CHAPTER III

ADMINISTRATIVE SET-UP AT THE DIRECTORATE AND ABOVE

The repository of the executive power of the state is the Governor who is required to exercise his functions with the aid and advice of the Council of Ministers with the Chief Minister at the head, except in so far as he is by or under the Constitution required to exercise his function in his discretion. Under the Rules of Business made by the Governor under the provisions of the Constitution, the business of government is allotted among the ministers, and, subject to the provisions of the rules and instructions thereunder, the business of the government is transacted in the departments of the secretariat under the control of the minister concerned. The business transacted in the secretariat consists, among other things, of the formulation of policy in matters within the constitutional responsibility of the state government; the framing of the statutory rules, regulations and orders in exercise of powers conferred by law; the issue of instructions, directions and advice to subordinate authorities like the heads of departments and officers in the field regarding the action which they are to take; the exercise of supervision, direction and control over the executive administration; the collection

1. Article 166(3).
of information required for answering questions in the legislature, and, in general, needed for justifying the policies and actions of government before the legislature; financial and budgetary control over the activities of subordinate authorities, dealing with the Government of India and its officers operating within the territory of the state; with other all-India authorities like the Planning Commission, Indian Council of Social Science Research, with other state governments, and disposal of appeals, representations and complaints from the public.

The responsibilities of the minister (cabinet rank) who is in charge of education are two fold in nature -- political and administrative. The political responsibilities primarily comprise (a) helping the cabinet to determine broad policies, (b) establishing departmental policies with the assistance of his officers, (c) securing legislative approval, where needed, to government's policies and for appropriation of funds, (d) accountability to parliament, (e) interpreting public needs and attitudes to the administration and (f) leading and shaping public opinions in favour of government policies and programmes. His administrative responsibilities include (i) ensuring efficient and clean administration within the department under his charge; (ii) inspiring confidence in the senior officers, securing team work, and promoting an internal effort for continuous improvement of personnel performance and methods of work; and (iii) ensuring prompt and effective
implementation of policies and programmes, reviewing progress periodically and resolving implementation difficulties.

Organisation Structure at the Secretariat Level

Minister (Cabinet Rank)
  Deputy Minister
    Secretary Education (IAS Selection Grade)
    Deputy Secretary (IAS Senior Grade)
    Under Secretary (P.C.S.)

| Superintendent I Education | Superintendent II Education | Superintendent III Education | Deputy Superintendent Languages |

The Secretary, normally called Education Commissioner is the principal adviser of the minister on policy matters and his chief agent for ensuring the implementation of policies and programmes. He belongs to Indian Administrative Services cadre (selection grade). Though constitutionally the minister is the master and the secretary his principal aide, in day-to-day working of the ministry or department they are more or less senior and junior partners upon whose active, unreserved and mutual cooperation depends the efficient and successful
functioning of the department. It is the duty of the secretary to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that any proposed course of action is contrary to the provisions of any rule or law or at variance with the previous policy adopted by the government. He exercises general supervision and control over the staff under him and is responsible for seeing that the members of the staff do the work allotted to them efficiently and expeditiously. He is also responsible for the careful observance of the Business Rules and Secretariat Instructions in the transaction of business. He is assisted in his work by one deputy secretary, two under secretaries and one assistant secretary. Cases are ordinarily disposed of by or under the authority of the minister who may delegate some of the powers to the secretary. By mutual arrangements and agreement, some cases are disposed of by the secretary, but he acts within the framework of the policy laid down by the minister, the nature of delegation depending upon the policies laid down by the latter. There is no rigidity regarding the demarcation of nature of cases, much depends upon the convenience of the minister.

Directorate of Education

The administration of general education in Punjab rests with the State Department of Education, Universities, and

2. The officers except assistant secretary belong to the administrative class. The assistant secretary belongs to the cadre of clerical class. The Deputy Secretary belongs to Indian Administrative Services cadre (senior grade) and the Under Secretary belongs to the Provincial Civil Services cadre.
State Recognised private managements. Technical, Medical, Veterinary and Agriculture Education are under the control of the State Department of Industries, Health, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture. The education department consists of three directorates - the Directorate of Public Instruction, the Directorate of Social Welfare, the Directorate of Archives cum State Museum; and the Department of Languages. Below the education secretariat, is the directorate of education with its headquarters at Chandigarh and controlled by 2 senior P.E.S. officers in the capacity of the Director of Public Instruction, Punjab I and II. The ambitious programmes of educational development as envisaged under the five year plans and the increasing work load following the provincialisation of local bodies schools, led to reorganisation of the directorate. The director of public instruction is assisted by the Joint Director of Public Instruction who is also from P.E.S. Class I and is at present looking after the sports side. There are three deputy directors, e.g., Deputy Director School Administration, Deputy Director Colleges and Planning, Deputy Director Secondary and Primary Education. Deputy Director (Schools) is responsible for all work relating to the subjects under his charge. Cases concerning appointments, postings, transfers, disciplinary action, promotions, selection grades etc. of the non-gazetted staff of the school fall under his jurisdiction. He is also a complaint officer, and all the complaints received in the

directorate are put to him as a personal assignment. Deputy Director (Secondary and Primary Education) supervises and controls the work of all matters relating to primary education (not establishment matters) namely, free and compulsory education, mid-day meals, milk supply scheme, pre-primary education, improvement in primary schools, staff requirements of primary schools, adjustments of surplus staff in primary schools. He also deals with coordination of secondary education and policy matters relating to secondary education. All matters relating to school scholarships on the basis of the secondary and primary examinations, Harijan scholarships of all types are tackled by him. Deputy Director colleges and planning is responsible for all work relating to planning and colleges. He supervises and controls all matters relating to college and university education (including non-gazetted establishment matters), N.C.C., physical education and government libraries. Administrative section is headed by an administrative officer who is assisted by registrar education, superintendents, deputy superintendents, assistants and clerks. He supervises the work of gazetted and administration branches. Gazette branch deals with all policy matters relating to establishment cases of gazetted officers of the department and also coordinates in the scrutiny of suspension cases of the education department and sending of monthly returns thereof. Registrar education supervises all matters relating to head office of director of public instruction as also the coordination of establishment matters. He controls three branches, namely, office administration I,
Office administration II, and records. Other officers who help the director and deputy directors are Assistant Directors, Evaluation Officer, Youth Welfare Officer, Statistical Officer, etc. (Please refer to the organisation chart).

