

# National Education Policy - 2020 of India and Educational Reforms in East Asia- Suggestive Lessons

**Dr. Sharad Phulari<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Amruta Pawar<sup>2</sup>, Aarti Singh<sup>3</sup>, Cressida Fernandes<sup>4</sup>**

Principal<sup>1</sup>, Assistant Professor<sup>2</sup>, SY BSc.IT<sup>3</sup>, TY BSc.CS<sup>4</sup>

ZSCT's Thakur Shyamnarayan Degree College, Kandivali (E), Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

**Abstract:** To cope with Goal 4 (SDG 4), of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in the Global Education development agenda, India implementing National Education Policy – 2020. It has high unique fundamental principles. NEP-2020 is having four main parts as, Part I - School Education; Part II – Higher Education; Part III – other key Areas to focus and Part IV. Making it happen means implementation of NEP-2020. The review is carried out to find experiences, outcomes, obstacles, achievements and failures as LESSON while implementation of Education Reforms in East Asian countries common being geographical, social and cultural similarities with India. The goal of review of this research attempt is to understand the challenges of implementation of reforms in education, distilling lessons – on implementation and examining the impact on educational development, its process and impact. Lessons about education reforms policies, process and implementation is studied. By reviewing the literature, experiences in the five East Asian countries discussed while implementing reform policies in education. It is all about. China, Indonesia, Thailand, Cambodia and Philippines. The first lesson is educational reform system requires humanizing a complex set of functions at each level of education. The second lesson is that the central authority (Central government) needs to step into new roles quickly to activate, to help the successful reforms. Third lesson states that replacing inappropriate structures and building the capacity to work within new arrangements. Fourth lesson is dramatic shifts in responsibilities and powers are lead to the breakdown to information and evaluation systems, fifth and last lesson is about strengthening the voice of the community in the delivery of public services.

**Keywords:** NEP-20, Goal 4, SDG4, East Asia, Lessons, Implementation, School Education, Higher Education, Making to happen, CABE- Central Advisory Board of Education, Moe, MHRD.

## I. DISCUSSION

### 1.1 National Education Policy – 2020 of India

India reform the national education in 2020 and develop NEP-2020 that National Education Policy - 2020. It is for - Quality education, Economic growth, Social justice, Social equality, scientific advancement, National integration, Cultural preservation and Universal access to quality education. It is for the best way march forward for our country's rich talents and resources. It is good for the individual, the society and the country.

Goal 4 (SDG4) of the 2030 Agenda for the Sustainable Development is the Global education development agenda. It is adopted by India in 2015. Goal 4 (SDG4) seeks to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and to promote lifelong learning. opportunities for all" by 2030. To cope with Goal 4 (SDG4), India implemented National Education Policy - 2020.

### 1.2 Fundamental principles of NEP-2020

1. Recognizing, identifying and the unique capabilities of each student.
2. Highest priority to get fundamental Foundational Literacy. highest foundational Numeracy,
3. Flexibility for learners to choose own paths as it interests
4. No hard separations in curriculum (Arts/science), activities of curriculum and extracurricular, streams of vocational and academic studies.
5. Multidisciplinary and holistic education to ensure the unity and integrity of all knowledge,

6. Focus on conceptual understanding
7. Focus on creativity and critical thinking
8. Promoting multilingualism
9. Focus on value education - Ethics, human value and constitutional values.
10. Focus on life skills
11. Focus on formative assessment for learning.
12. Focus on maximum use of technology in education.
13. Focus on quality of teachers and faculties.
14. Encouraging innovation and out of box ideas.
15. Encouraging outstanding research.
16. Focus on regular assessment for educational progress.
17. Synergy in curriculum in early childhood care education to School education to higher education.

### 1.3 Curricular Structure of NEP-2020

- Part-I – School Education
- Part II – Higher Education
- Part III – Professional Education (Other key areas of Focus)
- Part IV – Making it Happen

#### A. Part-I – School Education

4 Years		Class -9 to 12 Age – 14 to 18	Secondary
3 Years		Class – 6 to 8 Age – 11 TO 14	Middle
3 years		Class – 3 to 5 Age – 8 to 11	Preparatory
5 Years	2 Years	Class – 1 to 2 Age – 6 to 8	Foundational
	3 Years	Class- Preschool Class – Anganwadi/Balwadi Age- 3 to 6	

#### B. Part II – Higher Education

- A – Institutional Restructuring and consolidation.
- B- Holistic Education & Multidisciplinary Education.
- C- Optimal Learning and support for students.
- D- Internalization.
- E- student Progression.
- F- Faculty Progression.
- G- Value education in Higher Education.
- H- Vocational Education.
- I-National Research foundation for Academic Research.
- J- progression in Regulatory System of Higher Education.
- K- Combat and stop the commercialization of higher education.
- L – Effective Governance for HEI, Effective leadership for HEIs.

