International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)
ISSN (Online): 2319 – 7722, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 7714
www.ijhssi.org ||Volume 15 Issue 1 || January 2026 || PP. 71-81

Evaluating the Post-Implementation Challenges of NEP 2020 in School Education: A Comprehensive Analysis of Teacher Preparedness, Institutional Constraints, ICT Infrastructure, and the Declining Academic Performance of Students in Kanpur District

Dr. Rachna Trivedi
Associate Professor, Head, Department of Education Headquarters Officer, National Service Scheme DSN College, Unnao"

ABSTRACT
The implementation of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 has introduced promising reforms across India, yet teachers continue to face multiple challenges that hinder effective execution in real classroom settings. This study investigates the hurdles experienced by 50 teachers in Kanpur district and examines the corresponding decline in student academic performance between 2020 and 2024. Using a descriptive survey design, 12 analytical tables were generated to evaluate NEP awareness, ICT availability, training adequacy, workload distribution, student engagement, and teachers' perceptions. Results reveal significant gaps in digital infrastructure, insufficient professional training, increased administrative workload, and inconsistent NEP implementation strategies. These factors correlate strongly with reduced student engagement levels and falling academic scores. The findings underscore that while NEP 2020 has transformative potential, its success largely depends on strengthened teacher support systems, robust ICT infrastructure, and continuous capacity-building. The study concludes by recommending targeted training, workload rationalization, and technology enhancement to ensure the policy's effective translation into practice.
Keywords: *NEP 2020, teacher challenges, ICT infrastructure, academic performance decline, student engagement, Kanpur district*

I. Introduction

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 marks one of India's most ambitious attempts to reimagine schooling and higher education since independence. It sets out a wide-ranging vision: foundational literacy and numeracy for all, early childhood care and education (ECCE) integration, a restructuring of school stages (5+3+3+4), multidisciplinary undergraduate programmes, emphasis on vocational education, multilingualism, technology-driven learning, and a complete overhaul of teacher education and professional development systems. The policy's goals are laudable in scope and intent, but the gap between policy design and ground-level reality has become increasingly apparent as states, institutions, and practitioners attempt to operationalize NEP's reforms. For teachers—the engines of curriculum delivery and the primary interface between policy and learners—this transition has produced a range of complex challenges and hurdles that directly affect classroom processes and, in many cases, contribute to stagnation or decline in academic outcomes for students. This introduction examines those teacher-facing challenges in detail and links them to observed declines in academic performance, arguing that unless systemic obstacles are addressed with targeted resources and realistic timelines, NEP's educational aspirations risk remaining underfulfilled.

NEP 2020: Promise, scale, and the teacher's new role

NEP 2020 reconfigures many core assumptions about schooling. Teachers are expected to shift from traditional content-delivery roles to facilitators of inquiry-based, competency-focused, multidisciplinary learning. They are to assess learners formatively, integrate vocational and experiential learning, adopt multilingual pedagogies, leverage digital resources, and work in closer coordination with school leaders, community stakeholders, and newly proposed institutional bodies. In parallel, NEP prescribes a radical reorientation of teacher education: multidisciplinary teacher-preparation programmes within universities, continuous professional development, and a vision for raising teacher status and autonomy. While these prescriptions place teachers at the center of reform, they also substantially increase role complexity and skill requirements in a short period—without guaranteeing commensurate resources, training, or institutional support. This mismatch between expanding expectations and constrained capacities is a central source of stress and implementation friction.

Core challenges faced by teachers after NEP 2020 implementation

Below I map the principal categories of hurdles teachers are encountering, drawing on empirical studies, government implementation reviews, policy analyses, and recent education monitoring data.

1. Inadequate and uneven teacher preparation and continuous professional development

NEP 2020 envisions a wholesale reform of teacher education (B.Ed., pre-service training, in-service Continuous Professional Development—CPD), but many teacher-preparation institutions remain under-resourced, follow outdated curricula, and lack faculty with contemporary pedagogical expertise. Several studies and reviews indicate that existing B.Ed. programmes often emphasize theory over practice and have not kept pace with NEP's demand for competency-based, multidisciplinary pedagogy. Consequently, teachers report feeling ill-equipped to implement learning-centered, activity-based classrooms and formative assessment strategies. The problem is more acute in rural and small-town colleges where institutional capacity for redesigning curricula, arranging school-based practicum, and providing ICT-rich training is limited.

Moreover, while NEP calls for systematic, long-term CPD and mentoring structures, states and districts are at different stages of rolling out high-quality professional development. Where CPD exists, it is often short, top-down, or perfunctory—failing to provide sustained coaching, classroom modelling, and follow-up support. Education experts have pointed out that ad hoc workshops do not translate into changed classroom practice; teachers need continuous, school-embedded learning cycles and resources to redesign lesson plans and assessments.

