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Governance and regulation of teacher education remains a much neglected area across most countries in the developing world. Despite its importance to the education sector, policies on teacher education according to the MUSTER Synthesis Report 2006 remain ‘fragmented, incomplete and more often than not simply non-existent’ (p. ix). The report also notes that lack of mechanisms to develop, evaluate and renew teacher education curriculum; slow structural changes to teacher education institutions and misplaced cross-cultural borrowings which emphasise centrally driven reforms make it difficult to advocate easy solutions in this field.

In India, the field of teacher education remains fraught with complex concerns of quality and regulation. Post-independence, a series of Education Commissions have sought to foreground the importance of teacher education. The Education Commission (1964-66) called for professionalising teacher education with a focus on developing integrated programmes and comprehensive colleges of Education and internship. These demands gained traction only through the 1980s when the Chattopadhyay Commission Report (1983-85) called for reforming teacher education programmes institutionally. It emphasised the need to locate teacher education within the higher education system in order to bring more depth and rigour to the training programmes (Batra 2006, MHRD, 2012). Despite these disparate efforts at the national level to formulate policy frameworks and quality norms, it was largely up to the state governments to decide on conditions of recruitment and service for both regular and para-teachers. This created wide variations in teaching standards across the country (Govinda and Josephine 2005).

The twenty-first century brought a series of important policy reforms in India. Discussions on curriculum and free and compulsory education for all children came into the public domain with the National Curriculum Framework, 2005 (NCF) and the Right to Education Act, 2009 (RTE). The

---


National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education, 2009 (NCFTE9) noted that quality teacher education was essential for achieving educational goals. This focus on quality simultaneously intersected with an increasing emphasis on building frameworks for teacher assessment that were to impact processes of teacher recruitment. In 2011, the Teacher Eligibility Test was one such attempt in this direction. However, bulk of the candidates who appeared for the test which was administered at the Centre and the state-level failed. This highlighted both the poor quality of pre-service teacher education institutions as well as the poor subject knowledge of teachers.

Quality of teacher education gained national importance following the Justice Verma Commission (MHRD, 20125) report. It focused on several important aspects pertaining to the kinds of students who entered the teaching profession, the limitations of the existing pre-service teacher training programmes where teaching was embedded within archaic methodologies and the poor scope for intellectual enquiry within these institutional spaces. The commission recommended locating teacher education within higher education and offering integrated teacher education programmes. This has been the basis for the current reform efforts initiated by NCTE.

These issues gain significance considering the troubling scarcity of government teachers in schools despite the rapid increase in student enrolments post the coming of the RTE. As of 2014, there was a shortage of 9.4 lakh teachers in government schools. This included 5.86 lakh teachers in primary schools and 3.5 lakh teachers in upper primary schools. In addition, around six lakh teachers remain untrained (Rai 201510).

It is within these larger policy transitions and recent reform efforts toward regulating teacher education quality that a Roundtable is being organised with academicians, practitioners and policy makers to articulate our interests and concerns regarding regulation of teachers and teacher education and how we may collectively understand and formulate these in the larger interests of the growth of the sector.

The Roundtable seeks to engage with the following set of questions:

1. What are the conceptions of regulations, standards and quality in teacher education both within India and globally?
2. What are the bases for the existing norms on teacher education and their effect on the regulation of teachers and teacher education, within India and in the International context?
3. What must be the essential elements that need regulation and their scope? For example, What aspects of infrastructure of the institutes offering TE programmes should be regulated? of faculty qualifications and experience? Should tuition fees that an institute charges be regulated? content of TE programmes? outcomes of a TE programme? What is the justification for these choices? Why is it important to regulate them and what are their effects?
4. What kind of framework can include these elements and support regulation of a professional pathway from teacher preparation to recognising excellence in teaching? How can the framework remain flexible to allow for innovations and meet diverse needs as well as provide for robust regulatory mechanisms so as to not compromise on quality?

# Schedule

## 14 - 15 March 2019

### Day 1: March 14, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30 – 10.00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10.00 – 10.30 | Overview of the round-table and its intent  
Padma Sarangapani, Tata Institute of Social Sciences |
| 10.30 to 10.45 | Tea Break                                                                                   |
| 10.45 – 13.00 | Sharing of experiences and reflections on:  
a.  Nature and mechanisms of regulation of teacher education and teachers  
b.  Pathways to teacher preparation  
c.  Norms and standards  
Moderator: R. Govinda, Council for Social Development |
| 13.00 to 14.00 | Lunch                                                                                           |
| 14.00 to 17.00 | Presentation of national and international experiences:  
a.  Regulation of teacher education and teachers in Mexico  
Yolanda Leyva Barajas, National Institute for the Evaluation of Education, Mexico  
b.  Experiences of IFTRA & AFTRA  
Steve Nwokeocha - Africa Federation of Teaching Regulatory Authorities (AFTRA) (via webex)  
c.  Tracking changes in NCTE's regulations  
Gunjan Sharma, Ambedkar University, Delhi  
d.  Regulations, standards and conceptions of teacher education quality  
Anjali Jain, Centre for Teacher Accreditation  
e.  Regulation of teacher education and teachers in Bhutan  
Ganeshman Gurung, Royal University of Bhutan  
Chair: Disha Nawani, Tata Institute of Social Sciences |
| 17.00 to 17.15 | Tea Break                                                                                   |
| 17.15 to 18.00 | Summary of key issues  
Poonam Batra, Central Institute of Education, Padma Sarangapani & Mythili Ramchand, Tata Institute of Social Sciences |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00 to 10.30</td>
<td>Open discussion on key issues emerging from Day 1, to identify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Essential elements that require regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Frameworks that can remain flexible and support regulation to ensure quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Leena Wadia, Observer Research Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 to 10.45</td>
<td>Tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45 to 12.00</td>
<td>Presentation of national and international experiences:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Initial learnings from a comparative study on regulation of teacher education across South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meera Gopichandran and Poonam Sharma, Tata Institute of Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Regulation of teacher education and teachers in Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irfan Rind, Sukkur Institute of Business Administration, Pakistan (via webex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. RCI regulations and implications of RPD Act 2016 on preparing teachers for inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varsha Ghatoo, Ali Yawar Jung National Institute for Hearing and Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Rekha Pappu - Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Hyderabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 to 13.00</td>
<td>Open discussion on key issues (Contd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: MK Sridhar, Centre for Educational and Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 to 14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 to 16.00</td>
<td>Future Agenda for Research, Policy and Practice on Regulation of Teachers and Teacher Education. Discussions based on proposals of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Hridaykant Dewan, Azim Premji University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Pranati Panda, National Institute of Education Planning and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Mythili Ramchand and Ajay Singh, Tata Institute of Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Alok Mathur, Rishi Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00 to 16.30</td>
<td>Wrap-up and further action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vidya KS, Tata Institute of Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The roundtable provided a forum for sharing of experiences on the regulation of teachers and teacher education in India and a few other countries; identify the crucial issues and enduring questions that frame the complex task of regulation, what do we agree on and disagree with both in terms of recognising what is problematic in the sector and directions that regulation of the sector could possibly take. Drawing from the discussions, tentative plans for research and policy was put forth by a panel for further deliberations.

Sharing of experiences

International Experiences

Academics from three South Asian countries Bangladesh, Bhutan and Pakistan were invited to present what prevails in teacher education in their countries. Representatives from South America and Africa were also invited to understand how regulation is approached in these continents.

In both Bangladesh and Pakistan, schooling is stratified and shadow education is a big industry. Teacher education in Pakistan is decentralised and there are 270 teacher education institutes in four provinces across Pakistan. While pre-service teacher education is funded by external aid agencies in Pakistan, there is no provision for initial teacher preparation in Bangladesh. Subject based trainings are organised at the cluster level for in-service teachers and instructors to conduct the trainings are selected through a national test.

The situation in Bhutan is very different. Two teacher education colleges are able to meet the teacher requirement in the country. A 4-year concurrent programme of initial teacher education is being offered for over two decades, but currently the Government is reconsidering this since students’ strength is dwindling and they are finding that increasingly students are reluctant to commit for four years. Reforms in school education and teacher education are going hand in hand in Bhutan. As to evaluation of teachers, both Bhutan and Pakistan have evolved standards to assess teachers.

Mexico has also invested in a dedicated, autonomous institute for evaluation. Evaluation of teachers is through a three-pronged approach of using quantitative data of the population, qualitative data based on sampling and self-evaluation by teachers. Diagnostic testing is a component of professional teaching standards.

As for Africa, both teacher professional standards and a teacher qualification framework have been developed. The continent is moving towards a common understanding of quality in terms of curriculum of teacher education programmes and what is expected from the teachers that these programmes prepare, while at the same time attempting to value the diversity among the African nations.

Indian Experience

One of the challenges in the Indian context emerges from the fact that the teacher education institutes (TEI) are largely in the private sector. Of the 16,500 TEIs in the country, 8600 are affiliated to Universities and the remaining are stand-alone institutes offering a diploma in education. Therefore concerns of regulating the private sector largely drive the efforts of the regulatory body, the National Council of Teacher Education (NCTE). The NCTE was set up by an act of the Indian Parliament. Education of children with disabilities is regulated by another statutory body, The Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI). The RCI regulates all special education programmes as well as provides renewable license to organisations and individuals working with persons with disabilities. Another issue has been the attempt to provide on the job training to the large numbers of untrained parateachers appointed in many states, especially in North India. These issues have melded with new public management discourses around teacher accountability and performativity. A teacher eligibility test has been mandated since 2011 for prospective teachers and is conducted both at the
National and State level. A private organisation, Centre for Teacher Accreditation has independently evolved a standards framework to assess teachers through written tests.

The presentations and the discussions that followed brought out the need to exert caution in the use of standards as the solution to addressing quality issues of teaching and teacher education. Standards need to take into account social justice concerns and reflect on systems rather than as rewards/punishments of individual teachers. The group acknowledged that while standards start out as an aid to improve quality, they soon fritter down to control.

**Problematising regulation of teachers and teacher education**

The deliberations over two days brought out some of the tensions in conceptualizing regulation of teachers and teaching.

Questions that were raised included:

- Should teacher education be regulated at all? Who or what is regulated? Is it the teacher, the teacher education institute, or the programmes? At what stage should an institute be regulated? Should there be a conceptual framework for regulation? What aspects are to be regulated? At what level should regulations be framed - at the national, state or university level? Who decides the norms and standards for regulation? Can there be self-regulation? Does regulation imply better quality? How do sectors that are unregulated maintain quality?
- What is the purpose of accreditation? What are the essential components that need to be accredited? What evidence do we have on accreditation?
- What is the role of an affiliating university? What are its functions? Can a university take up the role of a regulator?
- What is the difference between a liberal arts programme and a teacher education programme?
- How much do we know about creating a synergy between a teacher education institute/department of education and schools? What is its nature? What models are available?
- Who should become a faculty of education? Should requirements such as school based experience or two Masters degree be categorical for all faculties? Will such requirements not preclude inter-disciplinary studies that the teacher education requires?

