

Institutional Governance, Distributed Leadership and Administrative Effectiveness in Teacher Education Institutions: A Study of B.Ed. Colleges in Assam

Dr. Abhijit Dev Adhikary

Principal

Krishna Ram Das College of Education, Chhaygaon, Kamrup, Assam

Abstract:

Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) occupy an essential position in the preparation of teachers and accordingly influence the quality, effectiveness and sustainability of the wider education system. In India, the transformation of teacher education under the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, the movement towards multidisciplinary institutions and the transition towards the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) have substantially increased the administrative and governance responsibilities of TEIs. Effective teacher education therefore requires not only competent teacher educators and appropriate academic programmes but also transparent governance, participatory decision-making, distributed leadership, digital administration and systematic quality assurance. The present study proposes to examine the relationship between institutional governance, distributed leadership and administrative effectiveness in selected Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in Assam. The study takes up a mixed-method research design. Quantitative data are proposed to be collected from principals, teacher educators and administrative personnel through an Institutional Governance and Administrative Effectiveness Scale developed for the study, while qualitative information may be obtained through semi-structured interviews with institutional heads. The quantitative component will employ descriptive statistics, independent-samples t-test, analysis of variance, Pearson's product-moment correlation and multiple regression analysis. Qualitative responses will be subjected to thematic analysis. The proposed study is grounded in the proposition that administrative effectiveness in TEIs is strengthened when leadership responsibilities are shared, institutional decisions are participatory, administrative processes are transparent, digital technologies are appropriately utilized and quality assurance is integrated into institutional planning. The paper develops an original conceptual framework, designated the Teacher Education Institutional Governance and Effectiveness (TEI-GEA) Model. The study is expected to contribute to the emerging discourse on teacher education administration by providing an Assam-specific empirical framework for strengthening institutional governance and administrative effectiveness. The paper also discusses implications for principals, governing bodies, affiliating universities, policymakers and regulatory agencies.

Keywords: Teacher Education Institutions, educational administration, institutional governance, distributed leadership, administrative effectiveness, B.Ed., teacher educators, Assam, NEP 2020, ITEP

1. Introduction

Teacher education plays an important role transforming the education system in India. It is one of the most important components of an education system because the quality of teachers is strongly related to the quality of learning experiences provided to students. Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) are therefore expected to function not merely as centers for the delivery of teacher-training courses but as professional institutions characterized by academic excellence, institutional responsibility, effective leadership, ethical administration and continuous quality improvement.

The present-day teacher education environment in India is undergoing significant transformation. The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 envisages teacher education as a multidisciplinary and professionally oriented field in which teacher preparation is expected to become more integrated, rigorous and responsive to changing educational requirements (Ministry of Education, 2020). The policy also places significant emphasis on institutional autonomy, leadership, accountability, professional development, technology and quality assurance.

The National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), as the statutory regulatory authority for teacher education in India, is responsible for formulating norms and standards and ensuring their implementation across teacher education institutions and programmes. The regulatory environment has become increasingly dynamic with the introduction and modification of the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP).

The transformation has direct implications for institutional administration. Principals and institutional heads are increasingly required to coordinate academic planning, teacher educator development, student support, school internship, curriculum implementation, digital record management, quality assurance, regulatory compliance, institutional planning and stakeholder communication.

Consequently, educational administration in TEIs should not be understood simply as routine office management. It encompasses a complex set of academic, managerial, human-resource, financial, technological and quality-assurance functions.

An important question therefore arises: **What institutional characteristics contribute to administrative effectiveness in Teacher Education Institutions?**

One possible answer is institutional governance. Governance determines how decisions are made, how responsibilities are distributed, how information flows and how accountability is established. Another is distributed leadership. Rather than concentrating all institutional responsibilities in the principal, distributed leadership encourages appropriate participation of teacher educators and other institutional stakeholders in decision-making and problem-solving.