Boards and Committees

The Government of Punjab has constituted some boards and committees for rendering advice and assistance to the director of public instruction in the formulation of policy. One such board is the Punjab Advisory Board of Education, on the analogy of the Central Advisory Board of Education. There are 32 members in the board under the chairmanship of the chief minister. The secretaries to government in education, industries, P.W.D (B & R) health and agriculture departments are amongst the list of the members of the board. It has been set up to

(a) Review the objectives of education for ensuring harmonious development of competence, (b) Examine curriculum for each stage of education and all questions relating thereto, (c) Make recommendations to government so as to ensure the maximum possible coordination and cooperation at all levels between the general education and other types of technical and professional education, (d) Advise government in regard to any programme and policy of social education and on any aspect of plan or non-plan schemes.

4. The strength of the various branches goes on changing from time to time. The functions are also distributed from time to time by the deputy directors to the officers who are under their control.

5. It was reconstituted vide Punjab Government Notification No. 677b-EDN-b3/18460 dated the 9th October, 1963.
State Advisory Board for the Government of India National Loan Scholarships Scheme:

Under the instructions of Government of India, this board consists of 13 members set up on ad hoc basis by the state government so as to advise the department on all matters relating to the efficient administration of the Government of India, loan scholarships scheme and to make a proper selection of the prospective genuine loanees.

Advisory Committee for Central State Library, Chandigarh and other Library Committees:

The committee consists of 7 members and advises the education minister on general policy matters and specified programmes relating to the library and afford members of the state legislature greater opportunities of advising the government on matters relating to public assistance and its formulation and implementation. There is another ad hoc committee consisting of 23 members to advise the librarian, Central Public Library, Patiala on general matters relating to the library. The state government has constituted 6 advisory committees for Central Library Chandigarh and other district libraries. All these are standing committees and no expenditure is involved.

State Advisory Committee on Education:

This committee consists of about 13 members and it was laid down that it shall meet quarterly under the chairmanship of the chief minister and in his absence the senior deputy
chairman shall preside over. The composition has changed several times but the committee has not been meeting regularly. There is a separate committee for the state institute of education, which consists of 14 members and performs the following functions: (a) Improvement of supervision and administration, (b) Professional improvement of teachers through in-service training programmes and through the production of necessary literature, (c) Improvement of curriculum, teaching methods and teaching aids, (d) Development of research to assist in the solution of educational problems, (e) Provision of extension services for teacher training institutions, (f) Conduct of educational experiments, and (g) Educating public opinion in matters relating to education. One advisory committee for the promotion of Sanskrit studies was also constituted in the state of Punjab and another high-powered committee for purchase of books. There is yet another consultative committee on education with chief minister as the chairman.

To bring coordination among the various universities operating within the territorial limits of the state and to

consider the pattern of higher secondary and university education, one standing committee for higher education was created. For looking into the matters relating to the printing, publication and distribution of nationalised textbooks, there is a separate standing coordination committee.

A major weakness in the existing system of presence of so many committees appears to be the presence of many committees having overlapping functions. An attempt should, therefore, be made to bring about integration of these committees on more rational basis. There is also a need to evolve a common policy to deal with advisory committees and the rules should be such which are uniformly followed. The case of every committee should be examined on merits and the committees which have outlived their utility may be wound up. Staffing of these committees should also receive more serious attention.

Personnel

The staff of the directorate can broadly be classified as (a) administrative and supervisory i.e., P.E.S. Class I and Class II officers of the directorate, and (b) ministerial staff. Most of the administrative and supervisory posts in the department of education were held by educationists drawn from the P.E.S. (Class I) till 1961. When the problems of reorganisation of the Directorate of Education cropped up a generalist (drawn from the higher administrative services) was made the administrative head; rather than a subject specialist, i.e., educationist.
Punjab Education Services Class I (Special Grades) include the posts of Director and Joint Director of Public Instruction. The post of the director of public instruction is filled by the appointment of either an I.A.S. officer or by promotion of the joint director. The selection of incumbent is made by the Governor on the recommendations of the cabinet. In the past the state government has followed a mixed policy. The non-IAS V.P.I. is placed in a time scale of Rs. 1800-2000. The post of the Joint Director is filled by the cabinet on the basis of selection out of P.E.S. Class I (Selection Grade) officers. The posts of deputy directors (headquarters), circle education officers, professors of colleges and several others are in P.E.S. Class I (Ordinary Grade). Usually one third of these posts carry the selection grade and appointment to these posts is made on the basis of seniority-cum-merit. There is at present a joint cadre in Punjab Education Service so far as the school and college work is concerned, but there is a division on the basis of sex. The P.E.S. (Class I) officers are selected (a) by selection from the Punjab Educational Service (Class II); or (b) from amongst the members of the Punjab Specialist Educational Service in the permanent or temporary employment of the local government or (c) from amongst officers holding or officiating in posts in the Indian Educational Service; or (d) by direct
At the level of P.E.S. (Class II), there are four separate divisions, viz., P.E.S. II - college cadre (for men and women separately), and P.E.S. II (school and inspection cadre for men and women separately). Before 1956, a joint cadre existed for these officers, but later, they were bifurcated into two cadres, viz., college cadre and school and inspection cadre, but this compartmentalisation was reversed by the High Court. For the posts of P.E.S. (Class II, the members are recruited by (i) Selection from the subordinate educational service; (ii) Selection from amongst those holding special or miscellaneous posts in the department, or (iii) Direct recruitment on the recommendation of the Commission.

There are three departmental committees for recruitment in various cadres. The first committee is of administrative wing with an Administrative Officer as its chairman who is of P.C.S. rank. He is competent to recruit clerks, junior librarians, steno-typists/stenographers etc. He is assisted by two other members who belong to other departments and one of them must belong to scheduled caste. The other departmental committee works under the Deputy Director School Administration.

11. Punjab Educational Service Rules (Class I), 1931. The P.E.S. Rules of various services, e.g., the Punjab Education Service (Class I) Rules, 1931, the P.E.S. (Class II) Rules, 1937, the Punjab Education Department (Subordinate Officers) Clerical Service Rules, 1941, have become obsolete. A special officer in the directorate may be deputed who may go through all the decisions which have been taken so far and suggest necessary amendments in the rules. The rules should be revised and made upto date.

