

# Adapting Teacher Education Programmes in Alignment with NEP 2020: Perceptions and Preparedness of Teacher Educators in Kerala

Dr Nowfal C

Assistant Professor, Farook Training College, Farook College University of Calicut

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1306000136>

Received: 08 June 2026; Accepted: 13 June 2026; Published: 27 June 2026

## ABSTRACT

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 introduced the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) as a major reform to improve the quality of teacher preparation in India. The successful implementation of ITEP largely depends on the preparedness and support of teacher educators. Therefore, the present study examined the perception of teacher educators regarding the implementation of ITEP in Kerala. The study adopted a descriptive survey design and collected data from 800 teacher educators working in Government, Aided, Self-Financing teacher education institutions and University Centres across Kerala. Data were collected using a standardized Perception Scale on ITEP Implementation developed by the investigator. The scale measured five dimensions, namely Understanding of NEP/ITEP, Faculty Readiness, Administrative Readiness, Institutional Preparedness and Infrastructural Readiness, and Opportunities and Challenges. The findings revealed that teacher educators possess a moderate level of perception regarding the implementation of ITEP ( $M = 137$ ). They demonstrated a high level of understanding of NEP 2020 and ITEP, while perception regarding faculty readiness, administrative readiness and institutional preparedness was found to be moderate. No significant differences were observed in perception based on the type of management or subject specialization. Teaching experience influenced perception only in the dimension of administrative readiness. The study highlights the need for capacity building, institutional preparedness, infrastructural strengthening and administrative support for the effective implementation of ITEP in Kerala.

**Keywords:** Integrated Teacher Education Programme, ITEP, NEP 2020, Teacher Educators, Teacher Education Reform, Kerala.

## INTRODUCTION

Education has long been recognised as a powerful instrument for individual empowerment and social transformation. In the contemporary global context, educational systems are increasingly expected to promote critical thinking, inclusiveness, multidisciplinary learning and competency-based approaches capable of preparing learners for rapidly changing social and technological realities. Within this broader context, the introduction of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 marked a historic turning point in the Indian education system. The policy envisions a learner-centred, flexible, multidisciplinary and globally competitive educational framework aimed at transforming all stages of education, from early childhood to higher education (Narsimulu, 2025). NEP 2020 further identifies teachers as the central agents of educational reform and emphasises that the quality of an education system ultimately depends upon the quality of its teachers and teacher preparation processes.

Teacher education therefore occupies a pivotal position in the successful implementation of NEP 2020. The policy highlights that teacher preparation should not merely focus on the transmission of pedagogical skills but must integrate multidisciplinary knowledge, professional ethics, classroom practice, Indian knowledge systems and contemporary educational innovations. NEP 2020 states that teacher education must develop “formation of dispositions and values” along with professional competencies and practical training (NEP 2020, Para 15.1). In this context, the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) introduced the four-year Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) as a major structural reform intended to replace fragmented teacher preparation models with an integrated and multidisciplinary framework.

The Integrated Teacher Education Programme combines disciplinary knowledge, pedagogical training and school internship experiences within a single structured programme. Unlike traditional teacher education programme that separate undergraduate education from professional teacher preparation, ITEP seeks to integrate both dimensions from the beginning of higher education. According to NCTE (2023), the programme is envisioned as an “integrated, multidisciplinary and comprehensive teacher education programme” designed to prepare professionally competent, reflective and socially committed teachers. Scholars have observed that the programme aims to address long-standing concerns relating to fragmentation, lack of professional integration and inadequate practical orientation in teacher education (Dhupal, 2026; Mandal, Mete, & Biswas, 2025).

Among Indian states, Kerala presents a unique context for examining the implementation of teacher education reforms under NEP 2020. The state has historically maintained high literacy levels, strong educational participation and significant social development indicators. Kerala’s teacher education system operates through four major universities—University of Kerala, Mahatma Gandhi University, University of Calicut, and Kannur University—which together supervise a large number of government, aided, self-financing and university-affiliated teacher education institutions. According to the Kerala State Higher Education Council (2024), the state has an extensive and diverse institutional network that has contributed significantly to accessibility and inclusiveness in teacher education.

