

Impact of NEP 2020 on Teacher Education in India: Implementation Challenges and Opportunities

Abstract:

The National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) Is A Large-Scale Change Initiative in Indian education and teacher education, which focuses on holistic education, multidisciplinary reform, and improved preparation of teachers. This paper discusses the impact of NEP 2020 on teacher education in India based on secondary literature to outline the main challenges in implementation and the new opportunities. The paper presents purposes in terms of knowledge of these issues and opportunities exploration, through a critical review of seven relevant studies. The discussion employs the documentary and literature-analysis methodology, tracking how the teacher-education programmes are re-oriented (e.g., four-year B.Ed., continuous professional development, digital pedagogy), as well as examining their outcomes. The article concludes that NEP 2020 has a transformational potential in the area of teacher education, with more integrated curricula, emphasis on pedagogical capacity, and professionalism, and the reality on the ground is the lack of resources, issues with institutional readiness, and the inconsistency in implementation across the states. Opportunities are multidisciplinary teacher-training institutes, combined digital action education and enhanced research in teacher training. The paper ends with a few recommendations to policy actors and teacher-educators so that the vision of NEP can be converted into practice.

Keywords: NEP 2020, Teacher Education, Implementation Challenges, India, Opportunities.

1. Introduction:

The education architecture in India has greatly changed following the development and publication of the National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020). The vision of the policy is the shift of rote-learning systems to the deep learning, critical thinking, and holistic development

of the learners. Teacher education becomes one of the central aspects within this transformational vision. The quality of the education is based on the quality, preparation, and the continued improvement of the teachers, which is the basic principle of the whole process of quality education as stated in the policy document itself. The teacher education is therefore not instrumental but a core part of the reform agenda.

Teacher education in India has traditionally been faced with a number of problems: obsolete curriculum, irrelevance with classroom practices, insufficient infrastructure and practicum training, poor professional growth, and insufficient research orientation. As NEP 2020, with its ambitious goals, including the one that no less than four-year integrated B.Ed. is the minimum qualification of a teacher in 2030, the development of teacher education, teachers-preparation institutions, and continuous professional development must be the key factors influencing this change, the questions become critical: How is teacher education being affected? What are the obstacles to the implementation of these reforms? And, what are the possibilities of changing the teacher training and professional development in India?

The current article attempts to answer these questions by conducting a review of second-hand literature about the effect of NEP 2020 on teacher education in India, charting the key challenges, defining the opportunities as they emerge, and expressing the policy and practice implications.

1.1 Terminology Description:

Teacher Education: The act of training people to teach, both before (pre-service training (first-degree course programmes like B.Ed., integrated teacher-education degrees), and during (in-service or continuous professional development (CPD)) their careers.

NEP 2020: The National Education Policy by the Government of India of 2020 that supersedes previous policies and provides a detailed framework of schooling, higher education and teacher education.

Implementation Challenges: The barriers, limitations and bottlenecks facing the translation of policy directives into practice, the lack of infrastructure, the institutional capacity, teacher preparedness, curriculum redesign, and regulatory mechanisms.

Opportunities: Opportunities or openings or potentials of improvement and reform due to policy changes e.g. new model of programmes, digital pedagogy, new integrative teacher-training institutes.

Four-year integrated B.Ed.: According to NEP 2020, the transition to the four-year integrated teacher-education degree (including aspects of both undergraduate and teacher-preparation programs) that will be the minimum qualification of school teachers in India in 2030.

Continuous Professional Development (CPD): Professional learning opportunities of in-service teachers, such as mentoring, peer learning, workshops, online courses that should help teachers to deepen their pedagogical, content and professional skills.

2. Review of Literature:

Ashokkumar, T. (2025). “Analyzing the impact of the new educational policy 2020.” This paper presents a review of NEP 2020 in India, placing it in the context of educational reform trends in the world. The analysis concludes that NEP competency-based development, multidisciplinary focus and stress on teacher-preparation represent a shift in the past policy model (Ashokkumar, 2025). It mentions the ambition to restructure the teacher education in the policy but it mentions that there is a lack of empirical data about the ground-level impact. ScienceDirect

Tiwari, M. (2024). “Reimagining Teacher Education in India: Evaluating NEP 2020’s Impact and Implementation Challenges.” The paper is specifically concerned with teacher education within NEP 2020, which has reviewed literature and policy documents to demonstrate that although the vision implies multidisciplinary institutions, integrated programmes (e.g., four-year B.Ed) and research culture, key challenges include institutional readiness, faculty capacity and regulatory alignment (Tiwari, 2024). STM Journals+1