Recent empirical research in higher education has further highlighted the importance of distributed leadership. Lizier, et al. (2024), in their empirical examination of distributed leadership within an Australian university, found that the effective implementation of distributed leadership depends substantially on clarity regarding leadership roles, responsibilities, and objectives, as well as on trust among institutional actors. Their findings further demonstrated that hierarchical structures can either facilitate or constrain the meaningful distribution of leadership, suggesting that distributed leadership requires more than the delegation of administrative tasks; it depends on a shared understanding of leadership and supportive institutional relationships.

However, the organizational context of a general university is substantially different from that of a stand-alone or affiliated Teacher Education Institution. TEIs operate within a particularly dense regulatory environment involving NCTE, affiliating universities and, in many cases, state-level higher-education authorities. Their administrative effectiveness therefore deserves specific investigation.

A recent study by Ansari examined educational administration practices within teacher education programmes under NEP 2020 and reported growing attention to decentralized decision-making and administrative preparedness.

These studies display the relevance of educational administration in teacher education. However, a research gap remains concerning the empirical relationship between **institutional governance, distributed leadership, digital governance and administrative effectiveness specifically within TEIs in Assam.**

The present study therefore proposes an empirical framework that connects these variables.

2. Background of the Study:

2.1 Teacher Education and Institutional Transformation

Teacher Education in India has traditionally been organized through programmes such as B.Ed., M.Ed., D.El.Ed. and Integrated Teacher Education Programmes (ITEP). The NEP 2020 envisages a transformation towards multidisciplinary and integrated teacher preparation (Ministry of Education, 2020).

The movement towards ITEP represents an important institutional shift. NCTE's regulatory framework provides that ITEP is aligned with the pedagogical and curricular restructuring envisioned in NEP 2020. The transition also places greater emphasis on multidisciplinary institutional structures.

This transformation has administrative implications because institutional leaders must coordinate different academic disciplines, faculty groups, student services and regulatory requirements.

2.2 Governance and Accountability

Institutional governance refers to the systems through which an institution establishes priorities, makes decisions, allocates responsibilities, monitors performance and maintains accountability.

In TEIs, governance involves multiple stakeholders, including:

Governing Body, Principal, Teacher educators, Administrative staff, Students, Affiliating University, Regulatory agencies, School partners, and Community Stakeholders.

The effectiveness of governance depends partly on the quality of communication and the extent to which institutional stakeholders understand their roles.

NCTE's regulatory role shows the importance of institutional accountability. Its Regulation Division states that the Council formulates norms and standards for teacher education institutions and programmes and seeks to ensure implementation of those standards.

2.3 Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership represents a shift from the traditional assumption that leadership is located primarily in one institutional head.

Under a distributed leadership approach, leadership functions may be shared among: **Principal, Academic coordinators, Teacher educators, IQAC members, Internship coordinators, Examination coordinators, Programme coordinators; and Administrative staff.**

Distributed leadership does not necessarily imply the disappearance of formal authority. Instead, it involves the appropriate distribution of leadership opportunities and responsibilities.

Madan's empirical investigation of Indian higher education provides particularly relevant evidence. The study found that participation in decision-making strengthened the relationship between empowering organizational structures and distributed leadership.

For teacher education, this suggests that teacher educators should not be treated solely as implementers of decisions made by institutional heads. Their professional knowledge can contribute to academic planning, quality improvement, curriculum implementation, student support and institutional development.

3. Rationale of the Study:

The rationale for the present study is based on five considerations.

First, changing regulatory expectations: Teacher education is increasingly characterized by quality assurance, accountability, performance monitoring and regulatory compliance.

Second, institutional transformation: The transition towards multidisciplinary teacher education and ITEP creates new administrative responsibilities. NCTE's current regulations explicitly address the transition towards ITEP.

Third, increasing administrative complexity: Modern TEIs must manage academic, technological, financial, regulatory and student-related responsibilities simultaneously.

Fourth, limited Assam-specific empirical evidence: Although educational leadership and teacher education administration have been studied in India, relatively less attention has been given to the specific relationship between institutional governance and administrative effectiveness in TEIs in Assam.

Fifth, need for evidence-based institutional improvement: Rather than treating administrative effectiveness as a matter of individual leadership style alone, institutions need evidence concerning the organizational factors that contribute to effective administration.

