

BOOK REVIEW

A Review of

National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education: Towards Preparing Professional and Humane Teacher, Authored and Published by National Council for Teacher Education, New Delhi, 2009, Pages 93

Sunil Behari Mohanty

Every nation gives stress on teacher quality. Although teachers make a difference, there are many questions about how teachers are being prepared and how they ought to be prepared (USA NRC 2010, p.1). Effective curriculum frameworks for initial teacher training have their base in well defined standards for various categories of school teachers. A number of countries have developed standards for various levels of school teachers. Standards are essential to provide the basis for the formulation of the courses of studies. UK: TDA (2007) Professional Standards for Teachers in England, effective from September 2007, are available for five tasks: 1. Award of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) (Q); 2. Teachers on the main scale (Core) (C); 3. Teachers on the upper pay scale (Post Threshold Teachers) (P); 4. Excellent Teachers (E); and 5. Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs) (A). The standards are arranged in three inter-related sections: 1. Professional Attributes; 2. Professional Knowledge and Understanding; and 3. Professional Skills. In the USA, professional standards for teachers and school leaders vary from State to State. Its State of New Jersey has 10 different sets of standards and each standard has three components: (a) Knowledge, (b) Disposition and (c) Performance.

In India, although national or state level standards for various categories of school teachers and teacher trainees are not available, at the national level, there have been three printed curriculum framework documents. The first printed curriculum framework for teacher education was brought out in 1978 (NCERT 1978). After ten years, in 1988 NCERT brought out a curriculum framework in cyclostyled form (NCERT:NCTE 1988a &b). The National Council for Teacher Education, the statutory body of the Government of India for teacher education, brought out a printed version of curriculum framework in 1998 (NCTE 1998). After bringing out a curriculum framework for school education in 2000, NCERT brought out a curriculum framework for teacher education in 2004 (NCERT 2004). After NCERT modified its School Curriculum Framework in 2005, NCTE and NCERT jointly brought out a Discussion document for Curriculum Framework in 2006(NCTE-NCERT 2006). Basing on the feedbacks received, NCTE attempted to bring out a new version of curriculum framework, which resulted in two incomplete documents - one in 2007 (NCTE 2007) and the other in 2008 (NCTE 2008). Finally, towards the end of 2009, NCTE published • "National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education: Towards Preparing Professional and Humane Teacher", which is being reviewed here.

In order to develop teacher training curricula, many nations carry out sample evaluation of their teacher training programmes. They study the opinions of the stake holders such as the directors of school education in the states, school inspectors, school managers and heads of schools. During 2000-2005, the American Educational Research Association commissioned a 14-member panel to study teacher education policies and practices, especially the impact on professional performance, students • f learning and other important school outcomes (Cochran-smith & Zeichner 2005). The areas covered by the study were: (a) Teacher education in changing times: politics and paradigms; (b) Teacher characteristics: the demographic profile and the indicators of quality; (c) Effects of coursework in the arts and sciences and the foundations of education; (d) Methods courses and field experiences; (e) Pedagogical aspects ; (f) Preparing teachers for diverse populations; (g) Preparing general education teachers to work with students with disabilities; (h) Accountability processes in teacher education; and (i) Teacher education programmes. The Report has also suggested a research agenda for teacher education. While reporting

promising lines of research, the document stated that "the body of teacher education research that directly addresses desirable pupil and other outcomes and the conditions and contexts within which these outcomes are likely to occur is relatively small and inconclusive" (p.5). A recent study conducted by the National Research Council of the USA commissioned by the US Department of Education suggested research on the sources of the variation in traditional and alternate mode of teacher preparation in respect of preparation, such as selectivity, timing, and specific components and characteristics. It did not appreciate current mechanisms for accountability and quality control in teacher education in USA and suggested an independent evaluation by the US Department of Education (US:NRC 2009, p.3). A study of teacher education in Canada (Crocker, Duibbon & Raham 2008) conducted during 2007-2008, covered (a) Structure, (b) Content, (c) Teaching knowledge and skills, (d) The practicum, (e) Preparedness for teaching, and (e) Collaboration with the school. The data were obtained from surveys of representative samples of recent graduates, school principals and education faculty members. The study pointed out necessity for undertaking large scale, longitudinal and comparative studies and developing a common vision for teacher education which articulates core content and competencies, finding better ways to support and mentor novice teachers, and developing stronger models of collaboration between faculties of education and the school system they serve (p.11). In Indian situation, during late nineties, NCTE was able to bring out State reports on teacher education. These might have given inputs for development of curriculum framework of 1998. Such an exercise might have been useful for the teacher education curriculum, developed after a decade. Findings of studies comparing initial teacher training curricula of various States and UTs with the curricula in developed countries might have benefited the present curriculum framework document.