However, despite Kerala’s strong educational legacy, the implementation of ITEP has emerged as a complex and challenging process. NEP 2020 mandates that all teacher education programmes should gradually function within multidisciplinary institutions by 2030. This requirement creates significant pressure on standalone teacher education colleges in Kerala to restructure, merge, collaborate, or transform into multidisciplinary institutions. Researchers have pointed out that such reforms involve substantial administrative, curricular, infrastructural and institutional changes (Gupta & Saxena, 2021; Singh, 2025). The transition also raises concerns regarding faculty preparedness, institutional sustainability, curriculum integration and the redefinition of academic roles within teacher education institutions.

Studies conducted in the Indian context indicate that although teacher educators generally acknowledge the transformative potential of NEP 2020 and ITEP, they also report uncertainties regarding implementation procedures, infrastructure readiness and institutional support mechanisms (Sajan & Thomas, 2025; Soni & Tiwari, 2024). Previous research further suggests that successful implementation of educational reforms depends heavily on systematic planning, stakeholder involvement, continuous professional development and effective change management strategies (Jadhav, 2022; Thompson et al., 2024). In Kerala, the relatively slow adoption of ITEP and the limited number of approved institutions offering the programme reflect the practical complexities involved in restructuring teacher education according to the expectations of NEP 2020.

In this context, understanding the perceptions and preparedness of teacher educators becomes critically important. Teacher educators play a central role in translating policy objectives into institutional practices and classroom realities. Their awareness, readiness, attitudes, and professional confidence significantly influence the success of policy implementation. Examining their perceptions regarding NEP 2020 and ITEP is therefore essential for identifying the opportunities, challenges, and support systems required for the effective transformation of teacher education in Kerala. Against this background, the present study seeks to analyse the perceptions and preparedness of teacher educators in Kerala regarding the implementation of ITEP in alignment with NEP 2020.

### **Need and Significance of the Study**

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 represents one of the most comprehensive educational reform initiatives undertaken in India in recent decades. The policy envisions a holistic, multidisciplinary, learner-centred and competency-based education system capable of responding to the emerging educational demands of the twenty-first century. Within this larger reform agenda, teacher education has been identified as a foundational element for ensuring educational quality and national development. NEP 2020 recognises that teachers are the most important stakeholders in educational transformation and therefore emphasises the urgent need to reform teacher preparation programmes in India (Saha, 2025).



To achieve this objective, the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) introduced the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP), a four-year multidisciplinary programme designed to integrate subject knowledge, pedagogy and school-based practice within a unified framework. The programme seeks to replace fragmented models of teacher preparation with a professionally integrated structure aligned with global standards and contemporary educational needs (Sharma, 2025). However, the successful implementation of such a large-scale reform requires substantial institutional preparedness, faculty readiness, administrative restructuring, curriculum redesign, infrastructural support and continuous professional development.

In the context of Kerala, the implementation of ITEP assumes particular significance because the state possesses a distinctive teacher education ecosystem characterised by a large number of standalone teacher education institutions operating under diverse management structures. Although Kerala has consistently maintained high literacy rates and strong educational achievements, the institutional restructuring proposed by NEP 2020 presents several practical and administrative challenges. Since the policy mandates that all teacher education programmes should function within multidisciplinary institutions by 2030, many standalone teacher education colleges in Kerala face uncertainty regarding their future sustainability, academic restructuring and institutional adaptation (Kerala State Higher Education Council, 2024).