Concerns were raised over several issues:

- The poor quality of higher education in general, reflected in the weak disciplinary knowledge of student teachers
- Focus on inputs going into minute details in regulating the setting up of new teacher education institutes and offering of programmes. There is little basis for stipulations such as a specific size of classroom, number of books required etc.
- An inspection model adopted by the regulatory body that seeks to control rather than facilitate improvement
- Over-emphasis on the ‘standards’ aspect has essentially thwarted the non-standard creative component in teacher education.

**Aspects around which consensus emerged**

There appeared to be consensus that the process of regulation must be separated out from the regulator. The current regulatory body was set up under specific historical context. It did manage to curb the highly problematic practice of awarding of teacher education degrees through ‘correspondence’ programmes but later could not withstand the onslaught of privatization, post liberalization of the country’s economy. The group felt there is now a need to move away from regulation to facilitation. Also, institutes evolve over a period of time and regulation must recognise this growth potential, instead of a now or never approach in allowing institutes to come into existence. While regulation comes under the purview of jurisprudence, practitioners and researchers can contribute to the formulation of what needs to be regulated, how and by whom so as to ensure teacher education
institutes, the programmes they offer and the teachers they produce are able to meet essential quality parameters. As the meaning of quality is multi-faceted, wider consultations and dialogues with multiple stakeholders is necessary to identify core elements of quality that must be ensured in teacher education. It is important to recognise that regulation of teacher education cannot be conceptualised apart from regulation of other aspects of education. In education, it is essential not to separate out inputs, processes and outputs but treat them holistically.

The group was categorical that a reductive, technicist view of standards has to be avoided.

**Differences of opinions**

Those that were expressed include:
- It is better to retain the term regulation instead of facilitation since it prevents marketisation.
- Leaving regulation to professionals can be problematic as they will act in their self-interest rather than the larger public good that education is expected to fulfill.
- Existence of a teacher education institute has wider ramifications and therefore its inception has to be regulated.

**Tentative Plans for Research and Policy**

The proposals put forward are summarised under three broad categories:

1. **Re-conceptualising the regulatory body**

   There is a need for the regulatory body to take on the role of a facilitator. Dialogues and wide ranging consultations are needed on the nature of a guiding force for such a regulatory body and whether regulations should necessarily be standards driven. There are multiple stakeholders in teacher education programmes, beyond private colleges. There is a need to include their voices as well. It is essential for a regulatory body to understand the complex nuances of teacher education.

   NCTE is now engaged with issues of demand and supply of teachers across the country. A disaggregated data across regions, subjects and levels is not available. This will be imperative for a nuanced planning of programmes and intake, both in the short and long term. Also India exports teachers to Africa, the Middle East and a few neighbouring nations. The regulatory body thus needs to engage with developing teacher education to international standards.

   It is not feasible to have all functions within one regulatory body. Multiplicity of regulatory bodies can create confusion, if there is inadequate co-ordination. Hence the possibility of arrangements for a multiplicity of functions within the same body has to be worked out.

2. **Reforming the regulation process**

   Regulatory processes cannot be the same in different parts of the country. The large size of teaching workforce and the diversity among them must be taken into account in any scheme of regulation. The workforce should not be treated as a monolith. Mechanisms have to be evolved to give teachers feedback and not only pass judgements on their performance. The education sector needs to be nurtured further in developing countries rather than punitive regulatory mechanisms.

   Systemic support for teachers is required. There should be a robust professional framework to provide it. The framework must be flexible and meet both the developmental context of India and the country’s aspirations as a global knowledge hub. Regulation of teachers and teacher education needs to support an evolutionary notion of quality.

   Regulation is never benign. Fundamental questions need to be constantly posed about who, what and why of regulations from time to time.

3. **Prioritising the research agenda**

   There is need for robust research to build a contextual understanding of the practice of teachers and
teacher education in India. Some specific areas of research that were suggested:

- What is the role of regulation in ensuring quality? What has been the impact of regulation on teacher education in other countries? How do the regulatory bodies in different professions function and what is their impact? How do sectors that do not have regulation ensure quality?
- How are the various aspects of regulation and accreditation being implemented across the country? What are the perceptions of various stakeholders on teacher education and its regulation?
- What is the systemic and institutional readiness to prepare teachers who are responsive to needs of present day students and schools?
- What is involved in creating a synergy between a teacher education institute/department of education and schools? What are the models available?
- How much do we know about the knowledge and practice of teaching? What is being communicated in teacher preparation programmes? What sense are student teachers making of their preparation? How does a teacher’s knowledge and practice evolve?

The roundtable helped articulate issues and problems in the regulation of teacher and teacher education. These are complex and preclude arriving at quick solutions. It is planned to organise further discussions based on what emerged from this roundtable towards a better understanding of the sector and potential solutions that are sufficiently nuanced to address the diverse needs of teachers and teacher education in India.
About the Report

This report provides details of the discussions that took place during the two-day roundtable conducted by the Centre for Education, Innovation and Action Research at the Tata Institute of Social Sciences in Mumbai.

The format of the roundtable included a few invited presentations followed by questions and answers. Sufficient time was provided for open discussions on select themes.

The report summarises key points from the presentations, along with the question-answer sessions. Open-discussion sessions where different participants raised their concerns and put forth their ideas have been captured verbatim, where possible. The report ends with a set of reflections on some of the problematics that were identified, and a broad set of pointers that emerged through the discussions.

Rapporteurs: Arati Bapat, Emaya Kannamma, Gomathi Jatin, Heena Goenka, Shaily Bhadauria and Tanuja Rawal

Prepared by: Mythili Ramchand & Vidya K.S.
Day 1

Thursday

14 March 2019
Overview of the round-table and its intent: Padma Sarangapani
This is reported verbatim as it sets the tone for the deliberations over two days.

Tata Institute of Social Sciences is 75-year old institution impacting social sciences. Our institution is involved with education for all from the point of view of access, equity and programme quality and excellence. About two years ago, we began a conversation with the Tata Trusts to develop and establish a Centre of Excellence in Teacher Education, with a view on initiating actions that can contribute to revitalizing the sector. Given our common experience of the frustrations of how the sector is performing today and its existing ability to attract and develop good quality teachers, we felt that we should initiate activities that directly go into revitalizing teacher education.

We have proposed to work with high-quality professionals, develop a strong research base, contextually relevant knowledge and understanding of education and outreaching. The purpose of today's roundtable is of course not to engage with the Centre of Excellence but directly dive into one of the areas that we have felt for a long time to be central in the question of the quality of teacher education. In fact, this is a common issue which most of us gathered around this table have. We have met in the past, we have discussed the issues in the past, we have addressed both our hopes for this question of regulation as well as immense frustrations with regulations and regulatory bodies.

I will begin with these very preliminary remarks on the space from which this roundtable has been launched. I would like to just introduce to you as to why we have thought about having a roundtable and try to focus a little bit on the kinds of issues with which we are hoping we will engage and also equally important to the process of deliberation that we will be engaging today and tomorrow. The idea came about because many of us felt that we were discussing our issues of regulation at a point in which it was too late to do anything about it. We were typically either experiencing effects of regulation and experiencing immense tension and frustration over what it was able to do, more importantly, what it was not able to do and what it was forcing us to do. So we were experiencing regulation and all of us have this huge load of experiences with regulatory processes which all of us carry. And we have to talk about it. But we have to talk about it in a way in which we can also reflect on it and broaden the issue beyond our own individual experience and interests. And try to understand where is the issue coming from and what is at stake with issues, trying to raise it and reformulate the experience so that we are able to focus on the issues that need to be addressed and the kind of advocacy that needs to take place rather than only a cathartic, getting rid of all the experiences.

We also found that actually, the sector is extremely complex, in the sense that there are many, many stakeholders involved and in the Indian context a wide diversity of stakeholders who are involved in offering teacher education, and it's important to bring in the process of deliberation, so that there is some possibility of a multi-stakeholder discussion of the process of regulations. We need to have spaces to have a multi-stakeholder deliberation. We also felt that although a lot of deliberation is happening, it is happening at a point at which it is not relevant. We are all vested in our own interests and then we begin defending our positions without actually allowing ourselves to hear other positions and be persuaded to change our minds. So we felt that it is really important for us to have a space in which all of us who are invested in the sector have experiences and strong views about what the sector should do, can do, should not do, cannot, is not yet ready to do. We need to create a space where we can begin to speak about these things without the tension and the pressure of having to make decisions tomorrow or today. We don't have to make any decisions when we leave this roundtable tomorrow!

The purpose of the roundtable is not to arrive at decisions. The purpose of the roundtable is really to understand what are the issues at stake and where is it possible to build consensus, (recognise) differences, what is the origin of those differences and how can regulation meaningfully respond to legitimate differences rather than standardize, standardization being the outcome of regulation. I say this also because the sector which we are speaking about - both teaching and teacher education,
is actually a sector which is deeply a knowledge sector. It is not simply a sector of applying some scientific knowledge to produce some kind of practice. In fact, a sector, which is deeply an epistemic endeavour, through which we discover practice, we create new knowledge and understanding. And how do you regulate and why must you regulate processing knowledge.

The whole question of what does regulation even mean, in an area of endeavour, a human endeavour which is deeply integrated with knowledge and is deeply an epistemic process, in other words, many of us are engaged with questions of the practice of teaching, the work of the teacher, the work of teacher formation with an understanding that not all answers are known. There are many possible answers. They are many to explore, discoveries to be made. And many new questions, for which nobody has any answers. And really without an active process of investigation, creation, experimentation, innovation, we won’t be able to address many of the deep questions of the sector. And what does it mean to regulate a process of exploration and knowledge? I think that’s also a question that deeply engages us and possesses us.

The nature of education itself, and many of us around this table today, have entered into education from very diverse trajectories and we all carry dual identities, triple identities even, owing our own intellectual (allegiance) to many disciplines from which we draw our own ability to think about educational issues, think about pedagogic issues and engage with aims of education. Given the complexity of the nature of education itself, I think the question of how should we view the knowledge of teaching, how should we view the knowledge and practices of teacher education is a very good question, and I think that there are probably as many opinions about it as there are people around this table and many more outside as well. So these are some of the issues that make the question of regulation very charged in our sector, very very complex and very very difficult to conceptualize in any easy way.

In addition to all of this, we all know that the sector has deep interests, legitimate interests from people who are employed in the sector based on certification, which is recognized. So there is an employment aspect to it. So there is an interest in the regulation and the consequences of regulation, then it also brings with it a question of the interests of providers of teachers, management of both teachers and teacher education institutions and I think it’s probably true, of the South Asian context - is definitely true of India - that we in our historical legacy have multiplicity of types of providers, many types of government providers, many types of non-government providers, we have many, many combinations of government and non-government as well.

Really when we look at the sector, it is very, very complex and has diverse interests from higher education, to school education. In fact, the very place for teacher education is located in the Indian MHRD, this is an indicator of how vested and complex it is, and sitting in the school education, but in the activity of higher education both ministries are involved in it. That’s just an indication of how complicated teacher education and teachers are.

