

Chapter 9

Teacher Education Curriculum in India: National Imagination and Actual Practices



Aarti Mangal

Abstract The historical changes in teacher education in India have been envisioned through the recommendations of various national policies and commission. Despite it, the most crucial of such changes in the contents of the teacher education programme is constituted and reviewed through the teacher education curriculum framework. How do those changes surface in the actual curriculum? This interrogation makes the problematic of this chapter. The chapter identifies and elucidates the shifts in the policies and teacher education curriculum frameworks since the independence of India (1947). It offers to examine such connected reflection as they seem to appear in the teacher education programme for secondary school teachers at University of Delhi. By doing so, the paper tends to show the gaps between the recommendations of teacher education and the actual curriculum of the teacher education programme. Finally, it attempts to problematize the innovations in the teacher's education and query why school education fails to match the national imagination.

Keywords Teacher education curriculum framework · Delhi University · B.Ed programme · Rigid · Constructivism

Introduction

Teacher education has always received an ample amount of attention because of its significance for school education, viz. preparing future citizens of the country, meeting the societal needs, syncing education with political agendas and in a globalized world, meeting the needs of the world market (Agoston & Nagy, 1974; Boatman, 1972; Giroux et al., 1988, Green as cited in Warren, 1998, Hayes et al., 2006; Boyle, 2011). Therefore, all over the world, different times saw different kinds of emphasis in teacher education and hence the development in the teacher education. For example, Germany after the defeat of Prussia by Napoleon had expressed its desire to compensate physical losses with spirituality through the medium of education and so the

A. Mangal (✉)
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

teachers were sent to learn the principles of Pestalozzi, teaching which to the subsequent candidates led to the need of instituting normal schools in Germany (Edwards, 1929). Similarly, in America, the need to spread Pestalozzi's principles in education led to the formation and increase in the normal schools. However, the case of England was different and teacher education in England gained prominence due to the need of the quality teaching in Grammar schools which provided students for the universities (McMahon, 1950). Since the present chapter deals with the teacher education in India, therefore, only the Indian scenario with regards to the teacher education will be discussed.

In colonial India, with the arrival of Wood's Despatch in 1854, education was considered a state duty, and simultaneously, establishment of teacher training institutions was recommended. The subsequent despatches in 1854 and 1859 noted the discontent with the existing condition of teacher training. Thereafter, a lot of committees, commissions have highlighted the question of teacher preparation. The deteriorating quality of teachers and the teacher education programmes has remained a constant concern, in order to ameliorate which, a lot of recommendations were put forward. As a result of this, the number of normal schools and teacher training institutes increased by the time India gained independence (1947), although many of the normal schools were also closed during the said time period. Similarly, new teacher degrees got devised as well as the syllabus of the teacher education undergone a change. However, the ideas with regard to the teacher education were fluid (Holme, 1923) and so the programme for preparing teachers became disparate and chaotic all over India. The discrepancy within the teacher education programmes occurred with regard to the admission eligibility criterion, the duration of the programme and syllabus which was followed. Nonetheless, in spite of the fluidity in the ideas for teacher preparation, the latter deemed significant for moral education and disciplining students (Croft, 1888). There was no doubt regarding disciplining the students and providing them moral education, however, the methods with which to do it was highly debated. This had also brought in light the preparation as well as selection of quality teachers.

A large part of preparation of teachers is determined with the curriculum of the teacher education programmes while they reflect the primary vision for not only the teacher preparation but also the school education. Fox and Gay (1995) write that although there are various ways in which a curriculum is defined but there is a consensus among the curricularists regarding curriculum being a desired plan intending a change in the students' behaviour or learning. Therefore, "it is the plan for instruction rather than the act of instruction itself" (Fox & Gay, 1995, p. 65). The most tangible form of curriculum is its course content or the written syllabus, which would be used for the purposes of present chapter.

In spite of the important role that a curriculum plays in the entire scheme of a programme, it is more shocking than surprising that the syllabus/curriculum of teacher education programmes did not receive sufficient attention from the point of view of research (Denham, 1985). In India, the curriculum of teacher education is an under researched area (Sharma & George, 2017). Therefore, the present chapter

concerns specifically with the curriculum of B.Ed programme of the Delhi University in the backdrop of the teacher education curriculum frameworks.