4. Review of Related Literature:

4.1 Educational Administration and Teacher Education

Educational administration involves planning, organizing, directing, coordinating and evaluating educational activities to achieve institutional objectives.

In teacher education, administration is especially complex because institutions must simultaneously address academic preparation, practicum, school internship, teacher educator development, assessment, regulatory compliance and student development.

Ansari's study of educational administration practices in teacher education under NEP 2020 highlighted the increasing relevance of decentralization, institutional autonomy and educational leadership.

Some other researcher examined academic administration in teacher education institutes in Andhra Pradesh and identified areas including academic programmes, curriculum development, assessment and resource management as important dimensions of institutional administration.

These studies establish the importance of educational administration but also indicate the need for empirical models connecting administrative practices with institutional effectiveness.

4.2 Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership has attracted increasing attention in educational research because leadership is increasingly understood as a collective rather than purely individual phenomenon.

Madan's Indian higher-education study used survey data from 269 respondents across six institutions and applied structural equation modeling. The findings indicated that empowering structures and participation in decision-making were associated with distributed leadership.

A broader review of distributed leadership in educational contexts identified shared vision, clear roles, adaptive leadership and collaboration as important features of effective distributed leadership, while also identifying challenges such as resistance to change, ambiguity and role confusion.

These findings are relevant to TEIs because teacher educators possess specialized academic knowledge that can contribute to institutional decision-making.

4.3 Teacher Leadership and Teacher Education

Leadership preparation is increasingly being considered within teacher education itself. Aliu and Kaçaniku (2023) examined future teachers' leadership preparedness and highlighted the relevance of teacher leadership within initial teacher education.

A systematic review of pre-service teacher leadership similarly identified teacher development, curriculum leadership, leadership styles, mentoring and professional development as significant themes in the literature.

This suggests that teacher education programmes should not merely prepare prospective teachers to follow institutional systems but should also cultivate professional leadership capacities.

4.4 NEP 2020 and Institutional Leadership

The New Educational Policy 2020 emphasizes institutional transformation, professional development and leadership. The Ministry of Education's leadership-development guidance explicitly refers to the need for trained and experienced institutional leaders and encourages faculty participation in collective decision-making, shared governance and problem-solving.

The policy direction is therefore compatible with a distributed approach to institutional administration.

4.5 Digital Governance

Digital technology has increasingly become part of educational administration. Administrative activities such as student records, attendance, examination management, communication, documentation, institutional reporting and quality-assurance records can be supported through digital platforms.

The use of digital administration may improve:

- accessibility of records;
- communication;
- institutional transparency;
- reporting;
- monitoring;
- data management; and

- decision-making.

However, digitalization alone does not guarantee effectiveness. Institutional capacity, staff competence, infrastructure and leadership support remain important.

4.6 Quality Assurance

Quality assurance is another important component of administrative effectiveness.

A TEI needs mechanisms for:

- institutional planning;
- internal evaluation;
- feedback collection;
- academic monitoring;
- faculty development;
- student support;
- documentation; and
- continuous improvement.

The contemporary regulatory environment makes such systems increasingly important. The Supreme Court's decision concerning NCTE's annual Performance Appraisal Report requirement further demonstrates the growing significance of institutional accountability and regulatory oversight.

5. Research Gap:

The review indicates four major gaps.

First, much of the existing discussion concerning teacher education administration is conceptual or descriptive.

Second, studies on distributed leadership have often focused on general higher education rather than specifically on TEIs.

Third, studies of teacher education administration have not sufficiently integrated **institutional governance, distributed leadership, digital governance and administrative effectiveness** within a single analytical model.

Fourth, there is a need for empirical evidence from Assam.

Therefore, the present study proposes to address the following gap:

There is insufficient empirical evidence concerning how participatory institutional governance, distributed leadership and digital administrative practices collectively influence administrative effectiveness in Teacher Education Institutions in Assam.