2. Workload inflation and non-teaching duties

NEP's curricular redesign and expanded programme offerings (e.g., integrating ECCE, vocational streams, and project-based learning) inevitably increase teachers' preparatory and follow-up work. Simultaneously, many teachers—especially in government schools—continue to be assigned non-teaching administrative duties (election work, census-related tasks, paperwork, midday meal coordination, etc.), which shrink instructional hours. Policy analysts and state orders have repeatedly flagged long-term non-academic deployments as a major drain on instructional time and teacher focus. The consequence is diminished lesson preparation, reduced time for remedial instruction, and higher teacher stress—factors that lower teaching quality and student learning inputs. Without a systematic redistribution of administrative responsibilities and hiring of specialist staff, teachers will continue to face role overload that hampers implementation of NEP-aligned pedagogies.

3. Infrastructure gaps: ICT, classrooms, and learning materials

NEP 2020 assumes a degree of infrastructural readiness—digital learning platforms, ICT labs, libraries, safe sanitation, and well-equipped classrooms—that is uneven across India. Many schools, particularly in rural and economically disadvantaged areas, lack reliable electricity, internet connectivity, device access, and even basic teaching-learning materials. While some states have actively rolled out ICT labs and smart classrooms in selected schools, usage remains inconsistent and teachers often lack the training and time to integrate digital pedagogies meaningfully. The digital divide further compounds inequities: teachers attempting blended or online approaches confront students who cannot access remote content, widening learning gaps and complicating classroom progress tracking. This infrastructural shortfall directly constrains teachers' ability to adopt NEP's envisioned pedagogies.

4. Curriculum change management and assessment transitions

Shifting from content-heavy, exam-oriented instruction to competency-based, multidisciplinary learning requires thoughtful curriculum unwinding and assessment redesign. Teachers must rework lesson plans, design project-based assessments, and implement frequent formative checks rather than rely on summative, high-stakes exams. However, many teachers report lacking clear, classroom-level curricular resources and exemplars that translate NEP's frameworks into daily practice. Centralized curricula may not be aligned with local realities (languages, contexts, resource constraints), leaving teachers to improvise. Assessment reforms are particularly challenging: aligning school-level evaluations, board examinations, and university-entry mechanisms is an ongoing policy process. In the interim, teachers must prepare students for older exam formats (still in use), creating conflicting pressures that dilute NEP-friendly pedagogical shifts.

5. Human resource shortages, recruitment, and retention issues

NEP's reforms expand the scope of schooling (ECCE integration, multi-disciplinary higher education pathways, increased focus on foundational learning recovery), but teacher recruitment has not scaled correspondingly. Shortages of qualified teachers lead to larger class sizes and multi-grade classrooms—conditions that make individualized, competency-based instruction harder. Additionally, the policy's new expectations and variability in working conditions have affected teacher morale. Contractual and ad hoc hires (e.g., para-teachers,

vocational trainers) often face job insecurity, irregular pay, and lack of professional recognition, which undermines retention and long-term capacity building. Advocates argue that increased budgetary allocations (NEP recommends 6% of GDP) are needed to hire and train teachers at scale; current spending remains short of that target, constraining recruitment drives.

6. Equity, multilingualism, and sociocultural complexity

NEP's emphasis on mother-tongue/home-language instruction and multilingual pedagogy promises better learning outcomes if implemented carefully. Yet many teachers are not trained to teach in multiple languages, and states differ widely in language policy execution. Migrant, disadvantaged, and special-needs students present additional pedagogical demands: differentiated instruction, remedial programming, and inclusive classroom practices are resource-intensive and require specialized training. Where teachers lack scaffolding techniques or remedial materials, vulnerable students fall further behind—undermining the equity goals of NEP and contributing to aggregate declines in measured performance.

7. Policy coordination, governance, and timelines

NEP 2020 envisions structural institutional changes—new regulatory bodies, multidisciplinary institutions for teacher education, and cross-sectoral convergence between health, nutrition, and early childhood services. Implementation, however, involves centre-state coordination, legislative changes (e.g., HECI), and financial planning. Delays, differing priorities across states, and uneven capacity at district education offices slow down reforms. Teachers often operate in an environment where policy directives change, administrative guidelines are delayed, and clarity on curricular changes or assessment shifts arrives piecemeal. The uncertainty complicates school-level planning and saps teacher energy that would otherwise be spent on pedagogy.

How these teacher challenges translate into declining academic performance

Teacher capacity and functioning are the primary mechanisms through which any policy improves student learning. When teachers face the combined effects of inadequate training, inflated workload, infrastructure deficits, and systemic uncertainty, the classroom experience shifts in measurable ways that depress learning trajectories. Below I outline the main causal pathways linking teacher-related hurdles to declining student performance.

1. Reduced instructional quality and contact hours

Non-teaching deployments and long administrative hours reduce teachers' time for lesson planning, continuous assessment, and remedial instruction. Even modest reductions in quality instructional time disproportionately affect foundational learning (literacy and numeracy), where repeated practice and immediate corrective feedback are essential. Studies documenting learning loss after COVID-19 show that even temporary interruptions can create deficits several months deep—deficits that require targeted remedial instruction to correct. When teachers are overwhelmed or untrained in remedial techniques, recovery lags, and cohorts of students progress through grades without mastering core competencies.

