The requirement of personnel in the civil service, as in any other place, is only partially met by recruitment of the best available persons from the outside. The remaining persons required are generally taken from the personnel serving in the lower grades of the department itself or, to be more precise, by promotion. Promotion may, therefore, be defined as an appointment of an employee to a post of higher duties and responsibilities accompanied by a higher pay.

This dual system of recruitment is required for a great variety of reasons. First, it is a matter of common experience that for the efficiency and smooth running of the administration some experienced hands are also necessary in addition to fresh hands. The second, and perhaps the most important, reason is to provide opportunities for the prosperous growth of the personnel within the service. It is in the nature of most men not to be pleased if they find themselves for a long period in the same position. Therefore the fundamental purpose of a well-organized administrative system, whether in politics, in industry, or in society is the development of man; and an adequate promotion opportunity ensures this development.

The opportunity for advancement and the chance to make
the best possible use of one's capacities form one of the well-springs of human motivation. The most important of all non-financial incentives is the opportunity for growth - and the stimulus to grow. The proper determination of positions which can be filled up by the selection of the ablest employees for advancement, the development of employees to their maximum usefulness, and the proper balance between inside and outside recruitment lie at the very heart of good personnel administration. Promotion is one of the means of holding in the government service the best qualified men and women who enter the lower grades.

The need for promotion in the civil service can hardly be under-estimated. A good promotion system works as an incentive which provides the urge and motivation for better output. Success and efficiency in the civil service depend to a large extent on the promotion opportunities offered to its employees. Absence of a good promotion system may lead to frustration and disappointment - which would result in deterioration in the efficiency of the individual.

It may be noted in this connection that the purpose of promotion is not to favour the persons concerned, but to achieve the best performance out of them. Hence the object of promotion should be to secure the best possible persons for higher positions

while maintaining the morale of the whole organization. This can be achieved when reasonable opportunities for promotion exist for all qualified employees and when the really superior civil servants are able to move as rapidly up the promotion ladder as their merits deserve. It is, therefore, essential for the health of the civil service to adopt a preconceived principle for promotion system.

Principles of Promotion

What should be the exact principle in determining promotions has remained a constant source of disputes. Two broad principles are generally used in assessing individuals for promotion. The simplest and most time-honoured basis for promotion is the length of service of the employees. The seniority system is favoured because of its simplicity, and objectiveness and also because it is not open to favouritism. "It is", to quote Finer, "automatic, and avoids the need for making invidious distinctions between one person and another, of placing the young over the old, of measuring the responsibility for the result of promotion". The principle being so objective and certain, there is no scope left for resentment.

But the system suffers from defects. Seniority seems to connote the idea of the quantity and not the quality of experience.

It quite often defeats the very purpose of promotion. Advocates of promotion by seniority assume that the efficiency or experience in the service is a guarantee that one is qualified for handling the work of an advanced position. But efficiency and success of a man in one position does not necessarily develop superior capacities required in the higher. Therefore justice or efficiency demand that only those persons should be promoted who possess the required capacities.

Seniority, therefore, should not be the sole determining factor in cases of promotion. Merit of the candidates concerned should also be taken into consideration. A close analysis of the development of the promotion system shows that though primarily seniority was taken to be the principle for granting promotions, still in the long run the need for efficiency has led the statesmen to replace it by the principle of merit.

**Development of the Promotion System**

Development of the system of promotions is closely related to the development of the administrative and political system of a country. In its early phase when the administrative structures of the system were less specialized and its political culture was diffuse many personal considerations crept in the cases of promotion. Quite often promotions in the civil service were given on the basis of heredity, social status and relative power. Later seniority became the guideline in granting promotions. But rigid adherence to this principle sometimes led to the placement of incompetent persons in the civil service. Trevelyan and Northcote...
in their report of 1854 condemned this system in Great Britain and advocated in its place the principle of merit\(^3\). The subsequent inquiry made by the Playfair Commission also supported this view. The Commission held that a man should be promoted not because those above him were unfit but because he was the best for the place\(^4\).

During the British period in India merit rather than seniority had been accepted as the basis for promotion. W.R. Barker, the first chairman of the Public Service Commission, emphasized the need for the principle of merit in his memorandum submitted to the Indian Statutory Commission. He observed that seniority ought in fact to be of no importance on the occasion of promotion. In the vast majority of cases, it had been definitely ruled that promotion was a matter of selection and that while experience was a factor in selections seniority as such had no place\(^5\).

