

Promises, Proxies, and Persistent Problems: A Critical Analysis of NEP 2020's Teacher Education Reforms and the ITEP Question

Dr. Ramandeep Singh,

Assistant Professor

Department of Education, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar

Dr. Kiranpreet Kaur

Guest Faculty

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar National Institute of Technology, Jalandhar

Abstract

The National Education Policy 2020 opens its teacher education chapter with a frank acknowledgement that the sector is in crisis: “A large number of substandard stand-alone Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) have mushroomed across the country that are not providing quality teacher education” (MoE, 2020, p. 183). The policy’s response — a four-year Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) replacing the two-year B.Ed, administered through a restructured regulatory framework under NCTE — has been widely welcomed as a structural leap forward. This paper argues that the welcome is premature. Drawing on close reading of NEP 2020’s teacher education provisions, analysis of NCTE’s regulatory history, and evidence from the existing literature, it contends that ITEP, as currently being implemented, risks becoming a proxy reform: the duration has changed, the name has changed, but the institutional ecology — private colleges with no research culture, faculty without classroom experience, minimal genuine teaching practice, and a regulatory body with a documented history of indiscriminate approvals — remains substantially intact. The paper is structured around three questions: What does NEP 2020 actually promise? What is ITEP actually delivering? And what would genuine reform of Indian teacher education actually require? The argument is not that NEP 2020’s vision is wrong — it is not — but that vision without mechanism is aspiration, and aspiration alone has never changed a classroom.

Keywords: NEP 2020, ITEP, teacher education, NCTE, B.Ed reform, proxy reform, India, teacher quality

1. Introduction

Imagine a private B.Ed college in a tier-3 city — Moga, Bhiwani, Osmanabad, take your pick. The building is decent; the prospectus is glossy. The curriculum lists courses in “Constructivist Pedagogy,” “Inclusive Education,” and “ICT in Teaching.” The library has a catalogue but few books. The teaching practice record shows twelve weeks of school internship. Ask any student privately and she will tell you it was four days. The faculty member who supervises her practice teaching has not been inside a school in eleven years. She will graduate, clear the TET, and enter a classroom carrying a degree that certifies competence she does not yet have.

We open with this composite portrait deliberately, because the debate over teacher education in India is too often conducted at the altitude of policy abstraction, where institutions are line items and reforms are clauses. The student in the tier-3 college is not an abstraction. She is the point at which every promise in every policy document is finally tested, and she is the person this paper keeps in view. Whatever a reform claims to achieve, the only meaningful question is whether it changes what happens to her — and, through her, to the thirty or forty children she will one day stand in front of.

NEP 2020 looked at this system and said, in language unusual for a government document, that the situation is not merely improvable but broken. It described “a large number of substandard stand-alone Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) that have mushroomed across the country” and declared that “such institutions will be given a time period to come up to standard, after which their affiliation and recognition will be cancelled” (MoE, 2020, pp. 183–184). It promised a four-year integrated programme, revitalised DIETs, continuous professional development, and an end to the two-year B.Ed as the standard qualification.

The question this paper asks is whether the implementation has matched the diagnosis. The short answer is: not yet. The ITEP — the Integrated Teacher Education Programme that NCTE has begun approving under NEP 2020 — represents a genuine structural shift in conception and a largely cosmetic shift in practice. The same institutions are applying for ITEP approval. The same NCTE that approved seventeen thousand

teacher education institutions by 2019 is now the approving authority for ITEP. The same absence of quality benchmarks for faculty, infrastructure, and teaching practice that characterised B.Ed regulation now threatens to characterise ITEP regulation. The course name has changed. The underlying ecology has not. This paper proceeds in four parts: a close reading of what NEP 2020 actually promises for teacher education, an examination of the NCTE–ITEP approval process and its emerging problems, an analysis of the structural issues the policy fails to address, and a set of proposals for what genuine reform would actually require. We do not claim neutrality on the question; we claim only that the evidence, read carefully, points in one direction.

A word on method and on tone. This is an argumentative paper, not an empirical study, and it does not pretend to offer a survey of ITEP institutions or a dataset of graduate outcomes — such data are, tellingly, scarce, which is itself part of the problem. What it offers instead is a close reading of the policy text set against the documented history of the institutions charged with implementing it, and an interpretation of where that history is likely to lead. We quote NEP 2020 at length and deliberately, because the policy’s own words are the strongest evidence both of how clearly the problem is understood and of how little the implementation machinery has been redesigned to match that understanding. The distance between the eloquence of the diagnosis and the familiarity of the delivery apparatus is the space in which this argument lives.

