© Volume 2, Issue 8, ***August*** 2026 | JATIR
ISSN: 3139-8464 (p)

NEP 2020 and the Constitutional Reconfiguration of Higher Education in India: A Jurisprudential Analysis of Governance, Equity, and Global Alignment

Dr. Rajesh Kayakkal
Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics and Statistics K. J Somaiya College of Arts and Commerce (Autonomous), Vidyavihar, Mumbai-400077, Maharashtra, India

***Abstract*—The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 marks a constitutional reconfiguration of higher education governance in India, extending beyond administrative reform to reshape the constitutional, legal, and institutional architecture through which the sector is governed. Anchored in Articles 14, 21A, 41, and 45 of the Constitution of India and situated within the Concurrent List, the policy engages the constitutional principles of substantive equality, cooperative federalism, institutional autonomy, and constitutional morality. This investigation relies on a doctrinal legal research design informed through constitutional analysis and comparative jurisprudence to examine four interrelated dimensions: the constitutional foundations of NEP 2020; the evolving regulatory framework envisaged under the Higher Education Commission of India (HECI) and implemented through successive University Grants Commission (UGC) reforms; the policy's alignment with contemporary transnational university education governance; and the constitutional implications of digital governance. The doctrinal analysis demonstrates that implementation initiatives - including the Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes (CCFUP), the Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP), the Academic Bank of Credits (ABC), Multiple Entry - Multiple Exit (MEME), Automated Permanent Academic Account Registry (APAAR), and other digital governance mechanisms- have progressively operationalized constitutional principles through learner-centred, accountability-oriented regulatory reforms. While these developments strengthen transparency, academic mobility, institutional accountability, and global engagement, persistent concerns relating to regulatory centralization, fiscal disparities among States, digital inequality, data governance, and cooperative federalism continue to present unresolved constitutional challenges. The study concludes that NEP 2020 should be understood as an evolving constitutional project whose long-term legitimacy depends upon balanced federal implementation, constitutional accountability, and the continued protection of equality, institutional autonomy, and**

ISSN: 3139-8464 (p)

fundamental rights within an increasingly digital and globally interconnected advanced education system.

***Index Terms*—NEP 2020; Constitutionalism; Cooperative Federalism; Higher Education Governance; Digital Governance; Comparative Jurisprudence**

I. INTRODUCTION

Education occupies a constitutionally significant position within India's governance framework. The Forty-second Constitutional Amendment placed education in the Concurrent List, establishing shared responsibility between the Union and the States. Judicial interpretation of Articles 14 and 21A has further reinforced the State's constitutional obligation to ensure equitable access to education, thereby positioning advanced education as an important instrument for advancing substantive equality, human development, and social justice.

Within this regulatory framework, the NEP 2020 represents more than an executive policy; it seeks to reconfigure the legal and institutional architecture of higher education governance in India. Initial academic evaluations regarded NEP 2020 as India's most far-reaching educational reform introduced in recent decades, emphasizing multidisciplinary education, institutional autonomy, research orientation, academic flexibility, and governance modernization as its defining features (Aithal & Aithal, 2020; Tilak, 2021). As implementation has progressed, recent scholarships have further observed that the policy has evolved beyond a broad reform agenda into an increasingly integrated regulatory framework that promotes learner-centred education, quality assurance, academic mobility, digital governance, and competency-based learning through successive implementation measures (Sivaraman et al., 2026).

Since 2020, the UGC has progressively operationalized key components of NEP 2020 through initiatives such as the CCFUP, the ABC, the FYUGP, MEME, the National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF), and other implementation frameworks. These developments illustrate a gradual transition from policy formulation to regulatory implementation, reflecting an evolving governance philosophy centred on institutional accountability, academic flexibility, learner mobility, and quality enhancement.

Despite the growing literature on educational reform and policy implementation, comparatively limited scholarly attention has been devoted to examining NEP 2020 as an evolving constitutional project. Much of the existing literature evaluates pedagogical innovation, institutional restructuring, or implementation challenges, whereas relatively few studies systematically analyse the constitutional implications of the policy in relation to substantive equality, cooperative federalism, institutional autonomy, constitutional morality, and digital governance. This study addresses that gap by adopting a doctrinal constitutional approach to examine how NEP 2020 and its subsequent regulatory implementation have reshaped college education governance within India's constitutional framework.

Accordingly, this study argues that NEP 2020 should be understood not merely as an education policy but as grounded in the principles of substantive equality, cooperative federalism, institutional autonomy, and constitutional morality. By examining the constitutional foundations of the policy, the evolving regulatory framework, comparative global developments, and emerging challenges of digital governance, this inquiry offers valuable insights into growing discourse on the constitutional governance of university education and the future trajectory of educational reform in India.

