

A Critical Analysis of India's National Education Policy 2020: Implications for Teacher Development

Tijo Thomas¹, Dr. Gowher Ahmad Naik²

¹Research Scholar, English language Teaching, Lingaya's Vidyapeeth, Faridabad, Haryana, India, Email: chennitijo@gmail.com

²Associate Professor, Department of English, Lingaya's Vidyapeeth, Faridabad, Haryana, India

HOW TO CITE: ABSTRACT:

Tijo Thomas, Gowher Ahmad Naik (2026).
A Critical Analysis of India's National
Education Policy 2020: Implications for
Teacher Development.
International Journal of Special
Education, 41(25s), 567 - 572

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms
and conditions
of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY)
license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

India's National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 is a landmark in teacher development with strategically designed interventions in the background of global standards and yet well ingrained in native-born values. The current paper critically analyzes the earlier precedents of history, criticism of earlier models, and the new NEP 2020 framework of teacher development. The paper, through qualitative policy analysis, counts effectiveness, limitation, and direction for future continuous professional development in the Indian context, and maintains pragmatist models closing the gap between policy intention and classroom practice (Bolitho & Padwad, 2013; Gupta & Sharma, 2020; Kumar et al., 2020).

Keywords: Teacher Development, National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, Continuous Professional Development (CPD), Reflective Practice

1. Introduction

India's Union Cabinet-approved National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 as the country's most ambitious so far to revamp its education system since independence (Government of India [GoI], 2020). The reform positions teachers at the forefront of systemic transformation with an assurance that their role as country-wide central planners in the development of the country towards a world knowledge hub will not be sacrificed. This philosophy is in line with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG4) vision of quality, inclusive education for everyone (Gupta & Sharma, 2020). NEP 2020 heralds a clean break from ad hoc, top-down in-service training and seeks to establish a culture of continuous, autonomous professional development (Sharma, 2019). They need to turn

into reflective facilitators and change agents who have the ability to teach critical thinking, imagination, and problem-solving skills to children. Central to the policy is that it clearly identifies teachers as agents of social change, a tale which will attempt to bring back dignity and energy to the profession of teaching (Singh et al., 2021). But it does pose very pertinent questions regarding the adequacy of support structures and whether it will amplify professional stress, particularly in the backdrop of working adversity in terms of overcrowding, absence of facilities, and widespread staff vacancies (Thakur, 2025).

India's National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 is a shift when it comes to teacher development, achieving the right balance between international standards and indigenous values. The article takes a stand against previous precedence, fault lines of

previous models, and the new NEP 2020 model based on qualitative policy analysis to assess its effectiveness, points of weakness, and potential future directions for professional development.

NEP 2020 seeks to reshape the Indian education system by putting teachers at the forefront of systemic transformation. The report shines the spotlight on the reach of NEP 2020, its international education aspirations, and the imperative of establishing strong support for teachers.

2. Historical Background

2.1 Post-Independence History

It seems essential to enumerate the context and scenario of Indian teacher education systems and Government initiatives that triggered the growth of teacher training in India. Also an Appropriate understanding of NEP 2020 reforms in the early phase demands analysis of the evolution of teacher policy in India's post-independence period. Major commissions, including the *Mudaliar Commission* (1952–53) and the *Kothari Commission* (1964–66), emphasized the salient contribution rendered by the quality of teachers to the achievement of effective schooling outcomes (Chauhan, 2025; Kothari Education Commission, n.d.).

The *Mudaliar Commission* recommended improved remuneration, working conditions, and introduction of systematic refresher courses and allowances (GoI, 1953), whereas the *Kothari Commission* recommended ambitious levels of continuous teacher training and institutionalization at university levels (Education and National Development, 1966). In this context, it is imperative to think of Institutional Arrangement and Policy Institutionalization. In implementing the National Policy on Education (NPE) 1986, teacher education was strengthened by the establishment of a three-level organization: District Institutes of Education and Training (DIETs), Colleges of Teacher Education (CTEs), and Institutes of Advanced Studies in Education (IASEs) (Concept of CTE, 2017; GoI, 1986). These institutions were created in order to offer multi-dimensioned education and to encourage innovation in pedagogy at

different levels of instruction. Critique of INSET Models Cascade training practice, which was common in in-service teacher training (INSET), was criticized across the board. Although, theoretically appropriate for outreach scaling, the practice led to widespread loss of content and pedagogical transparency with training accessible to layers of administration (Hayes, 2000; Yadav et al., 2022). The model also possessed an undercover "deficiency" model, much too frequently overlooking teachers' local knowledge and making them mere recipients only, inducing alienation and training burnout (Tyagi & Misra, n.d.).