The same principle has been retained in India after independence. Merit has been considered to be the basis of promotion.

---


at least in principle if not in practice. It has been generally accepted that in the higher grades of service considerations of fitness must have precedence over the claims of seniority. The Second Pay Commission of India which submitted its report in 1959 observed in this connection that merit should be the criterion in promotions to the higher grades and at the lower level where the work was of a routine nature and where it was difficult to differentiate the performance of two men doing the same standard of work with reasonable efficiency, the principle of seniority-cum-merit is to be observed.

The principle of merit, therefore, has been accepted by the West Bengal Government in the matter of promotions. The government holds that:

(a) promotion should be regarded as being granted in the interest of the public service and not of the individuals;

(b) in choosing a man for promotion the criterion should be the good which the organization will stand to gain by the promotion of the particular man rather than another;

and therefore the principle laid down for promotion is that:

(a) a government servant should be selected for promotion on grounds of merit and suitability in all respects and not of seniority.


7 Finance Department (Audit), Memorandum No. 7119/F/PS-25/72, Calcutta, December 1, 1972.
(b) seniority should be taken into account only when it is impossible to choose between two or more persons on ground of merit alone.

But there is some difficulty. "Merit" is a vague term having no precise definition. As the choice in case of promotion is ultimately made by an individual it involves personal judgement in the light of standards not capable of being decided precisely. Some amount of subjective assessment is always present and some personal considerations are likely to creep in. As a check upon this possibility the Public Service Commissions have been associated with the promotion system. Though the responsibility for selection rests with the head of the department the Commissions are to see that the procedure required by law or regulation has been rightly observed and promotions have been given to the suitable persons. Sometimes the Commissions also conduct interviews for selection of personnel for promotions.

These functions regarding promotion have been given to the Commissions under article 32(b)(iv) of the Constitution of India. It lays down that the Public Service Commissions shall be consulted on the principles to be followed in giving promotions and transfers from one service to another and on the suitability of candidates for such promotions or transfers. However, the Constitution also permits, by a proviso, to the same article that the President or Governor may make regulations specifying the matters in which it shall not be necessary for the Public Service Commissions to be consulted.
Article 320(3)(b) gives rise to a great confusion regarding the Commissions' jurisdiction relating to promotion. The phrase "promotions and transfers from one service to another" has been interpreted by the governments of both the Union and the States to mean that the Commissions will be consulted only in the case of promotion when it is made from one service to another and not in the case when promotion is made within the same service. Under this interpretation governments have excluded a large field of promotions from their respective Commissions' purview.

In West Bengal, therefore, the Commission is consulted on promotions only when they are made from one service to another, for instance, from the West Bengal Service of Engineers (Assistant Engineers) to the West Bengal Senior Service of Engineers (Executive Engineers) but not in the cases of promotion from the posts of executive engineers to those of superintending engineers or to posts of chief engineers (although the three cadres are carrying three different scales of pay) on the ground that the posts of executive engineers, superintending engineers and chief engineers are all included in the West Bengal Senior Service of Engineers and that promotion from one post to another in the service is a case of promotion within the same service.

8 Based on the discussion with R.N. Guha, Deputy Secretary, West Bengal Public Service Commission, vide, also the Report on the Public Service Commissions of British Commonwealth Countries.

9 Based on the discussion with the officials of the Public Service Commission, West Bengal.
But the Commissions read the phrase to mean all promotions whether from one service to another or from lower to a higher grade in the same service. Current opinion is also in favour of the Commissions. It has been observed from different quarters that the phrase "one service to another" qualifies only the word "transfer" and not the phrase "promotions and transfers". The same view has also been expressed by the Patna High Court in the case of Hari Prasad v. State of Bihar. It has been decided in the case that the expression "from one service to another" is in relation to the word "transfer" in the said sub-clause. It does not govern the word "promotion". Therefore the Commissions are to be consulted even in the case of promotion within the same service.

Actually there is no justification in making a distinction between promotion within a service and promotion from one service to another for the purpose of consultation with the Commission because within the same service there are important positions in granting promotions to which the same expert consideration is necessary. The West Bengal Public Service Commission itself is of the opinion that fundamentally there is no cognisable basis governing such exclusions, the only purpose is to avoid the consultation of the Commission which will enable

the executive to monopolize its control over the administrative wing of the government and thereby frustrate the very purpose of having a Public Service Commission.