**C. Part III – Other key Area to Focus**

- Professional Education as Agricultural, Legal, Health Care, Technical education.
- Lifelong learning opportunities with Adult education.
- Promotion of Indian Languages.
- Promotion of Indian art.
- Promotion of Indian culture.
- Promotion of Use of Technology and Integration.
- Promotion of online Education.
- Promotion of Digital Education.
- Creation of Dedicated Unit for world class digital Infrastructure.
- Creation of Dedicated Unit for world class Educational Digital Content and Capacity.

**Part IV – Making it Happen**

- A. Strengthening the Central Advisory Board of Education. (CABE)
- B. MHRD to re-designate as the MoE. (MHRD- Ministry of Human Resource Development) (MOE-ministry of education)
- C. Financing – Raising Educational Investment; Affordable and Quality Education for all.
- D. Focus on Implementation of NEP- 2020 led by MHRP, CABE, Union Government, State Governments, Boards, the governance bodies of schools and HEIs, Schools, HEIS.

**II. IMPLEMENTATION OF NEP-2020**

India, one of county of Asia, is undergoing. The Educational reforms by implementing the National Education Policy–2020. The implementation as of NEP. 20 will be guided by the following principles.

1. Implementation of NEP will be the most critical matter.
2. Implementation of NEP in phased manner.
3. Implementation of NEP by prioritization (most critical and urgent actions are taken up).
4. Implementation of NEM with Comprehensiveness.
5. Implementation of NEP with careful planning, joint monitoring and collaborative implementation between center and states.
6. Implementation of NEP with timely infusion at, requisite resources human, infrastructural and financial.
7. Implementation of NEP with careful analysis and reviews of the linkages between parallel implementation steps.

**2.1 Educational Reforms in East Asia- suggestive Lessons**

This review is carried out to find out experiences, Outcomes, obstacles, achievements and failures while implementation of Education Reforms in East Asia (especially in china Singapore, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, and Philippines). The goal of review is to understand the challenges of implementation of reforms in education, Distilling lessons on implementation and examining the impact on educational development, its process, and impact. Lessons of about Education Reforms Policies, process and implementation in East Asia.

By reviewing the literature, experiences of in the five East Asian countries discussed while implementing form policies in education. It is about China, Indonesia, Thailand, Cambodia and Philippines.

1. **First lesson:** Educational reform system requires complex set of functions at each level harmonizing of education. It is a difficult to reform, design and implementation. It suggests that strive to clarify the assignment of functions, simplify news processes and structures. It also asks to provide mechanism to co-ordinate and foster a shared understanding of reform at different levels of government.
2. **Second lesson:** The central authority (Central government) needs to step into new roles quickly to activate, to help the successful reform. These roles include setting standards and performance measures for use throughout

the education system. The central government also needs to perform system - planning and forecasting. It also expect fostering & support from wealthier states, wealthier regions and to Stimulate experiments.

3. **Third Lesson:** In reforming educational systems, replacing in appropriate structures and building the capacity to work. Within new arrangements these are key challenges.
4. **Fourth Lesson:** Dramatic shifts in responsibilities and powers are lead to the breakdown of information. and evaluation systems. It typically depend on the central government. It will help to fetch the information from lower levels of government and schools. According to this lesson, an accountability mechanisms - such as performance, information, and evaluation system, must not be placed and must be function with an interactively through active participation.
5. **Fifth lesson:** To advance education outcomes, educational institutes' stakeholders must have greater voice and exercise some control over educational institutes operation. It is about the decentralization, increasing local management and technical skills. It is also about strengthening the voice of the community in the delivery of public services. In many systems, local communities are not used to governing themselves, unfortunately politicians interferes, politicians represents their interests, the elected politicians use the right of local communities to vote to make politicians will. Breaking out of such mold is very important for successful implementation of educational reform.

Overall discussion leads to conclusion that for successful implementation of National Education policy – 2020 in India, these five lessons may considered as path finders as suggestion, as guidelines, as precautionary measures.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

To cope with Goal 4 (SDG 4), of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in the Global Education development agenda, India implementing National Education Policy – 2020. It has high unique fundamental principles. NEP-2020 is having four main parts as, Part I - School Education; Part II – Higher Education; Part III – other key Areas to focus and Part IV.