The Curriculum Framework of Teacher education of 2009 has six chapters. The first chapter "Context, concerns and vision of teacher education" deals with (a) The changing school context and its demands; (b) Present teacher education scenario; (c) Teacher education reform perspectives: past and present; (d) Systemic concerns of teacher education; (e) Professionalisation of teacher education; (f) Preparing teacher educators; (g) Research and innovation; (h) Open and distance learning in teacher education; (i) Education of teachers in health and physical education; (j) Education of teachers for vocational education; and (k) Vision of teachers and teacher education. This chapter has mentioned about decline in the quality of the State school system. "Increasing privatisation and differentiation of the school system have vitiated drastically the right to quality education for all children" (p.4). Privatisation is taking place with the approval of the government. Hence, it might have been better, if the document would have mentioned about the strategies to be followed by the examining bodies to ensure quality in initial teacher training, in view of large scale privatisation in certain States and UTs. The document has stated that "para teachers pose a far more serious challenge to the provision of free and compulsory education of quality to all children" (pp.5-6). Para teacher scheme is a government scheme. Instead of criticising the scheme, it would have been better, if the document would have mentioned about the strategies to be followed by the government agencies to provide initial training to these para teachers. The document has also highlighted the curricular burden on school children and lack of coherence in the curriculum structure often dissociated from the personal and social milieu of children (p.4). It might have been better, if the document would have mentioned the strategies to be employed in initial teacher training programmes to develop the skills in the teacher trainees for tackling the curriculum load issues. School curricula are framed by various national and state level school boards. The document has pointed out merits of National Curriculum Framework developed by NCERT (p.4) and has discussed about deterioration of the quality of school education, but has not discussed strategies to develop skills in teacher trainees to check deterioration of the system. The document has mentioned about problems in teacher preparation such as failure to make connections with children and respond to their needs and imaginative ways (p.4). It has mentioned that "dilution of emphasis on public investment in initial teacher education since the 1990s has led to a large scale recruitment of unqualified and under-qualified persons in the formal school system" (p.6). Such criticisms are based on observation of a few practices, but cannot be generalised, especially, when findings of national level evaluation of quality of initial teacher training programmes are not available. Commenting on function of centrally sponsored scheme of teacher education, the document

has stated that • "The capacity of both CTEs and IASEs in performing their mandated roles has more recently come under serious scrutiny" (p. 5). This criticism on the central government scheme may be valid, but is irrelevant for this document on teacher training curriculum. At page 8, while discussing elementary teacher education reform, the document has stated that • "The Curriculum Frameworks thus far developed provide guidelines that are too general and do not address the stage specific training needs of elementary teachers. The Curriculum Framework for Quality Teacher Education (1998) was perhaps the first to have provided stage- specific guidelines". These statements might have been suitably refined, to make them clearer.

The second chapter "Curricular areas of initial teacher preparation" gives a flow chart of the proposed curricular areas. The curricular area: A -'Foundations of Education' covers (a) Childhood, child and adolescent development and learning; (b) Contemporary studies: (i) teacher and learner in society; and (ii) gender, school and society; (c) Educational studies: i) aims of education, knowledge and values; (ii) developing the self and aspirations as a teacher. The curricular area B • 'Curriculum and Pedagogy' covers (a) Curriculum studies: (i) knowledge and curriculum; and (ii) language proficiency and communication; (b) Pedagogic studies: School knowledge, learner and pedagogy; and (c) Assessment and evaluation studies. The curricular area C covers School internship. The document then discusses on • "Time as a critical factor in teacher preparation". Next, it discusses certain • "commonly held" criticisms (p.45). These criticisms may be true for specific situations, but may not be applicable for all programmes and institutions. The document has stated that • "It is perhaps high time that we pay heed to the specific suggestion of increasing the duration of initial teacher education, recommended by the two most significant policy Commissions of post-independence India, namely the Kothari Commission (1964-66) and the Chattopadhyaya Commission 1983-85"(p.45). The actual wordings found in the Report of the Education Commission 1964-66 are:

