

IJRAR.ORG

E-ISSN: 2348-1269, P-ISSN: 2349-5138



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH AND ANALYTICAL REVIEWS (IJRAR) | IJRAR.ORG
An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Inclusiveness in the Indian Education System: Evaluation of the solutions offered in NEP 2020

Sri Charitha N

Lecturer in Political Science

SRR and CVR Government Degree College (A),

Vijayawada

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56975/ijrar.v13i2.331637>

Abstract

Even a cursory reading of the NEP 2020 document will reveal that Inclusiveness is one of the most important (if not the most important) objectives of the education policy of the Indian Government. The NEP 2020 gives many solutions to achieve this objective – increased expenditure on infrastructure, ramping up investment in digital infrastructure, providing education in vernacular languages, meaningfully integrating vocational, professional and academic courses, consolidating and uncomplicating regulatory frameworks, reducing class sizes, concentration on Teacher training, paying special attention to SEDGs (Socio Economically Disadvantaged Groups), addressing gender inequalities etc. An attempt has been made in this research paper to evaluate the solutions for inclusion provided in NEP 2020. For this, a comparative approach has been adopted to examine the solutions implemented by other countries. While the cultures and conditions might be different in other countries and the solutions might not be feasible for India, at least an exploration of the measures that those countries undertook might help us avoid common pitfalls and implement our education policies more effectively. Various dimensions of inclusiveness have been identified, and a dimension wise evaluation of NEP solutions has been attempted to get a thorough understanding of how inclusive NEP is, and how much more can be done.

Keywords: NEP 2020, Inclusiveness, SEDGs, Comparison of Inclusive Education Policies, Support to women students, Support to students with disabilities.

1. Introduction

In policy making, it is common knowledge that policies that work in one country cannot be transplanted to another and be expected to work in the same way. However, comparison shows us the solutions that already exist. When these solutions are implemented with the necessary changes, speedier, more efficient progress can be achieved. Besides, in this era of globalisation, when most countries are members of International Organisations like UNO and have pledged to fulfil certain global standards, studying policies of other countries becomes not just desirable but also necessary.

1.1 Background

Education is consistently regarded as one of the most important predictors of a nation’s development. Therefore, educational achievements of nations are tracked by various indices – HDI, PISA scores, World Bank school enrolment data etc. Hence any nation that is serious about development cannot neglect the quality of education of its citizens. In this context, India’s performance has not been very assuring on multiple education indices. To understand the need for a robust, inclusive education policy, one only needs to compare the educational achievements of India with those of the countries that have ranked consistently high in several indices. Given below is a table that does just that –

S.no	Country	HDI Rank (2025)	HDI Education scores		PISA 2009 scores			Universities in QS World University Rankings 2026	World Bank data on school enrolments
			Expected Years of schooling	Mean years of schooling	Reading	Math	Science		
1	Iceland	1	18.9	13.9	500	507	496	1 (Highest Rank 582)	98, 109, 76.5
2	Germany	5	17.3	14.3	497	513	520	Nearly 50 (highest rank 22)	102, 101, 78.6
3	UK	13	17.8	13.5	494	492	514	90 (highest rank 2)	103, 112, 80.5
4	USA	17	15.9	13.9	500	487	502	197 (highest rank 1)	97,97, 79.4
5	South Korea	20	16.6	12.7	539	546	538	41 (highest rank – 38)	100, 96, 106.7
6	Japan	23	15.5	12.7	520	529	539	51 (highest rank – 36)	102, 102, 64
7	France	26	16.1	11.8	496	497	498	35 (highest rank – 28)	103, 104, 70.5
8	China	78	15.5	8	556	600	575	72 (highest rank – 14)	100, 92, 76.9
9	Vietnam	93	15.5	9	Did not participate in 2009			10 (highest rank – 482)	106, 93, 37.6
10	India	130	13	6.9	72nd rank, just above Kyrgyzstan, scores not given.			54 (highest rank – 123)	121, 78, 34.4