Towards Reflective Practice National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education (NCFTE) (2009) was a conceptual touchstone for the formation of reflective practitioners, obliterating theoretical pedagogy of books into experience-based reflection and improvisation (NCTE, 2009). This path laid groundwork for the NEP 2020 goals to institutionalize autonomy, professional self-concept, and responsive pedagogy within the nation as a whole (Gupta & Sharma, 2020).

3. NEP 2020: Towards an Integrated System of Teacher Development

3.1 Continuous Professional Development (CPD): Agency-Fostered Growth

NEP 2020 institutes the minimum 50 hours of CPD for principals and all teachers annually, from an interest-based, individualized development opportunities system to a focus on bottom-up mandates (GoI, 2020). This innovation will strive to make professional development a tangible and interactive journey of personal and professional growth in varied forms like web pages, international workshops, and locally appropriate content (Bolitho & Padwad, 2013; Leadership for Equity, n.d.).

3.2 National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST): Setting Professional Benchmarks

Development of National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST) according to NEP 2020 is one of the constituents that require detailed standards for teaching competency at career

stages (NCTE, n.d.). NPST promotes career growth and merit-based recruitment and assessment, with the hope of cultivating excellence as well as merit-based advancement by competency.

3.3 Collaborative Mentoring: Creating Support Networks

The policy suggests a National Mission for Mentoring alongside collaborative building, peer learning, and coordinated support to new teachers (Gupta & Sharma, 2020). The policy has been taken from best practices documented in experiment school settings with focus on community-based professional development as the key for facilitating long-term pedagogic change (Sharma, 2019).

4. Enabling NEP 2020: Digital Infrastructure and Mass Programs

4.1 DIKSHA Platform: One Digital Infrastructure for All DIKSHA is India's digital flagship program for teacher learning and training that offers locally scalable, locally curricula-harmonized content and supported in over thirty languages (UNESCO, n.d.). The federated architecture of the platform enables national standardization in addition to contextualization at the state level to facilitate good-quality learning content to all equally.

4.2 NISHTHA Programme: Multi-Level Capacity Building Evidence NISHTHA series (1.0, 2.0, and 3.0) is a classic example of integrative professional development in harmony with diverse levels of schooling with an eye to foundational literacy, numeracy, and pupil development as a complete concept (NCERT, n.d.). Its infrastructure involves noble elements like inclusive pedagogy, technology adaptation, creative arts, and learner's well-being through activity-based modules.

4.3 Cascading Loss—And Its Emerging Paradox: In direct digitization of modules from master development, the DIKSHA-NISHTHA model successfully avoids traditional "cascade loss" (Yadav et al., 2022). Rather, it reinstates the "one-size-fits-all" model that it aims to replace, without the contextually responsive, interactive aspects of

face-to-face professional development. Long-term strategy success relies on reaching the equilibrium between scripted content and depth-rich school-based learning settings.

5. Problem Statement

India's National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 exemplifies teachers' professional development in continuous learning, digitalisation, and reflective practice. However, there remains a massive policy-implementation gap between aspiration and ground reality.

There are occasions of cascade models of teacher training at the top level with ingrained inefficacy, disaffection, and non-contextual responsiveness embedded into teacher training. Though NEP 2020 brings forth hopeful paradigms like Continuous Professional Development (CPD), the National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST), and online platforms like DIKSHA and NISHTHA, they are contaminated with system weaknesses like digital disparity, infrastructural gaps, and resource unevenness. Pedagogic reform from centuries of repetition, pedagogy, competency-based and reflective practice continues to be slow as a consequence of the absence of mentoring, monitoring, and institutional support systems. The test therefore is to reasonably examine how NEP 2020 teacher development measures achieve the right balance between policy ambitions and classroom realities so that teachers become empowered facilitators of educational reform and not just passive responders to reform.

6. Objectives

- Critically examine the post-independence until now trend of teacher development policy in India.
- Examine the usefulness of the NEP 2020 model in supporting quality continuous teacher professional development.
- Discuss and get out the constraints and challenges for teachers in applying the NEP 2020 reforms.

- Provide practical recommendations for quality teacher professional development in line with NEP 2020 objectives.

7 Research Questions

8.9. Research Questions and Interpretive Analysis

How does NEP 2020 redefine the teacher's role?

What had an impact on teacher development prior to NEP 2020?

How can ongoing teacher development be put into place?