Making it happen means implementation of NEP-2020. The review is carried out to find our experiences, outcomes, obstacles, achievements and failures as LESSON while implementation of Education Reforms in East Asian countries being geographical, social and cultural similarities with India. The goal of review of this research attempt is to understand the challenges of implementation of reforms in education, distilling lessons – on implementation an and examining the impact on educational development, its process and impact. Lessons about education reforms policies, process and implementation is studied. By reviewing the literature, experiences in the five East Asian countries discussed while implementing reform policies in education. It is all about. China, Indonesia, Thailand, Cambodia and Philippines. The first lesson is educational reform system requires humanizing a complex set of functions at each level of education. The second lesson is that the central authority (Central government) needs to step into new roles quickly to activate, to help the successful reforms. Third lesson states that replacing inappropriate structures and building the capacity to work within new arrangements. Fourth lesson is dramatic shifts in responsibilities and powers are lead to the breakdown to information and evaluation systems, fifth and last lesson is about strengthening the voice of the community in the delivery of public services.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- [1]. Ahmad, Junaid, Richard Bird, and Jennie Litvack. 1998. "Rethinking Decentralization in Developing Countries." PREM Sector Studies Series. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [2]. Akita, Takahiro, and Armida S. Alisjahbana. 2002. "Regional Income Inequality in Indonesia and the Initial Impact of the Economic Crisis." Bulletin for Indonesian Economic Studies 38 (2): 201–22. Asian Development Bank. 1999. Philippine Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. 1998 Philippines Education Sector Study. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- [3]. Azfar, Omar, SatuKahkonen, and Patrick Meagher. 2001. "Conditions for Effective Decentralization Governance: A Synthesis of Research Findings." College Park, MD: University of Maryland, IRIS Center.

- [4]. Bray, Mark. 1999. "The Private Costs of Public Schooling: Household and Community Financing in Primary Education in Cambodia." Paris and Buenos Aires: International Institute for Educational Planning.Cheng,
- [5]. China Education and Research Network. 2003. [www.edu.cn/HomePage/english/index.shtml](http://www.edu.cn/HomePage/english/index.shtml).
- [6]. Chicago Public School System. n.d. "Chicago Public Schools:Every Child, Every School." [www.cps.k12.il.us/](http://www.cps.k12.il.us/).
- [7]. Chua, Yvonne T. 1999. Robbed: An Investigation on Corruption in Philippine Education. Manila: Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism.
- [8]. Corrales, Javier. 1999. "The Politics of Education Reform: Bolstering the Supply and Demand—Overcoming Institutional Blocks." Education Reform and Management Series 2 (1).Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [9]. Delannoy, Françoise. 2000. "Education Reforms in Chile,1980–98: A Lesson in Pragmatism." Education Reform and Management Series 1 (1). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [10]. Edwards, Sebastian. 2003. "How Chile Can Make the Most of Its U.S. Trade Deal." Wall Street Journal, January 3.
- [11]. Government of Indonesia. 1998 and 2002. "Survei Sosial Ekonomi Nasional" [SUSENAS]. Jakarta: Bureau of Central Statistics. 2000. Statistik Indonesia [Statistical Yearbook of Indonesia]. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik. 2001. "Decentralization of Education." National Committee for Education, Subcommittee III, draft report. Translated into English. Jakarta: Government of Indonesia. 2003. Act of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20, Year 2003, on National Education System. Jakarta: National Gazette.
- [12]. Hannum, Emily. 2002."Educational Stratification by Ethnicity in China." Demography 39 (1): 91–117.
- [13]. Hanson, Mark E. 2000. Democratization and Educational Decentralization in Spain. Education Reform and Management Series. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [14]. Hawkins, John N. 2000."Centralization, Decentralization, Recentralization: Educational Reform in China." Journal of Educational Administration 38 (5): 442–55.
- [15]. James, Estelle, Elizabeth King, and Ace Suryadi. 1996. "Finance, Management, and Costs of Public and Private Schools in Indonesia." Economics of Education Review 15 (4): 387–98.
- [16]. Jimenez, Emmanuel, and Vicente Paqueo. 1996. "Public for Private: The Relationship between Public and Private School Enrollment in the Philippines." Economics of Education Review 15 (4): 389–99.
- [17]. King, Elizabeth, and BerkOzler. 1998. "What's Decentralization Got to Do with Learning? The Case of Nicaragua's School Autonomy Reform." Washington, DC: World Bank, Development Research Group.
- [18]. Kingdom of Thailand. 1999. National Education Act, B.E. 2542.Bangkok: Office of the National Education Commission. Leithwood, Kenneth A., and Teresa Menzies. 1998. "Forms and Effects of School-Based Management: A Review." Educational Policy 12 (3): 325–46.
- [19]. Lewis, Blane D. 2002. "Revenue-Sharing and Grant-Making in Indonesia: The First Two Years of Fiscal Decentralization." In Intergovernmental Transfers in Asia, ed. Paul Smoke. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- [20]. Lopez-Acevedo, Gladys, Vicente Paqueo, and SuhasParandekar. 2003. "On the Use of Transparent Formulae to Allocate Federal Education Transfers." Washington, DC: World Bank, Latin America and the Caribbean Region.
- [21]. Machado, Maria Aglaê de Medeiros. 2002. "School Autonomy in Brazil: General Overview and Selected States." Brasília: World Bank.
- [22]. Martin, Michael O., Ina V. S. Mullis, Eugenio J. Gonzalez, Steven J. Chrostowski. 2004a. TIMSS 2003 International Mathematics Report: Findings from IEA's Trends in Mathematics and Science Study at the Fourth and Eighth Grades. Boston: International Association for the Evaluation of Education Achievement (IEA).
- [23]. McMahon, W., with N. Suwaryani, Boediono, and E. Appiah. 2001. Improving Education Finance in Indonesia. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education, Institute for Research and Development, Policy Research Center; UNICEF; and UNESCO.
- [24]. Murnane, Richard, Judith Singer, John Willett, James Kemple, and Randall Olsen. 1991. Who Will Teach? Policies That Matter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [25]. Namo de Mello, Guiomar. Forthcoming. "Introdução: BreveHistórico." Background paper for Lemann Foundation. <http://www.fundacaoolemann.org.br>.

