



## NEP 2020 : ANALYSED WITH KUT LEVIN'S CHANGE THEORY

Divy Tiwari and Divyansh Tripathi

Department of History, Ramjas College, University Of Delhi

\*Corresponding Author: [tiwaridivy11@gmail.com](mailto:tiwaridivy11@gmail.com), [divyanshtripathi429@gmail.com](mailto:divyanshtripathi429@gmail.com)

Communicated : 08.01.2025

Revision : 09.02.2025

Accepted : 20.03.2025

Published: 30.05.2025

### ABSTRACT:

There have been a lot of attempts to transform the education system of India. Every policy has its own share of contributions, but they failed to touch upon some very critical areas. NEP2020 is like a gush of fresh air, and a lot has been written and discussed about it. This has created some unnecessary anxieties about the way it is moving forward. This paper navigates through these questions with Kut Levin's prism of theory of change backed with content analysis to have a nuanced understanding of its impact on ground.

**Keywords:** NEP 2020, Education, Indian Education System, UGC.

### INTRODUCTION :

It was in the constituent assembly of India that this country's tryst with education occurred because that is where the future of this republic was going to be penned by its founders. India, which was mainly an illiterate country, promised itself that it will give its people fertile ground in order to tap into potential.

A nation that was besieged by religious superstitions, fanaticism, and inequalities based on class-caste, it was of crucial importance that quality education prevails in order to make this country achieve the richness as it did when the world called it the golden bird. That is how they recognized that education is key to that image of a free, democratic, and equal country. Not that it was only a tool of personal empowerment in their view, but it was a collective effort that was of paramount importance in building a just and inclusive society.

One of the welfare objectives that was sought after by figures like Ambedkar, Nehru and Maulana Azad was Universal access to Education, which was not prevailing in quality as it should prevail when India became independent.

Dr.Ambedkar, who firmly championed dalit rights, went so far as to claim that education constituted the "weapon" of the oppressed.Azad, who later became the first education minister in free India, particularly focused upon the contribution of education to nation-building and empowerment of minorities. But financial and legislative constraints as a new-found country, prevented it from providing education as a fundamental right.

Our forefathers envisioned something so marvelous that after years of analysis and improvement, We are today witnessing Policies like NEP 2020. This policy not only allows us to provide quality education on ground zero but also reflects the flexibility to adapt with the ever Changing world.

However it's not possible that what all NEP promises will be delivered overnight, so obviously there will be a transition phase in which the adaptive measures will be taken by Educators and administration to achieve NEP's aims and objectives.

This paper appreciates the vision and nuances of NEP 2020 and analyses this transition phase reflecting challenges faced by students after NEP

2020 came into effect, which may resolve more quickly if this transition phase will be analysed more quickly as Kut Levin's change model proposes that change happens in 3 stages.

1. UNFREEZE - To recognise the need for change to break Old habits

**NEP recognised the need to reform the education sector.**

2. Change ( Transition) - Actual Phase where practices are introduced, but this phase comes with instability and challenges

Today we are witnessing this current phase and naturally facing challenges to better adapt with the new system.

3. Refreeze - Institutionalising the new System so that it becomes easier for us to make it a norm.

This research analyses these transitional challenges which we have to overcome to cement the vision of NEP 2020.

### **Background History**

The Indian Education System's history is profoundly shaped by the negotiations which happened among the British when they were ruling in India. They not only Anglicised the educational patterns in India but also institutionalized the roots of Classroom and University education which Indian students are receiving today. When the Charter Act of 1813 for the first time allocated funds for Indian Education, it gave birth to a debate between Orientalists who advocated for traditional Indian Education (Gurukuls, Madrasas etc) and Anglicists who supported Western style of Education. However this debate got settled with the intervention of Macaulay and his minutes (1835- Macaulay Minutes), which became the foundation of how Indians will receive education but, the most comprehensive policy or often called the Magna Carta of English Education in India arrived with the Wood's Dispatch of 1854 because it talked about a structural system which was advocating for the establishment of a

Department of Public Instruction in each province and was proposing the setting of Universities in Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. It's very important to understand and analyze these Historical developments because they act as a catalyst in developing our Understanding of Indian Education and help us to frame better tools of analysis to effectively understand NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY 2020. Talking of Wood's Dispatch, English was proposed to be the medium of Higher education and Like NEP vernacular languages were also given some limelight as they were the proposed medium for primary and secondary Education.