2. Poor alignment between pedagogy and assessment expectations

When teachers are unclear about assessment reforms or obliged to teach to legacy high-stakes formats, classroom instruction becomes fragmented. Some teachers revert to rote learning methods to ensure students can access examinations and progression pathways; such approaches run counter to NEP's competency goals and fail to develop higher-order skills. The result is an apparent paradox: curricular innovation on paper, but persistent low performance on standardized measures because classroom practices have not fully shifted. This misalignment contributes to disappointing assessment outcomes even where policy intent is strong.

3. Technology without teacher readiness causes mixed learning gains

Digital tools can accelerate personalized learning, formative assessment, and access to diverse resources—if teachers are trained to integrate them pedagogically. However, introducing ICT in contexts where teachers lack training, support, or time often produces uneven benefits: classrooms where teachers effectively use technology may see gains, while others face distraction, superficial use, or reinforcement of existing inequalities. The net effect at scale can be stagnation or decline in aggregate learning outcomes if technology is treated as an add-on rather than as one component of a coherent pedagogical redesign.

4. Teacher morale, motivation, and classroom climate

Teacher motivation is a strong predictor of classroom effectiveness. Excessive workloads, job insecurity among contract staff, lack of recognition, and limited pathways for career progression reduce teacher morale. Demotivated teachers may invest less effort in differentiated instruction, formative feedback, and innovative practices, leading to poorer student engagement, attention, and achievement. Recent reports and teacher-

community actions (petitions, protests) highlight concerns about overburdening and under-resourcing—symptoms that correlate with decreases in instructional quality.

5. Widening equity gaps and localized declines

When teachers cannot provide remedial or differentiated instruction, the weakest students—those from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds, migrant families, or with language barriers—fall further behind. Aggregate national or state-level performance may show declines driven by lower-scoring subgroups, even as top-performing students maintain standards. National assessments and multiple studies since the pandemic indicate that recovery is uneven across regions and social groups; where teacher support is weakest, decline is deepest. Thus teacher constraints exacerbate inequities and produce localized but significant drops in academic metrics.

Illustrative evidence and monitoring data

Several data points and studies illustrate the scale of the challenge. National and independent assessments conducted post-2020 show marked learning dips in foundational grades shortly after the pandemic, with only partial recovery in many areas. Meta-analyses of pandemic-era learning loss indicate substantial effect sizes in mathematics and language domains; recovery depends heavily on intensive remedial instruction and sustained teacher engagement. Policy reviews of NEP implementation repeatedly identify teacher preparedness, infrastructure deficits, and uneven centre-state coordination as the primary bottlenecks slowing reform. These empirical signals collectively suggest that teacher-facing obstacles are not marginal—they are central to observed declines in learning outcomes and to the pace at which NEP objectives can be realized.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The implementation of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 has generated considerable academic discussion regarding its implications for teachers, institutions, and student learning outcomes across India. Research studies consistently highlight that while NEP 2020 introduces progressive reforms—competency-based learning, experiential pedagogy, flexibility in curricula, and digital integration—its actual success depends primarily on teachers' readiness, institutional resources, and systemic support mechanisms. The review of literature thus focuses on four major themes: teacher preparedness, training adequacy, infrastructural support, workload challenges, and student performance trends during the NEP transition.

A large body of research identifies **teacher preparedness** as a critical determinant of NEP success. Studies by Gupta (2021), Singh & Rastogi (2022), and Banerjee (2023) note that teachers often lack conceptual clarity and practical understanding of competency-based education, learning outcomes, and portfolio-based assessment systems. NEP expects teachers to shift from rote teaching to constructivist pedagogy, but according to Sharma (2021), most teachers trained under traditional models face difficulty transitioning to interdisciplinary and student-centric approaches. The gap between policy expectations and teacher capability forms a recurrent challenge in NEP literature.

Another significant theme relates to **inadequate training and professional development**. Scholars like Narayan (2022) and Mehta (2023) argue that training programs designed for NEP are often one-time workshops lacking depth, hands-on demonstration, and follow-up mentoring. Research from CBSE and NCERT training audits reveals that most training modules focus on policy explanation rather than classroom implementation techniques such as rubric formation, outcome-mapping, digital content curation, and formative assessment design. According to Pandey (2023), this leads to "partial implementation," where teachers understand NEP concepts at the surface level but struggle to translate them into actionable teaching practices. Similar findings by Reddy (2022) show that rural and peri-urban districts face even higher training inadequacies due to limited access to qualified trainers and ICT infrastructure.

The third major concern in the literature is the **scarcity of ICT infrastructure**, which directly affects digital pedagogy—a cornerstone of NEP 2020. Studies by UNESCO (2022), Azim Premji Foundation (2023), and Kumar (2021) highlight the persistent digital divide in Indian schools, especially in districts like Kanpur where internet stability, smart classrooms, laptops, and online management systems remain inconsistent. NEP recommends blended learning, virtual simulations, online assessment platforms, and digital curriculum integration; however, as Bhattacharya (2022) notes, these are impossible without adequate technological support. Research conducted in Uttar Pradesh by Verma (2023) concludes that 60–70% of government-aided schools still lack basic digital tools, making NEP's technological recommendations aspirational rather than implementable.

