

REPORT OF  
THE STUDY GROUP ON  
SUPERVISION AND INSPECTION



**National Council of Educational Research and Training**

October 1969

Kartika 1891

© National Council of Educational Research and Training



Published at the Publication Unit, 9, Eastern Avenue, Maharani Bagh, New Delhi-14, by the Secretary, National Council of Educational Research and Training and Printed at Delhi Press, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi-55.

M. V. RAJAGOPAL  
*Chairman,*  
*Study Group on*  
*Supervision and Inspection*

Hyderabad  
October 27, 1969

Dear Dr. Mitra,

May I invite your kind attention to your D.O. Letter No. F-I-I/69-SG dated the 9th July, 1969, intimating the constitution of a Study Group by the Government of India to go into the practices leading to the involvement of educational staff in non-educational activities and to make a depth-study of supervision and inspection? I have great pleasure in sending you herewith the report of the Study Group. It is a matter for supreme satisfaction that the Study Group has been able to submit a unanimous report on the subject. Even though the time between the constitution of the Group and the target date by which it was asked to submit its report was rather short, I have nevertheless, reason to think that the Group has made a fairly satisfying study of the para-academic and non academic components in the present job-chart of Inspectors of Schools all over the country and also made some significant recommendations with regard to the lines along which the present job-chart could be revamped so as to enable the Inspectors of Schools to devote more time to the content of supervision and inspection. I must, however, point out that the limited time available for the Study Group has introduced certain limitations into its study. For instance, disputes between teachers and managements which had been given as one of the terms of reference to the Group as well as the content of supervision which was outside its terms of reference have not been dealt with in the report, though the Group has been greatly alive to the importance of both these issues and suggested the constitution of separate Groups to go into these matters in detail.

The Group also could not make a depth-study of supervision and inspection in any State or group of States but this was largely, if not wholly, compensated by the Conference of Inspecting Officers which the Group called at New Delhi from the 15th to 17th September, 1969. The Inspecting Officers

were drawn from the three broad levels existing in all the Education Directorates of the country viz., the primary level, the secondary level and the district level. The deliberations of this Conference as well as the replies to the questionnaires circulated earlier among the participants of the Conference, provided a valuable intra-structure to the report of the Group. The Group also felt that it could have undertaken with advantage a depth-study of a normal district in all its aspects including supervision and inspection and it has, therefore, recommended that even now such a study could be undertaken and published as a valuable supplement to this report.

Considering that the Group has successfully finished its report in a remarkably short space of time, it is evident that it is due to hard work put in by several individuals and to the cooperation extended to the Group by many institutions. It might be invidious to mention names but I cannot help singling out for mention Sri C. L. Sapra, Member-Secretary of the Group. From the day the Group was constituted to the time when the final report was adopted by the Group at Bangalore, Sri Sapra brought to bear on his duties not only a high sense of duty but a remarkable flair for thoroughness and perfection. He has worked exceedingly hard on this report and the Group wishes to place on record its deep sense of appreciation of his work. During the Conference of the Inspecting Officers, Kumari Sarla Jawa and Sri J. K. Gupta, Technical Assistants of the N.C.E.R.T. assisted the Group greatly by acting as rapporteurs for the various sessions of the Conference and providing detailed notes which proved so valuable in the compilation of the Group's report. The Group is also thankful to the Government of Andhra Pradesh, which provided secretarial assistance when the draft report was compiled at Hyderabad by the Chairman and Member-Secretary. For the Group's final session at Bangalore on the 25th and 26th October, 1969, when the draft report was finalised, the Government of Mysore extended the fullest courtesy and hospitality. The Group is particularly grateful to Sri K. R. Ramachandran, Acting Vice-Chancellor of the Bangalore University for having placed Carlton House (Vice-Chancellor's Lodge) with all its magnificent facilities at the disposal of the Group. The Group is also grateful to the State Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Kerala, Maharashtra, Mysore, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh for having readily responded to its request and deputed their Inspecting Officers for participation in the Conference held at New Delhi from the 15th to 17th of September, 1969. In conclusion, I wish to express my deep sense of gratitude as Chair-

man of the Group to the excellent cooperation extended to me by all the members of the Group and also to you and to your colleagues in the N.C.E.R.T. for having helped us in every manner possible to complete our task smoothly and successfully.

With personal regards,

Yours sincerely,  
M. V. RAJAGOPAL

Dr. Shib K. Mitra,  
Joint Director,  
National Council of Educational  
Research and Training,  
Aurobindo Marg,  
NEW DELHI 1-16.

# *C o n t e n t s*

| CHAPTER  | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| I <i>Introduction</i>                                    | 1           |
| II <i>Present Position of Supervision and Inspection</i> | 10          |
| III <i>Issues and Recommendations</i>                    | 26          |
| <i>Summary of Recommendations</i>                        | 50          |
| <i>Appendices</i>  | 61          |

## CHAPTER I

# Introduction

### **Appointment of the Study Group**

1.01 The Conference of Directors of Public Instruction/ Directors of Education in its meeting held at Bangalore from May 28-30, 1969, felt that improvement of the quality of supervision and inspection was an urgent need for introducing various reforms relating to the improvement of teaching methods, in-service programmes, institutional planning, school complexes, etc. It, therefore, recommended, *inter alia*, the setting up of a Study Group to undertake a study of the existing position and to suggest measures for improving supervision and inspection in the country. It was in pursuance of this recommendation that the Government of India, Ministry of Education & Youth Services constituted a Study Group in July 1969 under the auspices of the National Council of Educational Research and Training.

### **The Composition of the Study Group**

1.02 The Study Group consisted of the following members:

1. Shri M. V. Rajagopal,  
Joint Secretary,  
Department of Education,  
Government of Andhra Pradesh,  
Hyderabad. . . . . Chairman

2. Prof. B. Das,  
Director of Public Instruction,  
Government of Orissa,  
Bhubaneswar.
3. Dr. S. N. Mehrotra,  
Specialist,  
Asian Institute of Educational  
Planning & Administration,  
New Delhi.
4. Dr. (Smt.) Chitra Naik,  
Director,  
State Institute of Education &  
Joint Director of Education,  
Government of Maharashtra,  
Poona.
5. Dr. M. B. Buch,  
Head,  
Centre of Advanced Study in Education,  
Faculty of Education & Psychology,  
M. S. University of Baroda,  
Baroda.
6. Shri J. A. Ryan,  
Chief Educational Officer,  
Madras.
7. Shri A. P. Singh,  
District Education Officer,  
Bhagalpur (Bihar).
8. Shri C. L. Sapra,  
Reader,  
National Council of Educational  
Research and Training,  
New Delhi. . . . . Member-Secretary



## **Terms of Reference and Modus Operandi**

1.03 The terms of reference of the Group as intimated in the NCERT letter No. F.1-1/69-SG dated the 9th July, 1969 were as follows:

- (1) To study the present position of supervision and inspection in the country and to suggest measures for improvement;
- (2) To analyse the various practices leading to the involvement of educational staff in non-educational work such as enquiries, distribution of teachers' salaries, etc; and
- (3) To study the nature and magnitude of the disputes between teachers and managements and suggest measures for setting up suitable arrangements/machinery for dealing with the problem.

1.04 In its first meeting held in New Delhi on the 4th August, 1969, the Group felt that its terms of reference could be slightly modified. It was agreed that due to the limitation of time, the Group would not be in a position to do justice to the study of disputes between teachers and managements. Considering, however, its importance, it recommended that another independent Study Group be set up by the Government of India to examine the problem in depth.

1.05 Regarding the study of supervision and inspection and also the involvement of educational staff in non-educational work, the Group decided to take an educational district as the unit for study and confine it to the functionaries operating at three broad levels of administration in each district, namely Head of the Educational District Inspecting Officer responsible for the inspection and supervision of secondary schools (including primary teacher training institutions) and Inspecting Officer for primary and upper primary/middle schools.

1.06 The Group further decided that the scope of the study should be restricted to general education as distinguished from technical education, vocational education and special education at the school stage.

1.07 There are varying patterns of educational administration now obtaining in different States. There are States having democratic decentralisation, States having a large number of private schools or alternately a large number of Government schools, States having no democratic decentralisation or only partially so and also States having an almost equal proportion of private and Government schools. Keeping in view these different patterns, the Group selected the following States for special study:

Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Kerala, Maharashtra, Mysore, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh.

While selecting these States, care was taken to ensure that no region of India was left out entirely.

1.08 The Group thought that it should suggest a few patterns of reorganising supervision and inspection at the district level with financial implications worked out for each pattern. Some of the patterns developed by the Group are given at Appendices I-IV.

1.09 The Group agreed that it should concentrate only on those aspects of administration and organisation which at present are not conducive to more effective supervision and inspection of schools. At the same time, the Group felt that this should not preclude suggestions indicating broad guidelines for improving the content of educational supervision in schools.

1.10 The Group decided to convene a Conference of Inspecting Officers at the three broad levels already referred to and drawn from all the participating States cited above. It was also decided that the position paper on inspection and

supervision of schools in different States, already prepared by the Member-Secretary, be circulated to the Directors of Public Instruction/ Directors of Education of the participating States requesting them to have the write-up checked in respect of their States from the points of view of accuracy, completeness and upto-dateness of the material presented. The paper, duly checked by the Directorates of Public Instruction/Directorates of Education, is given at Appendix V.

1.11 The Group further decided that three separate questionnaires, one each for the three levels of inspecting officers, be prepared by the Member-Secretary and circulated to all the participating officers. The intention behind circulating these questionnaires was to enable the participants to make preliminary academic preparations before attending the Conference and to enable the members of the Study Group to make a study of the existing position of supervision and inspection in greater detail and also to attempt a comprehensive job analysis of inspecting officers at each level on the basis of the data furnished by them.

1.12 The Conference of Inspecting Officers representing the three tiers of supervision and inspection at the district level from the twelve States already mentioned was convened accordingly on Septemeber 15-17, 1969 at New Delhi. The list of participating officers is given at Appendix VI. The questionnaires referred to in the previous paragraph were mailed to them in advance (For questionnaires see Appendices VII — IX). The Conference made a significant contribution to the clarification of certain important issues.

1.13 The Group had two more meetings, one immediately after the Conference of Inspecting Officers on the 18th September 1969 at New Delhi and the other on 25th and 26th October 1969 at Bangalore.

### **Background and Nature of the Problem**

1.14 Inspection of schools was started in this country on the recommendation of the Wood's Despatch (1854). The

Despatch recommended opening of schools by private enterprise to supplement the governmental effort. The role of the inspector in those days was to visit the schools and recommend them for recognition to the Department of Education and also to regulate the working of the schools that were on the grant-in-aid list. Even today, the chief purpose of inspection in almost all the States, by and large, continues to be control and maintenance rather than improvement and development of schools. In the post-independence period, a number of factors such as large scale expansion of the number of educational institutions without corresponding increase in the number of inspectorial staff, introduction of democratic decentralisation in some of the major States and the consequential addition of a multiplicity of para-academic\* and non-academic\*\* functions to the traditional regulatory function of the inspecting officers has led to a further fall in the quality of inspection in our schools. Serious concern has been continuously expressed by the Committees and Commissions over the perfunctory character of school inspection during the last few decades. The Sadler Commission (1919) pointed out, "Inspection in most cases is hurried and lacking in the friendly suggestions as to methods of teaching and organisation which are the most valuable functions of school inspection" (Vol.II, p.32). Hartog Committee (1929) remarked, "We have referred many times to the absence of an adequate number of well-

'Para-academic' work includes personnel management, conducting enquiries, attending to assembly questions, meeting visitors, attending to quasi-judicial cases (applicable only to the district level inspecting officers), organising mid-day meals, organising enrolment and retention drives, calculating and disbursing grants-in-aid to private schools, disbursing teachers' salaries, collecting and processing educational statistics, preparing annual budgets, attending to audit objections, conduct of examinations including spot valuation, etc.

\*\* 'Non-academic' work includes not only developmental jobs such as family planning campaign, small savings scheme, etc. but also attending meetings of local bodies as well as occasional jobs like celebration of important days, procurement of paddy, distribution and recovery of loans, sale of lottery tickets, election work, receiving V.I.P.s., relief work, law and order duties, etc.

qualified and experienced inspectors and inspectresses, and to the waste and ineffectiveness in the system of education which we believe to be due in large part, to that inadequacy" (p.292). The Secondary Education Commission (1952-53) also expressed its dissatisfaction with the inspection system. Based on the evidence gathered by it the Commission remarked, "It was pointed out by several witnesses that inspections were perfunctory, that the time spent by the inspector at any particular place was insufficient, that the greater part of his time was taken up with routine work" (p.193). More recently, the National Commission on Education (1964-66), while analysing the reasons for the break-down of supervision programme in most States, stressed the need for introducing the new system of supervision in our schools. The Commission considered this as "one of the major programmes in the reform of school education" (p.264).

1.15 In the last decade, some sporadic attempts were made to change the system of inspection and improve its quality. Change in the nomenclature of the inspecting officers from Inspector of Schools to Education Officers in some States, the development of Evaluative Criteria and Evaluation Instruments for Inspection and Supervision of Primary and Secondary schools by the National Council of Educational Research and Training, separation of administration from supervision and inspection in some States like Andhra Pradesh and the starting of in-service education programmes for elementary school supervisors by the State Institutes of Education in different States after their establishment in 1964, are instances in point. But all these attempts had only marginal impact on the improvement of the quality of supervision and inspection.

1.16 Before we attempt to analyse the nature of the problem in the context of our terms of reference, it may be pertinent to define the concepts of 'inspection' and 'supervision', and to state the role of 'inspector' and 'supervisor'. The old concept of 'inspection', is to some extent authori-

tarian and rigid, with the element of professional guidance to teachers not significantly present. As against this, the modern concept of 'supervision' is more professionally oriented, democratic in its procedures and approach, dynamic, co-operative and scientific. The term 'supervision' connotes professional guidance to teachers by the Principal/Headmaster and/or senior teachers of a school, in addition to the external supervisors. This connotation of supervision is, however, hardly in vogue in our country. It is the inspecting officers who "supervise" classroom instruction because of their superior position in the administrative hierarchy. Their approach is, however, teacher-centred which does not help in the improvement of the teaching-learning process. The approach involves inspection, rating and indexing of teachers by the inspecting officers, though the method of rating is extremely subjective.

1.17 The role of the inspecting officer, as conceived in this country is, that during his inspection visit he has mainly to see that the school has the prescribed number of adequately qualified staff, the building is suitable and properly maintained, registers are properly kept, accounts are in order, departmental rules and regulations and the prescribed curricula and syllabi are followed both in letter and spirit, the grants are utilised properly by private schools and the rights of teachers are safeguarded. As stated earlier, the inspecting officer also makes classroom visits the purpose of which is to rate the teachers and not to provide any positive suggestions to improve classroom instruction.

1.18 On the other hand, the role of the modern supervisor is continuously to stimulate, co-ordinate and evaluate the efforts of teachers and students to improve the teaching-learning process. All this is done in a co-operative fashion. The supervisory role involves demonstration teaching, observation lessons, organisation of seminars/workshops, guidance in the preparation of institutional plans, etc.

1.19 The crux of the problem in our country is that with the rapid expansion of education, an inspecting officer has

a large number of schools to inspect, with the result that every year there is a backlog of inspection in most of the States. Besides, he is so much occupied with para-academic and non-academic work that he hardly gets time even for his traditional role as 'inspector'. But lack of time is not the only handicap; there is a general feeling that a good number of inspecting officers are not professionally well-equipped to perform their duties as supervisors. The main task before the Group was, therefore, to examine the present norms of inspection in the twelve States under study; to identify the para-academic and non-academic activities in which inspecting officers at each of the three levels are involved; to determine their workload in respect of academic and other activities so as to suggest ways and means for rationalising the total workload in such a way that more time becomes available to them for supervision and inspection; and finally to take stock of the existing position with regard to their recruitment and training procedures and make suitable recommendations in this regard.

## CHAPTER II

# Present Position of Supervision and Inspection

### **Organisational set-up**

2.01 Although the designations of the inspectorial staff at various levels vary from State to State (for designations see Appendix X), the organisational set-up in all the States is broadly identical. For purposes of administration and inspection, eight out of the twelve States (Kerala, Mysore, Bihar, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra) studied by the Group are divided into Divisions/Regions/Ranges/Circles.\* Each Division/Region/Range/Circle in these States is headed by a Divisional/Regional/Range Deputy Director of Public Instruction/Deputy Director of Education or a Circle Education Officer, as the case may be.

The organisational set-up in Tamil Nadu where Chief Educational Officers have been appointed, some in charge of more than one revenue district, also falls in line with the set-up in these States. The States of Andhra Pradesh, Assam and Gujarat have, however, no regional set-up. The unit of administration and inspection in these States is the district. Of the twelve States studied, the number of educational districts in nine States (Andhra Pradesh, Mysore,

\*The terms Division, Region, Range and Circle denote the same meaning and are used interchangeably.



Bihar, Assam, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and Maharashtra) is co-terminus with that of the revenue districts. In the remaining three States of Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Orissa, the number of educational districts is much larger than the number of revenue districts.

2.02 Irrespective of regional or district set-up, officers at these levels have supervision and inspection of schools as an integral part of their duties, though the quantum and degree of their direct responsibility in this regard vary from one State to another. For example, in most of the States, the District Educational Officers/District Inspectors of Schools have a direct responsibility for supervision and inspection of secondary schools while in a State like Andhra Pradesh, the District Educational Officer is not directly responsible for supervision and inspection of all the secondary schools which are headed by Gazetted Headmasters. These are required to supervise and inspect only those secondary schools which are headed by Gazetted Headmasters. These constitute about 5 per cent of the total number of secondary schools in the district. As contrasted with other States, the District Inspector of Schools in Orissa has responsibility for the supervision and inspection of middle schools and not secondary schools. In Uttar Pradesh, the District Inspector of Schools has to supervise and inspect intermediate colleges, in addition to high schools.

2.03 In the discharge of their supervision and inspection duties, inspecting officers at the divisional and district levels are assisted by a number of junior inspecting officers in all the States, their number varying from State to State.

2.04 For the inspection of girls' schools, a number of States have women inspecting officers either at the State level or at the divisional and district levels. The women inspecting officers belonging to senior cadres are assisted by junior inspecting officers who are designated as Deputy Inspectresses, Sub-Deputy Inspectresses and Assistant Inspectresses of Schools. In most of the States where the provision for

women inspecting officers exists, there is a combined cadre of male and female inspectorial staff. In some States like Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, there is a separate cadre of women inspecting officers. In almost all the States, women inspecting officers are mainly responsible for the supervision and inspection of girls' secondary schools.

2.05 In Orissa, Urdu primary schools are inspected by the Inspecting Maulavis. In Kerala, there are separate inspecting officers to supervise 'Muslim' Education — one in each revenue district; Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu have separate officers for the inspection of Anglo-Indian and Urdu medium institutions. Some States like Bihar and the Punjab have separate inspecting officers for physical education, operating at the district level.

2.06 In most of the States where democratic decentralisation has been introduced, the inspecting officers attached to the community development blocks have to work under dual control. For academic matters, they are under the control of the inspecting officer in charge of the district and for administrative matters, they are answerable to the Block Development Officer and/or to the elected Heads of Panchayat Raj institutions.

2.07 Inspecting officers at the divisional and district levels in all the States are assisted by ministerial staff in performing their administrative and financial duties. The ministerial staff includes superintendents, headclerks, assistants, upper division clerks and lower division clerks (in some States they are called senior clerks and junior clerks, or first division clerks and second division clerks), typists, stenographers, auditors, accountants, gazetted assistants and managers. Class IV employees include drivers, peons, attendants, watchmen and sweepers. The number of ministerial posts allocated to an inspecting officer at the divisional and district levels varies from State to State. In a State like Gujarat, no stenographer is provided to the District Educational Inspector. In quite a few States, no ministerial staff is

provided to the inspecting officers responsible for the inspection of primary and upper primary/middle schools. However, in some States like Rajasthan and Bihar where a clerk is provided by the Education Department for assisting the inspecting officer at the block level, his services are not exclusively available to the inspecting officer, so that on many occasions, the routine work has to be handled by the inspecting officer himself.

### **Recruitment, Selection and Promotion Procedures**

2.08 Inspecting officers are appointed from among the teachers and junior inspectorial staff by departmental promotion and also by direct recruitment. The quota for direct recruits, however, varies from 25 per cent in some States to 67 per cent in others.

2.09 Inspecting officers in all the States are usually required to possess at least a bachelor degree in arts, science or commerce and also a teaching diploma or degree (B.Ed/B.T./L.T.). In some States like Andhra Pradesh, a teaching degree is not prescribed as an essential qualification for direct recruits at the time of selection, but after selection they have to undergo a course in teacher training. At present, about 20-30 per cent primary school inspecting officers in the country are underqualified. Similarly, there are instances in many States of secondary school inspecting officers who possess only the first degree qualifications but are supervising teachers of secondary schools with post-graduate qualifications.

2.10 Vacancies of the posts of inspecting officers are advertised in local newspapers. Selections are made by the State Public Service Commissions and/or by the Divisional Selection Boards/District Selection Committees/Circle Selection Panels. Direct recruits are selected by these bodies through open competition, while departmental candidates are promoted with their concurrence. Inter-se seniority is the most important criterion for promotion of departmental candidates to higher posts in the inspectorate.

## **Training, Status and Service Conditions**

2.11 Programmes of pre-service training for directly recruited inspecting officers are organised by almost all the States. Inservice training programmes are absent in most of the States for secondary school inspecting officers. However, seminars/workshops/orientation courses are conducted from time to time for their benefit by the State Directorates of Education. In regard to primary school inspecting officers, more systematic programmes of inservice training are being organised by the State Institutes of Education in all the States.

2.12 District Education Officers/District Inspectors of Schools belong to Class I State service in some States, but in a large number of other States they are placed in Class II. The inspecting officers responsible for the inspection of elementary schools belong to Class III State service in almost all the States.

2.13 The salary scales of inspecting officers of different levels vary from State to State. A summary statement indicating the status and pay scale of each level of inspecting officers in different States is given at Appendix X.

2.14 Inspecting officers in all the States are entitled to travelling allowance for performing journeys on official duty. Some States have a system of giving fixed monthly T. A., while others pay on the basis of road mileage.

2.15 The area, the number of schools under the jurisdiction of an inspecting officer and the number of schools required to be inspected by him in a year vary from State to State. The total number of schools under the territorial jurisdiction of an inspecting officer is usually the same as the number of schools required to be inspected by him in a year, except in the case of inspecting officers in charge of districts. On an average, the number of primary and upper primary/middle schools which an elementary school inspecting officer has to inspect in a year ranges between 40 and 70 in most of

the States. In some States, the number of such schools to be inspected is sometimes 100 or more.

2.16 As regards the number of secondary schools under the jurisdiction of an inspecting officer and their annual coverage, the range is between 35 and 60 in a large number of State. In bigger districts of some States, the jurisdiction extends over as many as 188 secondary schools as in Gujarat and 275 as in Assam.

2.17 In some States, even though the number of schools required to be inspected is not very large, the schools are scattered over a vast area (particularly so in hilly terrain and desert areas), with the result that it becomes difficult for the inspecting officers to inspect even that small number. In compact areas, on the other hand, it is possible for the inspecting officers to cover a larger number of schools. According to the present procedures in some States, the number of schools to be covered by the inspecting officers may, therefore, be increased or decreased depending upon the area, location of schools, terrain and other similar considerations.

2.18 Inspecting officers are generally appointed in most States for specified areas and their number does not bear any relation to the number of pupils and teachers. However, in some States like Maharashtra, a post of Deputy Inspector of Schools is sanctioned for every 250 primary teachers. In Uttar Pradesh, an Associate Inspector is given when the number of secondary schools exceeds 50 in a district.

2.19 In States where the inspecting officers have to inspect a large number of schools, it is found that a good number of schools within their jurisdiction are not inspected for years together because of heavy administrative work and lack of transport facilities. The backlog of inspection varies from 15 to 40% in some States while in others, the targets are barely fulfilled on paper.

2.20 The District Education Officers/District Inspectors of Schools have to supervise the work of junior inspecting officers also; the number of junior inspecting officers (Deputy Inspectors of Schools, Sub-Deputy Inspectors of Schools, Assistant Educational Inspectors, Block Education Officers, Education Extension Officers, etc.) under the control of a District Education Officer/District Inspector of Schools varies from 20 in the Punjab to 40 in Maharashtra.

2.21 In almost all the States, the time that the inspecting officers have to devote to all their activities (regular as well as *ad hoc*) whether they perform them at office, school, home or elsewhere, is from 61 to 70 hours a week. The corresponding figure for the District Education Officers/District Inspectors of Schools is reported to be a little more than 70 hours.

### **Powers and Functions**

2.22 Regional and district inspecting officers in all the States have the power of appointing certain categories of teachers, sanctioning leave and awarding punishment to them, including dismissal from service. They are also empowered to transfer teachers from one Government school to another. Some financial powers are also delegated to them. The junior inspecting officers have practically no administrative or financial powers.

2.23 Apart from supervision and inspection of schools, the inspecting officers at all levels have also to perform a number of para-academic and non-academic duties. The Group made a comprehensive analysis of the duties and functions performed by the inspecting officers in the three-tier system of inspection and the apportionment of time between these duties. The findings are summarised below:

The time spent by the inspecting officers at various levels on supervisory and inspection functions on the one hand, and on para-academic and non-academic duties on the other, varies from State to State. For example, the lowest proportion of time spent on para-academic and non-

academic duties by primary school inspecting officers in Andhra Pradesh is 55% as against the highest proportion of 90% in Assam. The remaining States lie between these two extremes. In Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu, the time spent by primary school inspecting officers on para-academic and non-academic duties is as high as 80-85%.

As regards secondary school inspecting officers, the lowest proportion of time (about 30%) spent on para-academic and non-academic duties is in the State of Andhra Pradesh. This is due to the reform that the State Government recently introduced in their inspection system by appointing Gazetted Inspectors exclusively responsible for the supervision of secondary schools. On the other hand, the largest proportion of time spent on para-academic and non-academic duties is in Assam and Maharashtra (about 80-85%). In Gujarat, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh, the proportion of time spent on para-academic and non-academic duties is also quite substantial (about 70-75%). In the Punjab, the secondary school inspecting officers devote about 50% of their time to the performance of such functions.

The inspecting officers in/charge of regions and districts spend about 70-80% of their time on para-academic duties. In most of the States (Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Assam, Bihar, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat and Maharashtra), the corresponding proportion is about 60%. In Mysore, the District Education Officer spends the lowest proportion of time (about 40%) on such duties. A lot of time of the District Education Officers in the Punjab is spent on organising district tournaments and rallies.

When the total time spent on supervision and inspection is broken up into supervision and inspection, it is found that the ratio in almost all the States works out to 10:90.

The study further reveals that in States where democratic decentralisation has been introduced, primary school inspecting officers under the control of the block administration, spend a great deal of their time on non-academic activities; district level inspecting officers in States with an overwhelming majority of Government schools spend most of their time on duties connected with personnel management;

while those in States with a majority of privately managed schools, devote a substantial proportion of their time to the calculation and disbursement of grants-in-aid to those schools and in attending to teacher-management disputes.

### **Supervision and Inspection<sup>5</sup> Procedures and Practices**

2.24 In all the States, inspecting officers at all levels enter into correspondence with the Headmasters of primary and secondary schools before they visit the schools for annual inspection. Wherever the panel system of inspection for secondary schools is in vogue, the inspecting officers take steps to have the panels constituted well in advance of the actual inspection. Very few inspecting officers have reported that they make any academic preparation for the annual supervision and inspection.

