

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY 2020: MAJOR SHIFTS AND PROMINENT QUESTIONS

Ramanand, Sohom

The National Education Policy 2020 (NEP-2020), with its vision to introduce an 'education system rooted in Indian ethos' in the country, would lead to its transformation into an 'equitable and vibrant knowledge society,' aiming to bring large scale changes in the Indian education sector. The Committee for Evolution of the New Education Policy (NEP), constituted under the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) in October 2015, had submitted its report on May 7th, 2016. The report was a product of much deliberation, and extensive discourse involving the various stakeholders. Subsequently, a much shorter overview of the report was published by the government, and on July 30th, after 34 years, India got a new education policy at the approval of the cabinet, and the revelation of the final policy document.

The NEP 2020 has garnered considerable attention from the media and civil society. This article attempts to contribute to the discourse by discussing some of the themes presented in the document, which hold the potential for radically changing India's field of education. The provisions related to them have already become subjects of much praise, speculation, and criticism. However, a thorough understanding of their advent, meaning, and possible effect post-implementation are required.

Previous Education Policies

The NEP 2020 considers the different education policies that have already shaped this nation's education system. For a comprehensive understanding of the policy, we must look back at India's preceding education policies. Indeed, many of its provisions are in tandem with provisions mentioned in the previous policies. While certain issues like inequality in education, lack of adequate infrastructure, insufficiency of vocational education find repeated mentions in the policies, displaying the deep-rooted nature of those problems and the fact that pragmatic solutions to these problems remain unfound, provisions regarding other issues like nurturing a 'socialist' society, conducting examinations, or advancing secularism, have a reduced presence in later policies.

The National Policy on Education 1968, though only 8 pages long and highly limited in detail, also aimed for 'a radical reconstruction of education' for realizing the ideal of a 'socialistic pattern of society.' It visualized free and compulsory education for all students up to the age of 14 and highlighted teachers' importance in the education sector and the nation. An interesting point to note is that a separate clause (2b) was dedicated to highlighting the importance and ensuring teachers' academic freedom and their right to express opinions about significant national and international issues. The roots of a much important idea of NEP's school complexes can be found in the concept of the 'common school system' mentioned in the NEP-2020. Like NEP 1968, NEP-2020, also lays considerable importance on preservation and development of regional languages and also calls for special efforts for the development of Hindi as the 'link language' of India. It has basic provisions regarding equalizing educational opportunity among regions, social classes, genders, etc., and emphasizes the expansion of education in agriculture and industries. Like the NEP-2020, the document acknowledges the benefits of a uniform educational structure and calls for adopting a 10+2+3 system across India.

The National Policy of Education 1986 draws upon the education policy of 1968 but says that many of its general formulations did not get translated into 'detailed strategy of implementations.' Like the NEP 2019, the NPE 1968 calls for differentiating the first five years of schooling, as primary (called foundational in NEP), and has provisions for Early Childhood Care and Education, a subject that gets much attention in NEP-2020. Translation of books into the various regional languages and the importance of education for India's unity was emphasized even in 1986. There were provisions for Open University and Distance Learning in the 1986 policy and point 3.11 said that various groups like housewives, agricultural and industrial workers would be provided 'education of their choice, at a pace suited to them.' These attempts towards freeing education from closed classrooms became an important theme of the NEP. The document makes special provisions for the education of women, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, minorities, and the disabled. The 1986 policy kickstarted the essential Operation Blackboard, which brought about massive classroom infrastructure changes across India. It called for a child-centered approach to be followed in schools, like the NEP-2020, and its focus on Non-Formal education to bring back drop-outs. This document, too, encouraged autonomy in higher education and envisioned 'increasing flexibility in the combination of courses.' While in-service teacher education finds mention in the 1968 policy too, the NPE 1986 makes more detailed provisions and establishes the

District Institutes of Education and Training (DIETs) for teachers' pre-service and in-service education.

The NPE 1986 is very different from the NPE 1968 because it also addresses the administrative issues surrounding India's education. However, none of them contain detailed plans that could be implemented to achieve the objectives highlighted in them. The Programme on Action 1992 addresses this issue. It contains practical steps to materialize the provisions of NPE 1986. Both the 1968 and 1986 policies said that India's important aim is building a 'socialist pattern of society.' Interestingly, the words 'socialism' or 'socialist' finds no mention in the NEP 2020. Similarly, the 1968 and 1986 policies stress the importance of secularist ideals through education on multiple occasions, but the words 'secularism' or 'secular' find no mention in the newest document.