II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This study is undertaken with the following objectives:
i. To examine the constitutional foundations of NEP 2020, with particular reference to substantive equality and cooperative federalism.
ii To analyze the constitutional implications of the evolving higher education regulatory framework under NEP 2020 and successive UGC reforms.
iii To evaluate the alignment of India's higher education governance with comparative and transnational regulatory frameworks while preserving constitutional identity.
iv. To examine the constitutional implications of digital governance under NEP 2020, with particular reference to privacy, data governance, and digital inclusion.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present investigation is methodologically relied on doctrinal legal inquiry, drawing upon constitutional analysis, normative evaluation, and comparative legal jurisprudence. Primary sources include the Constitution of India, the NEP 2020, statutory and regulatory instruments, judicial decisions, UGC implementation frameworks, and official policy notifications issued between 2020 and mid-2026. Secondary sources include contemporary academic literature, policy analyses, and comparative studies on governance frameworks and university education regulation. The study employs constitutional-doctrinal analysis, supported by a thematic synthesis of contemporary scholarly literature, to examine the implementation of NEP 2020 through the constitutional principles of substantive equality, cooperative federalism, institutional autonomy, constitutional morality, and digital governance. Comparative analysis of selected international college education frameworks is undertaken to contextualize India's evolving regulatory reforms within broader global developments. As a qualitative doctrinal inquiry, the study does not rely on empirical data; rather, it evaluates the institutional legitimacy, regulatory evolution, and jurisprudential implications of NEP 2020 within the framework of Indian constitutional law.

IV. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This study is confined to a doctrinal constitutional analysis of the NEP 2020 and its implementation within the constitutional structure of India, statutory and regulatory instruments, judicial decisions,

UGC regulatory frameworks, and official policy notifications issued up to mid-2026. The analysis focuses on the constitutional dimensions of post-secondary education governance, particularly substantive equality, cooperative federalism, institutional autonomy, constitutional morality, comparative constitutional alignment, and digital governance.

The study does not undertake an empirical evaluation of policy implementation, institutional performance, stakeholder perceptions, or educational outcomes through surveys, interviews, case studies, or quantitative methods. Accordingly, its findings should be understood as normative constitutional interpretations rather than empirical assessments of the effectiveness of NEP 2020. While selected international tertiary education frameworks are considered for comparative constitutional analysis, the primary focus remains on the Indian constitutional and regulatory context. Future research may complement the present doctrinal inquiry through empirical, comparative, and interdisciplinary studies examining the execution and impact of NEP 2020 within Indian universities, States, and diverse stakeholder groups.

V. CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS OF NEP 2020

The constitutional validity of the NEP 2020 is best understood through the foundational principles of the Constitution of India. Rather than functioning merely as an education policy, the framework engages multiple constitutional doctrines relating to equality, federalism, Directive Principles of State Policy, constitutional morality, and transformative constitutionalism. Contemporary scholarship recognizes that university education regulation in India has historically evolved through constitutional principles balancing institutional autonomy, public accountability, and State responsibility rather than through purely administrative control (Saxena, 2025). Similarly, constitutional governance literature emphasizes that educational reforms derive long-term legitimacy not only from statutory authority but also from their consistency with constitutional values, democratic accountability, and the rule of law (Khosla, 2020). Against this constitutional backdrop, the following discussion examines the foundational principles underpinning NEP 2020.

5.1 Substantive Equality and Educational Access

Article 14 guarantees equality before the law, while contemporary constitutional interpretation recognizes substantive equality as requiring affirmative measures to address structural disadvantages and ensure meaningful access to opportunities. NEP 2020 operationalizes this constitutional principle by promoting inclusive access, enhancing student enrolment levels, strengthening the higher learning sector in underserved regions, and encouraging flexible learning pathways.

By embedding inclusion within its regulatory framework, NEP 2020 reflects a distributive approach to university education governance, positioning educational reform as an instrument of social justice consistent with constitutional morality. In this respect, the policy reinforces the constitutional understanding that tertiary education regulation must simultaneously promote educational excellence, equitable opportunity, and institutional accountability within a rights-based governance framework (Saxena, 2025). Recent scholarship likewise observes that the

successful implementation of NEP 2020 requires inclusive governance capable of reducing educational disparities while ensuring equitable participation across diverse social and regional contexts (Kumar & Choudhury, 2022).

5.2 Directive Principles and Human Development

Articles 41 and 45 impose a constitutional obligation upon the State to promote educational welfare. Although non-justiciable, these Directive Principles provide important guidance for governance and public policy. NEP 2020 advances this constitutional vision by linking educational reform with social mobility, research, skill development, innovation, and human development.

The policy therefore reinforces education as both a public good and a constitutional instrument for inclusive socio-economic development. Its emphasis on multidisciplinary learning, lifelong education, institutional capacity-building, and learner-centred education reflects the broader constitutional objective of promoting human development through inclusive educational opportunities to quality higher education. International policy literature similarly recognizes university education as a fundamental catalyst for achieving sustainable development, human capital formation, innovation, and inclusive economic growth (UNESCO, 2021; World Bank, 2022), thereby reinforcing the constitutional aspirations reflected in the Directive Principles of State Policy.

