



A Review New Education Policy 2020 of India

Rashid Ali

Assistant Professor

Meerut International Institute of Teachers,
NH 58 Ghat Institutional Area Meerut.

ABSTRACT

Education policies that differ from normal market-oriented reform approaches in many other countries may lead to “system-wide excellence in student learning at a reasonable cost, according to this article. The nation of Finland, in this respect, is an example of a country that, in the 1950s, went from a remote agrarian/industrial state to a model knowledge economy, stressing education as a key to economic and social success. Using data from global student assessments and previous policy studies, this article shows how Finland's education policies focused on equity, flexibility, innovation, teacher professionalism, and trust have consistently increased student learning. There has been no policy in Finland to include high-stakes testing and externally determined standards for learning in its education system. Finland's education policies are based on ideas of sustainable leadership that place a strong emphasis on teaching and learning, intelligent accountability, and encouraging schools to create optimal learning environments and implement educational content that best helps their students reach the general goals of schooling”.

KEYWORDS: Education policy, Development, Higher education, Schooling, Comparison, Teachers, Targets, Issues, Drawbacks, Challenges.

INTRODUCTION

Only through education can the full potential of humankind be realized, which is crucial to developing an equal society and promoting national progress. Economic and social success in India is linked to universal access to high-quality education, as stated in the Directive Principles of State Policy and Fundamental Duties. "National integration and cultural preservation" Indians began implementing their previous education agenda back in 1986. When India's National Education Policy (NEP) was amended, changed, and approved on July 29, 2020, the policy had been in existence for 34 years. As an important step forward for India's educational system, the initiative will definitely improve India's attractiveness as a study abroad destination worldwide. The policy is built on four pillars: accessibility, equity, quality, and affordability and accountability. It is recommended by NEP 2020 that Indian HEIs adapt their systems and



institutions to better regulate, manage, and support multidisciplinary research. The launch of NEP 2020 marks a turning point in Indian education. An educational system that is focused on India and aligned with the country's goal of becoming a knowledge-based economy and culture is the goal of the plan. Even more interesting is the new education plan's emphasis on merging multiple educational institutions and “specializations so that it may better address the needs of the students and the community as a whole.

In the early 1980s, John Smart and I started working together on *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. When it was first proposed, it seemed like an excellent concept, and it still does now. I thought it was a brilliant idea when John started asking some of our most senior scholars to reflect on the beginnings and development of their careers because I strongly believe that academics and administrators in higher education should have an understanding of their intellectual and professional heritage. While reviewing the previous writers' contributions, I was requested to write a chapter on how my career in higher education had grown, which was a surprise and honor. At the same time, I was both shocked and horrified to hear of these facts. This was the first time I had ever considered myself to be on the same level as scholars like C. Robert Pace, Wilbert McKeachie, Joan Stark, Alexander Astin, Marvin Peterson, and James Bess. Nevertheless, as a friend once observed, But if there's going to be a list, it's better to be on it than not. So I eagerly accepted Mike's offer and went out to uncover what I had to give that would be useful to my colleagues, students, and professional successors. However, the OECD's education work began with a focus on national education systems, but it has since extended to cover a wide range of qualitative and quantitative comparisons across schooling systems, as well as sub-national comparisons. We believe that the OECD has discovered its education policy niche worldwide by becoming a center of competence for the comparative assessment of national schooling systems' performance (Novoa and Yariv-Mashal, 2003). We believe that the PISA test has served as a prototype for future OECD assessments in education, such as school-based PISA tests and country-level PISA assessments. The OECD also publishes *Education at a Glance*, an annual statistical report on education that documents relationships between systemic inputs and outputs. A global education policy sector has been established as a result of the OECD's statistical work in this area (Lingard and Rawolle, 2011). There are now additional topological spatial linkages (Lingard and Sellar, 2013; Lingard, Sellar and Savage, 2014) in which the OECD's education work is also implicated as we shall explain. These operate through and across the local, national, and global”.



(Dumciuviene 2015) studied “The Impact of Education Policy to Country Economic Development” discovered and Knowledge-intensive businesses and services will play a critical role in the future of economic and social prosperity. In this situation, there will be more employment that demand a college degree. Identifying the links between education policy, other policies (such as research and technical development, social and economic growth), and the country's overall development is critical to its success. As a factor of production, a person's human capital is analyzed in this article and its influence on increased productivity is examined. High levels of education also have an influence on research, technological advancement, and the expansion of total factor productivity. A fresh approach to European education policy is needed as the information society grows. There is a strong focus on EU education policy, as well as how it relates to and impacts economic growth, in this article.

(Corbett 2003) studied “Ideas, Institutions and Policy Entrepreneurs: towards a new history of higher education in the European Community” discovered as well as The European Community's educational policies started in the 1970s in many people's views (Neave, 1984; de Witte, 1989; Beukel, 1994; McMahon 1995; Field, 1998; Moschonas, 1998). There was a "law" of education by the late 1960s and early 1970s, resulting from EC pledges to labor mobility and establishment independence, but the Treaty of Rome (European Economic Community) did not provide Community action in education competence (de Witte, 1989). As a consequence, this issue was deemed "taboo" in the early days of the EC (Neave, 1984). Ministers of education from across the European Community (EC) came together in 1971 for the first time under the leadership of EC leaders who had previously affirmed their countries' commitment to working together to "widen" and "deepen" the EC. This came out of the Hague Summit in 1969. To them, EC policy-making has evolved over time as a result of the Community's responsibility to secure free movement of labor, which has led to concerns like vocational training and education for migrant workers' children that do have treaty competence. Some of these critics (Neave, 1984; de Witte, 1989). European education, according to more recent research, is critical to developing the EU's overall economic ambitions, particularly the Single European Act of 1986. In 1998 (Field, 1998; Moschonas, 1998).