The B.Ed programme is a teacher education programme which prepares candidates to teach in a secondary school. The minimum admission eligibility criterion for B.Ed is graduation and so a graduate B.Ed candidate after passing the course is eligible to teach in secondary school classes, that is, from VI standard to X standard and a postgraduate B.Ed candidate after passing of the course is eligible to teach at the higher secondary classes, that is, XI and XII standards. The duration of the B.Ed programme was usually¹ used to be one year until recently in 2015 when it was extended to two years. This programme is offered in various centrally funded, state-funded and privately funded institutions.

The Delhi University which has been chosen as a site of inquiry in the present chapter is a public central university located in New Delhi (the capital city of India). This university is one of the premium and largest universities of India which was established in 1922 by an act of the then Central Legislative Assembly of British India. The decision for establishing faculty of education in Delhi University was taken after the Central Advisory Board of Education in 1944 presented post-war educational development report, and it proposed establishment of new teacher training institutions both by the central and by the provincial governments. After this, the educational plan of central government included setting up of faculty of education named as Central Institute of Education (CIE) in Delhi. In the establishment of CIE, a special interest has been taken by the first prime minister and first education minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, respectively. It was hoped that this institution would outturn the model teachers as well as help in solving the existing educational problems of the country. Therefore, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad did not want to delay the running of the institution even though the building for it was not built due to the non-availability of the building material and later due to disturbances in Punjab and then the partition (CIE, 1957). So, CIE was started in tents and a bungalow belonging to the university which finally was inaugurated on December 19, 1947 by Edwina Mountbatten. CIE still is a popular institution for its B.Ed programme and students from different places in the country come to study B.Ed here. The B.Ed programme in Delhi University, apart from CIE, is being run in three of its sister institutions.

Moving further, the present chapter includes the curriculum analysis of B.Ed programme of Delhi University from the years 1981, 2010, and 2015. The 2015 presents the recent reformed curriculum of the B.Ed programme, and 2010 is the one that was in use before. The curriculum of the year 1981 was found by sheer luck as it is not widely available and had been helpful in comparing and contrasting the gaps within the teacher education curriculum framework and actual curriculum, and, locating the shifts in the curriculum of the B.Ed programme of Delhi University.

Teacher Education Curriculum Frameworks and Policy Recommendations

After India gained independence, the first ever commission was the University Education Commission, set up in 1948–49. This commission while recognizing the poor service conditions and status of the teachers in the society had recommended improving both the salaries of the teachers as well as providing them better work conditions. It stated that only those who do not find employment with any other services join teaching and so the quality of school education suffers. It also stated that until the school education will improve the quality of the entrants to the university education will remain low. Therefore, it becomes essential to improve the quality of teacher education and teachers. However, the report had simultaneously defended the discrepancies between the pay of teachers and those in other administrative services saying that teaching is a noble profession, intellectually and spiritually satisfying and devoid of office anxieties, the privileges which people occupying posts in other public services cannot enjoy. Therefore, while recommending an increase in pay of the teachers, the report had also made a note that teaching should not be compared with other public services, and hence, their salaries also should not be comparable (University Education Commission, 1949). Moreover, while recognizing that men and women teachers should be paid equally for the equal work, the commission had refrained from giving it an women empowerment tone as it believed that teaching is in accordance with the nature of women so they should be promoted to take up roles such as teaching, nursing and home management. Therefore, the university education commission had although made recommendations which were needed at the time to ameliorate the condition of teachers, however, the overall approach of it towards teaching as a profession and women teachers was not very progressive. With regard to the curriculum of the teacher education programmes, the University Education Commission (1949) reported that the theory papers taught at different institutions were usually similar, but there were huge discrepancies regarding practice teaching. The theory course usually had compulsory papers on “Principles (or Theory) of Education”, “Methods of Teaching”, “History of Education”, “School, Management and Hygiene”. Besides these compulsory papers the students were also to specialize in the methods of teaching of one or more paper. The rest is the practice teaching of whose evaluation differed from institution to institution and where at one place students were to take 60 supervised lessons in school at another, they were not to take even 10 supervised lessons. This variation in the assessment of the practical aspect of teacher education programme has been lamented by the University Education Commission (1949) which then suggested that equal amount of weight and time should be given in assessing both the theoretical and practical aspects of teaching. It also suggested that during the one year course at least twelve weeks of practice teaching should take place. Furthermore, giving priority to the practice teaching experience at school, the commission recommended that at least 50% of the staff at the teacher education institution should have had a direct school experience as

well as it was desirable that M.Ed candidates obtain few years of school experience before joining the programme (University Education Commission, 1949).