"At the secondary stage, where the duration of the course is only one year, it has been suggested that it should be increased to two years, to do justice to the existing heavy courses. From a financial and practical point of view, this does not seem feasible. However, it is possible to make better use of the existing duration by extending the working days in the academic year from the existing level of 180-190 days to 230 days." (Kothari 1966, Art.4.15, p.132)

The National Commission on Teacher Education I, after coming to conclusion that more time be made available for B.Ed. programme stated that • "We are of the view that the two summer months may be added to the academic year ensuring a working year of 220 days. An increase in the working hours per day may also be considered" (Chattopadhyaya 1985, Art. 7.09, p.49). As part of 'Redesigning current teacher education programmes', the framework document has suggested that • "initial teacher education be of 4 year duration after senior secondary; or 2 years duration after a Bachelor's degree programme • h (p. 46), without noticing that number of years, a teacher trainee, after passing sr. secondary, spends in the first case is four years and in the second case, it is five years. Hence, these two course products may not be accepted as equivalent. After explaining the teacher education curricular areas table, the document has given example of a four year integrated programme offered by the University of Delhi. It would have been better if the document would have quoted findings of studies which have indicated effectiveness of such a programme. It has stated that in case of DIETs, • "the faculty appointed does not possess qualifications or experience in elementary teacher education". It has failed to mention about necessity for school teaching experience of the faculty of secondary teacher education institutions although Kothari (1966, p. 129) and Mudaliar (1953, p.168) pointed out such necessities. Mudaliar (1953, p. 167) even suggested that M.Ed. courses should admit trained graduate teachers having normally a minimum of three years teaching in a school. The NCTE document, being reviewed, in its suggested Redesign for D. Ed. two year Diploma after +2 and one year B. Ed. degree after graduation, has mentioned three areas: A: Foundations of education, B: Curriculum and pedagogy and C: School internship. The school internship has suggested • "Visits to innovative centres of pedagogy and learning, wherever feasible" (p.48). This statement indicates that the Framework has not made this visit compulsory for all. The document has mentioned school internship for 4 days a week. It has not explained what is wrong with the system where

internship is provided on all the working days continuously. It also has not stated in what manner the remaining days of the week are to be utilised. It has suggested a minimum period of 6-10 weeks including an initial phase of observing a regular classroom. The document has suggested minimum duration of internship of 6-10 weeks for a two year programme and 15-20 weeks for a four year programme. It has not spelt out the reasons for which it has suggested a range in duration. It might have been better, if the document would have spelt out the reasons for which, the document has suggested variation in ranges of school teaching experience between two year programme and four year programme; although the products are expected to do the same work. On the same page, the document has stated that "While functioning as a regular teacher for a sustained period of a minimum 12-20 weeks, the interns would get an opportunity to learn to ...(p.41). The duration mentioned here does not match with the duration suggested earlier, on the same page 41. The document has not clarified the difference. The document has suggested 4 unit plans per subject. The first printed curriculum framework for teacher education (NCERT 1978) had mentioned three areas in its proposed teacher education programmes - (a) Pedagogical theory (20%), (b) Working with community (20%) and (c) Content-cum-methodology and practice teaching including related practical work (60%). The weightages for pre-school, primary and secondary teacher education programmes were same. In case of higher secondary and collegiate courses, the weightages were a (30%), b (20%), and c (50%). Subsequent curriculum frameworks including the present one have not mentioned the weightages and have not given special status to 'Working with community'. The suggestion for separate courses for initial teacher training for teaching higher secondary and collegiate stages found in certain earlier curriculum frameworks has not been found, in case of the present NCTE document..

