

COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

(FIFTH LOK SABHA)

TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT

[Representations regarding alleged violations of the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973 and the rules framed thereunder by the Managements of the Modern School, New Delhi and the Air Force Central School, Delhi Cantt.]



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

November, 1975 | Kartika, 1897 (Saka)

Price: 60 p

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS	(ii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
REPORT :	
I. MODERN SCHOOL, NEW DELHI	
A—Petitioner's Grievances	1
B—Factual comments furnished by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education)	1
C—Oral evidence before the Committee.	
(i) Scales of Pay	3
(ii) Appointments	4
(iii) Termination of services	5
(iv) Continuance of super-annuated staff	6
(v) Scheme of Management	7
D—Observations/recommendations of the Committee	8
II. AIR FORCE CENTRAL SCHOOL, DELHI CANTT.	
A—Petitioners' Grievances	10
B—Factual comments furnished by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education)	10
C—Oral evidence before the Committee.	
(i) Scales of pay	11
(ii) Retirement age	12
(iii) Termination of services during probation	12
(iv) Delegation of powers by the Principal	13
(v) Additional benefits	13
(vi) Expenditure on expeditions ¹	13
(vii) Educational Qualifications of Staff	14
(viii) Scheme of Management	14
D—Observations/recommendations of the Committee	15

APPENDIX:

Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education) O.M.N.F. 44-9/74-UT.I, dt. 7th December, 1974, containing their parawise comments on the points raised in representations regarding alleged violations of the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, and the rules framed thereunder by the Managements of the Modern School, New Delhi and the Air Force Central School, Delhi Cantt

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(1975-76)**

1. Shri Jagannath Rao—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri S. C. Besra
- *3. Shri Ishwar Chaudhry
4. Shri Biren Engti
5. Shri D. P. Jadeja
6. Shri Mallikarjun
7. Shri Ajit Kumar Saha
8. Maulana Ishaque Sambhañi
9. Shri Shanker Rao Savant
10. Shri Shankar Dev
11. Shri Digvijaya Narain Singh
12. Shri Rana Bahadur Singh
13. Shri Rudra Pratap Singh
14. Shri S. N. Singh
15. Shri Tula Ram

SECRETARIAT

Shri B. K. Mukherjee—*Chief Legislative Committee Officer.*

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Senior Legislative Committee Officer.*

* Nominated with effect from the 20th August, 1975, *vice* Shri Hemendra Singh Bawera resigned from the Committee with effect from the 3rd August, 1975.

**TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(FIFTH LOK SABHA)**

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Petitions, having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present this Twenty-Sixth Report of the Committee to the House on the representations regarding alleged violations of the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, and the Rules framed thereunder by the Managements of the Modern School, New Delhi, and the Air Force Central School, Delhi Cantt.

2. The Committee considered the matter at their sittings held on the 28th January, 7th and 20th May, 18th July, 8th September and 16th and 17th October, 1975.

3. At their sitting held on the 20th May, 1975, the Committee heard oral evidence of the petitioners.

4. At their sitting held on the 18th July, 1975, the Committee took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education) and of the Directorate of Education, Delhi Administration. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the Officers of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education) and of the Directorate of Education, Delhi Administration, for placing before them the material and information they wanted in connection with the examination of the subject.

5. At their sitting held on the 8th September, 1975, the Committee also took oral evidence of the representatives of the Managements of the Modern School, New Delhi and the Air Force Central School, Delhi Cantt.

6. The Committee considered their draft conclusions for their Report on the said representations and adopted them at their sitting held on the 17th October, 1975.

7. The observations/recommendations of the Committee on the representations have been included in the Report.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 1st November, 1975.

JAGANNATH RAO,
Chairman,
Committee on Petitions.

REPORT

1.1. Shrimati P. Raghawan, General Secretary, Unaided School Teachers Association, Delhi, submitted representations regarding alleged violations of the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973 and the Rules framed thereunder by the Managements of the Modern School, New Delhi, and the Air Force Central School, Delhi Cantt.

I—Modern School, New Delhi

A—Petitioner's Grievances

1.2. The petitioner in her representation regarding the Modern School, New Delhi, complained *inter alia* as follows:—

- (1) teachers are not being given scales of pay as provided in the Act;
- (2) there is no Selection Grade for teachers as is available in Government and other Schools;
- (3) number of teachers are appointed on *ad hoc* basis;
- (4) the entire administrative staff is in super-annuated age ranging from 60 years to 70 years;
- (5) the Head of the Physics Department has been getting extensions after extension, since his appointment in the School 10 years back at the age of 61;
- (6) all such extensions of service are done by the Principal at his own level;
- (7) 1000 hours of School and maximum of 200 hours for remedial teaching are amalgamated to 1200 hours of mostly teaching and the teachers are overloaded with teaching work; and
- (8) there is misuse of funds.

B—Factual comments furnished by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education)

1.3. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education), to whom the representation was referred for factual

comments, in a note furnished to the Committee (See Appendix) stated *inter alia* as follows:—

- (1) "According to the information furnished by the Delhi Administration the Modern School is paying a consolidated salary including all allowances etc., to its teachers and the total emoluments which the teachers are getting in the Modern School are not less than those which teachers in schools under the same appropriate authority are getting."
- (2) "The question regarding grant of Selection Grades for teachers in such unaided Schools is being looked into by the Delhi Education Department."
- (3) "As regards appointment of teacher on *ad hoc*, basis Sub-rule (3) of Rule 105 of Delhi School Education Rules, 1973 permits the Management of the School to make appointment to fill a temporary vacancy or any vacancy for a limited period. However, regular vacancies are to be filled up in accordance with sub-rules (1) and (2) of Rule 105. The Delhi Administration will be asked to ensure that only temporary vacancies or vacancies for limited period are filled up on *ad hoc* basis."
- (4) "The question of age of the administrative staff is being looked into by the Delhi Education Department. Action will be taken by that Department to see that the Rules on the subject are observed by the School."
- (5) "Action will be taken in the case of the Head of the Physics Department also as mentioned above."
- (6) "The power to grant extension (of service) in an unaided recognised school vests in the Managing Committee of the School. If cases of extension in service of the employees of the School are not approved by the Managing Committee, this is irregular and the Delhi Administration will be asked to look into the matter."
- (7) "The Management of the School is competent to ask the teachers to devote 1200 hours in a year to the teaching of

students, without extra remuneration, by virtue of provisions of sub-rule (2) of Rule 31 and sub-rule (1) of Rule 114 of the Delhi School Education Rules.