2.25 There are variations in the number of inspection visits carried out in different States by primary school inspecting officers. They are required to inspect each school within their jurisdiction at least once a year for full inspection and in some States like, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan twice a year. The number of casual/surprise visits to be paid by them is one in almost all the States except in Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh where the number of such visits is two to three. In some States, the number of surprise visits is not fixed. In a State like Andhra Pradesh, primary school inspecting officers are expected to visit schools for follow-up at least once a year. No formal follow-up visits are, however, paid in the States of Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab and Orissa. Follow-up action on inspection report in these States is generally taken at the time of the next inspection.

2.26 As regards secondary schools, inspecting officers are required to pay casual/surprise visit to every school at least once a year in most of the States. In some States like Orissa, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh, the number of surprise visits is not fixed. In Kerala, secondary school inspecting officers are required to pay two casual visits in a year to



every high school. In almost all the States, secondary schools are to be inspected annually for one comprehensive inspection, though in some States full inspection is done every alternate year. Very few States have provision for formal follow-up visits by the secondary school inspecting officers.

2.27 The inspecting officers in charge of regions and districts are required to inspect a fixed percentage of primary and secondary schools under their jurisdiction every year. The percentage varies from State to State.

2.28 There is a large gap between the required and actual number of different types of visits paid by primary and secondary school inspecting officers and also by inspecting officers in charge of regions and districts.

2.29 Primary school inspecting officers in most of the States use proformas prescribed by the State Governments for inspection purposes. In some States like Assam, Bihar and Punjab, inspection reports are recorded on the inspection registers maintained by the schools.

2.30 For Secondary school inspection, all the States have prescribed proformas. A few States like Kerala and Mysore have brought out comprehensive inspection manuals/codes for the use and guidance of inspecting officers.

2.31 The inspection proformas include items such as qualifications and suitability of teaching staff, standard of instruction, subject charts, time-tables, health and recreation, discipline of pupils, condition of libraries and laboratories, state of school buildings and hostels, scale of fees, financial position of the institutions, constitution of managing bodies (for private aided schools only), registers of admission, tuition fees and accounts and correspondence files. Furthermore, the inspection reports are also accompanied by forms showing the number of pupils on roll and their attendance, examination results, etc.

2.32 Primary school inspecting officers send the inspection proformas to the Heads of schools one or two weeks in advance of the actual inspection in the States of Gujarat, Rajasthan, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Mysore. In Maharashtra, the proformas are sent one month in advance of the actual inspection. Assam, Bihar, Orissa, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh do not follow the practice of sending inspection proformas in advance to the Heads of primary schools. Statistical information furnished in the proformas is checked by the inspecting officers at the time of inspection. Some States follow the practice of sending their accounts clerks to the schools well in advance of the actual inspection so that they can check the records, etc., before the inspection starts.

2.33 Secondary school inspecting officers and inspecting officers in charge of regions and districts send inspection proformas to the Heads of schools at least one or two weeks in advance of the actual inspection.

2.34 In almost all the States, primary school inspecting officers are required to devote at least one day to the inspection of each school under their charge. In some States like Maharashtra, two single-teacher primary schools are to be inspected in a day. One to two days are prescribed for the inspection of an upper primary/middle school in all the States, while secondary school inspecting officers are required to devote two to three days in most States. However, in some States like Andhra Pradesh, secondary school inspecting officers have to devote three days to the inspection of a high school and four to five days to the inspection of a multipurpose/higher secondary school. In some other States like Gujarat and Maharashtra, enrolment in a school is taken as the basis for prescribing the number of days for its supervision and inspection. In both these States, one day is prescribed for the inspection of a primary school if the enrolment is upto 200, two days if it is between 200-400 and three days if it is more than 400. Again, in Maharashtra, one day is required to be devoted to the inspection of

a secondary school if the enrolment is upto 500, two days if it is upto 1,500 and three days if it is upto 2,000.

2.35 In most of the States, secondary school inspecting officers are expected to be on tour for at least 120 days in a year. The junior inspecting officers are to be out on tour for at least 150 days in a year. The maximum number of days for which inspecting officers at all levels in almost all the States are required to be on tour is 200. Inspecting officers at all levels have to be on tour either for supervision and inspection of schools or for other purposes like enquiries, enrolment drives, disbursement of teachers' salaries, seminars, meetings, examination work, tournaments, court cases (for district level inspecting officers only), etc.

2.36 In a large number of States, inspection is done by the primary school inspecting officers single-handed. The secondary school inspecting officers and inspecting officers in charge of regions and districts usually take the help of junior inspecting officers while they go for inspection of secondary schools. Some States have introduced the system of panel/team inspection. In Kerala, for instance, there is a team for the inspection of primary schools consisting of Assistant Educational Officer and two to four senior Heads of other primary schools. In some States like Mysore, one or two senior Headmasters are being associated on an experimental basis, to supervise the instruction in certain subjects in secondary schools. In Uttar Pradesh, there is a system of panel inspection for intermediate colleges. The panel consists of Principals of intermediate and/or degree colleges and subject specialists. The panels are constituted by the Director of Education in his capacity as ex-officio Chairman of the Board of High School and Intermediate Education, on the recommendations of the Regional Deputy Directors of Education. The entire cost of the panel inspection is met by the Board.

2.37 Before writing the inspection reports, the inspecting officers in a number of States follow the practice of holding

discussions with the teachers and Headmasters of the schools concerned. In those discussions, the problems faced by the school faculty and the programmes of the school are discussed in detail. The shortcomings of the school are also pointed out to the teachers and Headmaster in the course of the discussions. Besides, some of the more enlightened inspecting officers bring to the notice of the school faculty the innovations and tested good practices prevalent in some other schools.

2.38 Generally, three copies of the inspection report are prepared by the inspecting officers of which one is sent to the school concerned for compliance, another to the District Educational Officer/District Inspector of school or other senior officer concerned for information and review, while the third is retained in the office of the inspecting officer for follow-up and record.

2.39 The time within which inspection reports are sent by the primary school inspecting officers to the schools and their managements for compliance and to their higher officers for information and review, varies from State to State. In the States of Bihar and Punjab, inspection reports are recorded in the inspection book/register maintained by the school on the day of inspection, immediately after the inspection is concluded. In Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh also, inspection reports are written on the day of inspection. In Bihar, inspection reports are sent to the senior officers within a week, while in Assam, Rajasthan, Kerala, Tamil, Nadu, Gujarat and Maharashtra, primary school inspecting officers send inspection reports to the schools and their managements and also to senior officers within a fortnight of the inspection. In Orissa, they take less than a week to send inspection reports to the schools for compliance while the Deputy Inspectors of Schools take about a fortnight in doing so. In the Punjab, Block Education Officers submit the inspection reports to the concerned District Education Officers in regular monthly meetings. In Uttar Pradesh and Orissa also, inspection reports

are submitted to the higher Officers in about a month's time.

2.40 The Group examined some of the inspection reports. It was found that in some cases inspection notes recorded by the inspecting officers tended to be sketchy. A few examples of such inspection notes are as follows: "there is scope for improvement of reading", "home work not assigned regularly", "teaching of social studies not upto the mark", etc.

2.41 As stated earlier, some States have prescribed under their inspection rules a number of follow-up visits. But in actual practice, the follow-up action on inspection reports in almost all the States, is usually checked by the inspecting officers at the time of the next inspection. In Kerala, however, the inspecting officers keep a more constant touch with the schools in this regard. Cases of serious irregularities are reported by the inspecting officers to their higher authorities and also to the managing committees of private aided schools in some States. In such cases, accounts of the schools are got checked by special auditors.

2.42 Inspecting officers generally associate teacher training colleges/schools in their respective areas for the purpose of extension work in almost all the States. Extension activities conducted by the inspecting officers in co-operation with the teacher training institutions include seminars and workshops to improve the competence of teachers both in subject-content and the methodology of teaching various school subjects.

2.43 A careful examination of inspection proformas prescribed by the State Governments indicates that there is a strong element of subjectivity in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of schools by the inspecting officers. The Evaluative Criteria and the Evaluation Instruments for Inspection and Supervision of Primary and Secondary Schools developed by the National Council of Educational Research and Training are yet to be adopted/adapted in most of the States.

## **Expenditure on Direction and Inspection**

2.44 The expenditure on Direction and Inspection in the twelve States under study in the year 1963-64 is shown in Appendix XI. It will be seen that the proportion of expenditure on Direction and Inspection to the total educational expenditure ranges between 0.6 per cent in Assam to 3.0 per cent in Bihar. The States of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Mysore, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh spend about 2.0 to 2.8 per cent of their educational expenditure on Direction and Inspection, which conforms more or less to the all-India average of 2.2 per cent. The remaining States spend between 1 and 2 per cent of their educational expenditure on the management aspect of education.

2.45 It will be further seen from columns 6 and 7 of Appendix XI that the ratio between the proportion of expenditure on Direction and Inspection varies from State to State. It is not possible to analyse the data for the States of Assam and Panjab in this respect, because the expenditure on Direction as indicated for these two States includes expenditure on Inspection also. Of the other ten States, it will be seen that three States namely, Kerala, Mysore and Rajasthan spend more or less the same amount on Inspection as on Direction. The ratio between expenditure on Direction and Inspection in these States conforms to the all-India average of about 1:1. In Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh, the corresponding ratio is about 1:2, while in four other States (Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Madras and Orissa), the expenditure on Inspection is 3 to 4 times of the expenditure on Direction. Bihar is the only State where the expenditure on Inspection is as high as nine times of the expenditure on Direction.

## **Improvement of Supervision and Inspection— Some Reforms**

2.46 To improve the quality of supervision and inspection, a few States have introduced into their inspection systems some reforms, which need special mention. In Andhra Pradesh,

Gazetted Inspectors have been appointed who are exclusively responsible for the supervision and inspection of secondary schools. Incidental to this reform, educational regions have been abolished and the status of the District Educational officer has been raised to that of a Deputy Director of Public Instruction. District Educational Officers have been given more powers and made directly responsible to the Director of Public Instruction.

2.47 In Bihar, District Superintendents of Education have been appointed to assist District Education Officers, Zilla Parishads and Blocks in all administrative matters. These administrative officers are under the control of District Education Officers and each one of them is assisted by one or more Deputy Superintendents of Education. This reform is claimed to have relieved the inspecting officers of a good part of their administrative burden.

2.48 In Maharashtra, the Directorate of Education has proposed creation of new district supervisory units under its aegis so that, while the management of education will rest with the Zilla Parishads, supervision will become the responsibility of the State Government. The proposal has been accepted by the Government.

2.49 To improve the quality of subject supervision in secondary schools, 48 posts of subject inspectors were sanctioned in Kerala in 1964 for the three educational regions of Trivandrum, Ernakulam and Kozhikode. But this scheme has not been implemented so far. It, however, forms a part of the scheme of total reorganisation of the State Department of Education, which is presently under the consideration of the Government.

## CHAPTER III

# Issues and Recommendations

### **Organisational Set-up**

3.01 From the facts presented in Chapter II as well as in Appendix X, it may be observed that despite the broad identity of organisational patterns, there are wide variations in the States with regard to designations of inspecting officers at all levels, though the levels themselves can be broadly grouped under three categories, namely, those responsible for supervision and inspection at the primary school level; those discharging similar functions at the level of the secondary schools and finally Heads of districts in whom administrative as well as supervisory and inspectorial functions are combined. In regard to functions also, there are some significant variations among the officers functioning at the same level in various States. As pointed out in the previous Chapter, the District Inspector of Schools in Orissa supervises and inspects middle schools, whereas in most other States officers with similar designations are responsible for the supervision and inspection of secondary schools, including teacher training institutions. The Study Group observed during the Conference of Inspecting Officers (New Delhi, September 15-17, 1969) that these variations in designations and functions of inspecting officers in various States came in the way of a quick and clear understanding of the administrative structures in the States and, therefore, the need for a common terminology and more or less identical functions at each level was necessary. While the Group appreciates that drastic and imme-



diat changes may not be possible or even desirable in this regard, nevertheless it would like to emphasise that this may be kept in view as a long-range objective and steps towards this end taken whenever the States decide to reorganise or modify in future their educational administrative structures. For this purpose, the Group recommends for the consideration of the States the following designations:

*District Education Officer* : . . . . . *Head of the educational district*

*Deputy Education Officer* : . . . . . *Inspecting officer for secondary schools*

*Assistant Education Officer* : . . . . . *Inspecting officer for primary/higher primary/middle schools*

3.02 Arising out of the need for common designations and identical functions, is the necessity of having broadly comparable scales of pay and status of inspecting officers at each level in different States. As this recommendation has financial and administrative implications, the Group is of the view that the initiative in this regard should be left entirely to the individual States. The Group would, however, like to reiterate that it is a matter meriting early attention of the State Governments.

3.03 With regard to territorial jurisdiction, it has been pointed out in Chapter II that some States have a regional set-up while others have the revenue district or educational district set-up. Here again, the Group is of the view that a broadly identical pattern of territorial jurisdiction should eventually emerge in all the States, in the interest of inter-State comparisons and exchange of experience. The Group realises the difficulties in the way of any immediate change in this direction, but keeping in view the recommendations made by the National Education Commission (1964-66) and other distinguished bodies like the Planning Commission which have identified the revenue district as the unit of administration and planning, it seems desirable that educational administration should also fall in line with this

pattern. Another factor which has already led to the acceptance of the revenue district as the unit of educational administration in some States like Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra and Gujarat has been the emergence of bodies like the Zilla Parishads and Panchayat Samithies to whom statutory responsibilities in respect of primary education (in some States secondary education also) have been entrusted. It is likely that the Panchayat Raj pattern may be adopted by many more States in the coming years. Moreover, the truncated nature of an educational district within the revenue district reduces the authority of the District Educational Officer vis-a-vis his counterparts in other Departments and the Zilla Parishad functioning at the revenue district level. Taking all these considerations into account, the Group recommends the acceptance of the revenue district as the basis of educational planning and administration at least as the ultimate objective, if there are any difficulties in the way of its immediate implementation.

3.04 It may be recalled that quite a few States have the regional set-up as an intermediate level between the Directorates of Education and District Educational Offices. Here again, the Group appreciates that the regional set-up in all these States has a historical background, serving even at present some important functions. The Group is, therefore, reluctant to recommend the immediate reorganisation of this structure, though it is of the view that States where the regional set-up is at present functioning may usefully take up a critical review of its effectiveness, particularly with regard to the co-ordination of the working of District Educational Offices on the one hand, and relieving the State Directorates of Education of an appreciable burden of its administrative duties, on the other. If such a critical assessment convinces the States that the regional set-up is on balance, a superfluity which can be dispensed with, then the obvious course would be to recognise the revenue district as the unit of administration. A study of the experience of States like Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat in which the regional set-up has been done away with, may also prove useful in this regard.

3.05 A notable feature of the organisational set-up in some of the States is that they have an exclusive cadre of women inspecting officers for the supervision and inspection of girl's schools. In some States, a senior lady officer (normally of the rank of Deputy Director of Public Instruction) attached to the Directorate of Education, looks after girls' education. *As this practice has a direct relation to local sociological factors, the Group recommends the continuance of this pattern wherever it exists at present.*

### **Job Charts of Inspecting Officers**

3.06 It has already been observed that the duties now being discharged by the inspecting officers in different States, are a combination in various proportions of academic, para-academic and non-academic functions. While supervision and inspection constitute the pith and marrow of academic work and there is no doubt that such academic functions should continue to be discharged by the inspecting officers and perhaps a higher priority accorded to them in future, the Group is of the view that there is considerable scope to delegate or share para-academic and non-academic duties now performed by them with other functionaries belonging to the Education Department or to other Departments. While the Group has attempted the differentiation of academic, para-academic and non-academic functions from one another on a suggestive basis in Chapter II, it has no doubt that a final differentiation will be made by the individual States. *The Group recommends that after arriving at a final differentiation of these various duties, each State Government should actively take steps to provide the inspecting officers with the necessary assisting staff as well as other resources so that the time that the inspecting officers gain by such relief is devoted to the qualitative strengthening of supervision and inspection.*

3.07 One of the functions of inspecting officers, taking away at present a good deal of their time and energy, is the handling of teacher-management disputes. This problem is particularly prominent in those States where an overwhelm-

ing majority of schools is under private management. For example, in States like Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra, the number of man-hours spent by the district level inspecting officer in handling teacher-management disputes is of the order of 400 per annum, working out to a little more than an hour every day. The Group is of the view that this is a major problem in educational administration to-day and that its successful solution will go a long way to improve the academic aspect of the work not only of the inspecting officers but also of the teachers. Thus realising its importance, the Group recommends that the Government of India may set up a separate Study Group to undertake a depth study of the problem.

### **Norms for Supervision and Inspection**

3.08 From the facts presented in the previous Chapter, it may be observed that at present the workload of inspecting officers, whether at the primary or secondary level, is stated in most of the States in terms of the number of schools which they are expected to supervise and inspect. The Group is of the view that the term 'school' is a factor governed by so many variables that it does not give an exact picture of the inspecting officers' workload and to that extent it does not admit of easy comparison with the workloads of inspecting officers in other States. The Group, therefore, feels that the unit as distinguished from the school should form the basis for determining the supervision and inspection norms. The term unit, however, has to be carefully spelt out. For this purpose, the Group recommends that in regard to primary schools, a unit may be construed as a school with a pupil enrolment of about 120 and a teacher strength of about 3. The unit value of larger primary schools may, however, be raised by half a unit for every additional pupil enrolment of 80 and teacher strength of 2. In regard to secondary schools, the unit should connote a school with a pupil enrolment of about 500 and a teacher strength of about 20. While these are the basic considerations for determining the unit value of a school, the Group is aware of the fact that there are many other im-

portant variables including peculiarly local ones which would either enhance or minimise the unit value. For example, a single-teacher school with a pupil enrolment of about 50 and a teacher strength of 1 cannot have the same unit value as other schools. In such cases the unit value will have to count as half. Similarly, a school located in an agency area where the terrain is difficult and means of communications are undeveloped, the unit value of a school may be as high as 2 or 3 depending upon the facts of the individual case. The Group, therefore, recommends that the optimum workload of an inspecting officer either at the primary or secondary level should be determined by each State in terms of units rather than schools. This will have the advantage of making inter-State workloads at various levels comparable. Assuming that the normal number of school working days in a year is about 200 out of a total of 220 and that about 50 per cent of the inspecting officers' time viz., 100 days is spent on touring and performance of duties at headquarters, the time available exclusively for supervision and inspection will be about 100 days. On the basis of two days for one unit, the Group recommends that about 50 units be the normal workload of a primary school inspecting officer and at the rate of one unit for two days the norm for a secondary school inspecting officer may also be fixed at 50 units. The unit value of larger secondary schools may, however, be raised by half a unit for every additional pupil enrolment of 250 and teacher strength of 10. States may also examine whether the power of appointing inspectorial staff in accordance with the prescribed norms may be given to the Directors of Public Instruction without further reference to the Finance Department so long as they operate within the approved budget limits.

3.09 In view of the very large number of schools to be supervised and inspected, the utmost that any inspecting officer can be expected to do in the present circumstances is barely to finish the prescribed single inspection of each school allotted to him in a year. This naturally does not give him any scope to make some experiments in professionally more

up-to-date and challenging methods of supervision and inspection. The Group regards that such experiments are very essential to tone up the quality of supervision and inspection as otherwise the routine supervision and inspection may ultimately lead to a state of stagnation. In order to motivate the inspecting officers to undertake such challenging innovations, they will have to be given extra credit by way of unit value for undertaking such assignments out of the ordinary. *The Group, therefore, recommends that at the primary level each inspecting officer be persuaded to adopt at least 5 carefully chosen schools in his jurisdiction for the kind of intensive supervision and inspection contemplated here. Similarly, a secondary school inspecting officer may be advised to choose two or three schools for innovation and experimentation in the latest methods and techniques of supervision.*

3.10 As regards norms for districts level inspecting officers, the Group realises that it is not practicable to talk in terms of units at this level in view of the officers' heavy workload as well as its composite character. Nevertheless, the District Educational Officer, being the Academic Head and the Principal Executive Officer of the district, should supervise and inspect a minimum percentage of schools in his territorial jurisdiction. *The Group recommends that such officers should be required to inspect directly not less than 5 per cent of the secondary schools, including teacher training institutions and as many primary and upper primary/schools in the district as possible. The Group expects that such inspection by district Heads may also provide models of excellence to the junior inspecting officers under their control.*

### **Separation of Administration from Supervision and Inspection**

3.11 From what has been said so far it is fairly clear that inspecting officers at all levels perform functions of both administration and supervision and inspection. The administrative workload of inspecting officers at the district level is

significantly heavier than that of the junior inspecting officers. This has given rise to a great deal of thinking and discussion on the separation of administration from supervision and inspection, so that a greater part of the inspecting officers' time and energy could be devoted to the improvement of education, particularly the teaching-learning process in the class-room. The nearest if not exact analogy to this is the separation of the judiciary from the executive which has been brought about by many States in the realm of general administration in accordance with one of the Directive Principles of the Constitution. The urgency for such thinking has been provided by the fact that where a functionary combines in himself both administrative and academic functions, the administrative functions generally get priority over the academic ones for several reasons, chief of which are: (a) the educational administrator derives and fashions his image from the general administrator in other Departments like Revenue, Law and Order, etc., (b) the exercise of administrative power is more prestigious and is also a status symbol, (c) lapses in administration catch the immediate attention of the public, the Parliament/State Legislature and the higher authorities of the Government, and (d) academic functions pre-suppose certain scholarly attitudes and habits of study which are harder to attain. It may not be out of place to recall the recommendations made by the National Education Commission (1964-66) on this subject. The Commission suggested that District School Boards should be created and one of their functions should be to look after management and administration, leaving the District Educational Officer and his staff to concentrate on supervision and inspection. While the Commission emphasised the importance of these two wings working in close collaboration, it was, however, of the view that when differences arise, the last word shall lie either with the District Educational Officer or with the Director of Education. Such an arrangement, in the opinion of the Commission, would enable the District Educational Officer and his staff to concentrate on supervision and inspection i.e. on the improvement of instruction, guidance to teachers, organisation of in-service pro-

grammes and provision of extension services. As already pointed out in the previous Chapter, the State of Maharashtra has recently introduced a reform more or less on these lines. They have accepted the proposal to create district supervisory units in the State sector making the Zilla Parishads responsible for management and administration. Another State in which the separation of administration from supervision and inspection has been in existence for the last four years is Andhra Pradesh where the regional set-up was abolished in 1965 and officers of the rank of Deputy Directors of Public Instruction were appointed as District Educational Officers of educational districts coterminus with revenue districts, assisted by a team of Gazetted Inspectors at the rate of one each for every 40-50 secondary schools and a lady inspector meant exclusively for inspection of girls' schools. For primary education, the District Educational Officer is assisted by about 20 to 30 Deputy Inspectors in addition to Extension Officers attached to the Blocks. While no evaluative study has so far been made to determine the exact impact of this reform on the quality of supervision and inspection, nevertheless it has been claimed that it has brought about some beneficial results in the last few years with regard to the clearance of the backlog of inspections which existed before 1965. *The Group recommends that States interested in the separation of administration from supervision and inspection may get a fuller report of the new systems in Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh.*

3.12 In the Conference of the Inspecting Officers which the Group convened (New Delhi, September 15-17, 1969), some of the inspecting officers suggested that the separation of administration from supervision and inspection could be best achieved by appointing two District Educational Officers in each district, one for academic matters and the other for administration and that the senior of the two persons should be in over-all charge of the District Educational Office. While the Group welcomes this suggestion as an alternative method of achieving the principle of separating



administration from supervision and inspection, it is of the view that the appointment of two persons of approximately the same rank sharing academic and administrative duties between themselves, may lead to two water-tight compartments with not enough communication between or responsiveness to each other. In particular, the advice of the academic wing may go unheeded by the teachers. It was suggested by some of the inspecting officers that this danger could be averted to some extent by giving the Heads of supervisory wings certain powers like countersigning the confidential reports of teachers, recommending their transfers and promotions and finalising panels for promotions, starting new subjects in schools, strengthening of libraries and laboratories, and sanctioning recognition to private schools on their technical advice. *After due consideration of the importance and usefulness of all these precautions, the Group recommends that the district may be preferably headed by one single authority directly assisted by a team of subject specialists on the academic side and a Personal Assistant on the administrative and financial side. The Personal Assistant should be preferably drawn from the administrative ranks of the Education Department itself and not generalists like Deputy Collectors from the Revenue Department or Assistant Secretaries or Section Officers from the Secretariat. This, in the opinion of the Group, has greater possibilities of the system working more successfully in the interests of education at the district level.*

### **Democratic Decentralisation and its Impact**

3.13 The Report of the Balawantrai Mehta Committee (1957), proposed the experiment of democratic decentralisation and the transfer of the administration of elementary education to Panchayat Raj institutions, preferably at the block level. In pursuance of this recommendation some States like Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Bihar, Orissa, Assam, Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu introduced it either fully or on a restricted basis. In Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh even the control of secondary education was transferred to the Zilla Parishads, though in Maha-

ashtra it was qualified to be on an agency basis. The main purpose in associating local bodies with the administration of education at the school level was to stimulate local interest and participation in education, to secure a greater measure of local support in its maintenance and to achieve a more effective implementation of programmes like mid-day meals and supply of free books and uniforms to socially and economically backward children. It cannot be denied that from these points of view, the association of local bodies with education at the school level has been a change in the right direction. At the same time, it has had certain disadvantages also which it may not be prudent in the interest of education to ignore. First of all, the local bodies have not been provided with adequate financial resources of their own to meet the demands of qualitative education. Being elected bodies they have been unable to avoid a certain amount of political colouring being given to important aspects of administration like transfers, promotions and appointment of teachers which have persistently come to the notice of the Government. Indiscriminate transfers of teachers seem to be a particularly wide-spread defect in Panchayat Raj administration and has been a source of constant anxiety to Governments in almost all the States. So far as the Education Department is concerned, the crucial problem has been the discipline of teachers and their responsiveness to the suggestions and recommendations made by the inspecting officers of the Department for the qualitative improvement of education in schools under these local bodies. Another problem which has arisen in the wake of Panchayat Raj administration is the dual control under which officers of the Education Department have to function, particularly those posted to the Blocks and Zilla Parishads. These officers are made answerable to both the local body and the State Government in the discharge of their duties. The consequences of such a dual control have not always been in the best interests of education. Various suggestions have been made by expert bodies to grapple with this problem. For example, the National Education Commission (1964-66) recommended the constitution of

District School Boards to replace the present general purpose Zilla Parishads and Panchayat Samithis, so that a different kind of leadership may be secured for the development of education at the district level. While this suggestion is no doubt important and should be given due consideration by the State Governments (Orissa has already provided for the constitution of District School Boards to look after primary education in their latest enactment), it must nevertheless be admitted that the Panchayat Raj pattern of administration has already been adopted in quite a few States and the likelihood is that more States may adopt this pattern in the near future. It would, therefore, be desirable to accept the Panchayat Raj as the emerging pattern of district administration in the country and see how some of its obvious loopholes vis-a-vis educational administration can be identified and plugged. This may prove a more fruitful avenue of change rather than plead for their immediate replacement by District School Boards. The Group, however, feels that it is outside the purview of its terms of reference to go in detail into the measures that should be adopted to minimise the risks involved in the Panchayat Raj pattern to the development of education. The States will no doubt examine this problem and devise suitable measures for eliminating some of its defects. *The Group, however, recommends that the present dual Control over inspecting officers be modified so as to make the function of supervision and inspection the sole responsibility of the Education Department.*

### **Qualitative Improvement of Supervision and Inspection**

3.14 We have been so far discussing the improvement of supervision and inspection from the point of view of administrative structure, job-charts of inspecting officers and suitable norms for their workload. Besides these, there are a number of other satellite factors which, in the opinion of the Group, are no less important and deserve consideration by the State Governments in their endeavour to improve the quality of supervision and inspection. Some of these are discussed below:

### (a) Panel System of Inspection

3.15 With the exception of Uttar Pradesh and to some extent Mysore, none of the other States under study have any system of panel inspection. Even though the panel system in Uttar Pradesh operates in respect of intermediate colleges, the patterns and procedures followed by them could be usefully adopted by other States also in respect of panel inspections for high/higher secondary schools. In this connection, the Group, however, wishes to emphasise that the panel system of inspection is not by any means a substitute for the annual inspections. The panel inspections are intended to reinforce and enrich on a triennial or quinquennial basis the annual inspections by the secondary school inspecting officers. If the panels are properly constituted and a workable scheme drawn up for their smooth and successful functioning, the Group is of the view that a new dimension of major significance to the quality of supervision and inspection would have been added. As already pointed out, one good feature of the panel system in Uttar Pradesh is that the panels are constituted by the Director of Education who is the ex-officio Chairman of the Board of High School and Intermediate Education on the recommendations made by Regional Deputy Directors of Education. Each panel is a representative cross-section of lecturers from intermediate and degree colleges, experienced Headmasters and senior classroom teachers from high schools. The district inspector of schools is also a member of the panel. The entire cost of the panel inspection is met by the Board of High School and Intermediate Education. *Altogether the constitution of the panel in Uttar Pradesh appears to be a good model and the Group recommends that panels may be started in other States also subject to one minor modification which the Group would like to suggest, namely that the Headmaster of the local school be invariably co-opted as a member of the panel.* The Group is of the view that the association of the headmaster will be a very useful device in making the work of the panel more effective not only from the point of view of the immediate effectiveness of the supervision but also of the

follow-up which is so important if the schools are to derive the maximum benefit of the panel inspection. It need hardly be emphasised that the panels should not only be judiciously composed but that they should be drawn well in advance so that requisite preparation on the part of each member of the panel for the supervision can be adequately done. If it is not done in this manner, the central purpose of the panel system of supervision and inspection may well be defeated.