So the idea is really for this Roundtable to begin the process of thinking in a very open, deliberative way to begin to examine these issues and begin to understand our positions, allow our differences to get articulated, and also us to be able to listen to other differences and understand where it’s coming from, to demand from each other explanations of the positions that we take, ask ourselves to explain the origins of our positions, what are the consequences of multiple positions we take, actually allow ourselves to challenge each other’s positions, understand each other’s positions, explore where these positions will take us and allow that to get articulated and expressed. It is not for this roundtable to try to engage and complete everything that needs to be said because we are hoping that this will be the first of more roundtables and maybe with all of us sitting around the table, we may also want to take this progressively forward, allow some understanding to cumulatively develop, take the discussion into regional contexts as well into the national context. And try to bring more voices into the discussion.

So in terms of organizing, even in terms of all of you, whom we have been able to get together for discussion, it has been quite complicated. We wanted to keep the number small enough so that we
actually have a conversation and that is why it is a roundtable and we are going to speak to each other, so there is no head for this table, although we have some moderators to manage the discussion. But the idea is for thoughts to be exchanged. We also think that there is a research agenda which needs to be appraised. For us to inform ourselves more methodically and deliberately about the change in the sector and where it is going. So we began some preliminary work in terms of research - our colleagues will be sharing this. And we think that some of the outcomes of the roundtable is also to decide to evolve for ourselves an understanding of what are those areas in which we need more research, we need to gather evidence, need to come back to the table with much more information about really what’s happening out there. We need to understand the labour market of both teachers and much, much greater in-depth understanding, we need to bring those discussions into our deliberations. So we are hoping that this roundtable will be the first round of our conversation. So if you see the structure of the two-day deliberation, we have a lot of time really for us to, speak to each other, of course we have formal presentations. But that doesn’t mean that certain voices are privileged in this roundtable, by any means. It is just an indication of some work that has happened which we want to bring to the table. So we really want all of you to feel that we are really here to speak, to hear and listen to each other, we will all come again, meet and continue this conversation. So in a way, I hope you are binding to a longer engagement by coming for this first meeting, rather than thinking that you are just here, have your say and then leave.

I think this is the sector in which we need to understand both the possibility of consensus and the legitimate differences. But if there will be no consensus, that’s ok, but what should regulation do in that context in which there are consensus and differences which are legitimate? We need to evolve that understanding for ourselves as a community and build that into our own positions as regulation itself positioned.

We have been very fortunate that at this meeting we were been able to invite international voices whose experiences we think are very relevant for us to engage with. So we are very pleased to have you here. One is Yolanda Leyva Barajas from Mexico South America. We were very keen to have Steve Nwokeocha with us. But Steve is going to join us over WebEx. He has been involved deeply with the African Federation for Teacher Regulation and Accreditation. We thought that their experiences would help us engage with them. We are pleased that we extended an invitation to colleagues from Bhutan, Prof. Gurung, from the Royal University. We are pleased that you are here from Bhutan. We have also invited Dr. ZiaSabur from Bangladesh and we are expecting him soon. We have invited a colleague from Pakistan. We had to uninvite him, given the recent events, Irfan is going to join us also tomorrow. We thought that there are lot commonalities of issues in the sector in our countries. We will be enriched in our discussions by also listening to what is happening about their approach. We are very grateful for your time. We are hoping that it will be meaningful to engage with us as we go forward with these.

Session 1

Sharing of experiences and reflections on:
- A. Nature and mechanisms of regulation of teachers and teacher education
- B. Pathways to teacher preparation
- C. Norms and standards

Moderator: Prof. R. Govinda

R GOVINDA:

The output from this session provides the broad canvas for subsequent discussions. Regulatory agencies do not have a good reputation in India. Many are identified as corrupt agencies in the public mind. The question is not so much the regulation but what the regulators do.

When NCTE came into existence in the 1990s, the original idea was to look into the quality of new
teacher education courses and institutes which were coming into existence but it became a policing body. Is it possible to ever regulate quality? Are standards and quality the same when we talk about teacher education? Can we talk about teacher education without talking about teachers - who becomes a teacher and what happens to teachers? Are we improving teacher education quality in the process of regulating the institutions?

There have been many discussions about the quality of teacher training, for example the Verma Committee report but we haven’t identified what really needs to be done with the regulation of teacher education. What should NCTE be doing?

HRIDAYKANT DEWAN: The most important institute for teacher education is the university which accredits the B.Ed. courses. The problems don’t just relate to teacher education. The Universities do not have sufficient bandwidth to see how the courses can be improved.

The question of what kind of regulation is needed has many dimensions. Do teachers come into institutes with a good subject understanding after class 12? Whatever happens in 2-3 years of teacher training cannot completely address the backlogs of previous gaps.

One big problem is that we cannot get into the classroom of the teacher educator or teacher. So we are looking at the problem the wrong way around. It can only be based on trust. The current approach is based on mistrust and looks at faults and weaknesses. We have no way of knowing whether teachers are getting sufficient inputs to become good teachers. The problem is we are looking at quantity as a measure of quality rather than focussing on process.

SHIRIBATSA JENA: NCTE has mechanisms for controlling rather than supporting. There is no substance for improving quality. Norms and standards exist, which are never translated into action. Quality of teachers depends almost entirely on the teacher education process. This needs to be focussed on pre-service teacher training rather than in-service teacher training, which is too limited.

Are standards and quality synonymous? Standards give some unit of measurement.

In Orissa there is no regulation for school education from pre-primary to secondary. There has been a huge expansion at the secondary level but one can’t see the elements relating to quality in school education.

HASEEN TAJ: Teacher education is under pressure from various agencies compared to other courses in higher education. It is under state control, SCERT, Universities etc. There are too many regulatory agencies - which regulation should be followed?

Starting from pre-primary to secondary - are not all under the purview of the same institute and treated differently?

NCTE is in the business of controlling rather than improving. In terms of human resources, what competencies do teachers require, there is no support from NCTE. There are only infrastructure and input norms. Teachers are still unprepared. There should be academic support from organisations concerned with quality improvements.

We require different models of teacher education at the tertiary level but there is lots of disparity despite the guidelines which exist. The NCTE framework does not allow for flexibility or innovation in professional courses, so new courses which the institutes wanted to start were not allowed.

MK SRIDHAR: When discussing regulation, regulation of what? Teachers? Teacher education? Teacher education institutes? These distinctions are very important.

We can’t discuss regulation of teacher education apart from other spheres of higher education. When discussing regulation, should the focus be on inputs, the process or the outputs? All three of these? The organizational point of view is very important.

Often regulation is confused with uniformity.
VARSHA GATHOO: What is problematic is that regulation becomes control. Are the practices about “excellent education” which is measured in terms of pass rate/results or is it about “excellence in education”? The second of which is more a kaleidoscope maker. The teacher educator puts different elements into the tube which will be creatively applied by the teachers when they face different children.

At Mumbai University the guidelines for each course are very tight (e.g. B.Ed in special education) this restricts employment opportunities for graduates. The goal should be about bringing about excellence in education.

Who should be ready for what? The child ready for the system or the system ready for the child? Both learner and institutional readiness are required for the 21st century demands.

PRANATI PANDA: There are two types of frameworks for regulation - centralised and decentralised. Prior to 1986, there was a decentralised structure. Post 1986 - centralised governance model with the hope that quality would be improved. A complex, rigid model emerged after 1993. NCTE was the outcome but the rigid framework faced challenges due to the prevalence of private sector providers of teacher education (more than 90%). We need to focus on a conceptual framework of governance for India. Need a governance structure and regulatory framework which can address the diverse contexts and offer a holistic framework. Presently norms and standards operate at a granular level of detail for inputs but they do not address the knowledge horizon of teacher education.

There is a view that the National Curriculum Framework is a panacea for all. Looking at the international trends, self-development of teachers is the key. How do teachers need to perform better? Against which guidelines? This approach is absent from the Indian context.

Management and regulation should be supportive in nature not obstructive. Need to focus on concrete policies. Our national policies are diluted compared to those of other countries. We need focussed policies which can generate accountability. We need a regulatory framework with flexibility, which take a development perspective to accommodate the complex nuances of teacher education.

AJAY SINGH: Reflecting on rules and regulation is not the core area of education. These are traditionally in the ambit of legal studies. What is the basis for rules and regulations? Is it theory of natural justice? Far from this. How does NCTE get its power? Customs also form part of the rules and regulation. What are the forms of resistance and negotiations with respect to rules? Whatever is decided is not determined amongst education professionals but at the levels of parliament, judiciary and legislature.

R GOVINDA: One theme is to move away from the term ‘regulator’ to ‘regulation’ to conceptualise the issue. This has two dimensions. The purpose of regulation is to improve governance and to improve quality. Also highlighted was the difference between standardisation and standards. Teaching has two dimensions 1) a creative non-standard aspect and 2) a relatively standard aspect. Both need to be kept in mind but often the focus is on the standard aspect and in the process the creative dimension is “killed”. This needs to be avoided. We require standard setting instruments not standardisation. Also need to make the distinction between teachers and teacher education.

However the question is at what level should regulation be determined? In a diverse country is it meaningful to set standards at a national level? As noted earlier, this may kill the creative aspects which are key to teaching. Should standards be set at state level or at the level of the university? The feature of India is not just it’s size but the diverse languages, traditions and local conditions. This suggests a system which is operationally and conceptually decentralised.

Another question is who will do the standard setting in teacher education? A community of educationists? Can it be done by a bureaucratic body? We seem to be in the hands of external
bodies rather than educationists. Where should the locus of decision-making lie? Can it be generic or should it be specialised?

Issues specific to India:
i) Teacher education is not a monolith, not just in terms of regional variations but amongst the various layers of education from pre-primary upwards
ii) Within teacher education itself there are layers. There are departments of education which do not offer a BEd, there are those that offer BEd amongst other courses, there are BEd courses run by institutes which are not affiliated or are weakly affiliated with universities.

Decision making on the curriculum of courses should be based on discussions amongst academics (as is done with other university courses). In India many teacher education institutes are private, not linked to universities. The process of curriculum determination must be linked to the structure of the system. There is a small public component amongst a large private component, 80% of which is self-financing. How can quality standards be applied in this context. How can private vested interests be incentivized to improve quality?

PADMA SARANGAPANI: I will share experience of trying to establish a teacher education programme over the past 2 years. Regulatory question is very sharp. It is a question of existence and the right to exist. There are extremely high stakes in the efforts to get recognition status. There is an excruciating level of detail, is it necessary to have a multipurpose hall, 1000 books etc. Any of these can impact whether or not recognition is granted. Why is the system so hinged on these? There is no space for a process of deliberation. There is a god-like status for the list of requirements. What is the basis to be obliged to aspects about which they may have no knowledge? E.g. in Scandinavian countries, the state can determine who is fit to be a parent. Where is the authority valid? Where there is a danger of quackery, e.g. for medical colleges, practices come from an established body of knowledge, which is science. This is how MCI gets its legitimacy.

The second issue relates to corruption. The state has responsibility to regulate the quality of products in the market. If we view teacher education as a market, the state has a role to ensure that courses provided by the market are of the required quality.

In the scope of these questions we must note the purpose, intent and direction of regulation. The recognition question is very important. Why is M.Ed under regulation? Are we creating a new breed of teacher, a teacher educator?

Lastly, can we consider sectors which are currently not regulated e.g. early childhood education, are they worse off for not being regulated? How is quality achieved in the absence of formal regulation?