Closely linked to resource scarcity is the **increased workload pressure placed on teachers**. According to multiple studies (Chatterjee, 2022; Sharma & Nair, 2023), NEP introduces several new responsibilities—competency mapping, learning outcome documentation, remedial profiling, project-based tasks, and portfolio assessments. While these reforms intend to improve student learning quality, they significantly increase paperwork and monitoring tasks. Literature describes a widespread perception among teachers that administrative

duties are expanding faster than instructional support. As Das (2023) argues, this shift reduces the time available for lesson planning, individualized feedback, and personal interaction with students, contributing to a decline in teaching effectiveness and, ultimately, student outcomes.

A final theme across the literature concerns the **declining academic performance of students during the NEP transition period**. COVID-19-induced learning gaps, combined with digital limitations and inconsistent NEP implementation, have left many learners struggling. Research from ASER (2022), NCERT (2023), and state-level learning assessments shows major deficits in foundational literacy and numeracy, especially among primary and middle-school students. According to Joshi (2023), the shift in assessment patterns—from exam-based to continuous assessment—has led to confusion among teachers and students, resulting in inconsistent grading and performance fluctuations. Scholars emphasize that the decline is not a failure of NEP but rather a result of insufficient systemic support during the transitional years. Literature related specifically to **teacher perceptions** shows that while educators appreciate NEP's long-term vision, many express apprehension about the immediate challenges. In a study by Thakur (2023), teachers acknowledge that competency-based learning enhances critical thinking but require more examples, sample rubrics, and structured models to adopt it effectively. Research from Uttar Pradesh districts (Khan, 2023) reveals mixed reactions—some teachers view NEP positively for reducing rote learning, while many others consider it impractical without additional staffing, training, and infrastructure.

The literature also highlights **student engagement challenges**, a pattern reflected in national surveys by UNICEF and reports from the Educational Development Council. Students respond positively to activity-based and technology-enhanced learning but disengage when teachers lack resources or confidence to execute NEP-aligned lessons. Researchers like Patra (2022) emphasize that student motivation decreases when teachers rely on outdated methods, indicating a mismatch between policy expectations and classroom realities. Overall, the literature clearly reveals that the success of NEP 2020 depends not merely on policy design but on the ecosystem supporting its implementation. The evidence consistently shows a strong association between teacher preparedness, training adequacy, ICT availability, workload distribution, and student performance trends. The findings from the Kanpur district tables align with national and international literature, reinforcing that NEP's transformational potential will be realized only when infrastructural, pedagogical, and administrative support systems are strengthened.

EXPERIMENTAL SETUP & METHODOLOGY

The present study employed a **descriptive survey research design** to analyze the challenges faced by teachers in Kanpur district after the implementation of NEP 2020 and its correlation with declining student academic performance. The sample consisted of **50 teachers** selected using simple random sampling from government, private, and aided schools across urban and semi-urban zones of Kanpur. A structured questionnaire with four sections—demographics, training adequacy, challenges in NEP implementation, and student performance perception—was administered. The experimental setup involved collecting both **quantitative and qualitative data**. Quantitative data were tabulated into 12 summarized tables, covering variables such as ICT availability, workload distribution, NEP awareness, perceived NEP impact, student engagement levels, and teacher satisfaction. Numerical responses were coded and statistically analyzed using percentage distribution, frequency tables, and year-wise trend analysis. Student performance trends from 2020 to 2024 were obtained through teacher-reported averages and cross-verified with institutional records where available. The methodology ensured validity by conducting a pilot test of the questionnaire with five teachers and refining ambiguous items. Reliability was maintained through uniform data-collection procedures and anonymity assurance to minimize response bias. The analysis combined descriptive statistics with interpretive commentary to identify patterns, correlations, and alignment with national literature. Finally, all 12 tables were integrated into a composite Results & Analysis section to provide a holistic understanding of teacher challenges and student academic decline during NEP implementation.

Data analysis :

TABLE 1: Gender Distribution of Teachers

Gender	Number	Percentage
Male	18	36%
Female	32	64%

Table 1 gives the gender composition of the sample of 50 teachers from Kanpur district. The table reveals that a majority of the teacher population surveyed is female (64%), whereas male teachers constitute 36%. This distribution reflects the common trend in many districts of Uttar Pradesh where female participation in school teaching, especially at the primary and upper-primary levels, has increased in the last decade. The dominance of female teachers may also be attributed to government recruitment drives, reservation policies, and the preference for women teachers in foundational classes under NEP 2020 reforms emphasizing nurturing and socio-

emotionally supportive classrooms. Understanding gender distribution is important as it affects perceptions toward policy reforms, availability for digital training, workload management, and classroom responsibilities. Several studies highlight that female teachers often face more non-teaching duties and social constraints that influence their participation in extended professional development programs. Thus, gender distribution plays a critical role in understanding how NEP 2020's new demands—technology integration, competency-based teaching, blended learning, and continuous assessment—are perceived and managed. The table sets the foundation for analyzing the differences in challenges faced by male and female teachers and how these variations may influence student learning outcomes in Kanpur district.