6. Statement of the Problem:

“Institutional Governance, Distributed Leadership and Administrative Effectiveness in Teacher Education Institutions: A Study of B.Ed. Colleges in Assam”

7. Operational Definitions:

Teacher Education Institution

For this study, a Teacher Education Institution refers to an institution recognized by the competent regulatory authority for offering a teacher education programme such as B.Ed. or related teacher education programmes.

Institutional Governance

Institutional governance refers to the structures and practices through which institutional decisions are made, responsibilities are allocated, information is communicated and accountability is maintained.

Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership refers to the sharing of appropriate leadership responsibilities and decision-making opportunities among the principal, teacher educators and other institutional stakeholders.

Digital Governance

Digital governance refers to the use of digital technologies for communication, record management, academic administration, reporting and institutional decision-making.

Administrative Effectiveness

Administrative effectiveness refers to the degree to which an institution successfully plans, coordinates, implements, monitors and evaluates its academic and administrative activities.

8. Objectives of the Study:

The study proposes to:

- i. assess the level of institutional governance in selected TEIs in Assam;
- ii. assess the level of distributed leadership in selected TEIs;
- iii. assess the level of administrative effectiveness among selected TEIs;
- iv. examine the relationship between institutional governance and administrative effectiveness;
- v. examine the relationship between distributed leadership and administrative effectiveness;
- vi. examine the relationship between faculty participation and administrative effectiveness;
- vii. examine the relationship between digital governance and administrative effectiveness;
- viii. determine whether institutional governance, distributed leadership and digital governance significantly predict administrative effectiveness;
- ix. compare administrative effectiveness according to selected institutional variables; and
- x. develop a governance framework for improving administrative effectiveness in TEIs.

9. Research Questions:

- i. What is the level of institutional governance in selected TEIs?
- ii. What is the level of distributed leadership in selected TEIs?
- iii. What is the level of administrative effectiveness in selected TEIs?
- iv. Is institutional governance significantly related to administrative effectiveness?
- v. Is distributed leadership significantly related to administrative effectiveness?
- vi. Is faculty participation significantly related to administrative effectiveness?
- vii. Is digital governance significantly related to administrative effectiveness?
- viii. Which governance variables significantly predict administrative effectiveness?
- ix. What are the major administrative challenges experienced by institutional heads and teacher educators?

10. Hypotheses:

H01: There is no significant relationship between institutional governance and administrative effectiveness in TEIs.

H02: There is no significant relationship between distributed leadership and administrative effectiveness in TEIs.

- H03:** There is no significant relationship between faculty participation and administrative effectiveness.
- H04:** There is no significant relationship between digital governance and administrative effectiveness.
- H05:** Institutional governance, distributed leadership, faculty participation and digital governance do not significantly predict administrative effectiveness.
- H06:** There is no significant difference in administrative effectiveness between urban and rural TEIs.
- H07:** There is no significant difference in administrative effectiveness between different categories of TEIs based on management type.

11. Conceptual Framework:

The proposed framework is based on the assumption that administrative effectiveness is influenced by institutional governance and leadership processes.

Institutional Governance

- participatory decision-making
- transparency
- accountability
- institutional planning

↓

Distributed Leadership

- delegation
- collaboration
- faculty leadership
- shared problem-solving

↓

Digital Governance

- digital communication
- digital records
- online administration
- data-supported decisions

↓

Quality Assurance

- internal monitoring
- feedback
- evaluation
- continuous improvement

↓

Administrative Effectiveness

- academic coordination
- student services
- regulatory compliance
- institutional planning
- timely implementation
- institutional development

12. The Proposed TEI-GEA Model:

The present paper proposes an original conceptual framework called the:

Teacher Education Institutional Governance and Effectiveness Model (TEI-GEA Model)

The model proposes five interconnected dimensions:

P — Participatory Governance

D — Distributed Leadership

T — Transparency and Accountability

G — Digital Governance

Q — Quality Assurance

These five dimensions are expected to contribute to:

AE — Administrative Effectiveness

The model can be expressed conceptually as:

$$AE = f(PG + DL + TA + DG + QA)$$

where:

AE = Administrative Effectiveness

PG = Participatory Governance

DL = Distributed Leadership

TA = Transparency and Accountability

DG = Digital Governance

QA = Quality Assurance

The model does not assume that every factor has an identical effect. Rather, the proposed empirical study will determine the relative contribution of each factor.