These policies evolved with the 1882's Hunter commission which focussed on improving primary education and talked about a two tier system for secondary education separating them into vocational and University studies. After this another major development happened in 1917 which talked about enhancing the quality of University education. Finally in 1944 Sargent Plan decided to make Indian Education on par with England within 40 years proposing universal and compulsory elementary education. We can easily understand the roots of British style colleges and Right to Education by understanding these changes which reflect the importance of Education at an institutional level. Times evolved and now it is on our shoulders to design educational frameworks for our children.

### **After Independence Initiatives**

Directive Principle of State Policy under Article 45 of the Constitution of India, that "the State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years." Not legally enforceable at that time. University Education Commission(1948-1949)- The then prevailing university pattern was chiefly a legacy of colonialism, which was

convenient to colonial masters.

Thus, there was a need in the country to establish a new pattern of university education in line with the objectives of India's economic development, and of scientific advancement. The commission, which was headed by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, looked at what university education was, and made recommendations in regard to enhancing quality, autonomy, teacher education and research. It emphatically called upon academic freedom, university autonomy and freedom of thought and expression, to make the university centers of autonomous inquiry. It emphasized that undergraduate education should be restructured to be more broad-based and interdisciplinary. The commission recommended the introduction of a credit-based system, tutorial classes for personalized learning, and a semester system. We see that the above recommendations were only implemented efficiently with the NEP2020. The commission proposed that research and postgraduate education be strengthened to make universities dynamic centers of knowledge creation.

It recommended establishing the University Grant Commission (UGC) to coordinate, fund, and maintain standards in higher education institutions. This was implemented in 1956 by the establishment of UGC, which will continue to function till the establishment of Higher education commission of India (HECI), as proposed by NEP 2020. It also emphasized on using regional languages at the undergraduate level while retaining English at postgraduate and research education, to make education more accessible without compromising global relevance. While the commission's vision was far-reaching, implementation was partial and slow. One of its most significant impacts was the establishment of the University Grants Commission (UGC) in 1953, which continues to regulate and fund higher education institutions

in India. While tutorial systems and semester-based models were adopted in some universities, they were not implemented uniformly across the country. Similarly, the use of regional languages in undergraduate education saw uneven success due to linguistic diversity and practical challenges. Its recommendation on improving teacher status and salaries was acknowledged, but resource limitations and growing student populations made comprehensive reform difficult. Secondary Education Commission (1952-53)- The Secondary Education Commission

(1952-53) that came to be known as the Mudaliar Commission was then set up to revamp secondary education. Diversification of curricula, vocational streams, reducing examination loads, and development of character were emphasized. The commission also recommended a three-level educational ladder (8 years elementary, 3 years secondary, and 2 years higher secondary) that later went to inspire the 10+2+3 pattern. But as always, recommendations suffered due to flawed implementation, mainly due to non-cooperation at both central and at state government levels as also due to non-availability of funds.

D.S.Kothari Commission( 19G4-GG)- This commission is regarded as the most comprehensive and influential, chaired by Dr. D.S.Kothari, a well known figure in University of Delhi, for his glorious career with Kothari centre of science and Education and a postgraduate hostel named after him. It addressed all aspects of education and called for a national system of education based on equality, quality, and accountability. Its landmark recommendations included the adoption of the 10+2+3 structure, the introduction of a common school system, greater investment in education (G% of GDP), and integration of work experience and moral values into the curriculum. It emphasized the need for teacher training, curriculum reform,

and the use of science and technology in education. The National Policy on Education (19G8) was largely based on its recommendations. However, the failure to implement the common school system and underinvestment in public education remained major drawbacks. Additionally, the commission's idealistic vision often clashed with the ground realities of regional disparities and administrative bottlenecks, something which was duly addressed in NEP2020.