After four years of publication of University Education Commission Report (1949), the report of the Secondary Education Commission was released in 1953, which like the previous report has worried over the deteriorating condition and status of school teachers. The report expressed discontent over the recruitment of untrained teachers in school as well as disparities between the selection and recruitment procedures of teachers all over the country. Therefore, it was recommended that the policies regarding selection and recruitment need to be uniform all over the country as well as across different school managements (Secondary Education Commission, 1953). Moreover, like the previous report, Secondary Education Commission (1953) has also highlighted the importance of practical knowledge and inculcation of proper attitudes and habits among the students, which it stated could be done through the personal conduct and attitude of the teachers.

Similarly, after 10 years another commission known as the Education Commission (1964–66) set up which while taking cognizance of the disparate structures in teacher education had suggested about bringing parity in the condition of both the teachers and the teacher training institutions. Moreover, it was suggested that the traditional methods of training teachers should be abandoned to make way for flexibility and syncing it with the needs of the society (Indian Education Commission & Kothari, 1966). The discussions pertaining to education initiated as a result of Education Commission (also known as Kothari Commission) culminated into publication of National Policy on Education (1968) which had emphasized upon the importance of teachers in successfully implementing all educational endeavours vis-à-vis national development. Therefore, National Policy on Education stated that teachers be provided a respectable position in the society and they should receive satisfactory salaries and their work conditions should be adequate. Moreover, the academic freedom of teachers to speak, write, and publish on issues of national and international concerns should be protected (National Policy on Education, 1968).

In spite of various commissions reflecting over the concerns regarding the deteriorating status of teachers and the traditional ways of imparting teacher training, the scenario did not improve much. Moreover, there were thoughts going in to transform the school education of the country and so the national curriculum for school education was being set up. The first national curriculum for school education was released in 1975. After a year of its publication, the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) in its annual meeting had expressed a desire to bring reforms in the teacher education as a result of which committees were set up and issues pertaining to teacher education was discussed. The recommendations which emanated from these committees took the shape of the document “Teacher Education Curriculum Framework”. This got released in 1978, and it was the first teacher education curriculum framework. This framework criticized the existing curriculum of teacher education for being rigid and traditional. It also noted that in order to make education a transforming agent the current practices need to be discontinued. This framework suggested that a number of courses should be developed in teacher

education for the programme “education as a discipline” and “education as a pedagogy” separately. Besides, it also suggested introducing semester system, making the system flexible, making evaluation completely internal and research methods as an integral component of the teacher education. It also envisioned the role of a teacher that of a social transformer, a guide, a follower, and a leader (National Council of Educational Research and Training, 1978).

Even after having the teacher education curriculum framework and advising overhaul in the teacher education system, much does not seem to change. The National Policy on Education in 1986 and its subsequent review in 1990 have showed that the teacher education is still marred with similar problems. It still was using traditional methodology to train the candidates, there was no interest in developing the affective domain and inculcation of values in teachers and the given practicum was inadequate. The report envisaged removing the abovementioned defects in the teacher education and it has simultaneously recommended preparing teachers for the new thrusts in education such as, education for the differently abled children, activity-based teaching–learning, continuous and comprehensive evaluation, and scientific methods of obtaining knowledge. The recommendations of the National Education Policy to integrate the new thrusts in teacher training also got reflected in the NCTE’s annual meeting (National Council of Educational Research and Training, 1988). This is the same year when the second curriculum framework for teacher education got released in 1988 (this document could not be found though).