HRIDAYKANT DEWAN: We need to think about whether we want a framework of maintenance standards. This cannot be done by a centralised body. So who would set the standards? Standards should involve a process of maintenance.

Second, what should we try to regulate? In what way should we create the infrastructure norms? They are standards that we need to work towards, in an ideal world. Is there some validity in setting the challenges of opening a teacher training college, to achieve the norms and so that over a period of time recoup the costs? Need to think about this.

The process of curriculum development for teacher education has been reviewed in previous years. I feel we are pushing the system too fast. Creating centres of excellence works at many levels. We need to believe that teachers want to improve. It needs to be an evolutionary process. Can’t be offered as a finished product. Need some groups of teachers who are willing to participate in a self-evolutionary process.

LEENA WADIA: As a think tank we recognise that we are so under empowered to act, even though we are practitioners. Suppose we suggest self-regulation, how will it work? What kind of professional bodies are required to feed into regulatory bodies? How do we as a community of educationists push
for teacher education which is more responsive to the needs of students?

MYTHILHI RAMCHAND: Critiquing current direction of the country. We are moving towards creating ‘islands of excellence’ which doesn’t improve practice-oriented discourse more broadly. Regulation has been frittered down to “catching hold of people”. There are a large number of private providers offering teacher education which we regard as a public good. Then how can we maintain quality rather than merely allowing market forces to play out? How do we create capabilities at the ground level and move the mechanism of regulation towards self-regulation?

STHABIR KHORA: From a business perspective, regulation has a bad name, but from a social sector, regulation is regarded as a good thing. Decentralisation can lead to increased marketisation. In education, many of the best institutes are public e.g. IIT and IIM. They are considered to be high quality. It is therefore possible to create quality within a public framework. There is a role for the state in cases of market failure e.g. Wall Street collapse. Leaving regulation to professionals themselves can be problematic e.g. issues with the Bar Council of India. Professional autonomy must be a bilateral agreement with the state. Regulation is a minimum but quality is more than the minimum.

MK SRIDHAR: In the name of quality, there is too much quantification. For accreditation, quality is based on CGPA scopes. Recently NAAC peer review saw 30 per cent dependency on evaluation by an external team whereas 70 per cent was to be evaluated based on quantitative indicators.

Another example in Bangalore University, which had many affiliate colleges. Formerly there were broad guidelines for affiliation, but there was felt to be too much subjectivity. So cut off points were compiled. There is too much reliance on quantification of quality.

On the existential issue, we can suggest the approach that there is not too much regulation at the starting point, but accreditation should be granted on the basis of how they perform.

GUNJAN SHARMA: It is important to engage with the status and location of teacher education within institutions. Teacher education is not considered an equivalent academic discipline to other domains. External regulation has played some role in helping teacher education claim an equivalent space in institutions. The regulation question is about what by whom, rather than regulation or not.

HASEEN TAJ: Regulation starts with a measuring tape. The intent, credibility and past performance of the institute must also be considered. The number of education institutions is mushrooming. However, institutes are under minute instructions, which begin with the measuring tape at the initiation. There needs to be a paradigm shift towards looking at the process and exit point of teacher education. These are the points at which teacher education quality needs to be considered. Not just at the start but how inputs are used to create the right kinds of outcomes. Recognition is the first point of control but the process and outputs should also be controlled. There can be models and centres of excellence in the country.

SHRIBATSA JENA: What should be the locus of decision making for regulation? In the deliberation process, the stakeholders who matter most should be involved. Do we have the competencies? Bureaucrats sometimes listen to the voice of stakeholders, sometimes they do not respect these voices, and override others.

NCTE framework tries to set standards but the contribution of the range and depth of inputs to teacher education are largely missing. The issue of existence and quality need to be balanced.

PRANATI PANDA: When teachers pass out from college, can regulatory bodies identify the teacher competencies that they should possess? Regulatory bodies focus on inputs, but what about the academic activities which take place throughout the year?
KISHORE DARAK: Should recognise that regulatory bodies have a memory and history which influences their practices. They simply follow practices rather than understand the context in which they operate. Agencies show a lethargic attitude to change. Teacher education colleges are resistant to new ways of thinking. How do we keep a check on the conduct of regulatory agencies themselves?

DISHA NAWANI: We all agree that the meaning of quality is a contested process. The question about whether an external body should give a right to exist, given the impact of teacher training institutes on teachers and children, there is a virtue of regulation.

AJAY SINGH: Regulation is tightly knitted to the question of quality. This is probably an assumption. Proposed rules and regulation have nothing to do with quality. The Teacher Eligibility Test 2011, was failed by 90% of candidates from NCTE accredited institutes. So we can suggest that NCTE requirements have nothing to do with quality. Need to think about whether rules and regulations contribute to quality?

ZIA SABUR: Based on the experience of Bangladesh, initially the issue was about creating access. The issue of quality was left behind. Started with a centralised structure. Found that centralised structure did not support better classroom practices such as participatory learning. The Government wants to take responsibility for improving quality but does not have the bandwidth. There are a large number of schools, 25 categories, very loosely regulated. Secondary schools, mostly non government institutions, the salaries of teachers are not paid, little teaching takes place.

In terms of curriculum development, sustainable development goals (SDGs) are now being implemented. Learning has to be based on sustainable development and principles of lifelong learning. There are various NGOs and civil society organisations working on these changes.

A significant area which needs to be addressed is the independent functioning of primary and secondary education, towards a more integrated view.

Developing teacher training and a common teacher cadre is important. Merely increasing salaries will not help. Academic supervision of teacher education is required.

Another issue is the schizophrenic approach to governance. There is a fragmentation of responsibility over different aspects of education. Also there is no power to lower level bodies to create effective decentralisation. This requires devolution of decision making and financing.

Need a holistic approach based on synchronicity.

PRANATI PANDA: Need to think about the intent of regulation. In our experience we have observed how regulation has evolved. At the end of the 80s and early 90s, there was a need to respond to the ‘commercialisation’ of education. During the 1990s and early 2000s, NCTE had succeeding in controlling and coordinating teacher education. After 2000s, the NCTE could not maintain control in the face of neo-liberalism and increasing emergence of new institutions.

Within the Indian context the teacher education could not respond to the corruption within the system. NCTE was a response, crisis management to deal with issues of privatisation of teacher education, but in the process organisations like TISS and CIE were also affected. Now NCTE is thinking in terms of demand and supply of teachers ,at the demographics. How should institutions respond?

I feel there ought to be a multi-model approach to address different types of institutions. E.g. TISS compared to a new teacher training college which has just emerged.

How can we move away from an inspection model?

Recently at a meeting of private teacher education providers, I heard that they are equally concerned with quality issues. We do not have an attitude of trust towards privately managed institutions. However they are also evolving to attract students and build their reputation.
The current NCTE framework is a straight jacket. Participants in the process seem unhappy. The trajectory of changes in the last 30-40 years are not making people happy. We need to bifurcate our management processes.

I have undertaken an analysis of international teacher education standards and have found that few countries have well developed standards, only the US, UK and Canada. In the Indian context we are not prepared for changes, just repeating what has been done in the past. How do we improve in each area for overall development?

**YOLANDA BARAJAS:** The quality concept has several dimensions. We must consider everything that contributes to the quality of education received by the students. If we consider all these dimensions, the standards will be very good.

In Mexico we have improved on indicators such as PISA, but in the last 50 years have not improved outcomes for all students. Our states in the South are very poor, across indicators. The gap is huge. The regulation is good, there are guidelines and monitoring. I agree that regulation ought to be considered as a support process rather than a control.

**VARSHA GATHOO:** Have been learning from the Western experience. When referring to regulation, need to consider pragmatism. As well as idealistic notions, we must also think about pragmatics which ensures sustainability. For our specialist courses we have seen numbers dwindling from 30, now even 10 seats cannot be filled. Policies and legislation changes e.g. RTE Act, but teachers have problems in accommodating RTE children in the classroom. E.g. school fees are paid for but excursion fees are not included. Institutional sustainability has to be thought through for new programmes.

**NUTAN BHARATI:** In the corporate world, it is said that what cannot be measured does not exist but I would disagree with this. A common voice helped bring NCTE into existence to control the proliferation of new colleges and correspondence courses in teacher education. In the present scenario of online and blended courses, there is a voice. These areas are not so regulated.

We need a common voice to be able to “regulate the regulator”. The common voice needs to guide the regulator rather than complain about the regulator.

**GANESHMAN GURUNG:** Regulation is important but regulation may not equate to quality. Can help towards quality. All organisations can make mistakes but when our work has such a significant impact on future teachers and children, we have to make sure regulation is helping to set the correct practices. Regulation should not however be restrictive, but should be designed to be responsive to the context. Most of us worry about external regulation. There is a disconnect between the regulator and practitioners. A way forward can be a more collaborative approach. In Bhutan we have broad guidelines, and work within collaboration and with respect for each other.

**VNALALRUATFELA HLONDO:** Why is there a need for NCTE to regulate MEd course? NCTE regulates MEd course but not the MA in education. How to make sense of this?

**R GOVINDA:** Regulation is antithetical to learning and education. Regulation somehow does not fit in. The regulator wants to regulate. The words we use here are very important. The difficulties faced by TISS in setting up their new teacher educator course are faced by other institutions also. Once a body is created, it sets rules and regulations. Max Weber takes over! Can’t control the body once it has been established.

There is something seriously wrong in the way education is governed. The issue about the right to existence of institutions - there has always been right and wrong. There has always been some basis for recognition. Teachers actually learn how to teach after they become teachers. It’s the same
with institutions, some of the now esteemed institutions started off in a ramshackle state. They have evolved over time. The regulatory framework needs to take account of this evolutionary perspective. It is not a factory or shop which gets up and running from day 1. New institutions must be dealt with in a more sensitive manner. This is very difficult. Rather than a regulator, a facilitator is needed-it should be a structurally different type of body that can facilitate instead of policing.

Where does a body get the authority to oversee other institutions? There are 4 types of authority which are required. (Regulatory bodies are necessarily created by the state, state gives autonomy to that body).
1. Legal authority
2. Academic authority
3. Moral authority (by representing the community of practitioners - not viewed as an outsider)
4. Financial authority (however 90% are private and of that, 80% receives no government funding. How do we control what they do?)

Another point which has been repeated is that we have to regulate not only at the point of establishment. We talk about quality but we only look at quantity of inputs. Move towards quantity is because we are afraid of subjectivity. The focus on objective measurement is based on a fear psychosis. By insisting on objectivity we have reduced teaching to something that does not require a teacher. E.g. model answers for 12th standard exam cannot be deviated from.

Subjectivity is needed. Cannot be a good regulator/facilitator without subjectivity. We don’t have trust in our own peer group. Without trust we cannot progress in education. Regulatory authority cannot be achieved without the 4 authorities mentioned above and trust.

**Session Summary**

This session brought out some of the tensions in conceptualizing regulation of teachers and teaching. Questions ranged from: Should teacher education be regulated at all? Who or what is regulated? Is it the teacher, the teacher education institute, or the programmes? At what stage should an institute be regulated? Should there be a conceptual framework for regulation? What aspects are to be regulated? At what level should regulations be framed - at the national, state or university level? Who decides the norms and standards for regulation? Can there be self-regulation? Does regulation imply better quality? How do sectors that are unregulated maintain quality?