12. Punjab Educational Service (Class II), Rules, 1937. For the last so many years there has been no direct recruitment to P.E.S. Class I.
as its chairman with two other members and one of them belongs to scheduled caste. He is competent to recruit J.B.T. Teachers, B.A. B. Ed. Masters of School cadre. The third committee works under the chairmanship of Deputy Director Colleges and Planning, and there are two more members, one of them belonging to scheduled caste. The committee is competent to recruit junior lecturer assistant, senior lecturer, assistant registrar, and senior librarians in the grade of Rs. 220-500.

There had been rapid expansion of the department during the last few years which has resulted in premature and accelerated promotion of raw and inexperienced hands on the basis of sheer seniority. A large number of ministerial hands has been recruited on purely temporary basis. Such persons are normally on the look out for better prospects and are believed not to take much sustained interest in their present assignment.

In various grades of the service of the directorate, the seniority of members is determined as follows: (a) A member recruited by promotion from the service is considered senior to a member recruited, otherwise (b) A member recruited by transfer from the department of the state government or from the government of a state other than Punjab or of India, is considered senior to a member recruited otherwise, (c) In case of members, who are recruited by promotion from the service, seniority is determined according to the seniority in the posts from which the members are promoted. (d) In case of members who are recruited by transfer from other departments of the
state government or from the government of a state other than Punjab or India, seniority is determined according to pay in the grade drawn by a member at the time of transfer, preference being given to a member who was drawing a higher rate of pay in his previous appointment, and if the rate of pay drawn is the same, the seniority is determined according to the length of service, prior to joining the directorate, preference being given to a member having longer service. If length of service is also the same, the older member is considered to be senior to a younger member. (e) In case of members recruited by direct appointment on the same date, seniority is determined in accordance with the order of merit in which their names are placed by public service commission. (f) The services of a member of the service, appointed temporarily are terminable on notice of one month on either side provided that it will be open to the appointing authority to pay, in lieu of notice, the member's salary and allowances for the period by which the notice falls short of one month, and similarly if a member wishes to resign his post, he may do so by depositing with the appointing authority, his salary and allowances, in lieu of notice, in respect of the period by which the notice given by him falls short of one month.

Further, they are expected to carry on their duties with sincerity and probity, with impartiality and integrity and with industriousness and care. They are not to link their personal, communal or political interests while discharging
their official duties. They cannot be the members of any association representing government servants unless such association satisfied the following conditions, namely: (a) its membership is confined to a distinct class of government servants only and is open to all government servants of that class. (b) It is not connected with any political party. (c) It does not collect any funds for political purposes. (d) It has been recognised within 6 months from the date of its formation by the government; or its recognition has not been withdrawn or refused by the government. (e) It does not have as its office-bearer any person who is not a servicing government servant.

The budget is prepared by the state government and its execution starts when the finance department communicates to the director of public instruction, the amounts for which appropriation out of consolidated fund of state has been made under the head 28-Education. A copy of the letter communicating the grants is sent to Accountant General, Punjab and the Education Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Punjab. To make financial control effective, grants allotted to each major head of account are communicated under different minor heads of accounts and distributed over such primary units of appropriation as are prescribed by the finance department. There are

13. The major head "28-Education" is divided into sub-major heads, minor heads, primary and secondary units of appropriation, c-Primary-1-Government Primary Schools, B-Secondary Schools, D-Special, E-General, E-Miscellaneous, E-Social Education.
certain items of expenditure, i.e. supplementary allowances and pensions, payment of computed value of pensions, which are not communicated at all and remain at the disposal of the finance department. Out of the money allocated to the education department, the director makes distributions among the controlling and disbursing officers, subordinate to him, in such a manner as may appear to him suitable.

The director of public instruction, in carrying out the distributions, may retain a part of the grant as reserve in his own hands for distribution, later in the year when applications for additional appropriations are received. The distribution is required to be carried out not later than the 1st of May in each year. The director of public instruction is required to send to the finance department not later than 1st of May in each year, copies of all letters showing distribution to controlling and disbursing officers, of the appropriation placed at his disposal.

Should the Director of Public Instruction be an educationist?

The director of public instruction is the head of the directorate. He is responsible for organisation, planning, development and administration of general education at all levels - elementary, secondary, collegiate, and sports in the state. In Punjab as elsewhere in India, there has been a controversy about the head of the department being a generalist.
or a subject specialist. This controversy can be better understood in the overall perspective of administrative setting as the problem does not relate to education department alone.

Shri D.C. Pavate who was the first director of public instruction in Bombay narrated his first experience as:

"When I called on Mr. Taunton, Chief Secretary, he congratulated me all right, but he did not hide a feeling of annoyance. He said, "There are many senior officers you have superseded and I do not know how they will take it." I said, "In your I.C.S. cadre, you go by merit and suitability. Your judicial and executive branches are separate. A person junior to you might have become Chief Justice of Bombay High Court. You don't make a grievance of it, do you? Similarly, in the Education Department, the teaching or collegiate branch is distinct from the administrative so why should you grudge the senior officer in the administrative branch holding the highest position on his side."

The term 'generalist' denotes that group of permanent administrators who hold different administrative and policy making posts varying from that of a headship of secretariat department or that of the field of a district or subdivision excluding the specialists working in specialised branches like Medical, Engineering, Forest and Agriculture, etc. They are supposed to possess the broader understanding of a problem as useful tools of the government (as an ordering, balancing and integrating human institution). They are rotated from department to department, from the field to the secretariat and vice versa.

14. During the last year, there were many editorials in the newspapers, many discussions and seminars on this issue. Memorandums and counter-memorandums by various professional associations had been appearing in the press from time to time.

versa, the assumption being that diversity of experience makes for vitality and competence. They are assumed to be chosen primarily on the basis of potential for development and capacity to handle diverse administrative jobs. In the technical matters they are assisted by the specialists on the subject. Their main source of selection is competitive examination emphasising general ability, liberal education and potential for growth. General principle enunciated in one of the reports was "Public service should be carried on by the admission into its lower ranks of a carefully selected body of youngmen, who have not undergone the trial of any other job or faced failure elsewhere and then returned to public service."