Despite the policy's transformative vision, the actual implementation of ITEP in Kerala has progressed slowly. As of the 2025–26 academic year, only a limited number of institutions—including National Institute of Technology Calicut, Central University of Kerala, Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit, Majlis Arts and Science College and SAFI Institute of Advanced Study—have been approved to offer the programme. This limited expansion reflects the practical difficulties involved in implementing the policy at the institutional level. Studies indicate that confusion persists among teacher educators, administrators, institutional heads and management bodies regarding curriculum integration, faculty responsibilities, infrastructure requirements, and the operational procedures associated with ITEP (Kerala State Higher Education Council, 2024).

The significance of the present study therefore emerges from the urgent need to understand how teacher educators perceive these reforms and how prepared institutions are to implement them effectively. Teacher educators constitute the core human resource responsible for translating educational policy into practice. Their perceptions, awareness, attitudes and preparedness directly influence the success or failure of educational reforms. However, there exists limited empirical research examining the perspectives of teacher educators regarding the implementation of ITEP in Kerala. Most existing studies focus primarily on the philosophical foundations of NEP 2020 or discuss policy reforms at a general level without adequately addressing the regional and institutional realities of implementation.

The present study seeks to address this research gap by systematically examining the perceptions and preparedness of teacher educators in Kerala regarding the implementation of ITEP under NEP 2020. The study is expected to provide valuable empirical evidence regarding stakeholder awareness, institutional readiness, infrastructural adequacy, faculty preparedness and implementation challenges. Such evidence can support policymakers, universities, regulatory bodies and educational administrators in designing more effective orientation programmes, faculty development initiatives, institutional support mechanisms and implementation strategies. The findings may contribute to the development of context-sensitive implementation frameworks capable of addressing the unique structural and administrative characteristics of teacher education institutions in Kerala.

Furthermore, the study holds broader educational significance because strengthening teacher education is central to improving the overall quality of school education. NEP 2020 emphasises that educational transformation depends fundamentally upon professionally competent, reflective, technologically skilled, and socially committed teachers. Understanding the preparedness of teacher education institutions and identifying the challenges associated with implementing ITEP can therefore contribute not only to the successful implementation of NEP 2020 in Kerala but also to the larger national effort to improve teacher professionalism and educational quality in India.

---

## METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The study employed a descriptive survey design to examine the perception of teacher educators regarding the implementation of the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) in Kerala. A sample of 800 teacher educators from government, aided and self-financing teacher education institutions was selected for the study. Data were collected using a standardized Perception Scale on ITEP Implementation developed by the investigator. The scale assessed respondents' perceptions across five dimensions: Understanding of ITEP and NEP 2020, Faculty Readiness, Administrative Readiness, Institutional Preparedness and Infrastructural Readiness, and Professional Development. The reliability of the instrument was established using Cronbach's Alpha, and the coefficient obtained was 0.81, indicating that the tool possesses satisfactory reliability. Content validity was ensured by providing adequate representation and weightage to all dimensions of the construct. Face validity was established through expert review and consultation with specialists in the field of teacher education and educational research.

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as Mean, Standard Deviation, Percentage, Skewness, and Kurtosis, and inferential statistics such as t-test and ANOVA.

### Analysis and Discussion

The study examined the perception of teacher educators regarding the implementation of the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) in Kerala. The data collected from 800 teacher educators were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical techniques to examine their perception regarding the implementation of ITEP in alignment with NEP 2020. Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard were used to assess the overall level of perception and its various dimensions. Inferential statistics including t-test, one-way ANOVA, and post-hoc analysis were employed to examine differences in perception based on type of management, subject specialization, and teaching experience. The results of the analysis and their interpretation are presented below.

### Perception of Teacher Educators Towards the Implementation of ITEP

The Perception Scale consisted of 45 items with a maximum possible score of 225. The mean score obtained by the 800 teacher educators was 137, indicating a **moderate level of perception** towards NEP 2020 and the implementation of ITEP in Kerala. This suggests that teacher educators generally possess a positive attitude towards the reform, although there is scope for further strengthening their understanding and preparedness.

