InSight Bulletin: A Multidisciplinary Interlink International Research Journal
Peer Reviewed International, Open Access Journal.
ISSN : 3065-7857 / Website: https://ibrj.us / Volume-2, Issue-10 / October - 2025

Original Article

Bridging Urban Rural Education Gaps through NEP 2020: A Critical Analysis (2020-2025)

Dr. Vaishali Patil

Associate Professor, K. M. Agrawal College of Arts, Commerce & Science, Kalyan

Manuscript ID:
IBMIIRJ -2025-021029

Submitted: 10 Sept. 2025

Revised: 15 Sept. 2025

Accepted: 15 Oct. 2025

Published: 31 Oct. 2025

ISSN: 3065-7857

Volume-2

Issue-10

Pp. 130-132

October 2025

Correspondence Address:
Dr. Vaishali Patil
Associate Professor, K. M. Agrawal College of Arts, Commerce & Science, Kalyan
Email: vaishalikma1@gmail.com

OPEN ACCESS

Quick Response Code:

Web. https://ibrj.us

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17621254

DOI Link:
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17621254

Abstract

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 is a bold bid by Government of India to change the landscape of education. Putting equity and inclusion at its core, yet this monumental challenge comes with multiple social and economic forces which can hardly be resolved at once. It is my hope that by describing in this paper how NEP 2020 has been able to puncture certain margins of this urban-rural chasm something will be gained. Reviewing multiple data sources (UDISE+, ASER, PLFS, state reports), policy documents, and scholarly literature, shows that: NEP 2020 has on the whole brought about huge improvements in access, infrastructure, and some learning outcomes, particularly in foundational literacy and numeracy. However, significant gaps remain in retention towards higher levels, digital access, teacher quality, and resource allocation but there are limits on how long we celebrate the improvement it has wrought. The paper ends by offering policy recommendations to accelerate bridging the gap.

Keywords: *NEP 2020; Urban Rural Disparities; Foundational Learning; Digital Divide; India; Educational Equity; UDISE+; ASER*

Introduction

For a long time, India has witnessed education disparities both in rural regions and cities. All these disparities show themselves most visibly as unequal infrastructure, differences in teacher quality and (success with) learning outcomes, dropout and retention rates, use of technology, language medium etc. NEP 2020 was conceived to take on many of these problems: universal foundational literacy and numeracy by 2025, all children aged 0–6 going to school, increased public investment (~6 % of GDP), multilingualism, vocational integration and the use technology/digital learning in order that teachers are no longer required.

Objective of the study:

1. To what extent NEP 2020 has bridged the education gaps between urban and rural India in the period 2020-2025
2. To analyze the main provisions in the NEP 2020 aimed at reducing urban rural disparities
3. To assess to what extent progress has been made in key indicators (access, retention, learning outcomes, infrastructure, teacher quality, digital connectivity) comparing urban and rural areas over 2020--2025.
4. To explore the issues and barriers of rapid convergence
5. To consider what adjustment in policy or implementation might help close the urban rural gap more quickly.

Literature Review:

Both before and after NEP 2020, literature shows a very great consensus that urban rural disparities have been persistent. ASER surveys have repeatedly found large divides in foundational literacy and numeracy between rural government schools. Studies also show that infrastructure (electricity, toilets, drinking water, boundary walls, and internet) tends to be weaker in rural areas. Teacher shortages, especially those of subject specialists and trained teachers in remote rural districts, tend to be more acute.

How to cite this article:
Patil, V. (2025). Bridging Urban Rural Education Gaps through NEP 2020: A Critical Analysis (2020-2025). InSight Bulletin: A Multidisciplinary Interlink International Research Journal, 2(10), 130–133. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17621254

Creative Commons

Post-NEP literature (2022 2025) includes the earliest assessments of implementation (e.g. policy briefs, think ta nk reports), analysis from data sources such as UDISE+, and reports by civil society (e.g. ASER) which track learning losses suffered during COVID 19 and recovery, especially in rural settings. Some scholarly work has also looked at socio-economic, gender, and state-wise differences in the success of NEP reforms. A small number of studies raise concerns: digital divides, slow implementation of curriculum / exam reforms, under funding etc.