The HDI data is part of the UNDP HDI 2025 report but the data it is based on is from 2023. The PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) is an assessment undertaken by the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) in both member and non-member nations to measure 15-year old school students' performance on mathematics, science and reading (OECD, 2025). The scores for 2009 have been given because that was the only year that India participated. We chose to stay away in the following years because we felt there was a cultural disconnect between the framework of the tests and the curriculum taught in India (Chakrabarty, 2025). Vietnam did not participate in 2009 but has been participating since 2012. In 2022, it scored close to OECD average scores (across all three test areas of Reading, Mathematics and Science), thus giving a strong showing (OECD, 2023)

Though the QS University rankings are criticised for giving disproportionate weightage to institutional visibility, stakeholder perception and research output rather than teaching quality and equity (Badiuzzman, 2025), the rankings offer at least a global perception of India's higher education institutions. Only 54 institutions made it to the list, compared to 72 from China and most of the top-ranking Indian institutions that made it to the list are IITs.

When examining the World Bank school enrolment data (the three figures given for each country are the figures for primary, secondary and tertiary level education enrolments respectively) (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2025), in other countries, the drop off between primary and secondary levels of school enrolment is not very large – the same cannot be said about the difference between the secondary and tertiary level enrolments. But in the case of India, dropout rate increases steeply from the secondary school stage itself.

From the above table, it is evident that while our country has made major strides since independence in educating its citizens, there is still a long way to go. The NEP could not have come at a better time.

1.2 National Education Policy 2020

The National Education Policy announced in 2020 addresses all the major problems faced by the education sector in India. Starting from the pre-primary stage to tertiary stage, it systematically enumerates the problems faced at each level by students, parents, teachers and the government. Plenty of solutions are offered for systematic reforms (Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, 2020). Some of them are –

- A new 5+3+3+4 structure of education constituting Foundational, Preparatory, Middle and Secondary school stages.
- No hard division between sciences and arts in higher education.
- Encouragement to teaching in mother tongue at least in the first two stages.
- Concentration on Foundational literacy and numeracy skills
- Special focus on SEDGs through cash incentives and other forms of support

- Overhauling of teacher education programmes
- Increased flexibility allowing for a hybrid combination of learning environments – online and offline.
- Greater investment in schools and libraries
- Simplifying regulatory structures to achieve twin goals of maintaining global standards without dampening private philanthropic attempts at running educational institutions.

Thus, it can be said without a doubt that the drafters of the NEP had a very good idea of the problems plaguing Indian Education system and that they meant to pursue these problems as thoroughly as possible. The first impression one gets after completely reading the NEP is that the last word on education reform in India has already been said by the drafters of the policy. And that is why it is crucial to note here that any attempt to compare the NEP with the education policies and strategies of other countries is not a criticism of those who drafted it but only an exploration of possibilities and potential next steps.

1.3 Objectives of the study

This research paper aims to evaluate the solutions given by NEP 2020 to achieve a more inclusive education. The various aspects of inclusiveness that will be examined are as follows – Investment in Education, gender inclusion, Early intervention measures for developmental milestones, pre-primary education support, Measures to improve foundational literacy and numeracy, support for differently abled students, support for neurodivergent students, access to higher education and support for SEDGs in Universities. The objectives of the study are –

- To review the various measures given in the NEP 2020 for improving inclusivity in the Indian Education system.
- To compare the strategies given in the NEP 2020 document with the best practices adopted in countries that have consistently achieved top ranks in the HDI and other education measuring indices.

1.4 Research Methodology

A mixed methods approach had been adopted in the paper. A comparative method has been selected to examine the inclusiveness improving policies of India and other countries. This method relies heavily on historical analysis (studying past policy decisions) and secondary data collected by domestic agencies in the respective countries and international agencies like the UN and World Bank.

The comparison will be made in the following aspects –

- Investment in education.
- Early childhood care and education
- Measures to improve foundational literacy and numeracy.

- Support for marginalised students – socio-economically vulnerable students, differently abled/ disabled students, and neurodivergent students.
- Access to higher education.