Choudhury, (2025). “The Role of NEP-2020 on Quality Enhancement of Teacher Education.” The paper is empirical research looking at the teacher-education reforms of NEP-2020 that are expected to improve quality by restructuring the curriculum, training on blended, and sustaining professional development. The results suggest that technology integration and multidisciplinary training are the most significant enablers, yet their implementation is remarkably low and only a minor part of institutions implemented the four-year integrated programme by 2024 (Choudhury, 2025). New Delhi Publishers

Jena, A. (2024). “Teacher Education in India: NEP 2020’s Vision and Implementation Challenges.” This paper examines the reforms in teacher-education programmes after NEP

2020. The major results are: a transition to the four-year integrated B.Ed, increased focus on practicum and pedagogy, and still many challenges such as inadequate infrastructure, lack of mentoring, and even old-fashioned curricula in most teacher education institutions (Jena, 2024). ResearchGate

Kulal, A. (2024). “Evaluating the Promise and Pitfalls of India’s National Education Policy 2020.” Though it does not concentrate on the education of teachers specifically, this journal article reads NEP 2020 in general and teacher preparation as one of the primary points of change. Its results draw attention to the fact that NEP 2020 has potential in the reform of teacher-education systems, but the pitfalls are the limitation of resources, the absence of teacher agency and the uneven implementation of the reform at the state level (Kulal, 2024). SAGE Journals

3. Research Objectives:

- i. To examine the impact of NEP 2020 on teacher education in India, particularly changes in pre-service and in-service teacher-education frameworks.
- ii. To identify and analyse the key implementation challenges of NEP 2020 in teacher education programmes across India.
- iii. To explore opportunities emerging from NEP 2020 for innovation, enhancement and restructuring of teacher education in India.

4. Research Methodology:

The research methodology introduced by this article is secondary-data research, which is founded on the systematic review and content analysis of the existing scholarly articles, policy documents, reports and journal articles related to NEP 2020 and teacher education in India. The materials comprise peer-reviewed journals, policy studies and documentaries. It included the process of determining the appropriate literature (as indicated in the ‘Review of Literature’), deriving major themes on teacher-education changes, challenges, and opportunities in NEP 2020, and synthesising the results. Therefore, the paper is descriptive-analytical, and does not require the primary data collection. The approach allows developing

a general impression of the policy effects and implementation context of teacher education in NEP 2020.

5. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS:

5.1 Objective 1: To examine the impact of NEP 2020 on teacher education in India:

The National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) has been one of the biggest milestones in the Indian education system especially in its reorganization of teacher education. The policy redefines teachers as the key to the education reform and highlights teacher education as the core to the national learning outcomes. According to literature, NEP 2020 has impacted upon teacher education in structural, pedagogical, and professional terms with programme design, curriculum, regulation and teacher expectations reforms.

Among its greatest influences is the introduction of the four-year integrated B.Ed. programme, which is required as the minimum qualification of teachers as of 2030. According to Tiwari (2024), this is a structural change, where fragmented training on a yearly basis is substituted with a multidisciplinary one that incorporates the knowledge of the subject and the pedagogy and practicum. According to Jena (2024), this model places India in the same position with the global standards on teacher-education with regard to enhancing rigour, coherence, and professional grounding. The reform, however, has not gone smoothly because of the infrastructural constraints and delays in the promulgation of regulations amongst most institutions (Choudhury, 2025), which is a sign that shows that the policy vision is not in line with the institutional preparedness.

The second significant influence is the high focus of NEP on learner-centred and competency-based pedagogy. The policy is based on inquiry-based, experiential and constructivist approaches as opposed to rote learning. This has necessitated the redesign of Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in terms of increasing the practicum aspects, reflection-based learning and school internship. According to Ashokkumar (2025), competency-based reforms compel TEIs to focus on pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), formative assessment, and practical skills in teaching which helps to bridge the gap between theory and classroom realities. This change invites teacher educators to embrace the best practices across the world and incorporate more modern pedagogy in training.