- (8) "The Modern School is an unaided public school. The charge of misuse of funds is being looked into by the Delhi Education Department and action will be taken by the Administration to see that the accounts of the school are maintained according to the Rules. If necessary, an audit of the school accounts shall be got conducted by the Education Department."

C—Oral evidence before the Committee

1.4. The Committee took oral evidence of the petitioner; of the representatives of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education) along with the Director of Education, Delhi Administration; and of the representatives of the Management of the Modern School, New Delhi.

1.5. During evidence, the Joint Education Adviser in the Ministry of Education stated that soon after the Delhi School Education Act and the Rules framed thereunder were notified, Government brought to the attention of the Schools, both aided and unaided, the various provisions of the Act and the Rules for their implementation. By and large, the School had been complying with the rules. But, whenever any violation had been reported to the Administration, either through a representation or by an individual group of parents or by any other individual, that was looked into. If it was found that a particular School had violated any of the Rules, it was brought to the notice of the concerned School. In case, that School did not comply with the Rules, the ultimate power left with the Government was to derecognise that School but such a situation had not arisen so far.

(i) *Scales of pay*

1.6. Asked whether the pay scales of the teachers of the Modern School had been finalised in accordance with the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, and the Rules thereunder, the representative of the Ministry of Education stated that the Modern School was paying a scale of pay which was in some respects better than that of the Government schools in regard to the total emoluments.

1.7. In a written note to the Committee, the Management of the School furnished the following figures:—

<i>Delhi Administration Grades</i>	<i>Modern School Grades</i>
(a) Post Graduate Teachers : Taking XI Class— Rs. 550—25—750—EB—30—900 Selection Grade : Rs. 775—35—880—40—1000 Total minimum emoluments Rs. 814/-	(a) Senior : Taking XI Class— Rs. 570—30—700—40—940—40—1100 Selection Grade : Rs. 1100—50—1250 Total minimum emoluments <i>For dependent lady teachers</i> Rs. 893·60 <i>Independent teachers</i> Rs. 908·10
(b) Trained Graduate Teachers : Taking VI—X Class— Rs. 440—20—500—EB—25—700 —EB—25—750 Selection Grade : Rs. 740—35—880 Total minimum emoluments Rs. 651·20	(b) Junior : Taking VI—X Class— Rs. 450—25—600—EB—30—750 Selection Grade : Rs. 750—35—925 Total minimum emoluments <i>For dependent lady teachers</i> Rs. 716/- <i>Independent teachers</i> Rs. 748·50
(c) Primary : Taking upto V Class— Rs. 330—10—350—EB—15—380 —15—500—EB—15—560 Selection Grade : Rs. 530—20—630 Total minimum emoluments : Rs. 507·30	(c) Primary : Taking upto V class— Rs. 350—25—600—EB—25—700 Selection Grade : Rs. 700—25—800 Total minimum emoluments : <i>For dependent teachers</i> Rs. 581·50 <i>Independent teachers</i> Rs. 629·00

(ii) *Appointment*

1.8. The petitioner drew the attention of the Committee to the following observations made by the Delhi School Tribunal in its judgement delivered on the 11th April, 1975 in the case of Shri R. R. Ojha *vis.* the Modern School, New Delhi:

“It is unfortunate that no letter of appointment was issued to Shri Ojha in this case. If such a letter had been issued, the terms and conditions of appointment could readily have been ascertained. Institutions of repute and some

standing as the Modern School professes to be were expected to finalise the terms and conditions of the appointments of teachers at the time they were initially appointed and to issue letters of appointment... The practice which the Modern School has been adopting in respect of appointment and confirmation of teachers cannot be said to be commendable...."

1.9. The representative of the Management of the Modern School admitted during evidence that no letters of appointment were issued to teachers in the past but now these were being issued to everyone in view of the requirement of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973. He added that although formal letters of appointment were not issued in the past, everything was properly recorded and all appointments, termination of service or resignations were all formalised by the Board of Governors and subsequently by the Board of Trustees.

1.10. Describing the procedure regarding appointment of teachers, the representative of the Management of the Modern School stated that all appointments of teachers were made in the first instance on probation ranging from one year to two years and thereafter the Board of Governors and then the Board of Trustees confirmed all appointments. Once a teachers was confirmed, he was given increments and allowed provident fund facilities. The Principal denied the allegation that teachers were appointed on *ad hoc* basis to deprive them of the benefits of the continuity of service.

(iii) Termination of services

1.11. The petitioner stated that an unaided School (such as the Modern School or the Air Force Central School) could in its own discretion terminate the services of a teacher on probation since no prior approval of the Director of Education was required to be obtained by it as was necessary in the case of an aided school under rule 105 of the Delhi School Education Rules.

In this connection, the Joint Education Adviser in the Ministry of Education has stated during evidence as follows:—

"As far as probation is concerned, rule 105 applies to employees of both unaided schools and also aided schools; it does not apply to minority schools. The distinction comes with regard to composition of Selection Committee

for purposes of recruitment: we have suggested a separate composition in the case of aided schools and a separate composition in the case of unaided schools; this is only with respect of recruitment. In the case of aided schools, the prior approval of the Director is necessary if a person's services have to be terminated during the probation period because it is getting grant-in-aid and all that, but to unaided schools this provision does not apply. But the duration of the probation, including termination of the probation period, is common to both. The only distinction in respect of termination is that, in the case of aided schools they have to seek the approval of the Director and in the case of unaided schools they do not have to seek that approval."

1.12. The Committee were informed that the case of Shri R. R. Ojha, referred to in para above, was enquired into by the Deputy Director of Education who had in his report stated as follows:—

"Since the work and conduct of the teacher was found to be unsatisfactory by the Principal and the teacher was duly warned, twice or thrice, the School was within its right to terminate the services of the teacher under rule 105 of the Delhi School Education Rules, 1973."

1.13. When asked to explain the steps taken to ensure that in future there was no misuse of the rule relating to termination of services, the representative of the Department of Education stated that the provision which had been made in the case of unaided schools was that if they had to terminate the services of a teacher while he was on a probation, the Principal would have to seek the approval of the management committee. Government had suggested composition of the management committees to include a representative of the Directorate of Education.