2. What NEP 2020 Actually Promises: Reading the Text Closely

NEP 2020 opens its teacher education section (Chapter 5) with a statement of value: *“Teachers truly shape the future of our children — and, by extension, the future of our country”* (MoE, 2020, p. 182). This is standard. What is less standard is the candour that follows. The policy states directly: *“The current state of teacher education has many challenges. Many teacher preparation programmes are not of sufficient quality and are not adequately aligned with current research and knowledge on how students best learn”* (MoE, 2020, p. 183). Even more starkly: *“A large number of substandard stand-alone Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) have mushroomed across the country that are not providing quality teacher education. Such institutions shall be given a time period to come up to standard, after which their affiliation and recognition shall be cancelled”* (MoE, 2020, pp. 183–184). It is rare for a policy document to indict the very system it administers in such plain terms.

Candour of this kind is worth pausing on, because diagnosis is the half of reform that Indian education policy has historically done well. The Kothari Commission, the National Policy on Education 1986, the National Curriculum Framework 2005, and the Justice Verma Commission of 2012 all named, with varying degrees of force, the same underlying failures: under-prepared teachers, a debased market in private training colleges, and a regulatory apparatus unable or unwilling to enforce standards. NEP 2020 inherits this lineage of accurate diagnosis. What it does not obviously inherit — and what no previous policy supplied either — is a delivery mechanism equal to the diagnosis. The pattern in Indian education reform is not that we misunderstand the disease; it is that we keep prescribing the right medicine without building the pharmacy that would dispense it.

Five key promises structure the policy’s teacher education vision.

(a) The four-year integrated programme. *“By 2030, the minimum degree qualification for teaching will be a 4-year integrated B.Ed. degree that teaches subject knowledge, pedagogy, and practical skills in a multidisciplinary manner”* (MoE, 2020, p. 184). This is the centrepiece reform — replacing the two-year B.Ed with a four-year programme that begins university-level subject preparation and pedagogical training simultaneously, rather than bolting one onto the other after graduation.

(b) Closure of substandard institutions. *“All substandard teacher education institutions across the country will be held accountable...they will be shut down”* (MoE, 2020, p. 184). The promise is unambiguous. It is also not new: the Verma Commission made a near-identical promise in 2012. In the years that followed, the number of teacher education institutions continued to grow.

(c) Revitalisation of DIETs. *“All DIETs will be upgraded to develop as vibrant academic institutions that develop strong contextual curriculum and pedagogical material, continuous professional development programmes for teachers...and act as academic authorities for elementary education in their districts”* (MoE, 2020, pp. 185–186). This places enormous weight on an institution that most state education systems have chronically neglected.

(d) Continuous Professional Development. “All teachers will participate in at least 50 hours of CPD opportunities every year for their own professional development” (MoE, 2020, p. 186). The number is concrete; the delivery system is not. Without a structure to provide and verify CPD, the fifty-hour requirement risks becoming a compliance checkbox rather than a developmental commitment.

(e) Scholarships for teacher education. The policy provides that “there will be merit-based scholarships for students entering the 4-year integrated B.Ed.” (MoE, 2020, p. 184) — an attempt to attract academically stronger candidates into a profession that has, for decades, been a fallback rather than a first choice.

There is a sixth, less heralded commitment worth drawing out, because it reveals the policy’s theory of change. NEP 2020 envisions teacher education migrating out of stand-alone colleges and into multidisciplinary universities, on the reasoning that future teachers should be educated alongside students of the sciences, humanities, and arts rather than sequestered in monotechnic institutions. The intuition is sound: teaching is an intellectual vocation, and intellectual vocations are nourished by exposure to disciplines beyond pedagogy. But the migration is itself a vast undertaking. India’s stand-alone teacher education colleges number in the thousands; the multidisciplinary universities capable of absorbing them are comparatively few, and many of those are themselves under strain. To will the end without willing the means is to leave the stand-alone college sector — the very sector the policy condemns — as the default home of ITEP for years to come. The aspiration to dissolve the stand-alone college coexists, awkwardly, with a regulatory process that is busy re-credentialing it.