No one country has been considered the gold standard as each country might have met with victory in different areas of its education policy.

2. Literature review

Literature about inclusiveness in the National Education Policy can be broadly classified into two types – One type does a broad sweep of the various provisions in the NEP 2020 and attempts a critical analysis of the practicality and challenges present. The second type focuses on one particular parameter and discusses it with reference to provisions in the NEP.

Among the first type of literature, some of the notable articles have been mentioned in this section. Digvijay Singh (Singh & Mishra, 2023) focuses on whether the constitutional principles of equity and inclusion are reflected in NEP 2020. Amirullah (Amirullah, 2024) does a broad sweep of the education sector reforms in India – he looks at the inclusive policies in NEP in detail while also examining already existing inclusive policies like reservation and financial aid to vulnerable students.

One of the more comprehensive articles is by R. Rangarajan et.al (Rangarajan, Sharma, & Grove, 2025) – they clearly define inclusiveness, set a standard for it and systematically measure the various parameters of inclusiveness to see if the NEP 2020 meets them. However, this measurement is done according to education theory and beyond few instances, international best practices are not mentioned.

Khanam.S (Khanam & Ahmad, 2025) thoroughly analyses the NEP 2020 document and identifies the challenges present in its implementation. Phoghat (Phogat, 2024) does something similar but his scope is more encyclopaedic as he reviews NEPs from 1968 to 2020 for inclusiveness.

The second type of literature usually focuses on specific types of inclusiveness. For example, authors like Kushwaha et.al (Kushwaha, Joshi, Rashtrapal, & Mishra, 2023) and Jain, M. (Jain & Mishra, 2021) focus on the measures IN NEP 2020 for children with disabilities. Sarkar and Yadav (Sarkar & Yadav, 2023) concentrate on how the provisions for better teacher training should be implemented so that true inclusiveness can be achieved. Nag, S (Nag, 2024) looks into how adopting local language teaching is included in the NEP 2020 to foster inclusiveness. Sutar. D (Sutar, 2024) examines how increased investment in libraries can help the NEP 2020 impact the lives of many more students.

Thus, there is a lot of literature that talks about the overall inclusiveness in the NEP 2020 and also on how specific types of inclusiveness can be achieved. However, an exploration of international best practices in inclusive education is rather difficult to come by, especially in a single article. This paper attempts to fill that research gap.

3. Evaluation of Inclusiveness of NEP by using a comparative method

Now we will begin a systematic evaluation by comparing the seven parameters of inclusion mentioned in the 'Research methodology' section.

3.1 Investment in Education

The first parameter to compare when it comes to inclusion in Indian Education system is investment in the education sector. To make any system meaningfully inclusive, massive investment into its infrastructure is needed. Some of the countries with the best education index scores achieved inclusion because of consistent investment. Though the central budget allocation for education is increasing year on year in India, public spending (what both the central and state governments spend together on education, as it is a concurrent list subject) on education is still only 4.1% of GDP (UNESCO Institute of statistics, 2025). Denmark spends 6.4% of its GDP on education, South Korea spends 5.8%, USA spends 5.4% and UK spends 5.9% (Ibid).

One of the solutions given in NEP 2020 for increasing education investment is rationalising 'schools' by closing down schools functioning below capacity and creating school complexes (Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, 2020). This is rather contradictory because concentrating resources on school complexes would mean pupils have to travel farther to access education and this raises safety issues for students while also increasing opportunity cost of attending school especially for students belonging to socio-economically disadvantaged sections ((Rangarajan, Sharma, & Grove, 2025). Therefore, India needs to review its viability criteria and think of different solutions to optimise its expenditure on education.

