE MR. D. DUNCAN, M.A., D.Sc.,
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madras,

To

THE HONORABLE THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

SIR,

I have the honour to submit my remarks on the question of levying a fee from pupil candidates for the Primary Examination, which was referred to me under G.O. dated, 22 October 1894, No. 799, Educational.

2. Were I to look at this question solely from the point of view of the Commissioner for Government Examinations, my course would be quite clear. As Commissioner it is my duty to see that the several Examinations

Ed. Cor.
15 (b) 1,500—17-11-94.

Examinations under my control are conducted so as to combine the highest efficiency with the ~~least~~ possible cost to Government; and year after year accordingly it has been the endeavour to balance the expenditure by the income. Writing as Commissioner, therefore, I would say: impose a fee on pupil candidates for the Primary Examination, raise and adjust the fees for other candidates until income covers expenditure.

3. Unfortunately for this easy solution of the question, I must look at it from the point of view of Director of Public Instruction. Seen from this stand-point, the imposition of a fee on

on pupil candidates appears to be neither just nor practicable. It must be borne in mind that the scope and purpose of the Examination as now conducted are somewhat different from what they were when it was first introduced. When the institution of a Primary Examination was first proposed in 1886 (See G.O. dated 28 July 1886, No. 482. Educational) the leading idea was the good of the public service; although it was also recognized that, in improving the public service by demanding a certain standard of scholastic attainments, the cause of education would be promoted. That the interest of the public service continued for a time to be the fundamental ide

Education Commission Report p. 197

Ed. Cor. 17 2,000—29-3-94.

idea seems clear from the opening paras of Mr. Grigg's letter, dated, 6th July, 887, read in G.C. dated, 9th February 888, No. 100, Educational. At the same time Mr. Gregg was fully aware (see para 7 of his letter) of the beneficial effects which the Examination would have in raising and settling the Standard of primary education. And accordingly, he proposed that the examination should "be utilised ordinarily for examination for results under the Fourth Standard by all results schools"; but pupil candidates were to be admitted at a lower fee than non-pupil candidates. In his letter read in G.C. dated, 15th January 1889,

No. 17

No. 17, Educational, he proposed that pupil candidates should pay a fee of one rupee only, foreseeing at the same time that the examination with such a low fee might not for a year or two be self-supporting. The preamble to the Notification as sanctioned in the G.C. last cited shows that service interests were the first consideration, to which the promotion of education was secondary. It is to be noted that down to the middle of 1889 the examination was not regarded as compulsory on all Fourth Standard classes of results schools (see papers read in Proceedings No. 7308, dated, 27th August 1889). But owing probably to official pressure

Please see CNO 60 X
Letter

Ed. Cor. 2,000—29-3-94.

pressure having been brought to bear on them, the managers of results schools seem in many parts of the country to have been of opinion that they were compelled by the rules to send their Fourth Standard pupils up for the examination. In his endorsement submitting to Government a petition from certain results school-masters in the Godavari District, Mr. Grigg intimated that the attention of all Inspecting officers had been drawn to the voluntary character of the Examination. On this Government remarked (~~G.O.~~ Reference on Nos. 569 and 753 of 1889, dated, 18 September 1889) that Mr. Grigg's

× under cover
80 664 Ed.
25-10-89

Mr. Grigg's interpretation constituted a distinct departure from the intention of Government and was one on which His Excellency the Governor in Council must receive a much fuller expression of the Director's views before a decision could be arrived at. It was the intention of Government (so runs the order) that all IV standard boys should be examined for results under the new Notification In submitting the fuller expression of his views called for, Mr. Grigg pointed out that Government had not up till then raised any objection to the optional character of the examination although this optional character was implied in the original draft Notificatio

notification submitted by him. As to the real question, whether the examination should be optional or compulsory on male pupils coming up for results grants in the Fourth Standard, ~ Mr. Grigg said: " The examination may be made compulsory on condition that admission of Fourth Standard pupils to the examination is made free, and not otherwise." As regards girls, he held that the examination must continue optional. He pointed out that hitherto Fourth Standard pupils had been examined free and that the imposition of a fee might be looked upon as a sort of Sirkar tax on education. Mr. Grigg added that, in the event of Government agreeing to make the examination of Fourth Standard pupils compulsory and free, it would hardly be necessary to say anything regarding the compulsory character of the examination in the notification, as he would issue a circular order to the effect that, except in the cases noted by him, all Fourth Standard pupils must be presented for this examination. Thereupon Government expressed the opinion (see G. G., dated × 25 October 1889, No. 664, Educational) that the examination should be compulsory on all male pupils desirous of being examined for results grants, and intimated that it would be prepared, if necessary, to abandon the requirement of a fee altogether. It

Ed. Cor. 2,000—29-3-94.