Reading these promises together, what emerges is a genuinely ambitious vision. The policy correctly identifies that Indian teacher education is broken, correctly proposes that longer and more integrated preparation is part of the solution, and correctly calls for regulatory accountability. We have no quarrel with the diagnosis or the aspiration. The problem is in the mechanism — or rather, in its absence. Every promise above is a statement of intended outcome; almost none is accompanied by a specification of the institutional machinery that would produce it. It is here, in the gap between what is promised and what is built to deliver the promise, that the trouble begins.

3. ITEP and the NCTE Question: The Same Approver, the Same Problems

3.1 NCTE’s regulatory history: a pattern of indiscriminate approvals

The National Council for Teacher Education was established by the NCTE Act, 1993, with the mandate to achieve “planned and co-ordinated development of teacher education” and the “prevention of commercialisation of teacher education.” The history of the body is, in large part, the history of the failure of that second mandate. By 2014, the Supreme Court of India, in *Society for Un-aided Private Schools of Rajasthan v. Union of India*, criticised NCTE’s functioning sharply, noting that the council had approved teacher education institutions at a scale and speed that could not be reconciled with genuine quality regulation. By 2019, India had approximately 17,000 teacher education institutions, of which the vast majority were privately managed and a significant proportion were operating below acceptable standards (NCTE, 2019).

The Verma Commission (2012) had already documented the rot in detail, finding that NCTE’s regional committees had “granted affiliations in bulk” and that the inspection mechanism was “largely dysfunctional.” Inspections, where they occurred, frequently relied on documentation supplied by the applicant institution rather than independent verification; colleges that existed substantially on paper received recognition. This is the regulatory body that is now the approving authority for ITEP.

The deeper problem is one of incentives. NCTE’s regional committees grew during a period in which demand for B.Ed seats, driven by the recruitment requirements of an expanding school system and the eligibility rules of the Right to Education Act, vastly exceeded supply. Into that gap rushed private capital, and a recognition regime that depended on self-reported compliance proved no match for the commercial pressure to approve. The result was a sector in which the recognition certificate became a tradable asset largely decoupled from instructional quality. Nothing in the shift from B.Ed to ITEP alters this underlying political economy. The demand for credentials remains; the private capital remains; the recognition regime, restyled but not restructured, remains. Expecting a different outcome from the same incentive structure is the recurring error of Indian teacher education reform.

3.2 ITEP approvals: early evidence of the same pattern

NCTE notified the ITEP regulations and began a pilot in 2022–23 with 57 central institutions — a careful, bounded start, concentrated in institutions with existing academic capacity (NCTE, 2022). Had ITEP remained confined to such institutions, the reform might have had a fighting chance. But as the programme

has expanded, private institutions — including many of the same stand-alone colleges NEP 2020 promised to close — have begun applying for ITEP recognition. The concern that scholars and practitioners have raised, often quietly because the programme carries the prestige of NEP 2020, is that the approval process for ITEP is running through the same NCTE machinery that approved thousands of substandard B.Ed colleges.

The inspection visits are conducted by the same regional committees. The norms for faculty qualifications, library resources, and teaching practice supervision are notified in the regulations, but enforcement depends on the same inspectors whose predecessors signed off on colleges that existed on paper. The structural isomorphism is exact: a new four-year programme replacing a two-year programme, approved by the same body, through the same process, with the same weaknesses in quality verification. What has changed is the duration and the name. What has not changed is the ecology that determines whether a graduate can actually teach.

It is important to be fair to the design intent here. The decision to pilot ITEP in central universities and institutions of national importance was the right one, and it signalled an understanding that quality cannot be conjured by regulation alone. Had the policy held the line — expanding ITEP only as genuinely capable institutions came online, and allowing the stand-alone sector to wither as NEP 2020 explicitly promised — the criticism in this paper would not arise. The problem is that the pressure to scale a flagship reform quickly is enormous, and the path of least resistance runs straight through the existing pool of recognised colleges. A reform judged by the number of ITEP seats created will fill those seats from whatever institutions are available; a reform judged by the competence of the teachers it produces would expand far more slowly. The two metrics pull in opposite directions, and the history of NCTE gives little confidence about which one will prevail.

3.3 The name-change problem: when renaming masquerades as reform

This is the most important argument of the paper, and it deserves to be stated with force. In institutional theory there is a well-documented phenomenon called isomorphic mimicry — organisations change their formal structures (names, organograms, stated missions) while their actual functioning remains unchanged (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The pressures to conform to new norms produce surface-level change without substantive change, precisely because the incentives and capacities that drive behaviour remain untouched. The organisation learns to display the new form while continuing to perform the old function.