10+2+3 pattern attained wide acceptance in states and remains the basis of Indian education, until NEP2020's 5+3+3+4 supplanted it. The government also initiated the first National Policy on Education in 19G8, fundamentally grounded in Kothari Commission's report. The policy included the three-language formula, encouraged scientific and technical studies, and favored the use of local languages. An attempt was made at vocationalizing education at the higher secondary level and further improving teacher education by strengthening institutions such as NCERT and SCERTs. The Common School System and a few more cornerstone recommendations, though, did not become a reality due to opposition from politicians, lack of unanimity among states, and due to burgeoning private and elite sector schools that proliferated and intensified inequality. The higher spending of up to G% of GDP as a target for education costs was never attained consecutively, as it usually hovered around 3–4%. Value education and work exposure recommendations found places in school instruction, though often in superficial and poorly executed manners.

Article 21A and 51(k) - In response to increasing calls for more accessible and more equal education, the government at long last added Article 21A and Article 51A(k) by virtue of this historical 8Gth constitutional amendment in 2002, whereby it added education as a

fundamental right—something that must be provided by the state, failure of which would enable its citizenry to turn to the supreme court through article 32 in order to impose the same. This amendment also placed a corresponding duty on parents (Article 51A(k)) to ensure their children attend school. The idea behind was to prevent children from child labor so that to ensure economic hardship is not an excuse for keeping children out of school and forcing them into work. Article 21A, inserted by the 8Gth Constitutional Amendment Act, 2002, guarantees the right to free and compulsory education for children between G and 14 years as a fundamental right. It places an obligation on the State to ensure that every child receives basic education, thereby expanding the scope of Article 21 (Right to Life and Personal Liberty). This provision is transformative because it redefines "life with dignity" as impossible without access to elementary education. Parallelly, Article 51A(k) imposes a fundamental duty on parents or guardians to provide opportunities for education to their children in this age group. Both the articles work in tandem as for children, Article 21A ensures that socio-economic background cannot be a barrier to accessing education while, Article 51A(k) strengthens this by reminding families of their duty to actively facilitate education. In a broader sense, we can see how NEP2020 implements the spirit of Article 21A and 51A(k) on the ground in the modern context, as it shifts focus from rote learning to holistic development, early childhood care and flexible curriculum, recognizing that education is not just about access but also about quality and relevance. NEP 2020 does this by extending the scope of Article 21A beyond the G–14 age bracket. This broadens the constitutional promise and aligns with the fundamental duty under Article 51A(k), as it expects families and communities to value lifelong learning and active participation in their

children's educational journey. Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 and its role in implementing the vision of Article 21a and 51(k) - As seen above, both the article sets the motion but its implementation rests on the shoulder of the statutes passed by the parliament- RTE act, 2009, which is the primary legislation that gives operational meaning to Article 21a and 51A(k). While Article 21A guarantees education as a fundamental right for children aged G-14, the RTE Act lays down the framework for how this right is to be realised: free and compulsory schooling, minimum infrastructure norms, teacher-student ratios, quality benchmarks, and 25% reservation in private schools for disadvantaged groups. In doing so, the Act ensures that the constitutional promise is not just symbolic but enforceable in practice. Article 51A(k), which makes it the duty of parents or guardians to provide education to their children, is also strengthened by the RTE Act. By mandating compulsory enrolment and attendance, the law nudges parents to fulfil their constitutional duty, thereby creating a balance between State responsibility and parental obligation. The Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 safeguards the right to education for children in need of care and protection. The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 201G mandates inclusive education, ensuring that differently-abled children are not left behind. Similarly, the National Commission for Protection of Child Rights Act, 2005 monitors the enforcement of the RTE Act, while the Minority Educational Institutions Act, 2004 protects the cultural and educational rights of minorities, reflecting the inclusivity envisaged by the Constitution. In this broader context, these acts create a comprehensive ecosystem, a spider web, where the right to education is guaranteed, enforced, and monitored.