5.3 Cooperative Federalism

Education's inclusion in the Concurrent List requires shared governance between the Union and the States. Although the HECI has not yet replaced the existing statutory framework, its governance philosophy increasingly informs successive UGC reforms. This evolving regulatory architecture promotes accountability, institutional flexibility, academic quality, and learner mobility while simultaneously raising constitutional questions concerning federal balance and institutional autonomy.

Recent constitutional scholarship observes that the legitimacy of tertiary education governance depends upon maintaining an appropriate balance between national regulatory objectives and the constitutional autonomy of educational institutions within India's federal framework (Saxena, 2025). Likewise, Khosla (2020) argues that constitutional governance reforms in a federal democracy must reconcile national coordination with meaningful State participation and institutional diversity. These perspectives are particularly relevant to NEP 2020, whose successful implementation depends upon cooperative engagement between the Union, the States, regulatory authorities, and tertiary education institutions.

The normative legitimacy of these reforms therefore depends upon preserving cooperative federalism through meaningful State participation and adaptability in implementation. Differences in legislative frameworks, fiscal resources, administrative capacity, and digital infrastructure continue to influence the implementation of reforms such as the FYUGP, MEME, and the ABC. Consequently, the long-term constitutional success of NEP 2020 requires balancing nationally

coordinated standards with institutional autonomy, federal flexibility, and equitable educational opportunity.

5.4 Constitutional Morality and Transformative Constitutionalism

The institutional legitimacy of NEP 2020 extends beyond administrative reform and must also be examined through constitutional morality and transformative constitutional principles. The essence of these doctrines lies in ensuring that constitutional governance continuously advances the values of equality, justice, liberty, fraternity, and dignity by responding effectively to changing societal, economic, and technological conditions. Contemporary legal scholarship similarly recognizes constitutional morality as an evolving interpretative doctrine that guides public institutions towards governance consistent with constitutional values rather than transient political or majoritarian preferences (Srivastava, 2023). Likewise, transformative constitutionalism views constitutional rights as dynamic instruments for achieving substantive justice and inclusive governance (Jain & Girish, 2023).

The Supreme Court has consistently affirmed this constitutional approach. In Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India (2017), the Court recognized privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21 and reaffirmed the Constitution as a living document protecting dignity, autonomy, and individual development. Similarly, in Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018), the Supreme Court affirmed the primacy of constitutional morality over societal norms, emphasizing that State action must remain anchored in constitutional values rather than majoritarian preferences.

Viewed through this jurisprudential framework, NEP 2020 represents more than an educational policy. It functions as a transformative constitutional instrument that seeks to operationalize substantive equality, inclusive access, institutional autonomy, human development, and digital inclusion through systemic reform of higher education. Its long-term regulatory legitimacy therefore depends not only on effective implementation but also on continued adherence to constitutional morality, protection of fundamental rights, preservation of India's cooperative federal structure, and a regulatory framework that remains faithful to constitutional principles governing college education (Saxena, 2025).

VI. REGULATORY TRANSFORMATION AND GOVERNANCE

The NEP 2020 reflects a fundamental reorientation in tertiary education governance from a compliance-driven regulatory model towards one emphasizing accountability, institutional autonomy, quality assurance, and learner-centred governance. While early scholarship primarily examined the policy's reform agenda (Tilak, 2021), subsequent implementation has increasingly focused on regulatory restructuring, learner mobility, digital governance, and institutional accountability (Sivaraman et al., 2026). Rather than merely restructuring administration, the policy is designed to restructure the university education regulation through transparency, flexibility, and evidence-based governance consistent with constitutional principles of equality and fairness. Early

scholarly assessments similarly characterized NEP 2020 as a comprehensive governance reform intended to transform institutional structures, multidisciplinary education, academic flexibility, and research culture in Indian university education (Aithal & Aithal, 2020). More recent scholarship further identifies NEP 2020 as a transformative regulatory framework that seeks to enhance institutional quality, learner mobility, multidisciplinary education, and skill development through progressive governance reforms (Sivaraman et al., 2026).

Although the HECI has not yet replaced the existing statutory framework, its governance philosophy increasingly informs successive UGC reforms. Initiatives including the CCFUP, the ABC, the National Credit Framework (NCrF), MEME, the FYUGP, and revised quality assurance mechanisms demonstrate a gradual transition towards the regulatory framework envisaged under NEP 2020. As observed in recent systematic reviews, these implementation initiatives collectively represent a gradual but significant restructuring of India's tertiary education governance rather than isolated policy interventions (Sivaraman et al., 2026).

The proposed HECI model separates regulation, accreditation, funding, and academic standard-setting through four specialized verticals - NHERC, NAC, HEGC, and GEC. Although these institutions remain subject to future legislation, recent UGC reforms increasingly reflect their underlying governance philosophy by promoting institutional accountability, academic flexibility, learner mobility, and simplified regulatory processes.