School Complexes and School Mergers

Sustained governmental efforts through Sarva Siksha Abhiyan (later subsumed under Samagra Sikhsha Scheme) have ensured near-universal access to India's schools. However, this has also meant building up and maintaining thousands of small schools, with very few students and teachers. The NEP-2020 cites U-DISE 2016–17 data, according to which nearly 28% of India's public primary schools and 14.8% of India's upper primary schools have less than 30 students. The average number of students per grade in the elementary schooling system (primary and upper primary, i.e., Grades 1–8) is about 14, with a notable proportion having below 6. During the year 2016–17, there were 1,08,017 single-teacher schools, the majority of them (85743) being primary schools serving Grades 1–5. Small schools are financially and administratively difficult to manage. They make infrastructural up-gradation difficult, and the students of these small schools largely lack access to laboratories, sports grounds, and other necessary resources. Often a single teacher has to teach many subjects, even subjects he/she has no background in, and even teach multiple classes. The NEP-2020 recognizes these problems in section 7 and goes forward to recommend steps like 'consolidation of schools' (Pt. 7.4) and 'school complexes/clusters' (Pt. 7.6) to solve the problem. A more detailed understanding of these recommendations can be received if we look at the Draft NEP 2019 (the committee report). 'School Consolidation' refers to closing down small schools with very few students and merging them with nearby, possibly larger schools. Both the draft and the passed NEP calls upon authorities to ensure that school consolidation does not affect schools' accessibility. 'School complexes/clusters' are created by administratively linking several

primary schools and a secondary school(s) in an area. The complex/cluster can also include vocational education institutes, Anganwadi centers, and other related institutions. The schools in a complex share resource like teachers, playgrounds, laboratories, counselors, etc., ensuring that they are accessible to a larger number of students. They function under the school complex management committee and draw up collective plans for themselves. For improved governance, the NEP recommends devolving all finer decisions to Principals, teachers, and other stakeholders within each group of schools and treating such groups as integrated semi-autonomous units. School consolidation and school complexes allow a vibrant teacher community to develop knowledge sharing, and as a result students' isolation in small schools is broken.

It must be realized that the idea of school complexes/clusters is not exactly new. An education committee first recommended school complexes in Maharashtra State in 1948. However, no action was taken, and in 1966 the recommendation was repeated by the Kothari Commission instituted by the national government. Some state governments responded in the late 1960s and early 1970s, though with different models and varying degrees of success. Complexes were created in Bihar, Maharashtra, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Rajasthan, and Haryana (Bray, 1987). In 1987, CBSE brought out a publication titled, "Freedom to learn and freedom to grow through Sahodaya School Complexes" (SSCs), which characterized "SSCs" as a voluntary association of schools in a given area, who through mutual choices, have agreed to come together for a systematic and system-wide renewal of the total educational process; after which several school complexes were formed across India. Singhal (1983) scrutinized the functioning and effectiveness of school complexes in India and reported that they often bring in positive changes. For the school complexes of Bihar, he said that Supervision of teachers increased, which improved teachers' punctuality and techniques and impacted pupil achievement. Resources were used more efficiently, library books were used more frequently, laboratories shared, and teachers used as substitutes when colleagues were away. Singhal attributed the reduction of drop-out rates, increased enrollment rates, and improved student performances in some areas to school complexes.

According to Singhal, the complexes could not achieve their full potential due to the lack of political will and investment. While that might be resolved if the central government is dedicated to implementing the NEP-2020, the lack of strong leadership within complexes was another shortcoming reported by Singhal. The lack of initiative and leadership from the heads of school

complexes was also reported in Andhra Pradesh in 2019 (Varma, 2019). Because the NEP-2020 wants to devolve more powers to managers of school complexes, hoping that it would bring better results (pt. 7.8), mechanisms must be built to ensure that able and responsible individuals fill the positions of power within school complexes. Furthermore, the effectiveness of the idea of a school complex depends on the efficient sharing of resources. The efficient sharing of resources can only occur among the schools of a school complex if they are well connected infrastructurally. Students will not be able to access the libraries and laboratories of partner schools if they cannot reach them easily. Organizing collective events and forming the 'sense of a community' (Pt. 7.5 c) will be difficult if the schools grouped do not have proper roads connecting them.