What are teachers' biggest concerns right now?

8. Discussion

8.1 Digital Divide and Resource Disadvantage: Regardless of the high aspirations of NEP 2020, their realization is faced with alarming infrastructure hurdles. Barriers in the shape of sluggish internet, absence of devices, and geographical divide are the risk of scuttling attempts at digitally inclusive teacher preparation (Gupta & Sharma, 2020). This limitation squarely falls on rural and marginalized teachers at the greatest expense, with the risk of exacerbating prevailing inequities in education.

8.2 Pedagogic Innovation: Adopting Competency-Based Learning. The transition from rote learning to competency-based pedagogy requires pedagogy systemically embedded into the classroom and brains of teachers. There is a shared concern by teachers to adopt quality pedagogy techniques because they have been trained in conventional performance systems based on examination and topic coverage (Thakur, 2025). It requires experience-based support environments and capacity development with particular emphasis on creativity, questioning to think, and relevance of practice (Sharma, 2019).

8.3 Monitoring and Evaluation: Beyond Quantitative Measures Present implementation measures mainly focus on course completion and attendance, with insufficient detail on actual pedagogical change (Singh et al., 2021). Strong processes for ongoing monitoring, classroom

observation, and follow-up coaching are required to drive policy vision into evidence-based improvement in student outcomes.

8.4 Restructuring Teacher Professional Development in NEP 2020. The core of a long-term teacher development plan is embedded in the institutionalization of mentoring as a sequential and systematic professional support system (Gupta & Sharma, 2020). Global evidence shows that systematic mentoring develops teacher professionalism and turnover, for example, in Singapore and Finland. For India, embracing similar systems entails responsiveness to diversity of institutions, teachers' workloads, and state resource disparity (Sharma, 2019). The expected cascade of mentoring has to work at three overlapping levels, underpinned by technology-supported platforms to facilitate access and participation. Institutional incentives, i.e., credit accumulation, career progression, or lighter workload for mentors, are essential to credibility (Bolitho & Padwad, 2013).

8.5 Trends of the Teacher Development Policy following Independence in India

The teacher development situation in India has experienced a sea change since Independence. State-led developments since 1947 were guided by the perspective of sensitizing teachers for mass education (Kumar, 2005). The Kothari Commission during 1964–66 and the policies of 1968 and 1986 emphasized professionalization of the teaching profession. Even then, the process was patchy and uneven. DIETs setting had imagined decentralization of training but they did not have effective infrastructure and traditional pedagogy (NCERT, 2012). SSA and RMSA followed later with new visions of ongoing professional development (CPD). Again, most of the training was more about compliance than creativity or reflection (NUEPA, 2017). NEP 2020 is a change model. It moves from teacher training to teacher empowerment as change agents (MoE, 2020).

8.6 NEP 2020 Contribution towards Supporting Continuous Professional Development

NEP 2020 supports continuous wide-ranging teacher development. NPST is aligned to develop

capacities and ethics. Learning of teachers is connected with outcomes and reflective practice by the policy. School clusters, peer mentoring, and digital platforms such as DIKSHA enable self-directed development. ICT integration supports capacity building for teachers in in-reach environments. The model places highest importance on autonomy, innovation, and continuous learning over workshop-style one-offs. The model fosters the culture of professional responsibility in line with global education trends (OECD, 2021).

8.7. NEP 2020 Reform Implementation Constraints and Challenges

Implementation continues to be a problem. The teacher training colleges in most cases are not well provided with digital resources and revised curriculum. State-level inequality impacts the rhythm of reform (Mehta, 2021). The teachers have to overwork with no time for reflection. Others are reluctance to embrace new classroom pedagogy. Resistance to change, especially by experienced teachers, remains. The digital divide also inhibits access to training in rural areas. Unless there is robust backstopping and monitoring, NEP targets are unlikely to be met.

9. Quality Teacher Professional Development Recommendation in NEP 2020

1. Develop capacity of DIETs and SCERTs as institutions of innovation with adaptive training.
2. Promote blended learning—online-offline—with access in local languages.
3. Use reflective practices based on action research, peer learning, and self-evaluation.
4. Encourage teacher professional development using reward and promotion.
5. Build mentoring networks at the school complex level for continuous guidance.
6. Align policy changes with financing, leadership support, and time to learn.

8.9. Research Questions and Interpretive Analysis

How does NEP 2020 redefine the teacher's role?

It converts teachers from knowledge-delivery staff to facilitators of creativity, ethics, and critical thinking. Teachers as fellow learners and co-creators

What had an impact on teacher development prior to NEP 2020?