13. Research Methodology:

13.1 Research Approach: The study will employ a **mixed-method approach**.

The quantitative component will measure relationships among institutional governance, distributed leadership, digital governance and administrative effectiveness.

The qualitative component will explore administrative experiences and challenges in greater depth.

13.2 Research Design:

An **explanatory sequential mixed-method design** is recommended:

Phase I: Quantitative survey

↓

Phase II: Statistical analysis

↓

Phase III: Qualitative interviews

↓

Phase IV: Integration and interpretation

This design allows quantitative relationships to be supplemented by institutional experiences.

14. Population

The proposed population consists of:

- Principals/institutional heads;

- Teacher educators;
- Academic coordinators; and
- Administrative personnel

working in selected recognized Teacher Education Institutions in Assam.

15. Sample

A proposed sample is:

Category	Proposed Sample
Principals/Institutional Heads	40
Teacher Educators	200
Administrative Personnel	40
Total	280

The final number should be adjusted according to the accessible population and sampling frame.

16. Sampling Procedure:

A stratified sampling procedure may be adopted.

Institutions may be stratified according to:

- geographical location;
- urban/rural setting;
- management type;
- institutional age; and
- affiliating university.

Respondents can then be selected from the identified institutions.

17. Research Instruments:

The proposed primary instrument is:

Institutional Governance and Administrative Effectiveness Scale for Teacher Education Institutions (IGAE-TEI)

The instrument may contain six dimensions.

Dimension	Proposed Items
Institutional Governance	10
Distributed Leadership	10
Transparency & Accountability	8
Digital Governance	8
Quality Assurance	8
Administrative Effectiveness	12
Total	56

Responses can be measured on a five-point Likert scale:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree

- iii. Undecided
- iv. Agree
- v. Strongly Agree

18. Sample Questionnaire Items:

Dimension A: Institutional Governance

- 1. Faculty members are given opportunities to participate in institutional decision-making.
- 2. Institutional decisions are communicated clearly to faculty members.
- 3. The institution maintains transparent administrative procedures.
- 4. Institutional planning involves relevant stakeholders.
- 5. Responsibilities are clearly defined within the institution.

Dimension B: Distributed Leadership

- 6. Teacher educators are encouraged to assume leadership responsibilities.
- 7. Administrative responsibilities are appropriately delegated.
- 8. Faculty members are involved in institutional problem-solving.
- 9. Leadership responsibilities are shared according to professional competence.
- 10. The principal encourages collaborative leadership.

Dimension C: Transparency and Accountability

- 11. Institutional policies are communicated to staff members.
- 12. Administrative decisions can be appropriately reviewed.
- 13. Institutional records are maintained systematically.
- 14. The institution follows transparent procedures in academic administration.

Dimension D: Digital Governance

- 15. Digital platforms are used for institutional communication.
- 16. Student records are maintained digitally.
- 17. Digital systems facilitate academic planning.
- 18. Technology is used for institutional reporting.
- 19. Staff members receive adequate support in using digital administrative systems.

Dimension E: Quality Assurance

- 20. The institution regularly reviews academic activities.
- 21. Feedback from students is considered for institutional improvement.
- 22. Faculty development is included in institutional planning.
- 23. Quality-assurance activities are systematically documented.

Dimension F: Administrative Effectiveness

- 24. Academic activities are completed according to institutional plans.
- 25. Administrative decisions are implemented within a reasonable time.
- 26. Student grievances are addressed systematically.
- 27. Institutional records are maintained efficiently.
- 28. Regulatory requirements are monitored regularly.
- 29. Communication between academic and administrative sections is effective.

19. Validity of the Instrument:

Content validity should be established through expert review.

At least five experts in:

- teacher education;
- educational administration;
- educational measurement; and
- higher education administration

may review the items.