National Education Policy, 2020- The National Education Policy was formulated in this

background of what was transpiring in Indian education. The commissions and amendments that had been in place earlier could not tackle a few of the key issues: teacher education, vocational education, adaptation and technology, research, early childhood care and education (ECCE), holistic and interdisciplinary education, and universal access to education.

#### **NEP RESOLVES**

1) **Universal foundation literacy and numeracy (FLN)**- One of its key aims was to reach universal foundation literacy and numeracy (FLN) by 202G-27, acknowledging that early learning underpins long-term educational achievement. FLN refers to a child being equipped to read with confidence and understanding and being able to do basic arithmetic calculations by the end of Grade 3. They are the simplest foundations of learning; without them, children are unable to access the remainder of the curriculum and tend to get further behind as they get older.

NEP recognises the need for universal foundation literacy and numeracy, in sync with Kut Levin's UNFREEZE, something which was neglected in the previous policies , So to understand the challenges of second its better to examine the critiques, and one of the best secondary sources to understand these educational patterns is Pratham NGO ' ASER report.

ASER (Annual Status of Education Report) still reveals that even at higher grades, students are not even able to read easy writing or divide numbers by hand.

To tackle this problem, the government introduced the NIPUN Bharat Mission in 2021. The purpose is to ensure that all kids in India can read and perform basic arithmetic by Grade 3. The year in which the government aims to accomplish this is 202G-27. The argument is that if kids are not introduced to basic knowledge early in life, then later in school life,

it will be problematic. The program is particularly effective in cases of kids who are poor or come from deprived backgrounds. The initiative involves training teachers, enhancing textbooks and pedagogy, and periodically reviewing whether kids are learning anything or not. There has been a little improvement, as per the ASER Report 2024.

Approximately 23.4 percent of Government school Grade 3 students could read at Grade 2 level. That figure was 1G.3 percent in 2022. Basic calculation also improved. 33.7 percent of Grade 3 children could subtract in 2024 compared to 28.2 percent in 2018. Some of the states like Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, and Odisha performed much better. Those states made gains of over 10 percentage points in reading and numbers proficiency. Despite this improvement, there remain numerous issues. Most early grade students are yet unable to reach learning grades that are expected of them. Some states like Punjab and Andhra Pradesh made little gains. The program is mainly concentrated among children in Grade 1-3. However, higher-class students who lacked early learning continue to struggle. Most teachers are yet to get proper training. Most rural schools lack materials and resources needed to teach effectively. The digital divide is also a concern as most children lack access to online learning resources at home. This reflects that NEP is effective but it may take time as we lack optimum resources to cater these visionary demands.

**2) Curriculum and Pedagogy Reform-** The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 brought key changes in curriculum and pedagogy aimed at converting learning into more meaningful and reduced rote memorization. The old 10+2 pattern was substituted by a new 5+3+3+4 pattern and encouraged using mother tongue or local language as a mode of instruction in early grades.

It encourages activity-based and play-based learning in early years and accommodates flexibility in selection of subjects and integration of vocational studies, art, and life skills. There is some positive

trend observed over time since this policy was introduced. As per the ASER 2024 report, roughly 23.4 percent of Grade 3 students in government schools could read at a Grade 2 level, improving upon 1G.3 percent in 2022. Likewise, arithmetic skills like subtraction also registered improvements, with 33.7 percent of students showing this proficiency in 2024 compared to roughly 2G percent in 2022.