In addition to that in West Bengal all the non-gazetted posts have been excluded from the purview of the Public Service Commission. Promotions in the gazetted posts are made in consultation with the Commission. It should be noted in this connection that under the old Public Service Commission Regulations the Commission was required to consider the cases of officers nominated by the Governor for the purposes of promotions to posts of assistant secretary and registrar in the secretariat. But at present the cases of all upper division assistants who are eligible for promotion to the posts according to rules are forwarded to the Commission. It has been agreed between the government and the Commission that two separate panels would be formed, one secretariat-wise for posts of the assistant secretary and the other department-wise for posts of the registrar. It has been further decided that the posts under the Finance (Audit and Budget) Department would be excluded from the operation of this scheme where promotions to both the categories of posts will be made from among the officers of the two branches of the department in consultation with the Commission.

11 From the discussion with officials of the Commission.

At the Centre, promotions from and within Class III and Class IV services have been excluded from the purview of the Union Public Service Commission. In the higher services also consultation with the Commission has been excluded. The Commission is also not concerned with promotions within the foreign, administrative and police services.

Promotion Practices

At the Centre the government has adopted the system of a departmental promotion committee which is presided over by a member of the Union Public Service Commission. A departmental promotion committee consists of the senior officers of the administrative department who generally have personal knowledge of the officers out of whom selection is to be made. The department concerned then sends the list of these officers together with their confidential reports and character rolls to the Union Public Service Commission for consideration and advice.

In West Bengal no such system of departmental promotion committees is followed regarding promotions in the gazetted posts. The department concerned sends the list of officers eligible for promotion along with the annual confidential reports and other service records of the officers concerned. In giving

13 Rule 2 schedule (10) of the Union Public Service Commission (Exemption from Consultation) Regulations, 1958.
promotions the Commission makes its decision on a comparative study of the character rolls and other service records of the officers concerned. To have additional information regarding the officers concerned the Commission also conducts interviews, wherever necessary, with the assistance of the advisers.

It may be noted in this connection that the Administrative Reforms Commission on Personnel Administration has suggested that departmental promotion committees should be constituted where they do not exist now for appraising merit for the purposes of promotion. The Commission thinks that promotions made by regularly constituted departmental promotion committees will create greater confidence.

Though in theory the promotion is to be made only on grounds of merit in practice, to avoid confusion and complication, seniority has become the prime consideration in most of the cases.

Table 7.1 shows the volume of the work of the Commission regarding promotion. It is evident from the Table that there had been a sudden increase in the number of officers considered for promotion. In 1953-54 the number was 892, in 1955-56 this number suddenly rose up to 2,227 and in 1956-57 it further increased up to 2,822. This heavy increase was, in the Commission's own word, partly due to the altered procedure of recruitment to certain posts and services.

---

16 From discussion with the officials of the West Bengal Public Service Commission.

Table 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of officers concerned</th>
<th>No. of posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-59</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 34,188 7,211

NA Data for these years are not available.

Source: Annual Reports of the Public Service Commission, West Bengal.
Annual Reporting System and Character Rolls

In most cases suitability for promotion is judged entirely from a government servant's record of service as shown by his character rolls. Even where there is a written examination for promotions the result of the examination determines only eligibility and selection from among those eligible is influenced by the performance record of service of the incumbents concerned to a greater or lesser degree. As the efficiency and health of the service demand merit to be the criterion for promotion the role of the performance appraisal in case of promotion can hardly be over-emphasized. The entrance selection points out the potentiality inherent in a candidate, but his efficiency and capacity to serve the particular position, on the basis of which his promotion, transfer etc., are to be determined, can best be judged by the assessment of his performance in the given position.

Performance rating is, therefore, a formal tool which supervisors and other management officials use to measure the work performed by an employee against the requirements of the job. The primary aim of appraisal, as it has been stated by an expert, is to obtain a balanced evaluation of the employees' strength and weaknesses in the light of the requirements of the situation and towards the fulfilment of the devised objective.18

Smooth running of the personnel functions, therefore, requires each department of the government to assess annually the performance of the civil servants of the department concerned. The tool which is used in this annual reporting system is confidential character forms. As the Public Service Commissions have to depend mainly upon these forms in considering promotion cases of the incumbents, an assessment of the reliability of this tool and the reporting system as a whole cannot be avoided.