The term 'specialists' signifies a group of permanent executives, who have specialised in any sub-branch of technical departments like Engineering, Health, Agriculture and Forests, etc. They possess specialised knowledge or expertise in a given field of operation which is acquired through professionally oriented education or training. Such persons belonging to a specialised or technical or scientific field learn some of the techniques and tools and apply them. The term has generally been used to refer to heads of the technical departments (with technical qualifications coming up in the ladder from the technical personnel) in the field, as also such divisional

16. Northcote-travelyan Report, Royal Institute of Public Administration, (London: 1854), p.10. The term 'administrator', administrative technician, appointed non-specialist executives, or persons expert in generalisation, coordination, synthesis or management all signify the meaning of 'generalist'.
17. Education department can also be included in this category.
or district or subdivisional heads who besides exercising technical authority within their departments, also perform limited administrative duties concerning personnel, supervision, accounts, etc. These persons by dint of their specialisation in their subfields or subjects cannot be interchanged. By and large they are not preferred to be posted in the secretariat even in cases of technical ministries (though exceptions are there). When the generalists are at the top, they do not allow specialists to "invade the area of their vested interests."

The combination of the political executive and the generalist secretary at the top is to retain and strengthen amateurishness of the elite corps. The specialist is not expected to open his lips except when spoken to, which is more "like refusing a sick man medical advice except at the request of the family lawyer." This way the "generalist" constitutes an inner circle and expert as the outer circle. In the final discussions, the expert may not be heard, thus leading to his frustration and dissatisfaction. The confidence of his expertise if curbed unsympathetically may result in the


loss of some of his creativeness and purposiveness. He "usually reacts more sensitively than his clerical colleagues to the administrative climate of an organisation. These features seem to set him apart from his administrative and clerical colleagues and make the normal human relations approach inadequate."

While there is always a deprecation about the "narrowness" and "bias" of the specialist, it is said that every person has certain prejudices. "The generalists have their own bias - prudence, conformity, resistance to change rules and regulations as being ends in themselves and a general preference for things as they are. The experts want to get things done by whatever means. A country that wants to break from old traditions, raise itself from its own sandal- straps, innovate, has to make the appropriate choice among these two patterns of structuring the top hierarchy."

Those who favour a generalist as the head of the department advance the following arguments in their support: (a) Administration is a synthesis of different specialities. The divergent points of view are to be coordinated, filtered and ultimately crystalised into decisions. Dr. Appleby feels that there is a corresponding failure "to recognise that the importance of generalising competence in persons and in institutions

22. Dr. Jitendra Singh, op.cit., p. 29.
has gone up in a geometrical ratio as specialisation has proliferated in a rapid arithmetical ratio. The familiar dictum is increasingly true: "The expert should be on tap - and not on top." (b) Administrator has got to see the problem as a whole with a strong power of analysis and a clear cut vision of a layman. The distinction between the generalist and the specialist may be a relative one, but "it is agreed that one of the signs of emergent administrator is that fewer and fewer of his decisions are connected with his specialisation and more and more with general administration." Each problem has numerous solutions and every solution is fraught with varying degree of risk and many times a delightfully ideal solution to a problem has to be abandoned due to the difficulties it creates in other fields. Therefore, while taking a decision a chief executive has to consider, "the business as a whole and true use of optimising-balancing techniques. Frederick Pamp observes, "the exclusively technical or scientific man is on a tennis court as compared to the generalist who has the added dimensions more like those of a squash court available to him. The latter can get the ball of decision bouncing off more walls." (c) The main function of the administrator

24. A. Dunshire, The Making o. an Administrator, (Manchester: 1956), p. 191. McCaffrey said, "The specialist usually does not see overall effects of the business and so he tends to judge good and evil, right and wrong, by the sole standard of his only specialist."
is coordination. He has several experts under him whose suggestions he modifies, adopts and incorporates. The government "is charged with extraordinary functions of making general sense out of a dynamic proliferation of special occupations and pre-occupations." (d) If the specialist wastes his talent on administrative duties, he has less time to devote to his special field. Shri V. Shanker, a member of the Administrative Reforms Commission stated in his note of dissent to the Personnel Report, "as regards the outline of reform and the need for specialisation, I feel that the scope for a specialist in the present administration is generally over emphasised."

(e) Specialists are apt to use technical language when they try to convey their ideas. It produces difficulties in communication between the expert and the executive. Since administrative decisions are never "of the same character as technical decisions, the technical expert does not in principle have any merits over other persons as a performer of administrative functions." The two Hoover Commissions also recommended that higher civil service positions should be given to generalist administrators and thus established the desirability of putting the generalist administrators in top positions.

Keith was of the opinion that without leadership organisation is but a muddle of men and machines. Leadership is the human factor (and not technical) which motivates the group towards goals. Miss Follet visualised the executive role in terms of integrating the conflicts through human skills. Henry Fayol gave his finding that "after the fifth or sixth level (in the line of hierarchy), the managerial coefficient increases only at the expense of the others (commercial, financial security and accounting), which decline approximately to one tenth of the total evaluation." Donald Kingsley and Brian Chapman, though severe critics of British Civil Service, agree on one point that for higher posts it is the "generalist" and not the "specialist" who should be given preference.

Those who favour a subject specialist to head the department point out:

29. Denies Keith, *Human Relations at Work*, (New York: 1962), p. 103. Keith objects to the role of a specialist because of his emphasis on his subject of expertise, thereby ignoring "the forest because of a tree."


31. Kingsley terms administrative class as a "social aristocracy" mainly drawn from the privileged classes. He regrets that specialists are treated as step-children but he does not favour the assigning of top administrative and policy making posts to specialists where he quotes and agrees with Prof. Laski that "what is needed in the control of the administrative process is the general mind and not the special mind." *Representative Bureaucracy, An Interpretation of British Civil Service*, (London: 1944), p.165.

(a) The generalist head of a department is an unnecessary barrier between the expert and the political executive.  
(b) The generalists have often to spend a lot of time explaining to their lay bosses the intricacies of some technical matters, and are not experts in their fields.  
(c) The generalists being at the helm of affairs are rather unwilling to allow anyone to invoke the area of their vested interests. This creates a situation as Professor Gadgii puts it "a non-expert minister usually assisted by a non-expert secretary and who also in his turn is advised by a non-expert head of the department. There is thus a solid non-expert on top and many technical people feel that it is a hopeless situation." Continuing the argument he says, "if knowledge suffers at the hands of an un-or ill-informed but it is worse still if public interest is also effected adversely thereby."