Component-wise analysis revealed that teacher educators demonstrated a **high level of understanding** of NEP 2020 and ITEP ( $M = 60.20$ ). However, their perceptions regarding **faculty readiness** ( $M = 17.94$ ), **administrative readiness** ( $M = 17.25$ ), and **institutional preparedness and infrastructural readiness** ( $M = 26.33$ ) were found to be moderate. The dimension **opportunities and challenges** recorded the lowest mean score ( $M = 16.28$ ), indicating concerns regarding the practical aspects of ITEP implementation.

Overall, the findings show that while teacher educators have a sound understanding of the objectives and structure of ITEP, moderate levels of readiness and institutional preparedness may pose challenges to its effective implementation. The results highlight the need for faculty training, administrative support and institutional capacity building to ensure the successful implementation of ITEP in Kerala.

### Comparison of Perception of Teacher Educators Regarding ITEP Implementation Based on Type of Management

To examine whether teacher educators working in different types of institutions differ in their perception regarding the implementation of ITEP, a comparison was made between teacher educators from Government/Aided institutions and those from Self-Financing institutions/University Centres. The mean scores, standard deviations, and t-values were calculated for the overall perception score as well as for each dimension of the scale. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 1

Table 1 Data and Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Mean Scores of the Variable Perception of Teacher Educator on ITEP Implementation based on Type of Management

Dimensions		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t- value
Overall	1-Govt./Aided	248	137.84	18.93	.160
	2-Self-Financing/ University Centres	552	138.06	16.73	
1- NEP/ITEP Understanding	1- Govt./Aided	248	60.48	8.70	.607
	2- Self-Financing/ University Centres	552	60.08	8.86	
2- Faculty Readiness	1- Govt./Aided	248	18.14	3.82	1.12
	2- Self-Financing/ University Centres	552	17.84	3.30	
3- Administrative Readiness	1- Govt./Aided	248	17.30	3.76	.327
	2- Self-Financing/ University Centres	552	17.22	2.99	
4- Institutional preparedness and Infrastructural readiness	1- Govt./Aided	248	25.81	5.96	1.87
	2- Self-Financing/ University Centres	552	26.56	4.84	
5- Opportunities and Challenges	1- Govt./Aided	248	16.10	3.30	.985
	2- Self-Financing/ University Centres	552	16.36	3.33	

The perception of teacher educators regarding the implementation of ITEP was compared based on the type of management of their institutions, namely Government/Aided and Self-Financing/University Centres. The results revealed no significant difference in the overall perception scores between the two groups ( $t = 0.160$ ,  $p > .05$ ). This indicates that teacher educators, irrespective of the type of institution in which they work, hold similar perceptions regarding the implementation of ITEP.

Dimension-wise analysis also showed no significant differences between the two groups in Understanding of NEP/ITEP ( $t = 0.607$ ), Faculty Readiness ( $t = 1.12$ ), Administrative Readiness ( $t = 0.327$ ), Institutional Preparedness and Infrastructural Readiness ( $t = 1.87$ ), and Opportunities and Challenges ( $t = 0.985$ ). Although minor variations in mean scores were observed, these differences were not statistically significant.

The findings suggest that the perception of teacher educators towards ITEP implementation is largely independent of institutional management. Teacher educators across Government, Aided, Self-Financing institutions, and University Centres demonstrate comparable levels of understanding, readiness, and perception regarding the reform. Hence, the type of management does not appear to influence teacher educators' perceptions of ITEP implementation in Kerala.

**Comparison of Perception of Teacher Educators in Kerala Regarding Implementation of ITEP in Alignment with NEP 2020 Based on the Subject of teaching**

To examine whether perception of teacher educators differs based on subject of specialization, teacher educators were categorized into three groups namely **Language**, **Science**, and **Social Science**. Since more than two groups were involved, a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to test whether there are statistically significant differences in mean perception scores among the three subject groups and across its five dimensions.