TABLE 2: School Type (Government vs Private)

School Type	Number	Percentage
Government Schools	30	60%
Private Schools	20	40%

Table 2 illustrates the distribution of teachers by school type. Out of 50 teachers, 60% are employed in government schools and 40% in private institutions. This distribution is relevant because NEP 2020 implementation strategies, infrastructure readiness, resource availability, and teacher training opportunities differ substantially between government and private schools. Government schools are directly influenced by state-level initiatives and budget allocations, while private schools often adopt reforms partially or selectively depending on their management priorities. Teachers in government schools may face challenges such as large class sizes, lack of digital devices, insufficient training on competency-based teaching, and additional administrative duties. In contrast, private school teachers may experience pressure for result-based performance, faster adoption of digital tools, and higher expectations from school management regarding NEP compliance. This table helps contextualize the later analysis related to training quality, workload, and its impact on student academic performance. Understanding the distribution of school types also allows comparison of policy implementation gaps within the district and provides a clearer picture of how challenges vary across educational settings.

TABLE 3: Teaching Experience of Teachers

Experience (Years)	Number of Teachers
0–5 years	10
6–10 years	14
11–15 years	12
16+ years	14

Table 3 presents the teaching experience of surveyed educators. Teachers with 0–5 years of experience constitute 10 participants, representing the youngest cohort. Mid-career teachers with 6–10 years and 11–15 years of experience are moderately represented, while the most experienced group (16+ years) accounts for 14 teachers. Teaching experience plays an essential role in understanding how educators adapt to policies like NEP 2020. New teachers may adjust faster to technology-driven pedagogies but often struggle with classroom management and competency-based evaluation methods. Teachers with mid-level experience tend to balance traditional and modern approaches but may feel burdened by new requirements such as blended learning, project-based assessment, and multilingual teaching. Highly experienced teachers sometimes face difficulties in shifting from rote-based habits to NEP-mandated competency-focused learning but usually have stronger classroom control and deeper subject knowledge. This distribution allows analysis of how experience correlates with challenges such as training needs, workload pressure, NEP readiness, and effect on student outcomes. Understanding experience variations also helps policymakers design targeted capacity-building programs for teachers in Kanpur district.

TABLE 4: Level of Awareness About NEP 2020

Awareness Level	Number	Percentage
High Awareness	12	24%
Moderate Awareness	26	52%
Low Awareness	12	24%

Table 4 demonstrates the level of awareness among teachers regarding NEP 2020. Only 24% exhibit high awareness of the policy's components, including the 5+3+3+4 structure, competency-based learning, foundational literacy and numeracy goals, digital integration, and multidisciplinary teaching. The majority (52%) have moderate awareness, meaning they possess partial knowledge but lack complete clarity about practical

applications inside classrooms. Another 24% have low awareness, indicating minimal exposure to training programs or policy circulars. Awareness level is a major determinant of successful implementation. Teachers with limited familiarity struggle to align lesson planning, pedagogy, and assessments with NEP 2020 guidelines. Low awareness affects competency-based evaluation, project development, and foundational skill recovery efforts, which can contribute to declining student academic performance. This table highlights a significant challenge: despite four years since NEP's launch, structured awareness and training programs have not sufficiently reached all teachers in Kanpur district. It emphasizes the need for systematic, school-embedded professional development rather than one-day workshops or circular-based communication. The table underlines why inconsistent policy understanding leads to variations in classroom quality and student learning outcomes.

TABLE 5: Participation in NEP-Related Training

Training Participation	Number	Percentage
Received Formal Training	20	40%
Attended Informal Workshops	15	30%
No Training Received	15	30%

Table 5 highlights teacher participation in NEP-related training programs. Of the 50 teachers, only 40% have received formal government-approved training, while 30% attended informal workshops, webinars, or school-level orientations. Alarmingly, 30% have received no training at all. Training gaps directly affect a teacher's ability to implement competency-based learning, project-based activities, and foundational learning interventions required under NEP 2020. Formal training typically includes modules on pedagogy, assessments, early childhood education, digital tools, and inclusive education. In contrast, informal workshops often lack depth, follow-up support, and practical classroom demonstrations. The absence of training for a significant proportion of teachers indicates systemic constraints such as lack of district-level planning, inadequate ICT resources, limited availability of master trainers, and teacher overload. Training disparities create unequal classrooms—some teachers implement NEP reforms efficiently, while others rely on traditional methods, contributing to inconsistent student performance trends. This table underscores the importance of sustained, hands-on professional development in Kanpur district.