Issues include:
- the poor quality of higher education in general, reflected in the weak disciplinary knowledge of student teachers
- focus on inputs going into minute details in regulating the setting up of new teacher education institutes and offering of programmes. There is little basis for stipulations such as a specific size of classroom, number of books required etc.
- an inspection model adopted by the regulatory body that seeks to control rather than facilitating improvement.
- over emphasis on the ‘standards’ aspect has essentially thwarted the non-standard creative component in teacher education.

There appeared to be consensus that the process of regulation must be separated out from the regulator. The current regulatory body was set up under specific historical context. It did manage to curb the highly problematic practice of awarding of teacher education degrees through ‘correspondence’ programmes but later could not withstand the onslaught of privatization, post liberalization of the country’s economy. The group felt there is now a need to move away from regulation to facilitation. Also, institutes evolve over a period of time and regulation must recognise this growth potential, instead of a now or never approach in allowing institutes to come into existence. While regulation comes under the purview of jurisprudence, practitioners and researchers
can contribute to the formulation of what needs to be regulated, how and by whom so as to ensure
teacher education institutes, the programmes they offer and the teachers they produce are able to
meet essential quality parameters. As the meaning of quality is multi-faceted, wider consultations
and dialogues with multiple stakeholders is necessary to identify core elements of quality that must
be ensured in teacher education. It is important to recognise that regulation of teacher education
cannot be conceptualised apart from regulation of other aspects of education.

Differences of opinions that were expressed:

- It is better to retain the term regulation instead of facilitation since it prevents marketisation.
- Leaving regulation to professionals can be problematic.
- Existence of a teacher education institute has wider ramifications and therefore its inception
  has to be regulated.

Session 2

Presentation of national and international experiences:
Regulation of teachers and teacher education in Mexico

Yolanda Leyva Barajas, National Institute for the Evaluation of Education, Mexico

Yolanda Barajas presented on the recent experiences in Mexico regarding the professionalisation of
teaching with a focus on key teacher education policies and regulations.

The responsibility for evaluation of teachers lies mainly in the National Educational Authority (SEP)
with a technical regulation from the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education (INEE). Since
2013, the INEE is an autonomous institute, and since 2014, for the first time teacher’s evaluation is
a nationally consistent process. The Mexican Professional Standards for Teaching are established
and prescribed nationally through the SEP and approved by INEE. There are five dimensions of
standards, starting with diagnosis. The standards represent the minimum expected of teacher’s
knowledge, practice, and professional responsibilities.

The INEE provides normative guidelines and technical criteria for design, development and
carrying out evaluations, and make the technical review of all evaluation process, in order to assure
the validity and reliability of teacher’s evaluation.

Experiences of IFTRA & AFTRA

Steve Nwokeocha - Africa Federation of Teaching Regulatory Authorities (via Webex)

The presentation focused on the prospects and constraints of regulating teacher education and
practice in Africa, led by the Africa Federation of Teaching Regulatory Authorities (AFTRA) and
taking cognisance of the positions of the continental and global organisations such as the African
Union, International Task Force on Teachers and International Forum of Teaching Regulatory
Authorities (IFTRA). The presentation discussed the background of the present emphasis on
regulating teaching in Africa. It holds the professionalisation of teaching to be core of the work that
AFTRA does and operationalises the concept. It highlighted the innovations at the continental level
which included the development of professional standards, teacher qualification frameworks, teacher
mobility protocol, guidelines for the professionalisation of teaching, teacher awards and others with
a view to creating the teaching force required to meet the Continental Education Strategy for Africa
(CESA 2016-2025), which is the continent’s mid-term response to SDG4. The presentation
further discussed how these innovations were managed across the diversity of the African political
economies and cultures as well as the successes and challenges faced.

Tracking changes in NCTE’s regulation

Gunjan Sharma, Ambedkar University, Delhi

Gunjan presented an overview of the existing regulatory policy environment in teacher education
in India while reviewing the successive changes in the regulations implemented centrally by the
Regulations, standards and conceptions of teacher education quality

Anjali Jain, Centre for Teacher Accreditation

Regulators often measure the quality of teacher education by infrastructure related inputs, for example, classrooms, faculty size etc and over time, they have been found to be inadequate. Reforms have focussed on curriculum improvements, use of technology, practice orientation etc. While this is a good step forward, the definition of quality in teacher education has, therefore, remained focussed on inputs rather than outcomes. Anjali’s presentation focused on explaining CENTA’s outcome oriented teacher competency framework. The discussion examined how the framework was being implemented and what role regulation as well as the market could play in this field.

Regulation of teachers and teacher education in Bhutan

Ganeshman Gurung, Royal University of Bhutan

Since the beginning of the modern education in 1960, Bhutan has witnessed a considerable progress in the education sector. Among others, as of 2017, there were a total of 9,415 teachers and 168,092 students in the schools across the country. Similarly, at the tertiary level, there were 11,476 students. Much of this progress can be attributed to the numerous reforms and initiatives undertaken by the Royal Government of Bhutan, particularly the Ministry of Education and Royal University of Bhutan. While the Ministry of Education is responsible for the professional growth and development of in-service teachers, it is the Royal University of Bhutan where the initial teacher training and preparation takes place. Ganeshman Gurung described the current state of affairs in teacher education in Bhutan, its challenges and opportunities based on the review of available policies, guidelines, and other relevant literatures coupled with the author’s experiences as a teacher educator.

Following the panel discussion, the following questions were raised:

Questions for Anjali:

1. What is the basis of knowledge on which the framework for teacher competencies was developed? Also the tools used for assessment e.g. pencil and paper tests, how valid are they for assessing teacher competence? What type of test can capture what a teacher has learnt over 10 years of experience?

2. If we try to apply market model to teacher education, what matters most is the performance of the child, that is the outcome we are working towards. Then how much does the teacher matter? Can the same be achieved by a tuition teacher? If we apply this model what is the difference between a school teacher and tuition teacher?

3. With the size and complexity of our country, is it possible to adopt a competency model?

4. What are we actually talking about when a teacher has met certain competencies? An accomplished teacher has arrived. What is the impact on their attitudes? The process of teaching and relating to children’s knowledge is a dynamic process.

5. How can teacher competency framework work within the diversity of the Indian context?

6. Two issues seem problematic. 1) Attributing learning solely to teaching e.g. dismissal of
teacher when a child could not answer a question asked by a minister. 2) Can we just rely on passion for teaching?

Responses from Anajali:

1. We all know teacher quality needs to be improved and we need different ideas at the table. There are questions about whether a good teacher is born or can they be trained? Given the complexity of the problem, there are pros and cons to every solution. The focus we are trying to bring in is what are the possible solutions. The problem is so vast and complex.

2. What we are trying to do is offer an alternative which is the output driven model. Let’s establish the facts 1) there is a significant crisis in school education, 2) There is sufficient research which shows that regardless of advances in technology which makes the teacher less critical, the teacher is critical to the quality of education. Traditionally it has been believed that through teacher training, through technology or more standardised content we can improve quality but these approaches have failed. The reason they fail is that they don’t address the question of incentives - The teacher’s question is “What’s in it for me?” This is the basis we have used to establish the problem statement. Our intent is that: 1) teachers should ask for training as it benefits them directly (rather than being imposed on them) and 2) to make teaching a more aspirational career. Career paths for teachers are currently not well defined.

Question for Yolanda

1. How do you “guarantee quality” in Mexico?

Response from Yolanda:

We guarantee the quality of the evaluation process. At the system level we evaluate the condition of schools, results, examination of students. We implement evaluations such as PISA. We evaluate teaching not the teacher. With the information that is collected we make recommendations to the national education body, but these are not compulsory for them to follow. But they have to respond, and if they do not accept a recommendation they have to justify why.

Questions for Gunjan

1. What is the correlation between changes in teacher accreditation regulation and what is happening at the ground level?

2. What do you mean by commercialisation of education? Institutions must be running at a loss to meet all the guidelines. In what sense do we understand commercialisation and what is our problem with it? Need to clearly spell this out.

Responses from Gunjan:

1. No broad data yet on impact, and what is happening on the ground.

2. With respect to the term “commercialisation”, we (Ambedkar University) are a public space and we are just trying to understand how the private sector is affected by the regulations. Will get a better sense once the new graduates pass out. Discourse is moving towards a cost-benefit framework, and it doesn’t seem that the regulatory body knows how to respond

Questions for Ganeshman:

1. Is the progress in teacher education made by Bhutan due to advantages from being a small country or is it something else?
2. What evidence-based knowledge has been used to establish your framework for Bhutan? How will labelling the teacher into various categories of competency help them move to the next level? Teaching community needs more support, instead they are under increasing pressure and scrutiny. Even if we are going for professional standards, they should act as a stepping stone.

3. With reference to the labelling of teachers, do we understand the career path of teachers? How do we develop knowledge of practice and how do we put that in a competency framework?

Responses from Ganeshman:
1. People say small is beautiful but this is not always so. Small also means we have small budgets. If we have achieved anything at all, it is because of the will of our leaders.

2. The career standards are only for teachers not for managers. Whenever we start an initiative we know it may not always be successful but we will improve on it. For example, labelling of teachers may be problematic but we have included teachers in the process for developing the framework so 90% acceptance is already there. They know it is in the interests of the country. The framework is not just about evaluation of teachers, it also helps us see what is required in particular areas. We only apply standards if all the intervening conditions are met. We give more than the required time to make improvements but we make final decisions based on the larger interests rather than individual interests. We hope the standards will evolve.

General comments and observation:
PRANATI PANDA: The competency framework has the potential to either disorientate the system or create a good conceptual framework

SHAMIN PADALKAR: The changing of requirements for B.Ed and M.Ed has led to older people applying for programmes. Whilst they add value, there is also a value in recruiting younger candidates. Was it worth extending the years of these courses?

ZIA SABUR: We are trying to create the conditions for teachers to perform well. There is research in this area which has been undertaken by the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation. The study showed that whilst subject knowledge might increase over time, teaching performance peaks at around 3 years. If that is the case how do we think about regulation of teachers and their performance? Teachers do not perform well because of the absence of feedback in the classroom. These are critical research findings which have not yet been used to inform policy.

Session Summary
International Experiences
Mexico: The country has invested in a dedicated, autonomous institute for evaluation. Evaluation of teachers is through a three-pronged approach of using quantitative data of the population, qualitative data based on sampling and self-evaluation by teachers. Diagnostic testing is a component of professional teaching standards.

Africa: Keeping diversity of the African nations in mind the continent is moving towards a common understanding of quality in terms of curriculum of teacher education programmes, and what is expected from the teachers that these programmes prepare. This has led to the development of a teacher qualification framework and teacher professional standards.

Bhutan: A general policy for tertiary education is also applicable to teacher education. Reforms in school education and teacher education are going hand in hand. A developmental approach is used to
evolve standards, in consultation with teachers.