- [26]. National Statistical Coordination Board. 2003. Philippine Statistical Yearbook. Manila: National Economic and Development Authority.
- [27]. OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development). 1998. Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators. Paris: OECD, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.
- [28]. Pandey, Raghaw. 2000. "Going to Scale with Education Reform: India's District Primary Education Program, 1995–99." Education Reform and Management Publication Series 1 (4). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [29]. Pascoe, Susan, and Robert Pascoe. 1998. "Education Reform in Australia, 1992–97." Education Reform and Management Publication Series 1 (2). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [30]. People's Republic of China. 2001. Essential Statistics of Education in China, Vol.1. Beijing: Ministry of Education, Department of Development and Planning 2002. China Statistical Yearbook, Vol. 21. Beijing: National Bureau of Statistics, China Statistics Press.
- [31]. Prawda, Juan. 1992. "Educational Decentralization in Latin America: Lessons Learned." Washington, DC: World Bank, Latin America and the Caribbean Region, Human Resources Division.
- [32]. Rodríguez, Alberto, and Kate Hovde. 2002. "The Challenge of School Autonomy: Supporting Principals." Washington, DC: World Bank, Latin America and the Caribbean Region, Department of Human Development.
- [33]. Ross, Steven M., William L. Sanders, S. Paul Wright, and Sam Stringfield. 1998. "The Memphis Restructuring Initiative: Achievement Results for Years 1 and 2 on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS)." Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Royal Kingdom of Cambodia. 2001. Education Sector Plan, section I (1). Phnom Penh: Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport.
- [34]. Shen, A. 1994. "Teacher Education and National Development in China." Journal of Education 176 (2): 57–71.
- [35]. Turner, Mark. 2002. "Whatever Happened to Deconcentration? Recent Initiatives in Cambodia." Public Administration and Development 22 (4): 353–64. UNESCO (U.N. Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization). 2002/2003. "Education Statistics." Paris: UNESCO, Institute for Statistics
- [36]. Vasconcelos-Saliba, Alcione. 2004. "Governance and Accountability Tools for Accountability: School Report Cards—The Case of Paraná (Brazil)." Presentation at the International Conference on Governance Accountability in Social Sector Decentralization. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [37]. Wang, Yidan. 2004. "Governance of Basic Education: Service Provision and Quality Assurance in China." Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [38]. Waterreus Ib. 2003. "Lessons in Teacher Pay: Studies on Incentives and the Labor Market for Teachers." Dissertation. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- [39]. West, Loraine A., and Christine P. W. Wong. 1995. "Fiscal Decentralization and Growing Regional Disparities in Rural China: Some Evidence in the Provision of Social Services." Oxford Review of Economic Policy 11 (4): 70–84.
- [40]. World Bank. 2000. "China National Development and Subnational Finance: A Review of Provincial Expenditures." Washington, DC: World Bank, East Asia and Pacific Region, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit.
- [41]. Zhang, Tiedao, Zhao Minxia, Zhao Xueqin, Zhang Xi, and Wang Yan. 2003. "Universalizing Nine-Year Compulsory Education for Poverty Reduction in Rural China." Case study on scaling up poverty reduction for Shanghai Poverty Conference.
- [42]. [https:// www.education.gov.in](https://www.education.gov.in) – National Education Policy – 2020
- [43]. Victor, O and Rupert, M. (2000). Education in Asia : Some Current issues, concerns and prospectus. Prospectus. V-XXX no.3. (1-8)
- [44]. [https:// www.nipfp.org.in/publications/working-papers/5834](https://www.nipfp.org.in/publications/working-papers/5834).