Analytical Framework:

In order to critically analyze NEP 2020's impact on bridging the urban-rural education gap in India from 2020 to 2025 several specific strands must be combined. The study thus takes as its framework seven core dimensions essential to understanding both the width of such a gap and also how well policy has tried narrowing that width.

- First, the dimension of Access and Enrolment includes indicators such as Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER), Net Enrolment Ratio (NER), number of out-of-school children, and student transition rates from primary to upper primary and on to secondary education. These indicators reflect the extent to which children can enter and continue in the formal education system, particularly in rural areas.
- Second, the framework considers Retention and Dropout Rates at various levels of education. High dropout rates in rural regions, especially at secondary and higher secondary levels, have historically pushed educational disparities there into existence. Knowing the trend in dropout rates post NEP implementation will be a key to this assessment.
- Third, Foundational Learning Outcomes form a critical area of analysis. These are children's basic skills in reading, comprehension, numeracy—how proficient they are. Such competencies, especially for early grade levels (Classes 1 to 5) must be assessed through surveys like ASER. Often urban-rural divides are stark in this area.
- Fourth, Infrastructure and Educational Resources are examined. This includes availabilty our of electricity, clean drinking water, usable toilets (especially for girls), sufficiently spacious classrooms and crucially, digital infrastructure (computers, internet connectivity). Rural schools have traditionally lagged in these areas, and therefore whatever improvements followed NEP 2020 are monitored.
- Fifth, the Availability and Quality of Teachers is analyzed—pupil-teacher ratio (PTR), presence of trained teachers, subject specialists (especially at the seco ndary l evel), ongoing professional development. Both teacher training and competency-based education are key to improving rural education outcomes, and the NEP emphasizes these.
- Sixth, the framework includes Digital Access and Integration of Educational Technology. Since the NEP stresses digital tools and online learning platforms, disparities in access to technology, internet connectivity and digital literacy between urban and rural regions become a major concern. This also involves the extent of EdTech integration in rural classrooms after the pandemic.
- Finally, the Policy Implementation, Governance and Funding mechanisms are examined. This includes budget allocations from both central and state levels, the percentage of GDP actually spent on education, the timeline for implementing NEP reform policies in different states, and the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms like UDISE+, PARAKH, and ASER. Taken together, these seven dimensions provide a holistic basis for evaluating whether and to what extent the NEP 2020 has narrowed the urban-rural gap over the last five years

Methodology:

This descriptive analytical study combines the secondary data analysis with a reading of policy documents.

Data Sources UDISE+ reports (Unified District Information System for Education) on school infrastructure, enrolment, dropout, internet etc.

ASER (Annual Status of Education Reports) for reading/numeracy levels in the early grades, especially in rural areas.

PLFS / NSSO / Periodic Labour Force Surveys for literacy rates, educational attainment. Reports and analyses by civil society / think tanks (e.g., "Education for All in India") and government policy documents (NEP 2020, implementation guidelines, budget documents, state education reports).

Limitations:

Some of the data is late; some disaggregated rural/urban data not available for all indicators. Definition variance: what counts as rural/urban may differ between data sets. COVID 19 disruption muddies trend-lines (dropouts, learning loss). Missing data: good, detailed data for teacher quality and competency based learning usage are not sufficiently available.

Findings:

Based on data from UDISE+, ASER, PLFS, and the last two years of reports up to 2024–25, the following are the main findings on the urban-rural gaps during the NEP 2020 period.

1 Access & Enrolment Elementary / Primary enrolment (Gross Enrolment Ratio) has become close to universal (90 95 %) in many states and nationally. Elementary access has improved in both rural and urban areas, though rural areas lag slightly in Net Enrolment (age appropriate enrolment). However, transitions from primary or upper primary to secondary or higher secondary still present rural students with real problems. The Net Enrolment Ratio in secondary/higher secondary is a great deal lower, especially for rural regions, implying dropouts or non-age-appropriate enrolment.

2 Retention & Dropout Dropout rates have declined somewhat. According to UDISE+, India's secondary dropout rate fell to about 12.6 % in 2023–24, from higher levels. Yet rural dropouts keep higher than urban, especially for secondary and higher secondary. Many rural children drop out because of economic pressures, lack of access, weak infrastructure, etc. (Data disaggregated by rural/urban indicates this pattern, if unevenly everywhere).