Learning achievement in Class 5 also registered signs of recovery and was back at pre-pandemic status. Nevertheless, despite such encouraging signs, overall improvement remains slow and patchy, which is natural and nothing to worry about as this is end of Second stage and the transition into third stage, so this REFREEZE structure makes us less anxious but also beware of us of the fact that to fully move to the next stage, we need to continuously reform our practices when it comes to Implementation. For example, When we tried to talking to school teachers, we got to know that things are improving and NEP is a great policy as its making studies interesting for the Child especially at an early age, but still many of their practical projects are done by their parents at home so you can't check if the child is grabbing that knowledge or not. Adding more to it there are innumerable workshops to train these teachers but they are not interesting enough as they only focus on whether their content is delivered to the audience or not. There is no mechanism to test the teacher if they actually caught the concept or not. This practical delivery approach has increased the learning of new concepts for these teachers but if they are paid for this new learning, this issue still prevails. Overall NEP is helping these students

but there are some minor loopholes which if corrected, it can become a spectacular policy with strong foundations.

When compared to previous policies such as the Kothari Commission of 19G4 to GG, which also called for a flexible and relevant curriculum, NEP 2020 places more focus on how students learn and work to enhance quality instead of merely adding access. While previous policies primarily concentrated mainly upon enrolment and infrastructure, NEP 2020 makes a more robust argument in favor of learner-centered education and curriculum changes. In short NEP 2020 has made a great foundation and registered initial success, which shows that the transition to the second phase is consistent, in sync

and positive and, if continued in this degree and manner, the remaining host of structural issues will be resolved in order to reach its full potential across the country within its stipulated time period.

### 3) Restructuring and Multidisciplinary reforms-

NEP 2020 wishes to transform higher education by challenging institutions to be multidisciplinary. The notion is that rather than single-stream colleges (only engineering, only arts, only business etc.) colleges should have multiple streams under one institution, foster cross-discipline research, allow more flexible choices of courses, multiple entry and exit, and a credit-bank model. The policy also wishes by 2040, all higher education institutions (HEIs) to be multidisciplinary, to possess larger student numbers (thousands of students) so infrastructure and faculty are utilized optimally, and by 2030 at least one large multidisciplinary HEI within/around every district. One tangible reform is in the form of the Academic Bank of Credits (ABC) that enables students to gather credits across different institutions and avail them towards degrees, flexible transfers, and multiple exit/entry opportunities. Until early

2024 more than 3 crore students registered on the ABC platform and around 1G93 institutions (Universities and institutions of National Importance) registered.

Another aspect is the proposal to establish the Higher Education Commission of India (HECI) in place of current regulators such as UGC, AICTE etc. The proposal is for a single regulator with distinguishable verticals for accreditation, regulation, finance, academic standards. Up to 2025 the HECI bill is being formulated. Despite such measures though, there are limitations and gaps. Firstly, by getting many students enrolled on ABC does not necessarily translate into widespread use of its flexibilities across the country. Large numbers of students in small colleges in rural areas might struggle in moving credits or getting equivalent grades. Secondly, it might be challenging for many current institutions lacking infrastructure, faculties across disciplines, finances etc. to meet the mandate of becoming multidisciplinary and big. Thirdly, HECI bill has yet to pass so regulation is still fragmented. Fourthly, there is fear that emphasis placed on being multidisciplinary might lead to diminishing time or effort devoted to core/foundational disciplines (e.g. arts, pure sciences, root courses) should students or institutions dilute resources thinly across multiple disciplines. Some faculties fear that core disciplines might suffer in rigor should discipline-specialized faculties be under-supported or should cross-discipline imperatives distract attention.