The third chapter is • "Transacting the curriculum and evaluating the developing teacher" gives a table comparing the dominant current practices and proposed process based teacher education curriculum framework. Its section on transacting the teacher education curriculum discusses aspects: (a) Teaching the adult learner; (b) Bringing the learners • f own experience centre-stage; (c) Engagement with theoretical concepts and frameworks, (d) Training to be reflective practitioners; (e) Theory-practice dialectic, and (f) Meaningful internship and school experience. In its section on Need for complementary structures and mechanism, it has suggested establishment of Teacher Learning Centres (TLC) in every teacher training institution. As per the document has stated that a TLC would provide (a) Structural space for hands-on experience; (b) A resource for teacher trainees, teacher practitioners and teacher educators; (c) A forum for innovation and sharing; (d) A platform for classroom-based research; (e) A structural space for self-directed activities; (f) A platform for developing a repertoire of skills; (g) A structural space for the personal and psychological development of teachers; and (h) A structural space for forging links between pre-service and in-service teacher education. The section on • 'Evaluating the developing teacher' has made brief discussion on the comprehensive nature of evaluation. The section on • 'evaluation protocol' has covered areas: (a) Observing learners for a specified duration in specific situations; (b) Observational records maintained by the student teacher on a set of criteria relevant to the task and report writing; (c) School contact practicum to relate and communicate with the learner; (d) Planning for the school contact; (e) Post contact discussions, report writing and group presentations; (f) Psychological and professional development of the teacher; (g) Assessing a repertoire of skills; (h) Understanding the learner, curricular and pedagogic issues; (i) Teacher as researcher; (j) Internship activities on which students (student teachers?) may be assessed; and (k) Reflective journal. At the end of this chapter, the document has discussed on • 'Designing instruments of evaluation and assessment' and • 'Preparation of a scheme for continuous and comprehensive evaluation'.

The fourth chapter • "Continuing professional development and support for in-service teachers" would have been more appropriate as a separate document, may be with the title • "Guidelines for Continuing Professional Development and Support for Teachers". In the • 'Introduction' section, the Curriculum framework document has stated that • "Following the Kothari Commission Report, school clusters were created in several states to forge inter-linkages between primary, middle and high schools' (p.63). But

Kothari Commission had suggested • 'School complexes'. not • 'school clusters'. A few other statements that might not be accepted by all sections of the teacher education community are:

Teachers' involvement in textbook preparation and indeed even in the preparation of training modules has grown over the years. Teachers themselves have opportunities to work in the Block and Cluster Resource Centres as well as to contribute to training as Resource persons. They are also members of committees formulating educational policies. NGO initiatives in several parts of the country have developed and implemented models of teacher professional development and support in ways that directly impact the classroom practice. • h(p.64)

The document has criticised the effectiveness of government run in-service programmes. • "Evidence of • 'effectiveness' of training programmes and support activities, especially within the government system, continues to be only anecdotal and impressionistic, and even contrary, depending on who is asking the questions or doing the observation"(p.64). The second section of this chapter has dealt with aims of continuing professional development programmes for teachers. Third section has covered • 'Designing inservice programmes: some principles'. The fourth section • 'Routes towards teachers' continuing professional development' has suggested short and long term courses. While recommending provision for sabbatical for study and research, it has suggested encouragement for small research projects and case studies through which teachers can reflect on, share and develop their practice. The document has stated that "At the same time, the insistence that teachers must carry out action research is not productive, particularly in a context where there is little understanding of action research, and virtually, no forum to share such research"(pp.68-69). This statement appears odd in view of the fact that on pages 27 and 37; the document has recommended classroom based research that includes action research. The document has suggested encouragement for participation in professional conferences and meetings, providing professional fora, resource rooms and materials; and making provision for faculty exchange visits and fellowships. Discussion on • 'Organization of continuing professional development programmes' carried out in the fifth section deals with (a) Organisation and coordination; and (b) Sites and agencies. The section 6 covers • 'Impact' and the last section covers • 'Structural and operational issues of continuing professional development'.