3.2 Early childhood care and education

In India, early childhood education (education from 3yrs to 6yrs) is not a right. Educational research is increasingly highlighting the importance of access to early education in determining educational and economic outcomes later in life. India's investment in early childhood care and education is not very encouraging. According to the Annual Status of Education report 2024 (AESR, 2025), enrolment in early childhood care and education is highly uneven – some states fare better while others like Uttar Pradesh have discouraging reports. Budget allocation heavily leans towards education at the cost of investment in nutrition (Kapoor, Pandey, & Sharma, 2025) Statistics for 2022 indicate that, India's spending on early childhood education is

only 0.1% (Chandra, 2022) which is miles behind what Scandinavian countries invest in it. For example, In Sweden 93.7% of pre-primary education funding comes from public sources (OECD, 2025).

The NEP 2020 proposed to close this gap by coming up with a new curriculum that was in congruence with the cultural ethos of India, focused on play and storytelling. The curriculum was to be designed by the NCERT and Anganwadis were to play a crucial role. Reforms in teacher training were proposed to be brought about, for improvement in educational outcomes for children. These measures haven't been taken up substantially – teacher training is still majorly provided by private sector institutions and does not attract good talent because early child care and education is not seen as a field with fair compensation and career progression opportunities (Mondal & Mondal, 2025). This is in stark contrast to the situation in Sweden, where teachers receive pay close to the median income and are expected to have at least a bachelor's degree in teaching (Eurydice, 2024). Thus, India's education system cannot be confidently called inclusive when quality early development support is not accessible to many children in the country.

3.3 measures to improve foundational literacy and numeracy.

As mentioned in the introduction, India scored poorly in the PISA test held by OECD in 2009 and hasn't participated in it (Dhar, 2012). A credible assessment of the foundational literacy and numeracy is being done by an NGO Pratham which periodically releases reports on the status of education in India. As per the latest available data (AESR, 2025), while reading standards for standard III have improved compared to earlier years, they still show a lot of room for improvement – only 23.8% of class III students can properly read a class 2 text. Arithmetic performance is only a little bit better than reading performance – about 33% of children are able to do a numerical subtraction problem. Though NIPUN Bharath (National Initiative for Proficiency in Reading with understanding and numeracy) launched in 2021 has tasted moderate success, with students seeing gradual gains year on year, researchers have pointed out certain areas where the scheme can work better, especially using the feedback collected to further improve student and teacher performances (Jhingran, 2025).

India could learn from Singapore, whose students consistently rank high in the OECD held PISA (programme for international Student Assessment). This has been made possible by concentrating on teacher training and education – Singapore has been able to attract 10 to 30% of the top graduates to teaching because of the career progression opportunities in the field (Chen, 2024). Teachers are also assessed with the aim of helping them develop rather than just to assign them with a grade (Ibid). Centralised curriculum has also worked well for Singapore but that might not apply for India because of the size of our country and our diversity.

3.4 Support for marginalised students

Indian Government provides many schemes for the benefit of students belonging to the SC, ST and OBC communities. One of such schemes is the Pre and post matric scholarships provided for the students. The problem with these schemes is that most students are not even aware of these schemes (Mondal & Kar, 2022) and even if they are aware, the scholarships are simply not enough to meet all the expenses (hostel rent, travel expenses etc.). Even though the Right to Education Act mandates that 25% of the seats in private schools should be reserved for students belonging to low socio-economic status, such students experience isolation and discrimination in these schools and this adversely impacts how they absorb the curriculum (Khemka, 2024).

Another marginalised group of students is the differently abled/disabled student group. As of 2020, nearly 31% of disabled students were unable to attend school (Nath & Batra, 2025). Disabled students who already struggled to attend school were further pushed into the margins by the school shutdowns during COVID -19 (Ibid). The NEP 2020 talks about investing in assisting technology, improving school infrastructure, teacher training, integrating sign language in the curriculum and other measures, but these recommendations are criticised as being vague and definite timelines are not given for the implementation of these recommendations (Ibid). India also has a severe shortage of special education teachers ((Saiyam, et al., 2024). There is also the problem of inadequate training of special educators – many students, especially marginalised students, do not have access to special education institutions and regular teachers are not sufficiently adept at educating children with special needs (V S, MPM, & Karren, 2025).