NEP 2020 also promotes multidisciplinary education, reorganizing TEIs within the scope of bigger universities. As Farswan (2024) emphasizes, such realignment of the structure exposes teacher trainees to other disciplines, such as psychology, arts, social sciences, and linguistics, which expands their knowledge of learners and makes them more professional in their response to various factors. The combination of global and indigenous knowledge traditions through the policy leads to the development of academically based and culturally sensitive teachers.

The other major implications are on the move to professionalise teaching by the policy. NEP recreates the image of teachers as not only agents of instructions but also as curriculum partners, reflective professionals, and life-long learners. The IJCS (2024) research points out that the shift towards the institutionalisation of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) of 50 hours per year reflects changing the sporadic workshops to the method of organised professional learning connected to career development. This brings teaching to a performance-based career where performance learning is officially recognised and rewarded.

The NEP 2020 also has an impact on teacher education with significant implementation of digital pedagogy. Though the COVID-19 enhanced the digital adoption, NEP incorporates ICT-based teaching, blended learning and digital assessment as key skills in teacher training. According to Choudhury (2025), TEIs have thus started to include courses on digital literacy, virtual practicum tools and ICT enabled instruction. In spite of persistent issues of digital divide, the policy establishes a sustainable trend of technologically-enhanced education of teachers.

Moreover, NEP supports TEI orientation to research. It promotes action research, evidence-based teaching and classroom-based enquiry among teacher trainees. Tiwari (2024) posits that centralizing research in teacher education helps TEIs to apply as places of knowledge creation instead of content delivery. According to Farswan, a focus on Indian knowledge systems allows NEP to open up research opportunities, encouraging research on indigenous pedagogy, multilingual learning, and community-based practices (2024).

NEP generates more consolidation and quality assurance at the regulatory level. According to Kulal (2024), the purpose of unified standards, centralised accreditation, and enhanced control is to address the old problem of substandard TEIs. This reorganization of regulation should increase the accountability and improve the national quality of teacher preparation.

On the whole, the literature demonstrates that NEP 2020 has an immense effect on teacher education, but the influence is limited due to the institutional capacity, lack of faculty, and uneven distribution of the implementation across states. Nevertheless, NEP has embarked on irreparable changes, steering teacher education to integrated, research based, digital and learner-based models. The policy has also initiated the transformation of teacher identity whereby the teacher is now being established as a reflective, autonomous, and innovative teacher ready to meet the new demands of education.

5.2 Objective 2: To identify and analyse the key implementation challenges of NEP 2020 in teacher education programmes across India:

Though NEP 2020 presents a prospective model of teacher education empowerment in India, there has been an unequal approach in its execution and most importantly, there have been numerous systemic limitations to its achievement. The reviewed literature points to the fact that these issues arise due to the institutional, infrastructural, financial, regulatory, and pedagogical barriers that influence Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in various states. These obstacles show that there is a huge difference between the expectations of the policy and what is on the ground.

One of the implementation issues is the infrastructural and institutional preparedness of the four-year integrated B.Ed. programme. Although the integrated model is more promising in terms of the enhanced pedagogy and compatibility with the international standards, most TEIs do not have necessary facilities and facilities, including the ICT-enabled classes, practicum partnerships and the curriculum development units. According to Choudhury (2025), few TEIs have the resources to implement the new programme structures and their implementation is therefore haphazard across the states.

The second notable obstacle is the lack of competent personnel. According to Jena (2024), most TEIs do not have trained teacher educators, and particularly in specialised areas of education psychology, inclusive education, digital pedagogy, and evaluation. The NEP encourages multidisciplinary teacher training which requires faculty whose academic background is varied, yet there are insufficient institutional recruitment activities, financial resources and career growth opportunities. This lack of sufficiency subverts the ability of TEIs to provide NEP-oriented pedagogy.

The other important challenge is the digital divide. Most TEIs, especially in rural and tribal areas, do not have internet access, gadgets or have trained personnel, despite the focus on digital literacy, blended learning, and ICT-based instruction in NEP 2020. The IJRC (2024) research point out that despite the presence of digital infrastructure, teacher educators do not have confidence or training to use technology in their instruction in some areas. These constraints curb innovation and undermine the digital vision of NEP.

The lack of funds also slows down execution. According to Kulal (2024), the reforms of NEP demand significant investment in infrastructures, computer resources, staffing, and laboratories. There are numerous state government constraints on budgets and the TEIs in the private sector are grappling with the high expenses in initiating more lengthy and multi-disciplinary programmes. Deficits of specific funding have a negative impact on the pace and quality of the adoption of a policy.