(Lingard and Sellar 2014) studied “Representing Your Country : Scotland , PISA and New Spatialities of Educational Governance discovered and A global education policy field is the subject of this article, as is the rescaling and respatialization of education policy and governance. Is concerned with how education policy has evolved under the OECD's Program for International Student Assessment, which has a significant impact (PISA). Since PISA has



been so successful, we believe it has become the model for other OECD initiatives like the PISA-Based school examinations, the PISA for development tests and the PIACC and AHELO assessments. As a result of these advancements, a global education policy field and a worldwide educational data infrastructure are being created together. Although they also affect other spatial interactions, such as sub-national and local education effects. New policy spaces in education, such as the PISA-based test for schools program, may be employed directly by schools and sub-national educational systems. Our goal in writing this study is to show the importance of the OECD's educational efforts in addressing these issues”.

(Anon 2021)studied “New Education Policy 2020: a Comparative Analysis With Existing National Policy of Education 1986 discovered and On July 29, 2020, the Union Cabinet of India adopted the NEP 2020. Ex-ISRO Chairman Dr. K Kasturirangan was appointed as the chairman of a committee that laid out the vision for India's new education system. Quality, Affordability, Equity, Access and Accountability are all addressed in the New Education Policy. An India-centric education system is the goal of NEP 2020, which aims to convert our country into an equal and dynamic society rich with knowledge and high-quality education for everyone. New policy education of 1986 and New policy education of 2020 are discussed in this article, which focuses on the key contrasts between the two. NEP 2020 emerged as a result of an endeavor to identify the problems with the previous strategy. The highlights of the NEP 2020 have also been examined in a short examination. Journals, reports and other official websites have been used to get the information. There is no primary research in this article. In spite of NEP 2020's new 2035 goals, it has its own advantages and disadvantages, which have been made clear. How successful NEP 2020 will be in achieving its goals is one of the most important questions that must be answered”.

CONCLUSIONS

There are significant differences between developed and poor nations when it comes to the use of technology in education. For example, developed nations have a wealth of resources, expertise and experience that underdeveloped countries lack. Although to a lesser level, wealthy countries face many of the same issues as developing ones. In terms of teacher apprehension and motivation, lack of appropriate educational software and technical support, as well as the challenges of providing adequate teacher training, taking care of infrastructural deficiencies, and implementing learner-centered instruction and proper assessment procedures in schools, they all face the same issues. A lot of what wealthy nations have done to cope with technological integration issues may be applied to developing countries, as well. Educators and



policymakers may benefit from the suggestions made in this study. A priority list should not be seen as a list of rules that must be followed, but rather as a list of ideas that may be used by stakeholders to develop realistic implementation strategies for districts, schools, and classrooms. A list of priorities based on the requirements, specifics, and capacities of developing nations should be drawn up, and rules should be used in order to carry out and assess the plans. However, doing a requirements analysis and establishing objectives should be a top priority, as should procuring finances, purchasing ICT equipment, educating instructors, providing enough support for schools and teachers, and including significant stakeholders in the decision-making process. All of this has to be backed up by the government's unwavering support and regular monitoring and review of the implementation process.

REFERENCES

1. BALL, S.J. (1993) Culture, cost and control: self-management and entrepreneurial schooling in England and Wales. In J. SMYTH (ed.) *A Socially Critical View of the Self-Managing School* (London, Falmer) .
2. BALL, S.J. (1994) *Education Reform: A Critical and Post-Structural Approach* (Buckingham, Open University Press) .
3. BENNETT, A.L., BRYK, A.S., EASTON, J.Q., KERBOW, D., LUPPESCU, S. & SEBRING, P.A. (1992) *Charting Reform: The Principals' Perspective. A Report on a Survey of Chicago Public School Principals* (Chicago, Consortium on Chicago School Research) .
4. BLACKMORE, J. (1995) Breaking out of masculinist politics of education. In B. LIMERICK & B. LINGARD (eds.) *Gender and Changing Education Management* (Rydalme, NSW, Hodder) .
5. BLACKMORE, J. (1996a) The re-gendering and re-structuring of educational work. Paper presented at the 9th World Congress on Comparative Education, Sydney, Australia, 1–4 July.
6. BLACKMORE, J. (1996b) Breaking the silence: Feminist contributions to educational administration and policy. In K. LEITHWOOD, J. CHAPMAN, D. CORSON, P. HALLINGER & A. HART (eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration* (Part 2) (Dordrecht, Kluwer) .
7. BLACKMORE, J. (1996c) Doing emotional labour in the education market place: stories from the field of women in management, *Discourse*, 17 (3) , 337–350.