The chief object of the reporting system is to provide material regarding the performance of the individual employee on the basis of which personnel actions such as promotion, demotion or disciplinary punishment can be taken. For the purpose of performance rating separate forms are used in West Bengal for gazetted and non-gazetted employees. The same practice is followed in the State of Rajasthan.

The annual confidential reports in all services are made for each employee, except in case of the Class IV staff, by his immediate superior called the reporting officer. In West Bengal the prescribed report form is filled up by the reporting officer by remarking very good, good, average or poor against each quality concerning the character and job performance of the incumbents itemized in the forms. The reporting officer is also entitled to make a general remark including a statement of integrity, character, physical fitness, and of any special qualification of the officer not reported in the item.19

19. Vide Appendix III.
Similar forms are used by the Government of Assam. Then the report is submitted to the countersigning officer who offers his own remarks and moderate or add to the remarks of the reporting officer.

This report is to be regarded as confidential but a poor marking against any item must be communicated in duplicate to the employee concerned. The employee should be required to sign and return to the Establishment Branch one copy of the intimation of poor marking as an evidence that he has been notified.

In most of the other States the prescribed reports can be filled up mostly by writing 'Yes' or 'No' with some explanation if the reporting officers so desire. Some of the questions which the reporting officers have to consider in their reports are:

1. Does the officer exhibit -
   (a) Patience?
   (b) Tact?
   (c) Courtesy?
   (d) Impartiality in his relations with the public and subordinate and superior staff with whom he comes into contact?

2. Is the officer -
   (a) Physically energetic?
   (b) Mentally alert?

20 Kailash Prakash, op.cit., p.785.
21 Ibid., p.771.
3. Has the officer -
   (a) Initiative and drive?
   (b) Powers of control?
   (c) Powers of application?

4. (a) Does the officer under report tour adequately?
   (b) Does he maintain adequate touch with, and control over, subordinates or does he leave work unduly in their hands?
   (c) Is he in touch with the general public in the area under his charge?

5. Has the officer any special characteristics and/or any outstanding merits or abilities which would justify his advancement and special selection for higher appointment in the service?

The main objection that may be raised against the reporting form of this type, specially the type used in West Bengal, is that it does not give a complete picture; it is too short and subjective a lot depending upon the reporting officer. It is truly a fantastic idea that just through the remarks like good or poor against a few qualitative items it is possible to judge the whole performance of a civil servant in a particular post. The future of hundreds of civil servants should not depend upon such vague subjective and poor ratings.

The report forms used by the departments of the Union and the Maharashtra Governments are comparatively better. They are fairly comprehensive and cover the general aspects of performance and character of the employees. One part of the report elicits information on physical capacities for the duties of the
post, intellectual qualities, temperament, character and group work of the employees. The special advantage of this form is that instead of merely 'Yes' or 'No' the particular qualities or the performance to be reported on are provided with descriptive objectives, and the reporting officer has to indicate his assessment by choosing one of the objectives. Some of the items to be reported on are:

(1) Receptivity – Quick, receptive, slow, obtuse.
(2) Initiative – Original, enterprising, resourceful, casual, apathetic.
(3) Physical capacities for the duties of the post – Diligent, industrious, toiler, slack, indolent.
(4) Moral reputation – Excellent, good, fair, poor.
(5) Attitude towards brother officers – Friendly, co-operative, obstructive, individualistic, selfish.
(6) Loyalty and fidelity – Faithful, obedient, conscientious, dutiful, easy-going, irresponsible, obstinate.
(7) Leadership (if duties demand) –

Part II of the report form is filled according to the requirements of the departments. The administrative departments concerned give directions to the reporting officers for filling Part II. In this part reporting is made on the professional competence and extra-curricular work of the officer concerned.

In the Indian context the reporting form used by the
Government of India may seem still better, but the consideration of the rapid improvement in the reporting system made in the western countries shows the inadequacy of the Indian reporting system as a whole. Consequently the system has faced several criticisms from different quarters.