Colonial histories, administrative authority, and growing education influenced past policies. Reflective practice, innovation, and capability are now shaped by globalization and ICT.

How can ongoing teacher development be put into place?

Through the introduction of digital learning networks, reflective learning groups, and embedding CPD in practice.

What are teachers' biggest concerns right now?

They are worried about digital literacy, workload, and institutional support. Inclusive systems and mentoring can address the issues.

9. Concluding Remarks:

NEP 2020 can certainly lead to long-overdue reform of teacher training, but the issues will have to be addressed squarely if this vision is to materialize. Towards an Integrated CPD System Teacher development restructuring through NEP 2020 requires a move from episodic training to a continuum of lifelong professional development. Integrated systems such as Communities of Practice, a Tiered CPD Model, a Credit-based Professional Recognition System, and a Formalized Mentorship Cascade can make professional development sustainable in India's pluralistic education system (Gupta & Sharma, 2020; Sharma, 2019).

Success hinges on institutional complementarity between local, state, and national institutions. Teacher development needs to be re conceptualized beyond administrative compliance but as an ecology of learning in which reflection, mentoring, and innovation come together to engage teachers as agents of

educational transformation (Singh et al., 2021). India's NEP 2020 sets the broadest and most visionary path to teacher development in the country's history, and that grants agency, merit-based mobility and collaborative mentorship its highest priority. But technological, infrastructural, and cultural nuances necessitate

spiral strategies and administrative grit (Gupta & Sharma, 2020). Its future will be founded upon effective integration of monitoring systems, local context sensitization, and ongoing mentoring to enable teachers to become the architects of a knowledge society in the 21st century (Sharma, 2019; Singh et al., 2021).

References

- Aithal, P. S., Aithal, S., & Kumar, P. M. (2021). *HE5: New Education Policy (NEP) 2020: A roadmap for India 2.0*. M3 Publishing.
- Bolitho, R., & Padwad, A. (2013). *Continuing professional development: A review of literature*. British Council.
- Chauhan, P. (2025, March 12). *Mudaliar Commission 1952–53: Aims, recommendations, and impact on Indian education*. Adda247. Concept of CTE. (2017, March 29). *SlideShare*. <https://www.slideshare.net>
- DIKSHA – Financing the digital transformation of education. (n.d.). *UNESCO*. <https://www.unesco.org>
- Education and National Development: Report of the Education Commission 1964–66 (Kothari Commission Report). (1966). Centre for Policy Research.
- Government of India. (1953). *Report of the Secondary Education Commission (1952–53)*. Ministry of Education.
- Government of India. (1986). *National Policy on Education 1986*. Ministry of Human Resource Development.
- Government of India. (1992). *National Policy on Education 1986: Programme of Action 1992*. Ministry of Human Resource Development.
- Government of India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Ministry of Human Resource Development.
- Gupta, A., & Sharma, R. (2020). Global best practices in teacher professional development. *Journal of Educational Research*, 14(2), 45–62.
- Hayes, D. (2000). Cascade training and teachers' professional development. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 135–145.
- Kumar, K. (2005). Political Agenda of Education: A Study of Colonialist and Nationalist Ideas Leadership for Equity. (n.d.). Rethinking professional development for teachers in India. *India Review*. <https://idronline.org>
- NCERT. (2012). [Constituent or internal report / document] — for example, the NCERT RFD 2012–13 refers to NCERT programs including in-service training. NCERT.2012-13
- NUEPA — At a Glance 2017. New Delhi: National University of Educational Planning and Administration.
- NCTE. (2009). *National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education*. National Council for Teacher Education.
- NCTE. (n.d.). *National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST) Overview*. <https://ncte.gov.in>
- NCERT. (n.d.). *NISHTHA: National Initiative for School Heads' and Teachers' Holistic Advancement*.
- Sharma, S. (2019). Teacher development in the 21st century: International trends and Indian context. *Journal of Education Policy and Practice*, 9(1), 112–128.
- Singh, R., Rind, I. A., & Sabur, A. (2021). Teacher professional development in India: A critical review. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 11(5), 1360–1371.
- Thakur, A. (2025, October 13). CBSE exam: Are teachers ready for big shift from rote learning? *The Times of India*.
- Tyagi, C., & Misra, P. K. (n.d.). In-service education of school teachers in India: Critical reflections. *International Journal of Development Research*, 7(10), 17876–17880.
- Yadav, S. K., et al. (2022). Does the cascade model work for teacher training? Analysis of teachers' experiences.