In 1993, NCTE was made a statutory body by an Act of Parliament and so it got established in 1995. In 1998, the third curriculum framework for teacher education was published by NCTE titled “Curriculum Framework for Quality Teacher Education”. Like previous policies and curriculum frameworks, this framework has also lamented that the teacher preparation is still traditional, the balance between theory and practical is inadequate, and there are gaps between the methods advocated and methods employed in the teacher training institutes (Khosla, 1998). Nevertheless, this framework has expanded upon the previous curriculum frameworks and included the areas on alternative system of education, physical education and education of children with special needs. The framework also recommended expansion in the duration of the teacher preparation to two years at both primary and secondary levels. A new feature of “pedagogical analysis of teaching subjects” has been added into the given outline for course content (Khosla, 1998). It recommended several measures some of which include maintaining a link between institutions of higher learning and teacher education institutions, designing curriculum so as to maintain a continuity between the pre-service and in-service teacher education, preparing teachers to use culture-specific pedagogy, enabling teachers to actively cater to the community needs and making research and innovation an integral part of the teacher education at all stages. The framework also insisted on replacing the educational practices borrowed from different parts of the world with that of the indigenous ideas and thinkers. It also suggested a separate programme of teacher preparation at senior secondary which will include two courses: one for academic stream and other for vocational stream. Moreover, the framework recommended encouraging the teachers to realize the constitutional goals and inculcate values among the students.

After two years of the release of the teacher education curriculum framework in 1998, the school education curriculum framework was published in 2000. In order to direct the teacher education in sync with the new ideas put into the school education curriculum framework, the document of teacher education curriculum framework was released in 2004. The prime motive with which the committees for framing up of curriculum for teacher education set-up was to turn the existing institutions of teacher education into quality institutions. During this time, the areas of work education, vocational education, education of children with special needs as well as new techniques and technology were getting focus in education. The underlined idea of education as was manifested through the document was to achieve social cohesion, communal harmony, national integration, and establishment of peace. The teachers were sought to be prepared to integrate indigenous knowledge, to use culture-specific pedagogy, to inculcate values among children, and to establish links with the parents and the community. Moreover, this framework specifically mentioned about appreciating the impact of changes in society due to liberalization, privatization, and globalization. It has looked at the child as a constructor of his/her knowledge and thus has used the term “child-centred” (National Council of Educational Research and Training, 2004). Furthermore, this framework like previous frameworks and reports has recommended on substituting theory dominated methodology with practical approaches to bring a balance, to extend the duration of internship and to encourage the students to make use of action research.

The vision for school education was changing at a faster pace and so new frameworks for school education were getting devised. One such curriculum framework for school education was formulated in 2005. Along with suggesting changes in school curriculum, it also listed few problems in teacher education. Some of such problems as has been identified were discrepancy between the theory and practice and non-availability of criterion to assess pupils’ dispositions, habits and attitudes (National Council for Teacher Education, 2009; National Council of Educational Research and Training, 2005). It has also suggested that the teacher educators are the weakest links in the entire teacher education system. Post this in 2009, the “Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education” got enacted. Both the National Curriculum Framework (2005) and Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education had pushed for reform in the teacher education. Therefore, in 2009, the fifth and the latest curriculum framework for teacher education got formulated. This framework enlisted some of its immediate concerns in teacher education as inclusive education, gender concerns, information and communication technology (ICT) and e-learning, community knowledge and equitable and sustainable development. It advocated bringing humane and constitutional values to the core of the teacher education and highlighted preparation of teachers as reflective practitioners.

So, all of the policies and the teacher education curriculum frameworks have lamented the poor condition, salaries and status of teachers in the society. Simultaneously, they all have suggested some measures to improve the situation, some among which include removing the isolation of teacher training institutions and linking them with the other institutions of higher education, improving salaries and

work conditions of teachers, bringing uniformity in admission and recruitment criterion of teachers, and bringing parity between the women and men teachers in terms of their pay. These suggested measures have almost been fulfilled except removing insularity of the teacher training institutions²; yet, the status of the teachers in the society is not uplifted. Moreover, some of the suggestions mainly those given in the teacher education curriculum frameworks have focused on revamping the teacher education through changing the traditional methods of imparting the teacher education, removing the gap between methods advocated and methods employed, making a proper balance between theory and practicum, adequate practice teaching, availability of sufficient tools to assess the dispositions, habits and attitudes of pupils, preparing teachers to become reflective practitioners and making research an integral part of the teacher education at all stages. Whether these suggestions to reform the teacher education make its way into the actual curriculum of the teacher education programme is examined in the next section.