School mergers have also taken place in India before, but with rather negative impacts. From 2017-18, Jharkhand's government embarked upon a journey to merge thousands of schools in the state, under Niti Ayog's Sustainable Action for Transforming Human Capital in Education (SATH-E) project with help from the Boston Consulting Group (BCG). The move was met by stiff opposition from civil society members and the opposition parties who claimed that the policy would bring down enrollment rates. Even prominent MLAs from the ruling BJP protested against school mergers as they believed that due to the state's hilly terrain and the fact that several areas are affected by Naxalism, parents would be unwilling to send their children to schools if they are not nearby. Furthermore, they feared that the abandoned school buildings would be used for anti-social activities (Chowdhury, 2018). Sustained public pressure made the government modify its policy and ensure that parents' consent is taken before merging schools more than 1 km apart (Edex, 2018). Several journalistic works reported cases of students who dropped out after their schools were merged with schools they cannot regularly travel to (Choudhury 2019). School mergers became a major poll issue in the 2019 Jharkhand election, and the new ruling government has promised to open up closed schools.

In their 2017 study on school mergers in Telangana, Odisha, and Rajasthan, Rao et al. found that despite government assurances that no child will be left behind, enrollments were negatively affected by school mergers. The harm was more serious for students belonging to marginalized communities like Dalits and Tribes. Furthermore, they did not find any evidence of school mergers improving the quality of learning; rather, the reality pointed otherwise as they often found an inadequate number of teachers taking classes in cramped classrooms. Another research on mergers

in Rajasthan by Accountability Initiative found that school mergers have reduced students' enrollment from ST, SC, and OBC communities by around 6 percent. The decline was way higher than the average 1.4 percent reduction of enrollment rates in non-merged schools during the same period (Bordoloi and Shukla, 2019). In point 7.5, the NEP calls upon state governments to 'rationalize' schools by 2025 using 'innovative mechanisms.' It must be realized that thanks to the circumstantial diversity among different regions of India, for some states, the most rational thing to do would be not to rationalize schools at all.

The Language Policy

The NEP rightly identifies that children learn better if they are taught in their mother tongues. It also correctly proclaims that India's diversity in terms of its languages is wealth and that its many languages must be sustained and developed. Therefore, it recommends the medium of instruction in both public and private schools to be the 'home language/mother-tongue/local language/regional language' until 'until at least Grade 5, but preferably till Grade 8 and beyond' (Pt. 4.11). There is little doubt that this focus on the medium of instruction has had to come about because a large number of schools in India have adopted English as the medium of instruction. Some of their practice of forcing students to speak in English while they are in school, and even when they are in informal settings, is deplorable. The practice attaches a false inferior status to the students' mother tongues, which might negatively affect the students' sense of dignity and cultural pride. The Draft NEP 2019, while explaining the language policy, had correctly diagnosed the problem of 'the knowledge of English' becoming a structural barrier to upward social mobility (D. NEP 2019, Pg. 81).

However, when a change as big as this is planned, certain questions must be asked. The interesting case of Uttar Pradesh must be taken into account. In 2017, the BJP led UP government decided to start 5000 state-run English medium primary schools. The previous Samajwadi Party-led government had started a few English medium schools, and they were very popular. The government realized the demand for English medium schools among parents and decided to cater to the same by transforming some of the Hindi medium primary schools into English medium ones (Hindustan times, 2017). Furthermore, in 2019, the UP government decided to set up 1000 English medium junior high schools as per the demands of parents and students who studied in English medium primary school (Hindustan times, 2019).

However, it must be realised that the new policy is not looking at cutting down the English language as a whole. Thus, it must not be a matter of concern for parent who want their kids to excel in English. The policy just suggest to teach English after 5th grade which is not at all difficult for the present day students. Instead the NEP-2020 recognised the very fact that unless the medium of instruction between the teacher and student is not taken into consideratuion, it would always be difficult to universalise education and literacy. It also recognises that schools' medium of instruction should be congruent with the child's medium of thinking. Moreover, learning is always effective when it is from the known to the unknown. With a strong foundation in the mother tongue or local language, a child can easily shift to learning another language.