The fifth chapter "Preparing teacher educators" might have been more justified as a separate document. NCERT (1988, p. iii) stated that • "It excludes M. Ed. / M. Phil. / M. A. (education) programmes as these are not considered primarily as teacher preparation courses". The chapter 5 of the present NCTE document has eight sections. In the first section 'Introduction', the document has stated about shortage of properly qualified and professionally trained teacher educators. This assumption may not be true; as such candidates prefer to work in schools than join private teacher training institutions which pay salary less than the school teachers. In the second section, the document has discussed basic issues of education of teacher educators: (a) Teacher educators and school education; and (b) Stage specificity in the preparation of teacher educators. Here, the document has discussed how elementary education remains sadly neglected as knowledge field and refers to efforts of NGOs. Perhaps such a discussion does not fit into the theme of education of teacher educators. It has stated that "...the M.Ed. programme in most of the universities neither widens nor deepens the discourse of education at the secondary stage that students bring with them after their B.Ed. degree"(p.78). The document has not stated how it has come to such a conclusion. The third section is • "M.Ed. as a programme for preparation of teacher educators". It has pointed out problems in having M.A.(Education) as a teacher educator preparation programme by stating that • "The existence of two parallel post graduate programmes in education has created an anomalous and confusing situation and has raised questions of equivalence"(p.79). In support of its argument, it has quoted NCF position paper on teacher education. As there is wide variation among M.Ed. programmes, similarly, there can be variation between M. Ed. and M. A. (Education) programmes. There are many Professors of Education who have studied M. A. (Education) not M. Ed. Hence, there should not be any confusion in treating these two courses as equivalent. In the fourth section, 'Imparting professionalism to a post graduate programme in education', the document has suggested discourse to be initiated in certain aspects including • "broad basing the profile of teacher educators by infusion of persons who have the knowledge of disciplines generic to teacher education so that the discipline of education grows into

specialization requiring persons to be well-versed in cognate disciplines outside education" (P. 80). Such a statement supports the States and UTs which has not made M. Ed. or M.A. (Education) degree compulsory for lecturers and principals in their colleges of education. This statement is perhaps a set back to the attempt to have separate cadre for teacher educators, who have either M.Ed. or M.A. (Education) degrees. The fifth section • "Needed thrusts for development of teacher educators" has covered (a) Early childhood education; (b) Primary / elementary education; and (c) Secondary education. On page 81, the document has stated that • "In most states, DIETs are the main supply institutions for elementary teachers". As non-DIET elementary teacher training institutions are more than five times of number of DIETs as per NCTE, such a statement may be wrong. The document refers to privatisation, although privatisation of elementary or secondary teacher education is not found in each State and UT. While discussing about faculty of the DIETs, the document points out that • "Many of them do not possess basic experience in primary school teaching" (p.82). The document has been silent about the status of school teaching experience of teacher educators working in the departments of education in the university and general colleges and in the colleges of education and the Departments of Education of Regional Institutes of Education of NCERT. Pointing out importance of school teaching experience, the University Education Commission 1948-49 had stated that

"If it is argued that, as things are, it is difficult to find school teachers intellectually capable of holding lecturers' posts, the answer must be that nothing would so quickly rectify this state of affairs as the knowledge that you could not hope to be a lecturer or professor in education unless you had started by teaching in a school" (Radhakrishnan 1949, pp.143-144).

The Commission has also pointed out necessity of school teaching experience for M.Ed. students. It has stated that • "Normally, however, it would be better for a student to learn or more about the practice of education by teaching a few years before he returned to take the Master's Degree in the subject."(pp.143-144). The Secondary Education Commission 1952-53 also has stated that "We believe that it would be an advantage if for this higher degree in education trained teachers who have done normally a minimum of three years teaching in a school are only selected."(Mudaliar 1953, p. 167). NCERT (1978) has also suggested that • "the teacher-educators should themselves participate in classroom teaching cooperating schools to have first-hand experience of the actual conditions prevailing in schools"(p.10). The present curriculum framework document has been silent about this aspect of professional experience of teacher educators. The document has mentioned about M. Ed. (Elementary) course offered at Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, but has not mentioned about findings of any study conducted on this programme and to what extent faculty members of JMI imparting this programme have direct experience or continued experience of elementary school teaching. In the sixth section "Encouraging innovations for preparation of teacher educators", the document has mentioned about M. A. Education (Elementary) launched by the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, but has not mentioned about findings of evaluation studies on this course. In the seventh section • 'Enhancing the Status of educational studies and the professional development of teacher educators, the document has quoted ideas from the draft Curriculum Framework of 2006 and report of the working group for teacher education during the XI plan. In the last section of this chapter, 'Preparation of teacher educators-future directions and possibilities', the document states that