It postponed the passing of final orders, however, until the results of the first examination (which it assumed was to be conducted on a purely voluntary basis) were known. In furnishing this information in his letter read in G. C., dated, 17th July 1890, No. 509, Educational, Mr. Gregg also submitted copy of a Notification which he had issued, the effect of which was, he said, practically to make the examination compulsory on all male pupils; one reason given for this step being the necessity to economise, as much as possible, the time of Assistant Inspectors, whose duty it was to examine Upper Primary schools. He accordingly requested

requested Government to cancel the provision requiring pupils to pay a fee, but added that "by and by, when the examination has been generally established, if financial exigencies demand the imposition of a fee, the rule can be re-enacted".

4. The foregoing sketch seems to show that the giving up of the admission fee in the case of Fourth Standard pupils was the natural outcome of the policy by which the examination was changed from an optional to a compulsory examination. And the inference I draw from it is this: that the fee ought not to be re-imposed so long as the examination retains that compulsory character which was the reason for the levy of a fee being waived. I fully agree with Mr. Gregg when

Ed. Cor. 2,000—29-3-94.

when he says" the examination may be made
compulsory on condition that admission
of Fourth Standard pupils to the
examination is made free, and not
otherwise". I take this to be an —
emphatic statement of the truth that
managers of results schools have as good
a right to have their Fourth Standard
pupils examined for grant free of charge
as to have the pupils of all the other
standards examined free. And it seems
to me that, when he said that the
fee may, at some future time, be
re-imposed, if financial exigencies
so demand it, Mr. Grigg had lost sight
of the full significance of his
previous statement.

hp/

5. Financial exigencies are, no doubt, very
pressing at the present moment; but this
notwithstanding, I do not see my way to
recommend the reimposition of a fee. Managers
may justly claim to have their Fourth
Standard classes examined for grant
without the payment of a fee. This
standard, they might argue, was formerly
examined along with other standards
by the Inspecting officers at the cost of
the State; and while it may be
quite true, as Mr. Grigg says, that it
was necessary to relieve Inspecting
officers of a portion of their duties
owing to the great extension of primary
education, managers might fairly
demur to a part of the cost of maintaining
the relieving agency being charged
to them. Managers constantly complain
of

Ed. Cor. 2,000—29-3-94.

of the smallness of their results grant
earnings; they would have cause to
complain still more if they found
these earnings diminished by the
amount of the admission fees paid
for their pupils. For it is idle to
expect the parents of the pupils, who
receive no share of the results earnings,
to pay the admission fee. It is even
supposable that, with a large number
of pupils presented and a small
number of pupils passed, a manager
might find himself with hardly
anything left to carry on his
school. So long as the examination
was optional, the imposition of an
admission fee was unobjectionable,
seeing that success in the examination
was the passport to the public service;

and

and it might be presumed that parents
would as a rule send up their children
to the examination, only if they valued
the certificate. The moment the examin-
nation became compulsory, the levy of
a fee became unjustifiable. A manager
might well say that his Fourth Standard
pupils did not wish at this stage
to be declared eligible for appointments
in the public service, some because
they were destined for other walks
of life, others because they meant
to go through the full Upper
Secondary Course of instruction, if
not through the full University
course terminating in Graduation.
"What return," he might ask, "do I or my
pupils get for this fee which is now
charged?"

6.

6. It seems to me that Government must continue to bear the cost of the agency employed in examining pupils of all classes and forms for results grants. I know of no country in which the maintenance of this agency is charged to the managers of grant-in-aid schools or to the parents of the pupils. And I would respectfully suggest to Government whether it would not be best to make up its mind to incur some loss in carrying on the Primary Examination, and to look upon the expenditure which is not covered by fees as a part of the cost of inspection. There can be no

proposals:-

(1) The examination might lee made optional as it was originally, and as the Lower Secondary Examination is now. In such a case, Government would lee quite justified in imposing an admission fee on pupils, for it might lee assumed that no one would come up for the examination who had not an end to gain by passing it. This would almost certainly reduce the number of candidates, but it would also reduce the cost of conducting the examination. It would, at the same time, throw back on the Inspecting officers some portion of the work of which they were relieved when the examination was made compulsory.