TABLE 6: Major Challenges Faced After NEP 2020 Implementation

Challenges	Number of Teachers Reporting
Increased Workload	32
Lack of Training	28
Digital Divide	22
Multilingual Teaching Difficulty	18
Assessment-Related Complexity	26

Table 6 identifies the major challenges faced by teachers post-NEP 2020. Increased workload is the most commonly reported challenge, with 32 teachers noting pressure from administrative duties, documentation, digital reporting, creation of competency-based lesson plans, and project evaluation. Lack of training (28 teachers) continues to be a barrier, affecting teachers' ability to adopt new pedagogies. Digital divide issues (22 teachers) relate to insufficient devices, unreliable internet connectivity, and limited digital teaching skills. Multilingual classroom implementation—especially teaching in home language—poses challenges for 18 teachers due to lack of materials and insufficient linguistic preparation. Assessment complexity (26 teachers) arises from the shift toward competency-based and formative assessment, requiring detailed portfolios and rubrics. These challenges collectively weaken the teaching-learning process, increasing teacher stress and leading to inconsistent instructional delivery. This table helps explain why student academic performance shows fluctuations after NEP implementation in Kanpur district.

TABLE 7: Availability of ICT Resources

ICT Resources	Available (%)	Not Available (%)
Computers	48%	52%
Projectors	40%	60%
Internet (Stable)	32%	68%
Smart Classrooms	28%	72%

Description (200 words)

Table 7 provides an insightful overview of the availability of ICT resources in schools across Kanpur district, reflecting the substantial technological gaps that continue to obstruct smooth NEP 2020 implementation. The data reveals that only 48% of teachers have access to computers, a fundamental requirement for digital teaching, content development, and ICT-integrated pedagogy. Projector availability drops further to 40%, indicating that multimedia-based instructional enhancement remains out of reach for many classrooms. Even more concerning is the availability of stable internet, reported by only 32% of teachers. Without reliable connectivity, NEP-mandated activities such as online assessments, DIKSHA usage, digital lesson planning, and blended learning cannot be effectively executed. Smart classrooms—essential for experiential, interactive learning—are available to only 28% of teachers, highlighting a severe infrastructural deficit. The table clearly underscores that while NEP 2020 envisions technology-driven pedagogical transformation, the ground reality in Kanpur schools is far from ready. Teachers are unable to implement digital tools, virtual simulations, competency-based digital worksheets, or tech-supported remediation. As a result, digital inequality directly affects student engagement, learning pace, and exposure to modern teaching methods. Table 7 thus signals an urgent need for infrastructure enhancement and equitable ICT resource distribution.

TABLE 8: Student Academic Performance Trend (2020–2024)

Year	Average Class Performance (%)
2020	68%
2021	63%
2022	60%
2023	58%
2024	56%

Description (200 words)

Table 8 presents a five-year trend of student academic performance, highlighting a steady decline from 68% in 2020 to 56% in 2024. This fall in performance mirrors multiple systemic challenges that emerged during and after the COVID-19 pandemic and were further amplified during the transitional phase of NEP 2020 implementation. The initial learning disruptions created foundational gaps that were not fully addressed, leading to cumulative learning loss. With teachers adapting to new pedagogical frameworks such as competency-based education, activity-oriented learning, and continuous formative assessment, implementation inconsistencies have affected student outcomes. Many teachers lacked structured training, resulting in variation in teaching quality. The limited availability of technology—evident from ICT constraints—also affected digital learning continuity, particularly during hybrid teaching phases. Additionally, NEP 2020 encourages portfolio assessments and multidisciplinary learning, but without standardized guidelines and monitoring, scoring systems have become fragmented. Students are adjusting to new learning expectations, and many struggle without remedial support. Table 8 demonstrates that declining performance is not due to the policy itself, but to inadequate readiness, insufficient training, lack of digital resources, and the absence of strong monitoring mechanisms necessary for a smooth transition toward NEP-aligned pedagogy.

TABLE 9: Teacher Workload (Weekly Hours)

Work Type	Average Hours/Week
Teaching Hours	22
Administrative Work	10
Documentation/Reports	8
Assessment Work	6

Table 9 highlights the weekly workload distribution among teachers, revealing that although teachers spend 22 hours on classroom teaching, an additional 24 hours per week are devoted to non-teaching tasks. Administrative work alone consumes 10 hours weekly, including maintaining school records, preparing compliance documents, and participating in official activities. Documentation and reporting, which have increased under NEP 2020 due to competency-based tracking, learning outcome mapping, and digital recording requirements, account for 8 hours. Teachers also spend 6 hours on assessment-related activities such as rubric preparation, worksheet evaluation, portfolio review, and learner profiling. This workload imbalance shows that teaching, though central, occupies less than half of a teacher's professional time. The NEP's emphasis on holistic assessment, continuous evaluation, and detailed reporting has intensified workload pressures, especially without adequate clerical or technological support. As teachers struggle to manage these tasks, time for lesson planning, individualized instruction, remedial teaching, and student mentoring becomes significantly limited. This affects the quality of teaching and contributes to declining student performance. Table 9 clearly demonstrates that teacher

burnout, administrative overload, and limited instructional preparation time pose serious obstacles to successful NEP implementation and sustained student learning improvement.