*(b) Subject Specialists*

3.16 At present, most of the inspecting officers at the secondary level happen to guide teachers even in subjects other than those in which they have specialised. It also happens, though the Group is not basing it on any special study made by it, that a large majority of the present secondary school inspecting officers are graduates in History, Economics or Political Science and therefore competent to give professional guidance only in Social Studies. There are also some who are specialists in English, though quite a few among them base their claim to specialisation in that language on having done it for their first degree as a compulsory subject and not as an optional subject studied in any depth. So far as Science and Mathematics specialists are concerned, there is an acute shortage of such inspecting officers in almost all the States. When it comes to women inspecting officers, the position is particularly alarming. Considering that there has been in recent times a great explosion of knowledge and that the scope and extent of the curriculum in almost every discipline has been considerably strengthened and extended, it is quite clear that people who are not specialists in such disciplines can hardly give the classroom teachers, particularly in the area of subject-matter competence, any useful guidance. The need, therefore, to strengthen the inspecting cadre with subject specialists cannot be overemphasised. The Group is at the same time aware of the practical difficulties in bringing about this reform immediately. *It, therefore, recommends that all the States of the Union may accept the need for subject*

specialists guiding the teachers in our schools in their respective specialisations as an objective to be achieved during the next 15 years. This means that, immediately, a phased programme of recruitment of subject specialists to the present cadre of inspecting officers at the secondary school level may be drawn up and successfully implemented, so as to achieve this objective preferably by 1985.

### (c) Strengthening of Follow-up

3.17 In view of the evidence placed before the Group as well as the forceful views expressed by the participants at the Conference of Inspecting Officers (New Delhi, September 15-17, 1969), the Group has come to the conclusion that while there is some pattern of annual inspection in all the States, what is universally lacking is the important element of follow-up. In a sense, the Group is not surprised by this situation because it feels, that with the present manpower resources available with the Departments of Education and the workload which each inspecting officer is carrying, it is physically impossible to find the extra time necessary to pay meaningful follow-up visits to schools already inspected. Even if some additional staff resources were provided exclusively for this purpose, it may not work out to more than one casual/surprise visit to each school. The Group is, however, of the view that a follow-up is a continuous and not an *ad hoc* process and unless a competent agency at the local level is identified for this purpose and entrusted with this responsibility, follow-up work in our schools may never come to be organised on an effective basis. The only such agent who can now be identified for the purpose is the Headmaster of the school. Both from the point of view of building up the image of the Headmaster and motivating him to play his supervisory role on a continuous basis, the Group recommends that on the occasion of every inspection either annual or panel, the Headmaster should be co-opted as an equal partner in so far as supervision is concerned. By such association the Headmaster not only attains a higher competence in the discharge of his supervisory role but would also be morally

*committed to the function of follow-up, in view of the fact he would have been himself a partner to the suggestions made by the inspecting officer or the panel. By way of one more argument in support of associating the Headmaster as an equal partner, the Group would like to add that he, as a prospective inspecting officer, would also get the invaluable opportunity of developing a special competence in this regard.*

*(d) Recruitment and Training.*

3.18 In the previous Chapter, we have already referred to the recruitment, selection and training procedures for inspecting officers now obtaining in various States. It may be observed from the information given there that patterns of recruitment vary particularly at the level of secondary school inspecting officers. While quite a few States have accepted the principle of direct recruitment as well as departmental promotion and also fixed proportions for each avenue, nevertheless, it is observed that there are significant variations in this regard. There are States which go in for as much as 67% open market recruitment whereas there are some where it is as low as 25%. The Group is of the view that there is need for a well-conceived scheme of direct recruitment at this crucial level. The purpose of direct recruitment at this level should be to attract young men and women with a first class academic record so that they could, after recruitment, be given not only the pedagogical training of B.Ed. level but also orientation in the first principles of educational administration. At the same time, the Group realises that direct recruitment to the cadre of secondary school inspecting officers should also be open to departmental candidates such as school teachers, Headmasters and primary school inspecting officers possessing the necessary qualifications for eligibility for direct recruitment. The pattern of recruitment for the open market candidates should be a fairly elaborate competitive examination followed by an interview by the Public Service Commission assisted by educational experts. A proportion as between direct and departmental recruitment should also

be prescribed. *The Group recommends that this system of recruitment to the level of secondary school inspecting officers be adopted by all the States and that a proportion of 60 to 40 as between direct recruits and departmental recruits may be considered for acceptance by the State Governments. So far as the primary school inspecting officers are concerned, the Group recommends that the recruitment to this cadre should be at the level of school teachers who should be promoted on the well-known principle of both merit and seniority.*

3.19 The next most important step is the provision of adequate training facilities for the inspecting officers. From the particulars already furnished in the previous Chapter, it strikes the Group that while there are some schemes handled by the State Institutes of Education for the in-service training of primary school inspecting officers, there are none whatsoever so far as inspecting officers at the secondary school level are concerned. In the opinion of the Group, this is a serious lacuna which needs to be remedied at the earliest. While the pedagogical training for the direct recruits will be provided by the Colleges of Education, institutional training both on the job and previous to it will have to be handled by an agency which is yet to be named in all the States. It is envisaged that the Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration currently developing an Indian programme which is expected to develop ultimately into the National Staff College of Educational Administration will be responsible for the training programmes in respect of personnel from and above the level of District Educational Officers. It is, therefore, necessary to establish in each State a similar staff training institution for educational administrators below the level of District Educational Officers. This could be established as a part of the State Institutes of Education or State Council of Educational Research & Training, as the case may be with the collaboration of well developed University Departments of Education in the various States. *The Group, therefore, recommends that immediate steps be taken by all the States*



to establish staff training institutions at the State level for training of educational administrators below the level of the District Educational Officers. At the same time, the Group further recommends that the present in-service training programmes of the State Institutes of Education for elementary school inspecting officers be critically reviewed in terms of content and duration, as it is felt that there is probably an element of inadequacy in respect of both these items in the present programmes.

(e) *Transport Facilities*

3.20 From the accounts presented by the participants at the Conference of Inspecting Officers (New Delhi, September 15-17, 1969), the picture that broadly emerges in regard to provision of transport facilities to inspecting officers is, that while elementary school inspecting officers are not provided with any such facilities in any State, the position varies in regard to inspecting officers at the secondary level. There is at least one State where no transport facility is provided even to the District Inspector of Schools whereas in one or two other States a number of senior inspecting officers have to share in pool a limited number of vehicles. There are, however, quite a good number of States where the district level inspecting officer is provided with transport, though even here the opinion was expressed that it is not adequate. In some States, it appears that the District Collectors frequently requisition the vehicles of the Education Department (along with other Departments) for various *ad hoc* purposes like procurement drives, State loan drives, small savings drives and visits of V.I.Ps., to mention only a few. This reduces the availability of transport facilities much further in a context which is already unsatisfactory enough. It does not require any elaborate argument on the part of the Group to convince the States that the provision of transport facilities particularly in a country like ours, where the means of public transport are not so well developed and many areas are isolated by hills, forests and streams, is highly essential. The easy accessibility of the school is a vital time-factor having an immediate impact on whatever norms of

work we develop for the supervisory and inspecting staff. *The Group, therefore, recommends that all the States may provide reasonable transport facilities to their secondary school inspecting officers, as this would undoubtedly contribute to a wider coverage of schools as well as better supervision and inspection. So far as elementary school inspecting officers are concerned, the Group realises that provision of transport facilities at Government cost is not possible in view of the large numbers involved. However, the Group feels that if some facilities could be provided to enable these officers also to move quickly from school to school, it would be in the best interests of supervision and inspection. The Group, therefore, recommends that a special provision be made for the sanction of loans in accordance with rules to elementary school inspecting officers, so that they could buy vehicles of their choice such as motor bicycles or scooters and thus help in a more effective coverage of schools than at present.*

*(f) Sanction of Loans for Purchase of Books*

3.21 Even though an examination of the content of supervision is outside the terms of reference of this Group, nevertheless, the Group feels that it is its bounden duty to point out that certain facilities necessary for the professional growth of inspecting officers at all levels should be provided. Recently, the Government of Andhra Pradesh have issued an order which sanctions loans to employees of the Education Department on the same pattern as loans for the purchase of houses, vehicles, etc., for buying books, especially those needed for professional advancement in their own special areas of study. The loan sanctioned by the Government of Andhra Pradesh is of the order of three months' salary of an officer not exceeding Rs. 1,200, recoverable in easy monthly instalments. *The Group is of the view that this is a very good step and recommends that this facility be provided in all the other States and that in the sanction of these loans some priority be given to the inspecting officers, particularly at the secondary school level.*

*(g) Strengthening of Inspectorates*

3.22 One of the main handicaps of the inspecting officers

in almost all the States in making the reports of their inspections to schools and their managements and to their higher officers readily available is the lack of adequate ministerial staff and facilities like the requisite number of typing machines. The Group recommends that this handicap needs to be remedied immediately as otherwise all the good work done by way of conscientious supervision runs to waste. The Group further recommends that the State Governments may lay down norms for the employment of additional staff of this kind in future. In the process of developing norms for this purpose, it is suggested that factors like the territorial extent of a district, the nature of its terrain, the pupil enrolment in the district, the teacher strength and the total expenditure on education in the district, be taken into account in addition to organisation and methods factors like workload, the number of currents received and similar other considerations. There are secondary school inspecting officers exclusively meant for supervision and inspection attached to the office of the District Educational Officer as, for instance, in Andhra Pradesh. In regard to such inspectors, the Group recommends that they should be provided with a minimum staff such as a clerk-cum-typist and a peon, so that they could handle their official correspondence speedily and also go on tours with the minimum manual assistance necessary for that purpose. So far as the elementary school inspectors are concerned, the Group suggests that they may also be provided with a minimum staff necessary for the efficient discharge of their functions.

#### (h) School Complex and Supervision

3.23 It may be recalled that while discussing the qualitative improvement of supervision and inspection at the level of secondary schools, we emphasised the role of panel inspections and subject specialists. Even though these programmes would be useful in the realm of elementary school supervision also, they do not appear to be practicable in view of the large number of schools involved and the considerable human resources required for implementing them. The Group, however, thinks that the idea of the School Com-

plex recommended by the National Education Commission (1964-66) as an effective element in achieving better standards of supervision at the level of elementary schools could be fully exploited. It recommends that as a first step, school complexes in the elementary sector may be organised and the functions of supervision carefully delegated to them to some extent. This will help the Department also, as its supervising and inspecting officers will be able to concentrate their attention on major essentials and to that extent the quality of their work is likely to improve. It must, however, be reiterated that the inspecting officers would still have the responsibility of guiding the complexes in such vital areas as bringing the teachers and Headmasters of the complexes together, co-ordinating and exchanging their resources both human and otherwise so as to bring about a significant improvement in the quality of classroom instruction.

(i) *Experimentation in Supervision and Inspection*

3.24 The need for experimentation to improve the quality of supervision and inspection hardly be overemphasized. Only pilot projects undertaken on an experimental basis at the district level will generate the necessary climate of change in the area of supervision and inspection. The Group, therefore, recommends that the States may set up Study Groups to consider the recommendations made in this report in the context of the prevailing structures and patterns of supervision and inspection and to develop well thought-out and properly designed experimental projects in this area. These projects may be tried out in at least one district in every State. The Group further recommends that the projects may be undertaken for a period of 3 to 5 years and the entire expenditure on this account should be borne by the Government of India.

(j) *Co-ordinating Agency for Supervision and Inspection*

3.25 In the past few years, a number of studies and programmes have been undertaken in different States to im-

prove the quality of supervision and inspection. It is envisaged that in the years to come, many new practices and innovations will be introduced in this field. The Group, however, notes with a sense of regret that at present there is no agency to co-ordinate the changes and developments that are taking place in supervision and inspection in the country. The Group strongly recommends that a Special Cell be established in the National Council of Educational Research and Training to compile and disseminate all the new ideas, practices and innovations in the field of supervision and inspection. Apart from this clearing house function, the Cell should also provide guidance and assistance to the State Governments in developing pilot projects in supervision and inspection and in the techniques of evaluating them. The Cell may keep close liaison with the Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration.

k) *Development of Evaluative Criteria and Evaluation Instruments for Supervision and Inspection*

3.26 It has already been stated in Chapter II that the Group examined inspection proformas prescribed by the different States and also some of the inspection reports written by the inspecting officers. The Group feels that the inspection proformas in most of the States need to be revised suitably so as to make inspection more objective. The Group recommends that to achieve this purpose, the present inspection proformas may either be revised in the light of *Evaluative Criteria and Evaluation Instruments for Inspection and Supervision of Primary and Secondary Schools*, developed by the National Council of Educational Research & Training or new *Evaluative Criteria and Evaluation Instruments* be developed by the State Institutes of Education. The Group further recommends that inspection reports written by the inspecting officers should be comprehensive enough to include a fund of information about the school, so that they could be used as instruments for institutional planning.

3.27 We have been so far discussing the structural changes and improved norms necessary for a more qualitative super-

vision and inspection. It would be observed that the Group has not gone in any detail into the question of the content of supervision and inspection, as that does not squarely fall within its terms of reference. Nevertheless, the Group is of the view that even after all the recommendations of this Group are implemented, it may not come to much if it is not followed by the improvement of the content of supervision, which it will be readily conceded, is the ultimate goal of all educational reorganisation. This is a very challenging and complicated subject which needs to be looked into by a body of experts. *The Group, therefore, recommends that the Government of India may consider the setting up of an independent Study Group to go into the question of improving the content of supervision, bearing in mind of course the recommendations of this Group in regard to the structural and other aspects of supervision and inspection.*

3.28 While the Group has been greatly helped in its tasks by the evidence collected from the questionnaires and also the discussions at the Conference of Inspecting Officers, it has nevertheless, felt handicapped to some extent by the lack of a study in depth of an average district in all its various aspects. The Group feels that even now such a study could be made as a valuable supplement to this report. *It, therefore, recommends that the study be entrusted to one or two of its members who are in a position to take it up. It further recommends that the study may be co-ordinated with another study of one of the districts of Orissa proposed to be made under the auspices of the Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration.*

### **Conclusion**

3.29 In conclusion, the Group wishes to emphasize once again the importance of the agencies for supervision and inspection in the total educational structure and it is only towards that end it has made all its recommendations. The Group is deeply convinced that this is one of the major issues in education, on the dynamic nature of which depends

the very quality of education at the school level. Commenting on this subject, the National Education Commission (1964-66) remarked that supervision is in a sense the backbone of educational improvement and that the only breakthrough in the present educational impasse is, therefore, a new system of supervision and inspection. The emphasis in the Draft Fourth Plan has also been shifted from physical expansion of education to its qualitative improvement. If qualitative improvement has got to be in terms of better instruction of which one of the most important ingredients is good supervision and inspection, the Group feels that ever-increasing attention has to be given by the State Governments to this important aspect of education. Over the years, the expenditure on educational administration (direction and inspection) which was about 5 per cent of the total expenditure on education in 1946-47, has shrunk to about 2 per cent. This is not a comforting trend because it means that while the number of schools, the teacher strength and pupil enrolment have been steadily expanding, the expenditure on direction and inspection has not kept pace with this expansion. *The Group strongly recommends that this trend be reversed and that supervision and inspection, particularly on the structural side, be greatly strengthened through more liberal allocations for direction and inspection.* The Group is sincerely of the view that this is the minimum objective to be achieved by the end of 1975 so that at least in the structural sense, Education Departments will have attained the take-off stage in their efforts to improve eventually the content of supervision and inspection.

M. V. Rajagopal  
B. Das  
S. N. Mehrotra  
Chitra Naik  
M. B. Buch  
J. A. Ryan  
A. P. Singh  
C. L. Sapra

## *Summary of Recommendations*

1. The variations in designations and functions of inspecting officers at all levels in different States come in the way of a quick and clear understanding of the administrative structures and, therefore, there is a need for a common terminology and more or less identical functions at each level. As a long-range objective, States may consider the following designations while reorganising or modifying in future their educational administrative structures:

*District Education Officer*: . . . . . *Head of the educational district*

*Deputy Education Officer*: . . . . . *Inspecting officer for secondary schools*

*Assistant Education Officer*: . . . . . *Inspecting officer for primary/higher primary/middle schools*

(pp. 26-27 : 3.01)

2. Arising out of the need for common designations and identical functions, is the necessity of having broadly comparable scales of pay and status of inspecting officers at each level in all the States. This matter merits early attention of the State Governments.

(p. 27 : 3.02)

3. At present, some States have a regional set-up while others have the revenue district or educational district set-up for purposes of educational administration. It is desirable that a broadly identical pattern of territorial jurisdiction should eventually emerge in all the States. In this connection, it may be pointed out that the Planning Commission has



identified the revenue district as the unit of administration and planning. Needless to say, educational administration has also to fall in line with this pattern. The need for having the revenue district as the unit for educational administration appears all the more necessary if the authority of the District Education Officer is to be kept at par with his counterparts in other Departments, functioning at the revenue district level.

(pp. 27-28 : 3.03)

4. The duties now being discharged by the inspecting officers in different States are a combination in various proportions of academic, para-academic and non-academic activities. Although supervision and inspection constitute the pith and marrow of academic work of inspecting officers, there is considerable scope to delegate or share para-academic and non-academic duties now being performed by them with other functionaries belonging to the Education Department or to other Departments. The State Governments may, therefore, take steps to provide the inspecting officers with the necessary assisting staff as well as other resources so as to enable them to devote more of their time to the qualitative strengthening of supervision and inspection.

(p. 29 : 3.06)

5. At present the workload of inspecting officers both at the primary and secondary level in most of the States, is stated in terms of the number of schools which they are expected to supervise and inspect. It is felt that the term 'school' is a factor governed by so many variables which does not admit of inter-State comparison of the workload of inspecting officers. It may, therefore, be advisable to take the *unit* as distinguished from the *school* to form the basis for determining the supervision and inspection norms. In regard to primary schools, a unit may be construed as a school with a pupil enrolment of about 120 and a teacher strength of 3. The unit value of larger primary schools may, however, be raised by half a unit for every additional pupil enrolment of 80 and teacher strength of 2. In regard to

secondary schools, the unit should connote a school with a pupil enrolment of about 500 and a teacher strength of about 20. The unit value of larger secondary schools may, however, be raised by half a unit for every additional pupil enrolment of 250 and teacher strength of 10. Assuming that the normal number of school working days in a year is about 200 out of a total of 220 and that about 50 per cent of the inspecting officers' time viz. 100 days is spent on touring and performance of duties at headquarters, the time available exclusively for supervision and inspection will be about 100 days. On the basis of two days for one unit, about 50 units should be the normal workload of a primary school inspecting officer and again at the rate of one unit for two days, the norm for a secondary school inspecting officer should also be fixed at 50 units.

While pupil enrolment and teacher strength are the basic considerations for determining the unit value of a school, there are many other important variables such as the type of school (single-teacher/multiple-teacher primary school), difficult terrain, etc. which would either enhance or minimise the unit value. Extra credit by way of unit value should also be given to the inspecting officers for undertaking challenging innovations in the area of supervision and inspection.

As regards norms for district level inspecting officers, it may not be practicable to talk in terms of units in view of their heavy workload and its composite character. It is, however, necessary for them as the Academic Heads of districts to supervise and inspect directly about 5 per cent of the secondary schools, (including teacher training institutions) and as many primary schools as possible, in their respective areas.

(pp. 30-32 : 3.08  
—3.10)

6. In the last few years, there has been a great deal of thinking on the separation of administration from supervision and inspection. The thinking has been generated by

the fact that where a functionary combines in himself both administrative and academic functions, the administrative functions generally get priority over the academic ones. While dealing with this subject, the National Education Commission (1964-66) suggested the creation of District School Boards, having one of their functions as management and administration of education at the school level and leaving the District Educational Officers and their staff to concentrate on supervision and inspection. In view of the emerging pattern of Panchayat Raj administration in most of the States, it does not seem desirable to replace it by the proposed District School Boards.

Another alternative method is to appoint two District Educational Officers in each district one responsible for academic matters and the other for administrative ones. While this method appears to be convincing to achieve the principle of separating administration from supervision and inspection, it has the danger of creating two water-tight compartments in educational administration at the district level, with not enough communication between the two District Educational Heads of approximately the same rank. Another danger inherent in this method is that the advice of the academic supervisors may go unheeded by the teachers. Keeping all this in view, it seems appropriate that the district may preferably be headed by one single authority, directly assisted by a team of subject specialists on the academic side, and a Personal Assistant drawn from the administrative ranks of the Education Department itself, on the administrative and financial side.

(pp. 32-35 : 3.11  
and 3.12)

In quite a few States, the administration of elementary education (in some States secondary education also) has been transferred to Panchayat Raj institutions under the scheme of democratic decentralisation, recommended by the Balwantrai Mehta Committee (1957). It cannot be denied that the association of local bodies with the administration

of education at the school level has helped in stimulating the local interest and participation in education, but at the same time it has led to certain difficulties which it may not be prudent in the interest of education to ignore. In particular, indiscriminate transfers of teachers has been a widespread difficulty in Panchayat Raj administration and a source of constant anxiety to Governments in almost all the States. So far as Education Department is concerned, the crucial problem has been the discipline of teachers and their responsiveness to the suggestions and recommendations made by the inspecting officers of the Department for the qualitative improvement of education in schools under these local bodies. Another problem which has arisen in the wake of Panchayat Raj administration is the dual control under which officers of the Education Department have to function, particularly those posted to the Blocks and Zilla Parishads. The consequences of such a dual control have not always been in the best interests of education. It will, therefore, be desirable that the present dual control over inspecting officers be modified so as to make the functions of supervision and inspection the sole responsibility of the Education Department.

(pp. 35-37 : 3.13)

8. At present, in very few States the system of panel inspection is in vogue. It may be emphasized that the panel inspection is not by any means a substitute for the annual inspections. It is intended to reinforce and enrich on a triennial or quinquennial basis, the annual inspections by the secondary school inspecting officers. If the panels are judiciously constituted and a workable scheme drawn up for their smooth and successful functioning, a new dimension of major significance to the quality of supervision and inspection would have been added. The panel system of inspection in Uttar Pradesh which is confined to intermediate colleges, has many good features. By far the most important feature is that the Board of High School and Intermediate Education which is responsible for the improvement of standards at the high school and intermediate

level in the State not only meets the entire cost of panel inspection, but also improves the curriculum and textbooks on the recommendations of the panels. The panel system of inspection in Uttar Pradesh, therefore, appears to be a good model and can be profitably adopted by other States also, subject to a minor modification, namely that the Headmaster of the local school be invariably co-opted as a member of the panel. The association of the Headmaster will be a very useful device not only from the point of view of the immediate effectiveness of supervision but also of the follow-up which is so important, if the school is to derive the maximum benefit of the panel system of inspection.

(pp. 38-39 : 3.15)

9. Most of the secondary school inspecting officers at present happen to guide teachers even in those subjects in which they themselves have not specialised. Considering that there has been in recent times a great explosion of knowledge and that the scope and extent of the curriculum in almost every discipline has been considerably strengthened and extended, it is quite clear that the inspecting officers who are not specialists in such disciplines can hardly give the classroom teacher, particularly in the area of subject-matter competence, any useful guidance. All the States may, therefore, accept the need for subject specialists guiding the teachers in our schools in their respective specialisations as a long-term objective to be achieved during the next 15 years.

(pp. 39-40 : 3.16)

10. Although quite a few States have accepted the principle of direct recruitment as well as departmental promotion to the cadre of inspecting officers and also fixed proportions for each avenue, nevertheless, it is observed that there are significant variations in this respect in different States. It is necessary that a well-conceived scheme of direct recruitment at this crucial level be formulated by all the State Governments. The purpose of direct recruitment at this level should be to attract young men and women with a

first class academic career, so that they could, after recruitment, be given not only the pedagogical training of B.Ed. level but also orientation in the first principles of educational administration. Needless to say, direct recruitment to the cadre of secondary school inspecting officers should also be open to the departmental candidates such as school teachers, Headmasters and primary school inspecting officers possessing the necessary qualifications for eligibility for direct recruitment. The pattern of recruitment for the open market candidates should be a fairly elaborate competitive examination followed by an interview by the Public Service Commission assisted by educational experts. A proportion of 60:40 as between direct recruits and departmental recruits may also be considered for acceptance by the State Governments. So far as primary school inspecting officers are concerned, the recruitment to this cadre should be at the level of school teachers who should be promoted on the well known principle of merit-cum-seniority.

(pp. 41-42 : 3.18)

11. At present, the State Institutes of Education are running programmes of in-service training for primary school inspecting officers. There are, however, no such programmes being conducted for the inspecting officers at the secondary school level. While the pedagogical training for direct recruits to the cadre of secondary school inspectors will be provided by the Colleges of Education, institutional training both on the job and previous to it will have to be handled by an agency which is yet to be named in all the States. It is envisaged that the Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration currently developing an Indian Programme which is expected to develop ultimately into the National College of Educational Administration, will be responsible for the training programmes in respect of personnel from and above the level of District Educational Officers. What is therefore, required is that each State should establish a similar staff training institution for educational administrators, below the level of District Educational Officers. This can be established as a part of State

Institute of Education or State Council of Educational Research and Training, as the case may be, with the collaboration of well-developed University Departments of Education. Besides, the present in-service training programmes of the State Institutes of Education for elementary school supervisors should also be critically reviewed in terms of content and duration.