Furthermore, we must again see the benefits of learning in one's mother tongue, that the shift towards English has made us unsee. A child's learning begins at home in the mother tongue and when a child comes to school to learn in a foreign language, it does slow down the learning process. Continuing the learning in the mother tongue will ensure faster learning and retention. Furtherore, the policy also ensures that using the mother tongue as a medium of instruction will also result in a higher rate of parental participation in a child's learning. In India, due to a lack of English knowledge, many parents are unable to participate in their child's schooling effectively. Learning in the local language boosts children's self-confidence and will be able to express themselves better without any hesitation. Mother tongue is not just a language but a sense of belonging for an individual. Learning in the local language helps to preserve our cultural roots and deepen our understanding of our heritage. With the use of local languages for learning, dropout rates can be dramatically reduced in rural India. Many students show disinterest to go to school because they are unable to connect with English and with no substitute coaching and lack of parent's intervention, the odds are against them. The use of a known language can dramatically alter the situation.

In addition to benefits for students, this policy will also reduce the student-teacher ration in India. The switch to the local language will be a big boon for teachers, too. The realistic situation on the ground is that many teachers in "English medium" schools are not fluent in English. After all, one needs to have numerous opportunities to listen to and practice conversing in a language to become fluent in it. the interest, enthusiasm, and creativity of teachers when they can teach in the local

languages they are comfortable with will also help in the pedagogy. Knowing more than one language helps develop new perspectives for an individual and brings in various social and cultural opportunities.

Another question put forward by this policy's critics is that several Dalit-Bahujan groups and other marginal communities consider this policy as a back wards step because for them unlike other structural barriers like economic wealth, caste, or gender, English is presently one that can be easily dealt with. According to them, English knowledge is comparatively easier to gain, thanks to the schools offering English education, and for many members of the marginalized communities, English can open doors to upward social mobility. However, it must also be noticed that educationalist and language activists and various other scholars invested in drafting this policy take a stand that to take out a large section of community from poverty, education must be provided in their own language.

Furthermore, NEP does not envision to downplay the importance of English by promoting the importance of Indian language. The three-language programme is a very clear evidence to this stand. The NEP tactically accepts the need for English by its three-language formula, of which only two must be Indian (4.13), and it is not mentioning of English as one of the foreign languages one might learn as an 'extra' (Pt. 4.20). The makers of NEP-2020, it seems, envisioned English being taught as a second language while the medium of instruction remains an Indian language.

If the policy is implemented in letter and spirit, India can become a knowledge society as envisioned by this policy. This wonderful nation's diverse cultures and languages can become a rich source of knowledge system in this country. As mentioned in the draft NEP, India's chances of becoming a Vishva Guru are very high if this vision is well implemented and promoted.

Flexibility and Multidisciplinarity

The NEP 2020 implores on empowering students by allowing them the flexibility to choose the subjects they want to study and to design their course, starting from secondary school (Pt. 4.9). It intends to dissolve the hard barriers between the arts, science, and commerce streams and also those separating the 'curricular' from the 'extra-curricular' and 'co-curricular' and the 'vocational' from the 'academic.' It visualizes an education system where students are free to explore and choose the subjects they like and thus have greater chances in excelling in them. In the current

scenario, schools impose a set of subjects with their preset content on students. Often, certain students are not interested in one or more subjects, and they might not find themselves fit for them. Therefore, they have lower chances of performing as good as others in these subjects, and their overall academic scores suffer as a result. However, many of these students are interested and talented in other unoffered subjects, including so-called extra-curricular/vocational subjects. The lack of opportunity to study the subjects they are interested in and the societal pressure to study the 'desirable' available subjects is an injustice to them and a loss of resources for the nation. The NEP-2020 wants to break barriers and bring all subjects at par with each other. Students will therefore be free to try out different subjects, realize their abilities and interests, and hone their talents in the subjects of their choosing. This will certainly make their learning experience more enjoyable and productive. Furthermore, this might be a step towards dissolving the socially attached higher and lower statuses to certain subjects, something that has forced students to go against their wishes and study what society wanted them to study for too long.

A few concerns remain, however. Something that must be kept in mind is that we are talking about minors choosing their subjects. Considering India's social realities, there is a high probability that the students' parents would often decide for the students, undermining their own choices, and being influenced by the socially attached high and low status to subjects. Furthermore, students' vision of having a large pool of subjects to choose from might almost always remain unrealized on the ground. CBSE currently offers 91 non-language academic subjects to choose from, including Home Science, Early Childhood Education, Salesmanship, and Entrepreneurship (CBSE, 2019). However, very few students actually have the opportunity to choose from among these 91 subjects as the subjects they are going to study are dictated by the subjects offered in their schools. We must understand that few schools in India have the infrastructural and economic capability to hire teachers and provide classrooms for many subjects, and students will mostly have to choose from among the few subjects offered in their schools.