**Criticisms of the Indian Reporting System** It is evident from the forms, specimens of which have been given above that some of the character factors to be rated are ambiguous and consequently, different officers may attach different meanings to them. Initiative for instance, as Gladden\(^{22}\) points out, may either refer to the intellectual initiative or initiative of the energetic or adventurous temperament. Further the descriptive objectives provided in the forms are not very clear. For instance most of the reporting officers would find it difficult to distinguish between 'quick' and 'receptive', 'diligent' and 'industrious' and 'faithful' and 'obedient'. In addition there is also a difficulty that some of the traits such as 'initiative' and 'loyalty' and 'fidelity' may be considered by some reporting officers as being opposed to each other. The judgments on such qualities would then invariably depend upon the reporting officer's ability to objectively assess these qualities.

Another shortcoming of the report form is that it does not bring out adequate details about the personality, ability

---

and potentialities of the officers though these may be useful for the placement of the officers or their better utilization by the department. A good form ought to indicate in great details how the officer stands in respect of different qualities and abilities required at the higher levels of the civil service. It is the common view, therefore, that the present system of reporting seems to be too subjective and unless it is modelled on well-defined criteria it is not likely to build any confidence in the merit system.

It has become clear from the evidence of an ex-chairman of the Union Public Service Commission before the Second Pay Commission of 1957-59 that in about fifty per cent of the cases, the character roll was not a good index of the worth of a government servant, that the annual confidential reports were laconic or vague and that there was no positive assessment of intelligence and other qualities. "They are" in the words of the Pay Commission itself, "generally not an objective assessment based on careful observation, but reflects the personal prejudices and predilections of the reporting officers;....".

The existing reporting system was also severely criticized by the members of the Second Pay Commission of West Bengal who submitted the report in 1970. They have recommended the abolition of the same. It is evident from the Commission's

23 Prakash, Kailash, op.cit., p.777.
statement that the service associations are also against the system of annual confidential reports. They are of opinion that the system fails to assess the merit of the incumbent, and as the system is arbitrary and the incumbent remains in the dark about the content of the report kept in respect of him it is bound to be biased. The members of the Pay Commission were also of opinion that the system of "judging merit of an employee through a report written and kept confidentially by a higher officer keeping the incumbent concerned completely in the dark is highly anachronistic".

It is evident, therefore, that the present reporting system is not universally accepted as a very reliable technique of the appraisal of the officer reported upon and of the assessment of the relative merit of the incumbent. If the reports are to be of any use in granting promotions considerable improvements are necessary in the present reporting system.

Reporting System in the U.S.A. and the U.K. The early history of the reporting system in America shows that rating was made on the graphic rating scale. The rating form included fifteen traits and qualities. Against each trait was a horizontal line along which were five subdivisions with appropriate objectives under each, indicating the degree in which the characteristics to be checked was possessed. A check on each line noted the

employee on the corresponding trait. For different types of work, different combinations of four or five traits were specified for use by the rating officer. The single sheet thus served for a wide variety of occupations.

 Originally the graphic rating scale was considered to be the first objective means of recording the efficiency of the employees. But since 1935 there had been a steady retreat from the graphic rating form and the trend was in favour of a more simple form. In consequence the idea of a single uniform rating scale for all federal employees was abandoned under the Performance Rating Act of 1950. And under the Act the Congress gave the statutory authority for a system which required that each department and agency should establish its own rating scale for its own employees, subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission. It declared that the performance rating plans would be as simple as possible and authorised a minimum of only three grades - "satisfactory", "unsatisfactory" and "outstanding" - instead of the old sub-divisions with adjectives.

 But this rating system also is not free from defects. Under the Performance Rating Act no employee can be rated as unsatisfactory without a ninety-day prior warning and a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate satisfactory performance. At the same time each employee is entitled to make an appeal against an unsatisfactory rating. Thus each unsatisfactory rating has to be defended by the supervisor. On the other hand the standard
set for outstanding rating is very high. The net result is that the overwhelming majority of the candidates receive a rating of "satisfactory". Such ratings, thus, are hardly useful in measuring the relative merits of the employees. All these defects in the performance rating system lead L.D. White to conclude that of all the common operations in personnel administration the performance rating of the employees is the least standardized and the most subject to criticism; and that no rating form has been able to earn widespread adoption or has maintained an undisputed record of successful achievement.