(iv) *Continuance of super-annuated staff*

1.14. As regards the allegation that there were some teachers of more than 60 years of age and some of them were receiving repeated extensions, the Principal of the Modern School informed the Committee that normally teachers were allowed to retire at the age of 60. However, there were two cases one of Shri Puri who was 72 and was being allowed to continue in view of his eminence, being a Professor Emeritus and a national teacher, and the difficulty in getting a high-calibred physics teachers. In the other case i.e. of the Principal, who was given extension before the commence-

ment of the Delhi Education Act, 1973, in view of his outstanding services to the School, this year would be his last extension. On the junior side, two teachers, namely, Mrs. Sachdev and Shri Khurana reached the age of sixty on the 6th and 7th September, 1975, but they were allowed to continue upto the 30th April, 1976, i.e. till end of the academic year.

(v) *Scheme of Management*

1.15. The representative of the Ministry of Education informed the Committee that there had been delay in the finalisation of Scheme of Management by the unaided Schools. About 30 out of 41 unaided Schools had submitted their Schemes of Management and they were at various stages of examination. There were a few Schools, which claimed their minority rights and their Writ Petitions were pending in Courts of Law.

1.16. The representative of the Management of the Modern School stated that the Scheme of Management of the Modern School was submitted in April, 1974, to the Director of Education and it was approved by the latter on the 31st July, 1975.

D. OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

1.17. The Committee are surprised to note that the Management of the Modern School has been following the unusual practice of not issuing any letters of appointment to their teachers. The absence of appointment letters leaves the teachers in an unfortunate predicament where they do not have any sense of security of service. The Committee are also unhappy to note that the Delhi Administration did nothing to check this practice even after the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, came into force and that they acted only when the Delhi School Tribunal made adverse observations about this practice in the case of Shri R. R. Ojha vs. the Modern School, New Delhi. The Committee hope that the Delhi Administration would now ensure that the Management of the Modern School would, as assured before the Committee, issue letters of appointment indicating the terms and conditions of service to all teachers and other staff.

1.18. The Committee would like the Directorate of Education to take suitable steps with a view to ensure that the pay and allowances of the incumbents of the Modern School are not less than those of their counterparts in the Government Schools. The Committee also recommend that the Management of the Modern School should lay down definite rules in respect of promotion and for additional benefits and perquisites to the teachers.

1.19. The Committee feel that the cases of alleged victimisation and termination of service of teachers, whether before or after the commencement of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, as pointed out by the petitioner, should again be looked into by the Directorate of Education. The Committee may be apprised of the results of such enquiry in due course.

1.20. In order to prevent misuse of rule 105 of the Delhi School Education Rules, 1973, in respect of termination of services of a teacher on probation, the Committee suggest that the Government might examine the feasibility and desirability of amending the Delhi School Education Rules so that all cases of termination of service, after the approval by the Management Committee of an unaided School, are intimated to the Directorate of Education with a view to afford a second opportunity both to the Directorate as well as to the teachers concerned to have a review of such cases.

1.21. The Committee note that although the Management of the Modern School submitted its Scheme of Management to the Director of Education in April, 1974, its approval by the latter was given only on 31st July, 1975. The Committee regret this delay. The Committee hope that necessary care and vigilance will be exercised by the Directorate of Education to ensure the implementation of the Scheme of Management in toto and also compliance of the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, and the rules framed thereunder in future by the Management of the Modern School.

1.22. The Committee have been informed that the Delhi Administration has designated an Officer of the rank of Deputy Director to look into the complaints relating to violation of the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act and the rules framed thereunder by the Managements of the recognised Unaided schools and to ensure enforcement of the said provisions and that in course of time there would be a separate Unit in the Directorate of Education exclusively for the purpose. The Committee desire that the proposed Unit with full complement of staff should be set up expeditiously.

II. Air Force Central School, Delhi Cantt.

A. Petitioner's Grievances

2.1. In her representation regarding the Air Force Central School, Delhi Cantt., the petitioner *inter alia* stated as follows:—

- (1) *Disparity in emoluments.*—Wide disparity in respect of emoluments is prevalent in the recognised private school (AFCS) both in the case of the teachers and that of the Principal. While the Principal gets much more than what his counterpart in the Government school gets, the teachers are being deprived of their legitimate dues.
- (2) *Delegation of powers by Principal.*—The Principal has delegated most of his duties to other members of the staff, even office orders are being issued by persons other than him.
- (3) *Retirement age.*—Bursar and the Office Superintendent are continuing in their offices though both of them have already crossed the age of 58 years long back.
- (4) *Termination of services during probation.*—Services of three highly qualified and experienced teachers have been terminated.
- (5) *Additional benefits.*—(i) Children Education Allowance (ii) Re-imbursment of tuition fees (iii) Travelling Allowance and daily allowance (iv) Leave travel concession.

These benefits have not been duly provided to the employees in the Air Force Central School.

B. Factual comments furnished by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education)

2.2. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education), to whom the representation was referred for factual comments, in a note furnished to the Committee (*See Appendix*) have stated *inter alia* as follows:—

- (1) "The school has already been asked by the Delhi Education Department to raise the emoluments of its teachers and the Management has assured the Department that

they are taking steps to bring the emoluments of their teachers at par with those in the Government Schools. There is a little difficulty which the school is facing regarding the fixation of pay of teachers for which they have been asked to consult the A.G.C.R. or the Accounts Officer of the Directorate of Education and act according to their advice."

- (2) As far as powers vested in the Principal under the Delhi Education Rules, 1973, are concerned, the same have to be exercised by the Principal himself. He can, however, associate members of the staff in otherwise managing the affairs of the School. If any special power vested in him by virtue of the Delhi School Education Rules is being exercised by any other member of the School staff, the Delhi Administration will be asked to look into it.
- (3) The cases of super-annuated staff are being looked into by the Delhi Education Department and unless the persons are entitled to higher age of retirement, action shall be taken to see that the Rule is observed.
- (4) Rule 105 "itself provides that if a teacher's work and conduct are not satisfactory during the period of probation, his services can be terminated without any notice. The power of termination vests with the appointing authority and the Education Department is not generally supposed to interfere in such matters."
- (5) As for additional benefits, the School Management has assured the Director of Education, Delhi, to provide those benefits and they are already taking steps to see that these benefits are extended to their employees.

C. Oral evidence before the Committee

2.3. The Committee took oral evidence of the petitioner; of the representatives of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education) alongwith the Director of Education, Delhi Administration; and of the representatives of the Management of the Air Force Central School, Delhi Cantt.