The NEP-2020 aims to make all Higher Education Institutes in India multidisciplinary, meaning they would impart courses on various disciplines. Therefore, the students in these universities would have a wide variety of interests, outlooks, and passions, and the mutual interaction among them would be educative and beneficial. Also, the NEP-2020 wants to allow university students to choose subjects across disciplines and thus get a multidisciplinary education. With the Industrial

Revolution, the demand for specialized education for the newly created specialized jobs grew, and with that grew the distance between disciplines. Some educators like Charles Eliot, who played a key role in developing the "liberal arts education," expressed doubts about the increasing differentiation among disciplines. He believed that students should not be forced to follow pre-designed pathways under the guise of specialization in disciplines after attaining the age of eighteen. They should be free to choose the subjects they want to be educated in (Zakaira, 2016). He also believed that the hard separation of disciplines reduces the chances of positive social change, as it reduces interaction between the different disciplines and the evolution of new modes of thinking (Jones, 2012).

Furthermore, since the experience of university education often radically changes the outlook and thinking of students, it is difficult to understand how it can be assumed that students will know beforehand which exact discipline to be trained in (Misiewicz, 2017). With the ongoing technological revolution, it has become very difficult to predict which specialized skills will be in demand shortly, and the ability to upgrade and reskill has become important. Reskilling and learning anew becomes easier when a multifaceted and multidisciplinary understanding of the world around is achieved instead of straightforward, rigorous specializations. Education in singular disciplines trains students to look at the world only through that specific discipline's eyes. Multidisciplinary allows students to understand the various outlooks of different disciplines, helps them gain a more wholesome understanding of the world, and facilitates better solutions for its problems.

Vocational Education

India is one of the world's youngest nations, with about 62% of its population in the working-age group (15-59 years) and around 54% of its total population below 25 years of age. Its population pyramid is expected to bulge across the 15-59 age group over the next decade. Under such circumstances, our country presently faces a dual challenge of paucity of highly trained workforce and non-employability of large sections of the conventionally educated youth, who possess little or no job skills. The country has a big challenge ahead as it is estimated that only 4.69% of the total workforce in India has undergone formal skill training (NSSO, 2011-12) as compared to 68% in the UK, 75% in Germany, 52% in the USA, 80% in Japan and 96% in South Korea. According to the NCAER Skilling India Report published in 2018, nearly 1.25 million new workers aged 15–

29 are projected to join the workforce every month by 2022. The roughly 70 million workers entering or have entered the workforce between 2018 and 2022 need to be skilled for a 21st-century economy if India keeps pace with technological change.

Furthermore, many of the roughly 468 million workers currently in the workforce could be upskilled and reskilled, which is not easy because 92% are in the informal sector. Out of the more than 500 thousand final year bachelor's students aged 18–29 surveyed by NCAER, 54% were found to be unemployed, pointing out the massive prevalent skill gap. India is currently in a unique position where employers seek skilled workers, and those seeking employment face problems. A 2011 survey on 'Labor/ Skill Shortage for Industry' of over 100 companies by the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) found that 90% of companies were facing a labor shortage. On the other hand, in its Efficiency Study Report on Indian ITIs, the International Labor Organization (ILO) concluded that the employability of those completing training at state-run ITIs was poor and that only 30–40% found employment or became self-employed on completion of their training (ILO, 2003, p. 31). Under such circumstances, the development and improvement of the vocational education sector in India are essential.

As a response, the NEP-2020 firstly calls upon dissolving the hard separation between 'academic' and 'vocational' subjects in schools (Pt. 4.9). It makes way for students to attain vocational skills while studying other 'academic' subjects in schools. It also plans to introduce 'bagless days/weeks' in schools where all students will be involved in hands-on vocational activities and create opportunities to intern with local craftsmen and vocational experts for students (Pt. 4.26). The policy also visualizes multidisciplinary higher education institutes providing vocational education courses and other 'mainstream' subjects (Pt. 16.5). The NEP-2020 points out that vocational education is seen as inferior to mainstream academic education in India, and students are often discouraged from enrolling in vocational courses. The steps mentioned above, breaking the barriers between the 'academic' and the 'vocational,' would help raise the social status of vocational courses. The NEP-2020 also creates clear academic pathways for students of vocational education and allows vertical mobility for them.