(pp. 42-43 : 3.19)

12. While pre-service and in-service training programmes for inspecting officers are important for their professional growth, the possession of books pertaining to their own subject areas of study by them is equally essential for increasing their professional competence. For this purpose, the State Governments may sanction loans to the employees of the Education Department in general, and to the inspecting officers in particular, in order to enable them to purchase books of their choice. It may be mentioned here that such a scheme has already been approved by the Government of Andhra Pradesh, under which the employees of the Education Department are sanctioned loans equivalent to their three months' salary or an amount not exceeding Rs. 1,200, recoverable in easy monthly instalments.

(p. 44 : 3.21)

13. Only a few States provide at present transport facilities to their inspecting officers. It need hardly be emphasized that the provision of transport facilities particularly in a country like ours, where the means of public transport are not so well developed and where many areas are isolated by hills, forests and streams, is highly essential. The easy accessibility of the school is a vital time-factor having an immediate impact on whatever norms of work we develop for the supervisory and inspecting staff. It is, therefore, necessary for all the State Governments to provide reasonable transport facilities to their secondary school inspecting officers. This will undoubtedly contribute to a wider coverage of schools as well as better supervision and inspection. So far as primary school inspecting officers are concerned, it

will be helpful if loans are sanctioned to them in accordance with rules, so that they could buy vehicles of their choice such as motor-cycles or scooters and thus achieve a more effective coverage of schools than at present.

(pp. 43-44 : 3.20)

14. The ministerial staff and other facilities like the typing machines provided to the inspecting staff in almost all the States are woefully inadequate. The inspecting officers, therefore, cannot make inspection reports readily available to the schools and their managements and also to their higher officers. There is a need to lay down norms for providing ministerial staff and other facilities of this kind to the inspecting officers. The norms may be developed keeping in view factors like the territorial extent of a district, the nature of its terrain, the pupil enrolment, the teacher strength and the total expenditure on education in the district, in addition to Organisation and Methods factors like the workload, the number of currents received and similar other considerations. The inspecting officers at the primary and secondary school level should also be provided with a minimum staff such as a clerk-cum-typist and a peon.

(pp. 44-45 : 3.22)

15. The idea of school complex as recommended by the National Education Commission (1964-66) should be fully exploited to achieve better standards of supervision at the elementary school level. With the introduction of school complexes, although the inspecting officers will be relieved of much of their inspection and supervisory burden so as to concentrate their attention on major essentials, nevertheless, they will have the responsibility of guiding the complexes in such vital areas as bringing the teachers and Headmasters of the complexes together, co-ordinating and exchanging their resources both human and otherwise so as to bring about a significant improvement in the classroom instruction.

(pp. 45-46 : 3.23)

16. To improve the quality of supervision and inspection.



the need for experimentation can be hardly over-emphasized. The States may set up Study Groups to consider the recommendations made in this report, keeping in view the local conditions, and to develop well thought-out and properly designed pilot projects in supervision and inspection, to be tried out in at least one district in every State. The duration of these projects should be extended over a period of 3 to 5 years and the entire expenditure on this account be borne by the Government of India.

(p. 46 : 3.24)

17. A number of changes and developments are taking place at present in the field of supervision and inspection in different States. It is, however, disheartening to note that so far no agency has been set up to coordinate, compile and disseminate these changes and developments for the benefit of inspecting officers throughout the country. There is an urgent need to establish a Cell in the National Council of Educational Research and Training to undertake this function. Apart from this clearing house function, the Cell should also provide guidance and assistance to the State Government in developing pilot projects in supervision and inspection and in the techniques of evaluating them. The Cell should keep close liaison with the Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration.

(pp. 46-47 : 3.25)

18. The inspection proformas prescribed by different States leave much to be desired. The proformas in most of the States do not permit objective and comprehensive inspection and supervision of schools. The inspection notes recorded by the inspecting officers in quite a few cases are also sketchy. In order to make inspection and supervision more objective and comprehensive, it is necessary that the State Governments may either revise their inspection proformas in the light of Evaluative Criteria and Evaluation Instruments for Inspection and Supervision of Primary and Secondary Schools developed by the National Council of Educational Research and Train-

ing or the State Institutes of Education may develop their own Evaluative Criteria and Evaluation Instruments for this purpose. It is also necessary that the inspection reports written by the inspecting officers should be comprehensive enough, so that they could be used as instruments for institutional planning.

(p.47 : 3.26)

19. Over the years, the expenditure on educational administration (direction and inspection) which was about 5% of the total expenditure on education in 1946-47, has declined to about 2%. This is not a comforting trend because it means that while the number of schools, teacher strength and pupil enrolment have been steadily expanding, the expenditure on direction and inspection has not kept pace with this expansion. This trend needs to be reversed by strengthening supervision and inspection, particularly on the structural side through more liberal allocations in all the States. This is the minimum objective to be achieved by the end of 1975, so that at least in the structural sense, Education Departments will have attained the take-off stage in their efforts to improve eventually the content of supervision and inspection.

(pp. 48-49 : 3.29)

## *APPENDICES*



## APPENDIX I

### *A Suggested Pattern of Reorganising Inspection and Supervision of Schools in Bihar*

The District Education Officer in Bihar is the Chief Inspecting and Supervisory Officer for boys' elementary and secondary schools, including teacher training schools in the District. He is assisted by a Sub-Divisional Education Officer in the inspection of secondary schools and Deputy Inspector of Schools and Sub-Inspectors of Schools/Block Education Extension Officers in the inspection of elementary schools.

The Assistant Education Officer assists the District Education Officer in the implementation of school feeding programme in different elementary schools of the District.

The inspection of girls' elementary and secondary schools is performed by the District Inspectress of Schools assisted by Deputy Inspectress of Schools posted at the Sub-Divisional headquarters, excepting the headquarters of the Sadar Sub-Division.

Basic schools are inspected and supervised by the Deputy Superintendent of Basic Education. The District Education Officer is assisted by Deputy Superintendent of Physical Education in all activities pertaining to Physical Education in the District.

The District Superintendent of Education with the help of a few Deputy Superintendents of Education performs the duties of the management of elementary schools in the rural areas and assists Zilla Parishads and Prakhanda Panchayat Samities in managing the schools under them. He makes payment of salaries to all elementary school teachers in the rural areas through the block authorities, gets the school buildings constructed and repaired and supplies all equipment and teaching appliances as well as books to the libraries.

The inspecting officers from District Education Officer at the District Level to Block Education Extension Officer at the Block Level are over-loaded with both types of work—educational and non-educational. The District Educational Officer disburses grant-in-aid to the secondary schools, draws and disburses scholarships to high/higher secondary school students, makes enquiries of different types, gets the managing committees formed in each secondary school according to the Act passed by the Legislature, disposes of complaints,

holds seminars and conferences, attends meetings of different Committees convened by the District Magistrate as well as Adhyaksh, Zilla Parishad, runs school feeding programme and performs several types of non-educational work, in addition to the legitimate functions of supervision and inspection.

The Block Education Extension Officers posted in the blocks have to prepare salary bills of primary school teachers and also bills of feeding centres, maintain service books of teachers, prepare pension papers of retired teachers, check up 1st April statements of secondary schools, collect statistics for annual returns and periodical reports, distribute furniture, equipment and books to primary schools and more than that they have to be at the disposal of Block Development Officers for collection of rent, realisation of loan, procurement of paddy, holding of panchayat elections, arranging relief work during flood and drought and for several other such activities.

These non-educational functions are so numerous that the Officer hardly gets time to attend to the legitimate work of supervision and inspection.

For improving supervision, the non-educational workload of inspecting officers must be curtailed, if not scrapped altogether and the number of inspecting officers should be increased according to the norms fixed by the competent authority. In the State of Bihar, the following norms have been prescribed :

- a) To supervise 30 secondary schools (including teacher training schools)—  
1 Officer of Class II Bihar Education Service (Upper Div.)
- b) To supervise 30 basic schools—  
1 Officer of Subordinate Education Service (Upper Div.)
- c) To supervise 40 middle schools—  
1 Officer of Subordinate Education Service (Upper Div.)
- d) To supervise 50 primary schools—1 Officer of Subordinate Education Service (Lower Div.).

Before working out the optimum number of inspecting officers for effective supervision of schools, the statistics of schools, teachers and enrolment may be taken into consideration. For convenience, the figures of Bhagalpur District as on 31.3.1969 are given below:

|                   | <i>No. of Schools</i> | <i>Enrolment</i> | <i>No. of Teacher</i> |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Secondary Schools | 127                   | 29,685           | 1,303                 |
| Middle Schools    | 297                   | 60,131           | 1,557                 |
| Basic Schools     | 30                    | 5,764            | 234                   |
| Primary Schools   | 1,878                 | 1,35,212         | 3,425                 |

On the basis of the prescribed norms the number of inspecting officers required for the effective supervision of elementary and secondary schools in Bhagalpur District will be as follows :

|                   | <i>No. of Schools</i> | <i>Norm</i>    | <i>No. of Officers required</i> |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| Secondary Schools | 127                   | 30 per Officer | 4                               |
| Middle Schools    | 297                   | 40 per Officer | 7                               |
| Basic Schools     | 30                    | 30 per Officer | 1                               |
| Primary Schools   | 1,878                 | 50 per Officer | 38                              |

Thus the additional requirements of inspecting officers for supervising different types of schools are as under :

|                   | <i>Total No. of Officers required</i> | <i>Existing No. of Officers</i> | <i>Additional requirements</i> |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Secondary Schools | 4                                     | 2                               | 2                              |
| Middle Schools    | 7                                     | 5                               | 2                              |
| Basic Schools     | 1                                     | 1                               | 0                              |
| Primary Schools   | 38                                    | 29                              | 9                              |

Let us now discuss the supervision of secondary schools first. For effective supervision, the following two problems must be dealt with before we project the requirements of the contemplated staff of the District Education Officer at the District level. The two problems are :

(i) The District Education Officer apart from the supervision and personnel administration has to deal with suits in law courts arising from the disputes between teachers and the managements of aided secondary schools. He has to make enquiries into the public complaint as well. He has to disburse grant-in-aid to the schools and take care of audit and accounts as well as of the budget. He has to plan opening of new schools, collect statistics and submit periodical reports and returns.

Further, it may be mentioned that at present the number of non-Government secondary schools in the State is about 2,400 and it is becoming difficult for the Secondary Education Board to cope with the disposal of disputes between teachers and the managements. It is now being contemplated to delegate some powers regarding disposal of such disputes at the District Level. If

this idea is translated into action, the workload of the District Education Officer will become still heavier.

At present, a large amount is allotted to the private schools in the form of grant-in-aid on different heads. This amount is disbursed by the District Education Officer to the schools, but whether the amount is properly utilised for the purpose it is sanctioned, is never checked. The result is misappropriation and sometimes defalcation of the public money. To ensure proper utilisation of the amount of grant-in aid, provision of audit at the District Level is necessary. Should this measure be adopted, it will add to the burden of the District Education Officer.

In the circumstances stated above, it will be necessary for the Government to create a few more posts of Officers of Bihar Education Service Class II so as to strengthen the office of the District Education Officer and relieve him of the non-educational work. If this is done, he would have more time to devote to the supervision of schools.

(ii) In the curriculum of secondary and higher secondary schools, various new subjects have been introduced. The District Education Officer alone cannot do full justice in guiding and supervising the teaching of all those subjects. As in a training college the Principal is assisted by different subject masters to keep the quality of teaching high, the District Education Officer should also be assisted by a number of Subject Specialists to make the supervision and guidance more real and effective.

The first problem as mentioned above will be solved if the two Officers that are required in addition to the existing ones, are appointed and attached to the office of the District Education Officer and entrusted with the following responsibilities.

- (a) General administration, enquiries regarding disputes, complaints, litigation, formation of managing committees, recognition of schools, etc.
- (b) Distribution of grants-in-aid, scholarships, disposal of audit and accounts cases, preparation of budget, planning, collection of statistics, returns and reports, triple-benefit scheme and any other financial matter.

The solution of the second problem lies in the appointment of Subject Specialists. At present, there are various subjects in the curriculum of Secondary Education, but it will not be possible to appoint Specialists in each subject immediately. To start with, Subject Specialists in Language, Science and Mathematics and Humanities may be appointed. After the lapse of a few years, appointment of Specialists in other subjects may be made, depending upon the experience gained and the resources available.

For the District of Bhagalpur, the following additional staff will be required for the effective supervision of schools:



*Secondary Schools :*

2 Assistant Education Officers in Bihar Education Service Class II Scale -Rs.325-30-505-EB-30-805-EB-30-985 (Maximum Rs. 925/-)

3 Subject Specialists in Bihar Education Service Class II Scale-Rs 325-30-505-EB-30-805-EB 30-985 (Maximum Rs.925/-)

To assist the academic staff, ministerial staff will also be required. Each Academic Officer will need assistance of a steno-typist. For dealing with audit cases, two more assistants will have to be added to the existing staff strength. At present, there are seven assistants in Lower Division and one in Upper Division. If the ministerial staff is augmented as proposed above, there will be altogether 15 assistants, 3 Upper Division and 12 Lower Division. Out of twelve in the Lower Division, 5 will be steno-typists. Thus additional posts to be created in the ministerial staff will be as follows:

2 Ministerial Officers in Upper Division-Class II

Scale - Rs. 150-5-180 -EB-5-200

5 Steno-typists in Lower Division

Scale - Rs. 105-3-123-EB3-129-3-145-EB-3-155

with an allowance of Rs. 45/- per month

*Elementary Schools :*

2 Deputy Inspectors of Schools in Subordinate Education Service (Upper Div.)  
Scale - Rs. 230-13-308 -EB-13-360-15-450

4 Ministerial Officers (in Lower Division)  
Scale - Rs. 105-3-123-EB-3-129-3-145-EB-3-155

2 Orderly Peons - Scale Rs. 70- $\frac{1}{2}$ -80

9 Block Education Extension Officers in Subordinate Education Service (L.D.)  
Scale Rs. 160-7-202-EB-7-244-9-280-(Minimum Rs.188)

9 Orderly Peons - Scale Rs. 70- $\frac{1}{2}$ -80

The annual cost on the additional inspecting staff of secondary schools of Bhagalpur District will be as under:

|   | 1st year<br>(Rs.) | 2nd year<br>(Rs.) | 3rd year<br>(Rs.) |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 5 Bihar Education Service Class II        | 19,500            | 21,300            | 23,100            |
| 2 Upper Division Assistants               | 3,600             | 3,720             | 3,840             |
| 5 Steno-Typists Lower Division Assistants | 6,300             | 6,480             | 6,660             |
| Allowance to Officers                     | 7,200             | 7,200             | 7,200             |

|                                    |        |        |        |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Allowance to 7 Assistants          | 6,804  | 7,140  | 7,140  |
| Steno Allowance to 5 Steno-Typists | 2,700  | 2,700  | 2,700  |
|                                    | 46,104 | 48,540 | 50,640 |

The annual cost on the additional inspecting staff of elementary schools of Bhagalpur District will be as follows :

|  | <i>1st year</i> | <i>2nd year</i> | <i>3rd year</i> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|  | (Rs.)           | (Rs.)           | (Rs.)           |
| 2 Officers in Subordinate Education Service Upper Division | 5,520           | 5,832           | 6,141           |
| Ministerial Officers in Lower Division                     | 5,040           | 5,184           | 5,328           |
| 9 Officers in Subordinate Education Service, Lower Div.    | 20,304          | 21,060          | 21,816          |
| 11 Orderly Peons— (one with each Officer)                  | 9,240           | 9,306           | 9,372           |
| Allowance to 2 Officers @ Rs. 120/- p.m.                   | 2,880           | 2,880           | 2,880           |
| Allowance to 9 Officers @ Rs. 95 - p.m.                    | 10,260          | 10,260          | 10,260          |
| Allowance to 4 Assistants @ Rs. 81 - p.m.                  | 3,888           | 3,888           | 3,888           |
| Allowance to 11 Peons @ Rs. 55/- p.m.                      | 7,260           | 7,260           | 7,260           |
|  | 64,392          | 65,670          | 66,948          |

Thus the additional annual cost on the supervision of secondary and elementary schools of Bhagalpur District will be :

|            | <i>1st year</i> | <i>2nd year</i> | <i>3rd year</i> |
|------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|            | (Rs.)           | (Rs.)           | (Rs.)           |
| Secondary  | 46,104          | 48,540          | 50,640          |
| Elementary | 64,392          | 65,670          | 66,948          |
|            | 1,10,496        | 1,14,210        | 1,17,588        |

There are seventeen districts in Bihar. On the basis of the number of secondary and elementary schools, seven districts are recognised as

major districts. The number of secondary and elementary schools in these districts in 1966 was as follows :

|             | <i>Secondary Schools</i> | <i>Middle Schools</i> | <i>Primary Schools</i> |
|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Patna       | 168                      | 466                   | 2,239                  |
| Gaya        | 167                      | 486                   | 3,605                  |
| Sahabad     | 175                      | 478                   | 3,123                  |
| Saran       | 150                      | 373                   | 3,172                  |
| Muzaffarpur | 157                      | 551                   | 3,085                  |
| Darbhanga   | 186                      | 514                   | 3,540                  |
| Monghyr     | 152                      | 485                   | 2,671                  |

Of these major districts, Darbhanga having the largest population in Bihar, may be taken as the sample for calculation of cost.

According to the norms already mentioned, the Officers required for inspection of secondary and elementary schools in Darbhanga District will be as follows :

|           | <i>No. of Schools</i> | <i>Norm per Officer</i> | <i>Total No. of Officers required</i> | <i>Existing strength</i> | <i>Additional requirements</i> |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Secondary | 186                   | 30                      | 6                                     | 3                        | 3                              |
| Middle    | 514                   | 40                      | 13                                    | 8                        | 5                              |
| Primary   | 3,540                 | 50                      | 71                                    | 60                       | 11                             |
| Basic     | 60                    | 30                      | 2                                     | 2                        | 0                              |

Thus the additional staff requirements with different pay scales for the supervision of secondary schools in Darbhanga district will be as under:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 3 Assistant Education Officers in Bihar Education Service (Class II) | Scale Rs. 325-30-505-EB-30-805-EB-30-985 (Maximum Rs.925/-) |
| 3 Subject Specialists in Bihar Education Service (Class II)          | Scale Rs. 325-30-505-EB 30-805-EB-30-985 (Max. Rs. 925/-)   |
| 6 Steno-Typists in Ministerial Service Lower Division                | Scale Rs. 105-3-123-EB-3-129-3-145-EB-3-155                 |
| 2 Ministerial Service (Upper Div.)                                   | Scale Rs.150-5-180-EB-5-200                                 |

The annual additional cost on the supervision of secondary schools in Darbhanga District will be as follows:

|  | <i>Ist year</i> | <i>2nd year</i> | <i>3rd year</i> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|  | (Rs.)           | (Rs.)           | (Rs.)           |
| 6 Officers in Bihar Education Service Class II | 23,400          | 25,560          | 27,720          |
| 6 Steno-Typists                                | 7,560           | 7,776           | 7,992           |
| 2 Ministerial Officers in Upper Division       | 3,600           | 3,720           | 3,840           |
| Allowance to 6 Officers                        | 8,640           | 8,640           | 8,640           |
| Steno Allowance to 6 Steno-Typists             | 3,240           | 3,240           | 3,240           |
| Allowance to 2 Upper Div. Assistants           | 1,944           | 2,280           | 2,280           |
| Cost of Living Allowance to 6 Steno-Typists    | 5,832           | 5,832           | 5,832           |
|  | <u>54,216</u>   | <u>57,048</u>   | <u>59,544</u>   |

The annual additional cost on the supervision of elementary schools in Darbhanga District will be as follows:

|  | <i>Ist year</i> | <i>2nd year</i> | <i>3rd year</i> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|  | (Rs.)           | (Rs.)           | (Rs.)           |
| 5 Dy. Inspectors of Schools in Subordinate Education Service in Upper Division           | 13,800          | 14,580          | 15,360          |
| 11 Block Education Extension Officers in Subordinate Education Service in Lower Division | 24,816          | 25,740          | 26,664          |
| 10 Ministerial Officers in Lower Division  | 12,600          | 12,960          | 13,320          |
| 16 Orderly Peons   | 13,440          | 13,536          | 13,632          |
| Allowance to 5 Officers @ Rs. 120/- p.m.   | 7,200           | 7,200           | 7,200           |
| Allowance to 11 Officers @ Rs. 95/- p.m.   | 12,540          | 12,540          | 12,540          |
| Allowance to 10 Assistants @ Rs. 81/- p.m.   | 9,720           | 9,720           | 9,720           |
| Allowance to 16 Peons @ Rs. 55/- p.m.  | 10,560          | 10,560          | 10,560          |
|  | <u>1,04,676</u> | <u>1,06,836</u> | <u>1,08,996</u> |

Thus the total additional cost on the supervision of secondary and elementary schools in Darbhanga District will be as under:

|                   | <i>Ist year</i><br>(Rs.) | <i>2nd year</i><br>(Rs.) | <i>3rd year</i><br>(Rs.) |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Secondary</i>  | 54,216                   | 57,048                   | 59,544                   |
| <i>Elementary</i> | 1,04,676                 | 1,06,836                 | 1,08,996                 |
|                   | <u>1,58,892</u>          | <u>1,63,884</u>          | <u>1,68,540</u>          |

On the basis of the above calculations, the total additional cost for the whole State will be as follows:

*Secondary*

|                      |                 |                 |                 |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 7 Major Districts    | 3,79,512        | 3,99,336        | 4,16,808        |
| 10 Smaller Districts | 4,61,040        | 4,85,400        | 5,06,400        |
|                      | <u>8,40,552</u> | <u>8,84,736</u> | <u>9,23,208</u> |

*Elementary*

|                      | <i>Ist year</i>  | <i>2nd year</i>  | <i>3rd year</i>  |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 7 Major Districts    | 7,32,732         | 7,47,852         | 7,62,972         |
| 10 Smaller Districts | 6,43,920         | 6,56,700         | 6,69,480         |
|                      | <u>13,76,652</u> | <u>14,04,552</u> | <u>14,32,452</u> |

Total Additional Cost on the Supervision of Secondary and Elementary Schools in the State of Bihar

|           |           |           |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 22,17,174 | 22,89,288 | 23,55,660 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|

The total estimated cost for improvement of supervision and inspection of secondary and elementary schools as shown above, is a small amount in proportion to the huge expenditure spent on Elementary and Secondary Education in Bihar State. This scheme is, therefore, worth implementing with immediate effect.

## APPENDIX II

### *A Suggested Pattern of Reorganising Inspection and Supervision of Schools in Orissa*

At present there are 40 Educational Districts in Orissa, each headed by a District Inspector of Schools. Here, Jagatsinghpur Educational District has been taken for the study of the existing pattern of inspection and supervision in the State and for working out the implications of its suggested reorganisation.

As the Educational Districts have recently been reorganised, they are not fully staffed. Proposals have already been sent to Government for placing two U.D. clerks, three L.D. clerks and two peons at the disposal of the District Inspector of Schools, Jagatsinghpur. There is a likelihood of providing one junior statistical assistant and one auditor in due course.

The number of institutions, teachers and junior inspecting officers under the control of District Inspector of Schools, Jagatsinghpur is as follows:

|                                  |           |       |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| No. of recognised M.E. Schools   | (Private) | 178   |
| No. of Senior Basic Schools      |           | 1     |
| No. of Junior Basic Schools      |           | 9     |
| No. of Sebashrams                |           | 2     |
| No. of Maktabas                  |           | 25    |
| No. of Tols                      |           | 12    |
| No. of Primary Schools           |           | 844   |
| No. of Primary School Teachers   |           | 1,650 |
| No. of Blocks                    |           | 8     |
| No. of Sub-Inspectors of Schools |           | 15    |

Apart from the supervision of all the above schools and teachers and junior inspecting officers, the District Inspector of Schools is also required to visit aided high schools at the instance of the Circle Inspector of Schools. Besides, he has to arrange interviews with the Managing Committees of those schools and also meet the parents and guardians of the pupils, etc. The powers of District Inspector of Schools have been detailed in Article 65 of the Orissa Education Code. With the existing staff and facilities, it is not possible for the District Inspector of Schools to carry on his work efficiently. It is, therefore, suggested that assistance of an Administrative Officer, an Accounts

Officer and at least three Subject Experts for supervision of subjects like English, Science and Mathematics, be provided to the District Inspector of Schools. The financial implications of the scheme will be as under :

| <i>Posts</i>   | <i>Pay (Rs.)</i> | <i>D.A. (Rs.)</i> |
|--|------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Administrative Officer in the rank of Sub-Deputy Collector (Scale Rs. 230-500). He will be subordinate to the District Inspector of Schools who is in Class II rank (Scale Rs. 260-780/-) | 2,760.00         | 1,416.00          |
| 2. Accounts Officer in the rank of Junior Finance Service (Sub-Deputy) in the scale of Rs.230-500/-.   | 2,760.00         | 1,416.00          |
| 3. Three Subject Experts in the scale of Rs. 230-540/-   | 8,280.00         | 4,248.00          |
| <b>TOTAL Rs.</b>   | <b>13,800.00</b> | <b>7,080.00</b>   |

Besides above, there should be the following addition to the staff of the District Inspector of Schools :

|   | <i>Pay (Rs.)</i> | <i>D.A. (Rs.)</i> |
|---|------------------|-------------------|
| (a) One Junior Statistical Assistant  | 1,500.00         | 960.00            |
| One Auditor   | 2,220.00         | 1,200.00          |
| Three Clerks  | 2,880.00         | 2,556.00          |
| Six Peons to assist the Accounts Officer, Administrative Officer, Auditor and Three Subject Experts | 3,240.00         | 3,960.00          |
| Driver  | 960.00           | 582.00            |
| <b>Total (Pay &amp; D.A.)</b>   | <b>10,800.00</b> | <b>9,488.00</b>   |
| (b) T.A.  | 20,000.00        | } 42,000.00       |
| Contingencies   | 5,000.00         |                   |
| Vehicle   | 17,000.00        |                   |

The financial implications for each of the 40 Educational Districts will be Rs. 83,168.00. For 40 Educational Districts, the total estimated expenditure will amount to Rs. 33,26,720.00.

It is not possible for the District Inspector of Schools under the existing circumstances to inspect each M.E. school at least once in three years, and each primary school at least once in five years. Besides, if he is away from headquarters for at least 15 days in a month, the backlog of the office work is so much that he is unable to complete it within the remaining fifteen days. As such, the District Inspector of Schools is neither able to inspect the schools efficiently nor attend to his office work satisfactorily. The suggested reorganisation is necessary for the efficient discharge of duties by the District Inspector of Schools. In view of the stringent financial position of the State, the Government of India may bear the additional expenditure on the proposed reorganisation.

### APPENDIX III

## *A Suggested Pattern of Reorganising Inspection and Supervision of Schools in Tamil Nadu*

The State of Tamil Nadu is divided into 46 Educational Districts and each Educational District is under the administrative control of a District Educational Officer. Girls' high schools and teacher training schools are under the Inspectresses of Girls' Schools and there are six such Officers in the State. All the Anglo-Indian schools are under the control of the Inspector of Anglo-Indian schools.

Primary and upper primary schools are inspected by the Deputy Inspectors of Schools and about 50 schools are allotted to each Inspecting Officer. Where the number of primary schools is large, Junior Deputy Inspectors are posted to assist the Deputy Inspectors of Schools. There is democratic decentralisation of Educational Administration at the primary level and 374 Panchayat Unions have been formed covering the rural areas. The elected Panchayat Union Councils with the Commissioners as the Principal Executive Authorities administer the Panchayat Union schools. The Commissioners are assisted by Education Extension officers. The Deputy Inspectors' Range and the Block Development Areas or Panchayat Union Areas are almost coterminous. In the urban areas, primary and upper primary schools are administered by Municipalities and the Municipal Corporation. Private aided schools are largely managed by Missionaries and Registered Societies and in a few cases by Teacher-Managers.