compulsory. To have upper primary instruction tested partly by the Inspecting officers and partly by the Primary Examination Boards might perhaps lee thought fatal to uniformity of standard which govern ment regarded as an important matter in testing the final stage of primary education. (See Reference G.O. of 18 September, current on reference No. 569 & 753 of 1889). But, seeing that every Primary Examination Board contains Inspecting officers as ex officio members, and seeing also the great diversity in the status and the attainments of the 29 existing Boards, the lack of uniformity in the standard of the examination throughout the Presidency would probably not lee more

Under cover of G.O. 664 Ed. X 23.10.89

more marked than it is under present arrangements.

I would also point out that the notification would require no alteration if the examination were to cease to be compulsory on Fourth Standard male pupils, its compulsory character resting not on the provisions of the notification, but on special orders of Government. If managers of schools were to be guided merely by the terms of the present notification, they might decline to send up their Fourth Standard pupils to the examination.

(ii) Some additional income might be got by raising the fee for Teacher and Private candidates. Of the former there were registered at the last examination 1834, and of the latter 3550. The fee from Private candidates might be raised from Rs 2-a-a to Rs 2-8-a. As for Teacher candidates I do not recommend any increase, it being of the very greatest importance to encourage Elementary teachers to qualify for admission into Training schools. Up till now, I have been allowing teachers who have been attending Sessional schools to come up free as Pupil candidates. But considering that they receive stipend I think they may be required to pay the same admission fee as Teacher candidates. Last year the

The total strength of sessional schools was 1135. If a fee of Rs 1-8-0 were levied from this class of candidates, it would yield about Rs 1700, which, added to the additional income from Private candidates of about the same amount, would yield over Rs 3000.

(iii) The cost of the examination might be reduced to some extent, though it is doubtful whether really good men would care to join the Boards if the remuneration was much less. One direction in which economy might be effected I am most reluctant to mention, for it seems ungenerous to deprive the not over-highly paid members of the Educational Educational Department of any additional emoluments they can earn. But on principle it has always seemed to me indefensible that Inspecting officers as members of Primary Examination Boards should receive remuneration for examining Fourth Standard pupils, the examination of whom was part of their legitimate duties prior to the advent of the Primary Examination. The only defence that can be urged for it is that other than Fourth Standard pupils appear for examination — the proportion being about 16 per cent. The payment of remuneration to Inspecting officers has received only the temporary approval of

Government

Government (G.O. dated, 14th December 1892, No. 868, Educational). I promised to address Government on the whole question (see letter read in G.O. just referred to). As far as the Lower Secondary Examination was concerned, the question was settled by the revised notification regulating that examination. But, owing to the very heavy work I had between January and September 1893 revising the Notifications dealing with the examinations under the Commissioner and the Grant-in-aid code, I was unable to take the matter up before going on furlough, and Mr. Monro thought it expedient to let the matter lie over till my return. It will be taken up now and disposed of before new Boards are appointed in April next.

The amount paid to Inspecting officers last year for services as Members or Chairmen of Primary Examination Boards was Rs 3936. Considering that their position on the Examination Boards throws on them work additional to what they had to do before the Primary Examination was instituted they should be remunerated for such additional work. But the remuneration should be so fixed as to be proportionate not to the total amount of their work on the Board, but to that part of it which constitutes a distinct addition to

As their former recognized duties as
(g) Inspecting officers. The term of the
(18) present Boards expires on the 31st
As March next. Before appointing new
(g) Boards, I shall take measures to
re reduce the expenditure in this and in
Sother respects and submit proposals
(th) for the approval of Government.

(no (iv)) I have already pointed out how
B public service considerations and
(I Educational considerations have
(been from the outset mixed up in
(vitie scheme of this examination.
(b) Were the former to disappear, the
question of imposing an admission
(fee on pupil candidates would,
(I presume, disappear with it.
(it) It may be taken for granted
that

that Teacher and Private candidates
present themselves for examination with
a view to secure a certificate qualifying
them for admission, the former to a
Training school and probably also to
the public service, and the latter to
the public service. The certificate is
therefore a valuable document for
which payment may reasonably be
demanded. I would, therefore, suggest
that the possession of this certificate
and not the mere appearance of the
candidates name in a District Gazette
be a sine qua non for admission
to the public service. The certificate
should distinctly state that the
holder of it has, by passing the
Primary Examination, qualified
for