Table 2 Result of ANOVA on Mean Scores of the Variable Perception of Teacher Educator on ITEP Implementation based Subject of Teaching

Dimensions	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Overall	Between groups	252.721	2	126.360	.415
	Within groups	242457.20	797	304.212	
	Total	242709.920	799		
1- Understanding of NEP/ITEP	Between groups	68.872	2	34.436	0.443
	Within groups	61916.917	797	77.687	
	Total	61985.789	799		
2- Faculty Readiness	Between groups	3.997	2	34.074	2.838
	Within groups	4.123	797	12.007	
	Total	4.152	799		
3- Administrative Readiness	Between groups	3.737	2	11.762	1.113
	Within groups	4.076	797	10.566	
	Total	4.048	799		
4- Institutional preparedness and Infrastructural readiness	Between groups	3.775	2	.422	0.016
	Within groups	3.968	797	27.316	
	Total	3.980	799		
5- Opportunities and Challenges	Between groups	4.085	2	10.856	0.983
	Within groups	4.143	797	11.045	
	Total	4.155	799		

Table 2 presents the results of the one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) conducted to examine whether teacher educators belonging to different subject specializations (Language, Science, and Social Science) differ in their perception regarding the implementation of ITEP in alignment with NEP 2020. The obtained F-value for the overall perception score was found to be non-significant at the 0.05 level, indicating that teacher educators across the three subject groups hold similar perceptions regarding ITEP implementation. Likewise, the F-values obtained for all five dimensions of the scale—Understanding of NEP/ITEP, Faculty Readiness, Administrative Readiness, Institutional Preparedness and Infrastructural Readiness, and Opportunities and Challenges—were also found to be non-significant. These findings indicate that subject specialization does not have a significant influence on teacher educators’ understanding of ITEP, their readiness for implementation, or their perception of the opportunities and challenges associated with the programme. Therefore, it can be concluded that teacher educators, irrespective of their subject background, share similar views regarding the implementation of ITEP in Kerala.

**Comparison of Perception of Teacher Educators in Kerala Regarding Implementation of ITEP in Alignment with NEP 2020 Based on Teaching Experience**

Teacher educators in Kerala were classified in to four categories based on their teaching experience namely less than two years, 2-5 years, 5-10 years and above 10 years. Accordingly, four groups were identified from the total sample to investigate the influence of their experience on their perception regarding implementation of ITEP. To examine whether their perception varies according to teaching experience a comparison was made among these four groups namely Less than 2 years (n = 122, 15.3%), 2–5 years (n = 234, 29.3%), 5–10 years (n = 240, 30.0%), and above 10 years (n = 204, 25.4%).

Since more than two independent groups were compared, a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was considered appropriate to test whether significant differences exist in mean perception scores across the four groups of teacher educators based on their teaching experience.

Table 3 Result of ANOVA on Mean Scores of the Variable Perception of Teacher Educator on ITEP Implementation based on Experience

Dimensions	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Overall	Between groups	977.252	3		1.073
	Within groups	241732.668	796		
	Total	242709.920	799		
1- Undersetting of NEP/ITEP	Between groups	145.619	3	48.540	0.665
	Within groups	61840.170	796	77.689	
	Total	61985.789	799		
2- Faculty Readiness	Between groups	15.940	3	5.313	0.440
	Within groups	9621.809	796	12.088	
	Total	9637.749	799		
3- Administrative Readiness	Between groups	167.813	3	55.938	5.38*
	Within groups	8276.676	796	10.398	
	Total	8444.489	799		
4- Institutional preparedness and Infrastructural readiness	Between groups	156.534	3	52.178	1.92
	Within groups	21615.314	796	27.155	
	Total	21771.849	799		
5- Opportunities and Challenges	Between groups	76.099	3	25.366	2.31
	Within groups	8748.296	796	10.990	
	Total	8824.395	799		