(d) The frequent transfers of generalist administrators from one department to another result in breaking the continuity of sustained interest in a particular field of activity.  
(e) The generalist is overall incharge of the department. If anything goes wrong, he blames the technical man. It is, thus, a pattern where there is authority without responsibility and responsibility without authority. 

Rather than having cooperation, there is generally a tendency for the expert to look at the generalist "as a necessary

32. Planning in India, Indian Institute of Public Administration, Short-term course lectures, 1959, pp. 132-134.
appendage, as somebody who may or may not get him the money he needs, as somebody who will keep him out of trouble but not as somebody who is going to have or is capable of having any great effect on policy."

The Punjab Administrative Reforms Commission observed,

The Director of Public Instruction belonged to the State Education Service, Class I, until the 10th of February, 1961, when an officer of the I.A.S. was appointed as Director. Since then another officer also of the I.A.S. has taken over. We feel that the posting of Administrative Officers as heads of specialised departments has acted as an adverse influence on the status and dignity of the departmental officers and of the departmental Heads of Department. We find no justification for continuing an arrangement which came about because certain specialised services had not either been organised or adequately developed... Exceptions may have to be made temporarily for one valid reason or the other, but, as a rule, the Head of the Department must belong to the Departmental Cadre. 34

The Commission was of the view that the main ideals and objectives of the society can be achieved only through educational system and the integrated growth of a nation, also depends largely on the quality and the uniformity of the educational system of the country. It observed that there was scope for improvement in the administration of the education department and the director of public instruction "should be an educationist of proved merit so that he can competently advise government on educational policy matters. Administrative training for a short period can be given to a suitably selected

The Kothari Commission observed that except in West Bengal, the Education Secretary is an I.A.S. officer, a generalist and recommended that "the Education Secretary also, like the Educational Adviser to the Government of India should be an educationist rather than an administrative officer." The Commission wanted to make the education department at par with other technical departments with a separate Indian Educational Service (I.E.S.) of its own and the director of public instruction plus other officers of the directorate and district level should be drawn from it.

Administrative Reforms Commission pondered over this controversy and came to the conclusion that the functions of government have become greatly diversified. Wherever the numbers involved in a particular function are viable, the posts should be grouped into regularly constituted services. Senior management posts should be filled by members of the respective functional services.

The whole problem is to achieve a proper balance between the two factors and the essence of the generalist system is that while it does not ignore subject-matter knowledge, it gives more importance to professional administrative skill.

35. Ibid., p.162. Emphasis added.
37. Ibid., p. 458.
There is likely to be a heavy demand on the administrative machinery in the future, so "there is perhaps a need to restrict the area of transferability of the generalists in India, to group together areas of subject-matter knowledge on the basis of their inter-relationship and the similarity of their area of administration." In an ideal situation the role of an expert should be auxiliary and not conflicting to the role of the administrator. He is expected to "work as a full member of the team engaged in formulating policy and carrying it out, in order to ensure that the team has the benefit of advice and experience on all matters of relevance."

It is not possible to suppose the total eclipse of the generalist. If we wanted the specialists in the roles or in the positions of the generalist administrators, then we would also want them to communicate effectively -- a thing which they were incapable of doing in the circumstances. Only the generalist can communicate the alternatives of decisions effectively in a language and in a manner which were understandable to the decision makers. These qualities can easily be acquired by the subject specialists in the course of time and by training on the job. A specialist on the other hand should also endeavour to acquire the generalist's vision in addition to the intensive knowledge of his field of work.

Fulton Committee also examined this point and came to the conclusion that the service should act more quickly to identify and recruit new specialist skills that are needed. The specialists could carry more responsibility than they do it at present, the obstacles preventing them from reaching top management should be removed; there should be a deliberate policy of training in administration and management for specialists who are to carry these greater responsibilities. Further it observed that the administrator should specialise, particularly in his early years, in an area of administration. Administrative specialisation should be based on categorisation by subject-matter rather than by departments. The art of administration, in this century is still in its infancy and the administrative tools are changing rapidly with the development of electronic computers, new filing systems and other devices. The belief that the general administrator can do all that is necessary is harmful for the skilled specialist administrator can be of great value to the general administrator, for he then tries to speak both languages. Any "risk that the two interests may clash is a calculated one and worth taking. It can be minimised by seeing that the general principles of administration are properly taught and fully understood on both sides." This issue of generalist versus specialist has not
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been resolved in spite of the recommendations of various com-
mittees and commissions. On the one hand, there is pressure
from the specialists demanding status suitable to their skills
and on the other there is the service tradition of rewarding
the generalist with high status. The necessity is being felt
within the service of an increasing expert advice and guidance
in dealing with problems today, but "as long as the representa-
tives on both sides of the question can work together during
the debate, the debate itself is probably a healthy sign." 47

Status of the Director?

Relations between the secretariat and executive departments
are currently one of the major controversial issues of admin-
istrative reforms. The controversy is mainly about the quest-
on whether or not the executive heads should also have
secretariat status, and act as secretary to government in the
case of some departments like education. The executive heads
of technical departments are generally pretty sore about their
having to work under a generalist administrator, who they feel,
hardly understands their point of view and difficulties.

Basically, the main grievance of the executive heads is that
the secretariat really contributes little but delay: it is
nothing but an obstacle in the prompt execution of projects
and schemes. They find the secretariat control extremely
frustrating - an unwarranted curb on their freedom to manage
the things in their own way. The administrative secretaries
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on the other hand, often complain of irresponsibility on the part of the executive heads. Essentially, the core of the problem is lack of clearer perception of mutual roles, inadequate effectiveness of these roles, and a revolt by and the unwillingness of the secretariat ' overlords' to delegate authority. The latter revolt in a way also symbolises the growing desire to have more power, without any restraint or check on 'administrative licence'.

The purpose of educational administration is to help the organisation to achieve efficiency in the implementation of various policies and programmes. The educational process revolves around the child and the purpose of administration according to Sir Graham Balfour, the eminent English administrator is "to enable the right pupils to receive the right education from the right teachers, at a cost within the means of the state, under conditions which enable the pupils best to profit by their learning."