(i) Scales of pay

2.4. The representative of the Ministry of Education informed the Committee during evidence that after the enactment of the

Delhi School Education Act, 1973, the Management of the Air Force Central School had been asked that pay scales as well as allowances of its staff should not be less than those in the Government schools. The School had since revised its pay scales with retrospective effect. The Director of Education, Delhi, pointed out that there was a little difficulty which that School was facing in regard to fixation of pay of some teachers for which they had been asked to consult the Accounts Officers of the Directorate and act according to their advice.

2.5. The representative of the Management of the Air Force Central School informed the Committee that before the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, came into force, the staff of the School was being paid their salaries on a consolidated basis. He also informed the Committee that in order to meet the requirements of the said Act, the Management of the School had worked out the entitlement of an individual as if he had been an employee of a Government school from the date of joining in a particular category save in exceptional cases, where the entitlement had worked out to be less than what the individual was actually drawing, he had been permitted to remain on the old scale with attendance benefits till such time as the revised scale became more advantageous to him, when he would be automatically fixed on the revised scale. He added that the staff had now been brought to the revised pay scale and arrears up-to-date had been paid.

(ii) *Retirement age*

2.6. In regard to the continuance of two super-annuated persons on the staff of the School, namely, the Bursar and the Office Superintendent, the Committee were informed that they had been retired from the 31st March, 1975 and the 30th April, 1975, respectively. The Committee were also informed that the statutory requirement regarding retirement age was now being enforced strictly and quite a few people other than the said two had also been retired. It was explained to the Committee by the representative of the Management of the School that there was no rigid age of retirement for staff before the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, came into force.

(iii) *Termination of services during probation*

2.7. The Committee were informed by the representative of the Management of the School that the services of three teachers were terminated by the Management of the School because their work and conduct during the probationary period were unsatisfactory. The teachers concerned were given ample opportunities to explain

their cases before the Management. One teacher went to the Delhi School Tribunal with her case but the verdict of the Tribunal was against her. The Management paid these teachers one month's salary in lieu of notice in accordance with the terms and conditions of their original appointment. Under the Delhi School Education Rules, 1973, no advance notice was required for termination during the probationary period.

2.8. Asked whether any instances of misuse of rule 105 of the Delhi School Education Rules by the Management of the Air Force Central School had come to the notice of the Government, the representative of the Ministry of Education stated that it was not correct to say that the Management of the School had misused the rule for terminating the services of teachers without any justification. He added that the number of cases in which services of teachers had been terminated had been checked up and the individual cases had also been examined.

(iv) *Delegation of powers by the Principal*

2.9. Regarding delegation of powers by the Principal, the representative of the Management of the School stated that, as was customary in other institutions or organisations, the Principal was fully justified in delegating tasks to his senior subordinate staff like the Vice-Principal, Bursar, etc., and this had been done to effect good administration. But overall responsibility in all these matters rested with the Principal and if anything went wrong, he was answerable.

(v) *Additional benefits*

2.10. The representative of the Management of the School informed the Committee that the Management had never refused any additional benefits to the staff and certain clarifications sought from the Directorate of Education, Delhi, in this connection, were still awaited.

(vi) *Expenditure on expeditions*

2.11. In regard to expenditure on the following two expeditions, the representative of the Management of the School *inter alia* stated during evidence:

(1) *Black Peak Expedition, 1973*

Only a few students can take part in an expedition of this nature. Only students who have the required

strength, stamina and dynamism are selected for this... checked out by the Delhi Mountaineering Association. Sometimes we get them checked out by the Himalayan Mountaineering Association.... We have to ensure that there are no fatalities. Though initially the expenditure was met out of the school fund, subsequently, the money has been paid by DMA with the exception of Rs. 1,900 which has been waived at their request."

(2) *Bara Banghal Expedition, 1974*

"A sum of Rs. 23,237.42 has been spent on this expedition in 1974. Elaborate arrangements have to be made for such expeditions keeping in mind many other things, the safety and well-being of the participants....No donation was ever received from M/s. Mohan Meakin. M/s. Union Carbide donated a few torch lights along with cells which were duly taken on charge and utilised for the expedition."

(vii) *Educational Qualifications of Staff*

2.12. Asked whether there were some teachers in the School who did not fulfil the prescribed qualifications, the representative of the Management of the School replied in affirmative and added that in the interest of educational requirements of the children and also in the interest of rehabilitation of such persons, they had been allowed to stay on till December, 1975, whereafter the School would have their replacement fulfilling the prescribed qualifications.

(viii) *Scheme of Management*

2.13. The representative of the Ministry of Education has informed the Committee that the Scheme of Management for the Air Force Central School, as required under the Delhi School Education Rules, 1973, had been approved by the Directorate of Education, Delhi, in February, 1975.

D. OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
COMMITTEE

2.14. The Committee note that the Air Force Central School has since revised the scales of pay of their teachers making them comparable with those obtaining in the Government Schools, as required under the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, and Rules framed thereunder. The pay of their staff has also since been refixed in the revised scales of pay.

2.15. The Committee also note that the rule regarding the retirement age is now being adhered to by the School Management.

2.16. The Committee suggest that the Management of the School be asked by the Government to lay down definite rules in respect of promotion and for regulating the grant of additional benefits and perquisites to the staff.

2.17. The Committee note that the Scheme of Management for the Air Force Central School, as required under the Delhi School Education Rules, 1973, has since been approved by the Directorate of Education. The Committee hope that the Government would keep a constant watch to see that the Scheme is implemented in full and the Managing Committee under the new set up complies with all the requirements contemplated in the Delhi School Education Act, 1973 and the rules framed thereunder.

2.18. From the material placed before them, the Committee find that some of the allegations have been made without adequate justification by the petitioner in respect of this School.

The Committee feel that while legitimate grievances should be looked into expeditiously by the concerned authorities, frivolous charges of nepotism and corruption against institutions with a distinguished record of public service should be discouraged.

JAGANNATH RAO,

Chairman,

Committee on Petitions.

NEW DELHI;

Dated the 1st November, 1975.

Appendix

(See paras 1.3 & 2.2 of the Report)

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare (Department of Education) O.M. No. F.44-9/74-UT.I, dt. 7th December, 1974, containing their parawise comments on the points raised in representations regarding alleged violations of the provisions of the Delhi School Education Act, 1973, and the rules framed thereunder by the Managements of the Modern School, New Delhi and the Air Force Central School, Delhi Cantt.]