**Indian Experience**

There are 16,500 teacher education institutes in the country of which 8,600 are affiliated to Universities. The remaining are stand-alone institutes offering a diploma in education. Over 92% of these institutes are in the private sector. Thus, concerns of the private sector largely drive the concerns underlying regulations and the quality of teachers. Another issue has been the attempt to provide on the job training to the large numbers of untrained para teachers appointed in many states, in North India. These initiatives have brought about a discourse around teacher accountability and performativity, and simultaneously raised doubts on the need and modalities of regular teacher preparation. Currently two types of regulations exist in the country:

a) for determination of minimum qualifications for recruitment of teachers in schools (school-stage wise)

b) for recognition norms or standards and procedures for teacher preparation programmes, which includes: programme duration and working days; programme intake, eligibility and admission procedure for students; curriculum, programme implementation and assessment (included from 2014); academic, technical and non-teaching staff (numbers, qualification and terms and conditions of service); facilities such as infrastructural and instructional; and a managing committee for overseeing the functioning of the applicant TEIs.

These regulations are considered as stipulating those minimum benchmarks that are essential for the maintenance of quality of teachers and teacher education.

Centre for Teacher Accreditation is a private organization that has independently evolved a standards framework to assess teachers through written tests.

The presentations and the discussions that followed brought out the need to exert caution in the use of standards as the solution to addressing quality issues of teaching and teacher education. Standards need to take into account social justice concerns and reflect on systems rather than as rewards/punishments of individual teachers. The group was unanimous that a reductive, technicist view of standards has to be avoided. It was also acknowledged that while standards start out as an aid to improve quality, they soon fritter down to control.

In education, it is essential not to separate inputs, processes and outputs but treat them holistically.

**Final session**

**Summary of key issues: Pranati Panda and Hridaykant Dewan**

- Need to think about how we look at our teaching community and teaching as a profession. In the past we had a romanticised view and an ideal type in our minds but we need to focus on actual teachers. Then think about how regulation can cater to this.
- Need a deliberation of the NCTE Act. Do we need amendments of the Act for the regulatory body to survive? What should be the guiding force for the regulatory body? Should it necessarily be standards driven? How can the regulatory body take on the role of a facilitator?
- Systemic support is required. There should be a professional framework to provide it. One which allows the flexibility and developmental context of India. Needs to support an evolutionary notion of quality.
- As there are a large number of private providers, how do we collect voices from them at the ground level? There are multiple stakeholders in teacher education programmes, beyond private colleges. Need to include their voices as well. Essential to understand the complex nuances of teacher education.
- There exists a diversity of teacher education institutes in the urban sector. But need to address
the needs of rural students. Teaching is an aspirational profession for the marginalised. Orissa established a teacher training institute in a tribal area. Need to look at the duration and location of the courses. Need to consider a multi-model approach.

- Employability - NCTE is now very engaged in issues of demand and supply. India is a supplier of teachers to African nations. Many mothers take up BEd to be able to better educate their children. Need to engage with developing teacher education to international standards.
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Session 1
Open discussion on key issues emerging from Day 1, to identify:

A. Essential elements that require regulation
B. Frameworks that can remain flexible and support regulation to ensure quality
C. Moderator: Leena Wadia, Observer Research Foundation, Mumbai

LEENA WADIA: The main observations: we have fallen into a pit and we need to get out. We cannot afford to make sweeping generalizations. While recognising that there are many devoted teachers out there and many good private players are doing a good job, a lot of issues due to politicisation of education must be taken cognisance of. As researchers we must rely on data, which we do not currently have. We must ensure good quality data from the ground and then only we must take better decisions.

MYTHILI RAMCHAND: Regulation or facilitation focuses on two aspects- Teacher certification and professional accreditation. What are the essential elements within these two? For teacher certification – teachers need to display an understanding of their domain in context, a robust understanding of learners and a global understanding of issues and how the larger issues have a bearing on the society. As Pranati mentioned centralization did not work and I don’t think that’s the answer. Facilitation is required where a robust body of academicians is working to prepare the ground. Professional accreditation will need to take into account the nature of education where inconsistencies, politically driven nature of education etc play a role. All the more important to have a broader discourse. How does one build up that, what is the kind of evidence we currently have?

RUCHI KUMAR: Standards have to consider the creative aspect. Teacher interaction in the classroom- if evaluation separated from regulation, it will not work. Without developing pedagogical thinking of the teachers, can’t develop the idea of how to evaluate it. Superficial evaluation for the sake of evaluation is likely in that case. Based on knowledge of teaching and integrated evaluation in regulation. Also, need to have a dialogue with the larger community.

ALOK MATHUR: The missing link in all this - where does all that happen- school- a mini-society? Need to bring linkages with actual functions in school. That rarely happens in India. Teacher education programmes and schools link- what does it means to be working with children? Corollary to it is quality and experience of teacher educator- can teacher educators be prepared without a reasonable amount of school experience? A teacher isn’t alone but works together with peers, administrators. How can this be facilitated?

PADMA SARANGAPANI: It is difficult to be categorical about requirements. A proportion of faculty must have school experience, but can’t be categorical. Balancing that is important to discuss.

NAMITA RANGANATHAN: We went through NAAC three months ago. It is a very mechanical approach. Only 30% is set for processes and quality. Accreditation may not be the best approach to ensure quality.

PRANATI PANDA: Universities are not benefitting through accreditation. There is a lack of research base to inform accreditation. Evidence-based research should say which models work for India. In Finland they go for quality rating then look at placement etc. NCTE needs to discourage that kind of model.

BINDU THIRUMALAI: One missing thing is how to evaluate teaching? Teaching is dynamic, so regulation could be generated by the peer group. How to develop an inquiry approach? How to connect people so that they validate and evaluate each other’s practice? I think it’s also good for a
teacher to step out and get an outside view. Link with the university can be brought in. Right now we
don’t have those structures. An imagination into the inquiry of one’s own practice is not there.

HRIDAYKANT DEWAN: What is the reason for which you give accreditation? Without knowing the purpose it becomes difficult.

R GOVINDA: Through technology we seem to have greater faith in number and symbols. In some years, artificial intelligence will decide grades. There is data burden across the world. Data doesn’t go away.

• Do we need to have one national benchmark? Should we not think about local needs? National guidelines for Governance, Institution and Financial management can be evolved. But national norms for academic activities are counter-productive and has a distorting effect. Teacher education is a very localized activity. The context of a teacher in a rural primary school will be different from teachers in an urban Delhi school. What is the basis for evaluating the work of these two? We need to be decentralized in this case. Maybe NCTE should produce not ‘one’ but 25 models?
• Curriculum in education is never derived completely empirically but is normative. An empirically driven curriculum will tend to maintain a status-quo.
• Teacher Professional Development is linked to the trajectory of the career path progress the world over. But not in India. I do not think that personal motivation will ever come. Nobody is bothered about good rural teachers. Asian countries like Sri Lanka are trying to link teachers and teaching, we need to do the same. Teachers’ progress is to be seen as a continuum. Primary activity of teacher is teaching, so need to reflect much more on it.

PADMA SARANGAPANI: Empirical evidence is required because we try to understand what is not working. What is broken we don’t know. Regulation tends to have an empirical impact. We know we have a dearth of teachers and to know that we need empirical evidence. The real issue is what the normative framework is. The content of that framework- who should come in, knowledge, sites, space etc. But why be categorical? Some fundamentals are different. How we approach these are different. Knowledge base for teacher education is diverse too. School experience is important. A higher degree is necessary but what about well-trained researcher contribution etc? Can people be provisionally employed and then trained?
Schools as sites- on what grounds we say 20-30 days or anything else. Does simplification work? Shouldn’t we admit complexity and respond to it? One model, will it work?
Career path- regulation in in-service once we think of career path. Nobody seems to create any more new roles.

STHABIR KHORA: Standards are as good as long as they are executed. Standard comes before and accreditation comes after. TPD in the Indian model has to be scalable (large), centralised is not possible but handing it to market also is problematic.

NAMITA RANGANATHAN: NCTE and UGC create confusion. Can we only be regulated by one? BEd-MEd is regulated by NCTE while the MPhil/PhD is regulated by UGC. There is no free space.

PRANATI PANDA: What counts as an accomplished teacher? Assumption based view. The concept of TPD gets distorted by this. The idea should be an improvement of the teacher. What are we exposing the students to during the internship? 6 months without any guiding document in their hands. What they learn and what they observe is contradictory. We should operationalize keeping in view the Indian context.

MYTHILI RAMCHAND: When we think of a framework, we start out with a developmental
perspective but soon it returns to norms. Do we know enough to rationalize it? Standard takes a technicist approach. We need to have broader discourses.

ZIA SABUR: Bangladesh started professional courses but people don’t have professional competency or evaluation skill. Also, the informal structure does not have the required skill-testing expertise. It is taking shape gradually. The economy cannot sustain only on the formal economy. Lack of institution, lack of coordination is also there.

GANESHMAN GURUNG: Bhutan has not debated or thought about models of regulatory framework. If a college wants to start a new programme or revamp, it applies to the university. There are steps and it takes one year to get permission. Academia decides along with relevant stakeholders. Equivalent to NAAC is there in Bhutan but no equivalent of NCTE. The Bhutan body accredits entire institutes but does not regulate, that is done internally by academia. School immersion and teaching practice. 6 months in an internship. The school teachers are trained to be mentors. In the first phase, students don’t teach but familiarise with the community and area, in the next phase co-teaching with the mentor and last phase, independent teaching. There is support from the mentor but no direct help.

GUNJAN SHARMA: The NCTE forms are made from the perspective of standalone institutions. But many are affiliated with universities. Can universities serve as regulators?

LEENA WADIA: Universities mostly don’t have undergraduate teaching and that contributes to the problems. (There were disagreements to this statement)

AJAY SINGH: There is a singular entry but we can think about multiple entries. In education, we believe experience is very important. The dominance of school teaching as fieldwork experience. But all fieldwork is not synonymous with school experience.

YOLANDA LEYVA BARAJAS: Curricula is good and facilitates contextualization in Mexico. But 15 years ago systems were endogamous. Regulation is result based and therefore poor schools have no access to resources. Such regulation where funding is linked to results is not good for equity.

Session Summary
Some of the issues that the session brought out included:
- What is the purpose of accreditation? What are the essential components that need to be accredited? What evidence do we have on accreditation?
- What is the role of an affiliating university? What are its functions? Can a university take up the role of a regulator?
- What is the difference between a liberal arts programme and a teacher education programme?
- How much do we know about creating a synergy between a teacher education institute/department of education and schools? What is its nature? What models are available?
- Who should become a faculty of education? Should requirements such as school based experience or two Masters degree be categorical for all faculties? Will such requirements not preclude inter-disciplinary studies that the teacher education requires?
Session 2
Presentation of National and International experiences

Regulation of Teachers and Teacher Education in Bangladesh
Zia Sabur, Skills and Innovations, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Zia Sabur presented on teacher regulations and its effects on teacher education as a critical determinant of quality of education in the context of Bangladesh. Bangladesh is now faced with the renewed challenge of aligning its education policies and actions to Sustainable Development Goals 4 (SDG4) within the context of Bangladesh, as a signatory to SDGs. This issue has become significant since the government has taken the issue rather seriously. Currently the GOB (Government of Bangladesh) is in the process of reviewing its current education policies and strategies in the light of SDG4. The purpose of this initiative is to evolve strategies in order to integrate SDG 4 mandate into national policies. This is being done through a combination of desk review and nationwide consultations. The consultation took the form of key informant interviews, FGDs and workshops nationwide. The early findings suggest that social and institutional realities of teachers regulation and teacher education often hinder the expected learning outcomes and finally, the system is not yet fully ready to integrate SDG 4 mandate into curriculum and teacher development.