Implementation of National Curriculum Frameworks for Teacher Education

The different curriculum frameworks on teacher education since 1978 have although emphasized upon some of the common problems in teacher education as already been discussed here, but there also have been noted shifts in these as has been observed by Pandey (2011) with regard to the weightage given to the practicum, issues of real-life problems, change in the structure and titles of the core papers. Whether the same has been observed in the actual curriculum of teacher education of Delhi University is a query this section tries to understand.

Foremost, the first curriculum framework on teacher education in 1978 has recommended that there shall be two different programmes for preparing teachers at the secondary level; first is one year professional education after graduation, and second is four-year integrated programme after higher secondary. While the first kind of programme already existed, the second kind of four-year integrated programme never came to exist except those which were taught in regional colleges of education in India. Secondly, the framework of 1978 has advised that education should either be made a social science discipline or an independent discipline, development of courses to cater to a discipline-oriented teacher education and task oriented teacher education programme, introducing semester system, making evaluation completely internal and making research an integral part of the entire teacher education. None of these suggested measures were implemented in the B.Ed curriculum of 1981–82. In this curriculum, annual system is followed, evaluation is not internal completely, and research does not become a part of the teacher education at least at this stage. Moreover, the proportion of weightage given to the theory and practicum areas as suggested in the framework does not get reflected in the B.Ed curriculum of Delhi University (1981–82). Furthermore, there is no paper on “teacher and education in

the emerging Indian society” as has been envisaged in the framework as well as there is no section on “working with community” for which a special committee was formulated prior to release of the framework (1978). The focus in this curriculum was still on the methods and techniques of teaching a subject and the course of studies for core papers were very briefly and abruptly described. Moreover, minimal attention is given towards the attitudinal and inculcation of values among students. Furthermore, the teacher education curriculum framework 1978 stated that teachers should be prepared to be leaders, social transformers, and socially sensitive. However, the given course of studies of 1981 does not emphasize any of these. The syllabus does not even mention anything about the kind of roles that teachers are to be prepared for. For example, it writes words and phrases like “The Geography Teacher—his qualities and outlook on training and education”, “The Civics Teacher—Knowledge, outlook, and skills”. But it does not talk about what those qualities, outlook or skills are supposed to be. Therefore, the B.Ed curriculum of Delhi University of 1981–82 does not reflect the suggestions and recommendations made in the teacher education curriculum framework of 1978.

Similarly, the teacher education curriculum framework of 1998 has provided a number of recommendations. For example, it recommended an expansion in the duration of the teacher education programme to two years, which did not get implemented until recently in 2015.³ It has also included the features of special education, education of alternative systems, pedagogical analysis of school subjects, maintaining a balance between theory and practice,⁴ removing the discrepancy between methods advocated and methods employed, using culture-specific pedagogy, enabling teachers to actively respond to the community needs and, making research an integral component of the teacher education. However, on looking up the curriculum of the B.Ed programme of Delhi University of 2010, it was found that it largely was the same curriculum to that of 1981–82 with minor changes. Most of the papers in 2010 were ditto from the 1981–82, only there have been changes in the number of papers in the category of “Methodology of Teaching” and “Compulsory Elective” papers. Although some of the new papers have been introduced in these categories, but some of these followed the traditional patterns and content while some others actually showed new thrusts that were been given in the curriculum frameworks of the teacher education. However, the papers which were developed on the basis of emerging needs and trends were very few in number. Even after the time lapse of 30 years and a plethora of recommendations given in 1998 curriculum framework, 2004 curriculum framework and 2009 curriculum framework, it appears strange that the theory papers and practicum in 2010 carried the same weightage as it carried in 1981–82. Even the titles and structures of the papers were same. Research and community work failed to become the part of the curriculum in spite of every other document suggesting otherwise. Even the pedagogical analysis of school subjects as was suggested in the curriculum framework of 1998 has not been added in the old teaching methodology papers. Similarly, the feature of alternative systems of education did not get reflected in this curriculum as opposed to the curriculum framework. The lethargy of bringing changes in the teacher education curriculum becomes more apparent when the list of colleges offering B.Ed programme in Delhi

University remained same even after there has been an addition in the list 14 years prior to the release of 2010 curriculum. All of this happens in spite of the direction by the National Knowledge Commission to the University Grants Commission (UGC) that the “departments that do not update their syllabus for the two consecutive years shall be asked to provide a justification” (as cited in Sharma & George, 2017, p.43).⁵ There is no answer as to why the direction made by the National Knowledge Commission was not adhered. This then also leads to the role of the UGC in making the teacher education departments accountable for being stagnant for such a long period of time.