Points raised by the petitioners	Reply of the Ministry
I	2

I. MODERN SCHOOL, NEW DELHI

1. The teachers are not being given the scales of pay as provided for in the Delhi School Education Act.

According to the information furnished by the Delhi Administration the Modern School is paying a consolidated salary including all allowances etc. to its teachers and the total emoluments which the teachers are getting in the Modern School are not less than those which teachers in schools under the same appropriate authority are getting.
2. Certain perquisites are being given to the teachers which are dependent upon the sweetwill and discretion of the Principal.

The school is giving fringe benefits and other perquisites to its teachers on its own goodwill. Neither the Delhi School Education Act nor the Rules framed thereunder prohibit any school to grant any extra benefits to the employees over and above those to which have been mentioned in the Act.
3. The entire administrative staff is superannuated-age ranging from 60 to 70 years.

The question of age of the Administrative staff is being looked into by the Delhi Education Department. Action will be taken by that Department to see that the Rules on the subject are observed by the School.
4. The Head of the Physics Deptt. has been getting extension after extension, since his appointment in the School 10 years' back at the age of 61. Now he is 71.

Action will be taken in the case of the Head of the Physics Department also as mentioned at item 3 above.
5. All such extensions of service are done by the Principal at his own level.

The power to grant extension in an unaided recognised school rests in the Managing Committee of the School. If cases of extension in service of the employees of the school are not approved by the Managing Committee, this is irregular and the Delhi Administration will be asked to look into the matter.

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 6. The promotion of students from each class is decided only by the Principal at the back of the teachers. | The Principal of the school is the appropriate authority to decide about the promotion of students to next classes according to the Rules laid down by the schools. |
| 7. Certain favourite teachers are encouraged to take tuitions in violation of the Code of Conduct formulated under the Rules. | The charge regarding private tuitions can be looked into only when a specific complaint to this effect is received by the Delhi Education Department. The said Department is, however, taking steps to enforce the relevant rules. |
| 8. Election of the teachers' representatives on the management as prescribed in the rules has not been conducted. Only nominations have been made. | The question of election of teachers for the new Managing Committee would arise only on approval of the scheme of Management of the School by the Director of Education and the Management shall have 3 months' time thereafter to constitute the Managing Committee on the approved basis. |
| 9. The Provident Fund Rules Regulations and Restrictions are being flouted in very many cases. | The charge of flouting the Rules about the Provident Fund etc. can be verified only when some specific complaint case has been brought to the notice of the Delhi Administration. |
| 10. The Principal does not take even a single subject nor does he take any interest in teaching in the School. He is purely an administrator. | The matter regarding the Principal's not taking any class or subject is being looked into by the Administration. |
| 11. There is misuse of funds:
(i) Rs. 21 per head per year is collected from each student for charity, which is disposed of by the Principal according to his own sweetwill.
(ii) Rs. 21 per head per year is collected from each student for Trips, which is not utilised properly.
(iii) No proper accounts are kept of the Annual charges of Rs. 360/- per head per year. | The Modern School is an unaided public school. The charge of misuse of funds is being looked into by the Delhi Education Department and action will be taken by the Administration to see that the accounts of the school, are maintained according to the Rules. If necessary, an audit of the school accounts shall be got conducted by the Education Department. |
| 12. Any number of teachers are appointed on <i>ad hoc</i> basis. | Sub-rule (3) of Rule 105 of Delhi School Education Rules 1973 permits the Management of the school to make appointment to fill a temporary vacancy or any vacancy for a limited period. However, regular vacancies are to be filled up in accordance with sub-rules (1) and (2) of Rule 105. The Delhi Administration will be asked to ensure that only temporary vacancies or vacancies for limited period are filled up on <i>ad-hoc</i> basis. |
| 13. Unfair means are employed to secure distinctions in the field of sports. | No specific complaint has been received by the Education Department regarding use of unfair means by the school in games and sports. |
-

14. There is no Selection Grade for teachers as is available in the Government schools and in many other schools.

The question regarding grant of Selection Grades for teachers in such unaided schools is being looked into by the Delhi Education Department.

15. 1000 hours of school and maximum of 200 hours for remedial teaching are amalgamated to 1200 hours of mostly teaching and the teachers are overloaded with teaching work.

The Management of the School is competent to ask the teachers to devote 1200 hours in a year to the teaching of students, without extra remuneration, by virtue of provisions of sub-rule (2) of Rule 31 and sub-rule (1) of Rule 114 of the Delhi School Education Rules reproduced below:—

Sub-rule (2) of Rule 31:

“The unaided recognised schools may specify their own timings, but, in any case, the total school hours in a year shall not be less than 1000 hours; provided that in addition to 1000 school hours a teacher may be required to devote not more than 200 hrs. in a year for remedial or other teaching”.

Sub-rule (1) of Rule 114:

“Every teacher shall devote in a year not less than 1200 hours to the teaching of students out of which not more than 200 hours may be required to be devoted for the coaching, in the school premises, of weak or gifted students, whether before or after the school hours: Provided that if any teacher is required to devote more than 1200 hours to the teaching of students, extra remuneration shall be paid to him at such rates as may be determined by the Managing Committee, for every hour in excess of 1200 hours devoted by him to the teaching of students”.

16. About 20% of students in 14 age group are confirmed smokers and quite a number is also addicted to drugs. No conscious effort is being made to retrieve them from these evils.

The charge regarding smoking and addiction to drugs by students of the school is being looked into by the Education Department.

17. The Government of India scholars and their parents (coming from various States) are treated like second class citizens. Such students are developing an inferiority complex and are feeling dispossessed.

No such complaint from any parent of a merit scholar has been received by the Delhi Education Department against the behaviour of the staff or the Principal.

II. AIR FORCE CENTRAL SCHOOL, DELHI CANTT.

Violations of the Delhi School Education Act and Rules.

1. Section 10(i) provides:

(“The scale of pay and allowances, medical facilities, pension, gratuity, provident fund and other prescribed bene-

The examples about the scale of pay and allowances etc. given in the Petition are not correct as there is no scale of pay of

fits of the employees of a recognised private school shall not be less than those of the employees of the corresponding status in the schools run by the appropriate authority".)

Rs. 400-1020, Rs. 150-190 and Rs. 1200-1800 in the Govt. Schools and hence comparison made regarding the emoluments is not correct. The table in the enclosure will show the scales of pay of different categories of teachers as are available to the Government School employees.

Example—1

Salary & allowances paid in AFCS to an incumbent in the scale of Rs. 400-1020.