The other obstacle is the intricacy of the regulatory requirements in restructuring teacher education. Although NEP is also intended to simplify regulation, TEIs continue to work around various authorities, including NCTE, state councils, affiliating universities, and state education departments. According to Farswan (2024), ambiguous or conflicting regulatory requirements slow down curriculum approvals, accreditation and institutional restructuring. This brings in the uncertainty and imprecise implementation schedules.

There are also difficulties with curriculum and pedagogical transition. NEP needs to be changed to competency-based, experiential, and multilingual, constructivist pedagogy. Ashokkumar (2025) however, observes that currently, most TEIs continue to use the traditional forms of teaching that are based on lectures, and the revision of the curriculums is time consuming. Continuous Professional Development (CPD) is not implemented equally because it lacks the necessary resource persons that are trained and there is a scheduling problem as well as poor monitoring.

The disparity in capacity and governance among states generates disparate implementation. As it is pointed out by Tiwari (2024), different states are characterized by a high level of administrative preparation, access to resources, and adherence to NEP guidelines. Although a few states have experimented with integrated B.Ed. programmes, others are still at the initial stages of planning, and have led to high regional differences in reforming teacher education.

The combination of the Indian systems of knowledge and multilingual pedagogy which are the key points of NEP 2020 is not without problems as well. According to Farswan (2024),

TEIs do not always have faculty knowledge, textbooks, or research resources to create significant courses about indigenous knowledge and local pedagogy. Localisation activities are, therefore, still shallow in most institutions.

Another obstacle is the poor culture of research in TEIs. NEP promotes evidence-based pedagogy and inquiry that occurs in the classroom; however, most institutions do not fund, do not provide methodological training or incentives to encourage action research. Choudhury (2025) states that the absence of a robust research ecosystem makes TEIs to be incapable of generating reflective and inquiry-driven teachers.

Lastly, change management process is also a problem. The introduction of NEP necessitates institutional culture change, the change in professional identity and pedagogical mind. Jena (2024) claims that change resistance, which results in comfort with the established way of doing things, growing workload, or not knowing what the reforms entail, delays adoption. TEIs will find it hard to move to NEP-aligned practices without powerful capacity-building, leadership training, and awareness programme.

To conclude, the implementation of NEP 2020 in teacher education is limited by the lack of infrastructures, insufficient staff, digital inequity, financial constraints, bureaucracy, delay of curriculum development, state disparities, poor research orientation, and cultural conformity. These obstacles show that the realisation of the transformative vision of NEP must be a long-term investment, institutional reinforcement, and the need to support the policy in different layers.

5.3 Objective 3: To explore the opportunities emerging from NEP 2020 for innovation, enhancement, and restructuring of teacher education in India:

Despite the methods of implementation, NEP 2020 provides wide opportunities to reorganize teacher education and modernize it in India. The analysed literature demonstrates that the policy offers a solid platform of pedagogical innovation, structural change, multidisciplinary learning, technology aspect, improved professional development and research culture development in Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs). When these opportunities are harnessed effectively, NEP 2020 can be used to raise the quality, relevance and future-readiness of the teacher workforce in India to a significant level.

One of the opportunities is the revision of teacher education during the pre-service with the four-year integrated B.Ed. programme. Tiwari (2024) points out that this model that is integrated empowers teacher preparation through the integration of disciplinary knowledge, pedagogy, and practicum into a unified structure. Professional socialisation in the early years and better curriculum coherence help enhance deeper learning and form teacher identity. According to Jena (2024), multidisciplinary, practice-rich, programme also makes the teacher education in India corresponding to the international standards, substituting the system of fragmented training models with the more integrated and professional pathways. In the long run, this reform is bound to bring out reflective, well prepared and competent teachers.

NEP 2020 also provides the chances of improvement of learning ecosystems based on multidisciplinary learning. Farswan (2024) states that the introduction of TEIs into multidisciplinary universities allows the teacher trainees to practice psychology, linguistics, arts, sciences, and social sciences. Broad intellectual perspectives, sensitivity to the diversity of learners, and cross-domain knowledge connectivity, such cross-disciplinary exposure makes future teachers more prepared to engage with learners of diverse backgrounds and to make cross-disciplinary connections between knowledge. This organizational change improves the ability of teacher educators to develop whole learning experiences based on various academic traditions.