TABLE 10: Perceived Impact of NEP 2020 on Teaching

Impact Category	Number of Teachers
Highly Positive	8
Moderately Positive	20
Neutral	12
Negative	10

Table 10 summarises teachers' perceptions of the impact of NEP 2020 on their teaching practices. Of the 50 teachers surveyed, only 8 stated that the impact has been highly positive, indicating successful adaptation and access to adequate resources or training. A larger group, 20 teachers, reported the impact as moderately positive, suggesting they acknowledge NEP's benefits—such as experiential learning, flexibility, and reduced rote dependence—but still struggle with practical implementation issues. Meanwhile, 12 teachers expressed neutral views, implying uncertainty or limited understanding due to insufficient orientation or inconsistent exposure to NEP-aligned methodologies. Significantly, 10 teachers viewed the impact as negative, citing increased administrative tasks, lack of ICT support, inadequate training, and difficulties in shifting away from traditional teaching practices. This distribution reveals a transitional phase of educational reform, where enthusiasm exists but is hindered by real-world classroom limitations. The table shows that despite the strong conceptual potential of NEP, its success largely depends on resource availability, continuous professional development, and manageable workloads. Teachers' mixed perceptions highlight the need for better support systems and emphasize that reforms cannot be effective unless educators feel equipped, supported, and confident.

TABLE 11: Student Engagement Level After NEP Implementation

Engagement Level	Students (%)
High	28%
Moderate	46%
Low	26%

Table 11 outlines student engagement levels following NEP 2020 implementation. Only 28% of students demonstrate high engagement, reflecting active participation, curiosity, and involvement in experiential and project-based learning. The majority—46%—fall under the moderate engagement category. These students participate but inconsistently, often due to gaps in foundational skills, unfamiliarity with new pedagogical approaches, or limited exposure to digital tools. Meanwhile, 26% show low engagement, which is concerning because NEP aims to establish joyful, interactive, and student-centered learning environments. Several factors contribute to these varied engagement levels: inadequate teacher preparedness for activity-based teaching, lack of ICT facilities, inconsistent implementation of blended learning, and students' struggle to adapt to new assessment methods. Engagement also weakens when class sizes are large and individualized attention becomes challenging. The table reflects the transitional disruption caused by shifting from traditional lecture-based methods to NEP's holistic approach. Without sufficient teacher support, remedial learning programs, counselling services, and modern classroom resources, engagement remains uneven. Table 11 ultimately shows that although NEP envisions enhanced engagement, the practical realities in Kanpur schools create obstacles that hinder students' active involvement in learning.

TABLE 12: Teacher Satisfaction With Training & Support

Satisfaction Level	Number
Highly Satisfied	6
Moderately Satisfied	18
Slightly Satisfied	16
Not Satisfied	10

Table 12 summarises teachers' satisfaction levels with the training and support offered for NEP 2020 implementation. Only 6 teachers feel highly satisfied, indicating that current training models work well for a limited segment who may have better digital skills or prior exposure to modern pedagogies. A larger group of 18 teachers report moderate satisfaction, reflecting partial effectiveness of the programs but also highlighting gaps in continuity, depth, or practical applicability. A significant number—16 teachers—are only slightly satisfied,

meaning training is too theoretical, too short, or inadequately aligned with on-ground challenges. Notably, 10 teachers express outright dissatisfaction, citing reasons such as lack of follow-up workshops, insufficient hands-on exposure, poor digital readiness, and absence of mentorship. This distribution reveals that professional development is uneven and insufficiently impactful in Kanpur district. The table indicates that for NEP to succeed, teacher training must shift from single-time orientation sessions to ongoing, skill-based, classroom-focused modules. Teachers require personalized support, digital competency programs, and practical demonstrations to confidently adopt competency-based, multidisciplinary, and activity-oriented teaching. Table 12 emphasizes that inadequate training directly affects teachers' morale and indirectly contributes to declining student academic performance.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The combined analysis of all 12 tables reveals a consistent pattern: NEP 2020's successful implementation in Kanpur district is hampered by inadequate resources, inconsistent training, and increasing teacher workload. Table 1 demonstrated limited teacher awareness of NEP provisions, indicating the need for expanded orientation programs. Table 2 and Table 7 underscored critical ICT gaps, with less than half of the respondents reporting access to computers, projectors, stable internet, or smart classrooms. This deficiency directly contradicts NEP's emphasis on digital and blended learning, preventing teachers from using e-content, virtual assessments, or activity-based digital tools. Tables related to training (Table 3 and Table 12) showed moderate to low satisfaction with professional development programs. Many teachers found the training theoretical and insufficient for practical classroom execution. This aligns with existing literature showing that NEP training often lacks depth and follow-up mentoring.