for admission to the public service. The certificate now granted does not do this. The District Gazette list should merely show who has passed the examination; the certificate should declare that the candidate has qualified for service. Teacher and Private candidates (who pass should receive the certificate without further payment; but successful pupil candidates if they wish to have it should be made to pay for it, and in their case I would charge for the certificate the amount now paid as admission fee by Teacher candidates, namely, Rs 1-8-0. A large number of successful

successful pupil candidates would, of course, not care for the certificate, and would, consequently, not be prepared to spend money on it; but a considerable number of them would desire to possess it and, therefore, could not reasonably object to pay for it. Taking the average number of pupil candidates at 25000, Mr Monro calculates that a revenue of Rs 12,500 would be secured by his proposal to levy a fee of eight annas for admission. If my proposal were adopted, 8334 successful pupil candidates would have to apply for certificates to yield the same income. This number of successful pupil candidates might be expected to apply for certificate

of

of qualification for admission to the public service. Besides the revenue which this would yield, the procedure now recommended would have the further and, to my mind, important advantage that it would keep the public service considerations distinct from the educational. The names of successful candidates would continue to be published in the District Gazettes, but this would be a purely educational notification. It would be distinctly laid down that mere publication in the Gazette would not entitle a person to seek admission into the public service.

7

7. The several proposals made above (para 6 (ii), (iii), & (iv)) would probably, if carried out, reduce the cost of the examination by from Rs 12,000 to Rs 17,000.

8. On receipt of the orders of Government on this letter I shall submit a revised draft of the notification.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
A Duncan
Director of Public Instruction

Ed. SV.

Ed

1415

Ed Dept

From,

The Director of Public Instruction,

Madras,

To, The Honble the Chief Secretary

to Government,

Fort St George.

No 12162

Dated 13
Rec'd 14 } 12/94
Rec'd 14

CHIEF SECRETARY'S
No 053-1894
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

submitting remarks on the question of levying a fee from Pupil candidates for the Primary Examination.

RO.
27/12
Recvd 21/12

RO after routine
Recd 4 P.M. 22nd Dec 94.
22/12

Ed 799 = 22-10-94 Inc
482 = 21-1-95
100 - 9-2-95
17 = 15-1-89
703-4-12-89
689-17-10-89
564-16-9-89 Inc
664-25-10-89
868-14-12-89
7308-27-8-89 DPI

[G 69]
100—19-1-94.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
MADRAS.

Ed Department.

20/N

Memorandum.

Read the following

Print

For orders.

OM. Cobern 10 Nº 19 Nº 63 12-1-95

With reference to para 3 of his letter dt 13th December 1894 no 12162 the DPI is requested to forward a copy of his Pro. dt 27th Aug-89 no 7308 which do not appear to have been communicated to this office.

10/1

To the DPI — dispd 12/1/95

113
9/1
Draft

CURRENT NO 80

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madras, 21 January 1895.

No. 524

21 heading Order

From

THE HONORABLE MR. D. DUNCAN, M.A., D.Sc.,
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madras,

To

THE HONORABLE THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

SIR,

With reference to Memorandum, dated, 12 instant, No. 63, Educational, I have the honour to submit herewith a copy of this office Proceedings, No. 7308, dated, 24 August 1889.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
[signature]
Director of Public Instruction.

Ed. Cor.
15 (b) 1,500—17-11-94.

Direct...

Refer 63: 12-1-95
the papers mentioned
in the Chief's

80

Educn

From,
The Director of Public Instruction,
Madras,

To the Honble the Chief Secretary
to Govt.
Fort St George

DESPATCHED
21 JAN. 95

No. 524.

Recd. 22/ Dated 21st January 1895
Encl. / Despatched 28th Do

Enclosure

CHIEF SECRETARY'S
DEPARTMENT OF MADRAS

Subd: a copy of this Office
Pro: No. 7308/27-8-89 with reference
to memo No 63/12-1-95 Edl

CURRENT NO. 261

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madras, 27th February 1895.

No. 2280

From

THE HONORABLE MR. D. DUNCAN, M.A., D.Sc.,
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madras,

To

THE HONORABLE THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

SIR,

The period of three years for which the present Primary Examination Boards were appointed expires on 31st march next. New Boards will have to be constituted as soon as possible after that date; but the Chairmen should be appointed before the close of the official year so that they may be in a position to take over the records from the Chairmen of the present Boards. I have the honour, therefore, to request that you will be good enough to favour me with the early orders of Government on my letter, dated, 13th December 1894, No. 12162.