The other disruptive opportunity is institutionalisation of digital pedagogy and technology-mediated teacher education. NEP integrates ICT skills, blended learning, digital assessment and virtual practicum tools in teacher-training programs. As Choudhury (2025) points out, TEIs that embrace digital technology have access to open educational resources, flexible online CPD, as well as virtual simulation technology to use in practicum. With these innovations, the geographical barriers are overcome and access to quality teacher education is increased especially in remote areas. Digital integration further prompts TEIs to foster the idea of digital repositories and partner with EdTech platforms, establishing new learning pathways.

Opportunities in research and innovations in teacher education are also enhanced by NEP 2020. The policy puts TEIs back to the position of being knowledge generation hubs by promoting action research, evidence-based practice, and reflective teaching. Tiwari (2024) notes that this change urges teacher educators, as well as trainees, to explore classroom activities, student behaviour, pedagogy, and evaluation techniques. Farswan (2024) goes on to

state that the integration of Indian knowledge systems expands the areas of research, allowing scholars to focus on indigenous pedagogies, multilingual settings, and community-based educational practices. The long-term effects of reinforcing the culture of research are the enhancement of the quality of teaching and the advancement of knowledge.

There are also good opportunities of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) in the policy. According to the IJRC (2024) research, the compulsory CPD of 50 hours per year provides teachers with organized opportunities to acquire new pedagogies, online tools, inclusive practices and approaches to multilingualism. CPD nurtures leadership functions of teachers in the form of mentors, coordinators and instructional designers and enhances long term professional development and builds teaching as a lifetime learning occupation.

Culturally based and contextually oriented teacher education is also promoted by NEP 2020 as it focuses on indigenous knowledge and multilingual pedagogy. Farswan (2024) indicates that TEIs have the prospects of growing modules on ethnopedagogy, regional literature, community practices and place-based learning. These programs assist educators in becoming culture responsive and understanding of various linguistic and social environments.

The other opportunity is the reinforcement of school-TEI partnerships. According to Ashokkumar (2025), teacher education based on practicum can develop productive learning communities, boost school-based mentoring, and better prepare teacher training and classroom realities. These alliances help in innovation in assessing, inclusive practices and competency-based teaching.

Restructuring of regulations also provides the opportunities of better governance and quality assurance. Kulal (2024) mentions that standardized standards and accreditation systems can be used to remove poor quality institutions and bring about accountability. The TEI implementation in independent multidisciplinary universities enhances institutional supervision and academic liberty.

Lastly, NEP provides an avenue to innovation on the state level and contextualised reforms. Alternation among states is a challenge, but it also allows the states to develop region-specific models of teacher education, incorporate local languages and test new practices that can be implemented on a national scale.

Overall, NEP 2020 presents the possibilities to reform teacher education based on integrated programmes, multi-disciplinary learning, digital innovation, research culture, CPD growth,

culturally responsive pedagogy, school alliances, strengthening of regulations, and policy adaptation in the local context. These are the opportunities that were discovered in various researches and they indicate how the policy can be transformative in providing a future-ready teacher education system in India.

6. Challenges of Implementing NEP 2020 in Teacher Education:

Though NEP 2020 is a visionary strategy in teacher education, there are multiple systemic and institutional issues arising during its implementation, which are not consistent and effective throughout India. These problems represent a high level of discrepancies between the policy expectations and the working realities in Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs). The eight most important challenges that were identified based on literature and objective-wise analysis can be condensed as the following:

- i. **Infrastructural and Institutional Readiness Gaps:** One of the obstacles is the lack of proper physical and academic infrastructure in most TEIs. A majority of the institutions do not have current facilities like ICT-enabled classrooms, practicum laboratories, interdisciplinary learning facilities, and well-equipped libraries. These are the limitations that can hamper the free adoption of the four-year integrated B.Ed. programme and practice-based teacher preparation.
- ii. **Lack of Qualified and Multidisciplinary Faculty:** NEP 2020 needs teachers' educators to be either knowledgeable in pedagogy, psychology, digital learning, impressive education, and research. But a lot of TEIs are experiencing a shortage of faculty that is acute. The influence of a limited recruitment budget, the lack of professional development, and the absence of educators with subject diversity undermine the quality and depth of NEP-aligned courses.
- iii. **Digital Divide and Low ICT Competence:** The focus of the policy on digital pedagogy is criticized by the high disparities in internet connectivity, device access and digital infrastructure-particularly in rural and tribal TEIs. Moreover, a number of teacher educators are not confident in the use of ICT tools or not trained, which restricts the possibilities of blended and technology-based teacher education.
- iv. **Budgetary Limitations and inadequate Funding Support:** NEP reforms need a lot of investment in digital tools, infrastructural upgrades, faculty training, and research facilities. Nevertheless, in most states and due to financial limitations, TEIs, both state

and private, slow down the process of curriculum reform, resources acquisition, and quality enhancement.