Pay	Rs. 400.00
Only allowance admissible is House Rent @ 5%	Rs. 20.00

Gross Salary Rs. 420.00

Allowances paid by the Govt. to an incumbent in the scale of Rs. 400-1020.

Pay	Rs. 400.00
D.A. Pay	Rs. 120.00
D.A.*	Rs. 36.00
C.C.A.	Rs. 41.60
H.R.A.	Rs. 78.00
I.R.	Rs. 50.00

G. Salary Rs. 725.60

Example—2

Salary & allowances paid in AFCS to an incumbent in the Scale of Rs. 150-190 (Class IV employees)

Pay	Rs. 150.00
Only allowance admissible is H.R.A. @ 5%	Rs. 7.50

Gross Salary Rs. 157.50

Allowances paid by the Govt. to an incumbent in scale of Rs. 150-190.

Pay	Rs. 150.00
D.A. Pay	Rs. 90.00
D.A.*	Rs. 32.00
C.C.A.	Rs. 19.20
H.R.A.	Rs. 36.00
I.R.	Rs. 41.00

G. Salary Rs. 368.20

Comparison of the emoluments of the principal in AFCS and what the principal of a Government school gets:

Principal at AFCS

Pay Scale : Rs. 1200-1800	Other benefits :
(a) Free residence	Say Rs. 400.00
(b) Free telephone at residence	Rs. 200.00
(c) Car Allowance	Say Rs. 200.00
(d) Entertainment Allowance	Rs. 100.00
(e) Peon and Mali at residence. (App.)	Rs. 300.00

Gross Salary Rs. 2400.00 (roughly) P.M.

Principal in Government

Pay Scale :	Rs. 700-1100
D.A. Pay	Rs. 120.00
C.C.A.	Rs. 65.60
H.R.A.	Rs. 123.00
L.R.	Rs. 60.00

G. Salary Rs. 1088.60

The school has already been asked by the Delhi Education Deptt. to raise the emoluments of its teachers and the Management has assured the Department that they are taking steps to bring the emoluments of their teachers at par with those in the Govt. schools. There is a little difficulty which the school is facing regarding the fixation of pay of teachers for which they have been asked to consult the A.G.C.R. or the Accounts Officer of the Directorate of Education and act according to their advice.

*This does not included the D.A. given by the Government after 31st January, 1973.

The Above comparison shows the wide disparity prevalent in the recognised private school (AFCS) both in the case of the teachers and that of Principal. While the Principal gets much more than what his counterpart in the Government school gets, the teachers are being deprived of their legitimate dues. As has been mentioned in the relevant provision of the Act, the employees of the recognised private school must be given not less than those the employees of the corresponding status in the schools run by the appropriate authority. The position now prevailing in the AFCS is quite different. A directive must be issued to the management of that the AFCS the provision of the Act must be implemented forthwith.

2. *Rule 59(2 b) provides :*

("The duties, powers and responsibilities of the Head of the school, which shall provide that he shall :—25 points are given-i to xxv").

Under the administrative law, delegated powers cannot be further delegated. But the Principal of the AFCS has delegated most of his duties to other member of the staff (even the office orders are being issued by persons other than the Head of the school).

3. *Rule 104 Age limit*

The Minimum and maximum age limit for the recruitment to a recognised private school, whether aided or not, shall be the limits as specified by the Administrator for the appointment to the corresponding posts in the Government schools.

In the Air Force Central School, Shri Laxman Singh has been appointed as the Mathematics teacher in January, 1974, though he is approximately 52 years in age.

4. *Rule 110—Retirement Age*

Except here an existing employee is entitled to have a higher age of retirement, every employee of a recognised private school whether aided or not, shall hold office until he attained the age of 58 years.

In the Air Force Central School, Shri B.Lal, the Bursar and Shri M.L. Dhawan, the office Superintendent are continuing in their offices though both of them have already crossed the age of 58 years long back.

As far as powers vested in the Principal under the Delhi Education Rules, 1973 are concerned, the same have to be exercised by the Principal himself. He can, however, associate members of the staff in otherwise managing the affairs of the school. If any specific power vested in him by virtue of the provision of the Delhi School Education Rules is being exercised by any other member of the school staff, the Delhi Administration will be asked to look into it.

The Administrator has not so far prescribed any age limit for recruitment of employees in recognised private schools. However, the school has already been advised to seek relaxation of age if they want to appoint a person beyond the present prescribe limits as are prevalent under the Delhi Administration for recruitment of teachers.

The matter is being looked into by the Delhi Education Deptt. and unless the person are entitled to higher age of retirement action shall be taken to see that the Rule is observed.

5. *Rule 105—Probation*

This rule is being misused in the Air Force Central School indiscriminately. The services of three highly qualified and experienced teachers have been terminated under the shelter of this Rule. They are :—

- (i) Mrs. Geeta Gupta—B.A.(Gold Medalist) M.A., B.Ed.
- (ii) Mrs. Veena Kapoor—M.A. B.Ed.
- (iii) Mrs. Keshwani—B.A., B.Ed.(Nursery Trained)

Before using such a power, the authorities should go into the details of the guidance provided by the Head of the School. The work and conduct of the teacher should be properly inspected by competent persons and the teachers should be given a due hearing and then only if the work and conduct of the person concerned is not found satisfactory, such an extreme action should be considered.

The Rule itself provides that if a teacher's work and conduct are not satisfactory during the period of probation his service can be terminated without any notice. The power of termination vests with the appointing authority and the Education Department is not generally supposed to interfere in such matters.

6. *Rule 125—Additional benefits*

- (i) Children Education Allowance.
- (ii) Re-imbusement of tuition fees.
- (iii) Travelling allowance and daily allowance
- (iv) Leave travel concession.

The school Management has assured the Director of Education, Delhi, to provide these benefits and they are already taking steps to see that these benefits are extended to their employees.

These benefits have not been duly provided to the employees at the Air Force Central School.

MAL-ADMINISTRATION, IRREGULARITIES, MAL-PRACTICES AND THE ACTS OF FAVOURITISM OF THE PRINCIPAL, SHRI HARI DANG OF THE AIR FORCE CENTRAL SCHOOL

(A) *Mal-administration and inhuman nature*

His treatment with the staff, since his joining the school, has been obnoxious. He loses temper on them. Due to his suspicious nature, he does not permit the growth of a tension free and healthy relationship to exist among the staff members. He has a strong element of childish inconsistency in his make up, suffers from megalomania and sadistic instinct. A few of the cases are listed below :

The Delhi Education Department has not received any such complaints against the attitude and behaviour of the Principal either from the staff, students or from the parents.