Compared to earlier policies and commissions: Earlier commissions like the Kothari Commission (19G4-GG) urged relevant curriculum, value education, flexibility, and vocationalisation but did not stress multidisciplinary institutions at every district nor credit banking. They tended to work in the pre-existing streams model. The earlier National

Policies of Education (19G8, 198G) too stressed access, equity, and relevance of curriculum but not so institutional restructuring at scale with inter-discipline mobility. This shows how the earlier commissions and polices lacked in UNFREEZE, by failing to recognise the need to break the old habits and here the NEP 2020 has more leeway in this respect. In terms of success so far: The ABC registration numbers are one of the more robust measures of qualitative progress. Having 3 crore students and more than 1700 institutions registered means that numerous HEIs are involved. Yet several institutions remain in a single stream mode. Again, rural colleges and small colleges may struggle to transform to multidisciplinary models or teach courses in disciplines that they did not previously.

This is something which is intrinsic in the second phase where we will observe some irritation in the system as it prepares itself to accommodate new changes which would be adjusted with time and effort.

The curriculum has been shortened, and while trying to offer more courses in terms of semesters and holidays, NEP sometimes when implemented without optimum resources, dilutes the content and seriousness of core courses which reduces academic rigour. This is a challenge which we need to overcome to move in third stage.

Earlier, professors had a whole year to teach topics and could spend more time on important ones. Now, due to the semester system, teaching has become hurried and diluted in the name of interdisciplinarity and flexibility. For example, previously teachers had to maintain a workload of 1G hours for assistant professors and 14 for associate professors. But because of NEP and lack of financial resources, departments sometimes do not hire specialized faculty. However NEP does not restrict departments to hire faculty but realistically it is not possible for

departments to hire many Professors. To meet their teaching load requirements, non-specialized professors have to take these courses. This fails to give students the exposure and interdisciplinary experience NEP aims for and wastes a lot of their time and energy. Furthermore, due to lack of classrooms and labs—because new courses have been added but infrastructure has not kept pace—the efficiency of NEP reforms is hindered. Now in most of the colleges it may be possible that this problem does not prevail but in some colleges this is a very serious issue. It may be possible that because it is a transition face that's why in some time or years the system will adapt to NEP. We can say this on the basis of trends NEP has shown from the first phase to Second phase, but this brunt of transition is faced by current batches as expected by Kut Levin's transition phase –Actual Phase where practices are introduced, but this phase comes with instability and challenges.

This is not the case in every college but relevant data should be collected about these resources so that we can implement the policy in better manner.

**4) Teacher Training Reforms-** NEP 2020 outlines central changes in teacher training, pre-service (before teachers join service) and in-service (after teachers join service). One of the major reforms is that by 2030, fresh teachers should possess a four-year integrated B.Ed degree, in place of shorter duration two-year or one-year degrees. The policy also includes the National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education (NCFTE) 2021 to update university teacher education programs. Another reform is expanding in-service training under programmes such as NISHTHA and NEP-PDP so that working teachers get regular professional development. The policy aims to align teacher training with foundational literacy and numeracy (FLN) goals, so early-grade pedagogy training becomes more

important. Also teacher training is to cover interdisciplinary skills and new pedagogies to match other reforms. will revolutionize Indian education forever. Some data shows NEP 2020 has made progress in teacher training. As of 2025 over 12.97 lakh teachers have been trained under NISHTHA according to a report of achievements. Also more than 4 lakh teachers have received training under the NEP-PDP (Professional Development Programme) via digital platforms like DIKSHA and PM e-Vidya. Many higher education institutions have reported that large proportions of faculty members participated in professional development initiatives. There is also evidence from a QS Report that more than 92% of faculty have undergone some professional development programmes. However there are also gaps and failures. Many teachers say they did not get enough training or enough time to adapt to new pedagogies. For example a survey (National Achievement Survey NAS-2021) found about 45% of school teachers reported being overloaded with work. Only 58% of teachers said they took part in discussions around NEP reforms. There are many vacant teaching posts especially in elementary and secondary levels that make training harder to execute properly. Also teacher education institutions often lack staff who are specially trained in early grade pedagogy or FLN methods. Earlier commissions and policies (e.g. Kothari Commission, National Policies of Education 19G8, 198G) also emphasized teacher training and teacher professional development. Recommended better teacher preparation colleges, regular refresher courses, higher qualifications, and raising teacher status. But such earlier policies never meant a uniform mandate offour-year integrated B.Ed, nor tied teacher education so indelibly with initial literacy and numeracy, nor with new pedagogies such as in NEP 2020. Nor did such earlier policies usually highlight digital media,