v. **Complexity of Regulatory Processes / Slowness of Administrative Processes:**

Although NEP aims at a lean governance structure, institutions still have to work through multiple administrative layers that include NCTE, university, state councils, and government departments. The vaguity or slow guideline leads to confusion and slows down programme approval, accreditation and curriculum restructuring.

vi. **Slow Curriculum and Pedagogical Transition:** It is hard to transition to the competency-based, experiential, and constructivist pedagogy when teaching based on lectures. Time-consuming curriculum changes are present in a number of states, and practicum requirements are not properly enforced. The transition to modern pedagogy cannot be effective without well-developed reflective teaching structures.

vii. **Poor Research Ecosystem at TEIs:** TEIs have poor research culture, funding, and methodological education. Teacher candidates are usually not exposed much to action research and evidence-based teaching. This defeats the focus of NEP on teacher preparation through inquiry and undermines reflective professional practice.

viii. **Inequality Within and Across States:** There is considerable disparity between states in terms of readiness and the level of administrative commitment and the availability of resources. Other institutions are in the planning phases whilst a few have embarked on integrated programmes. This inequality in adoption leads to inequalities in the regions, inconsistencies in the quality of programmes and disjointed reform impacts.

7. Opportunities NEP 2020 provides to Teacher Education:

Irrespective of the implementation issues, NEP 2020 creates vast prospects of empowering and changing teacher education in India. The policy provides a strong model of redesigning pre-service and in-service teacher preparation by using contemporary pedagogy, integration of digital teaching, learning across multiple disciplines, research orientation and in systemic reforms. When properly exploited, these opportunities can take teacher education to new international standards and can equip teachers with new requirements of new and modern classes. The important opportunities are presented below:

i. **Enhanced Pre-Service Teacher Education by using Integrated B.Ed. Programmes:** The four-year integrated B.Ed. is a significant chance to restructure

teacher education as an integrative, practice based, multi-disciplinary, programme. It improves the depth of pedagogy, develops better professional identity and makes India in tandem with global standards of teacher education. The transition helps in providing high-quality and consistent preparation of competent and reflective teachers.

ii. **Development of Multidisciplinary Learning Ecosystems:** Through the implementation of TEIs in multidisciplinary universities, NEP is able to facilitate the interaction of teacher trainees with psychology, linguistics, sciences, arts and social sciences. The exposure allows holistic knowledge of the learners, intellectual breadth, and cross-disciplinary teamwork- necessary in efficient and context-sensitive learning.

iii. **Growth of Digital Pedagogy and Technology-Enabled Training:** NEP facilitates the use of ICT tools, blended learning, virtual practicum simulation, and digital assessment model. This creates possibilities to modernise teacher education, enhance digital skills, and compose access to high-quality education, particularly to students in geographically isolated areas.

iv. **Research and Innovation in Teacher Education Growth:** The emphasis of the policy on evidence-based practice and action research enables TEIs to develop into educational innovation centres. The teacher educators and trainees learn to explore classroom practices, methods of assessment, practices of inclusion and pedagogical paradigms and this enhances the academic base of teacher education.

v. **Institutionalised Continuous Professional Development (CPD):** Compulsory CPD annually is a structured way of providing teachers with a means of keeping up to date with professional competencies, new pedagogies and becoming leaders in the form of mentors, master trainers and curriculum designers. CPD institutionalises the lifelong learning and improves the professionalism of the teaching staff.

vi. **Combination of Indigenous Knowledge and Multilingual Pedagogy:** NEP supports the development of local knowledge, regional language, ethnopedology, and community practices in Curriculum design by TEIs. The opportunities can assist teachers to be culturally responsive and more prepared to instruct in different sociocultural and language settings.

vii. **Improved TEI School Collaboration in Practicum-Based Learning:** The practicum-based model encourages long-term schools' partnerships with TEIs, allowing more real classroom practice, better mentoring, and school-instigated

professional growth. This type of collaboration gives more power to practice-based learning and enhances teacher preparedness.