The Wood's Despatch gave considerable attention to the machinery for educational administration. It pointed out that "it may perhaps be advisable that the first Heads of the Educational departments, as well as some of the Inspectors, should be members of our Civil Services as such appointment in the first instance would tend to raise the estimation in which these officers will be held, and to show the importance we attached to the subject of education .... But we desire that neither these officers nor any other connected with education shall be
considered as necessarily to be filled by members of that service to the exclusion of others, Europeans or natives, who may be better fitted for them, and that in any case the scales of their remuneration shall be so fixed as publicly to recognise the important duties they will have to perform."

Under the Constitution of India, education is primarily the responsibility of the state government. Education department ranks first in budgetary provisions and the number of persons it employs. It has to perform the following types of functions:

(a) Development of standards, rules and regulations.
(b) Examination and inspection to determine competence.
(c) The investigation, where necessary, of compliance with procedures.
(d) It has also to undertake operational functions, long-range planning.
(e) To provide competent consultative and advising service to the Legislature, the minister, the staff of school systems, educational associations, etc.

The secretary is the presiding officer in the secretariat where all policies regarding education are decided. All correspondence of the directorate to the Minister of Education is routed through him. The existence of the secretariat arises from the need for separating questions of policy from actual details of administration. There is also the need to attend to the work connected with financial control and legislation. Routine cases are disposed of by him and all orders of government are issued in his name. The traditional pattern of organisational relationship between the secretariat
and the directorate of education is said to be based on the following considerations:

(a) In a parliamentary form of government, the cabinet formulates policies within the broad framework set by the political party it represents. The secretariat as the office of the cabinet helps in this policy formulation. The execution of policies is, therefore, of necessity, to be assigned to a separate agency which can be made responsible for the task. While the secretariat thus, as a staff aide, represents the government, the executive department is responsible for implementing these policies.

(b) Separation between policy-making and policy execution is essential in view of the public character of governmental operations. Such division of labour also is necessary for promoting specialisation and attaining effective results.

(c) The secretariat brings to bear a detached and objective point of view in policy making.

(d) The executive department, by the very nature of their narrow specialisation, are ill-equipped to examine various policy issues from a broader all-state perspective. This vital role can only be performed by a secretariat, which is broken down into a number of administrative departments. Each administrative department coordinates policies and programmes of the executive agencies under it and also coordinates its activities with those of the other administrative departments.

The relationship between the secretary and the director has been a subject of bitter controversy. Sir John Sargent, the Educational Adviser to the Government of India in 1947, said, "It has always struck me as curious that the authorities in India, in the past at any rate, should have shown themselves almost completely impervious to the experience of other countries so far as educational administration is concerned. They have followed a policy, which, in my opinion, has often been both extravagant and inefficient and has, I believe, contributed
in no small measure to the present unsatisfactory state of affairs in Indian education. They have been satisfied only too often to appoint as D.P.I's, people with little or no administrative experience and to compensate for this have put them under the virtual control of I.O.S. secretaries who have known little and care less about education. Even D.P.I's with first class administrative ability have been subjected to such control. The result has varied between complete frustration on the one hand, and the waste of the highly paid officers' time on the other."

Shri S.N. Mukerji has analysed three reasons for the appointment of the secretary. The first is the concentration in many states of all executive power in the Governor, who, through pressure of his manifold duties, was unable to maintain personal contact with all heads of the departments. Secondly, while the secretary can have an overall view of the resources and administrative problems of the entire state, the director's attention is confined to the needs of his department only. Thirdly, the assumption that the director would require reinforcement on the administrative and political side. Shri Mukerji has not given any solution but has only repeated the suggestion of the Secondary Education Commission that, "where the director himself is not the secretary of the

department, he should have the status of a joint secretary and should have direct access to the minister."

The traditional arrangements, based on the dichotomy between the policy making and policy execution, which were valid two decades ago are no longer operationally viable today, in view of the changed political, economic and social conditions in the country. As a result of plans of development, government expenditure in the state has increased manifold since Independence and the state has to undertake numerous projects of large and complex dimensions. The attainment of political Independence and advance of democratic institutions have imported new stresses and strains into the working of administrative machinery. It is, therefore, necessary to examine how far the underlying principle of the traditional dichotomous arrangements for policy making and policy execution are applicable today. Here, the following few factors deserve to be taken into account:

(1) Studies of the secretaries' role and the itemised studies of files indicate that the function of policy making is no longer concentrated in the state secretariat. The secretariat is actually engaged in the control function, and not in policy making. All major programme policies are mostly made in the Planning Commission or in the main secretariat of the
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Government of India. Minor programme policies are largely formulated initially in the executive departments themselves. This in a way negates the main raison d'être of the existing separation of policy making from policy execution. Administrative policies are neither of a large dimension nor do they change as frequently, as to justify a total organisational segregation of the executive departments from the secretariat.

(2) As regards the separation of the policy making organ from the executive agency in the interest of attaining effective results, such total separation is at the present stage of development of our country neither feasible nor profitable. The traditional pattern has, in the context of contemporary conditions, led to diffusion of responsibility, with the consequential adverse effect on attaining of development goals and targets. This is borne out by the pronounced emphasis placed in the Second and Third Five Year Plans and the Memorandum on the Fourth Plan on the needs for fixing responsibility. While each of the two sides may not openly accuse the other for its errors of omission and commission, they firmly believe that the fault lies with the other side. This acts as a constraint on remedial action by either of them. Policy execution in a developing economy is a continuum and its total bifurcation hinders more than promotes the efficient attainment of results in any developmental activity.

Against this it may be contended that the administrative secretary is ultimately responsible for execution.
The functions of the secretariat in regard to coordination and scrutiny from a detached and objective angle in no way conflict with the integration of the executive departments into the secretariat machinery. Such an integration makes the executive departments more 'coordination minded'. At the moment the theory of 'detachment and objectivity' has been carried too far to the point of programme neutrality and indifference to achieving final results. The basic policies and priorities are no longer set by an administrative department. Detachment and objectivity can, therefore, be meaningful only in one respect, that is, ensuring that sub-policies and programme contents are not manipulated to subserve the interest of a particular individual, interest group or the executive head himself. The separation of policy making from policy execution does not by itself insulate the processes of policy making and programming from the unreasonable pressures of interest groups, the problem is much more complicated and complex and is perhaps much more pronounced at the minister's level. Any how, they do not in themselves necessitate a total separation of policy making and policy executing organs. Thus these considerations eventually reduce themselves to one basic factor in any scheme of integration, the generalist should be on the top, and not the specialist.