ITEP, as currently implemented in many private institutions, risks being a textbook case. A private B.Ed college that received NCTE approval a decade ago, ran a two-year programme with minimal teaching practice and faculty of questionable qualification, and graduated hundreds of teachers who were not adequately prepared — that college can now apply for ITEP recognition, extend its programme to four years, and receive a new certificate of approval. The college's infrastructure is the same. The faculty are largely the same. The school partnerships for teaching practice are the same, or absent. The institutional culture — which is the hardest thing to change and the most consequential — is the same. But the degree its graduates receive will now say "ITEP" rather than "B.Ed."

For students, the change means two additional years of fees in an institution that may not provide two additional years of value. For the school system, it means teachers who spent four years in the same quality environment as their two-year predecessors. For the policy, it means a claim of reform that the evidence will, in time, be unable to sustain. Mimicry is not malice; it is the predictable response of an institution asked to change its form without being given the means, the incentive, or the supervision to change its function.

3.4 The precedent: B.Ed replacing B.T., D.El.Ed replacing JBT

This is not the first time India has changed the name of a teacher preparation qualification without changing its substance. The Basic Teaching certificate became the Junior Basic Training programme, which became the Diploma in Elementary Education — and in many states the D.El.Ed continues to be delivered by institutions that have not substantially changed since the JBT era. The two-year B.Ed itself replaced older teacher training diplomas on the promise of greater rigour; the rigour arrived in the curriculum document but not in the classroom. NEP 2020 and ITEP are the latest entries in this sequence. Unless the reform addresses what happens inside the institution rather than what the institution is called, the sequence will simply continue, with ITEP one day playing the role that B.Ed plays in this paper — the discredited old name that the next reform promises to replace.

4. What the Policy Fails to Address: Four Structural Blind Spots

4.1 Faculty quality and the missing research culture

NEP 2020 does not adequately address how teacher education faculty — many of whom hold academic qualifications but have no recent school experience — will be developed as scholar-practitioners. The policy notes that “*teacher educators will also need to be trained*” (MoE, 2020, p. 186) but offers no mechanism for doing so. Batra (2014) has documented that Indian teacher education faculty are themselves products of a system that privileges examinations over inquiry; asking them to produce reflective practitioners without investing in their own transformation is circular. As Kumar (2005) argues, the deeper malaise is epistemic — a culture that treats teaching as transmission rather than as intellectual work. A credible reform would mandate periodic school re-immersion for teacher education faculty, create genuine research partnerships between TEIs and schools, and establish career pathways that reward pedagogical scholarship rather than mere seniority.

4.2 Teaching practice: still the broken heart of teacher preparation

The research is unambiguous: the quality of teaching practice — its duration, the quality of mentoring, the degree of genuine classroom responsibility — is among the strongest predictors of beginning teacher effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, 2006). NEP 2020 mentions extended school immersion but does not specify what it must look like, who must supervise it, or how it will be assessed. Dyer (2018) notes that across South Asia the practicum is routinely the most underspecified and least resourced component of teacher preparation. Without mandatory partnership agreements between TEIs and schools, trained cooperating teachers, and externally verified assessment of practice teaching, the internship will continue to be what it is now in most institutions: a paperwork exercise completed retrospectively rather than a developmental apprenticeship lived in real classrooms.

Lengthening the programme to four years does not, by itself, lengthen or deepen the practicum. A two-year B.Ed that delivered four functional weeks of supervised teaching can become a four-year ITEP that delivers six, and the policy will still be able to claim that immersion has been extended. Duration is the easiest variable to legislate and the least informative about quality. What matters is the density of the practicum experience: whether the student-teacher carries real instructional responsibility, whether a skilled cooperating teacher observes and debriefs her, whether her university supervisor visits the school more than once, and whether her assessment turns on demonstrated classroom competence rather than a portfolio assembled the week before submission. None of these conditions is guaranteed by adding years, and none is currently mandated with the specificity that would make it enforceable.