nor use of online/ blending mode of training. One specific issue is how many classes a teacher has to take. Under NEP, changes in structure (semester systems, transient or transitional batches) sometimes reduce the total number of teaching hours or require teachers to take more papers outside their specialization in order to meet load requirements.

Because of transient batches (for example when degree programmes change under NEP or when courses are reshuffled), some teachers are required to cover subjects they are less trained in or to handle higher load in core subjects as well as new electives. This can weaken depth of teaching in core subjects and make training less effective, since teacher time gets divided among many tasks. There is no publicly available large-scale data (yet) that shows exactly how the class load change under NEP has affected student outcomes in core subjects. During our interactions with professors from different fields, one common point was that the number of classes has been reduced from five to three. The syllabus has been condensed, and in an attempt to provide more courses through semesters and vacations, NEP has, in a sense, diluted the essence and rigor of core subjects. Earlier, professors had a whole year to teach topics and could spend more time on important ones. Now, due to the semester system, teaching has become hurried and diluted in the name of interdisciplinarity and flexibility. For example, previously teachers had to maintain a workload of 1G hours for assistant professors and 14 for associate professors. But because of NEP and lack of financial resources, departments sometimes do not hire specialized faculty. To meet their teaching load requirements, non-specialized professors have to take these courses and there is no one to check if that professor can actually Teach that course. There is no mandatory internship attached with the course so if the student got the exposure or not we

can't really say. Furthermore, due to lack of classrooms and labs—because new courses have been added but infrastructure has not kept pace—the efficiency of NEP reforms is hindered.

### **CONCLUSION :**

As it is a proven fact that NEP is a well drafted document which aims to reform Indian Education system with the best of nation 's ability. Now as citizens its our duty make this policy a success and think of possible ways in which we can implement the policy. NEP faces and faced many critiques, but when We try to structure NEP with Kut Levin's change theory we comes in a better position to empathise with the policymakers and Education leaders of our time . We can develop an outstanding understanding of acceptance that it's very hard to implement such a policy in few years so implementation challenges will arrive and they are natural, but when we reduce our anxieties and try to think of solutions, NEP can become the foundation of the revolutionary Education system of India.

### **REFERENCES**

Best Colleges. "Bridging the Teacher Training Gap for Effective NEP Implementation." August 23, 2024.  
<https://bestcolleges.indiatoday.in/news-detail/bridging-the-teacher-training-gap-for-effective-nep-implementation>.

The Indian Express. "ASER 2024 Survey Highlights: Education and Childhood." January 29, 2025.

<https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/aser-2024-survey-highlights-education-childhood-9804229/lite/>.

The Indian Express, Editorial. "ASER 2024: Good News, Mountain to Climb." February G, 2025.

<https://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/aser-2024-good-news-mountain-climb-98 21521/>.

The Indian Express, Editorial. "Behind NEP's Success Story, the Real Heroes." February 1, 2025.

<https://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/behind-neps-success-story-the-real-heroes-9810517/>.

Ministry of Education, Government of India. National Curriculum Framework for School Education 2023. July 29, 2023.  
[https://dseb.education.gov.in/sites/default/files/guidelines/ncf\\_2023.pdf](https://dseb.education.gov.in/sites/default/files/guidelines/ncf_2023.pdf).

G. Prosci. "What Is Lewin's Change Theory? Explanation, Pros and Cons." October 1, 2024.  
<https://www.prosci.com/blog/lewin's-change-theory>.