The experts can assess:

- relevance;
- clarity;
- appropriateness;
- redundancy; and
- alignment with the constructs.

A Content Validity Index (CVI) may subsequently be calculated.

20. Reliability:

A pilot study should be conducted with respondents who are not included in the final sample.

Internal consistency may be examined using **Cronbach's alpha**.

A reliability coefficient of approximately .70 or above is commonly regarded as acceptable for exploratory social-science research, although the interpretation should consider the number and nature of items and the purpose of the scale.

The final paper should report the actual reliability coefficient obtained from the pilot data rather than inserting an assumed value.

21. Data Collection Procedure:

Permission should be obtained from the concerned institutional authorities.

Participants should receive information concerning:

- purpose of the study;
- voluntary participation;
- confidentiality;
- anonymity;
- approximate time required; and
- intended use of the data.

Questionnaires may be administered physically or electronically.

Selected institutional heads may subsequently participate in semi-structured interviews.

22. Ethical Considerations:

The study should follow standard research ethics.

- Participation should be voluntary.
- No respondent should be required to disclose personally sensitive information.
- Institutional names should be anonymised in the research dataset unless explicit permission for identification has been obtained.

- Data should be used only for academic/research purposes.
- The researcher should not alter responses to produce statistically significant results.

23. Data Analysis Plan:

23.1 Descriptive Statistics

The following will be calculated:

- frequency;
- percentage;
- mean;
- standard deviation.

23.2 Inferential Statistics

t-test

For comparison between two groups, such as urban and rural institutions.

ANOVA: For comparison among three or more institutional categories.

Pearson's correlation: To determine associations among governance variables.

Multiple regression: To determine the predictive contribution of institutional governance, distributed leadership, digital governance and quality assurance to administrative effectiveness.

24. Regression Model:

The following model can be tested:

$$AE = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PG + \beta_2 DL + \beta_3 TA + \beta_4 DG + \beta_5 QA + \varepsilon$$

Where:

AE = Administrative Effectiveness

PG = Participatory Governance

DL = Distributed Leadership

TA = Transparency and Accountability

DG = Digital Governance

QA = Quality Assurance

ε = Error term

The analysis will determine which variables significantly predict administrative effectiveness.

25. Qualitative Component:

The interview component may examine questions such as:

- i. What are the major administrative responsibilities of the principal in your institution?
- ii. To what extent are teacher educators involved in institutional decision-making?
- iii. What administrative functions are delegated to faculty members?
- iv. What are the major challenges in implementing regulatory requirements?
- v. How is technology used in institutional administration?
- vi. What challenges does the institution face in maintaining digital records?
- vii. How effective are existing quality-assurance mechanisms?
- viii. What changes would improve institutional administration?

26. Qualitative Themes:

Thematic analysis can generate themes such as:

Theme 1: Centralization versus Participation

Respondents describe the balance between principal-led and participatory decision-making.

Theme 2: Faculty Leadership

Teacher educators report opportunities or constraints concerning leadership responsibilities.

Theme 3: Regulatory Pressure

Institutional heads describe challenges associated with documentation, reporting and compliance.

Theme 4: Digital Transformation

Institutions differ in their capacity to adopt digital administration.

Theme 5: Resource Constraints

Some institutions face limitations concerning personnel, infrastructure and technology.

Theme 6: Quality Assurance

Institutions may vary in the extent to which quality assurance is integrated into everyday administration.

27. Discussion:

The proposed study is situated at the intersection of educational administration, teacher education and institutional leadership.

The literature indicates that educational leadership is increasingly moving away from highly centralized models towards more participatory and distributed approaches. Evidence from Indian higher education suggests that participation in decision-making can strengthen distributed leadership.

This proposition is particularly relevant to TEIs because teacher educators possess specialized professional knowledge concerning pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment and teacher preparation.

A principal who retains responsibility for all institutional decisions may encounter administrative overload. Conversely, excessive decentralization without clearly defined roles may result in confusion and duplication. Distributed leadership should therefore be accompanied by role clarity, accountability and communication.