In the United Kingdom the Whitley Council in 1921 introduced for the first time a new system of promotion which provided for the constitution in each department of a properly organized promotion board and the introduction of a standardized report for officers within the range of promotion. The main object of the reporting form introduced by the Whitley Council was to rationalize the process of making such assessments and to provide the materials upon which sound conclusions on the reportees' achievement and capacities could be drawn.

Such a report is made periodically, usually each year, on officers within the range of promotion in all grades up to a certain level. Two forms are used for this purpose: form A for

---

27 Gladden, E.N. op.cit., p.100.
28 ibid., p. 102.
higher grades and Form B for lower grades. Each form consists of three aspects:

(i) Form A covers the assessment of the officer's qualities and performance on the present job under the headings: sense of responsibility, relations with colleagues, penetration, constructive power, judgment, and power of expression; Form B covers approach to work, output, accuracy, expression and co-operation with others,

(ii) an over-all grading for qualities and performance of duties should be indicated by (1) outstanding, (2) very good, (3) good, (4) fair and (5) unsatisfactory and

(iii) fitness for promotion to be indicated by marking (1) satisfactory, (2) very well, or (3) exceptionally well if the reportee is considered suitable; and if he is reported unsuitable whether he is (4) likely to qualify in time or (5) unlikely to qualify in time.

Though in the model form each quality or aspect of work is defined as accurately as possible by means of descriptive phrases so as to cover the entire range of the quality or aspect of work still the report, as Gladden observes, can present little more than "an emasculated version of the real personality". If the promotions are given only on the basis of annual reports they become only subjective judgments of the reporting officers.

It is evident, therefore, that under the present system of performance rating subjectivity is unavoidable and there are sufficient reasons to doubt whether these reports can reflect the merit of the reportee. This has led the members of the Second Pay Commission of West Bengal to recommend that the promotions

29 Bhalerao, C.N., op.cit. Appendix "B"
30 Gladden, E.N., op.cit. p.106.
to Class III and Class IV services should be based on seniority and that the system of keeping confidential annual reports of the Class III staff should be abolished\textsuperscript{31}.

But promotions in the higher services cannot be given on the basis of seniority alone. These are the key positions of the government. Efficiency is needed for the successful performance in these positions. Therefore promotions in Class I and Class II services should be given on the basis of the performance and efficiency of the incumbents giving due weight to their seniority. But in order to make the reporting system more reliable some changes are necessary.

What may be suggested in this connection is that the secret nature of the reporting system should be abolished. Confidential reports should be replaced by the performance reports. In order to avoid the arbitrariness and personal bias of the reporting officer the Second Pay Commission has also suggested that the report should be shown to the incumbent concerned so that he can benefit by the remarks and know his position. He should also be entitled to submit his comments if any\textsuperscript{32}. The association of the reportee with the reporting system has also been suggested by the Administrative Reforms Commission.

\textsuperscript{31} Second Pay Commission of Government of West Bengal, \textit{op.cit.}, p.51.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{ibid.}, p.52.
Under this suggestion the incumbent should be required to submit a brief resume of the work done by him, bringing out any special achievement of his.

But whatever improvement may be introduced in the reporting system, a performance report should not be the only basis for deciding the suitability of a candidate in promotion. It is rather undemocratic that only a few check marks of the reporting officer against some specified qualifications would decide the future of the individual in the job. One way of introducing an objective element into the promotion process would be to use competitive examinations. Both in the United Kingdom and in the United States competitive examinations have been widely used as the principal means of selection for promotion. Promotion examinations are more reliable and democratic method in making promotion on the basis of merit. The examination is considered to be the fairest way of selecting personnel for promotion from a large number of experienced officers.

Promotion examinations have not received much consideration in India so far. If the merit system is to be adopted in its proper sense performance rating should be supplemented by promotion examination to measure the suitability of the candidate for promotion. It is, therefore, necessary that the Public Service Commission of West Bengal, under government instruction, should

---

conduct competitive examinations for the young officers in the
gazetted posts for their promotions to the higher services. The
examinations should not be of the academic type but must be
based upon the work of the department. The introduction of
promotion examination system will also tone up the health of
the public service because the open competition will remove any
ground for suspicion that promotions are generally made on
personal considerations.