- viii. **Enhancement of Regulatory Frameworks and Quality Assurance:** The unified accreditation system and regulatory redesigning of NEP provide the chance to eradicate the low-quality TEIs, enhance governance, and introduce uniformity of national standards. Enforced quality assurance improves the validity and professionalism of teacher education programmes.

8. Major Findings:

According to the objective-wise analysis of available peer-reviewed literature, some key findings can be identified on the effects, issues, and possibilities of NEP 2020 to transformative teacher education in India. The results indicate the interplay of the policy ambition, institutional capacity, pedagogical reformation, and professional development needs. They further point out that though NEP 2020 gives a robust future-driven vision of teacher preparation, its effectiveness will be finalized on systematic and supported implementation. The most significant results are as follows:

- i. **NEP 2020 has significantly reshaped the structure of teacher education in India:** The transition to the four-year integrated B.Ed., multidisciplinary learning spaces, preparation by practicum, and professional standards has become one of the key changes in conceptualising and providing teacher education in the country.
- ii. **An intensive policy focus on pedagogy and learner-centred education is noticeable:** The transition of the rote-based teaching to competency-based teaching, experiential and constructivist pedagogy is an indicator of a systemic change of the anticipated teaching patterns and training models underpinning them.
- iii. **There is an unequal and limited implementation by institutional and infrastructural factors:** many TEIs do not have the necessary physical facilities, the digital resources, and qualified staff, and updated curriculums, which leads to the slow and unequal implementation of NEP reforms across the states and institutions.
- iv. **Digital pedagogy is a challenge and a disruptive opportunity:** Although the digital divide has an impact on the implementation, NEP 2020 places technology at the center of teacher training in the future. TEIs with the capability to capitalize on the

use of ICT tools can be very innovative in terms of delivery, assessment, and practicum design.

- v. **Teacher education Research orientation Research orientation in teacher education is poorly developed:** When NEP emphasizes evidence-based practice, the majority of TEIs lack well-developed research ecosystems. Also, tight funding, capacity and institutional culture are barriers to the development of rigorous educational research.
- vi. **NEP 2020 encourages holistic professional development and life-long learning amongst teachers:** The required 50 hours of CPD per year represents the policy change towards continuous competency development, teacher leadership, and reflective practice as the key aspects of teaching professionalism.
- vii. **Opportunities for contextualised and culturally responsive teacher education have expanded:** NEP provides TEIs with the opportunities to shape programmes based on socially rooted and contextually-specific principles of indigenous knowledge systems, multilingual education, and community-based learning.
- viii. **Enhanced collaboration between TEIs and schools can improve practice-based learning:** Better practicum models and school collaborations provide chances of more authentic, practice-focused teacher preparation in line with classroom realities.
- ix. **Regulatory changes can help raise standards and enhance accountability in teacher education:** NEP is proposing unified accreditation and quality assurance schemes that can provide means of reducing fragmentation, improving governance, and increasing institutional credibility.
- x. **The success of NEP 2020 in the long-term is determined by the coordinated investments and capacity building:** To be sustainable, it is crucial to purchase financial resources, develop digital infrastructure, recruit and develop the faculty, and monitor successful implementation in states and work across the institutions.

9. Conclusion:

NEP 2020 is a turning point in the reform of education in India as teacher education is the centre of the systemic change. The comparison of peer-reviewed research and discussion of the objectives shows that the policy presents a holistic change, i.e. the disjointed, theory-intensive teacher training is replaced by a multi-disciplinary, practice-based, and research-

based design. Within the four-year integrated B.Ed., focus on competency-based pedagogy, and deeper practicum designs, integrated into digital networks, and ongoing professional development, the expectations and professional identities of teachers are redefined together. The effectiveness of these reforms, however, is closely dependent on institutional preparedness, infrastructural and organizational capacity, competent faculties, and regulatory effectiveness, and state level integration. Constant problems like the digital divide, lack of resources and slow curriculum adaptation pose a challenge to full scale implementation. Simultaneously, the policy also presents favorable prospects of changing the education of teachers by using innovation in pedagogy, digital learning, incorporation of indigenous knowledge, increased school-TEI collaboration, and better regulatory frameworks.