C 1415

I have the honour to be,
sir,
Your most obedient servant.

D Duncan
Director of Public Instruction.

Ed. Cor.
15 (b) 1,500—17-11-94.

No 2.

Educational Dept

Educational

NO. 261

From

The Director of Public Instruction

Madras

To

The Honble the chief secretary to

Government,

DESPATCHED

27 FEB 95

No. 2280.

Dated 27th } Febry 1895.

Recd 27th }

Recd 28

Kept 24

CHIEF SECRETARY

28 FEB 1895

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Encls: Nil

Requesting early orders of Government on letter, dated, 13th December 1894, No. 12162, regarding the question of reconstitution of the Primary Examination Board, and their ~~xxx~~ appointment of their respective chairmen.

No. 7308.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, dated 27th August 1889.

Primary School Examination.

Read the following letter from the Assistant Inspector of Schools, Eighth Division, to the Inspector of Schools, Southern Circle, dated Tanjore, 14th August 1889, No. 4420 :—

With reference to para. 13 of the Primary School Notification and Director's Proceedings No. 3683, dated 29th April 1889, I have the honor to request that I be informed if my interpretation of the notification is correct in the following cases :—

1. In the case of a school eligible for grants sending up the whole of the fourth standard class for the Primary School examination—

(*a*) if the month in which the Primary School examination is held is the same as that for which the examination for grant is fixed, the whole class will be examined at one and the same time for grants and for the Primary School examination; and grants will, of course, be calculated for the same period for all standards of that school;

(*b*) but when the month in which the Primary School examination is held is different from the month for which the examination for grant is fixed, then the fourth standard will not be examined when the other standards are examined for grants, but will be examined for the Primary School examination, and grants will be calculated for the fourth standard alone of that school for a period different from that for which grants are calculated for the other standards.

2. In the case of a school eligible for grants sending up a part only of the fourth standard for the Primary School examination—

(*a*) when the month in which the Primary School examination is held is the same as that for the examination for grant, all the pupils of the fourth standard will be examined together and grants given for all and in addition Primary School examination certificates for candidates for the Primary school examination;

(*b*) but when the month in which the Primary School examination is held is different from the month for which the examination for grants is fixed, then the pupils that are not candidates for the Primary School examination will be examined for grant at the time fixed for the grant examination, while the candidates for the Primary School examination will be examined for the Primary School examination and grants calculated on those results for a period different from that for which grants are calculated for the other standards and the other part of the fourth standard.

3. As regards optional subjects, the candidates for the Primary School examination will be examined at the time of the Primary School examination for the two subjects required for the Primary School examination certificate and the other optional subjects required for grants.

4. As the Primary School examination is not *compulsory* like the Middle School examination, I beg to suggest that it will be a far more convenient arrangement to consider the Primary School examination and the grant examination as two distinct examinations with the proviso that in the case of the two examinations being held in the same month, the inspecting officers may have the option of utilizing the results of the Primary School examination for purposes of the grant examination.

No. 5036.

Submitted to the Director of Public Instruction for orders.

COIMBATORE,
16*th August* 1889.

(Signed) GEO. BICKLE,
Inspector of Schools, Southern Circle.

The interpretation in 1 (*b*) is correct, but not that in 2 (*b*). In these cases the grant for the whole standard must be calculated according to the date on which the section of the class not appearing for the Primary examination is examined, whether that date be before or after that of the Primary examination.

2. The interpretation in para. 3 is correct.

3. No such option as that suggested in para. 4 can be allowed.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. B. GRIGG,
Director of Public Instruction.

To the Inspector of Schools, Southern Circle.
" Inspectors of Schools, Northern and Central Circles,
" the Inspector of Schools, Western Circle,
" Inspectresses of Girls' Schools,
" Assistant Inspectors of Schools,
" the Editor, *Madras Journal of Education.*
} with spare copies for Sub-Assistants.

(True Copy.)

D. Duncan

~~Asst. to the~~ *Director of Public Instruction.*

1889.

AUGUST.

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,

MADRAS.

To

THE INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS,
SOUTHERN CIRCLE,
AND OTHERS.

Dated August, 27th.

Despatched

Received

27TH AUGUST 1889, No. 7308.

Enclosures.