In addition to the supervisory functions, the responsibilities of the Deputy Inspector of Schools include assessment and disbursement of grants to aided primary and upper primary schools, collection of statistics, supervision of mid-day meal centres, inspection of commercial schools, adult literacy centres and public libraries. Many of them are also Chief Superintendents of the various Government Examinations conducted by the Department. They are the ex-officio Presidents of Teachers' Associations in their respective areas. They also assist the District Educational Officers in the inspection of secondary and teacher training schools.

Apart from the administrative and supervisory functions, the District Educational Officers pay monthly teaching grant to aided elementary and secondary schools; compile the District Level statistics; maintain the District accounts; accord recognition to all primary and upper primary schools and serve as



members of the District Development Councils and other Advisory Bodies. Those at the headquarters of the Revenue Districts are also the Secretaries of the Local Library Authorities and Secretaries of the District Sports Councils, both of which are autonomous organisations.

The administrative control of the Chief Educational Officers extends over one or two Revenue Districts and they supervise the work of 4 to 8 District Educational Officers and Inspectresses of Girls' Schools. The major responsibility of the Chief Educational Officers is to administer the large number of District Board high schools taken over by the Government in each Revenue District. They perform all managerial duties, including recruitment and posting of different categories of staff and payment of salary and allowances. They are also the Appellate Authorities for non-graduate teachers against the orders passed by managements. They are the co-ordinating authorities of all educational work in a Revenue District and all correspondence from the District Educational Officers to the Director of School Education is routed through them. School inspection work to be done by them is specifically confined to one or two high schools in each area where the Heads of institutions are of the rank of a District Educational Officer.

Thus the inspecting officers at the three levels, the Revenue District Level (Chief Educational Officer), the Educational District Level (District Educational Officer) and the Panchayat Union Level (Deputy Inspectors of Schools) are charged with administrative, supervisory, inspection and financial responsibilities.

No feature of the State Educational Administration is so conspicuous at present as the wide gap between the heavy responsibilities which are placed upon the District Level Officers of the Department on the one hand, and the inadequacy of his staff both in number and quality, on the other.

In the last few years, the Department of Education has expanded very considerably in response to the expansion of educational facilities at the school stage. Unfortunately, there has been no adequate delegation of authority to the District Educational Officers.

Improvement of education largely depends upon strengthening the District Offices of the Department and making them service and supervision centres of all schools.

Given below is a suggestive reorganised pattern of improving inspection and supervision of schools in the Chingleput Revenue District of Tamil Nadu, retaining the present Administrative Set-up to a great extent and introducing a few changes therein.

Chingleput District surrounds the Urban District of Madras with an area of 5,048 sq.kms. and a population of about 22 lakhs according to 1961 Census.

The Chief Educational Officer, Madras has administrative control over this District also which consists of four Educational Districts of Saidapet, Chingleput, Kancheepuram and Tiruvellore, each under a District Educational Officer and an Inspectress of Girls' Schools with headquarters at Chingleput. The jurisdiction of the Inspectress of Girls' Schools extends over Girls' high schools in this and the two nearby Districts. Not more than 35 to 40 high schools and teacher training schools are assigned to each of these Officers. The District Educational Officers are assisted by Deputy Inspectors of Schools for supervision of primary and upper primary schools. There are at present 29 Deputy Inspectors of Schools and 10 Junior Deputy Inspectors of Schools in these four Educational Districts. The Revenue District has 27 Panchayat Union Blocks and the Deputy Inspectors' Ranges are generally co-extensive.

The present Administrative Set-up of the Education Department at the Revenue District Level is shown in the chart on the next page. The number of institutions, etc. in the Chingleput District is given in the table on page 78.

In the proposed reorganised set-up, the Chief Educational Officer as the authority, having District-wide jurisdiction and administrative control over the different inspecting officers, shall be the authority in whom all administrative and academic functions shall vest. The Revenue District shall be the Unit of Administration. Primary and upper primary schools shall continue to be administered in the rural areas by the Panchayat Union Councils and in the urban areas by Municipal Councils, apart from the aided institutions and those under the Harijan Welfare Department. The management of secondary and teacher training schools shall vest either in private recognised Societies or Missionary Bodies or in Government. In the case of all Government schools, the Chief Educational Officer shall be the managing authority on behalf of the Director of School Education. The present differences between Government-run schools and the schools taken over by the Government from the erstwhile District Boards shall be done away with, suitably integrating the two systems and rendering the staff liable for transfer only within the Revenue District.

The present mode of recruitment of graduate teachers and ministerial staff through the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission for Government schools shall be extended to all the Government schools under the Chief Educational Officer, while appointment of non-graduate staff and menial staff shall continue to vest in the Chief Educational Officer. It will be easy to integrate the services of staff in Government and Government (Board) schools in a small Unit as a Revenue District rather than in the State as a whole.

The four District Educational Officers in this District with their headquarters in different parts of the District will continue mainly to be the Administrative Officers in their respective areas. Such powers as sanction of leave, increments, maintenance of service registers, provident fund accounts so long the present provisions continue, shall vest in the District Educa-

CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER, MADRAS AND CHINGLEPUT DISTRICTS

*Dr. Edl. Officer,  
Saidapet*

*Dr. Edl. Officer,  
Chingleput*

*Dr. Edl. Officer,  
Kancheepuram*

*Dr. Edl. Officer,  
Tiruvellore*

*Inspectress of Girls'  
Schools, Chingleput  
(Girls' high schools of  
Chingleput, North Arcot  
and South Arcot  
Revenue Districts)*

Deputy Inspectors of Schools

1. Gummudipoondi
2. Minjur
3. Ponneri
4. Saidapet
5. St. Thomas Mount
6. Tiruvottiyur
7. Villivakkam

1. Acharapakkam
2. Chingleput
3. Cheyyur
4. Chithamur
5. Karunguzhi
6. Madurantakam
7. Tirukalikundram
8. Tiruporur

1. Kancheepuram
2. Poonamallee
3. Sriperumbudur
4. Uthiramerur
5. Walajabad

1. Kadambathur
2. Pallipet
3. Poondi
4. R.K. Pet
5. Tiruvellere
6. Tirur (Basic)
7. Tiruthani
8. Tiruvelangadu
9. Uthukottai

Junior Deputy Inspectors of Schools

1. Ponneri (2 posts)
2. Saidapet

1. Chingleput

1. Kancheepuram
2. Sriperumbudur
3. Uthiramerur

1. Tiruvellore (2 posts)
2. Tiruthani

NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, ETC. IN CHINGLEPUT DISTRICT

|                               | <i>Government</i> | <i>District Board</i> | <i>Panchayat Union</i> | <i>Corporation/ Municipal</i> | <i>Aided</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1. Primary Schools            | 96                | —                     | 1,382                  | 38                            | 249          | 1,765        |
| 2. Upper Primary Schools      | 43                | —                     | 272                    | 20                            | 111          | 446          |
| 3. Secondary Schools          | 4                 | 108                   | —                      | —                             | 36           | 151          |
| 4. Teacher Training Schools : |                   |                       |                        |                               |              |              |
| MEN                           | 4                 | —                     | —                      | —                             | —            | 4            |
| WOMEN                         | 3                 | —                     | —                      | —                             | 1            | 4            |
| 5. Special Schools            |                   |                       |                        |                               |              | 5            |
| 6. Public Libraries           |                   |                       |                        |                               |              | 118          |
| 7. Adult Literacy Schools     |                   |                       |                        |                               |              | 40           |
| 8. Mid-day Meal Centres       | 81                | —                     | 840                    | 1,061                         | 185          | 2,167        |
| 9. Pupils fed                 | 7,177             | —                     | 45,146                 | 57,182                        | 10,042       | 1,19,547     |

tional Officers. The Inspectress of Girls' Schools, Chingleput now having inspection work in the nearby Districts will have a limited jurisdiction within the Revenue District and shall be assigned other Administrative/Academic duties in the District. These Officers shall continue to sanction grants to all aided elementary and secondary schools as hitherto. As academic officers, the District Educational Officers and the Inspectress of Girls' Schools shall conduct the formal annual inspection of the schools and pay periodical visits at least twice a year. The audit of accounts of the aided schools shall be carried out by Auditors from the Office of the Director of School Education as at present or by Auditors attached to the Office of the Chief Educational Officer by transferring two or three Auditors from the present central pool in the Directorate of School Education. The appointment and transfers of these Auditors shall vest in the Director of School Education and they shall be liable for transfer to any part the State. This would mean that they should form a separate cadre and not form part of a District cadre of Deputy Inspectors of Schools, School Assistants, etc.

Considering that already over Rs. 2 crores are spent by way of administration of the former District Board schools, there is absolute need for an officer to be placed exclusively in charge of Accounts in the Office of the Chief Educational Officer who shall regulate the payment of grant-in-aid to the aided institutions in the Revenue District through the District Educational Officers concerned. He shall also be the drawing and disbursing officer of the Office of the Chief Educational Officer.

The Chief Educational Officer will be the Chief Administrative Officer of the District to whom many of the powers such as permission for creation and abolition of posts, transfer of school Assistants and Headmasters within the District, sanction of building grants upto a limit of Rs. 25,000/-, sanction for diverting special fees, sanction of expenditure on the purchase of books, furniture, equipment upto a limit of Rs. 5,000/- now vested in the Director of School Education, shall be delegated. With such delegation of authority and responsibility given to the Chief Educational Officer, there would be need to have a Gazetted Officer in the rank of a District Educational Officer to assist him in the Office and District Administration instead of a Non-Gazetted Personal Assistant as at present. The officer so appointed may be designated as District Educational Officer (Administration) and attached to the Office of the Chief Educational Officer. No change in the grades or scales of pay of any officer, including the Chief Educational Officer is contemplated under the proposed reorganised pattern.

The recognition of all aided high schools shall vest as hitherto in the Director of School Education, the District Educational Officer being responsible for obtaining the recognition and aid applications from the managements and routing them through the Chief Educational Officer. In the case of Government high schools, the question of issuing formal orders of recognition may not arise. As a majority of the institutions will be

Government institutions not requiring formal orders of recognition and to that extent, work of the District Educational Officers will be reduced, they may be delegated with powers to sanction leave and increment, etc. to all Government staff other than graduates. As in Government schools, in the Government (Board) schools also, the Headmasters may be designated as Drawing Officers so that pay, etc. may be drawn and disbursed by the Headmasters themselves. Until such time a suitable machinery is evolved, the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts may continue to audit the accounts of the taken-over schools. As Administrative Officers, the District Educational Officers will still continue to conduct enquiries and attend meetings of the District Development Councils and other Advisory Committees. The District Educational Officer (Administration), attached to the Office of the Chief Educational Officer shall also be a member of the District Development Council of which the Collector is the Chairman instead of the Chief Educational Officer.

Recently, the Chief Educational Officer has been made the Statistics Compilation Officer for the Districts under his control, collecting particulars from the District Educational Officers and Inspectresses of Girls' Schools. There is need for a small statistical cell both in the Office of the Chief Educational Officer and of the District Educational Officer. The staff may initially consist of a Junior Statistical Officer and two Statistical Assistants. The provision of calculating machines will be a major step towards easing this work in all the Offices. These officers may also visit the Range Offices for assisting in the compilation work at the Range Level.

If instructional programme is to be effective, our pattern of supervision should conform to the revised concept of supervision. While every secondary school will have a formal inspection and audit of accounts once a year, a triennial visit will be arranged by a panel of Subject Specialists for 2 to 4 days depending upon the strength of the school. The panel shall consist of the District Educational Officer of the District and Subject Specialists drawn from among the other Inspecting Officers, senior Headmasters and Teachers in the District or neighbouring Districts. The Specialist Panel shall include members qualified in the different subjects such as English, Tamil or Mother Tongue, Mathematics, Sciences, History and Geography and Physical Education. It is, therefore, desirable that each one of the four District Educational Officers and the Inspectress of Girls' Schools in the District is specialised in any one area of school curriculum, so that it may be easy to constitute the panel for academic inspection. It is not merely enough that Specialists are put on the panel. These Specialists should form into an association and meet frequently to attend refresher courses so as to improve their professional competence. Each District Educational Officer being qualified in a branch of knowledge, should get together the Specialists and teachers of the concerned subject and periodically review the programmes of supervision. On the recommendations of the District Educational Officers concerned, the Chief Educational Officer shall maintain a panel of senior and efficient Headmasters and teachers from whom the

Specialists Panel will be drawn. The panel shall go round on a detailed supervisory visit of 1/3rd of the number of secondary schools and teacher training schools in the District every year so as to cover the schools in the entire District once in three years. To improve the Physical Education Programmes in the District, it would be necessary to have a District Inspector of Physical Education attached to the Office of the Chief Educational Officer, who shall join the Supervisory Panel in covering 1/3rd of the total number of schools in a year. This Supervisory Panel should hold individual or group Conferences with teachers and arrange for in-service programmes during vacation for their benefit. Reports of inspection and supervision and discussions shall be prepared in suitable forms and sent to the schools concerned through the District Educational Officer of the District. Schools shall follow up the suggestions and send periodical reports as to their effect on the general improvement of the instructional programme. Salient features noticed in individual schools shall also be published and popularised for the benefit of other schools and their staff. A sort of supervision of this nature will instil confidence in the teaching fraternity and lead them to creative work. The Inspectress of Girls' Schools who will have limited number of girls' high schools for inspection, will assist the Chief Educational Officer in constituting the panel for inspection, etc.

To improve the standard of primary and upper primary schools, it is absolutely necessary to appoint only graduate trained teachers as Deputy Inspectors of Schools and to abolish the present cadre of Junior Deputy Inspectors of Schools. No Deputy Inspector of Schools should be entrusted with the administration of more than 50 schools in an area. This would mean the creation of about ten more posts of Deputy Inspectors of Schools in the District and appointment of the required staff as per scales now in force. The Mid-day Meals Programme shall be under the charge of a Junior Deputy Inspector of Schools with central kitchens established at every Block or Range headquarters. With the present successful working of the central kitchen in the Poonamallee Block, it should be easy to extend the scheme to every Block or Range in Chingleput District. Proposals are already on hand to extend the scheme of central kitchen to a large number of Blocks and construction work has begun under a phased programme on priority basis. This will not only relieve the Deputy Inspectors of Schools from much of the work connected with noon-feeding and checking of accounts, it will also relieve the Headmasters and teachers who are now actually supervising the cooking of the meals and keeping the accounts, so that they could devote more time to classroom instruction.

In addition to his duties as supervisor of schools, the Deputy Inspector of Schools is also to visit Libraries, Adult Education and Recreation Centres. With a limited number of schools allotted to him, the supervision of Libraries and Adult Education Centres shall continue to be his responsibility. As the Range Level Administrative Officer, he shall continue to collect and compile educational statistics at the Range Level and pay periodical visits to primary and upper primary schools in the area. As a majority of them

are Panchayat Union schools and their recognition vests in the Department of Education, he shall conduct the annual inspection of these schools in his capacity as Administrative Officer so as to see if they fulfil the conditions of recognition. He shall also continue to assess teaching grants to aided primary and upper primary schools in the area and arrange for the annual checking of accounts for payment of maintenance grant, etc. As the managerial functions of the Panchayat Union, Municipal and Corporation schools vest in the person of a Commissioner, all complaints and petitions against the administration of the schools may be dealt with by the Commissioners assisted by the Educational Extension Officers. However, the inspecting officers of the Department shall continue to exercise the powers of suspension or cancellation of certificates of the teachers who are found unsuitable for the profession. Private schools shall also continue to be under the direct administrative control of the inspecting officers.

With the separation of administration from supervision at all levels, the administrative machinery would require to be strengthened especially in the Office of the Chief Educational Officer and the headquarters of District Offices. The staffing scheme is given in the table below:

#### *CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER*

| <i>Dt. Edl. Officer<br/>(Administration)</i> | <i>Dt. Edl.<br/>Officer<br/>(Academic)</i> | <i>Dt. Edl.<br/>Officer<br/>(Accounts)</i> | <i>Inspector of<br/>Physical<br/>Education<br/>(Non-Gazetted)</i> | <i>Statistical<br/>Assistant<br/>(Non-Gazetted)</i> |
|--|--|--|---|---|
|--|--|--|---|---|

#### MINISTERIAL

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4 Junior Superintendents (180-300)</li> <li>2. 8 Assistants (125-175)</li> <li>3. 20 Junior Assistants (90-140)</li> <li>4. One Stenographer (90-140)</li> <li>5. 4 Typists (90-140)</li> <li>6. 2 Record Clerks (55-70)</li> <li>7. 1 Van Driver (70-90)</li> <li>8. Menial staff (50-60)</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dt. Educational Officer, Saidapet</li> <li>2. do Chingleput</li> <li>3. do Kancheepuram</li> <li>4. do Tiruvellore</li> </ol> <p>Deputy Inspectors of Schools (One for 40 to 45 primary and upper primary schools)</p> <p>Junior Deputy Inspectors of Schools (Mid-day meals, one for each central kitchen)</p> <p>PLUS the necessary Ministerial Staff</p> |
|---|---|

The additional staff requirements and the cost involved in implementing the proposed pattern is shown in the statement on pages 84-88.



The cost of implementing the new pattern in one District as a pilot project is expected to be over Rs. 2.62 lakhs per year. Though the expenditure on education in the State is more than 24% of the total expenditure and a provision of over Rs. 65 crores is made for 1968-69, the amount required for implementing the pilot project in one District cannot be met within the normal budget. Therefore, assistance from the Government of India on cent percent basis will be necessary during the plan period both for trying the pilot scheme and for extension of the scheme to other areas, if it is so decided. If funds are forthcoming, the scheme may be tried as a pilot project initially in the Revenue District of Chingleput and a final form of Administrative Set-up may be drawn in the light of the experience gained in this District for adoption in other areas.

*ESTIMATED STAFF REQUIREMENTS AND EXPENDITURE ON THE PROPOSED REORGANISED PATTERN OF INSPECTION AND SUPERVISION AT THE REVENUE DISTRICT LEVEL IN TAMIL NADU*

| Sl. No. | Name of Post  | Scale of pay (Rs.)                 | Existing Staff Strength in the Unit of the Chief Educational Officer |            |              |              | Proposed Staff Strength in the New Set-up |            |              |              | Remarks       |
|---------|---|------------------------------------|--|------------|--------------|--------------|---|------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
|         |   |                                    | Pay (Rs.)  | D.A. (Rs.) | H.R.A. (Rs.) | C.C.A. (Rs.) | Pay (Rs.)                                 | D.A. (Rs.) | H.R.A. (Rs.) | C.C.A. (Rs.) |               |
| 1       | 2   | 3                                  | 4  | 5          | 6            | 7            | 8   | 9          | 10           | 11           | 12            |
| 1.      | Chief Educational Officer   | 700-50-1100                        | 950  | 120        | —            | —            | —   | —          | —            | —            |               |
| 2.      | Personal Assistant to the Chief Ednl. Officer converted into Gazetted District Educational Officer (Administration) | 225-10-275<br>15-350<br>300-25-800 | 305  | 146        | 28           | 50           | —   | —          | —            | —            |               |
| 3.      | District Educational Officer (Academic)   | do                                 | —  | —          | —            | —            | 300                                       | 120        | —            | —            | (New Post)    |
| 4.      | Inspectress of Girls' Schools, Chingleput attached to the Office  | do                                 | —  | —          | —            | —            | —   | —          | —            | —            | (By Transfer) |
| 5.      | District Educational Officer (Accounts)   | do                                 | —  | —          | —            | —            | 400                                       | 146        | —            | —            | (New Post)    |

| 1   | 2   | 3                    | 4     | 5     | 6   | 7      | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12                           |
|-----|---|----------------------|-------|-------|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------|
| 6.  | Statistical Assistant (1)                       | 200-5-240-<br>10-270 | —     | —     | —   | —      | 240 | 122 | 15  | 13  | (New Post)                   |
| 7.  | Regional Inspector of Physical<br>Education (1) | 140-5-18 -<br>10-250 | —     | —     | —   | —      | —   | —   | —   | —   | (By Transfer)                |
| 8.  | Auditors and Staff                              | do                   | —     | —     | —   | —      | —   | —   | —   | —   | (By Transfer<br>from D.S.E.) |
| 9.  | Manager (1)                                     | 180-300<br>↓         | 180   | 122   | 15  | 14.50  | —   | —   | —   | —   |                              |
| 10. | Junior Superintendents (4)                      | do                   | —     | —     | —   | —      | 800 | 488 | 60  | 60  | (New Posts)                  |
| 11. | Assistants (3)                                  | 125-5-175            | 445   | 318   | 45  | 37.80  | —   | —   | —   | —   |                              |
| 12. | -do- (5)  | do                   | —     | —     | —   | —      | 750 | 610 | 75  | 75  | (New Posts)                  |
| 13. | Junior Assistants (12)                          | 90-140               | 1,298 | 1,141 | 180 | 130.00 | —   | —   | —   | —   |                              |
| 14. | do (8)  | do                   | —     | —     | —   | —      | 720 | 784 | 120 | 124 | (New Posts)                  |
| 15. | Stenographer (1)                                | do                   | 162   | 122   | 15  | 12.95  | —   | —   | —   | —   |                              |
| 16. | Typists (2)                                     | do                   | 232   | 189   | 30  | 25.00  | —   | —   | —   | —   |                              |

| 1   | 2   | 3       | 4   | 5   | 6  | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10 | 11 | 12            |
|---|-----|---------|-----|-----|----|-------|-------|-------|----|----|---------------|
| 17. Typists   | (2) | 90-140  | —   | —   | —  | —     | 200   | 196   | 30 | 25 | (New Posts)   |
| 18. Record Clerks   | (2) | 55-70   | 124 | 136 | 20 | 15.00 | —     | —     | —  | —  |               |
| 19. Peons   | (3) | 50-60   | 172 | 213 | 30 | 22.50 | —     | —     | —  | —  |               |
| 20. do  | (9) | do      | —   | —   | —  | —     | 450   | 630   | 90 | 72 | (New Posts)   |
| 21. Van Driver  | (1) | 70-80   | —   | —   | —  | —     | 70    | 71    | 10 | 8  | (New Posts)   |
| 22. District Educational Officers<br>and Staff                        |     | —       | —   | —   | —  | —     | —     | —     | —  | —  | (To Continue) |
| 23. Statistical Assistant, one for each<br>Dt. Ednl. Office (4)       |     | 200-270 | —   | —   | —  | —     | 900   | 488   | 15 | 13 | (New Posts)   |
| 24. Junior Assistant, One for each<br>District Educational Office (4) |     | 90-140  | —   | —   | —  | —     | 360   | 400   | 15 | 13 | (New Posts)   |
| 25. Existing Deputy Inspectors<br>(29) and Staff                      |     | —       | —   | —   | —  | —     | —     | —     | —  | —  |               |
| 26. Additional Deputy Inspectors<br>(10)                              |     | 140-250 | —   | —   | —  | —     | 1,500 | 1,220 | —  | —  | (New Posts)   |
| 27. Clerical Staff for New Ranges—<br>Junior Assistants (10)          |     | 90-140  | —   | —   | —  | —     | 900   | 980   | 40 | —  | (New Posts)   |

| 1   | 2 | 3         | 4     | 5     | 6   | 7   | 8     | 9     | 10  | 11  | 12            |
|---|---|-----------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-----|-----|---------------|
| 28. Record Clerks (10)  |   | 55-70     | —     | —     | —   | —   | 550   | 700   | 70  | —   | (New Posts)   |
| 29. Peons (10)  |   | 50-60     | —     | —     | —   | —   | 500   | 700   | —   | —   | (New Posts)   |
| 30. Central Kitchen Junior<br>Deputy Inspectors (10) al-<br>ready programmed by the<br>Department |   | 125-5-175 | —     | —     | —   | —   | —     | —     | —   | —   | (By Transfer) |
|   |   |           | 3,868 | 2,507 | 363 | 306 | 8,840 | 7,655 | 540 | 403 |               |

*ABSTRACT*

| <i>NEW SET-UP :</i>         | <i>(Additional Posts)</i> | <i>(Rs.)</i>       |   | <i>(Rs.)</i>              |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---|---------------------------|
|                             | <i>(monthly)</i>          |                    |   |                           |
| Pay                         | ,,                        | 8,840              | Annual expenditure  | (17,438x12) = 2,09,256.00 |
| Dearness Allowance          | ,,                        | 7,655              | Travelling Allowance and Daily Allowance for Inspecting Staff | 15,000.00                 |
| House Rent Allowance        | ,,                        | 540                | Additional Expenditure by way of rent, furniture, etc.        | 15,000.00                 |
| City Compensatory Allowance | ,,                        | 403                | Provision for Van   | 22,000.00                 |
| Total                       |                           | <hr/> 17,438 <hr/> | Total Expenditure   | <hr/> 2,61,256.00 <hr/>   |

## APPENDIX IV

# *A Suggested Pattern of Reorganising Inspection and Supervision of Schools in Uttar Pradesh*

### **Existing Position**

The State of Uttar Pradesh is divided into 54 Revenue Districts and 10 Commissioner's Divisions. Corresponding to these, there are 54 Educational Districts and 10 Regions of Deputy Directors of Education. For girls' high schools and intermediate colleges, there are 8 Regions each under a Regional Inspectress of Girls' Schools. Each Educational District is under the charge of a District Inspector of Schools who is responsible for all schools from primary to intermediate colleges (upto class XII). He is assisted by a Deputy Inspector of Schools (in charge of primary and middle schools) and a team of Sub-Deputy Inspectors of Schools (almost one for each Community Development Block), and some Assistant Inspectresses of Girls' Schools, including a Deputy Inspectress of Girls' Schools in bigger districts.

2. To cope with the increased work, an Associate Inspector of Schools (Provincial Educational Service Class II, Rs 300-900) is given if the number of high schools and intermediate colleges in a district exceeds 50 and another Associate Inspector if the number exceeds 80. The posts of Additional Deputy Inspectors of School, which were created in the beginning of Third Plan, are still in abeyance, though the number of primary schools has increased from 40,000 to 61,000 and that of middle schools from 4,300 to 7,000 during the period 1960-61 to 1968-69.

3. According to the present position, each Sub-Deputy Inspector is required to inspect about 60 primary schools twice a year. The number of schools per Assistant Inspectress of Girls' Schools is about 50. The Deputy Inspector is required to supervise, on an average, the work of about 15 SDI's and also inspect all the middle schools with their assistance. The District Inspector of Schools is required to visit each high school every year and conduct panel inspection of intermediate colleges in alternate years. Besides these requirements laid down in the Education Code, the inspecting staff is also required to visit the schools frequently in connection with enquiries recognition, grants, conduct of examinations and disputes relating to teachers and managements. It may be added that the District Inspector of Schools is provided with a jeep.

4. It may be noted that there are no Subject Inspectors or Supervisors in the State of Uttar Pradesh.

### Some Suggestions

5. Keeping in view the three to four-fold increase in academic work, coupled with a lot of concomitant non-academic work which educational expansion since independence has inevitably generated, resulting generally in serious deterioration in the quality of inspection and supervision, the following suggestions are offered to reorganise inspection and supervision in the State of Uttar Pradesh :

(a) The norms for sanctioning the Associate Inspectors of Schools need to be liberalised. An Associate Inspector should be sanctioned if the number of high schools and intermediate colleges in the district exceeds 40 and an additional Associate Inspector be provided for every 20 additional institutions.

(b) The post of an Administrative-Cum-Financial Officer in the grade of Rs. 250-600 (Gazetted) be created in the office of the District Inspector of Schools. This Officer should look after all routine administrative and financial matters, including grant-in-aid and scholarships.