The NEP-2020 says that by 2025, at least 50% of Indian learners will have vocational education (Pt 16.5). While simply 'exposing' 50% of students to vocational education might not be a very hard task to achieve, training 50% of students properly with the available infrastructure might be

so. There is an urgent requirement to close the prevalent skill gap in India, i.e., train students in vocations in demand in the economy. The quality of vocational education teachers and skill imparters also need to be improved. Both of these must be an important part of the 'reimagination of vocational education' called upon by the NEP. There is some confusion regarding how much skill training can be imparted to children in schools, keeping their safety and health in mind. Many groups have also pointed out the importance of ensuring that converging vocational with academic education does not lead to further structural discrimination of the marginalized. While strengthening India's vocational education sector, the government must ensure that students from marginalized communities are not discouraged from joining the educational institutes offering non-vocational courses.

Conclusion

The National Education Policy 2020 has a huge potential to change. Whether or not it will be a change for improvement largely depends on its implementation. Education being a subject of the concurrent list, the implementation would depend heavily on the decisions and actions of particular state governments. This is indeed necessary because the educational scenario is very different across the different regions of India. This is also in tandem with NEP-2020's support for decentralization- in the form of more autonomy to educational institutes and engaging local community members in education to teaching content with 'local flavor.' While the policy has been made, the dialogue about it is still ongoing. The policy's impact on the would depend on dialogue and negotiations between the population and the government agencies, and the particular circumstances on the ground.

Works Cited

- Bordoloi, Mridusmita, and Ritwik Shukla (2019): *School Consolidation in Rajasthan- Implementation and Short Term Effects*. Accountability India. Available at-

<https://accountabilityindia.in/publication/school-consolidation-in-rajasthan-implementation-and-short-term-effects/>. Accessed on August 8th, 2020

- Bray, Mark (1987): *School Clusters in the Third World: Making them Work*. UNESCO-UNICEF Co-Operative Programme. Pg. 65. Available at- <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234676905>. Accessed on August 7th, 2020.
- CBSE. Senior School Curriculum. Classes 11-12. 2019-2020. Available at- http://cbseacademic.nic.in/web_material/CurriculumMain20/SrSecondary/Intitial_pages_srsec_2019-20.pdf. Accessed on August 11th, 2020
- Chowdhury, Shreya (2018): "School mergers: Jharkhand's BJP MPs believe the Rajasthan model will not work in their state," *Scroll.in*. September 3rd, 2018. Available at- <https://scroll.in/article/891982/school-mergers-jharkhands-bjp-mps-believe-the-rajasthan-model-will-not-work-in-their-state>. Accessed on August 8th, 2020
- Choudhury, Abinash (2019): "Primary schools: Merger muddle" in *Frontline*, The Hindu. July 19th, 2019. Available at- <https://frontline.thehindu.com/cover-story/article28259500.ece>. Accessed on August 8th, 2020
- "Coming soon: 5000 govt-run English medium primary schools in Uttar Pradesh", *Hindustantimes*. October 7th, 2017. Available at- <https://www.hindustantimes.com/lucknow/coming-soon-5000-govt-run-english-medium-primary-schools-in-uttar-pradesh/story-gGUZII1tGltx1A3JMwLb3HJ.html>. Accessed on August 8th, 2020.
- *Draft National Education Policy 2019*. Committee for Draft National Education Policy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India. Available at- https://www.mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/Draft_NEP_2019_EN_Revised.pdf
- Edex Live, 2018: "Jharkhand schools now need parents' nod to merge a primary school beyond 1 km" in *Edex Life*. December 14th, 2018. Available at- <https://www.edexlive.com/news/2018/dec/14/jharkhand-schools-now-need-parents-nod-to-merge-a-primary-school-beyond-1-km-4730.html>. Accessed on August 8th, 2020
- FICCI 2011: *Labor/Skill Shortage for Industry*. Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry. Available at-

[http://ficci.in/Sedocument/20165/FICCI Labour Survey.pdf](http://ficci.in/Sedocument/20165/FICCI_Labour_Survey.pdf). Accessed on August 13th, 2020.