- (i) Since he has joined, a large number of staff members had to leave the school under mysterious circumstances. The circumstances under which the staff members had to leave should be thoroughly investigated by a high power Committee. Some of the persons who had to leave the school are named below :

- (a) Mrs. Gaddi (b) Mrs. Khanna
- (c) Mr. Romesh Sahai (d) Mr. V.K. Anand (e) Miss Bina Wadhwa

Since no dates of leaving the school by the teachers listed in the above observations have been given nor any specific charges have been mentioned, it is not known to the Delhi Administration as to when these teachers left and what were the reasons for their leaving the school. If they have been forced to leave as the suggestions appear to be, after the promulgation of the Act and the Rules, the matter can be looked into by the Delhi Education Deptt.

wan (f) Miss Lakshmi Iyer (g) Mr. Jaswant Rai (h) Mr. T.R. Singh (i) Mrs. Mascrehanas (in this case, civil and criminal suits ensued in a Court of Law) and many others.

- (ii) He has been in the habit of shouting at and insulting the teachers in the staff meetings in the school assembly etc. No complaint from staff regarding this allegation have been received by the Delhi Education Department so far.
- (iii) A school campus sweeper Shri Ramesh Chand was beaten up by the Principal. The sweeper, Shri Ramesh Chand has not made any such complaint to the Delhi Admn., if it is received the matter will be looked into.
- (iv) A peon Shri Net Ram who fell down from the second floor of the school building while fixing the window-pane and got fractured was later on removed from the service by him. The date when the peon was removed from the services has not been given. However, the matter will be looked into by the Delhi Education Deptt. if a complaint to this effect is received from the person concerned.
- (v) Late Shri Laxman Dass, who was the woodcraft instructor and one of the founder teachers in the school, and who was fit enough to come to school from Patel Nagar (a distance of about 10 kms). on bicycle was insulted at several occasions by him and in one of the staff meetings, the Principal went to the extent of saying "Either you will stay or I will stay" in the school. Later on Shri Laxman Das died of heart attack in the Willingdon Hospital. The principal created a scene with some of the staff members who requested him to make some arrangements for the staff to attend his funeral. He uses pressure tactics and methodology and the result being that the people suffer from fear psychosis generating high blood pressure and perhaps culminating in heart attacks. This appears to be an old case and has nothing to do with the violation of the Act and the Rules. No such complaint has been received against Principal from any member of the staff.

(B) Irregularities :

Shri Hari Dang, the Principal, has been committing several acts of irregularities simply to influence the staff and the students through his wilynon-academic methods rather than his academic capabilities. Some of the examples are given below :

- (a) In June, 1972 he threw a party to the new members of the staff at the Gymkhana Club, who incidently joined the school only in July, 1972. He charged the school @ Rs. 5/- per head to meet the expenditure.
- (b) On 7th July, 1972, he threw a dinner to the staff to celebrate the birth of his son. It was a lavish drink party.
- (a), (b) & (c) : The irregularities alleged by the Association pertain to the year 1972. The Delhi Education Department is, therefore, not concerned with any such action if they have been committed prior to the passing of the Act as the Delhi Administration had no control over the school prior to that.

He charged the school @ Rs. 5/- per head on the plea that he gave an official party to the staff on the beginning of the new session. To confirm that it was a birthday party, staff gave a present to his son on that occasion.

(c) He has also been throwing several parties to the boarders and the perfects of the school at his residence. Some of the boarders are also Perfects and hence he has been drawing rations from the Boarding House. Over and above, he has been charging the school some money per head for such parties.

(d) In the name of Public School, 'Perfect Social' was arranged some time in the month of April 1974 and the young boys and girls of the age group 15 to 16 years danced till 10.30 in the night, under the kind patronage of the Principal and that too inside the school building.

(e) In July or August 1973, a social was arranged by the Principal for the new members of the staff, where a few selected old teachers were also invited. This was organised in the Junior School Hall and ladies and gentlemen danced to the beat of the drum till 11-00 in the night.

(f) A radiogram which was presented to the Boarding House by a parent a few years ago has not been taken on the stock.

Some of the examples mentioned above out of several speak enough of the Principal Shri Hari Dang's capabilities. It is evident that he is trying to impress the staff and the students by such non-institutional and non-academic activities. In an educational institution where right type of education should be the primary aim, these type of activities and influence will only distract the minds of the young boys and girls of the school and will act as a fuel to the fire. Such activities create a barrier between the students and the teachers. The students show scant respect to the teachers.

(C) Malpractices

Several acts of malpractices are committed by the Principal regarding the financial matters in the school. Some of the examples are given below :—

(i) **Black Peak Expedition, 1973** :—The Principal withdrew a sum of approximately fifteen thousand rupees from the

(d) (e) & (f) : The allegations made during these periods are a matter which should be looked into by the school management. The Delhi Education Dept. is not expected to interfere in the internal affairs of the school unless a specific complaint is made either by the parents and staff or the students of the school in respect of any violation of the Act or the Rules.

The charge pertains to the period prior to the promulgation of the Act and the Rules and hence the Managing Committee

school funds. The Delhi Mountaineering Association refused to re-imburse the money spent by the Principal on this expedition because that was not the agreement. How the money was refunded to the school should be everybody's concern. Only a few students could be benefited and the entire arrangement of the expedition were very lavish.

of the school should look into these irregularities as the Delhi Education Department has no jurisdiction over such matter.

- (ii) *Bara Banghal Expedition, 1974.*—A sum of approximately twenty to twenty-five thousand rupees have been spent on ten students out of the total strength of about 800 students in the Air Force Central School. Several donations in kind and cash from Mohan Meakins, Union Carbide etc., have been received by the Principal, in 1973 and 1974 and no account has been kept for it. Recently an amount of Rs. 2500 was deposited on 14th May, 1974 in the school in cash without any supporting letters. What is the justification for such a lavish expenditure on about 1% students of the school.

The matter is being looked into by the Delhi Education Department and necessary action will be taken by them.

The Delhi Mountaineering Association authorities can vouchsafe whether these trips should be called expeditious or luxury trips. A thorough investigation of the account of these trips should be made and the persons responsible for the wasteful expenditure should be brought to book.

- (iii) The Principal of the school has a favourite contractor, i.e. Sardar Mohinder Singh. He carried out some major repairs at the Principal's residence near Safdarjung (private), but was paid only a nominal sum through a cheque. To meet out his loss and underpayment, perhaps he is given all sorts of school contracts at much higher rates. An enquiry will reveal the truth about the shady deals and dubious acts.