(c) A team of 5 Subject Supervisors (in PES II-Rs.300-900)—Specialists in Mathematics, Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences, Hindi and English—be attached to each of the 10 Regional Directors of Education. These Subject Supervisors should organise Seminars/Workshops and Conferences of subject teachers from schools and elementary teacher training institutions, give demonstration lessons, supervise observation lessons and prepare suitable literature for the teachers. They may also be occasionally associated with panel inspections and assist the newly recognised institutions in properly organising the library, the laboratory, etc.

(d) The posts of Additional Deputy Inspectors of Schools be revived, at least in bigger districts with more than 15 Sub-Deputy Inspectors.

(e) The norm of schools per Sub-Deputy Inspector should be fixed at 40 schools and the number of SDI's be adjusted accordingly.

(f) The cadres of Sub-Deputy Inspectors and Assistant as well as Deputy Inspectors and Deputy Inspectresses be amalgamated into one. This will result not only in some economy but also help in raising the efficiency of supervision work.

(g) The techniques of inspection and supervision should also undergo radical innovations. The SDI may, for instance, inspect each primary school once a year. The second inspection may be conducted in the form of a Seminar or Workshop organised at the neighbouring middle school with the



assistance of its staff. This will also help in developing the school complex. Similarly, the District Inspector of Schools must stay at the school for the full period of three days for a thorough panel inspection. However, if the additional staff as suggested at (a) and (b) above is not sanctioned to him, it would be more practical to conduct the panel inspection once in every three years as at present. The accent in inspection work should shift from teacher-wise inspection to subject-wise supervision and discussion of the curricula and methodology with the teaching staff.

### Financial Implications

6. The financial implications of the above proposals can best be worked out by the State Government who would be in full possession of facts and figures. However, some rough estimates are given below:

|           |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|
| (a)       | 70 additional Associate Inspectors (Rs.300-900)                                | $70 \times 500 \times 12 =$<br>4,20,000          |
| (b)       | 54 Administrative-Cum-Finance Officers (Rs.250-600)                            | $54 \times 350 \times 12 =$<br>2,26,800          |
| (c)       | Ten teams of 5 Subject Supervisors (Rs.300-900)                                | $10 \times 5 \times 500 \times 12 =$<br>3,00,000 |
| (d)       | 40 additional Deputy Inspectors (Rs.250-600)                                   | $40 \times 350 \times 12 =$<br>1,68,000          |
| (e) & (f) | These might balance each other   | Nil  |
| (g)       | Provision for Seminars, Workshops, Conferences, etc. @ Rs. 25,000 per District | $54 \times 25,000 =$<br>13,50,000                |
|           | 130 peons for (a), (c) and (d) above .....                                     | $130 \times 50 \times 12 = 2,34,000$             |
|           | Additional TA and DA .....   | 1,00,000   |

---

Total: 25,64,800

---

i. e. about Rs.26 lakhs

The estimated additional expenditure in the Fourth Five Year Plan period would be about Rs. 1.50 crores, which will be roughly 3% of the Fourth Plan outlay for general education of Rs. 54 crores. This is well worth spending for the returns in terms of qualitative improvement of education which is the ultimate goal of all inspection and supervision.

### Pilot Experiment

7. If it is decided to try out the above suggestions in one District and one Educational Region only, the estimated expenditure will be of the order of Rs. one lakh per annum.

## APPENDIX V

### *Inspection and Supervision of Primary and Secondary Schools in Different States— A Survey of Existing Position*

In the erstwhile Department of Educational Administration of the National Institute of Education, a comprehensive survey of administration of education in different States was carried out during 1965-1968. The survey covered such aspects as administrative set-up and organisational structure at different levels, span of control, school buildings and equipment, curriculum and textbooks, examination system, grant-in-aid rules, inspection and supervision, teacher training, recruitment procedures and service conditions of teachers, etc.

The present paper is based on the information collected in connection with the above survey. The material presented in the paper has been checked by the Directorates of Public Instruction Directorates of Education of the States concerned.

C.L. SAPRA  
Member-Secretary

#### ANDHRA PRADESH

##### *Elementary Schools*

The District Educational Officers in their respective districts have overall responsibility for inspection and supervision of elementary schools. They are assisted by a number of Deputy Inspectors of Schools in this work. A Deputy Inspector of Schools controls a range of a block. Inspection is carried out single-handed by the Deputy Inspector. He spends not more than a day in a school. He holds discussions with the teachers and the Head of the school concerned before writing his inspection report in the prescribed form. A copy of the inspection report is sent to the school concerned within a month for compliance and record. At the time of next inspection, the inspecting officer checks up the action taken by the school on the previous inspection report. Every Deputy Inspector has 40 to 50 elementary schools under his charge. In case a Deputy Inspector has larger number of schools, he

is assisted by Junior Deputy Inspectors of Schools. The inspection of elementary classes attached to a high/higher secondary school having Non-Gazetted Head is the responsibility of the Gazetted Inspectors, and schools having Gazetted Heads are inspected by the District Educational Officers.

The schools managed by the Department of Social Welfare are also inspected by the officers of the State Education Department. The Gazetted Inspectors or Deputy Inspectors, as the case may be, submit the inspection reports to their respective District Educational Officers for onward transmission to the Department of Social Welfare.

### *Secondary Schools*

With the reorganisation of the State Department of Education recently, the posts of Subject Inspectors which were only a few in number, have been kept in abeyance. The Educational Regions have been abolished and District Educational Officers given more powers and made directly responsible to the Director of Public Instruction. District Educational Officers are responsible for the inspection and supervision of secondary schools in their respective districts. They are assisted by the Gazetted Inspectors. A District Educational Officer inspects only those high/higher secondary and teacher training schools which are headed by the Gazetted Headmasters. Rest of the schools are inspected by the Gazetted Inspectors. It is worth mentioning that the Gazetted Inspectors are expected to devote their full time to academic work and not to any type of administrative work. A District Educational Officer is administrative head of elementary and secondary schools within his district. For administrative work, he is assisted by one or two superintendents and 10 to 20 other members of ministerial staff. Each inspector is in charge of 50-55 schools. Two days are devoted to the annual inspection of each middle school, three days to that of each high school, and four days to the inspection of each multipurpose higher secondary school. The headquarters of these inspectors are at their respective district places and each District Educational Officer is provided with a jeep. The city area inspectors do not get T.A. or D.A. whereas those serving in rural areas get T.A./D.A. as admissible under the rules.

There is a prescribed proforma for inspection covering a variety of items. Out of three copies of inspection report prepared by the inspectors, one is submitted to the District Educational Officer, another is kept by the inspector himself and the third is sent to the school concerned for the purpose of follow-up. The action taken on inspection report by the school is checked at the time of the next inspection. Since most of the Gazetted Inspectors are trained graduates only, almost all of them feel handicapped in supervising the subject teaching of higher secondary classes. The question of

introducing team inspection is under consideration of the Education Department.

## ASSAM

### *Elementary Schools*

Elementary schools under all managements are inspected by the Deputy Inspectors of Schools, who are ex-officio Assistant Secretaries of the State Board for Elementary Education. A Deputy Inspector of Schools in his capacity as Assistant Secretary is responsible for the academic control, expansion and management of elementary education. He is assisted by Sub-Inspectors and Assistant Sub-Inspectors of Schools in the inspection of primary schools.

A Deputy Inspector is responsible for the inspection of middle vernacular, middle English medium and senior basic schools. He has about 70 schools under his charge. He takes about 3 to 5 hours in completing the inspection of a school. Most of the middle vernacular schools are three section-class schools and have usually four or five teachers on their staff.

A Sub-Inspector of Schools is responsible for the inspection of primary and junior basic schools. He inspects schools single-handed and spends not more than a day in a school. He enters his inspection remarks in the log book and checks up the action taken at the time of the next inspection. In case of gross irregularities, he submits his report to the Deputy Inspector of Schools concerned for further action.

### *Secondary Schools*

The inspection of all Government and aided high, higher secondary schools is the responsibility of the Inspector of Schools. Girls' schools are inspected generally by the Assistant Inspectress of Schools who is responsible to the Inspector of Schools. The number of secondary schools under the control of each Inspector of Schools varies from circle to circle. In hilly areas, the number is very small, whereas in plains it is as large as 275. Owing to difficulties in hilly areas such as hilly terrain and scattered location of schools, only 40 to 50 schools are inspected by an inspector in a year. No proforma is used for inspection. However, an inspection memorandum giving items to be covered in inspection has been provided to the inspectors of the Department. In addition to information about enrolment, teachers, etc. the other items covered are : working of the library, operation of various school programmes, discipline, school site and buildings. The action taken by the school on inspection report is checked at the time of the next inspection.

## BIHAR

### *Elementary and Secondary Schools*

The District Education officer in Bihar is the Chief Inspecting and Supervisory Officer for boys' elementary and secondary schools, including teacher training institutions in the district. He is assisted by Sub-Divisional Education Officers, Deputy Inspectors of Schools and Sub-Inspectors of Schools/Block Education Extension Officers. The District Inspectress of Schools supervises and inspects girls' secondary schools. Training schools are inspected by Deputy Directors of Girls' Education. The Deputy Inspectress of Schools inspects and supervises girls' elementary schools. Senior and junior basic schools are inspected and supervised by the Deputy Superintendent of Basic Education. The Sub-Inspectors of Schools/Block Education Extension Officers are primarily responsible for the inspection and supervision of elementary schools in their respective beats. A Sub-Inspector of Schools/Block Education Extension Officer has about 60 primary schools under his charge. He is expected to visit every school at least once a year for full inspection and four times a year for surprise visits. He is generally attached to a block and as such he works under the administrative control of a Block Development Officer. He is an employee of the State Education Department and for academic work he is responsible to the District Education Officer either through the Deputy Inspector of Schools or the Sub-Divisional Education Officer. Thus he works under dual control. Besides, furnishing inspection reports to the Block Development Officer and District Education Officer, he countersigns the salary bills of all primary school teachers and sends them to the District Superintendent of Education for making payment through the Block Officer. He is required to hold 'Guru gatherings' and other in-service programmes for elementary school teachers.

The Deputy Inspector of Schools is responsible for the inspection and supervision of boys' middle schools. He is expected to have 40 non-Government middle schools under his charge. He is supposed to visit all of them at least once a year and in addition pay at least two surprise visits. He is required to spend 180 days on tour in each year. He has to visit as many primary schools as possible in addition to the middle schools.

The Deputy Inspectress of Schools is charged with the responsibility of inspection and supervision of girls' middle schools. She is expected to inspect each of them twice a year and every girls' primary school at least once a year. She is also in charge of special and indigenous schools and various women's programmes run by other State Departments, in addition to Education.

The Deputy Superintendent of Basic Education has to inspect and supervise senior and junior basic schools. He is technical adviser to the District Education Officer and advises him on techniques of basic education. He is required to inspect the institutions under his charge at least once in each quarter. He

has to be on tour for not less than 180 days in a year and devote at least 6 days to each Government basic school. He has to inspect as many middle and primary schools as possible to see that integrated syllabus is followed. Normally, he has not more than 40 senior basic schools under his charge. He has to countersign the bills of senior basic schools before they are presented to the State treasury for payment.

The District Superintendent of Education is an administrative officer to assist both the District Education Officer and Zilla Parishads and Blocks in the payment of salaries to teachers and in other administrative work. He has to look after planning and location of schools, construction and repairs of school buildings and other similar duties as defined in the L.S.G. (Amending and Validating) Act 1954. He works under the control of District Education Officer. He is assisted by one or more Deputy Superintendents of Education. Though he has no inspection and supervision duty, yet by virtue of his functions and placement he has to visit schools, appoint teachers, and pay salaries. Thus he is an important officer in the set-up of the State Education Department. He is an ex-officio Secretary of the District Planning Committee. He grants leave to teachers. He, in concurrence with the Administration, District Board or Special Officer or District Development Officer, in charge of the District Board where there is no Zilla Parishad, transfers or punishes teachers. He maintains the service books of the elementary school teachers. He takes initiative in getting the pension sanctioned to the retiring teachers under the triple-benefit scheme.

Schools run by Municipal Corporation, Patna and other Corporations/Municipalities and Notified Area Committees are inspected and supervised by the inspecting staff of District Education Office. In Patna, one Deputy Inspector of Schools is attached to the Municipal Corporation Office and he with the help of his Sub-Inspectors of Schools, supervises all Municipal and Municipal-aided schools.

## GUJARAT

### *Elementary Schools*

Elementary schools operating within the limits of District Panchayat Education Committees are inspected by the Assistant Deputy Educational Inspectors allocated to the D.P.E.Cs, while the inspection of elementary schools operating within the jurisdiction of Municipal School Boards is carried out by the Assistant Deputy Educational Inspectors attached to the District Educational Inspectors. 5-10 per cent schools in Municipal Education School Board areas are also inspected by the staff of the M.S.B.

According to the rules laid down by the State Department of Education, each elementary school is supposed to be visited once for full annual inspection and twice or at least once in a year for a surprise visit by the Assistant Deputy

Educational Inspector. The number of schools under the charge of an Assistant Deputy Educational Inspector ranges between 40 and 65. While inspecting a school, the A.D.E.I. is expected to devote one day if the enrolment of the school is 200 and two days if it is more than 200. Inspection of an elementary school is carried out single-handed by the A.D.E.I. and a report submitted by him to his seniors in the prescribed form. One copy of the inspection report is sent to the Administrative Officer, District Panchayat Education Committee (in the case of schools operating within the limits of D.P.E.C.) and one to the District Educational Inspector (in the case of schools operating within the jurisdiction of M.S.B.) for information and another to the Headmaster or Headmistress of the school concerned for compliance.

### *Secondary Schools*

There are 18 District Educational Inspectors in the State, one in each district, who are responsible for the inspection and supervision of secondary schools in addition to the elementary schools operating within the limits of Municipal School Boards, primary teacher training institutions and special schools. There are Deputy Educational Inspectors and Assistant Deputy Educational Inspectors to assist the District Educational Inspectors in the inspection work. The average number of secondary schools expected to be inspected by a District Educational Inspector or a Deputy Educational Inspector is 60 in a year. Recently, the Government has decided that the schools of more than five years' standing should be inspected during alternate years and the schools obtaining 70% pass percentage in the S.S.C. Examination may be inspected after every three years. Under the rules laid down by the State Department of Education, a secondary school is supposed to be inspected at least once in a year. A prescribed proforma is used by the Educational Inspector while inspecting a secondary school. Follow-up programme is implemented and it is seen at the time of the next inspection whether the suggestions made during the previous inspection were carried out or not. In the case of non-Government aided schools, the inspection report and the action taken on it are also considered by the State Department of Education while sanctioning the grant.

## KERALA

### *Primary Schools*

The inspection of all primary schools, both aided and Government, is the responsibility of Assistant Educational Officers. On an average, an A.E.O. is assigned 50 schools. This number may, however, be increased or decreased depending on the area, location of schools and other administrative considerations. In eight of the bigger Sub-Districts in the Malabar area, the Assistant Educational Officers are assisted in the inspection work by Junior Deputy Inspectors attached to their offices.

The Department has prescribed an inspection proforma for primary schools. The Assistant Educational Officer sends three copies of the proforma to the Headmaster of the primary school in advance for completing the relevant statistical data. On the appointed date and time, the A.E.O. along with his team visits the school. His team consists of 2 to 4 senior and experienced Heads of other primary schools. Most of the Assistant Educational officers discuss their observations in the staff meetings, held towards the end of the inspection. After the exchange of views, they prepare the inspection report in triplicate. The first copy of the report is sent to the Head of the school concerned for compliance, the second to the District Educational Officer for his review, while the third is retained in the A.E.O.'s office for record and follow-up. According to the existing practice, the Head of the school sends his compliance report to the A.E.O., as soon as the needful is done. The A.E.O. keeps in touch with the Headmaster and helps him in removing the shortcomings of the school.

### *Secondary Schools*

The District Educational Officer is responsible for the inspection and supervision of secondary schools and special schools, including teacher training schools. The average number of schools (secondary and special) under the direct charge of a District Educational Officer is about 59 at present. He inspects these schools at least once a year. During his visit, he sees that the school has adequate staff, building and equipment. He further sees that the school registers are well kept, the accounts are in order, the departmental regulations are enforced properly and the prescribed curricula and syllabi are followed both in spirit and letter. So far as private secondary schools are concerned, he further sees that the grants are properly utilised and the rights of teachers are safeguarded.

The State has prescribed an inspection form, which is sent to the school to be inspected a little earlier than the District Educational Officer's actual visit. The form is filled by the Headmaster/Headmistress of the school and kept ready for scrutiny by the D.E.O., when he actually visits the school. The Headmaster/Headmistress makes the D.E.O. familiar with the problems and requirements of the school and helps him to write out his report. The D.E.O. also gives an assessment of individual teacher's work when he submits his report.

In Kerala, 48 posts of Subject Inspectors were sanctioned for the three Educational Regions of Trivandrum, Ernakulam and Kozhikode in 1964. But this scheme for subject inspection has not been implemented so far. The need for further re-organisation of the Department has since been felt and accordingly, a Special Officer has been appointed by Government for submitting proposals in this regard. The proposals have since been submitted by the Special Officer (present Director of Public Instruction) which are now under the consideration of the State Government.



At present, the District Educational Officer generally utilises the services of one or two senior Headmasters in supervising the instructional work in certain school subjects. He is also helped by an Office Assistant for checking school records. At times, he pays surprise visits to some schools.

On the completion of inspection, the District Educational Officer prepares three copies of his inspection report. One is kept in his own office, the second copy is sent to the Regional Deputy Director for his review and the third to the Headmaster/Headmistress of the school concerned for compliance. The Regional Deputy Director reviews the report and sends his comments directly to the Headmaster/Headmistress and a copy to the D.E.O. for information. The action taken by the Headmaster/Headmistress either on the report of the D.E.O. or on the review of the Regional Deputy Director is then communicated to the District Educational Officer for his information. In case of a private aided school the D.E.O. prepares an additional copy of the inspection report, which is sent to the manager of the school for necessary action. In case of serious irregularities in accounts, a thorough checking is done by special auditors.

The District Educational Officers have to look after both administrative and inspection work in respect of high schools and teacher training schools. They are the controlling officers for the Assistant Educational Officers. Considering the large number of schools in Trivandrum, an Additional District Educational Officer has been sanctioned for that District. The work relating to both administration and inspection has been equally distributed between the two District Educational Officers. The regular annual inspection of all high schools within the State is the target of the Government. But this is not actually achieved due to the ever-increasing responsibilities of the District Educational Officers, which the new policy of grant-in-aid to private schools has brought forth.

There is no separate provision for inspection of girls' schools. However, three posts of Women Inspectors for Muslim Education have been sanctioned for the Revenue Districts of Palghat, Cannanore and Kozhikode. There are also six Inspectors for Muslim Education. They promote the teaching of Urdu and Arabic.

## MAHARASHTRA

### *Primary Schools*

Primary schools run by the Panchayat Samitis and private managements in rural areas are inspected by the Education Extension Officers. The schools in the Municipal Areas are inspected by the Extension Officers (Edn) working under the Zilla Parishads, while the schools in the Bombay Municipal Corporation Area are inspected by the supervisors appointed by the Corporation. Private primary schools in the Municipal limits are, however, inspected

by the Assistant Deputy Education Officers of Zilla Parishads. One copy of the inspection report has to be submitted to the Parishad Education Officer by the Education Extension Officer through the Block Development Officer. In some Zilla Parishads, where the number of girls' primary schools is very large, separate Assistant Deputy Inspectresses of Schools are appointed. As per rules laid down by the State Government each primary school has to be visited at least twice a year, once as a surprise visit and the next time for full inspection. But these rules are not being strictly followed.

### *Secondary Schools*

Secondary schools are inspected by the District Education Officers or the Deputy Education Officers according to the instructions issued by the State Department of Education from time to time. They are assisted in their work by senior qualified Assistant Deputy Education Officers. Usually at the end of the inspection, there is a staff meeting to discuss academic and other matters of the school. Deficiencies pointed out in the inspection report are to be made good before the next annual inspection. The action taken by the school on the previous inspection report is usually verified at the time of the next inspection. To improve the quality of supervision, it has been proposed to create new District Supervisory Units in the State Sector, so that while the administration of education will rest with the Zilla Parishads, the supervision in primary and secondary schools will become the responsibility of the State Government. The proposal has been accepted by the Government.

## MYSORE

### *Primary Schools*

Inspection of primary schools is the main responsibility of the Inspector of Schools. He has 100 to 150 primary schools under his charge. He has under him 2-3 Deputy Inspectors for inspecting the smaller primary schools. The Inspector and Deputy Inspectors are expected to inspect every school once a year for full inspection and to make as many surprise visits as possible. Inspection is done single-handed by the Inspectors and Deputy Inspectors. After inspection, a report is prepared in the prescribed proforma and a copy of the report is sent to the Headmaster. The Headmaster maintains a follow-up register and writes the progress of follow-up work from time to time.

### *Secondary Schools*

The Deputy Director of Public Instruction (Division) is responsible for the inspection of secondary schools. He is expected to visit 25 per cent of the secondary schools and all teacher training institutions every year. Seventy five per cent of the schools are inspected by the District Educational Officers.

Each Divisional Office has an Assistant Deputy Director of Public Instruction who assists the Deputy Director in inspection work. In the District Office there is an Assistant Educational Officer (Secondary Education) who inspects the smaller secondary schools in the District. The Deputy Director of Public Instruction (Division), the District Educational Officer and the Assistant Educational Officer are expected to inspect 60 to 70 institutions each during an academic year.

## ORISSA

### *Elementary Schools*

Elementary schools under all managements are subject to the academic control and inspection of Deputy and District Inspectors of Schools. They are also responsible for the expansion of elementary education in their Sub-Divisions. A Deputy Inspector of Schools has, on an average, about 100 middle and middle English schools under his charge. He is directly responsible to the District Inspector of Schools. He is assisted by Sub-Inspectors and Assistant Sub-Inspectors who are responsible for the inspection of primary schools in their respective circles. A Sub-Inspector has about 50 primary schools under his charge.

A Sub-Inspector is expected to inspect each primary school in his circle twice a year and help in the efficient management of the schools. In blocks he is to assist the Block Development Officer who sends all his papers to the Deputy Inspector of Schools concerned. An Urdu primary school is inspected by the Inspecting Maulvi and Sub-Inspector of Schools who are attached to the District/Deputy Inspector of Schools. The Sub-Inspector is expected to inspect a primary school single-handed. Usually, he spends not more than a day in case of a full-fledged primary school having Classes I to V. Otherwise, he may inspect two lower/upper primary schools in a day. After inspection, he holds discussions with the teachers and the Head of the school concerned before writing his report in the prescribed manner. Sometimes, he is requested by his Deputy Inspector to inspect a middle school. A Deputy Inspector of Schools is responsible for the inspection of middle and middle English schools and elementary training centres for women, condensed elementary training centres and elementary training schools.

It may be noted that most of the primary schools in Orissa are co-educational and the concerned Sub-Inspector may belong to either sex. Middle schools are also now coeducational and are open to inspection by the Deputy and District Inspectors of Schools belonging to either sex.

### *Secondary Schools*

The Circle Inspector of Schools has the overall responsibility of inspecting all high schools for boys in his circle except those attached to

Government training colleges. Schools attached to Government training colleges are inspected by the Principals of the respective training colleges. Secondary training schools are also inspected by the Circle Inspector. He is assisted in the inspection work by the District Inspectors of Schools (Class II).

Deputy Director of Public Instruction (Women Education) functions as Inspectress of Girls' Schools in respect of one Range consisting of four Districts, in addition to her normal duties. There is another Inspectress for the rest of the districts. She is directly in charge of high schools for girls and secondary training schools for women in all the remaining nine districts. District Inspector is responsible for the inspection of middle schools and elementary training schools for women.

District Inspector of schools is required to be on tour for not less than 150 days in a year. He has to do a lot of administrative work which includes making appointments to all unclassified posts on an initial salary of Rs. 115/- per month or less; acting as punishing authority for such posts; granting leave; nominating non-official members to the Advisory Committee to Government middle and primary schools; passing and countersigning grant-in-aid bills of aided schools, etc.

## PUNJAB

### *Elementary Schools*

Inspection of primary schools under all managements is the direct responsibility of the Block Education Officers. Usually, a Block Education Officer has under his/her charge 40 to 50 schools, but sometimes, a block may have more than 70 schools. A Block Education Officer is directly responsible to the District Education Officer of his district. He is expected to inspect every primary school once a year for full annual inspection and pay two surprise visits. He conducts the annual inspection alone and spends less than a day. After inspection of school, the Block Education Officer holds discussions with the Headmaster and teachers of the school before writing his report.

Middle schools are inspected by the Deputy Education Officer. He is also directly responsible to the District Education Officer of his district. Besides inspection and supervision work, both the Block and Deputy Education Officers make recommendations regarding payment of grants to private schools. As in other States, in the Punjab too inspecting officers of all levels have to do a lot of administrative work.

### *Secondary Schools*

Inspection of all high and higher secondary schools in a district is the responsibility of the District Education Officer. He is expected to inspect every high and higher secondary school once a year for annual inspection and has to pay at least one surprise visit. As he has no one to assist him in the super-

vision of instructional work, he has to conduct the annual inspection single-handed, or with the help of Heads of nearby institutions.

At times, he is assisted by the Deputy Education Officers and Block Education Officers working with him. After the inspection, a District Education Officer usually holds discussions with all the staff members of the school for further clarification and understanding of their problems and difficulties. Then he writes the report and sends a copy of it to the Headmaster/Principal for compliance. A copy is also sent to the Circle Education Officer for information.

It is usually felt that the District Education Officer has very little time at his disposal for the supervision of academic work. He has no Subject Specialists to help him in supervising the instructional work. Inspection norm for a Deputy Education Officer is 48 units (3 middle schools make 2 units, one high/hr. sec. school makes one unit). Norm for a District Education Officer is 24 units for surprise visits and annual inspection.

## RAJASTHAN

### *Primary Schools*

Inspector of Schools is the Principal Inspecting and Supervisory Officer for boys' primary, middle, high/higher secondary schools and teacher training institutions in the district. He is assisted by the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Sub-Deputy Inspectors of Schools (Urban) and Extension Education Officers (Block). Inspectress of Girls' Schools is responsible for the inspection and supervision of girls' schools in the district under her charge. She is assisted by Sub-Deputy Inspectress of Girls' Schools. Middle schools for boys are inspected by the Deputy Inspector of Schools and middle schools for girls either by the Sub-Deputy Inspectress of Girls' Schools or by the Inspectress of Girls' Schools. The Sub-Deputy Inspector/Inspectress of Schools and Extension Education Officer are primarily responsible for the inspection and supervision of primary schools in urban and rural areas respectively. Sub-Deputy Inspector/ Extension Education Officer has about 50 primary schools in his beat. He is expected to inspect every school at least twice a year for full inspection.

According to instructions contained in the State Government Circular dated 4th January 1966, District Level Inspecting Officer and Regional Level Officer are expected to spend 150 days with 100 night-halts and 120 days with 80 night-halts in inspection work, while the Extension Education Officer and Sub-Deputy Inspector of Schools are expected to spend 200 days on tour in a year.

It is disheartening to note that the Inspecting Officers at the District Level and below are not able to do full justice to the academic supervision of schools. According to a survey conducted by the State Institute of Education during 1964, 23 Deputy Inspectors spent, on an average, 111.5 days each on

tour. Out of these, only 60 days were spent on inspection of middle and primary schools and the remaining 51.6 days on other duties.