The TEI-GEA Model proposed in this paper attempts to address this balance by combining participatory governance with transparency, digital governance and quality assurance.

The model is also consistent with the broader policy direction of NEP 2020, which emphasizes institutional leadership, professional development, autonomy and collaborative decision-making. The Ministry of Education's leadership-development guidance specifically identifies shared governance and collective decision-making as important leadership capabilities.

28. Administrative Implications:**28.1 For Principals**

Principals should develop mechanisms for structured faculty participation.

This may include:

- departmental committees;
- academic committees;
- quality-assurance committees;
- internship committees;
- examination committees; and

- student-support committees.

28.2 For Teacher Educators

Teacher educators should be encouraged to undertake institutional leadership responsibilities alongside teaching and research.

28.3 For Governing Bodies

Governing Bodies should establish clear delegation mechanisms while retaining appropriate oversight.

28.4 For Universities

Affiliating universities may provide training programmes concerning:

- institutional governance;
- academic leadership;
- digital administration;
- quality assurance; and
- regulatory compliance.

28.5 For Regulatory Authorities

Regulatory agencies may consider institutional leadership capacity as part of broader quality-assurance processes.

The contemporary regulatory environment already places significant emphasis on institutional accountability and reporting.

29. Recommendations:

Based on the conceptual analysis, the following recommendations are proposed.

1. Establish participatory governance mechanisms

TEIs should create formal opportunities for teacher educators to participate in academic and institutional decisions.

2. Develop distributed leadership

Leadership responsibilities should be allocated according to professional competence.

3. Strengthen digital administration

Institutions should develop integrated digital systems for:

- student records;
- attendance;
- examinations;
- communication;
- institutional reports; and
- quality-assurance documentation.

4. Strengthen institutional planning

Annual institutional plans should contain measurable objectives, responsible persons, timelines and evaluation indicators.

5. Develop leadership capacity

Teacher educators should receive opportunities for professional development in educational leadership and administration.

6. Strengthen quality assurance

Quality assurance should be treated as a continuous institutional process rather than an activity undertaken only during inspection or accreditation.

7. Improve documentation

Institutions should maintain systematic and easily retrievable records.

8. Encourage evidence-based decision-making

Administrative decisions should increasingly be informed by institutional data, stakeholder feedback and documented evidence.

9. Establish grievance and feedback mechanisms

Students and staff should have accessible mechanisms for providing feedback.

10. Prepare institutions for multidisciplinary transformation

TEIs moving towards multidisciplinary structures and ITEP should undertake institutional planning concerning faculty, infrastructure, governance, curriculum and administrative capacity.

30. Proposed Institutional Governance Framework

The following framework is recommended:

Level I – Strategic Governance

Governing Body



Policy, finance, institutional development and oversight

Level II – Institutional Leadership

Principal



Planning, coordination, implementation and monitoring

Level III – Distributed Academic Leadership

Teacher Educators / Coordinators



Academic planning, internship, examination, IQAC, student support

Level IV – Administrative Support

Administrative Personnel



Records, communication, finance and documentation

Level V – Stakeholder Participation

Students + Schools + Community



Feedback, collaboration and institutional development

This structure can facilitate a balance between formal authority and participatory administration.

31. Original Contribution of the Study:

The principal contribution of the proposed study is the development of the **TEI-GEA Model**.

The model integrates five dimensions:

1. Participatory Governance;
2. Distributed Leadership;
3. Transparency and Accountability;
4. Digital Governance; and
5. Quality Assurance.

These dimensions are conceptualized as institutional mechanisms that may influence administrative effectiveness.

The study therefore moves beyond the question:

“What is educational administration?” and instead asks:

“Which institutional governance and leadership practices contribute to administrative effectiveness in Teacher Education Institutions?”

This distinction provides the study with a stronger empirical orientation.

32. Limitations:

The study may have the following limitations:

1. The study may be restricted to selected TEIs in Assam.
2. The findings may therefore not be automatically generalisable to all Indian TEIs.
3. Questionnaire responses may be influenced by respondents' perceptions.
4. Institutional administrative practices may vary considerably across management types.
5. The cross-sectional nature of the study may limit conclusions concerning long-term causal relationships.
6. Access to institutional data may vary across institutions.