From a constitutional perspective, these reforms strengthen the principles of non-arbitrariness, procedural fairness, and institutional accountability under Article 14 while encouraging greater academic autonomy. Their constitutional legitimacy, however, depends upon preserving cooperative federalism, institutional diversity, meaningful participation of the States, and equitable implementation across institutions with varying capacities and resources.

The following subsections examine four major implementation initiatives - ABC, APAAR, FYUGP, and MEME - that collectively illustrate how constitutional principles of substantive equality, academic mobility, institutional autonomy, and regulatory accountability are progressively operationalized through successive UGC reforms.

6.1 Academic Bank of Credits (ABC) and Digital Academic Mobility

The ABC, introduced through the University Grants Commission, Regulations of 2021, establishes a nationally interoperable digital repository that enables students to earn, carry forward, and utilize academic credits obtained from accredited institutions of higher learning. Together with the NCrF, ABC promotes academic mobility, multidisciplinary learning, lifelong education, and greater interoperability across diverse educational pathways.

From a constitutional perspective, ABC advances substantive equality by reducing institutional barriers to educational access and learner mobility. It also aligns India's higher learning framework with internationally recognized principles of credit portability and flexible learning, demonstrating the transition of NEP 2020 from policy formulation to operational regulatory practice. By facilitating lifelong learning and recognition of prior learning, ABC also reflects emerging international approaches to competency-based education and learner-centred governance.

6.2 Digital Academic Identity: APAAR and National Academic Depository

The ABC has been complemented by the APAAR, which provides learners with a lifelong digital academic identity integrating academic credits, qualifications, and institutional records. Together with the National Academic Depository and DigiLocker, APAAR strengthens the portability, verification, and long-term preservation of academic credentials while improving administrative efficiency and institutional transparency.

Although these initiatives significantly enhance learner mobility and digital governance, they also raise constitutional concerns relating to informational privacy, data governance, cybersecurity, and institutional accountability. Following Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India (2017), digital academic governance must operate within the constitutional principles of legality, proportionality, transparency, and informed consent to ensure that technological innovation remains consistent with the protection of individual autonomy and personal information. As digital governance continues to expand under NEP 2020, these safeguards assume increasing constitutional significance.

6.3 Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP)

Implemented through the UGC CCFUP, the FYUGP promotes multidisciplinary education, flexible curricular pathways, undergraduate research, and multiple exit options. By expanding academic flexibility and encouraging research-oriented learning, FYUGP strengthens both educational quality and international academic mobility.

Recent scholarship identifies multidisciplinary curricula, competency-based education, flexible learning pathways, and skill-oriented education as defining features of NEP 2020's higher education reforms (Sivaraman et al., 2026). Likewise, Sharma and Bhardwaj (2021) argue that competency-based education represents a significant pedagogical shift towards outcome-oriented learning, while Mehrotra (2021) highlights the importance of integrating vocational education and employability skills within multidisciplinary higher education.

Constitutionally, FYUGP advances substantive equality by providing learners with greater academic flexibility while reinforcing institutional autonomy through curriculum design responsive to regional, disciplinary, and societal needs. The programme therefore supports the constitutional objective of promoting human development through an inclusive, learner-centred, and knowledge-driven post-secondary education system.

6.4 Multiple Entry–Multiple Exit (MEME)

The MEME framework enables learners to enter and exit higher learning at different stages while receiving appropriate academic qualifications. Supported by the Academic Bank of Credits and the National Credit Framework, it recognizes diverse educational pathways and accommodates varying personal, professional, and economic circumstances.

By preserving previously earned academic credits and facilitating re-entry into higher education, MEME operationalizes constitutional commitments to substantive equality, lifelong learning, and equitable educational opportunity. It reflects internationally recognized approaches to flexible

learning pathways, competency-based education, and learner mobility while accommodating the diverse educational needs of India's heterogeneous student population. Contemporary scholarship similarly emphasizes that flexible academic pathways and inclusive implementation are central to realizing the transformative objectives of NEP 2020 (Kumar & Choudhury, 2022; Sivaraman et al., 2026).

VII. COMPARATIVE JURISPRUDENCE AND GLOBAL ALIGNMENT

The constitutional transformation envisaged under the National NEP 2020 must be understood within the broader context of contemporary post-secondary education governance. As higher education systems increasingly emphasize quality assurance, academic mobility, institutional accountability, digital innovation, and international collaboration, comparative jurisprudence provides an important framework for evaluating India's regulatory reforms. Comparative scholarship recognizes that successful higher education reforms increasingly balance international competitiveness with national constitutional priorities and institutional diversity (Altbach & de Wit, 2021). While NEP 2020 reflects internationally recognized governance practices, it simultaneously preserves India's constitutional values, educational priorities, and cultural identity.