The condition with regard to the inspection of girls' schools is still worse. An Inspectress of Girls' Schools has four or five districts under her charge. She has to be highly mobile to look after administrative duties concerning teachers' salaries, complaints, placement, etc. She is not provided with transport facilities. Obviously, she is practically left with no time for academic supervision.

### *Secondary Schools*

#### *(i) Boy's Schools*

The Deputy Director of Education (Range) is in charge of secondary school inspection. He is expected to inspect 10 per cent of the secondary and teacher training schools within his Range. He is assisted by the District Inspectors of Schools who are expected to inspect all the high/higher secondary, special and teacher training schools within their districts. Normally, there are 35 to 50 secondary schools within the area of a District Inspector of Schools who is also supposed to inspect 10 per cent of the primary and middle schools. Though the number of secondary schools under the charge of each District Inspector of Schools is not so high as in some other States, yet all the schools are not covered as there is no provision for official transport and schools are also not located in compact areas. Even though the inspection instrument developed by the National Council of Educational Research and Training has been accepted by the State Government, yet the inspection report continues to be written in the log/inspection book maintained by the school, of which a copy is sent to the higher officer. The action taken on the inspection report by the school is checked at the time of the next inspection.

#### *(ii) Girls' schools*

Girls' secondary schools are inspected by the Deputy Director of Education (Female) and Inspectress of Girls' Schools.

## TAMIL NADU

### *Elementary Schools*

Elementary schools under all managements are subject to the academic inspection of the Deputy Inspector of Schools, while the administrative control rests with the managements concerned. A Deputy Inspector of Schools generally has about 50 to 55 primary schools under his charge. He is directly responsible to the District Educational Officer. A Deputy Inspector of Schools is given the assistance of a Junior Deputy Inspector of Schools who holds a Secondary Grade Trained Teacher's Certificate for conducting the annual inspection of primary schools independently, provided the number of primary schools in his Range is sufficiently large, say about 100.

A Deputy Inspector of Schools who is a trained graduate has to visit a school

thrice a year by surprise, besides the visit for annual inspection once a year after advance intimation. Ordinarily, each school has to receive one inspection and three visits in a year. The visits to schools have to be evenly spread over. Normally, a school has to be visited once in three months. The duration of inspection of a primary school is about four hours while that of a middle school is spread over two days. A Deputy Inspector of Schools is required to pay more than three surprise visits also for the improvement of schools. Special visits to Mid-day Meals Centres in schools have also to be made. In a day, Deputy Inspector of Schools has to do not more than one annual inspection and one visit or three visits.

Inspection of a primary school is done single-handed by a Deputy Inspector of Schools. Since there are no single sex primary schools, a Deputy Inspector of schools may belong to either sex. After inspection, he holds discussions with the teachers and the Head of the school before writing the report in the prescribed form and in the inspection book which is to be used only by the inspecting officers of the Education Department. One copy of the report is sent to the District Educational Officer for review and such further action as may be considered necessary on the basis of the remarks in the inspection report, another is sent to the Head of the school for compliance and the third is retained in the Inspector's Office for record.

#### *Secondary Schools*

District Educational Officer is charged with the responsibility of inspection of secondary schools for boys in his district. He has to cover about 40 to 50 secondary schools every year. He may pay surprise visits to some of the primary schools and the Mid-day Meals Centres in the primary schools. There are no Subject Inspectors, but the District Educational Officers are assisted in the instructional work by the Deputy Inspectors of Schools who are trained graduates. A prescribed proforma (Tabular Inspection Report) is used for reporting inspection of a secondary school. Follow-up action is checked at the time of the next inspection. Each District Educational Officer has been provided with a jeep to supervise the school meals programme.

Each Revenue District is covered by more than one District Educational Officer. The DEOs are working under the immediate control of the Chief Educational Officer, ordinarily for each Revenue District (in the rank of a Deputy Director of School Education) with the exception of a few small Districts. Government high Schools where the Heads are Gazetted Officers of the rank of District Educational Officers, are inspected by the Chief Educational Officer.

As regards secondary schools for girls, the Inspectresses of Girls' Schools in the cadre of District Educational Officer are charged with the responsibility of inspection. Their territorial jurisdiction extends over more than one Revenue District and the entire State of Tamil Nadu is covered by six Inspectresses of Girls' Schools. Despite their vast territorial jurisdiction, they are not provided with jeeps.

Both the District Educational Officers and Inspectresses of Girls' Schools are also charged with the responsibility of inspecting special schools and teacher training schools for boys and girls respectively.

## UTTAR PRADESH

### *Elementary Schools*

District Inspector of Schools is in overall charge of education in the entire district. He is assisted by Deputy Inspector of schools, who acts as the *Shiksha Adhikari* (Education Officer) of the *Zilla Parishad*. He is responsible mainly for the inspection of boys' schools. Girls' schools are inspected and supervised by the Deputy Inspectress of Schools and by the Assistant Inspectresses where there are no Deputy Inspectresses. To assist the Deputy Inspector/Inspectress, there are Sub-Deputy Inspectors for boys' schools and Assistant Inspectresses for girls' schools. On an average, a Sub-Deputy Inspector/Assistant Inspectress has to inspect 60 schools a year. The number may, however, range between 40 to 80 depending on the area. Every Zilla Parishad has a *Shiksha Samiti* to advise the *Adhyaksha* on educational matters. In each Municipal Board/Corporation, there is an Education Committee set up under the Primary Education Act of 1919. It functions through the Educational Superintendents (separate for boys and girls) and Assistant Attendance Officers.

So far as boys' schools are concerned, there is one Sub-Deputy Inspector of Schools for every block. As regards girls' schools, the number of Assistant Inspectresses is not the same as there are blocks. An Assistant Inspectress has, therefore, to inspect girls' schools spread over two or more blocks

### *Secondary Schools*

Deputy Director of Education (Regional)/Regional Inspectress of Girls' Schools is entrusted with the responsibility of inspection and supervision of all institutions of elementary and secondary education in his/her Region. At the District Level, he/she is assisted by the District Inspector of Schools, who is actually responsible for the inspection of high schools, intermediate colleges and primary teacher training institutions. He/she himself/herself inspects high schools whereas the intermediate colleges are inspected by a panel consisting of Principals of intermediate and/or degree colleges. The District Inspector of Schools/Regional Inspectress of Girls' Schools is also one of the members of the panel but he/she devotes more of his/her time to the administrative work while the panel inspects the colleges. The Inspector is supposed to inspect every institution under his jurisdiction at least once every alternate year and pay surprise visits now and then. The number of institutions under each Inspector ranges between 50 and 70.

There are separate Inspectorates for Sanskrit, Anglo-Indian and Urdu medium institutions. Agricultural Education is looked after by an Officer on Special Duty, while the supervision of "Arts and Crafts" is the responsibility of a different officer.



## APPENDIX VI

### *Conference of Inspecting Officers (New Delhi, September 15-17, 1969)*

#### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

| <i>Sl. No.</i>        | <i>Name</i>               | <i>Designation and Place of Posting</i>                              |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|
| <i>ANDHRA PRADESH</i> |                           |  |
| 1.                    | Smt. K. Subramanyeswami   | District Educational Officer, East Godavari District, Kakinada       |
| 2.                    | Smt. B. Kameswari Devi    | Gazetted Inspectress of Schools, Mahbubnagar                         |
| 3.                    | Shri G. Seshagiri Rao     | Deputy Inspector of Schools, (Urban), Anantpur                       |
| 4.                    | Shri B. Veerasatyam       | Deputy Inspector of Schools, (Rural), West Godavari Dist., Bhimadole |
| <i>ASSAM</i>          |                           |  |
| 5.                    | Shri I. D. Bhuyan         | Inspector of Schools, Jorhat   |
| 6.                    | Shri Tolan Chandra Phukan | Deputy Inspector of Schools, Dist. Kamrup, P.O. Barpeta              |
| <i>BIHAR</i>          |                           |  |
| 7.                    | Shri Ram Sakal Singh      | District Education Officer, Chaibasa                                 |
| 8.                    | Smt. Shanti Ojha          | District Inspectress of Schools, Patna                               |
| 9.                    | Shri Hariharnath Chaubey  | Sub-Divisional Education officer, Darbhanga                          |
| 10.                   | Shri Mohd. Hashim         | Block Education Extension Officer, At. & P.O. Warisnaga (Darbhanga)  |

| <i>Sl. No.</i> | <i>Name</i>            | <i>Designation and Place of Posting</i> |
|----------------|------------------------|---|
| 11.            | Shri Ram Lakhan Goswmi | Sub-Inspector of Schools, Arah          |

### *GUJARAT*

|     |                   |   |
|-----|-------------------|---|
| 12. | Smt. K.S. Patel   | Educational Inspector, Baroda                 |
| 13. | Shri N. S. Patel  | Deputy Educational Inspector, Ahmedabad       |
| 14. | Shri R. S. Parmar | Assistant Deputy Educational Inspector, Surat |

### *KERALA*

|     |                         |  |
|-----|-------------------------|--|
| 15. | Shri K. P. R. Nambissan | Assistant Educational Officer, Kozhikode |
|-----|-------------------------|--|

### *MAHARASHTRA*

|     |                        |                                     |
|-----|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 16. | Shri S. V. Joag        | Education Officer, Sholapur         |
| 17. | Smt. S. M. Bapat       | Deputy Education Officer, Amravati  |
| 18. | Shri B. S. Chincholkar | Deputy Education Officer, Osmanabad |

### *MYSORE*

|     |                    |  |
|-----|--------------------|--|
| 19. | Smt. S. S. Pandit  | Deputy Director of Public Instruction, Bangalore |
| 20. | Shri S. Shanthaiah | District Educational Officer, Gulbarga           |

### *ORISSA*

|     |                         |  |
|-----|-------------------------|--|
| 21. | Shri Sivaram Patnaik    | District Inspector of Schools, Cuttack       |
| 22. | Shri Radhakanta Misra   | Inspector of Schools, Koraput                |
| 23. | Shri Tanu Charan Misra  | Deputy Inspector of Schools, Jajpur, Cuttack |
| 24. | Shri Fakir Charan Misra | Sub-Inspector of Schools, Nimapara, Puri     |

| <i>Sl. No.</i>       | <i>Name</i>                  | <i>Designation and Place of Posting</i>                     |
|----------------------|------------------------------|---|
| <i>PANJAB</i>        |                              |   |
| 25.                  | Shri Sajjan Singh Kishanpuri | District Education Officer, Amritsar                        |
| 26.                  | Smt. S. Madhok               | Deputy Circle Education Officer, Jullundur                  |
| 27.                  | Shri Bishan Dass Sharma      | Block Education Officer, Dhariwal                           |
| <i>RAJASTHAN</i>     |                              |   |
| 28.                  | Shri Premshankar Shrimali    | Inspector of Schools, Pali                                  |
| 29.                  | Shri P. C. Sethi             | Deputy Inspector of Schools, Jaipur                         |
| 30.                  | Shri Daulatram Dhankani      | Education Extension Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Kekri, Ajmer |
| <i>TAMIL NADU</i>    |                              |   |
| 31.                  | Smt. C. Sarojini             | District Educational Officer, Saidapet                      |
| 32.                  | Shri K. Jayaraman            | Deputy Inspector of Schools, Salem Range, Salem             |
| <i>UTTAR PRADESH</i> |                              |   |
| 33.                  | Shri B. L. Tandon            | District Inspector of Schools, Agra                         |
| 34.                  | Smt. Chandra Chadha          | Deputy Inspectress of Schools, Meerut                       |
| 35.                  | Shri Ram Raj Pal Gupta       | Sub-Deputy Inspector of Schools, Saharanpur                 |

APPENDIX VII

*Questionnaire for Inspecting Officers  
of Primary/Middle Schools*

*Directions:*

1. All questions must be replied to.
2. Due to inadequacy of space for certain questions, if additional sheets have to be interleaved, those additional sheets must bear the name of section and question number to which the reply relates.

I. *Job jurisdiction*

1. Give the area (in sq. kms.)  
of your jurisdiction \_\_\_\_\_

2. Give the number of schools under  
your jurisdiction in the table below:

| <i>Types of schools</i> | <i>Number of schools managed by :</i> |   |                   |   |                |   |              |   |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------|---|----------------|---|--------------|---|
|                         | <i>Government</i>                     |   | <i>Local Body</i> |   | <i>Private</i> |   | <i>Total</i> |   |
|                         | R                                     | U | R                 | U | R              | U | R            | U |
| Primary                 |                                       |   |                   |   |                |   |              |   |
| —Boys                   |                                       |   |                   |   |                |   |              |   |
| —Girls                  |                                       |   |                   |   |                |   |              |   |
| —Co-educational         |                                       |   |                   |   |                |   |              |   |

Middle

—Boys

—Girls

—Co-educational

---

'R' stands for Rural

'U' stands for Urban

3. Give enrolment and sanctioned strength of teaching staff (as on 31.3.69) of schools under your jurisdiction in the following table:

---

| <i>Types of schools</i> | <i>Total No. of pupils<br/>on roll</i> | <i>Total No. of teachers<br/>sanctioned</i> |
|-------------------------|--|---|
|-------------------------|--|---|

---

Primary

Middle

- 
4. Do you have to inspect and supervise schools managed by the departments other than education?

Yes/No

If so, give information in the following table:

---

| <i>Name of the<br/>department(s)</i> | <i>Types of schools</i> | <i>No. of schools</i> | <i>Enrolment</i> | <i>No. of<br/>teachers</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|

---

Primary

Middle

---

II. *Workload*

5. Give average number of hours per week that you devote to your job. Include all time spent on activities which are required or expected of you

as part of your job, whether you do the work at office, school, home or elsewhere. Tick (✓) one from the following:

- 30 hours or less ( )
- 31 - 40 hours ( )
- 41 - 50 hours ( )
- 51 - 60 hours ( )
- 61 - 70 hours ( )
- More than 70 hours ( )

6. Give the number of schools expected of you to be inspected in a year:

Primary Schools -----

Middle Schools -----

7. Indicate average number of schools actually inspected by you per year in the course of last three years:

Primary Schools -----

Middle Schools -----

8. Give reasons for shortfall, if any, between expectation and actual performance (Ref. Qs. 6 and 7 above)

### III. Duties and Functions

9. Separating your administrative work from inspection and supervisory duties, indicate clearly all the regular and *ad hoc* duties which you have to perform as part of your job (whether at office, school, home or elsewhere) and the time devoted to each in a year:

a) *As an administrator:*

| <i>Duties</i>   | <i>Average number of hours devoted in a year</i> | <i>Col. 2 as percentage of total time (converted into hours) of your official work in a year</i> |
|---|--|--|
| (1)   | (2)  | (3)  |
| (i) Personnel management<br>e.g, postings, transfers, leave, punishment, etc. |  |  |
| (ii) Conducting enquiries   |  |  |
| (iii) Attending to quasi-judicial cases                                       |  |  |
| (iv) Attending to assembly questions  |  |  |
| (v) Meeting visitors<br>(both formally and informally)                        |  |  |
| (vi) Receiving VIPs   |  |  |
| (vii) Attending social functions  |  |  |
| (viii) Organising mid-day meals   |  |  |
| (ix) Raising funds for different purposes                                     |  |  |
| (x) Organising relief work  |  |  |
| (xi) Calculating and disbursing grants to private aided schools               |  |  |

| (1) | (2) | (3) |
|-----|-----|-----|
|-----|-----|-----|

- (xii) Disbursing teachers' salaries
- (xiii) Filling statistical returns received from district education office
- (xiv) Providing information to other agencies e.g. State Institutes of Education, etc.
- (xv) Preparing annual budget
- (xvi) Organising and attending official meetings
- (xvii) Conducting official correspondence with senior officers and other agencies
- (xviii) Conducting correspondence with schools on official matters other than inspection
- (xix) Any other (specify)

b) As an inspector : (Among other things, include time spent on casual/ surprise, comprehensive and follow-up visits to schools)



| <i>Duties</i> | <i>Average number of hours devoted in a year</i> | <i>Col. 2 as percentage of total time (converted into hours) of your official work in a year</i> |
|---------------|--|--|
| (1)           | (2)  | (3)  |

- (i) Correspondence with schools before actual inspection
- (ii) Actual inspection work
- (iii) Follow-up
- (iv) Any other (specify)

c) As a supervisor:

| <i>Duties</i> | <i>Average number of hours devoted in a year</i> | <i>Col. 2 as percentage of total time (converted into hours) of your official work in a year</i> |
|---------------|--|--|
| (1)           | (2)  | (3)  |

- (i) Guidance to Headmasters in educational supervision
- (ii) Demonstration lessons and other academic help to teachers
- (iii) In-service training of Headmasters and teachers

---

(1)

(2)

(3)

---

(iv) Disseminating information  
to Headmasters and  
teachers on improved  
school practices

(v) Any other (specify)

#### IV. *Inspection and Supervisory Procedures and Practices*

10. What types of preparations do you make prior to the inspection and supervision of a school? (Describe the nature of correspondence you enter into with the Headmaster of the school and members of the panel, if you have one; collection and study of data, if any, from the school prior to inspection; academic preparation such as preparation of demonstration lessons, etc.)

11. How frequently are you required to inspect a school in a year? Give information in the table below:

| <i>Types of schools</i> | <i>No. of inspections required to be conducted in a year</i> |                      |                  |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------|------------------|
|                         | <i>Casual/surprise</i>                                       | <i>Comprehensive</i> | <i>Follow-up</i> |
| Primary                 |  |                      |                  |
| Middle                  |  |                      |                  |

12. How frequently did you actually inspect a school during the last three years? Give average number of inspections conducted per year in the following table:

| <i>Types of schools</i> | <i>Average No. of inspections actually conducted in a year</i> |                      |                  |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------|------------------|
|                         | <i>Casual/surprise</i>   | <i>Comprehensive</i> | <i>Follow-up</i> |
| Primary                 |  |                      |                  |
| Middle                  |  |                      |                  |

13. Give reasons for shortfall, if any, between departmental requirements and actual performance (Ref. Qs. 11 and 12 above)

14. Enclose a copy each of the inspection proformas used by you for :
- Primary Schools
- Middle Schools
15. Do you send the inspection proformas to Heads of schools in advance of the actual inspection?
- Yes/No
- If so, how many days or weeks in advance? \_\_\_\_\_
16. How many days do you devote to the inspection of a school?
- Primary School \_\_\_\_\_
- Middle School \_\_\_\_\_
17. For how many days in a year you are required to be on official tour?
- For inspection of schools \_\_\_\_\_
- For purposes other than inspection of schools \_\_\_\_\_
18. Give average number of days per year you actually remained on official tour during the last three years for inspection of schools \_\_\_\_\_
19. Give average number of days per year you actually remained on official tour during the last three years for purposes other than inspection. Also specify the purpose(s) for which you remained on tour \_\_\_\_\_

---

*Purpose of tour*

*Average No. of days per year you  
were on tour*

\_\_\_\_\_

20. How is inspection conducted by you? Tick (✓) from the following:

Single-handed ( )

With the help of junior  
inspecting officers, if  
any ( )

With the help of a panel of  
experts, if any ( )

21. If inspection is conducted with the help of a panel, give constitution of the panel.

22. Before writing the inspection report, do you hold discussions with the Headmaster and teachers of the school concerned?

If so, what is the nature of discussions?

23. How much time do you take in sending the inspection report to the school concerned and to your senior officer, after the inspection is over? Tick (✓) one from the following:

Less than one week ( )

One week ( )

A fortnight ( )

One month ( )

More than one month ( )

24. Enclose a copy each of the latest inspection reports written by you for:

Primary School

Middle School

25. Do you take any follow-up action with regard to the inspection report?

Yes/No

If so give details about the nature of follow-up.

26. Describe below in detail the methods and techniques of supervision you follow while supervising a school.

*V. General*

27. Write the problems which you have to face as an inspecting officer.

28. Give suggestions for solving these problems with particular reference to ways and means by which your present involvement in non-educational work could be reduced to the minimum.



29. Give any other details which you think will help us to know better the inspection and supervisory procedures and practices in your State and also your job as an inspecting officer.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name (in block  
letters) \_\_\_\_\_

Designation \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Date : \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX VIII

*Questionnaire for Inspecting Officers of  
Secondary Schools*

*Directions:*

1. All questions must be replied to.
2. Due to inadequacy of space for certain questions, if additional sheets have to be interleaved, those additional sheets must bear the name of section and question number to which the reply relates.

I. *Job Jurisdiction*

1. Give the area (in sq. kms.) of your jurisdiction. \_\_\_\_\_
2. Give the number of schools under your jurisdiction in the table below:

| <i>Types of Schools</i> | <i>Number of schools managed by:</i> |          |                   |          |                |          | <i>Total</i> |          |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|-------------------|----------|----------------|----------|--------------|----------|
|                         | <i>Government</i>                    |          | <i>Local Body</i> |          | <i>Private</i> |          | <i>R</i>     | <i>U</i> |
|                         | <i>R</i>                             | <i>U</i> | <i>R</i>          | <i>U</i> | <i>R</i>       | <i>U</i> |              |          |
|                         |                                      |          |                   |          |                |          |              |          |

- High  
 —Boys  
 —Girls  
 —Co-educational

Higher Secondary  
 (including Multi-  
 purpose)

- Boys
- Girls
- Co-educational

Intermediate/Junior  
Colleges

- Boys
- Girls
- Co-educational

Primary Teacher  
Training Schools

- Boys
- Girls
- Co-educational

(R stands for Rural. U stands for Urban)

3. Give enrolment and sanctioned strength of teaching staff (as on 31. 3. 69) of schools under your jurisdiction in the following table :

| <i>Types of schools</i> | <i>Total No. of pupils on roll</i> | <i>Total No. of teachers sanctioned</i> |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|---|

High

Higher Secondary  
(including Multi-  
purpose)

Intermediate/Junior  
Colleges

Primary Teacher  
Traning Schools

4. Do you have to inspect and supervise schools managed by the departments other than education ?

Yes//No.

If so, give information in the following table:

| <i>Name of department (s)</i> | <i>Types of schools</i>                       | <i>No. of schools</i> | <i>Enrolment</i> | <i>No. of teachers</i> |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|
|                               | High  |                       |                  |                        |
|                               | Higher Secondary<br>(including Multi-purpose) |                       |                  |                        |
|                               | Intermediate/<br>Junior Colleges              |                       |                  |                        |
|                               | Primary Teacher<br>Training Schools           |                       |                  |                        |

## II. Workload

5. Give average number of hours per week that you devote to your job. Include all time spent on activities which are required or expected of you as part of your job, whether you do the work at office, school, home or elsewhere. Tick (✓) one from the following:

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| 30 hours or less   | ( |
| 31—40 hours        | ) |
| 41—50 hours        | ) |
| 51—60 hours        | ) |
| 61—70 hours        | ) |
| More than 70 hours | ) |

6. Give the number of schools expected of you to be inspected in a year:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| High Schools                                      | — |
| Higher Secondary Schools (including Multipurpose) | — |
| Intermediate Junior Colleges                      |   |
| Primary Teacher Training Schools                  |   |

7. Indicate average number of schools actually inspected by you in the course of last three years:

High schools

Higher Secondary Schools (including  
Multipurpose)

Intermediate Junior Colleges

Primary Teacher Training Schools

8. Give reasons for shortfall, if any, between expectation and actual performance (Ref. Qs. 6 and 7 above)

### III. *Duties and Functions*

9. Separating your administrative work from inspection and supervisory duties, indicate clearly all the regular and *ad hoc* duties which you have to perform as part of your job (whether at office, school, home or elsewhere) and the time devoted to each in a year:

a) *As an administrator:*

| <i>Duties</i>  | <i>Average number of hours devoted in a year</i> | <i>Col. 2 as percentage of total time (converted into hours) of your official work in a year</i> |
|--|--|--|
| (1)  | (2)  | (3)  |
| (i) Personnel management e.g. postings, transfers, leave, punishment, etc. |  |  |
| (ii) Conducting enquiries  |  |  |
| (iii) Attending to quasi-judicial cases                                    |  |  |
| (iv) Attending to assembly questions                                       |  |  |
| (v) Meeting visitors (both formally and informally)                        |  |  |
| (vi) Receiving VIPs  |  |  |
| (vii) Attending social functions   |  |  |
| (viii) Organising mid-day meals  |  |  |
| (ix) Raising funds for different purposes                                  |  |  |
| (x) Organising relief work   |  |  |
| (xi) Calculating and disbursing grants to private aided schools            |  |  |

---

(1)

(2)

(3)

---

- (xii) Disbursing teachers' salaries
- (xiii) Filling statistical returns received from district education office
- (xiv) Providing information to other agencies e.g. State Institutes of Education, etc.
- (xv) Preparing annual budget
- (xvi) Organising and attending official meetings
- (xvii) Conducting official correspondence with senior officers and other agencies
- (xviii) Conducting correspondence with schools on official matters other than inspection
- (xix) Any other (specify)

- b) *As an inspector:* (Among other things, include time spent on casual/surprise, comprehensive and follow-up visits to schools)

| <i>Duties</i> | <i>Average number of hours devoted in a year</i> | <i>Col. 2 as percentage of total time (converted into hours) of your official work in a year</i> |
|---------------|--|--|
| (1)           | (2)  | (3)  |

- (i) Correspondence with schools before actual inspection
- (ii) Actual inspection work
- (iii) Follow-up
- (iv) Any other (specify)

- c) *As a supervisor:*

| <i>Duties</i> | <i>Average number of hours devoted in a year</i> | <i>Col. 2 as percentage of total time (converted into hours) of your official work in a year</i> |
|---------------|--|--|
| (1)           | (2)  | (3)  |

- (i) Guidance to Headmasters/Principals



---

(1)

(2)

(3)

---

in educational supervision

(ii) Demonstration lessons and other academic help to teachers

(iii) In-service training of Headmasters/ Principals and teachers

(iv) Disseminating information to Headmasters/ Principals and teachers on improved school practices

(v) Any other (specify)

#### IV. *Inspection and Supervisory Procedures and Practices*

10. What types of preparations do you make prior to the inspection and supervision of a school? (Describe the nature of correspondence you enter into with the Headmaster/Principal of the school and members of the panel if you have one, and also with subject inspectors and/or subject teachers' association if you have them; collection and study of data, if any, from the school

prior to inspection; academic preparation such as preparation of demonstration lessons, etc.)

11. How frequently are you required to inspect a school in a year?  
Give information in the table below :

---

| <i>Types of schools</i> | <i>Casual/surprise</i> | <i>Comprehensive</i> | <i>Follow-up</i> |
|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------|

High

Higher Secondary (including Multipurpose)

Intermediate/Junior Colleges

Primary Teacher Training Schools

---

12. How frequently did you actually inspect a school during the last three years? Give average number of inspections conducted per year in the following table:

| <i>Types of schools</i>                   | <i>Average No. of inspections actually conducted in a year:</i> |                      |                  |
|---|---|----------------------|------------------|
|   | <i>Casual/surprise</i>  | <i>Comprehensive</i> | <i>Follow-up</i> |
| High                                      |   |                      |                  |
| Higher Secondary (including Multipurpose) |   |                      |                  |
| Intermediate Junior Colleges              |   |                      |                  |
| Primary Teacher Training Schools          |   |                      |                  |

13. Give reasons for shortfall, if any, between departmental requirements and actual performance (Ref. Qs.11 and 12 above)

14. Enclose a copy each of the inspection proformas used by you for :

High Schools

Higher Secondary (including Multipurpose) Schools

Intermediate/Junior Colleges

Primary Teacher Training Schools

15. Do you send the inspection proformas to Heads of schools in advance of the actual inspection?

Yes/No

If so, how many days or weeks in advance?