While autism is a recognised disability under the Right to Disabilities Act, ADHD, a major learning disability recognised around the world, is not officially recognised in India as a disability. Though screening for ADHD is undertaken in government schools, such an exercise is not largely present in private schools. Awareness about ADHD, diagnosis for children and training for educators to teach children with ADHD are all problem areas in India which need more attention from stakeholders and policy makers (Gore & Morgan, 2025).

In contrast to the uncertain and incomplete special education policy landscape, UK has a strong embedded special education system – Education, Health and care plan (EHCP). Parents of students with SEND (Special educational needs and disabilities) can apply for an EHCP. Once their needs are assessed and the level of support they need is determined, the local council sets up an EHCP that can remain in place till age 25 (BBC, 2026). Support is available for mobility issues, communication issues and cognition issues that influence behaviour and learning ((Uk Government, n.d.). Though systematic support available in UK is more robust compared to India, it still has issues related to access and funding (BBC, 2026).

3.5 Access to higher education

The Gross enrolment ratio in higher education is 34% according to latest World Bank Data. This is far behind China's 77% and pales in comparison to Greece's 165%. We need not look far for the reason for such low enrolment ratios in India – GER rates generally mirror the socio-economic splinter lines in our society. Urban men from upper caste wealthy households are more likely than women from rural disadvantaged groups to access professional higher education. Wealth seems to be the more influencing parameter – caste and gender played less of a role in access to higher education, the wealthier the family was (Choudhury & Kumar, 2024). Low enrolment ratios are not the only cause for concern. A significant chunk of students who enrol are dropping out (nearly 25%) without finishing their degrees

4. Conclusion

India has come a long way since Independence when it comes to education – overall literacy rates have improved. Gender gap in school enrolments at all levels is slowly but surely closing. Structural inequalities in access to education are being addressed through legislations and other government measures. The NEP 2020 is doubtlessly a visionary document, which, if implemented correctly can lead to massive improvement in quality of life for billions of Indians. However, learning from the success and failures of the policies of other countries can save us a lot of time and money when implementing innovative educational policies in India. Some crucial lessons highlighted in this paper are –

- High public spending on education can lead to more equity and inclusion as evidenced by the educational policies adopted in the Nordic countries (Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland) and the other top achievers in OECD countries like Singapore, Japan and South Korea.
- Early childhood care and education cannot be neglected. In fact, it lays the foundation for the educational trajectory of the individual, determining their overall educational achievement and success in their chosen careers. One way of strengthening early childhood care and education is to invest heavily in teacher training and education. A pioneer in this area is Sweden, where early education teachers earn decent pay and are required to have at least a bachelor's degree in education.
- Foundational literacy and numeracy are crucial because they foster independent learning, reducing reliance on private tutors and coaching. Though India's performance is showing a gradual improvement, our continued reluctance to participate in PISA is concerning and indicative of ongoing anxieties about achieving foundational literacy and numeracy standards. We could follow Singapore's example in making the teaching profession attractive to top graduates in the country by providing robust career growth opportunities to teachers and also through innovative curriculum design.

- Inclusion can be meaningful only when the most marginalised have access to education. That doesn't hold true for India, at least not right now. Nearly eight decades after getting independence, inequalities along caste and gender lines still influence access to education in India. Marginalised students and their parents are largely unaware of the support schemes brought about by the government. They still face discrimination at school, especially those run by private entities. The system followed by the UK offers valuable lessons on how to offer consistent support to students from marginalised sections with local councils setting up Education, Care and Health Plans (ECHPs) that remain in place as long as students continue in the education system.
- One of the major determinants of career success and higher education is attainment of tertiary education. India has one of the lowest gross enrolment ratios in tertiary education trailing far behind countries like China, South Korea, Japan, Greece and several Nordic countries. Though NEP 2020 has come up with many policies to tackle systemic obstacles to higher education, it needs more refinement. Valuable insights can be gleaned from the Finnish education system, where equity is more important than achievement. The health and well being of individual students are focused on rather than overall educational achievement metrics. Another example that shows that focusing on individual students rather than following group policies is more effective in reducing dropout rates is that of Harvard University. Harvard University has student retention rate of 97% and this is possible because of an aggressive student support system – individual students' needs are tended to with professors and student groups offering tailor made academic support for those who need it.