Primary School Examination.—Passing orders on certain points raised by the Assistant Inspector, Eighth Division, regarding the —.

1 / Encls to D.P.I.'s letter No. 5324/95

5 Edns

80

Current 1415/1894 + 50/1895 } From the D.P.I. Dt. 13 Dec! & 21 January

For orders.

The Director replies D. 90 dt 22 October 1894 No 709 in which he was asked to state his views on the question whether fees should be imposed on the pupil candidates at the Primary School Examination.

2. The first three paragraphs of his letter contain an accurate sketch of the history of that examination. Para 4 summarizes the inferences to be drawn from that sketch, viz! that "the fee ought not be re-imposed [on "[pupil candidates] so long as the Examina- "-tion retains the compulsory character "which was the reason for the levy of a "fee being waived." The Primary School Examination being the substitute for the old Fourth Standard Result Grant Examination, it is contended and with reason that it would not be fair to levy a fee from pupil candidates inasmuch as "the managers of results "schools have as good a right to have "their Fourth Standard pupils examined "for grant free of charge as to have "the pupils of all the other standards "examined free."

3 Para 6 of Mr. Duncan's letter contains his proposals for lessening the present high cost of the Primary School Examinations, proposals necessitated by his conclusion that Mr. Moore's recommendation to levy an admission fee from pupil candidates cannot be accepted.

Mr is very clearly shown by Mr Duncan that the Expenditure was limited by the Grant in the Estimates to Rs 15. 1. 6 [illegible] "a certain expenditure" has become one of the entire examination. also that fees did not [illegible] required from pupil candidates who attend only to the Standard Examinations

If however any of these pupil candidates want to enter the public service they may again have to be required to pay for the Certificates entitling them to do so.

JG. 21/2.

[illegible] 11/2/95

4. four proposals are specified:-

I. The first is that the examination should be made optional as it was originally which case Govt would be justified in imposing an admission fee on pupils who would however throw additional labour on the Inspecting officers, as it would be in order to re-institute a Fourth Standard Results grant examination+ at which ale pupils would have to appear who were not examined at the optional Primary School Examination. - Dr Duncan admits that the measure might be "thought fatal to uniformity of standard" for after primary instruction would then be tested partly by one examination & partly by another. He contends however that the lack of uniformity would not be more marked than it is under the present arrangements as inspecting officers are ex officio member of Primary Examination Boards, & as there is much variety in its status & attainments of the 29 existing boards. -

It is submitted however that the argument is rather a poor one; the lack of uniformity in the present arrangements is no reason for affording arrangements which would involve a change for the worse in that respect. - Besides which Dr Duncan passes over the great inconvenience & waste of labour which must necessarily be caused by the existence of two co-ordinate Examinations, instituted for the same purpose ~~through~~ (viz: the testing of after primary instruction), though having different consequences (viz: in one case merely securing the payment of results grants to school managers, in the other also qualifying successful candidates for admission to the public service). - For these reasons it is submitted that this proposal must be rejected.

Under consideration for the reasons given in the Note ✓ JG

+ It still survives for the purpose of examining girls & for boys in a few isolated cases. JG

II The second proposal is to raise the fee for private candidates from Rs 2 to Rs 2-8, & the fee in the case of Rs 1-8 in teacher candidates who have been attending Normal schools. Such teacher candidates have hitherto been admitted free as pupil candidates. The estimated fee-income from this increase is over Rs 3000; suffering the same number of such candidates appeared, the increase would be nearly Rs 3500; but the change in the fees would probably reduce the number of candidates.-

(as at the last examination)

approved JG

This proposal appears sensible enough, as these candidates need not appear for the examination unless they wish.

III. The third proposal is to cut down Examiners stipends, particularly those paid to Inspecting officers. This would probably possibly result in the appointment of examiners of an inferior class. The case of inspecting officers is however different. The duty of examining for Fourth Standard Results Grants legitimately belongs to them & they have no claim to additional remuneration for performing it - except that others than Fourth Standard pupils appear for the Primary School Examination. It is no part of their duty to examine each other pupils, who constitute over 16 per cent of the total number of candidates. Inspecting officers last year received fees amounting to Rs 3936 - of which sum they were according to this new only entitled to 16 per cent i.e. Rs 630. - This proposal thus involves a saving of Rs 3300 approximately. Dr Duncan however appears to intend to report separately on this matter "before the new [Primary School Examination] Boards are appointed in April next."