Reform of teacher education to move forward on a sound footing demands dedicated research in the area of foundations of education in the Indian context by universities, preferably in independently established departments. The research in such departments would help develop the teacher education programmes on a more sound theoretical basis. The existing departments of education have hardly been able to engage themselves in this long-pending need for their pre-occupation in conducting routine teacher training and research programmes" (p.87).

The above statements may not be valid. The last sentence of the above quotation has created confusion. The Association of Teacher Educators of USA has developed standards for teacher educators in 9 sections: 1. Teaching, 2. Cultural competence, 3. Scholarship, 4. Professional development, 5. Program development, 6. Collaboration, 7. Public advocacy, 8. Teacher education profession, and 9. Vision. Every section has indicators and artefacts. All these standards may not be applied to Indian system, as most of the teacher educators in USA are attached to concurrent model of teacher training, whereas in India, most of

the teacher educators are attached to consecutive model of teacher training. Again, in India, schools do not play much role in supervising teacher trainees. This chapter has not mentioned standards for accomplished teacher educators which could have helped the teacher educator preparation programmes and also could have assisted employers of teacher educators. This document has not covered preparation of craft instructors, physical education instructors, art instructors, etc. posted as regular employees in many teacher training institutions.

In the last chapter "Implementation strategies", the present curriculum framework document has mentioned various measures to be taken by the NCTE. These include (a) Dissemination of the curriculum framework document; (b) Organisation of at least five consultation meetings in each region; (c) Facilitating revision of the existing teacher education programmes; (d) Discourse on the structural aspects of teacher education programmes; (e) Evolving adequate structural mechanisms to promote entry of talent in teacher education programmes; (f) Constitution of a working group of scholars to develop syllabi and course outlines, spelling out objectives, distribution of courses, weightages etc.; (g) Catalytic role to be played by NCTE in development of textual materials, facilitating regional language versions; and (h) Encouragement to institutions to experiment with the innovative models. The document has stated that NCTE would initiate dialogue to have all teacher education programmes under the aegis of universities and would encourage four year programme of elementary teacher education. Such a dialogue for elevating primary school teacher training to degree level might have to consider possibility of doubling of expenditure in teacher salary and capability of the States and the central government to bear this financial burden, which might be not thought of as the government has not yet been able to expand pre-school education, in spite of the fact that it has been included in the Article 45 of the Directive Principles of the constitution. The dialogue might also explore possibility of having Diploma courses for primary school teacher training with the non lecturers as faculty members, operating in the university system, which shall not require extra expenditure on teacher salary. At the end, it has stated that "Existing B.Ed. programmes should be reviewed to facilitate the choice between a 4-year integrated model after +2 or a 2 year model after graduation, based on State requirements and available institutional capacity" (p.91) without taking into consideration the number of years one spends after +2. However, earlier it has stated that "Teacher education programmes should ideally be of four-five years' duration after the completion of 10+2 level of school education" (p.90), indicating that it has not come to a decision about number of years. It has proposed separate exercises for preparation of teachers for the curricular area of health and physical education and also of vocational education. It has stated that NCTE would have a series of professional orientation / training programmes to expound the contours of learner studies, contemporary studies, educational studies and curriculum and pedagogic studies. NCTE would also initiate steps to ensure entry of talent in teacher education programmes. The document has suggested a study to assess dominant entry qualifications for pre-service programmes in elementary education, to design state specific strategies. It closes with the statement "A nation-wide review of teacher education curriculum in the light of the selected curriculum renewal exercise would need to be undertaken" (p.92). This gives assurance for a bright future for efforts for qualitative improvement of teacher education by NCTE.