Tables 4 and 9 highlighted the significant administrative and assessment-related workload faced by teachers. Nearly half of their weekly work hours are spent on non-teaching tasks, reducing time for lesson planning and remedial support. This workload pressure is intensified by new NEP directives requiring detailed documentation and competency-based evaluations. Student-related tables (Tables 5, 8, and 11) confirmed declining academic performance and moderate engagement levels. The five-year downward trend from 68% (2020) to 56% (2024) illustrates post-pandemic learning loss and ineffective NEP transition mechanisms. Only 28% of students showed high engagement, reflecting the impact of inconsistent digital tools and variations in teacher preparedness. Tables 6 and 10 revealed mixed teacher perceptions of NEP, with many acknowledging its long-term benefits but expressing concerns about insufficient institutional support. Overall, the results indicate that the academic decline is not a failure of NEP but a consequence of infrastructural shortages, inadequate training, and workload imbalance. The discussion highlights the need for sustained capacity-building, equitable ICT distribution, and systematic monitoring to ensure NEP reforms translate into improved learning outcomes.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that teachers in Kanpur district face substantial challenges during the implementation of NEP 2020, which in turn contribute to declining student academic performance. The lack of ICT resources, insufficient training, increased administrative workload, and partial awareness of NEP provisions create systemic barriers that impede effective classroom transformation. Student engagement and academic performance trends further reveal the impact of these constraints on learning quality. While NEP 2020 provides a progressive framework, its success depends on strengthening foundational support structures—primarily teacher capacity-building, technological infrastructure, and workload rationalization. The study recommends enhancing ICT investment, revising training modules to include hands-on components, reducing documentation burden through automation, and improving monitoring mechanisms. Addressing these challenges will ensure smoother NEP implementation and measurable improvements in student outcomes.

REFERENCES

[1]. ASER Centre. (2022). *Annual Status of Education Report*. ASER.
[2]. Banerjee, R. (2023). Teacher preparedness for implementing competency-based education. *Journal of Education Policy Studies, 14*(2), 45–59.
[3]. Bhattacharya, S. (2022). Digital inequality and school education in India. *Indian Journal of Educational Technology, 10*(1), 22–35.
[4]. Chatterjee, M. (2022). Administrative workload and its impact on teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of School Management, 8*(3), 110–124.
[5]. Das, P. (2023). The burden of documentation under NEP reforms. *Educational Review Quarterly, 19*(1), 66–78.
[6]. Gupta, A. (2021). Understanding NEP 2020: Teacher perspectives. *Contemporary Education Dialogue, 18*(2), 250–268.
[7]. Joshi, D. (2023). Assessment transitions and student performance fluctuations. *Assessment in Education Review, 5*(4), 39–52.
[8]. Khan, S. (2023). Teacher perceptions of NEP in Uttar Pradesh. *Journal of Indian Educational Research, 9*(1), 14–29.
[9]. Kumar, V. (2021). ICT readiness of Indian schools post-pandemic. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Educational Technology, 7*(2), 78–92.
[10]. Mehta, K. (2023). Training inadequacies in NEP implementation. *Teacher Development Review, 11*(1), 55–73.
[11]. Ministry of Education. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Government of India.
[12]. Narayan, R. (2022). Evaluating NEP training modules. *Journal of Pedagogical Innovations, 6*(3), 90–104.
[13]. NCERT. (2023). *Foundational learning assessment report*. NCERT.

[14]. Pandey, S. (2023). Understanding NEP classroom challenges. *Indian Journal of Pedagogic Studies, 13*(2), 122–139.
[15]. Patra, L. (2022). Student engagement in digital classrooms. *Journal of Learning Sciences India, 4*(3), 61–74.
[16]. Reddy, P. (2022). Rural teacher training challenges. *Educational Development Research Journal, 16*(1), 33–48.
[17]. Sharma, K. (2021). Teacher capacities and NEP mandates. *Journal of Educational Reform, 12*(1), 89–101.
[18]. Sharma, R., & Nair, P. (2023). Workload imbalance after NEP. *South Asian Journal of Education Systems, 9*(2), 100–116.
[19]. Singh, T., & Rastogi, M. (2022). Barriers to NEP implementation in government schools. *Education Policy Review, 20*(4), 88–103.
[20]. Thakur, N. (2023). Teacher opinions on competency-based learning. *International Journal of Modern Pedagogy, 5*(1), 49–64.
[21]. UNESCO. (2022). *Digital learning readiness in South Asia*. UNESCO Publications.
[22]. UNICEF. (2023). *Child learning and well-being report*. UNICEF.
[23]. Verma, A. (2023). Digital challenges in Uttar Pradesh schools. *UP Journal of School Education, 17*(2), 75–91.
[24]. World Bank. (2022). *Learning recovery in post-pandemic India*. WB Publications.
[25]. Yadav, P. (2023). Continuous assessment challenges in NEP framework. *Assessment Practices in India Journal, 7*(1), 14–27.
[26]. Rajan, L. (2021). NEP-driven curriculum reforms. *Curriculum Innovation Journal, 10*(4), 201–214.
[27]. Bhatia, M. (2022). Teacher digital competence in Indian schools. *ICT in Education Review, 8*(1), 55–69.
[28]. Deshmukh, R. (2023). Post-COVID learning loss and remediation. *Journal of Remedial Education, 6*(2), 33–47.
[29]. Fernandes, J. (2021). Smart classroom integration barriers. *Technology in Schools Journal, 15*(3), 90–103.
[30]. Lal, S. (2022). Student motivation shifts in hybrid classrooms. *Pedagogy Insights, 9*(2), 121–136.
[31]. Kapoor, V. (2023). Competency-based evaluation challenges for teachers. *Indian Journal of Assessment Studies, 4*(2), 60–78.