Comparing policies in India with international best practices is only to finetune the NEP 2020 and not to disparage educational achievements in India, which are substantial. Despite years of colonial resource drain and systemic socio-economic issues, India has made massive gains in literacy rate, school enrolment and foundational enrolment and numeracy. However, there is still a lot of room for making the system from inclusive and the international best practices mentioned above are a good starting point in evaluating our own inclusive policies.

References

- AESR. (2025). *ASER 2024 - Rural*. New Delhi: ASER Centre.
- Amirullah. (2024). NEP 2020 and the Quest for Equity: Promoting Inclusion in Higher Education. *MANAVIKI*, 395 - 412.
- Badiuzzman, M. (2025). Unpacking the metrics: a critical analysis of the 2025 QS World University Rankings using Australian university data. *Frontiers in Education*.
- BBC. (2026, February 23). *What is SEND and how many children get support?* Retrieved from BBC: <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cwyl18y5jpw1o>
- Chakrabarty, R. (2025, March 12). *No PISA for India? Country may skip global student assessment again*. Retrieved from India Today: <https://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/news/story/india-may-drop-out-of-international-student-assessment-pisa-again-2692495-2025-03-12>

- Chandra, J. (2022, September 21). GOovernment expenditure on early childhood education a mere 0.1% of GDP. *The Hindu*.
- Chen, Q. (2024). Factors influencing High-Performing Education Systems: A Case Study of Singapore. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*.
- Choudhury, P. K., & Kumar, A. (2024). Socioeconomic Inequality in Accessing Professional Higher Education in India: New evidence from a Household Survey. *The Indian Economic Journal*.
- Dhar, A. (2012, January 16). Indian students fare poorly in International evaluation test. *The Hindu*.
- Eurydice. (2024). *Conditions of service for teachers working in early childhood and school education*. European Commission.
- Eurydice. (2025, June 19). *Finland*. Retrieved from Eurydice: <https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/euryperia/finland/overview#:~:text=A%20key%20feature%20of%20the,government%20transfers%20are%20not%20earmarked>.
- Gore, M., & Morgan, J. (2025). Children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder in India: Strengthening Diagnosis, Support, Training and Research. *Journal of Indian Association for Child and Adolescent Mental Health*.
- Jain, M., & Mishra, S. K. (2021). Inclusive education in NEP 2020: Looking Beyond Horizon. *TISS Journal of Disability Studies and Research*, 110-135.
- Jhingran, D. (2025). Improving Learning Outcomes at Scale, Learning from system-focused programmes. In V. N. V, V. Sarup, D. Anuradha, & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Improving Learning Outcomes in Schools*. Routledge.
- Kapur, A., Pandey, S., & Sharma, A. (2025, January 10th). *Investing in India's children: A look at Child Budgets*. Retrieved from The Hindu Centre for Politics and Public Policy: [https://www.thehinducentre.com/the-arena/current-issues/investing-in-indias-children-a-look-at-child-budgets/article69076140.ece#:~:text=and%20protection%20services,-,As%20a%20share%20of%20the%20country's%20Gross%20Domestic%20Product%20\(GDP,21%20and%20202](https://www.thehinducentre.com/the-arena/current-issues/investing-in-indias-children-a-look-at-child-budgets/article69076140.ece#:~:text=and%20protection%20services,-,As%20a%20share%20of%20the%20country's%20Gross%20Domestic%20Product%20(GDP,21%20and%20202)
- Khanam, S., & Ahmad, J. (2025). Transformation of Indian Education through Inclusive Practices under NEP 2020. *Shodhpatra: International Journal of Science and Humanities*, 92-104.
- Khemka, S. (2024). Access to private schooling under the Right to Education Act in Rajasthan, India: Exploring exclusion amongst the Scheduled caste groups. *University of Cambridge*.
- Kushwaha, R. K., Joshi, A. D., Rashtrapal, A. D., & Mishra, G. (2023). *Diversified Dimensions of Special Education*. Blue Rose Publishers.
- Leland. (2025, June 14). *Harvard Graduation Rate: Employment Overview and Analysis*. Retrieved from Leland: <https://www.joinleland.com/library/a/harvard-graduation-rate-analysis>
- Ma, L., Gan, Y., & Huang, P. (2024). Higher education investment, human capital, and high-quality economic development. *Finance Research Letters*.
- Malhotra, A. (2026, February3). Higher education in Union Budget 2026: Pivot to market readiness, skilling. *The Hindu*.
- Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*.
- Mondal, A., & Kar, S. (2022). Awareness level of SC students about different caste-based incentives schemes of Government. *Journal of emerging technologies and innovative reasearch*.
- Mondal, A., & Mondal, P. (2025). Early Childhood care and education (ECCE) in India in the light of National Education Policy 2020: a reality check. *International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early years Education*.