Thus there appear to be two schools of thought: one favours the status quo with minor modifications, the other is either for the abolition of the secretariat altogether or for giving 'secretariat status' to the directors. Those who are opposed to the present system point out:
(a) It is not always possible to draw a clear line of demarcation between policy and execution.

(b) There is overcentralisation in the secretariat which causes delay.

(c) It leads to duplication of work.

(d) The officers in the secretariat being generalists do not always understand the problem of technical departments.

(e) The layer in between the director and the minister is superfluous.

(f) Already there is sufficient check on the discretion of the director about proposals which involve financial matters.

(g) The attitude of the secretariat is generally fault-finding and negative.

(h) The secretariat has been compared to the House of Lords in England. If it agrees with the director, it is superfluous and if it disagrees, it is mischievous. In majority of the cases, there is no contribution at the secretariat level and it adds nothing but delay.

Those who support the present arrangements contend:

(a) It is always better to keep policy separate from execution to avoid chaos and confusion.

(b) The minister is an amateur. He needs the advice of an administrator who can ponder over the proposals of the director and act as "filter and funnel."

(c) A specialist is likely to press his point of view regardless of the administrative repercussions.
(d) The director if given secretariat duties is likely to neglect field work.

(e) It is not good to combine two functions in one officer and to make him a prosecutor and the judge.

(i) The executive head i.e., director should not be close the political decision making. A little distance may be helpful in the interest of clean administration.

Different Patterns of Relationship between Executive and Secretariat Departments

It would be of interest to examine here the different types of possible organisation relationships between the secretariat and executive departments (other than total separation which we have found is not workable). The more important among them are:

A. Separate offices but common files located in the executive department.

B. Separate offices but the executive head invested with ex-officio secretariat status.

C. A complete merger between the administrative and executive departments.

D. A secretariat officer concurrently holding the charge of the executive head or the executive head concurrently holding a secretariat post.

Let us discuss all these possibilities in somewhat greater details.

A. Maintaining common files for the directorate and the Secretariat:

It is claimed that such an arrangement will have many advantages. When the complete file is sent to the secretariat the officer can see all the papers underlying the proposal so
that queries which are generally raised are reduced. It also saves the trouble of initial noting etc. by the subordinate staff because the director can mark the file direct to the appropriate secretariat officer. This method is not free from defects as it is likely to create delay. While scrutinising the proposal, the secretariat will have to go through the whole or major part of the file.

Bengal Administration Enquiry Committee 1944-45, examined the relationship between a head of the department and the secretary in general. It recommended that the proposals which originate in the directorate should be prepared in such a form as to show all relevant facts, precedents and reasons, for and against. The order of the decision making authority should be passed on the file itself. Files which originate in the secretariat should also be marked direct to the head of the department. The outstanding advantages claimed for this procedure are: speed, a greater understanding of the government's policy by the heads of departments, cutting down of unnecessary and dilatory work, and, therefore, ensuring economy. This procedure would place a great responsibility on the officers of the heads of departments. The office routine and procedures, if any, cannot be said to be suited to the work which these offices will have to do if the entire secretariat work is to be done by them.
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B. Secretariat Status to the Director:

By giving the director the secretariat status, it is claimed that he will be associated both with policy formulation and execution, his knowledge of the field can be made use of at various stages of policy formulation. Being fully conversant with the background of formulation of policy, there is convenience in implementing it. The Secondary Education Commission, 1952 observed,

in actual practice, the Director of Education has to submit his proposals for the reorganisation and expansion of education to the Minister through the Secretary. This has actually meant that such proposals and policies are subjected to criticism by the subordinate officers of the Secretariat and are often presented in a form which may be quite different from what was originally conceived by the Director. The Secretary himself may not be fully conversant with those problems as he is frequently transferred from one department of the Secretariat to another. If education is not to be treated as a mere administrative problem, we feel that the Director of Education should be mainly responsible to advise the Minister, and, for this purpose, we recommend that where the Director himself is not the Secretary of the Department he should have the status of a Joint Secretary and should have direct access to the Minister. It would, of course, be open to the Minister, when he considers it necessary, to consult the Secretary particularly in regard to administrative and financial matters. 52

This system is far from being the ideal one. With one officer and two separate offices, there is the disadvantage of scrutinising of proposals etc. in two different offices thus causing delay. It may also result in incidents where the director exercising his powers as a secretariat officer may express views against his own proposal.

The supporters claim that Bombay has given the Chief Engineers the status of *ex-officio* joint secretaries for the last few years, with an administrative service officer as secretary. Developmental commissioners have also been *ex-officio* secretaries to government in all the states during the last few years, and the chief electoral officers have also been given a similar status. This system "has resulted in quicker disposal and greater efficiency, inasmuch as correspondence between the heads of departments and the secretariat has been completely cut out; the heads of departments being in closer touch with their problems have been able to pursue them more vigorously and with greater zeal at the level of the government. All back references from the secretariat, on objections raised have been eliminated."

Further, the combining of two distinct functions and responsibilities in one individual may be detrimental to both, thus involving a waste of professional talent and experience without any appreciable advantage. It would also involve less of scrutiny. The need for an independent evaluation of the proposal of the director by an experienced administrator is apparent and secretariat plays a vital role in this sphere. There is another important matter as well. Giving the heads of departments secretariat status will tend to bring about greater
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centralisation at the secretariat level, which is contrary to the trend now in vogue. It would also unobtrusively but surely bring into play greater departmental influence in the examination of cases and the taking of decisions by the state government, and the advantages of an independent examination at the secretariat level and viewing problems in the broader perspective of state policies will, to some extent, be minimised.

C. Amalgamation of the Directorate with the Secretariat:

The amalgamation will cut off a lot of delay in the formulation of proposals. The proposals will be scrutinised only once keeping in view both the policy and the practical considerations. It would also lead to easier implementation of the policies as the officer will be fully conversant with the background thereof.