It is primarily for the Management of the School to deal with such complaints.

(D)—Acts of Favouritism

- (a) Shri B.L. Sharma, who has been promoted to the post of Vice-Principal during Shri Hari Dang's tenure is not only given the Vice Principal's grade but also the Vice Principal's allowance of Rs. 100 per month. Such a practice is never heard of and seen anywhere in the country that a person is given a particular grade and also the allowance for that particular grade. These are the small crumbs to entice the Vice Principal Mr. Sharma to

All the allegations mentioned in paras (a), (b) and (c) fall within the purview of the Managing Committee. The charge levied in para (c) regarding the use of help-books, notes and keys will be looked into by the Delhi Education Department.

toe the line of the Principal's grand design to act as potentate in order to juggernaut the humble but efficient members of the staff.

(b) Miss Usha Gautam, who is the daughter of Shri B.L. Sharma, was rejected by the Selection Board of the school for the teacher's post in the Junior school, but later on she was appointed by the Principal Shri Hari Dang for reasons best known to him.

(c) Use of help books, notes and keys in the schools is discouraged by the Directorate of Education, but in the AFCS, help book in Physics written by Shri B.L. Sharma (Vice-Principal) has been prescribed and sold through the PTA store to the students. It is against the professional ethics as well as a clear cut proof of sheer favouritism shown by the Principal in favour of the Vice-Principal of the school.

(iv) The Principal shows favouritism even in the matter of the promotion of the school students. The following statement proves this contention :—

The matter regarding promotion of students as has been alleged under this para will also be looked into by the Delhi Education Deptt. It may, however be stated that the Delhi Education Deptt. have not laid down any Rules for promotion of students for the unaided recognised schools of Delhi. They have their own Rules of assessment of evaluation; yet if any injustice have been done to any student, action will be taken by the Delhi Education Deptt.

	Eng	His	Maths	Phy	Bio	Geog	hist	sans.
Rahul Chadha	30	25	16	24	43	29	30	17
Mukta Gautam	28	37	17	12	25	20	20	43

(The pass percentage is 40%)

(Both the students are failing in even subjects but Mukta Gautam has been promoted to the next higher class while the other student has been detained in the same class, in spite of the fact that Rahul Chadha is even getting more marks in the total and securing a better rank in the class than Mukta Gautam who is the daughter of the Vice-Principal, Shri B L. Sharma).

	Eng	Hist	Geog	Eco	Maths	G.Sc.	Hindi	BKA
1. Samsher Sibbal . . .	29	31	34	40	49	40	47	26
2. Suvashish Das Gupta . . .	40	46	25	40	20	36	25	20
3. Ammeta Singh . . .	37	19	34	42	42	28	36	30
4. Ram Dhan . . .	34	29	36	37	22	40	59	30

(Out of the above four students only Ram Dhan has been promoted to the next higher class. He is the son of the head of the Hindi department, Shri Vir Singh Shastri. Samsher Sibbal (passing in four subjects) and Suvashish Das Gupta (passing in three subjects) have been detained in the same class though they are passing in more subjects than Ram Dhan. This is a clear cut proof of favouritism and malpractices in the school promotion programmes).

There are several other examples in which selected few persons are being shown undue favour.

(E)—*Duke of Edinburgh's Award Scheme*

1

2

Shri Dang is the Secretary of the said scheme in India. It is alleged that the accounts of the scheme are kept in a clandestine manner. A thorough investigation is needed to pierce the veil of the anti-national and foreign dominated scheme and its accounts. It is also alleged that foreign money has been generously inducted into this scheme. It will be worth mentioning here that under the Foreign Exchange Act' no individual or organisation can receive foreign donations without the knowledge of the Government.

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award Scheme is designed for the all round growth and development of students and offers a challenge to endeavour and achievement through a balanced programme and leisure time activities. The Scheme Authorities had entrusted the implementation of the scheme in India to the Indian Public Schools Conference. Shri Hari Dang, present Principal of the Air Force Central School, Delhi Cantt. is the Convenor of the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme in India. The Government of India has under consideration formulation of a President's Awards Schemes on the same lines as the Duke of Edinburgh Awards Scheme which will be more suited to Indian conditions and would be implemented in a large number of schools and not merely in the public schools. Shri Hari Dang has been entrusted with the responsibility of drawing the Blue-Print Document of the scheme and he has been given only small amount as financial help for secretarial assistance.

The allegation that the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme involves violation of foreign exchange regulations will be looked into.

It will not be out of place to mention that Shri Hari Dang does not even fulfil the minimum prescribed educational qualifications for the post of a Principal of a recognised Higher Secondary School in

Whether the Principal is duly qualified or not can be looked into by the Central Board of Secondary Education to which the school is affiliated. Since the appointment of Principal has taken place a

Delhi. The following points illustrate the above facts :—

- (i) He is not an M.A. in a school subject.
- (ii) He does not possess any teachers training degree.
- (iii) He does not possess the requisite teaching experience of teaching the Higher Secondary classes.
- (iv) He seems to be quite ignorant about the Modern teaching trends and practices, since he has not attended any Summer Institute, Re-orientation courses, Workshop, Seminar etc. in the field of education. He also seems to be utterly blank in the field of education. His contribution towards the growth, progress and the development of education in the school is almost nil.

few years back, the Education Department can not obviously take any action at this stage.

Hence his selection as a Principal of the school on merits is on dubious grounds.

Enclosure.

Sl. No.	Category of teachers	Existing scales of pay <i>w.e.f.</i> 27-5-1970	Selection Grade
1	Primary School Teachers and others in the same scale of pay.	165—10—215—15—275— EB—15—350.	34C—2C—4C
2	Head Master (Primary School)	220—15—310—20— 430	400—25—500
3	Trained Graduate Teachers and others in the same scale of pay.	250—20—450—EB— 25—550	55C—3C—7C.
4	Head Master, Middle School	300—25—600	600—30—63C—4C— 750.
5	Drawing Teacher, Grade III and other teachers in this scale.	220—15—310—20— 430.	400—25—500.
6	Post Graduate Teachers	350—25—400—30— 700.	600—40—800.
7	Headmaster, High School and Vice-Principal of Higher Secondary Schools.	400—30—640—EB— 40—800.	No selection grade.
8	Principal	700—40—1100	No selection grade.