Finally, in 2015, after the recommendations of the teacher education curriculum framework 2009 and Justice Verma Commission 2012, the duration of the B.Ed programme was extended from one year to two years. Therefore, the curriculum of the teacher education programme had to be completely revamped following the guidelines of the teacher education curriculum framework of 2009. This curriculum has integrated epistemological concerns of the disciplines as was envisaged in the curriculum framework. Furthermore, it has included the gender concerns, inclusive education, constructivism and has focused on the constitutional values and values of peace. However, the larger focus of the curriculum was still on the teaching–learning processes related to understanding of child-childhood and the concerns for preparing a humane teacher which has been stressed equally in the teacher education curriculum framework 2009 seemed to be sidelined. This curriculum seemed to be progressive in comparison with the previous curriculums of the teacher education programme. It also seemed to be largely based on the recommendations of the national curriculum framework of teacher education 2009; however, the actual curriculum still have missed some points which have been repeated over a long period of time. One of those concerns is with regard to making research an integral component of the teacher education programmes. The B.Ed curriculum of the 2015 does not specifically mention anything about conducting a research project as part of the programme. Moreover, the curriculum does not mention anything about conducting a project or discussion on reservation⁶ policy as opposed to the teacher education curriculum framework 2009 recommending about it. Furthermore, there have been no conscious effort to evaluate the dispositions, habits and attitudes of the teacher candidates as has been recommended in the framework. One of the best thing that happened in the teacher education system of the country as per the recommendations provided for the last 50 years was expanding the duration of the teacher education programme and giving sufficient time for the practice teaching (however, there have been doubts among the educationists, researchers, educators and practitioners about the efficacy of this current arrangement in the teacher education programme).

Conclusion

It is seen that after India gained independence various attempts were made to bring reforms in the teacher education of the country, be it the structural reforms or at the

level of the curriculum. A big step towards improving the quality of the teacher education programmes through curriculum was taken by initiating the publication of teacher education curriculum frameworks in almost every ten years. These curriculum frameworks along with the policies on teacher education gave some of the common recommendations over a period of time. Some such recommendations included getting rid of traditional methods of teaching, making a balance between theory and practicum, providing sufficient school teaching practice to the candidates, removing the gap between the theory and practice, removing the discrepancy between the methods employed and methods advocated by the teacher educators, making research an integral component of teacher education, emphasizing on attitudinal domain along with the cognitive and inculcation of values. The repetition of these recommendations over a long period of time is in itself an indicator that the suggested measures were not getting implemented in spite of the felt need. This became more apparent after actual curriculums of the B.Ed programme from Delhi University have been analysed in this chapter.

The substantial changes in the actual curriculum of B.Ed programme of Delhi University starting from 1981 did not happen until 2015. Moreover, most of the changes which appeared in the previous curriculums such as that of 2010 seemed superficial, and they were actually in sync with the old ideas (Morgan, 2008). In 2015, one year teacher education programme was expanded to two years and so the reform in the curriculum of teacher education sort of became mandatory. The lethargic or no changes in the actual curriculums of teacher education programme for decades in spite of having policy recommendations, school education curriculum framework, and teacher education curriculum framework is not only reflective of the weak relationship between the social development and the actual academic progress (Lee, as cited in Morgan, 2008) but is also worthy of raising questions on the education system of the country and its administration.

There have been ample evidences that teacher education is intrinsically linked with the school education. Therefore, both of these need to go hand in hand. Hence, this chapter reveals that in spite of having changes in national imagination for teacher education, the same has not been resulting into the changes in the actual scenario. This becomes one of many reasons for stagnancy not into the teacher education of the country but also the school education. If a teacher is not prepared according to the emerging needs of the society as well as the school education, it would be becoming overambitious to demand changes or reforms in the society through the mode of education.