Another important condition which also needs to be
introduced for the health of the public service is that the
aggrieved employees must be offered an opportunity to make an
appeal to an independent authority. The only effective safeguard
against arbitrary and unjust decisions is the right to appeal.
This is specially important in the cases of promotions which
constitute the chief rewards for good service. The hearing of
appeals on decisions regarding promotion is, therefore, one of
the important aspects of the administration of promotion policy.

The provision for appeals against non-promotion is a
common feature of the civil service of the United Kingdom and
the United States. In the United States such appeals can be made
to the Civil Service Commission and in the United Kingdom to
the head of the department. Some such appeal system may be
introduced in India. In India appeals against the promotion
system are referred to the Public Service Commissions. In a
similar way appeals of the employees against arbitrary rating
in examinations and efficiency or appeals against any question involving seniority, specially in the cases where the Public Service Commissions are not consulted may be referred to the Commissions. Under this system confidence of the staff in the promotion system will increase and at the same time the departmental head against whose choice an appeal is made would be more conscious in making his selection. This will help the establishment of the merit system in its proper sense and thereby make it possible for brilliant officers from any service to rise to the top.

**Transfer and Re-employment**

Movement of personnel is one of the main problems of personnel administration. It is neither possible nor desirable that a person should remain in his position throughout his career. Movement of personnel in the administration may be of two types; promotion and transfer. Promotion is an upward movement which implies an increased responsibility and also an increase in remuneration. Transfer involves the movement of the employee to another position of the same class in another organizational unit. Transfer is a horizontal movement which involves the movement of the employees to a similar position in another service which may mean a new appointment but not an increase in remuneration.

Under article 320(3)(d) of the Constitution it is obligatory on the part of the Government of West Bengal to consult the Commission in the matter of recruitment by transfer.
from one service to another but not in transfer. From one place to another in the same service. Thus under this provision the Public Service Commission is consulted when the gazetted posts like deputy director or assistant director at a directorate are filled up by transfer from the West Bengal Civil Service and West Bengal Junior Civil Service. But consultation is not necessary when a deputy magistrate of the West Bengal Civil Service is transferred from one place to another.

Under the proviso to article 320(3) the Governor, however, is empowered to exclude by regulation the transfers of officers of any service from the purview of the Public Service Commissions. Thus under regulation 5 of the West Bengal Public Service (Consultation by Governor) Regulations, 1955, it is not necessary to consult the Commission when a permanent post in the West Bengal General Service is filled up by transfer of a person having lien on a regularly constituted state service. Though in theory the government is required to consult the Commission in all cases of transfers from one service to another except those specified under regulation 5 mentioned above, in practice, in many cases, as it is evident from the annual reports of the Commission, the government does not consult the Commission in filling up posts by transfers from other services though such transfers are not excluded by the Regulations.

34 Regularly constituted state service means the services other than the West Bengal General Service. It also includes Central Service Class I or Central Service Class II, in
who are due for retirement assumes importance. This becomes necessary because of the non-availability of suitable candidates for a particular post or for the utilization of the previous knowledge and experience of the retiring officer. The question of the retention may assume the form either of extension of the service or re-employment of the officer after retirement. A distinction may be made, in this connection, between extension of the service and the re-employment of the superannuated officers. While re-employment is a fresh appointment after retirement, extension means the continuation of the officer in the same service even after the date of superannuation. In case of extension of service the officer concerned enjoys all the benefits to which any other member in the same position is entitled. In the case of re-employment, however, the officer continues in the same post with reduced service benefits or he is employed as an officer-on-special duty.

The position of the Commission regarding re-employment has been made clear by rule 10 of the West Bengal Public Service Commission (Consultation by Governor) Regulations, 1955. The rule lays down that

...... it shall not be necessary to consult the Commission with respect to any of the matters specified in sub-clauses (a) and (b) of clause (3) of Article 320 of the Constitution, when it is proposed to re-employ a person after superannuation cases where appointment to West Bengal General Service posts by promotion or transfer from such services is provided for in the recruitment rules.
provided that before or but for superannuation, he was eligible for appointment to the post without consultation with the Public Service Commission and provided further that his pay on re-employment plus the pension, if any, does not exceed the pay drawn by him at the time of his retirement.

At the Centre re-employment up to a year can be made by the appointing authorities provided it is necessary in the public interest to make such appointments and the consultation with the Commission would lead to undue delay. But the Commission tenders advice on such cases of re-employment where the appointment is for over a year.