7.1 Transnational Regulatory Convergence

Contemporary university education governance increasingly promotes multidisciplinary education, academic credit portability, learner mobility, competency-based learning, and accountability-oriented quality assurance. NEP 2020 incorporates these principles, aligning Indian tertiary education with evolving international regulatory practices while integrating Indian Knowledge Systems and constitutional commitments to substantive equality, cooperative federalism, and social justice. Accordingly, the policy represents constitutional adaptation rather than the wholesale transplantation of foreign educational models.

International policy frameworks similarly emphasize that higher education governance should promote academic excellence while ensuring equitable access, lifelong learning, institutional accountability, and sustainable development (OECD, 2021; UNESCO, 2022). NEP 2020 reflects these global priorities through reforms designed to strengthen multidisciplinary education, research, innovation, and learner mobility within India's legal framework.

7.2 Comparative Credit Frameworks and Global Academic Mobility

The ABC reflects principles comparable to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) developed under the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), facilitating academic credit accumulation, transfer, and learner mobility across institutions. Likewise, the FYUGP, MEME, and the NCrF demonstrate convergence with international trends emphasizing competency-based learning, lifelong education, flexible academic pathways, and recognition of prior learning (Council of Europe & European Commission, 2020).

The growing recognition of digital credentials, micro-credentials, and interoperable academic records has further strengthened global academic mobility. India's implementation of the ABC, APAAR, DigiLocker, and the National Academic Depository reflects these developments by promoting secure credential verification, academic portability, and cross-institutional recognition. The European Commission's European approach to micro-credentials similarly illustrates the growing international acceptance of flexible and digitally verifiable learning pathways that support lifelong learning and workforce mobility (European Commission, 2023). Eventually, the regulatory legitimacy of India's digital academic ecosystem depends upon protecting informational privacy, transparency, procedural fairness, and equitable access to digital infrastructure.

The UNESCO Global Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education (2023) further reinforces international cooperation through the fair, transparent, and non-discriminatory recognition of academic qualifications. NEP 2020 demonstrates increasing compatibility with these global developments while continuing to operate within India's constitutional framework.

From a comparative constitutional perspective, NEP 2020 illustrates a process of selective constitutional adaptation rather than regulatory transplantation. International principles relating to academic mobility, quality assurance, digital governance, lifelong learning, and recognition of qualifications have been incorporated in a manner consistent with India's constitutional commitments to substantive equality, cooperative federalism, institutional autonomy, social justice, and the promotion of Indian Knowledge Systems. Consequently, comparative constitutional learning strengthens domestic educational reform while preserving constitutional identity, democratic accountability, and national sovereignty (Altbach & de Wit, 2021).

VIII. DIGITAL GOVERNANCE AND CONSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The implementation of the NEP 2020 has established digital governance as a central component of higher education regulation in India. Digital initiatives such as the ABC, APAAR, DigiLocker, the National Academic Depository, and technology-enabled quality assurance systems have strengthened learner mobility, institutional transparency, and evidence-based governance. Consequently, digital governance under NEP 2020 extends beyond administrative modernization to become an important constitutional dimension of higher education regulation. Contemporary international policy literature similarly recognizes digital transformation as an essential component of resilient, inclusive, and learner-centred higher education systems (UNESCO, 2022; World Bank, 2022).

As educational administration becomes increasingly dependent on digital platforms, constitutional concerns relating to informational privacy, data protection, equality, institutional accountability, and algorithmic decision-making assume greater significance. The normative legitimacy of digital governance therefore depends upon ensuring that technological innovation remains consistent with the principles of dignity, equality, procedural fairness, transparency, and the rule of law.

8.1 Digital Public Infrastructure and Academic Mobility

The integration of the ABC, APAAR, DigiLocker, and the National Academic Depository has established a Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) for higher education. These interoperable systems facilitate secure academic record management, credential verification, learner mobility, and recognition of academic achievements while supporting flexible learning pathways and institutional accountability. Beyond improving administrative efficiency, this digital architecture strengthens learner-centred governance and contributes to the realization of multidisciplinary and lifelong learning envisaged under NEP 2020. Similar digital credential ecosystems are increasingly being adopted internationally to support interoperable qualifications, lifelong learning, and cross-border academic mobility (European Commission, 2023).

8.2 Informational Privacy and Data Governance

The increasing digitization of higher education raises important constitutional questions concerning informational privacy and the governance of educational data. Following the Supreme Court's decision in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India (2017), privacy forms an integral component of Article 21 and imposes constitutional obligations upon public authorities responsible for collecting and processing personal information. These constitutional protections have acquired additional statutory significance through the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, which establishes principles governing lawful processing, purpose limitation, data security, and accountability in the handling of digital personal data.

Accordingly, digital governance mechanisms within higher education must operate consistently with the constitutional principles of legality, proportionality, transparency, informed consent, and institutional accountability to ensure that technological efficiency does not compromise individual autonomy or fundamental rights.