Initial learnings from a comparative study on regulation of Teacher Education in select South Asian countries
Meera Gopi Chandran and Poonam Sharma, Tata Institute of Social Sciences

Developments in initial teacher education are arguably influenced by regimes of accountability and performativity that have come to dominate the global discourse in education. Initial teacher education in countries of the global South is of specific interest as they grapple with historical disadvantages while attempting to address critical issues of equity.

Meera and Poonam used a comparative framework to study initial teacher education (ITE) in the South Asian context, particularly to understand how ITE is structured and organised in these countries. A desk review of institutional structures in these countries is in process with a view to develop an account of ITE regulations, nature of regulatory bodies, the context in which these bodies emerge and function, as well as aspects that are being regulated. Data has been obtained with respect to entry level requirements for teacher training programmes, pathways to becoming a teacher, duration of ITE and the private international players in the respective contexts. Regulation of teacher education intersects diverse policy issues and actors responsible for the positioning of teacher education in higher education, constitution of knowledge base of teaching, the nature of and extent of autonomy of institutions of teacher education, regimes accountability and outcomes.

An attempt is being made to understand the complex process of regulation using the framework of governance perspective to study regulation in teacher education. It provides a useful analytical framework to study regulation as a system of coordination and negotiation among multitude of actors to achieve the desired performance of the social systems. In the context of regulation of teacher education in India, the framework is particularly useful in studying the coordination among actors, namely, the regulating body (NCTE), the Ministry of Human Resource Development in the advisory role, institutions of higher education in their academic function, teacher education institutions (TEIs) that are to be regulated, and the school systems that are the locus of practice. The particular challenge in the Indian context emerges from the fact that the TEIs are largely private entities that frame the notions of occupational practice. Regulation must simultaneously address the question of quality of teacher education that filters through the increasing demand for evidence style of governance within the school systems. In regulatory terms, TET as a measure of quality is insufficient to address the larger question of equity which the public school systems are mandated to meet. The diversity of agenda of the state and private actors combined with the historical
shortcomings of institutions create a gap between regulation and implementation that must be contended with.

**Regulation of Teachers and Teacher Education in Pakistan**  
**Irfan Rind, Sukkur Institute of Business Administration, Pakistan (via Webex)**

Although teacher education has been discussed in all the national education policies since the independence of Pakistan, it has become high on the educational agenda since 2009 mainly due to increasing internal and international reform pressures. Internally, many government policy documents, reports, recommendations of commissions and independent research papers published, criticize the declining standard of education in the country and emphasise on improving teacher education. In addition to this, the international reform pressure was built due to the poor performance on Millennium Development Goal 2 (i.e., achieve universal primary education). Although, Pakistan’s literacy rate improved marginally over the years, it remains considerably short of the MDG target of 88% by 2015 at 58%. Moreover, Pakistan being the coalition partner of USA in the war against terrorism, receives a considerable financial and technical support from USA via USAID. In teacher education particularly, USAID has spent around $75 million since 2009. USAID initiated the Pre-Service Teacher Education Program (Pre-STEP) ‘to improve systems and policies that support teachers, teacher educators and education managers; to support HEC [Higher Education Commission] and Ministry of Education teacher-institutes to develop, revise, evaluate and finalize elements of pre-service teacher education degrees; and to develop a plan to implement a new curriculum for new and existing teachers’ (EDC 2011:7). With its influence and strong lobbying, USAID mobilized different stakeholders to develop consensus for initiating different programs. With these reform pressures, there has been a significant change in teacher education in Pakistan. The paper highlighted some of these initiatives and discussed different issues that the country faced in implementing the new reforms initiatives

**RCI regulations and implications of RPD Act 2016 on preparing teachers for inclusion**  
**Varsha Gathoo, Ali Yawar Jung National Institute for Hearing and Disabilities**

The Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI) (1992) a statutory body is mandated to regulate and monitor services for persons with disabilities by standardising training programs. The Council offers about 58 pre-service and in-service training programs ranging from Certificate to Masters’ level in various disability specialisations through close monitoring and evaluation. The Central Rehabilitation Register of all qualified professionals and personnel working in the field of Rehabilitation and Special Education offers opportunities for professional up-gradation via Continual Education Programs. In the light of inclusive education as mandated by the RPwD Act (2016) the Council has initiated a 4 year Integrated Bachelors program in various disciplines and an Advanced Certificate Course in Inclusive Education. Her presentation focused on the details of the efforts being undertaken and the future needs for human resource development to facilitate inclusive education.

**Following the panel discussion, the following questions were raised:**

**Questions for Irfan Rind:**

1. What are the qualifications to become faculty of education in your county?
2. Are initial teacher preparation institutes largely run by the government or by private organisations?

**Responses by Irfan:**

1. A lecturer has 18 years of education and MPhil/MS. Most departments of education have PhDs. The four year BEd programme offers electives - mathematics, physics, chemistry etc. and have mastery over content knowledge. College of Education needs 16 years. University
promotes educational standards. College promotions are time-bound.
2. Some good universities are private also like Agha Khan University, Law and Management university. But they are producing teacher educators for teachers. In the past, universities were usually affiliated to 1-2 year BEd programmes. Now there’s NCEAC - the accreditation body. All private colleges could not clear the criteria. The Higher Education commission is also playing a good role.

Questions for Meera and Poonam:
1. There would be different types of teachers in different conflict-ridden countries. Are you considering these aspects in your research? (To Meera and Poonam)
2. Can they be looked at through characteristics of that country’s history? (to Meera and Poonam)
3. Would you also try to deconstruct the constraints in the regulatory forms? (To Meera and Poonam)

Responses by Meera and Poonam:
1. With respect to the South Asian context, it’s important to keep in mind the historical context. We are trying in that trajectory. The way in which we are looking, we are trying to deconstruct. Defacto deregulation.
2. Couldn’t locate the teacher appointment document in Afghanistan.

Questions for Varsha:
1. It would be necessary to look at the whole spectrum and not have one kind of design for all. (To Varsha)
2. Do you think at the macro level all education comes under a single ministry of education? (to Varsha)

Responses by Varsha:
Schools are not regulated by RCI. Special schools are facing a challenge regarding who will give the NoC to the child? Many disabilities do not have instructional issues, like acid attack victims, thalassemia etc. Their attendance is also an issue. Speech disability is now recognized. When we are teaching in the classrooms teachers have to be sensitized about disabilities. Yes one body of education will help.

Questions for Zia:
1. After ’71, things started changing. What frameworks? (to Zia)
2. What is the dominant medium of instruction in TE institutes and are there readings etc available for students in that language? (to Zia)

Responses by Zia:
1. There was a secular, democratic and socialist outlook in early Bangladesh. Since the Constitution is obligated to maintain these, schools were nationalized. In consequence, teachers started behaving like government officials. Since Jomtien, got a boost. The state didn’t have resources, so the state offered community to help. Good schools were taken up by the government but this creates an anomaly.
2. We do not have enough TE resources in Bangla.

General comments and observation:
We are a federal country. That has created problems sometimes. So, I look at how the federal US and Canada do it. We need to learn from international global perspective. Why not ask more fundamental questions? We are still evolving. In India, there isn’t a single system. Situations differ across Bihar and Kerala.
Session Summary

Bangladesh: There is no provision for initial teacher preparation in the country. Teacher education institutes are too few in number to cater to in-service training requirements of teachers. Subject based trainings are organised at the cluster level. Instructors to conduct the trainings are selected through a national test. The weakest link is academic supervision since feedback is essential to improve teachers’ performance.

Pakistan: Curriculum reforms did not translate into better students’ outcomes. Schooling is stratified ranging from vernacular medium to elite, English medium schools. Teacher education is a provincial matter. There are 270 teacher education institutes in four provinces across Pakistan. Pre-service teacher education is funded by external aid agencies. National standards for teachers have been evolved comprising of 10 standards focusing on knowledge, disposition and values required of teachers.

India: The particular challenge in the Indian context emerges from the fact that the TEIs are largely private entities that frame the notions of occupational practice. There are a multiplicity of actors involving a statutory regulatory body for teacher education (NCTE), a higher education regulatory body (UGC), Universities (as the affiliating body), an accreditation body, the teacher education institutes and the schools.

Education of children with disabilities is regulated by another statutory body, The Rehabilitation Council of India. The council regulates all special education programmes as well as provides renewable license to organisations and individuals working with persons with disabilities.

This highlights of this session included:

- It is not feasible to have all functions within one regulatory body. Multiplicity of regulatory bodies can create confusion, if there is inadequate co-ordination. Can arrangements be worked out for a multiplicity of functions within the same body?
- The large size of teaching workforce and the diversity among them must be taken into account in any scheme of regulation. The workforce should not be treated as a monolith.
- Mechanisms have to be evolved to give teachers feedback and not only pass judgements on their performance.
- Regulation is never benign. Fundamental questions need to be constantly posed about who, what and why of regulations from time to time.
- Regulations cannot be the same in different parts of the country.
- Education sector needs to be nurtured further in developing countries rather than punitive regulatory mechanisms.

Session 3

Brief overview of discussions by MK Sridhar, Centre for Educational and Social Studies

- Things are not good in teacher education. Things are not good in higher education in general.
- There are 18 regulatory bodies for different dimensions of higher education.
- NITI Aayog had conducted a study on MCI. It was found that the same body was involved in multiple functions.
- Should the regulatory body be different when there are multiple functions?
- Teacher numbers are huge and come from diversified contexts.
- Important for some kind of framework to support teachers.
Session 4
Future Agenda for Research, Policy and Practice on Regulation of Teachers and Teacher Education.
Open discussion led by:
Hridaykant Dewan, Azim Premji University
Pranati Panda, National Institute of Education, Planning and Administration
Mythili Ramchand, Tata Institute of Social Sciences
Ajay Singh, Tata Institute of Social Sciences
Moderator: Alok Mathur, Rishi Valley

ALOK MATHUR: We talked about the needs of teachers, professional growth, career pathways. We looked at many different stakeholders, players in this whole arena, a comparative study between India and other countries. We got a measure of some way how difficult and complex this field is, in a situation where education itself is a developing enterprise. Would say the background of all this, the needs, maybe not explicitly stated, aligns with the needs or visions of school education. In a very diverse country like India, where the equity and quality concerns have to go hand in hand, stakes are extremely high. I would say for this kind of deliberation, because especially Education For All being something of an accepted worldwide view now, countries are moving towards that. And very few children are now out of school. So schooling has become very much, the way in which societies are getting formed.

The future of our society is also being shaped, new generations are coming into being. Somewhere the role of the teacher is very critical in this whole thing. Few proposals are being shared by Hardy, Pranati, Mythili and Ajay.