Table 3 presents the results of the one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) conducted to examine whether teacher educators belonging to different categories of teaching experience differ in their perception regarding the implementation of ITEP in alignment with NEP 2020. The obtained F-value for the overall perception score was found to be non-significant at the 0.05 level, indicating that teacher educators with varying years of teaching experience hold similar perceptions regarding ITEP implementation. Likewise, no significant differences were observed in the dimensions of Understanding of NEP/ITEP, Faculty Readiness, Institutional Preparedness and Infrastructural Readiness, and Opportunities and Challenges. However, a significant difference was found in the dimension of Administrative Readiness ( $F = 5.38, p < .05$ ), suggesting that perceptions regarding administrative preparedness vary across different experience groups. Overall, the findings indicate that teaching experience does not significantly influence teacher educators' perception of ITEP implementation, except in the area of administrative readiness, where experienced teacher educators appear to differ in their assessment of institutional preparedness and support.

### Post Hoc Analysis Based on the Component Administrative Readiness

The one-way ANOVA results revealed a statistically significant difference among teacher educators with different levels of teaching experience in the component **Administrative Readiness** ( $F = 5.38, p < 0.05$ ). Since ANOVA only indicates the presence of a significant difference without specifying the groups between which the difference exists, a post hoc analysis was conducted.

Table 23 Summary of the Comparison with Matrix of Ordered Means for Various Categories of Teacher Educators based on Administrative Readiness

(I) Experience	(J) Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Less than 2	2 to 5	-.159	.360	.978
Less than 2	5 to 10	.609	.359	.411
Less than 2	Greater than 10	-.599	.369	.452
2 to 5	5 to 10	.768	.296	.082
2 to 5	Greater than 10	-.440	.309	.567
5 to 10	Greater than 10	-1.21*	.307	.002

The data presented in the table indicate the mean difference between each pair of four categories of teacher educators classified based on their teaching experience with respect to their perception of administrative readiness. A difference is observed between two groups namely those with 5-10 years of experience and those with more than 10 years' experience. The results of Post Hoc analysis are presented in the following table

Table 24 Summary of Scheffe's Test of Post Hoc Comparison with Matrix of Ordered Means for Various Categories of Teacher Educators based on Administrative Readiness

Experience	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
5 to 10	240	16.62	
Less than 2	122	17.23	17.23
2 to 5	234	17.39	17.39
Greater than 10	204		17.83
Sig.		.154	.362

The post-hoc analysis revealed a significant difference in Administrative Readiness between teacher educators with 5–10 years of teaching experience and those with more than 10 years of experience. Teacher educators with 5–10 years of experience reported significantly lower levels of administrative readiness (Mean Difference = -1.21,  $p = .002$ ) compared to their more experienced counterparts. The group with 5–10 years of experience recorded the lowest mean score ( $M = 16.62$ ), whereas teacher educators with more than 10 years of experience reported the highest mean score ( $M = 17.83$ ). This finding suggests that experienced teacher educators may possess greater confidence in evaluating institutional leadership, administrative support, and organizational preparedness for ITEP implementation.

Overall, the quantitative analysis of data collected from 800 teacher educators indicates a moderate level of perception regarding the implementation of ITEP in alignment with NEP 2020 in Kerala ( $M = 137$  out of a maximum score of 225). The findings suggest that teacher educators possess a generally positive orientation towards the proposed reform. Component-wise analysis revealed a high level of understanding of NEP 2020 and ITEP, while faculty readiness, administrative readiness, and institutional preparedness were found to be moderate. The dimension Opportunities and Challenges recorded the lowest mean score, indicating concerns regarding the practical aspects of implementation.

Further analysis showed that teacher educators' perceptions did not differ significantly based on the type of management of the institution or subject specialization. However, teaching experience was found to influence perceptions related to administrative readiness. Overall, the findings suggest that while teacher educators are supportive of ITEP and understand its objectives, greater attention is required to strengthen institutional preparedness, administrative support, and capacity-building initiatives for the effective implementation of the programme in Kerala.