4.3 Caste, language, and diversity in teacher preparation

NEP 2020’s teacher education chapter does not name caste. This is a striking omission in a document that elsewhere acknowledges the persistence of inequality. Nambissan (2009) and Ramachandran (2018) have documented how teacher expectations, shaped by caste assumptions, operate as a hidden curriculum of exclusion — Dalit children seated at the back, called on less, marked harder, and quietly steered away from aspiration. A teacher education programme that does not explicitly prepare future teachers to recognise and counteract caste-based bias in their own practice is producing teachers who will reproduce the inequality they inherit. Similarly, NEP 2020’s commitment to mother-tongue instruction in early schooling requires teachers trained in multilingual pedagogy — yet no ITEP regulation mandates competence in teaching across the home-language gap, leaving the policy’s linguistic ambition without a workforce equipped to deliver it (Mohanty, 2019).

4.4 The DIET dependency problem

NEP 2020 places continuous professional development — the principal mechanism for improving the existing stock of in-service teachers — almost entirely on DIETs. UNESCO (2021) found that most DIETs are severely under-resourced, with faculty vacancies, negligible research capacity, and crumbling infrastructure. Govinda and Bandyopadhyay (2008) documented this same problem more than fifteen years ago; it has not been solved. A policy that assigns its in-service development ambitions to an institution that has been demonstrably under-resourced for decades is either very optimistic or not taking implementation seriously. The fifty-hour CPD promise is only as real as the institutions tasked with delivering it, and those institutions have been starved for a generation.

These four blind spots — faculty, practicum, equity, and the DIET — share a common feature. Each names a condition that determines whether teacher preparation works, and each is precisely the kind of condition that is invisible in an approval document and expensive to fix in reality. It is far cheaper to specify a curriculum, a duration, and a list of required rooms than to cultivate a research culture, broker durable school

partnerships, retrain a generation of faculty, or rebuild a district institution. A reform that addresses only the cheap, document-friendly variables will look complete on paper and fail in the classroom. That gap between documentary completeness and classroom reality is, in the end, the whole subject of this paper.

5. What Genuine Reform Would Require

If the diagnosis is correct, the remedy must reach inside the institution. We offer five concrete proposals, each deliberately specific.

5.1 An independent accreditation body separate from NCTE

NCTE has a structural conflict of interest: it is simultaneously the promoter and the regulator of teacher education. These functions should be separated. An independent National Accreditation Authority for Teacher Education, with statutory powers, transparent and published inspection criteria, and real closure authority, would replace the current arrangement in which NCTE's regional committees both approve and inspect the same institutions. This is not a novel idea; it mirrors the separation of promotion and regulation that has been attempted, with varying success, in other sectors. Accreditation must carry consequences — an institution that fails should lose recognition, not receive a longer compliance horizon. Critically, inspection should rest on outcome evidence rather than infrastructure checklists: graduate teaching competence, the quality of the practicum, and the destinations and effectiveness of alumni in classrooms, sampled and verified independently. A regime that counts rooms and books will keep approving institutions that have rooms and books and nothing else.

5.2 Mandatory school partnership agreements for every ITEP institution

Before any ITEP institution receives recognition, it should be required to demonstrate a formal, signed partnership with a minimum number of schools that agree to host student-teachers, assign trained cooperating teachers, and participate in joint assessment of teaching practice. No partnership, no recognition. Renewal should be annual and tied to the demonstrated quality of those partnerships, verified independently rather than self-reported. The practicum cannot be fixed in the abstract; it can only be fixed school by school, relationship by relationship.

5.3 Faculty re-immersion requirement

All faculty in ITEP institutions should complete a minimum of four weeks per year in school classrooms — not as observers but as co-teachers. This should be a condition of continued employment and tied to institutional accreditation. Faculty who have not been inside a school in more than three years should be ineligible to supervise teaching practice. A teacher educator who cannot teach children has no business certifying that others can; re-immersion is the only credible way to keep faculty honest about the realities of the classrooms they prepare others to enter.

5.4 DIET revitalisation as a funded national programme, not a policy aspiration

The DIET system needs a dedicated budget line, ring-fenced from state discretion, for infrastructure, faculty recruitment, and research capacity, paired with accountability benchmarks and public reporting. Without money and monitoring, the DIET aspiration will remain what it has been since the 1980s: a vision that lives in policy documents and dies in budget allocations. Teacher burnout and attrition in the public system (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017) make a functioning in-service support structure not a luxury but a precondition for retaining the teachers the system already has.

5.5 A national rural teacher incentive framework

Finally, reform must confront the question teacher education reform almost never asks: who will teach in the hardest places, and why would they choose to? A structured programme of differential compensation, housing, accelerated career progression, and community-embedding for teachers willing to serve in underserved areas — designed in consultation with communities and linked to multi-year commitments — is overdue. ASER data, year after year, show that learning outcomes in rural government schools are the crisis (ASER Centre, 2023); and as Tilak (2018) argues, equity in education is finally a question of where public investment is willing to go. Yet teacher education reform rarely addresses who will staff those schools. An ITEP that does not change the rural staffing equation changes very little for the children who need change most.