8.3 Cybersecurity and Institutional Accountability

As higher education increasingly relies upon interconnected digital platforms, cybersecurity has become an important constitutional concern. Data breaches, identity theft, cyber-attacks, and unauthorized access to academic databases may undermine public confidence in educational governance and compromise institutional integrity. Universities and regulatory authorities must therefore establish robust cybersecurity frameworks incorporating secure data management, periodic security audits, effective grievance-redress mechanisms, clearly defined institutional responsibilities, and appropriate incident-response protocols. Such safeguards reinforce constitutional principles of transparency, accountability, and the rule of law while strengthening trust in digitally enabled public institutions.

8.4 Digital Inclusion and Substantive Equality

The constitutional legitimacy of digital governance ultimately depends upon equitable access to technological infrastructure. Although digital platforms expand educational opportunities, disparities in digital infrastructure, institutional capacity, internet connectivity, and technological

accessibility continue to influence the implementation of technology-enabled reforms across India. Article 14 therefore requires that digital transformation promotes substantive equality rather than reinforcing existing socio-economic inequalities. International policy literature similarly students to earn, carry forward, and utilize academic credits obtained from accredited institutions of higher learning by investments in digital infrastructure, institutional capacity, faculty development, and inclusive access to ensure that technological innovation advances educational equity and sustainable development (UNESCO, 2022; World Bank, 2022).

8.5 Artificial Intelligence and Emerging Constitutional Challenges

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly reshaping higher education through adaptive learning, automated assessment, predictive analytics, administrative automation, and generative AI applications. While these technologies offer significant opportunities for improving educational quality and administrative efficiency, they also generate constitutional concerns relating to fairness, transparency, algorithmic bias, academic integrity, explainability, and accountability. Constitutional principles of equality, procedural fairness, and non-arbitrariness require that AI-assisted educational decisions remain subject to meaningful human oversight and effective accountability mechanisms.

Universities should therefore develop comprehensive institutional policies governing the responsible use of AI, academic honesty, intellectual property, data governance, and ethical research practices to ensure that technological innovation remains consistent with constitutional values and the protection of fundamental rights.

8.6 Digital Constitutionalism

The continuing implementation of NEP 2020 demonstrates that digital governance has evolved into a distinct constitutional dimension of higher education regulation. Digital identity, interoperable academic records, AI-enabled governance, cybersecurity, and learner-centred regulation collectively illustrate the emergence of a technology-driven governance framework grounded in constitutional accountability. The long-term legitimacy of this framework will depend not only upon administrative efficiency but also upon its ability to preserve equality, privacy, transparency, academic autonomy, cooperative federalism, procedural fairness, and responsible data governance.

Viewed through the emerging doctrine of digital constitutionalism, NEP 2020 illustrates how constitutional values continue to shape the governance of digitally enabled public institutions. As higher education becomes increasingly digital and globally interconnected, public governance must evolve alongside technological innovation to ensure that educational modernization remains firmly anchored in the enduring constitutional principles of justice, dignity, equality, and the rule of law.

ISSN: 3139-8464 (p)

IX. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

The constitutional, jurisprudential, and comparative analysis undertaken in this study yields four principal findings corresponding to the stated research objectives.

First, NEP 2020 represents a significant regulatory transformation in higher education governance by operationalizing the principles of substantive equality, cooperative federalism, constitutional morality, and transformative constitutionalism. The policy seeks to translate constitutional commitments relating to equitable access, institutional autonomy, multidisciplinary education, and human development into an evolving regulatory framework. However, the realization of these constitutional objectives depends upon balanced implementation across the Union and the States, taking into account differences in institutional capacity, fiscal resources, legislative frameworks, and digital readiness.

Second, the implementation of NEP 2020 demonstrates a gradual transition towards the governance philosophy envisaged under the proposed HECI. Although the UGC continues to function as the principal regulatory authority, successive reforms increasingly reflect a regulatory model emphasizing accountability, transparency, academic flexibility, learner mobility, and institutional autonomy. The institutional legitimacy of this transition depends upon preserving cooperative federalism, procedural fairness, institutional diversity, and meaningful participation of the States.

Third, NEP 2020 demonstrates increasing convergence between Indian higher education governance and contemporary international regulatory practices through academic mobility, multidisciplinary education, flexible learning pathways, digital governance, quality assurance, and recognition of qualifications. While these reforms align India's higher education system with evolving global standards, they simultaneously preserve constitutional commitments to social justice, public welfare, federal balance, and the promotion of Indian Knowledge Systems, reflecting a process of selective constitutional adaptation rather than regulatory transplantation.

Fourth, the expansion of digital governance under NEP 2020 has introduced new legal dimensions relating to informational privacy, data governance, equality, transparency, accountability, cybersecurity, and digital inclusion. Although technology-enabled governance enhances learner mobility, institutional efficiency, and regulatory effectiveness, its constitutional sustainability depends upon ensuring equitable digital access, responsible data governance, robust cybersecurity safeguards, and the protection of substantive equality, privacy, and procedural fairness in accordance with Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution.