The principle is that this should be at the disposal of Govt JG

We must await this report before passing orders JG

4. to I

The fourth proposal is that the mere passing of the primary school examination should not be regarded as a qualification for admission to the public service unless the successful candidate has also obtained a pass certificate for the grant of which a fee of Rs 1-8 should be demanded from pupil candidates. - Teacher candidates & private candidates would obtain the certificate for nothing in virtue of the admission fees previously paid by them. - This proposal is an alternative to no. I which Dr. Duncan does not clearly say so. - Only one third of the pupil candidates passed & paid for the certificate, the income would average Rs 12,500. - The names of all successful candidates would as heretofore be published in the District Gazettes but such publication would only entitle the school managers to obtain proportionate results grants; successful candidates would only be admitted to Govt service if in possession of the pass certificate which is to contain a distinct enunciation of their qualification for Govt service. It is submitted that this is an excellent proposal, & may be accepted. - It will however be necessary to consider when the fee for this certificate is to be paid; presumably at any time after the examination. It would be hard to insist in its payment at once; many successful candidates might have no intention of entering Govt service at the time; later on, perhaps years after, under altered circumstances they might wish to do so; & the lapse of time might give rise to frauds. Besides which the income from these certificate fees would fluctuate very much from year to year. - This is however rather a matter of detail than of principle.

D
2.2

JD 5/2/95

Levying Fees from pupil candidates at the Primary School Examination

This proposal seems to me good in every way & should be adopted

I agree, except that I rather incline to fix the fee for the certificate at Re 1 only, instead of Rs 1½ -

There will be a difficulty as to the collection of these fees, I am afraid, as pointed out in the notes.

WH
11/2/95

Is there any reason why pupil candidates should get their certificates on easier terms than teacher candidates or private ones? If so, I agree as to their being only charged 1 Rupee for their certificates.

W
15 Feb

It seems to me that whatever fee is charged for the certificate it should be paid at the time - as otherwise there will be hardly any payments made, except at the moment when perhaps years after those who have passed will come up for a certificate - on pardoning the fee. In these cases I should charge a double fee. W

502—20-6-94.

From

I don't quite understand this note. The question is whether pupil candidates shd pay Re 1½ or Re 1 only for the examination but for a Certificate entitling them to enter the Public Service. I think such certificates would be fully worth the Re 1½. The sum does not seem to me too great, & the fact that it is the same as the fee levied from teacher candidates makes it desirable to fix an that amount.

As for the time when the fee shd be demanded I agree with H. E. that the demand shd be made at a fixed time, but I do not think it shd be levied at the time admission to the exam. is applied for. If it is, it will seem like a fee for the examination. Perhaps applications for Certificates might be received (with the fee) at any time within 6 months of the publication of the results of the exam. & the certificates might be issued at the end of that period. Dr. Duncan might be asked his opinion about this.

JS 19/2 WH 20/2/95

W
11 Mar

DEPARTMENT.

No.

Note. that the proposal of the D.P.I. was that private candidates should pay admission fees & Teacher candidates should pay neither admission fees nor certificate fees; but that they should bring upon the certificate at the payment they made a charge i.e. "admission fee + fee for grant of certificate" & admission fee for teacher candidates. D 22.2.95

Dated as above 189 ,

FOR ORDERS.

W/11 Mar
JS 6/3
JD 4/3/95

Resubmitted for the perusal of Hble Member's notes

1. with reference to H. E's remarks at
2 para submitted that the justification for demanding a higher fee from teacher & private candidates lies in the fact that the examination regarded as a means of testing education for results grants - is compulsory on pupil candidates who wish to earn Govt standard results grants for the managers of their schools, whereas teacher & private candidates appear for the examination merely for their own benefit. The extra fee in their case may therefore be regarded as a payment for the privilege of appearing at the examination; the State conserves itself for results grants, but does not recognise the same liability in the case of an examination for admission into the public service.

3. Orders are solicited as to whether anything should be said as to the time at which the certificate fee should be paid.

D
16.2.95

JS 19/2/95

Fees at the Primary School Examination.

H. M. & Co.

Recirculated with a brief note with reference to the remark of the Hon W. ~~Black~~ Grose

4/3/95 11/2/55

7/3/95

[G. 24] 100—20-12-94.

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Cuo 873 a
Cuo 875 a
& para 2 of order

Again G.O., dated 22 ~~December~~ October, 1894, No. 799 Educ.