6. Conclusion

Return to the opening scene — the B.Ed (now ITEP) student in the tier-3 college. The question is simple: will the four-year programme change her experience, or merely extend it? The answer depends entirely on whether the reform reaches the inside of the institution — the faculty, the school placements, the actual culture of learning — or stops at the label on the degree.

NEP 2020 is honest about the problem in a way Indian education policy documents rarely are, and that honesty deserves acknowledgement. The text is worth quoting once more in closing: “*The need of the hour is to have an education system rooted in Indian ethos that contributes directly to transforming India, that is, Bharat*” (MoE, 2020, p. 4). Teacher education is the most direct route to that transformation — every child’s education passes through a teacher. If the teacher is well-prepared, every child benefits. If the teacher carries a credential but not the competence it implies, every child in that classroom bears the cost. None of this is an argument against ITEP, and it should not be read as one. A four-year integrated programme, taught well, in an institution with a research culture and genuine school partnerships, is a better way to prepare a teacher than a hurried two-year B.Ed bolted onto an unrelated bachelor’s degree. The conception is sound. Our argument is narrower and, we think, harder to dismiss: that conception is not implementation, and the machinery currently tasked with implementation is the machinery whose failure produced the crisis the policy describes. To hand a reform to the institution that has most consistently undermined the value the reform seeks to create, and to do so without changing that institution’s incentives, capacities, or accountability, is to wager that the same actor will behave differently in the same conditions for the same reasons. That is not a wager the evidence supports.

ITEP, as a concept, is the right direction. ITEP, as currently implemented, risks being another iteration of a recurring pattern: a new name, a new regulation, a new set of approvals from the same body, and the same institutions graduating the same teachers who will walk into classrooms they were not adequately prepared to inhabit. Whether this generation of reform breaks the pattern or extends it is not determined by the policy document. It is determined by what NCTE approves, what state governments fund, what DIETs actually deliver, and — most of all — by what happens in the relationship between a student-teacher and the school that was supposed to prepare her for the profession. That relationship remains, in most of India, the unexamined and underfunded heart of a reform that has found its language but not yet found its mechanism.

References

- ASER Centre. (2023). *Annual Status of Education Report (Rural) 2022*. New Delhi: Pratham.
- Batra, P. (2005). Voice and agency of teachers: Missing link in National Curriculum Framework 2005. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(36), 4347–4356.
- Batra, P. (2014). Teacher education in India: Mapping the concerns. *Seminar*, 655.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 300–314.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
- Dyer, C. (2018). Teacher education and quality in India. In M. Schweisfurth & C. Dyer (Eds.), *Developing Teachers and Teaching Practice*. Routledge.
- Govinda, R., & Bandyopadhyay, M. (2008). *Access to Elementary Education in India*. New Delhi: NIEPA.
- Kumar, K. (2005). *What Is Worth Teaching?* (3rd ed.). New Delhi: Orient BlackSwan.
- Ministry of Education (MoE). (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Government of India.
- Mohanty, A. K. (2019). *The Multilingual Reality: Living with Languages*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Nambissan, G. B. (2009). *Exclusion and Discrimination in Schools: Experiences of Dalit Children*. IIDS/UNICEF Working Paper.
- National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE). (2019). *Annual Report 2018–19*. New Delhi: NCTE.
- National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE). (2022). *Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) Regulations 2022*. New Delhi: NCTE.
- Ramachandran, V. (2018). *Inside Indian Schools: The Enigma of Equity and Quality*. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Dimensions of teacher burnout: Relations with potential stressors at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 20(4), 775–790.
- Supreme Court of India. (2014). *Society for Un-Aided Private Schools of Rajasthan v. Union of India*. Writ Petition (C) No. 95 of 2010.
- Tilak, J. B. G. (2018). *Education and Development in India*. Singapore: Springer.

- UNESCO. (2021). *No Teacher, No Class: State of the Education Report for India 2021*. New Delhi: UNESCO.
- Verma Commission. (2012). *Report of the Justice J.S. Verma Commission on Teacher Education*. New Delhi: MHRD.

Copyright & License:



© Authors retain the copyright of this article. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.