- Nag, S. (2024). Language as a tool for Inclusive and Equitable School Education: A critical review of NEP 2020. *Contemporary Education Dialogue*.
- Nath, A., & Batra, R. (2025). The capabilities approach to education of disabled children: reimagining policy framework for inclusive education in India. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*.
- OECD. (2010). *PISA 2009 Results: What Students Know and Can Do: Student Performance in Reading, Mathematics and Science (Volume I)*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2023). *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I and II) Country Notes: Viet Nam*.
- OECD. (2025). *Education at a Glance 2025: Sweden*. OECD.
- OECD. (2025). *Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)*. Retrieved from OECD: <https://www.oecd.org/en/about/programmes/pisa.html>
- Phogat, C. (2024). Mapping the Provisions for Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education in the Indian Education Policy documents: NEP 1968 to NEP 2020. In V. Dutta, & P. (. Ghosh, *Sustainability: Science, Policy and Practice in India*. Springer.
- Rangarajan, R., Sharma, U., & Grove, C. (2025). Inclusion and equity in India's new National Education Policy (NEP): an analysis using the Context Led Model of Education Quality. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*.
- Saiyam, Y. S., Sahu, M., Koshale, S., Sontake, P., Thakur, M., & Sharma, H. (2024). The Future of Special Education in India: Challenges, Opportunities and Innovation. *International Journal of Social Impact*.
- Sarkar, L., & Yadav, S. (2023). Teacher Preparation for Inclusive education - Intervention of NEP 2020. *International Research Journal of Educational psychology*, 6-10.
- Shekhar, U. (2026, January 30). UGC's anti-discrimination rules: What has changed, what has improved and what still concerns experts. *The Hindu*.
- Singh, D., & Mishra, R. S. (2023). Approaches, Equity and Inclusion in Indian Education: Constitutional Principles and NEP 2020. *BSSS Journal of Education*, 106 - 117.
- Sutar, D. B. (2024). Libraries and National Education Policy (NEP 2020) of India in Higher Education. *Library Hi Tech news*, 12-16.
- The Hindu Editorial Board. (2025, February 5). Learning steps: On the union Budget. *The Hindu*.
- Uk Government. (n.d.). *Children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND)*. Retrieved from Gov. uk: <https://www.gov.uk/children-with-special-educational-needs>
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2025). *School enrolment, primary (% gross)*. UNESCO.
- UNESCO Institute of statistics. (2025, September). *Government expenditure on education, total (% of GDP)*. Retrieved from World Bank Group data: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.XPD.TOTL.GD.ZS>
- V S, T. R., MPM, P. K., & Karren, J. (2025). Understanding the disconnect: A study on competency of special educators in autism education in India. *Support for learning*, 334-342.
- Venkatadri, N., & G.V., R. K. (2025). Analysis of Student Dropouts in Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Technology*, 3353 - 3358.