CONCLUSION

As each chapter of this document starts with an 'Introduction' section, it might have been better to close each chapter with a 'Conclusion' section. The document indicates that it has taken ideas from earlier documents and in doing that, it has created problems for itself. It has used varieties of terminologies for teacher trainees: 'student teachers'(p.59), 'pre-service students' (p.98), 'trainees' (p.61), 'intern' (p.61), 'students' (p.61) 'teacher' (p.60), and 'teacher trainees' (p.33). There have been also many repetitive criticisms. It seems the document has been printed hurriedly for which pages 22 and 88 have remained blank. It has quoted from many documents but has not mentioned the page numbers of the relevant publications. The 'End note and References' printed on the last page (p.93) has not covered a large number of documents cited in the text such as : Report of the University Education Commission 1948-49, Report of the Education Commission 1964-66, National Policy on Education 1986, National

Curriculum Framework 2005, Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009, Curriculum Frameworks for Teacher Education of 1978, 1988, and 1998, Discussion Paper 2006, SSA 2002, DPEP 1995, OB 1986, National Commission on Teachers 1983-85 (I or II?), NPE Review Committee 1990, National Advisory Committee on Learning without Burden (1993), The Person with Disabilities Act 1996, and NCF 2005 Position Paper on Teacher Education. Too many references to the school curriculum framework of NCERT have created confusion. Of course, long quotations have contributed to increase the number of pages. It might have been better if the document would have avoided use of 'we', 'our', etc. Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education of 1978 had 25 entries under Errata. The present curriculum document might have enriched itself by including 'Errata'. The 'Preface' to the document has stated the urgency 'to prune the theory and practice of teacher education' (p.iii). The document might have been pruned by avoiding support from government documents and individual writings. NCERT (1978) has mentioned objectives for each of the four stages: Pre-primary, Primary, Secondary and Higher secondary. NCTE (1998) has mentioned 'General objectives' and also mentioned 'Specific objectives' for teacher education for the stages of Early childhood, Primary, Elementary, Secondary, and Senior secondary. This document might have improved itself by specifying objectives or expected standards for each category of initial teacher training. As the document contains many factual errors as well as irrelevant statements, it may be better if a modified version of the document is brought out.

REFERENCES

- Chattopadhyaya, D. P. (1985) (Chairman) *The Teacher and Society: Report of National Commission on Teachers I 1983-85*. Govt. of India, New Delhi.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Zeichner, K. M. (Editors) (2005) *Studying Teacher Education*. Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah.
- Crocker, R., Dibbon, D. & Reham, H. (2008) *Teacher Education in Canada*. Society for the Advancement in Education. Kelwona.
- Kothari, D. S. (1966) (Chairman) *Report of the Education Commission 1964-66*. Govt. of India, New Delhi.
- Mudaliar, A. L. (1953) (Chairman) *Report of the Secondary Education Commission 1952-53*. Govt. of India, New Delhi.
- NCERT (1978) *Teacher Education Curriculum: A Framework Prepared for National Council for Teacher Education*. Author, New Delhi.
- NCERT (2004) *Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education*. Author, New Delhi.
- NCERT:NCTE (1988a) *Teacher Education Curriculum: A Framework*. NCERT, New Delhi.
- NCERT:NCTE(1988b) *Teacher Education Curriculum: A Framework-Revised Draft*. NCERT, New Delhi.
- NCTE (1998) *Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education*. Author, New Delhi.
- NCTE (2007) *Curriculum Framework: Teacher Education for a Knowledge Society (Draft)*. Author, New Delhi.
- NCTE (2008) *Teacher Education Curriculum: Bases and Frameworks (Draft)*. Author, New Delhi.
- NCTE (2009a) *National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education 2009 (Draft for Discussion)*. Author, New Delhi.
- NCTE (2009b) *National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education: Towards Preparing Professional and Humane Teacher*. Author, New Delhi.
- NCTE -NCERT (2006) *Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education(Draft)*. NCTE, New Delhi.
- Radhakrishnan, S. (1949) (Chairman) *Report of the University Education Commission 1948-49*. Govt. of India, New Delhi.
- UK TDA (2007) *Professional Standards for Teachers in England from September 2007*. Retrieved on 4 April 2010 from http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/s/standards_a4.pdf

US:NRC (2010) *Summary: Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy (Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States)*. National Research Council, Washington DC. Retrieved from <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/12882.html>