33. Suggestions for Further Research:

Future researchers may:

1. undertake longitudinal studies of administrative effectiveness;
2. compare TEIs across different Indian states;
3. compare B.Ed., M.Ed. and ITEP institutions;
4. examine the relationship between leadership and teacher educator job satisfaction;
5. study digital transformation in teacher education administration;
6. investigate gender and leadership in TEIs;
7. develop an institutional governance index for TEIs;
8. examine the administrative implications of multidisciplinary transformation; and
9. conduct comparative research between stand-alone and multidisciplinary teacher education institutions.

34. Conclusion:

The Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in Assam are experiencing a period of substantial transformation. NEP 2020 has created a policy environment that places greater emphasis on multidisciplinary education, professional competence, institutional leadership, technology, quality and accountability. The continuing regulatory development surrounding ITEP demonstrates the scale of this transformation.

Within this changing environment, educational administration can no longer be treated as a purely routine managerial function. Effective TEI administration requires institutional planning, participatory governance, distributed leadership, transparency, digital capacity and continuous quality assurance.

The present paper proposes that these dimensions should be examined collectively rather than independently. The proposed TEI-GEA Model provides a conceptual framework through which administrative effectiveness can be empirically examined.

The study is particularly relevant to Assam because teacher education institutions operate within a complex network involving regulatory authorities, affiliating universities, governing bodies and institutional stakeholders. Empirical evidence concerning their governance and administrative effectiveness can therefore assist institutional leaders and policymakers in designing more effective administrative systems.

The central proposition of the study is that:

Teacher Education Institutions are more likely to achieve administrative effectiveness when leadership is appropriately distributed, institutional governance is participatory and transparent, administrative processes are digitally supported, and quality assurance is embedded within everyday institutional practice.

The proposed research can therefore contribute to the emerging discourse on educational administration by connecting institutional governance with the practical realities of teacher education.

REFERENCES:

1. Aliu, J., & Kaçaniku, F. (2023). An exploration of teacher leadership: Are future teachers ready to lead? *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 13(4), 37–62. <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1634>
2. Ansari, M. T. A. (2024). Enhancing educational administration through practices in teacher education programs under the guidelines of NEP 2020: An exploratory study. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(11), 2444–2457.
3. Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(3), 251–269. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x>
4. Lizier, A., Brooks, F., & Bizo, L. (2024). Importance of clarity, hierarchy, and trust in implementing distributed leadership in higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 52(4), 901–915. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221105154>
5. Madan, A. O. et al. (2024) (Antecedents and consequences of distributed leadership in Indian higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 39(3), 689–708. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2023-0116>
6. Ministry of Education. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Government of India.
7. National Council for Teacher Education. (2024). *ITEP (Amendment) Regulations, 2024*. Government of India.
8. National Council for Teacher Education. (2024). *Public notice: Transition from the 4-year Integrated Programme (B.A.B.Ed./B.Sc.B.Ed.) to Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP)*. Government of India.
9. National Council for Teacher Education. (2021). *NCTE regulations*. Government of India.
10. Pohan, V. R., et al. (2024). Exploring the landscape of pre-service teacher leadership: A systematic literature review. *Cahaya Pendidikan*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.33373/chypend.v10i2.6600>
11. Razak, A. F. A., Faizal, & Norfariza. (2024). The empowering tomorrow's educators: A systematic literature review of pre-service teacher leadership. *International Journal of Education*.

12. Shal, T., et al. (2024). Teacher leadership and virtual communities: Unpacking teacher agency and distributed leadership. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 15025–15042. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12446-5>
13. Tian, M., Risku, M., & Collin, K. (2016). A meta-analysis of distributed leadership from 2002 to 2013: Theory development, empirical evidence and future research focus. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(1), 146–164. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214556830>
14. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024). *Global report on teachers: Addressing teacher shortages and transforming the profession*. UNESCO.