So this session will be structured upon proposals for research, policy, practice and advocacy in the regulation of teachers and teacher education. Each may speak for about 10 minutes. And then we can go for an open discussion, based on their proposals.

Key points of Dr. Dewan’s proposal:
One cannot divorce teacher education from education, nor can education be divorced from society. So the political economy, the social fabric, the dispositions and perceptions involved are embedded in what we call education. Human societies have multiple dimensions, with education being the center, in some sense. It has therefore to be conceptualised holistically. Education requires immense coordination, support, and a deep understanding on the complexity of the interaction of various elements for its holistic evolution. Having multiple bodies responsible for education (such as tribal welfare board for education of tribal children) can be counter-productive. It would be better to have one institution responsible for all aspects related to education but interactions among them is crucial.

Also there cannot be a linear model for regulating education. The term ‘model’ itself is problematic as it is antithetical to humans.

There are a large number of stakeholders in teacher education, with diverse backgrounds, multiple capabilities, dispositions and interests. So it’s very difficult to try and see whether we can converge on a common way forward which will be widely acceptable. So the proposal is tentative to see whether there is convergence among the group at the roundtable, before being taken to a wider audience:

- A federation of institutions to frame standards and also monitor meeting these standards. There has to be wide-ranging dialogues with all concerned stakeholders, from different ideological positions. When standards are being evolved, there has to be a critical understanding of who are going to do it, what are the possibilities of structures and individuals who are going to take forward that effort, then determine what is possible, what is not. We should then move towards facilitation and support, to achieve these standards.
- Decentralisation is essential. The scale of decentralisation cannot be larger than block or cluster level as it is important not to lose out subjectivity and individuality of the people.
involved. The framework should not become dominant, rather focus to be on the situation and what is possible within it, the areas, the individual and institutions that are part of it. Authority should be vested in practitioners.

Principles that can make the proposal work include:
- Reposing trust and faith in the people and institutions
- Initiating dialogues and conversations with the community of practitioners, that is currently fractured
- Maintaining small systems to keep them manageable
- Providing collegial support to teachers

Key points of Prof. Panda’s proposal:
One needs to frame a perspective from different angles. An analysis of the voices of people drafting policies clearly indicates gaps in the structure of teacher education.

The current situation in India
- The previous National Education Policy in 1986 approached teacher education through a complete sectoral approach. The response to that policy requirement was however fragmented. Ultimately it led to the emergence of diversified institutions, programmes, Schools of Education in many central and state universities as well as a large number of independent teacher education institutions either affiliated to a university or operating under the Department of Education of state Governments.
- Teacher education institutes depend on central agency for funding. Withdrawal of state agency is evident. Most states are not investing in more resources and not appointing faculties.
- The regulatory framework is straight jacketed and unable to address the need of all these diversified TE institutions, located in different locations, with differential human resources. This is really creating quality variation across the TE institutions. 90% are in the private sector. Possibly huge numbers are not performing well. So the institutions who perform well are overpowered by non-performing ones. That’s why the straight jacketed format is there. However this regulation is not aiding TE.
- Teacher education is aspirational among a section of the society. But access to teacher education in remote areas is an issue. Also linkages to job market is tenuous.

Research agenda and a suggestive model
- The current policy pronouncements are not giving any kind of direction to transform teacher education. Most of the developed world have a separate policy for TE. India needs to deliberate on one as well.
- Access to teacher education for disadvantaged communities in the remote areas must be created.
- Move away from straight jacketed structure to a multi-models approach to cater to diversified TE institutions.

Key points of Dr. Mythili Ramchand’s proposal:
- A humanistic-liberal paradigm focusing on intrinsic worth and flourishing of individuals and a market-driven paradigm of instrumentalist view of education appears to be melding. A more nuanced understanding of these aspects needs to be cultivated among practitioners and students. Both professional and liberal education must develop critical thinking among students. This preparation is required to ensure a move towards self-regulation.
- Accreditation, regulation, licensing are constructs that are borrowed from the West. How mature are higher education systems of the global South to adopt/adapt them? Current regime of control through measurement to give way to consultations on flexible frameworks. Flexibility is essential for social justice. Dialogues with practitioners and stakeholders are
essential to identify what are the essential aspects that need to be regulated? Which ones are to be done centrally and what must be decentralised? How do we better gear up for self/peer assessment?

• Consortia of universities to undertake research on:
  — Alternate modes of teacher preparation
  — Institutional readiness to be more responsive to the needs of students and schools as labour markets
  — University/teacher education institute-School synergy
  — Knowledge and practice of teaching

Key points of Dr. Ajay Singh’s proposal:
• There is a concern with the present norms—who can afford 23-24 yrs of education to become a teacher educator? Given complex social reality, poverty, parents’ capacity etc., we can come out with a strategy that creates a demand for revisiting these norms.
• Communities of Practiceis a powerful idea, even if it is currently a little raw. How to initiate it? Potential for scaling is immense.

ALOK MATHUR: Thank you! We talked about pedagogic imagination, self-regulation, re-imagination of teacher education. The question remains that how do we move from where we are right now which is extremely flawed, with lots of control, lots of regulation, to an imagination where there is a possibility of dialogues shaping up standards and regulations. How will it be received? Personally, I have more empathy for the imagination of policy and practice on regulation of teacher education, to take off in the future. I invite comments from others.

NAMITA RANGANATHAN: Time spent in preparing to become a teacher educator is humongous. Even if lesser than law and medicine. The assumption that long education guarantees quality is also problematic. Cost of investment does not match the remuneration. NCTE gives 70% regulation some of which common people in towns etc do not have access to. So it gets watered down. Research needs to be done to look at it in detail. Regulators look at only the teacher educator. Who is the larger actor- teacher is largely not discussed? There is a complete divide between what an MA gets and what an MEd or an MSc-MEd gets.

R GOVINDA: Historically- the medical profession created a body- a self-regulatory body of professionals. In India, today the body has disappeared. Need to bring back the idea that it is a collective -they come together to regulate themselves. UGC is not a regulatory body. Finance was given to make UGC autonomous. NCTE as an idea is there. Problem is that it makes efforts to create one view for the whole country. We cannot have the same norms for all states. NCTE is a platform for providing role, guidance, and approve regulation. Its role has to be revamped. How? Institutions evolve. Don’t decide at the time of origin. So, different set of norms for early and for a later stage is required. Need to develop a dynamic scaling- some standards will overlap. Who can become a teacher educator? Rigidity must be removed. Pick capable ones. This is a challenge for the recruiter.

AMIT DHAKULKAR: Some organizations bypass norms completely. Teach For India pushes volunteers teachers after 6 weeks of training. Dilution of norms. What can be done against them?

PADMA SARANGAPANI: It is important to recognize the need for governance. Statutory function. The state created activity with consequences. As a professional community, we are not thinking to come up with government structures. Need to collaborate much closely with legal people. Governance should ensure that the client and the provider must be protected. The TE community is deeply fractured. Impossible to do things with deeply vested interests. There is an enormous mediocrity in this profession. It will be valuable if we find out a way to find out structures.
GYANDEO TRIPATHI: NCTE had been formed to regulate mushrooming private colleges. NCTE norms are never followed entirely even in govt colleges. Look at history to find out why UGC and NCTE in Delhi have no dialogue. It was never formed to facilitate. Therefore creates norms that prevent capable people from entering education.

ARINDAM BOSE: There is empirical evidence that municipal corporation run schools by external interventions. Year after year teacher cadres are being reduced to zero. Bengal is appointing graduates on internships as teachers for a pittance.

BINDU THIRUMALAI: How do we manage communities of practice? Technology is changing but we don’t look at the possibilities of communication and leveraging it for creating TE. Networking small local communities that can self-regulate.

SANJEEV RAI: Any technical institute inside a university campus doesn’t need AICTE permission but not so in education. BEd and MEd are separate in the UGC list, not together. These issues should be looked at.

ALOK MATHUR: I will not attempt to summarise the discussions! Last thoughts from the panelists.

HRIDAYKANT DEWAN: ‘We’ reflects the suspicion of the other. This is problematic. Is parliament authorized to do something? Bureaucracy is a part of the national structure. They understand the country perhaps better than us. Are we talking about immediate decisions? TFI etc. as a group of educators, need to think about the hard task- conversation. If we think they have vested interests, communication stops there, for them we have vested interests. A difficult task to start doing something- building dialogue. Improving the state of education is beyond regulation.

PRANATI PANDA: Complexity, political structure, ideological structure- from tokenism to total change. Need to look at the macro issue and micro issues simultaneously. How do we bring in the concept of improvement?

MYTHILAI RAMCHAND: Regulation is part of the problem, need to address wider problems too. A huge quantity of mediocrity exists in the sector but we need to accept it and consider.

AJAY SINGH: We need to find out a strategy so that teaching also becomes a celebrated task. How to ensure that?

Reflections
Regulation of teacher education is complex and fraught with a number of issues. The roundtable was not meant to come up with a set of ‘solutions’ or strive for a simple consensus, but to engage with the complexities through an academic discourse involving policy makers, academicians and practitioners. It is hoped that more roundtables be held across the country to build on these discussions.

A regulatory body needs to move towards facilitation rather than policing. While this is indeed desirable for the growth of teacher education in India, the nature of such facilitation and mechanisms of doing so require further deliberations. Such a body will require legal and academic authority but in order to wield moral authority over the profession, it should be financially independent. Also questions on whether there can be one body to address multiple aspects that facilitation will require or should there be inter-related departments under one over-arching body need to be resolved satisfactorily, taking into account experiences of other sectors/countries while being critically aware.
of the current context and needs of teacher education in India.

Regulatory processes need to be flexible to accommodate the diverse needs of the country and levels of development across teacher education institutes. Multiple stakeholders need to be consulted to evolve satisfactory processes. Quality in teacher education can be assured only if teachers and faculties of education are actively involved in self-regulation. Regulation is a fiduciary process and the system needs to trust practitioners. With the intent of regulating private providers of initial teacher education, quality cannot be strait-jacketed. The singular linear model of regulating quality of inputs must make way for multiple cyclical models that can support growth of the system, institutions and individuals. In education inputs, processes and outputs are integral and one component cannot be seen in isolation.

For the same reason, caution has to be exercised in the current discourse on standards as the solution to addressing quality issues of teaching and teacher education. A reductive, technicist view of standards has to be avoided. Standards need to take into account social justice concerns and reflect on systems rather than as rewards/punishments of individual teachers. They have to be evolved in consultations with practitioners as partners in the reform process.

Robust data gathering mechanisms and improved data management systems are required across levels. The country also requires focussed research agenda for the short term and long term to inform policies and practices in teacher education. The agenda has to be evolved through consultations among various stakeholders.

Academic discussions on high stakes issues like regulations needs to be kept alive, without the pressure of having to make decisions or arrive at compromised consensus. Such discussions with wider networks and through the setting up of vibrant communities of practitioners will allow complex issues to be analysed through multiple prisms of perspectives and experiences. Ultimately they would contribute to the strengthening of the sector through a more nuanced understanding and a greater sense of belonging coming from active participation.