- "Govt to set up 1,000 English medium junior high schools in UP", *Hindustantimes*. March 3rd, 2019. Available at- <https://www.hindustantimes.com/education/govt-to-set-up-1-000-english-medium-junior-high-schools-in-up/story-MPrdINSh4Prt0NLm97jfyH.html>.

Accessed on August 9th, 2020

- ILO 2003: *Industrial Training Institutes of India- The Efficiency Study Report* Subregional Office for South Asia. ILO, New Delhi. Available at- https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/32663645/ITI_efficiency_report.pdf?1388633223=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DIndustrial_training_institutes_of_India.pdf&Expires=1597318871&Signature=JgFrsBzOK6zxVuqEW-2Nu49oR1C82no73j4Qoz-2WRXpSwcn4j9RZ1fF87-bnZlxKW7mZO48~6kqX3dLVjgcc4cN62qnnw~~Hm4pFnSO-I3W1hQ0Xzd~iBJOSeAe~cSvFesLvONbIMB0OdUIdUUmFuwiI69sD~Ajv27Vw8pv2VyfxZaBxJDv0trtgmWlsw5eXxpjZexkKD241iSIReJbgDJBNNKPOD0HVABjn~mz5-e81WE6dJAxtm8tcLn8ATi43VfPYn3yVdBaUPZztUaiuxoq2jxOYTN9KfuQBQ6JP016F2cEvv9nO201o8mq2TZVcyC767ngjU2T9Gmt4Pw_&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA. Accessed on August 13th, 2020

- Jones, Casey. "Interdisciplinary Approach – Advantages, Disadvantages, and the Future Benefits of Interdisciplinary Studies." *ESSAI*: Vol. 7, Article 26. Available at- <http://dc.cod.edu/essai/vol7/iss1/26>. Accessed on August 11th, 2020

- Lobachev, Sergey (2008): *Top Languages in Global Information Production*. University of Guelph, Canada. Available at- https://www.google.com/search?q=percentage+of+books+printed+in+English&rlz=1C1CHBF_enIN816IN816&oq=percentage+of+books+printed+in+English&aqs=chrome..69i57.12116j1j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8#. Accessed on August 9th, 2020.

- McCarthy, Niall (2018): "How Languages Used Online Compare To Real Life," *Forbes*. Available at- <https://www.forbes.com/sites/niallmccarthy/2018/07/27/how-languages-used-online-compare-to-real-life-infographic/#2b1ff58e2c7c>. Accessed on August 9th, 2020.
- Misiewicz, Janina (2017): *The Benefits and Challenges of Interdisciplinarity*. Rebus Community. Available at- <https://press.rebus.community/idsconnect/chapter/the-benefits-and-challenges-of-interdisciplinarity/>. Accessed on August 11th, 2020
- *National Education Policy, 2020*. Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India. Available at- https://www.mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf
- NCAER 2018: *Skilling India- No Time To Lose*. National Council for Applied Economics Research. Supported by J.P Morgan. Available at- https://www.ncaer.org/publication_details.php?pID=300. Accessed on August 13th, 2020
- NSS Report No. 554. 2011-2012. *Employment and Unemployment Situation in India*. National Sample Survey Office. Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. Government of India. Available at- http://mospi.nic.in/sites/default/files/publication_reports/nss_report_554_31jan14.pdf. Accessed on August 13th, 2020.
- Rao, Srinivas, et al. (2017): *School Closures and Mergers: A Multi-State Study of Policy and its Impact on Education*. Save The Children. Available at- <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320056186>. Accessed on August 8th, 2020
- Singhal, R.P. (1983): *Revitalising school complexes in India*, National Institute of Educational Planning & Administration/ Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
- St. George International (2015): "How Many People in The World Speak English?" in *St. George International The Language Specialists*. Available at- <https://www.stgeorges.co.uk/blog/learn-english/how-many-people-in-the-world-speak-english#:~:text=In%202015%2C%20out%20of%20the,around%20the%20European%20Union...> Accessed on August 9th, 2020
- Varma, Sujata (2019): " 'School complexes' need more focus," *The Hindu*. September 18th, 2019. Available at- <https://www.thehindu.com/news/cities/Vijayawada/school-complexes-need-more-focus/article29446414.ece>. Accessed on August 7th, 2020.

- Zakaria, Fareed 2016: *In Defense of a Liberal Education*. W.W. Norton and Company.
Print.