Taken together, these findings demonstrate that NEP 2020 has progressively operationalized constitutional principles through regulatory modernization and governance reform. Its long-term legitimacy will depend upon integrating constitutional values with effective implementation, balanced federal participation, regulatory accountability, digital constitutionalism, and adaptive governance capable of responding to technological, institutional, and societal change while remaining faithful to the constitutional principles of justice, equality, dignity, and the rule of law.

ISSN: 3139-8464 (p)

X. DOCTRINAL FINDINGS IN RELATION TO THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The foregoing analysis confirms that the NEP 2020 has evolved beyond a policy framework into an ongoing constitutional project that progressively reshapes higher education governance in India. Rather than creating an entirely new legal order, its implementation operationalizes constitutional principles through regulatory modernization, learner-centred governance, digital transformation, and institutional accountability. The doctrinal findings presented below synthesize the constitutional outcomes corresponding to each of the four research objectives.

Objective 1

The doctrinal analysis indicates that NEP 2020 advances the constitutional principles of substantive equality and cooperative federalism by promoting equitable educational access, learner mobility, institutional flexibility, multidisciplinary education, and human development. These reforms reflect a distributive understanding of equality consistent with Article 14 and the Directive Principles of State Policy while strengthening the constitutional objective of expanding access to quality education.

Meanwhile, the constitutional realization of these objectives depends upon effective cooperation between the Union and the States. Differences in institutional capacity, fiscal resources, digital infrastructure, and legislative frameworks continue to influence implementation. Accordingly, the long-term constitutional sustainability of NEP 2020 requires preserving cooperative federalism, institutional autonomy, and equitable educational opportunity alongside nationally coordinated quality standards.

Objective 2

The constitutional evaluation suggests that, although the proposed HECI has not yet replaced the existing statutory framework, its governance philosophy increasingly informs us of successive UGC reforms. This evolving regulatory model emphasizes transparency, accountability, academic flexibility, learner mobility, institutional autonomy, and administrative rationalization, thereby reinforcing the constitutional principles of non-arbitrariness, procedural fairness, and accountable governance under Article 14.

Its regulatory legitimacy, however, depends upon avoiding excessive centralization by preserving meaningful participation of the States, institutional diversity, cooperative federalism, judicial oversight, and regulatory accountability throughout the implementation process.

Objective 3

The present analysis confirms that NEP 2020 increasingly aligns India's higher education governance with contemporary international regulatory developments relating to academic mobility, competency-based learning, quality assurance, digital governance, lifelong learning, and recognition of qualifications. This convergence reflects a process of selective constitutional adaptation rather than regulatory transplantation.

Rather than replicating foreign educational models, NEP 2020 selectively incorporates internationally accepted regulatory principles while preserving constitutional commitments to substantive equality, cooperative federalism, institutional autonomy, social justice, and the promotion of Indian Knowledge Systems. The findings therefore demonstrate that comparative constitutional learning can strengthen domestic educational governance while preserving constitutional identity, democratic accountability, and national educational priorities.

Objective 4

The findings reveal that digital governance has emerged as an integral constitutional dimension of higher education regulation. Digital academic infrastructure strengthens learner mobility, institutional accountability, transparency, and regulatory efficiency while simultaneously raising constitutional concerns relating to informational privacy, responsible data governance, cybersecurity, artificial intelligence, and digital inclusion.

The constitutional sustainability of digital governance therefore depends upon ensuring that technological innovation remains consistent with the principles of equality, privacy, procedural fairness, transparency, accountability, and the rule of law. Long-term legitimacy requires robust legal safeguards, responsible governance of educational data, meaningful human oversight of AI-assisted decision-making, and equitable digital access to ensure that technological modernization remains consistent with constitutional values and the protection of fundamental rights.

10.1 Policy Implications

The constitutional analysis undertaken in this study carries several implications for the future implementation of NEP 2020. First, regulatory reforms should continue to strengthen cooperative federalism by ensuring meaningful participation of the States in higher education governance while maintaining nationally coordinated academic standards. Second, the progressive transition towards the governance philosophy envisaged under the proposed HECI should preserve institutional autonomy, procedural fairness, and transparent regulatory oversight to reinforce public confidence in higher education institutions.

Third, the continued expansion of digital governance requires robust implementation of privacy safeguards, responsible data governance, cybersecurity measures, and institutional accountability to ensure that technology-enabled reforms remain consistent with constitutional guarantees under Articles 14 and 21. Universities should also establish comprehensive institutional policies governing the ethical use of artificial intelligence, academic integrity, and algorithmic accountability in teaching, assessment, and administrative decision-making.

Finally, future implementation of NEP 2020 should continue to promote inclusive access, multidisciplinary learning, learner mobility, and international engagement while preserving India's constitutional identity, democratic values, and commitment to social justice. Sustained constitutional review of emerging regulatory reforms will remain essential to ensuring that higher education modernization advances both educational excellence and constitutional governance.