3 Foundational Learning Outcomes

•ASER and other survey data indicate that many students in early grades (Class 3, 5) both in rural and urban government schools are below expected reading or numeracy levels. For instance, in Grade 3, a large majority of pupils in rural schools are unable to read at Grade 2 level.
•"Some progress has taken place, e.g. Uttar Pradesh has seen a turning-around of reading/arithmetic levels in their rural schools over the last several years in the ASER data released this spring.

4 Infrastructure & Resources

•There have been improvements. More schools now have, for example, electricity, computers, and internet connectivity. In the 2024-25 UDISE+ this reached 63.5% of Indian schools being online; computer availability has finally been extended somewhat.
•However, significant rural schools lag behind: some have no reliable electricity; some, no internet connectivity or insufficient digital infrastructure; some have insufficient sanitation facilities and no clean drinking water. These deficits are particularly acute in remote/less developed rural districts.

5 Teacher Quality & Availability

•Although training initiatives have been initiated, many rural schools still do not have enough qualified teachers, especially in secondary subjects. Competency based learning has received only limited implementation in most areas.
•Preservice teacher education and in-service competence building, like subject specialists, all have gaps, especially in remote / rural areas. The time lag in rolling out new curriculum frameworks and assessment reforms leaves most rural districts still employing older, pedagogical and assessment methods.

6 Digital Access / EdTech

•The digital divide still constitutes a major obstacle. Even as schools go online with computers and internet, the situation varies from place to place. Many rural schools or students do not have the necessary devices. Even when there is infrastructure, connectivity is not always stable.
• Remote learning during COVID- 19 was particularly difficult for rural students because of equipment she is not connected.
Post-COVID recovery efforts have been made, but they are a long way from making up for lost ground.

7 Policy / Governance / Funding

• NEP 2020 sets ambitious targets (100 % GER by 2030, foundational literacy by 2025, public spending of ~ 6 % of GDP etc.), but actual government spending still falls far short (roughly 3– 4 % of GDP by many estimates).
• Implementation across states is uneven, with some areas installing many NEP reforms and others few; delays in changing curricula, assessment, and teacher education.
• Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms (like ASER, UDISE+, PARAKH etc.) are beginning to yield disaggregated data, since it is only with this that gaps can be highlighted and priorities defined.

Critical Analysis

From the findings, some trends stand out:
• Convergence in some areas, continued gaps in others: there has been considerable progress in increasing rural people's access to primary schooling; infrastructure conditions have improved (computers, internet, and electricity). But learning outcomes and retentions at junior/ senior levels lag behind those of urbandwellers.
• The vision was ambitious, but NEP must now face up to practical constraints: especially in govenance and spending (budget, staff numbers, and state capacity). Rural areas are extremely short of resources.
• Digital divide as a key barrier: Although connections are good, home connectivity, equipment and so reliability in rural areas is still lacking, thus limiting the advantages to be gained from digital learning drive.
• Teacher capacity & curriculum reform: Teacher training is vital in new pedagogies, instruction through mother tongue etc. But rural teachers are often required to teach more subjects, over a wider age range, with little time or chance for in-service training in modern methods. Also, the change over from rote learning to competency-based learning has been slow.
• Socio economic and cultural barriers: Poverty, child labour, gender discrimination, distance from school, the "opportunity cost" (what else forgone for schooling)… the list is long, so much more weight is placed on all these things in rural areas. This means fairly predictably that the dropout rate is higher, and learning outcome lower, than average.

Policy Advice:

To speed the process of urban and rural education bridging under the NEP 2020, the following policy suggestions and implementation measures are offered:

1. An Increase in the Education Budget and Specific Rural Expenditure: Increases in the total education budget will approach the 6 % of GDP target of Education Officers will be notified when they arrive at their next duty station. More money must also be appropriated for rural and remote areas (infrastructure, digital, teacher recruitment).
2. Retention of Students and Transition: to Developing Regions Especially Special interventions at transition points (primary → secondary, secondary → higher secondary) for rural areas. Scholarships, transportation aid, midday meals services, and gender-sensitive facilities are necessary to make sure that students from poor backgrounds are more likely than their peers who have more advantages in life to stay in school
3. Strengthening Foundational Learning: Reinforce existing programmes such as NIPUN Bharat, remedial classes, bridge courses in rural areas. Ensure that mother tongue education and also early literacy and numeracy are properly implemented.
4. Equity of Access to Digital Technological Resources: Rural campground schools need reliable electricity, broadband internet so that people can study well there. Devices have to be supplied to students; blended learning patterns are supported; a range of resources are used even in areas where the connectivity is weak.
5. Teacher Training & encouragements: Enhance pre-service and in-service training for teachers, particularly in understanding new curriculum, competency based teaching and working with multi-lingual instruction groups. Start appropriate training programs to help qualified personnel teaching backcountry positions; get subject specialists where they are needed; lower the burden on multi-grade level teachers.

6. Monitoring, Evaluation and Separation: More broken down data (urban vs rural, by state/district, gender etc.) about learning outcomes and retention/enrolment needs to be gathered and publicized and used to guide policy- making in schools. Use tools such as ASER, UDISE+ better. Ministry of Education, NSSO, NUEPA & Independent Research institutes, UNICEF
7. State-level Flexibility & Local Supports: Given 'one size fits all' makes no sense in this vast country, allowing states/districts to vary policy to what suits them locally: language choices, times of day, how resources are deployed, etc. The Centre should help weaker states (financially, technically) quite a bit.
8. Resolve Socio Economic Barriers: Measures to reduce the cost of school, help families with low income, or aid female students; lower their opportunity cost for involvement in schools. Better transportation facilities and construction of dorms; more publishing- editing by Jie Jiang. Overrideownikio

Conclusion

In India, NEP 2020 promises little hope to bridge entrenched differences between urban and rural education. Recent years have brought real progress in getting children into school; now what we need is more and better facilities, higher learning levels for all students throughout their lives (including working with computers through interactive storytelling projects), and a renewed focus on basic literacy skills combined with remote instruction for those who can't make it into class. But important gaps remain between states at a high level of income development such as Maharashtra or Gujarat (or Haryana) and not so us as these three show--Keralan sub-national units even among themselves there are many factors that separate one entity from another.

To close these gaps, what is essential is not only pronouncements of policy, but also the investment in resources; adaptable implementation strategies; and more efficient methods of monitoring--especially sensitive to rural settings. By the 5 year mark the first signficant stirrings have begun, but there will be a need in the next few years for sharper, more equitable interventions if NEP 2020 is considered to have truly pampered all escaped the street kids on its alarm clock come 2030.

Acknowledgment

The author expresses sincere gratitude to the Department of Education, K. M. Agrawal College of Arts, Commerce & Science, Kalyan, for their academic support and encouragement throughout the preparation of this research paper. Special thanks are extended to respected colleagues, mentors, and researchers whose insightful discussions and feedback enriched the quality of this study.

The author also acknowledges the use of secondary data sources and policy documents, including UDISE+, ASER, and PLFS reports, as well as scholarly literature and government publications, which provided valuable data and analytical perspectives.

Finally, heartfelt appreciation is conveyed to all educators, policymakers, and institutions committed to realizing the vision of the National Education Policy 2020, whose collective efforts continue to drive equitable and inclusive education across India—bridging the long-standing divide between urban and rural learning environments.

Financial Support and Sponsorship

Nil

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References:

1. https://microdata.gov.in/NADA/index.php/catalog/PLFS/?page=1&sort_order=desc&ps=15&repo=PLFS
2. https://udiseplus.gov.in/#/en/home
3. https://asercentre.org/aser-survey/
4. https://www.drishtiias.com/current-affairs-news-analysis-editorials/news-editorials/27-08-2025?utm_source=chatgpt.com
5. https://tcxpress.blogspot.com/2025/07/transforming-indian-education-promise.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com
6. UDISE+ reports (tc25324:fiJ2, 2014–15) – facilities, enrolment, dropout. Drishti IAS
7. ASER reports (tc25324:183 2024 etc.) – foundational learning levels. tcxpress.blogspot.com
8. PLFS /Periodic Labour Force Survey for literacy rates, urban-rural literacy gap etc. Education for All in India
9. "Five Years of NEP2011: Achievements, Missed Opportunities" – Education for all in India
10. Analysis of vocationalisation under NEP etc. Education for All in India