### Educational Implications of the Study

**Need for Comprehensive Faculty Training:** Since faculty readiness was found to be only moderate, universities, SCERT, NCTE, and teacher education institutions should organize systematic orientation programmes, workshops, and capacity-building initiatives to familiarize teacher educators with the philosophy, curriculum, and pedagogical requirements of ITEP.

**Strengthening Institutional Preparedness:** The moderate level of institutional and infrastructural readiness indicates the need for improving physical infrastructure, ICT facilities, library resources and multidisciplinary learning environments necessary for the successful implementation of ITEP.

**Enhancing Administrative Support:** The significant difference observed in administrative readiness based on teaching experience highlights the importance of effective institutional leadership, planning and administrative coordination. Institutions should develop clear implementation strategies and support systems for faculty members.

**Continuous Professional Development:** Teacher educators require regular professional development programmes focusing on interdisciplinary teaching, competency-based education, inclusive practices, educational technology, and research skills in accordance with NEP 2020.

**Policy-Level Support for Implementation:** The findings suggest the need for a clear state-level roadmap for ITEP implementation in Kerala. Financial assistance, academic support and institutional mentoring should be provided to ensure a smooth transition to the new programme.

**Awareness and Orientation Programmes:** Although teacher educators demonstrated a good understanding of NEP 2020 and ITEP, continuous awareness programmes are necessary to address misconceptions and promote a deeper understanding of the objectives and expected outcomes of the reform.

**Support for Multidisciplinary Transformation:** Since ITEP is to be offered through multidisciplinary institutions, teacher education institutions should be supported in establishing academic collaborations and restructuring their programmes in accordance with NEP 2020 requirements.

**Evidence-Based Implementation Planning:** Educational authorities may use the findings of the study to identify areas requiring intervention and formulate strategies for strengthening readiness at the faculty, institutional, and administrative levels before large-scale implementation of ITEP.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) for the research project titled 'Adapting Teacher Education Programmes in Kerala in Alignment with NEP 2020: Challenges and Opportunities,' on which this article is based.

## REFERENCES

1. Dhupal, S. (2026). Relevance of ITEP in transforming teacher education programme in the present context. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 14(2).
2. Govt. of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Ministry of Education, Government of India.
3. Gupta, R., & Saxena, P. (2021). Redesigning teacher education under NEP 2020: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, 35(2), 67–78.
4. Jadhav, N. (2022). Issues and challenges of National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 implementation in teacher education. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Educational Development*, 10(3), 188.
5. Kerala State Higher Education Council. (2024). Report on implementation of Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) in Kerala.
6. Mandal, R., Mete, J., & Biswas, R. M. (2025). ITEP in India: Problems and prospects under NEP 2020. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(5), 2940. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25may1596>
7. Narsimulu, G. (2025). National education policy 2023: Transforming India's education landscape. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 7(4).
8. National Council for Teacher Education. (2023). Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) Guidelines/Regulations. New Delhi: NCTE.
9. Saha, R. P. (2025). Relevance and significance of teacher education in relation to NEP 2020. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(4).
10. Sajan, A., & Thomas, N. (2025). A study on teacher readiness towards implementing Integrated Teacher Education Programme in Kerala. *The Academic: International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(7), 176–186.
11. Sharma, N. K. (2025). Teacher education programs, teacher challenges and perspectives on NEP-2020. *Techno Learn: An International Journal of Educational Technology*, 14(1), 17–24.
12. Singh, A. (2025). Teacher education and NEP 2020: Transforming teacher training programs. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies*, 7(5), 45–47.
13. Soni, R., & Tiwari, D. (2024). Evaluating educators' perspectives: A study on teachers' feedback regarding the implementation of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020. *Iris Journal of Educational Research*, 3.
14. Thompson, M., Carter, J., Williams, R., Anderson, E., & Paul, C. (2024). Educational change management: Strategies, challenges, and transformative pathways in modern education systems.