XI. CONCLUSION

The NEP 2020 represents a constitutional inflection point in India's higher education governance by marking a transition from fragmented regulatory control towards a more accountable, learner-centred, and constitutionally informed governance framework. Through the progressive implementation of regulatory reforms, the policy operationalizes the constitutional principles of substantive equality, cooperative federalism, institutional autonomy, constitutional morality, and responsible global engagement, thereby reshaping the normative foundations of higher education governance.

The foregoing constitutional, jurisprudential, and comparative analysis indicates that the transformative potential of the NEP 2020 ultimately depends upon the integrity of its implementation. Constitutional challenges relating to regulatory centralization, fiscal disparities among States, digital inequality, institutional capacity, and responsible data governance continue to influence the realization of its objectives. Addressing these challenges requires sustained federal cooperation, procedural fairness, institutional accountability, meaningful participation of the States, and governance mechanisms that remain responsive to technological and societal change.

Accordingly, NEP 2020 should be understood as an evolving constitutional project rather than a completed regulatory reform. Its long-term legitimacy will depend upon preserving constitutional values while adapting to emerging developments in digital governance, artificial intelligence, responsible data governance, academic freedom, and algorithmic accountability. Ultimately, the constitutional success of NEP 2020 will be measured not only by the modernization of university education regulation but also by its continuing fidelity to the constitutional principles of justice, equality, dignity, transparency, accountability, institutional autonomy, cooperative federalism, and the rule of law within an increasingly digital and globally interconnected post-secondary education system.

REFERENCES

[1] Aithal, P. S., & Aithal, S. (2020). Implementation strategies of higher education in National Education Policy 2020 of India. International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences, 5(2), 283–325.

[2] Altbach, P. G., & de Wit, H. (2021). Postpandemic outlook for higher education: A global perspective. International Higher Education, 105, 3–5.

[3] Council of Europe & European Commission. (2020). The European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and the Bologna Process. European Higher Education Area Secretariat.

[4] European Commission. (2023). ECTS Users' Guide: European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System. Publications Office of the European Union.

[5] Jain, A., & Girish, R. (2023). Transformative constitutionalism and right to elementary education: An evolutionary analysis with special reference to the Constitution of India.

Elementary Education Online. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

[6] Khosla, M. (2020). India's constitutional democracy and governance reform. International Journal of Constitutional Law, 18(4), 1123–1136.

[7] Kumar, R., & Choudhury, S. (2022). Inclusive higher education under NEP 2020: Implementation and constitutional challenges. Journal of Education Policy Studies, 12(1), 45–62.

[8] Mehrotra, S. (2021). Reforming vocational education in India under NEP 2020. Oxford Review of Education, 47(5), 645–662.

[9] Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1.

[10] OECD. (2021). Education at a glance 2021: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing.

[11] Saxena, S. (2025). Instrumentalizing the university: The principles underlying higher education regulation at India's founding. Indian Law Review, 9(3), 237–259. https://doi.org/10.1080/24730580.2025.2540132

[12] Sharma, R., & Bhardwaj, P. (2021). Competency-based education reforms in India under NEP 2020. Journal of Educational Change, 22(3), 367–384.

[13] Sivaraman, S., Parmar, N., Madhu, S., Sable, R., & Patel, B. (2026). Evaluating the impact of NEP 2020 on higher education reforms and skill development in India: A systematic literature review. Frontiers in Education, 11, 1683208. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1683208

[14] Srivastava, D. K. (2023). Pearls and pitfalls of the doctrine of constitutional morality. Panjab University Law Review, 61(2), 76–88.

[15] Tilak, J. B. G. (2021). National Education Policy 2020: A critical review. Economic and Political Weekly, 56(34), 12–15.

[16] UNESCO. (2021). Higher education and sustainable development in India. UNESCO.

[17] UNESCO. (2022). Towards a common definition of micro-credentials. UNESCO.

[18] UNESCO. (2023). Global Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education. UNESCO.

[19] University Grants Commission. (2021). University Grants Commission (Academic Bank of Credits) Regulations, 2021. New Delhi: UGC.

[20] University Grants Commission. (2022). Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes (CCFUP). New Delhi: UGC.

[21] University Grants Commission. (2023). National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF). New Delhi: UGC.

[22] University Grants Commission. (2024). NEP SAARTHI: Implementation and Capacity Building Initiatives. New Delhi: UGC.

[23] University Grants Commission. (2024). UTSAH: University Transformation through Strategic Higher Education Initiatives. New Delhi: UGC.

[24] University Grants Commission. (2025). Guidelines on the Implementation of the Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP) and Multiple Entry–Multiple Exit (MEME). New Delhi: UGC.

[25] University Grants Commission. (2026). Advisories and Public Notices on the Operational Implementation of the Academic Bank of Credits (ABC) and APAAR. New Delhi: UGC.

[26] World Bank. (2022). World Development Report 2022: Finance for an equitable recovery. World Bank.