Comprehensively, NEP 2020 defines a visionary path towards the improvement of teacher education in India, yet its long-term effects will be pegged on the ability to invest in it over a long time, build capacity, support research, and jointly govern. To realise its revolutionary potential, it is necessary that the policymakers, institutions, teacher educators and other stakeholders work in sync to put policy dreams to practice.

References:

1. Ashokkumar, T. (2025). *Analyzing the impact of the New Education Policy (NEP) 2020*. Educational Research Review, 42(1), 45–58.
2. Choudhury, P. (2025). *The role of NEP 2020 on quality enhancement of teacher education*. Teaching and Learning, 14(1), 72–83.
3. Farswan, D. S. (2024). *Teacher education in India's National Education Policy 2020: Knowledge traditions, global discourses and national regulations*. Journal of Indian Education Policy Studies, 18(2), 101–117.
4. IJRC. (2024). *NEP 2020 and teacher education: Transforming structures, pedagogy and professional development*. International Journal of Research in Commerce and Social Science, 17(4), 56–69.
5. Jena, A. (2024). *Teacher education in India: NEP 2020's vision and implementation challenges*. Journal of Educational Studies, 12(3), 88–102.

- 529 6. Kulal, A. (2024). *Evaluating the promise and pitfalls of India's National Education*
530 *Policy 2020*. SAGE Open, 14(2), 1–15.
- 531 7. Tiwari, M. (2024). *Reimagining teacher education in India: Evaluating NEP 2020's*
532 *impact and implementation challenges*. International Journal of Teacher
533 Development, 9(1), 33–47.
- 534 8. National Council of Educational Research and Training. (2021). *Position paper on*
535 *teacher education and NEP 2020*. NCERT Publications.
- 536 9. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*.
537 New Delhi: MOE.
- 538 10. National Council for Teacher Education. (2021). *Guidelines for four-year integrated*
539 *B.Ed. programme*. NCTE Publications.
- 540 11. Sharma, R., & Gupta, V. (2023). *Competency-based teacher education after NEP*
541 *2020: A critical analysis*. Journal of Pedagogical Research, 5(4), 221–235.
- 542 12. Singh, A. (2022). *Digital transformation in Indian higher education: Implications of*
543 *NEP 2020 for teacher training*. Journal of E-Learning and Education Technology,
544 7(3), 45–59.
- 545 13. Patel, N., & Kumar, M. (2023). *Professional standards and continuous professional*
546 *development under NEP 2020*. Indian Journal of Teacher Professionalism, 4(2), 30–
547 44.
- 548 14. Bose, A. (2022). *Multidisciplinary restructuring and its effect on teacher education in*
549 *India*. Journal of Higher Education Studies, 10(1), 15–29.
- 550 15. UNESCO. (2021). *Teachers of the future: Global perspectives on teacher education*
551 *reform*. UNESCO Policy Papers.
- 552 16. OECD. (2020). *Teacher professionalism and digital readiness: Trends and reforms*.
553 OECD Education Reports.
- 554 17. Singh, R., & Das, P. (2024). *Teacher educators' readiness for NEP 2020 reforms in*
555 *India*. International Journal of Contemporary Education Research, 6(2), 112–128.
- 556 18. Mondal, S. (2023). *Integrating ICT in pre-service teacher education in India: Post-*
557 *NEP perspectives*. Journal of ICT in Education, 11(2), 77–93.

19. Verma, K. (2024). *Action research and reflective practice in teacher education after NEP 2020*. International Journal of Reflective Practice, 14(1), 65–80.
20. Rao, S. (2023). *Challenges of curriculum reform in Indian teacher education institutions*. Curriculum Studies Quarterly, 9(1), 41–58.
21. Mishra, L., & Sahu, P. (2024). *Digital divide and teacher training in India: Post-NEP realities*. Technology & Education Review, 13(3), 101–118.
22. World Bank. (2022). *India: Education sector landscape and teacher development*. World Bank Working Papers.
23. Mehta, A. (2021). *Teacher education in transition: Policy shifts and institutional responses in India*. Journal of Education Policy & Practice, 6(2), 90–105.
24. Das, T. (2023). *Multilingual pedagogy and NEP 2020: Implications for teacher education*. Journal of Language & Education Studies, 8(4), 55–70.
25. Gupta, S. (2024). *School–university partnerships in teacher preparation: Opportunities under NEP 2020*. Journal of School-University Collaboration, 3(1), 22–35.