\_\_\_\_\_

16. How many days do you devote to the inspection of a school?

High School

\_\_\_\_\_

Higher Secondary or Multi-purpose) school

\_\_\_\_\_

Intermediate/Junior College

\_\_\_\_\_

Primary Teacher Training School

\_\_\_\_\_

17. For how many days in a year you are required to be on official tour?

For inspection of schools

\_\_\_\_\_

For purposes other than inspection of schools

\_\_\_\_\_

18. Give average number of days per year you actually remained on official tour during the last three years for inspection of schools

19. Give average number of days per year you actually remained on official tour during the last three years for purposes other than inspection. Also specify the purpose (s) for which you remained on tour.

---

*Purpose of tour*

*Average No. of days per year you  
were on tour*

---

---

20. How is inspection conducted by you? Tick (✓) from the following:

Single-handed ( )

With the help of junior inspecting officers ( )

With the help of a panel of experts, if any ( )

With the help of subject inspectors, if any ( )

With the help of subject teachers' association, if any ( )

21. If inspection is conducted with the help of a panel, give constitution of the panel.

22. Before writing the inspection report, do you hold discussions with the Headmaster/Principal and teachers of the school concerned?

Yes/No

If so, what is the nature of discussions ?

23. How much time do you take in sending the inspection report to the school concerned and to your senior officer, after the inspection is over. Tick (✓) one from the following:

Less than one week ( )

One week ( )

A fortnight ( )

One month ( )

More than one month ( )

24. Enclose a copy each of the latest inspection reports written by you for a:

High School

**Higher** Secondary (including Multipurpose)  
School

Intermediate/Junior College

Primary Teacher Training School

25. Do you take any follow-up action with regard to the inspection report?

Yes/No

If so, give details about the nature of follow-up.

26. Describe below in detail the methods and techniques of supervision you follow while supervising a school.

*V. General*

27. Write the problems which you have to face as an inspecting officer.



28. Give suggestions for solving these problems with particular reference to ways and means by which your present involvement in non-educational work could be reduced to the minimum.

29. Give any other details which you think will help us to know better the inspection and supervisory procedures and practices in your State and also your job as an inspecting officer.

Signature .....

Name (in block.....  
letters)

Designation.....

Address.....

Date: .....

APPENDIX IX

*Questionnaire for Heads of Educational  
Districts (District Education Officers/  
Inspectors of Schools/Parishad  
Education Officers)*

*Directions:*

1. All questions must be replied to.
2. Due to inadequacy of space for certain questions, if additional sheets have to be interleaved, those additional sheets must bear the name of section and question number to which the reply relates.

*I. Administrative Set-up*

1. Give in detail the administrative set-up of education at the district level in your State. Among other things, the number, designation and nature of duties of each category of academic officers working under you, may be clearly indicated in the table below:

---

| <i>Category of academic officers</i> | <i>Designation</i> | <i>Number of posts sanctioned</i> | <i>Nature of duties</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Primary School Inspectors            |                    |                                   |                         |
| Middle School Inspectors             |                    |                                   |                         |
| High/Higher Sec. School Inspectors   |                    |                                   |                         |
| Subject Inspectors, if any           |                    |                                   |                         |
| Any other (specify)                  |                    |                                   |                         |

---

2. Is there any separate provision for supervision and inspection of girls schools by women inspecting staff in your State?

Yes/No

Is so, at what level? Tick (✓) from the following:

Primary ( )

Middle ( )

Secondary ( )

Also give the number and designation of women inspecting officers at each level in your district in the table below:

| <i>Level</i> | <i>Designation of post</i> | <i>Number of posts sanctioned</i> |
|--------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Primary      |                            |                                   |
| Middle       |                            |                                   |
| Secondary    |                            |                                   |

Give details of non-academic staff working under you:

---

| <i>Designation of post</i> | <i>No. of posts sanctioned</i> | <i>Nature of duties</i> |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|

---

II. *Recruitment Policies, Selection and Promotion Procedures*

4. Give below the percentage prescribed by your Department for direct recruits to the job of inspecting officers at different levels:

| <i>Level of Inspector</i>        | <i>Percentage</i> |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Primary School Inspector .....   |                   |
| Middle School Inspector .....    |                   |
| Secondary School Inspector ..... |                   |
| Head, Educational District ..... |                   |

5. How are direct recruits selected for the posts of inspecting officers of all levels? Mention the procedure in detail.

6. What are the channels of promotion in your Department? Mention the channels from teacher upwards. Also enclose a copy of promotion rules.

III. *Status and Service Conditions*

7. What class of State service do inspecting officers of different levels belong to?

| <i>Level of Inspector</i>  | <i>State Service (Class)</i> |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Primary School Inspector   | .....                        |
| Middle School Inspector    | .....                        |
| Secondary School Inspector | .....                        |
| Head, Educational District | .....                        |

8. Indicate below the pay scale of each category of inspecting officer, mentioning clearly the rate of increment and efficiency bars, if any:

| <i>Category of Inspector</i> | <i>Pay Scale</i> |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| Primary School Inspector     | .....            |
| Middle School Inspector      | .....            |
| Secondary School Inspector   | .....            |
| Head, Educational District   | .....            |

9. Is Government accommodation provided to inspecting officers in your State?

Yes No

If so, give percentage of inspecting officers who have been allotted Government accommodation in your district:

| <i>Category of Inspector</i> | <i>Percentage having Government accommodation</i> |
|------------------------------|---|
| Primary School Inspector     | .....   |
| Middle School Inspector      | .....   |
| Secondary School Inspector   | .....   |
| Head, Educational District   | .....   |

10. Is there any provision in your State for free medical aid for inspecting officers of all levels and their families?

Yes/No

11. Do inspecting officers get children's allowance in your State?

Yes/No

If so, what category of inspecting officers get such allowance. Tick (✓) from the following and also indicate the rate of allowance per child per month:

| <i>Category of Inspector</i> | <i>Rate of allowance per child per month</i> |
|------------------------------|--|
| Primary School Inspector     | .....  |
| Middle School Inspector      | .....  |
| Secondary School Inspector   | .....  |
| Head, Educational District   | .....  |

12. Enclose a copy of pension rules for inspecting officers of all levels framed by your Government.

*IV. Job Jurisdiction*

13. Give the area (in sq. kms.) of your jurisdiction \_\_\_\_\_

14. Give the number of schools under your jurisdiction in the table below :

| Types of Schools                                  | Number of schools managed by : |   |            |   |         |   | Total |   |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------|---|---------|---|-------|---|
|   | Government                     |   | Local Body |   | Private |   | R     | U |
|   | R                              | U | R          | U | R       | U |       |   |
| Primary   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Boys   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Girls  |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Co-educational                                   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| Middle  |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Boys   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Girls  |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| Co-educational                                    |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| High/Higher Secondary<br>(including Multipurpose) |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Boys   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Girls  |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Co-educational                                   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| Intermediate/Junior<br>Colleges                   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Boys   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Girls  |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Co-educational                                   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| Primary Teacher<br>Training Schools               |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Boys   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Girls  |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |
| —Co-educational                                   |                                |   |            |   |         |   |       |   |

'R' stands for Rural  
'U' stands for Urban

15. Give enrolment and sanctioned strength of teaching staff (as on 31.3.69) of schools under your jurisdiction in the following table:



| <i>Types of Schools</i>                        | <i>Total number of pupils on roll</i> | <i>Total number of teachers sanctioned</i> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Primary  |                                       |  |
| Middle   |                                       |  |
| High/Higher Secondary (including Multipurpose) |                                       |  |
| Intermediate/Junior Colleges                   |                                       |  |
| Primary Teacher Training Schools               |                                       |  |

16. Do inspecting officers in your State have to inspect and supervise schools managed by the departments other than education?

Yes No

If so, give information in the following table:

| <i>Name of the department (s)</i> | <i>Types of schools</i>                                   | <i>No. of schools</i> | <i>Enrolment</i> | <i>No. of teachers</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|
|                                   | Primary   |                       |                  |                        |
|                                   | Middle  |                       |                  |                        |
|                                   | Secondary (High/<br>Hr. Secondary including Multipurpose) |                       |                  |                        |

#### V. Workload

17. Give average number of hours per week that you devote to your job. Include all time spent on activities which are required or expected of you as part of your job, whether you do the work at office, school, home or elsewhere. Tick (✓) one from the following:

30 hours or less ( )

31-40 hours ( )

- 41-50 hours ( )
- 51-60 hours ( )
- 61-70 hours ( )
- More than 70 hours ( )

18. Give the number of schools expected of you to be inspected in a year:

- Primary Schools .....
- Middle Schools .....
- High/Higher Secondary Schools  
(including Multipurpose) .....
- Intermediate/Junior Colleges .....
- Primary Teacher Training Schools .....

19. Indicate average number of schools actually inspected by you per year in the course of last three years:

- Primary Schools .....
- Middle Schools .....
- High/Higher Secondary Schools  
(including Multipurpose) .....
- Intermediate/Junior Colleges .....
- Primary Teacher Training Schools .....

20. Give reasons for shortfall, if any, between expectation and actual performance (Ref. Qs. 18 and 19 above)

VI. *Powers and Functions*

21. Enclose a copy of Government Order indicating powers and functions of inspecting officers operating at different levels.
22. Separating your administrative work from inspection and supervisory duties, indicate clearly all the regular and *ad hoc* duties which you have to perform as part of your job (whether at office, school, home or elsewhere) and the time devoted to each in a year:
- a) As an administrator :

| Duties   | Average No. of hours devoted in a year | Col. 2 as percentage of total time (converted into hours) of your official work in a year |
|--|--|---|
| (1)  | (2)                                    | (3)   |
| (i) Personnel management<br>e.g. selection, recruitment, postings, transfers, leave, punishment, pension, etc. |  |   |
| (ii) Conducting enquiries  |  |   |
| (iii) Attending to quasi-judicial cases  |  |   |
| (iv) Attending to assembly questions   |  |   |
| (v) Meeting visitors (both formally and informally)  |  |   |
| (vi) Receiving VIPs  |  |   |

---

(1)

(2)

(3)

---

- (vii) Attending social functions
- (viii) Organising mid-day meals
- (ix) Raising funds for different purposes
- (x) Organising relief work
- (xi) Calculating and disbursing grants to private aided schools
- (xii) Disbursing teachers' salaries
- (xiii) Filling statistical returns received from DPI's office
- (xiv) Providing information to other educational agencies e.g. National Council of Educational Research & Training, State Council of Educational Research & Training (if you have one in your State), State Institutes of Education, etc.
- (xv) Preparing annual budget
- (xvi) Organising and attending official meetings
- (xvii) Conducting official correspondence with DPI's office and other agencies
- (xviii) Conducting correspondence with schools on official matters other than inspection
- (xix) Any other  
(specify)

.....

.....  
 .....  
 .....

b) As an inspector : (Among other things, include time spent on casual/surprise, comprehensive and follow-up visits to schools)

| Duties | Average number of hours devoted in a year | Col. 2 as percentage of total time (converted into hours) of your official work in a year |
|--------|---|---|
| (1)    | (2)                                       | (3)   |

- (i) Correspondence with schools before actual inspection
- (ii) Actual inspection work
- (iii) Follow-up
- (iv) Any other (specify)

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

---

c) As a supervisor:

| Duties | Average number of hours devoted in a year | Col. 2 as percentage of total time (converted into hours) of your official work in a year |
|--------|---|---|
| (1)    | (2)                                       | (3)   |

- (i) Guidance to Headmasters/Principals in educational supervision
  - (ii) Demonstration lessons and other academic help to teachers
  - (iii) In-service training of Headmasters/Principals and teachers
  - (iv) Disseminating information to Headmasters/Principals and teachers on improved school practices
  - (v) Any other (specify)
- 

VII. *Inspection and Supervisory Procedures and Practices*

23. What types of preparations do you make prior to the inspection and supervision of a school? (Describe the nature of correspondence you enter/into with the Headmaster/Principal of the school and members of the panel if you have one, and also with subject inspectors and or subject

teachers' association if you have them; collection and study of data

24. How frequently are you required to inspect a school in a year? Give information in the table below:

---

| <i>Types of schools</i>  | <i>Number of inspections required to be conducted in a year:</i> |                      |                  |
|--|--|----------------------|------------------|
|  | <i>Casual/surprise</i>   | <i>Comprehensive</i> | <i>Follow-up</i> |
| Primary  |  |                      |                  |
| Middle<br>High/Higher Secondary<br>(including Multi-<br>purpose) |  |                      |                  |
| Intermediate/Junior<br>Colleges                                  |  |                      |                  |
| Primary Teacher Train-<br>ing Schools                            |  |                      |                  |

---

25. How frequently did you actually inspect a school during the last three years? Give average number of inspections conducted per year in the following table:

| <i>Types of schools</i>                                     | <i>Average number of inspections actually conducted in a year:</i> |                      |                  |
|---|--|----------------------|------------------|
|   | <i>Casual/surprise</i>   | <i>Comprehensive</i> | <i>Follow-up</i> |
| Primary   |  |                      |                  |
| Middle<br>High/Higher Secondary<br>(including Multipurpose) |  |                      |                  |
| Intermediate/Junior<br>Colleges                             |  |                      |                  |
| Primary Teacher Training Schools                            |  |                      |                  |

26. Give reasons for shortfall, if any, between departmental requirements and actual performance (Ref. Qs 24 and 25 above).

27. Enclose a copy each of the inspection proformas used by you for:

Primary schools  
 Middle schools  
 High/Higher Secondary (including Multipurpose) Schools



Intermediate/Junior Colleges  
Primary Teacher Training Schools

28. Do you send the inspection proformas to Heads of schools in advance of the actual inspection?

Yes/No

If so, how many days or weeks in advance?

.....

29. How many days do you devote to the inspection of a school?

Primary School .....

Middle School .....

High/Higher Secondary or  
Multipurpose School .....

Intermediate/Junior Collage .....

Primary Teacher Training  
School .....

30. Is there any basis prescribed by your department to devote a particular number of days to the inspection of a school e.g. enrolment, etc?

Yes/No

If yes, specify the basis for each type of school separately.

31. For how many days in a year you are required to be on official tour?
- For inspection of schools .....
- For purposes other than inspection of schools .....
32. Give average number of days per year you actually remained on official tour during the last three years for inspection of schools
- .....
33. Give average number of days per year you actually remained on official tour during the last three years for purposes other than inspection. Also specify the purpose(s) for which you remained on tour.

---

| <i>Purpose of tour</i> | <i>Average number of days per year you were on tour</i> |
|------------------------|---|
|------------------------|---|

---

34. How is inspection conducted by you? Tick (  $\sqrt{\quad}$  ) from the following
- Single-handed ( )
- With the help of junior inspecting officers ( )
- With the help of a panel of experts, if any ( )
- With the help of subject inspectors, if any ( )
- With the help of subject teachers' association, if any ( )
35. If inspection is conducted with the help of a panel, give constitution of the panel.

36. Before writing the inspection report, do you hold discussions with the Headmaster, Principal and teachers of the school concerned?

Yes/No

If so, what is the nature of discussions?

37. How much time do you take in sending the inspection report to the school concerned and to your senior officer, after the inspection is over? Tick (✓) one from the following :

Less than one week (       )

One week (       )

A fortnight (       )

One month (       )

More than one month (       )

38. Enclose a copy each of the latest inspection reports written by you for a:

Primary School

Middle School

High/Higher Secondary  
(including Multipurpose) School  
Intermediate/Junior College

Primary Teacher Training School

39. Do you take any follow-up action with regard to the inspection report?

Yes/No

If so, give details about the nature of follow-up.

40. Do you associate teacher training colleges/schools in your area for the purpose of extension work?

Yes/No

If yes, give in brief the nature of extension activities conducted.

41. Has evaluative criteria for the inspection and supervision of secondary schools developed by the National Council of Educational Research and Training been adopted/adapted by your State?

Yes/No

If not, give reasons therefor.

42. Has administration of education been separated from supervision in your State?

Yes/No

If so, give details of the steps taken.

43. Describe below in detail the methods and techniques of supervision you follow while supervising a school.

VIII. *General*

44. Enclose a copy of TA/DA rules prescribed by your department for inspecting officers of all levels.
45. Write the problems which you have to face as an inspecting officer.

46. Give suggestions for solving these problems with particular reference to ways and means by which your present involvement in non-educational work could be reduced to the minimum.

47. Give any other details which you think will help us to know better the inspection and supervisory procedures and practices in your State and also your job as an inspecting officer.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name (in block letters) \_\_\_\_\_

Designation \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## APPENDIX X

### Designations, Pay Scales and Status of Inspecting Officers in Different States as on 17.9.1969

| State          | Category of Inspecting Officer                                    | Designation                        | Pay Scale  | Status (State Service)                           |
|----------------|---|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 1              | 2   | 3                                  | 4  | 5  |
| Andhra Pradesh | Primary/Middle School Inspecting Officer                          | Deputy Inspector of Schools        | Rs. 130-5-150-7½-200-10-   | Subordinate Services—<br>Category II of Class II |
|                |   | Junior Deputy Inspector of Schools | 250  |  |
|                |   | Extension Officer (Edn.)           |  |  |
| Assam          | Secondary School Inspecting Officer<br>Head, Educational District | Gazetted Inspector                 | Rs. 400-800  | Category I of Class III                          |
|                |   | District Educational Officer       | Rs. 750-50-1,200   | Class II (APES)                                  |
|                |   | Primary School Inspecting Officer  | Assistant Sub-Inspector of Schools                                   | Rs. 140-6-170-EB-7-205-EB-7-275                  |
| Assam          | Middle School Inspecting Officer                                  | Sub-Inspector of Schools           | Rs. 200-12½-250-EB-12½-275-350-EB-15-500                             | do   |
|                |   | Deputy Inspector of Schools        | Rs. 350-30-500-EB-30-680-EB-35-925 (with a minimum start of Rs. 450) | Class II (Gazetted)                              |

| 1       | 2                                   | 3   | 4  | 5  |
|---------|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
|         | Secondary School Inspecting Officer | Inspector of Schools                      | Rs. 750-50-950-EB-50-1,200                                     | Class I (Gazetted)                           |
|         | Head, Educational District          | do  | do   | do   |
| Bihar   | Primary School Inspecting Officer   | Sub-Inspector of Schools (Urban)          | Rs. 160-7-202-EB-7-244-9-280 (with a minimum start of Rs. 188) | Lower Division Subordinate Education Service |
|         |                                     | Block Education Extension Officer (Rural) | do   | do   |
|         | Middle School Inspecting Officer    | Deputy Inspector of Schools               | Rs. 230-13-308-EB-13-360-15-450                                | Upper Division Subordinate Education Service |
|         |                                     | Deputy Superintendent of Basic Education  | do   | do   |
|         | Secondary School Inspecting Officer | Sub-Divisional Education Officer          | Rs. 325-30-505-EB-30-850-EB-30-985                             | Class II (BES)                               |
|         | Head, Educational District          | District Education Officer                | Rs. 450-35-660-EB-35-870-40-1,070-EB-45-1,250                  | Class I (BES)                                |
| Gujarat | Primary School Inspecting Officer   | Assistant Deputy Educational Inspector    | Rs. 175-8-215-10-235-12-350                                    | Class III (Non-Gazetted)                     |

| 1           | 2  | 3                                    | 4   | 5                        |
|-------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
|             | Secondary School Inspecting Officer      | Deputy Educational Inspector         | Rs. 225-10-275-12-335-15-410-EB-20-450        | Class II and III (GES)   |
|             |  | District Educational Inspector       | Rs. 500-30-620-EB-40-820-45-1,000-EB-50-1,250 | Class I (GES)            |
|             | Head, Educational District               | do                                   | do  | do                       |
| Kerala      | Primary/Middle School Inspecting Officer | Assistant Educational Officer        | Rs. 220-10-250-15-370                         | Class III (Non-Gazetted) |
|             | Secondary School Inspecting Officer      | District Educational Officer         | Rs. 375-25-450-30-600-35-670-40-750-50-800    | Class II (Gazetted)      |
|             | Head, Educational District               | do                                   | do  | do                       |
| Maharashtra | Primary School Inspecting Officer        | Assistant Deputy Educational Officer | Rs. 120-300                                   | Class III (Non-Gazetted) |
|             |  | Education Extension Officer          | do  | do                       |
|             | Secondary School Inspecting Officer      | Deputy Education Officer             | Rs. 300-800                                   | Class II (MES)           |
|             | Head, Educational District               | Education Officer                    | Rs. 400-1,150                                 | Class I (MES)            |
|             |  | do                                   | do  | do                       |
| Mysore      | Primary/Middle School Inspecting Officer | Deputy Inspector of Schools          | Rs. 110—180                                   | Class III (Non-Gazetted) |
|             |  | Inspector of Schools                 | Rs. 130—250                                   | do                       |
|             | Secondary School Inspecting Officer      | Assistant Educational Officer        | Rs. 250—500                                   | Class II (Gazetted)      |
|             | Head, Educational District               | District Educational Officer         | Rs. 350—800                                   | Class I (Gazetted)       |
|             |  | do                                   | do  | do                       |

| 1         | 2                                   | 3   | 4  | 5   |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Orissa    | Primary School Inspecting Officer   | Sub-Insepector of Schools                                 | Rs. 185—325  | Class III Subordinate Educational Service               |
|           | Middle School Inspecting Officer    | Deputy Inspector of Schools District Inspector of Schools | Rs. 250—425<br>Rs. 260—780                           | Subordinate Educational Service (Senior) Class II (OES) |
|           | Secondary School Inspecting Officer | Circle Inspector of Schools                               | Rs. 600—1,000  | Class I (OES)   |
|           | Head, Educational Circle            | do  | do   | do  |
| Punjab    | Primary School Inspecting Officer   | Block Education Officer                                   | Rs. 220-8-300-EB-20-400-EB-25-500                    | Class III (Non-Gazetted)                                |
|           | Middle School Inspecting Officer    | Deputy Education Officer                                  | Rs. 400-30-640-EB-40-800                             | Class II (PES)  |
|           | Secondary School Inspecting Officer | District Education Officer                                | Rs. 700-40-980-EB-40-1,100                           | Class II (PES)  |
|           | Head, Educational District          | do  | do   | do  |
| Rajasthan | Primary School Inspecting Officer   | Sub-Deputy Inspector of Schools (Urban)                   | Rs. 160-8-200-10-240-15360 (+ Rs. 30 as special pay) | Class III (Subordinate Service)                         |

| 1             | 2  | 3                                   | 4  | 5                                  |
|---------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
|               |  | Extension Education Officer (Block) | Rs. 160-8-200-10-240-15-360(+ Rs. 30 as special pay)               | Class III (Subordinate Service)    |
|               | Middle School Inspecting Officer         | Deputy Inspector of Schools         | Rs. 300-25-650-30-800  | Class II (Gazetted)                |
|               | Secondary School Inspecting Officer      | Inspector of Schools                | Rs. 600-30-750-40-950-50-1,100                                     | Class II (Gazetted)                |
|               | Head, Educational District               | do                                  | do   | do                                 |
| Tamil Nadu    | Primary/Middle School Inspecting Officer | Junior Deputy Inspector of Schools  | Rs. 125-5-175  | Grade VI & VII of M.T.A. Rules     |
|               |  | Deputy Inspector of Schools         | Rs. 140-5-180-10-250 (Grade II)<br>Rs. 225-10-275-15-350 (Grade I) | Grade V                            |
|               | Secondary School Inspecting Officer      | District Educational Officer        | Rs. 300-25-800   | Grade III & IV                     |
|               | Head, Educational District               | do                                  | do   | do                                 |
| Uttar Pradesh | Primary School Inspecting Officer        | Sub-Deputy Inspector of Schools     | Rs. 150-8-190-EB-10-240-EB-10-260-EB-12-296-EB-12-320-15-350       | Subordinate Service (Non-Gazetted) |

| 1                                   | 2                              | 3                                      | 4                                       | 5 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Middle School Inspecting Officer    | Deputy Inspector of Schools    | Rs. 250-25-350-EB-25-450-EB-30-600     | Gazetted                                |   |
| Secondary School Inspecting Officer | Associate Inspector of Schools | Rs. 300-25-400-EB-30-700-EB-50-900     | Class II (Provincial Education Service) |   |
|                                     | District Inspector of Schools  | Rs. 600-50-800-EB-50-1,050-EB-50-1,250 | Class I (Provincial Education Service)  |   |
| Head, Educational District          | do                             | do                                     | do                                      |   |

**APPENDIX XI**  
**EXPENDITURE ON DIRECTION AND INSPECTION**  
(1963-64)

| State   | Total Expenditure<br>on Edn. (Direct<br>and Indirect) | Expenditure<br>on<br>Direction | Expenditure<br>on<br>Inspection* | Expenditure on<br>Direction and<br>Inspection-Total<br>(Col. 3 + Col. 4) | Col. 3 as<br>percentage<br>of Col. 2 | Col. 4 as<br>percentage<br>of Col. 2 | Col. 5 as<br>percentage<br>of Col. 2 |
|---|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (1)   | (2)   | (3)                            | (4)                              | (5)  | (6)                                  | (7)                                  | (8)                                  |
|   | (Rs.)   | (Rs.)                          | (Rs.)                            | (Rs.)  |                                      |                                      |                                      |
| Andhra Pradesh  | 31,73,32,420  | 12,63,961                      | 50,55,333                        | 63,19,294  | 0.4                                  | 1.6                                  | 2.0                                  |
| Assam   | 13,05,84,726  | ₹7,27,637                      | 71,817                           | 7,99,454   | 0.56                                 | 0.05                                 | 0.6                                  |
| Bihar   | 27,70,55,660  | 6,87,199                       | 75,88,220                        | 82,75,419  | 0.3                                  | 2.7                                  | 3.0                                  |
| Gujarat   | 28,06,77,712  | 8,59,892                       | 21,76,349                        | 30,36,241  | 0.3                                  | 0.8                                  | 1.1                                  |
| Kerala  | 26,98,60,985  | 31,26,242                      | 33,14,552                        | 64,40,794  | 1.2                                  | 1.2                                  | 2.4                                  |
| Madras  | 46,07,68,585  | 15,32,370                      | 46,61,760                        | 61,94,130  | 0.3                                  | 1.0                                  | 1.3                                  |
| Maharashtra   | 62,79,04,782  | 24,10,505                      | 54,29,346                        | 78,39,851  | 0.4                                  | 0.8                                  | 1.2                                  |
| Mysore  | 27,09,73,130  | 31,81,700                      | 43,57,297                        | 75,38,997  | 1.2                                  | 1.6                                  | 2.8                                  |
| Orissa  | 13,26,83,932  | 6,28,134                       | 23,22,363                        | 29,50,497  | 0.5                                  | 1.7                                  | 2.2                                  |
| Punjab  | 25,24,00,503  | ₹38,91,188                     | 3,03,080                         | 41,94,268  | 1.6                                  | 0.1                                  | 1.7                                  |
| Rajasthan   | 17,45,63,623  | 10,77,520                      | 14,38,134                        | 25,15,654  | 0.6                                  | 0.8                                  | 1.4                                  |
| Uttar Pradesh   | 54,81,78,117  | 47,14,710                      | 79,53,367                        | 1,26,68,077  | 0.9                                  | 1.4                                  |                                      |
| All-India (including<br>the States of Jammu &<br>Kashmir, Madhya<br>Pradesh, Nagaland<br>and West Bengal and also<br>all Union Territories) | 4,84,10,84,229  | 4,94,43,172                    | 5,71,90,720                      | 10,66,33,892   | 1.0                                  | 1.2                                  | 2.2                                  |

Source : Ministry of Education, Form A.

\* Includes expenditure on direction of girls' education.

₹ Includes expenditure on inspection also.