This also shows that there is hardly any attention given to analysing the actual curriculums of either teacher education and school education. Lack of research in this area also indicates towards the complacency of the educationists with the national level reforms. The teacher education departments were not held accountable for not updating their syllabus even after having guidelines for doing the same. Therefore,

the need of the hour as it appears is to constantly check whether the policy recommendations get implemented at the ground level and to have a system of making the teacher education departments accountable for implementation of the given recommendations. Otherwise, if the changes at the ground level occur at its current pace, such as 30 years for any substantial changes (as shown in this chapter) to happen, the educational policies will be a waste and educational change an unachievable dream.

Notes

1. Four regional colleges of India established in the four regions of the country, named as RIE (Regional Institutes of Education) offered four year integrated B.Ed programme leading to the degree like, B.Tech.Ed, B.Sc.B.Ed and B.A.B.Ed.
2. The recent National Education Policy (2020) has advocated measures to bring in the teacher education within the fold of the institutions of higher education.
3. The expansion in the duration of the teacher education programme was a result of the recommendations made in the teacher education curriculum framework 2009 and justice verma commission 2012.
4. It was deemed that the weightage given to practicum is still not sufficient.
5. The National Knowledge Commission got suspended in 2014.
6. Reservation policy in India is an affirmative action meant to reserve certain number of seats in the education, job and politics for the historically marginalized groups of people.

References

- Agoston, G., & Nagy, J. (1974). Reorientation of teacher education in the framework of lifelong education. *International Review of Education*, 20(4), 486–496.
- Boatman, K. (1972). Reexamining teacher education. *The Journal of Education*, 155(1), 14–22.
- Boyle, R. (2011, March). Open the door effective teaching is no secret. *Teacher: The National Education Magazine*, 16.
- CIE. (1957). *Decade in retrospect 1947–1957*.
- Croft, S.A. (1888). *Review of education in India 1886, with special reference to the report of the Education Commission*. Superintendent of Government Printing.
- Denham, C. (1985). The expanding knowledge base of the teacher education curriculum. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 12(3), 84–94.
- Edwards, I. N. (1929). The development of teaching as a profession. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 11(6), 167–169.
- Fox, W., & Gay, G. (1995). Integrating multicultural and curriculum principles in teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 70(3), 64–82.
- Giroux, H. A., Freire, P., & McLaren, P. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Hayes, D., Mills, M., Christie, P., & Lingard, B. (2006). *Teachers and schooling making a difference: Productive pedagogies, assessment and performance*. Allen & Unwin.
- Holme, J. W. (1923). *Progress of education in Bengal, 1917–18 to 1921–22: Quinquennial Review*. Bengal Secretariat Book Depot.

- India Education Commission, & Kothari, D. S. (1966). *Report of the Education Commission, 1964–66: Education and National Development*. Ministry of Education.
- Khosla, D. N. (Ed.). (1998). *Curriculum framework for quality teacher education*. NCTE.
- McMahon, C. P. (1950). Teacher education in the fifteenth century. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 44(2), 134–137.
- Morgan, J. (2008). Curriculum development in 'new times.' *Geography*, 93(1), 17–24.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). (1978). *Teacher Education Curriculum: A Framework*.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training. (1988). *National Council for Teacher Education: Annual report (January 87 to March 88)*.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). (2004). *Curriculum framework for teacher education*.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). (2005). *National curriculum framework, 2005*.
- National Council for Teacher Education. (2009). *National curriculum framework for teacher education: Towards preparing professional and humane teacher*.
- National Policy on Education 1968. (1968). Ministry of Education, Government of India.
- Pandey, S. (2011). *Professionalization of teacher education in India: A critique of Teacher Education Curriculum reforms and its effectiveness*. www.icsei.net/icsei2011/Full%20Papers/0007.Pdf.
- Secondary Education Commission. (1953). *Report of the Secondary Education Commission, October 1952–June 1953*. Education Commission.
- Sharma, R.M., & George, A.M. (2017). Life, ideals and learning(s) to be a 'Teacher' in B.Ed: An analysis of the literature of B.Ed programme. *Journal of Indian Education*, 38–56.
- University Education Commission. (1949). *The Report of the University Education Commission, December 1948–August 1949* (Vol. 1). Government of India.
- Warren, D. (1998). Waiting for teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 25(4), 90–95.