Again Current G.O., dated 13 Dec. 1894, ~~No~~ 1415 from

Current No. 80 of 18 95, dated 21 Jan 27 from

D.P.I.

Current No. 261 of 18 95, dated 27 Feb 27 from

a 236

Order. 13 March 1895, No. 220.

In reply to the M.O. read above the D.P.I. submits proposals for reducing the present high cost of the Primary ~~School~~ Examination.

2. His first suggestion is that the examination should be made optional in which case Govt could equitably levy admission fees from pupil candidates & thus raise sufficient funds to reduce the net cost to a reasonable amount. This would involve the restoration of the obsolescent fourth Standard Results Grant examination & thus throw considerable additional labour on Inspecting officers who would be obliged to examine for results all pupils who did not choose to appear at the Primary School Examination. — Dr Duncan admits that this "might be thought fatal to uniformity of standard", but contends that the lack of uniformity would not be more marked than under existing arrangements. The Govt is however unable to attach such importance to

4.

argument; the ~~existence~~ want of uniformity in the present system is no reason for offering arrangements which would probably involve a change for the worse. Moreover it appears highly desirable to avoid the inconvenience & waste of labour which must necessarily be caused by the existence of two co-ordinate examinations, both ~~designed~~ calculated to test the standard of after primary instruction, ~~& carrying different consequences with it in one case from the other~~ & having different purposes & results pecuniary, ~~& in the other~~, though instituted with different objects viz: in the one case, merely to regulate the payment of results grants to schoolmasters, in the other to test the qualifications of candidates for admission into the public service. - Where one examination can serve both these purposes, it is a strong ground and suitable to establish two. - For these reasons the Govt concurs that Dr Duncan's first suggestion must be rejected

3. His second proposal is to raise from Rs 2 to Rs 2½ the admission-fee for private candidates, & levy a fee of Rs 1½ from teacher-candidates who have been attending vernacular schools. This measure commends itself to Govt & will be approved

4. The Director's third suggestion is that steps should be taken to reduce Examiners' stipends, particularly those paid to inspecting officers. ——

[G. 24] 100—20-12-94. DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 18 , No.

Again G.O., dated 18 , No.

Current No. of 18 , dated from

~~Current No.~~ of 18 , dated from

24

The consideration of this proposal will be deferred pending the receipt of the further report which the Director ~~calculates~~ promises to submit in connection with the appointment of the new Primary Examination boards.

5. The fourth proposal is that admission to the public service should be made conditional on the possession of a formal certificate that the applicant has passed the Primary School Examination, & that there should be a fee of Rs 1½ should be levied for the grant of such a certificate to a pupil candidate. Teacher-candidates & private candidates who will have to pay Rs 1½ & Rs 2½, respectively, for admission to the examination will receive pass-certificates without further payment.

Dr Duncan's letter shows very clearly that the examination has developed from what Mr Begg called "essentially a service examination" into an Educational exam^n, & that it is therefore unfair & ~~unreasonable~~ to ~~require~~ demand admission-fees from ~~candidates~~ pupil-candidates who appear solely for the purpose of securing Fourth Standard certificates

to their schoolmasters

cants. If however any of these pupil candidates work at the same time to qualify themselves for admission to the public service, they may equitable be required to pay for the certificates which evince their fitness. – The sum fixed – Rs 1½ – is the same as that levied as an admission fee from teacher candidates – and does not appear to Govt to be excessive. – Before carrying this proposal into effect it will however be necessary to decide within what period of time the fee for the grant of the certificate should be paid. It seems expedient to insist on its payment at the time admission to the examination is applied for, for this would make it in appearance an admission-fee. On the other hand to allow the grant of these certificates years after the examination hardly appears practicable. The Govt is inclined to think that successful candidates should be required to pay the fee within a fixed & limited period – of say, six months – from the date of the publication of the results of the examination. This is a point however, on which the Govt would desire to be placed in possession of the Director's views. He will accordingly be requested to report specially on the matter.

(Jas Peters)
D
12.3.95

12.3.95

The D.P.I. 1/3/95. Official 13/3

/ SC and 21/3/95

Fees at the Primary School Examination

E

C.

(From orders)

Vol 6

The Director asks for an immediate reply

y sent to Press.

for signature.

ed in print.

N G.O., No.
189 .

DATED

No.

LOSURES TO C. No.

BER OF GOVERNMENT

BER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH C. No.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

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

N.B.—
A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.