This again is not free from defects. The director will have to look after secretariat work, little time would be left for his supervisory work. The technical knowledge about education may also not be used by him to the fullest extent. The fusion of policy formulation and policy implementation is likely to affect the policy decisions in quality. Involving the secretariat in policy execution, may entail the danger of policy decisions being susceptible to exigencies and expediencies.

D. Appointment of the Director as the Secretary for Education:

Sir John Sargent was protagonist of the view that "There can be no possible justification for interposing an officer without an expert knowledge of education between the Director of Public Instruction and the Minister of Education to whom he should be responsible." The Secondary Education Commission, 1952, also favoured this view, "If education is not to be treated as a mere administrative problem, we feel that the Director of Education should be mainly responsible to advise the Minister and, for this purpose, we recommend that where the Director himself is not the Secretary of the Department, he should have the status of a Joint Secretary and should have direct access to the Minister."

There are, however, objections to this alternative as well. In framing policies and implementing them, the secretary and the director have their respective roles to play. The minister has a very limited experience of the details of the activities of his department and is busy with legislators and the party work. The minister needs the assistance of an administrator "who can advise him in formulation of policies on the basis of proposals made by a head of the department and to discover from time to time with what fidelity and success the policy laid down is carried out." The wisdom of appointing a head of the

---

department as the secretary to the government is challenged on the ground that "this would involve government's depending on a professional or technical man for final advice in the shaping of policies. A specialist, by reason of his pre-occupation of a single problem or activity, is likely to press for the adoption of his own technical schemes regardless of their administrative repercussions or financial complications."

Sir John Sargent, while not favouring a non-specialist as secretary for education was not in favour of appointment of an educationist to senior administrative posts. He said, "These, however, should be the exception rather than the rule, because apart from blocking promotion, experience suggests that the senior teacher turned-administrator often suffers from a certain rigidity of outlook and is inclined to impose on all under his control the pedagogical methods which he himself employed. Such an attitude is inimical to experiment and is fatal to enlightened administration. There is also an additional risk in India that such senior teachers would be mainly drawn from Universities and would have little experience of the lower stages of education."

A. Abbot and S.H. Wood have regarded education as a technical subject whose administration inevitably involves delicate and complicated issues. They were not in favour of the director holding the post of the secretary, "We are not
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suggesting that the director of public instruction, with his present duties, should also be secretary to the government for education. On the contrary we think the directors of public instruction are already too much immersed in administration for the effective discharge of all their duties, including an authoritative direction of the Inspectorate, based on a personal knowledge of individual inspectors of all grades a first-hand knowledge of the content of education provided in the schools. The director of public instruction ought to have secured to him the time and the opportunity for studying educational problems in general and for informing himself about local issues so that he can direct his staff with authority and advise the Secretary and the Minister with conviction."

The secretariat examines the recommendations made by a departmental head from the larger administrative standpoint and in the light of the overall policy of the government and operates as a check on departmentalism. Another objection is "that it is an attempt to combine two distinct functions and responsibilities in one individual to the detriment of both and it also involves a waste of professional talent and experience without any corresponding advantages." After dealing with the arguments for and against the combination of the functions of the secretary and the head of the department, the


Administrative Reforms Committee of Kerala observed, "We have carefully considered the conditions prevailing here, and are of the view that it is not desirable to combine the functions of the secretariat officers and heads of the department."

The existing arrangement has much merit to commend its continuance. Firstly, it keeps the process of policy making distinct from its implementation. Secondly, consideration of the proposals at the bottom ensures that the decision making authorities will have the benefit not only of the facts of the case but also of similar facts considered in other cases. Thirdly, it ensures continuity which would not be there if decision is personalised at certain level. Fourthly, full examination of the proposal checks hasty decisions. Fifthly, the examination in the secretariat sets the scheme of priorities and likely repercussions of alternative approaches to policy formulation.

An essential requisite for the efficient functioning of the director is that he should have adequate financial and administrative powers. Lack of proper delegation of powers results in filling the secretariat with routine references and the latter finds it difficult to deal with them with any degree of promptness. The failure to make appropriate changes in systems and procedures renders even the existing delegation

63. Report of the Administrative Reforms Committee, Kerala, op.cit., p. 82.
of powers infructious. Another practice which swells the volume of unimportant work in the secretariat is of the government calling for reports on petitions and representations which can very well be disposed of by the director. It is "necessary for the higher officers of government and the ministers themselves to develop a proper attitude towards delegation of powers on the basis that action should be taken initially at the lowest level, that subordinate officers should be left to exercise their powers without hindrance, the higher authority interfering only in appeal or revision or where there has been gross abuse of powers, and that in the latter contingency, the proper remedy is not to resume the powers delegated, but to replace the erring officers." The Kothari Commission which went into the details of this relationship, pleaded for a better type of understanding between the two. It observed,

The relationship between the Education Secretary and the Director of Education has been a subject of long controversy since the issue was first highlighted by the Hartog Committee in 1928. The most common complaint is that the Education Secretariat completely dominates over the Directorate of Education and interferes even in purely technical matters. It has also been argued that the dual scrutiny of proposals that now takes place in the Directorate as well as in the Education Secretariat leads to considerable delays. The remedy most frequently suggested is that the Director of Education should be ex-officio Secretary or Additional Secretary to the government. The problem is difficult and there is no easy answer to all the complex relationship. Broadly speaking, the role of the Education Secretariat should be to examine educational problems from the administrative and financial points of view.

---

and in the wider context of government policies for development. It should give due weightage to the views of the Directorate in technical matters, and assist the Director to function as the effective head of the department. The key to a successful relationship lies, however, in the personal equation "between the Director of Education and the Education Secretary; and where this has been of the right type, the results have been satisfactory. 65

The Secretariat should confine its activities to the framing of policies, laying down rules and principles of procedures, financial control work connected with delegation, general direction and also evaluation of work done. The secretaries, should be valued on three principal points:

(a) Frank and independent adviser in the first instance,
(b) Facilitation of opportunities for others to get before the minister views different from those of the secretary's and (c) Careful maintenance in all important matters of written records clearly who recommended and what decisions were made.

The role of the director, on the other hand, should be recognised and he should be encouraged to take part in the shaping of policies.