



# शोध भूमि

शिक्षा एवं शिक्षण शास्त्र विषय की पूर्व समीक्षित शोध पत्रिका

## Evaluating Resilience-Driven Remedial Strategies for Students With Disabilities in India's NEP 2020: Effectiveness, Challenges And Outcomes

**Himani Saxena**

Research Scholar

Department of Education

Adarsh Krishna Post Graduation College, Shikohabad

Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Agra, Uttar Pradesh, India

Email: himani15900@gmail.com

**Prof.(Dr.) Sanjay Kumar Yadav**

Professor, Department of Education

Adarsh Krishna Post Graduation College, Shikohabad

Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Agra, Uttar Pradesh, India

### ABSTRACT

In modern human society, education is the foundation that shapes individual growth and societal development. However, access to education and participation in educational activities have historically remained distant for children and youth living with disabilities. These disabilities include social, infrastructural, and pedagogical barriers. Due to these barriers, the challenge of building of an inclusive education system in India, that serves all the learners impartially, has remained at the central focus of policy debates for decades. Under the recent administrative reforms, the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, has now sought to address these concerns by reframing the structure and scope of the modern education. Within the broader discourse of this policy, resilience-driven educational strategies have emerged as an imperative tool for enabling students with disabilities to not only cope with social adversities, but also to thrive academically, professionally, and emotionally. This review analyses resilience-based education within the context of NEP 2020, and evaluates its potential effectiveness, challenges, and outcomes in terms of disability empowerment.

**Key words** : Disabilities Education, National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, Inclusive Education, Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016

## 1. Introduction

### Resilience and Its Relevance to Disability Education

According to the available research literature in psychology and modern education, **resilience** can be viewed as a dynamic and context-dependent capacity that enables the individuals to adapt positively in the adverse environments. It is not a fixed trait with static parameters (Masten & Reed, 2002; Sabouripour et al., 2021), instead an ever-evolving developmental process which is shaped by various personal, social, and environmental factors (Masten & Reed, 2002; Sabouripour et al., 2021). For children with chronic illness or disabilities, resilience determines whether they can cope with barriers and continue meaningful learning (Radovanovic et al., 2020; Silván-Ferrero et al., 2020). In addition to the physical or cognitive challenges, such children also face psychological stress and structural exclusion, often leading to social stigma (Singh & Wani, 2020; Marwaha & Anand, 2019). Here, programs focused on resilience-oriented practices help them to develop skills such as self-efficacy, emotional regulation, and problem-solving ability (Amitay & Gumpel, 2015; Popa-Velea et al., 2021). The combination of these skills helps the disabled learners to manage aforementioned challenges, eventually reducing the risk of their social disengagement, weakened peer relationships, and lowered self-esteem (Rahimi & Aliakbari, 2015; Patra, 2021). Here, examples from the schools, healthcare facilities, and community programs reveal that the resilience-building initiatives can significantly improve the psychological well-being, academic engagement, and positive social interactions of the individuals (García-Parra et al., 2021; Shochet et al., 2022; Klutsey et al., 2025). When embedded in the mainstream education, the resilience-oriented strategies transform classrooms into adaptive environments that support both coping and flourishing of learners in society (Kotzé & Kleyhans, 2013; Ordway et al., 2020).

### Inclusive Education as a Constitutional and Policy Imperative

The pursuit of inclusive education in India is rooted in the constitutional guarantee of education as a fundamental right. These rights include, the Right to Education Act (2009) and the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act (2016). These rights and India's participation in the international commitments under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) collectively establish a legal framework for equal access to learning for all individuals. The NEP 2020 builds on this framework by emphasizing that the education must be equally accessible and meaningful for all the children, irrespective of their physical, cognitive, or socio-emotional differences (Aithal, 2020). Here, contrary to earlier fragmented approaches, the NEP 2020 makes a transformative reform by explicitly recognizing disability inclusion as integral to educational equity (Kumar & Singh, 2022; Vyas, 2021). It supports to prepare schools and educators for barrier-free schools, individualized support, cross-disability training, flexible curricula, and integration of assistive technologies through diverse classrooms (Aithal, 2020).

### Disability Rights in Indian Education: from RCI Act to NEP 2020

India has witnessed a gradual but uneven evolution of disability-inclusive education. The **Rehabilitation Council of India Act (1992)** was an early governmental foundation to

professionalize the special education by establishing formal training requirements for the educators working with the disabled students. By building on this foundation, the **National Policy for Persons with Disabilities (2006)** introduced the integrated and inclusive education as a national priority for the first time. Despite these advances, several gaps persisted in both the implementation and the outcomes on the grounds. Here, numerous students with the disabilities remained excluded from the mainstream schooling. Contrarily, the enrolled students often faced issues such as the inadequate infrastructure, limited learning resources, and untrained teachers. In this scenario, the **Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act (2016)** sought to address these issues by guaranteeing free education for children with benchmark disabilities in the age group of 6 to 18 years. It also mandated for reserving 5% of seats in higher education, and providing accessible infrastructure (Vyas, 2021). Currently, the NEP 2020 builds upon these legal foundations (Aithal, 2020).

## **2. RESILIENCE AND INCLUSIVE EDUCATION: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

### **2.1 Resilience as a Dynamic and Context-Sensitive Process**

Resilience, in the context of disability education, is understood as a dynamic and context-sensitive process rather than a fixed personal trait (Masten & Reed, 2002). Existing psychological and educational literature describes resilience as an evolving capacity that enables individuals to adapt positively in adverse environments. For students with disabilities or chronic illnesses, resilience reflects the ability to maintain balance and well-being despite physical impairments, health-related limitations, social stigma, and structural exclusion (Silván-Ferrero et al., 2020; Radovanovic et al., 2020). Importantly, resilience does not imply the absence of difficulty. Instead, it captures the continuous efforts of the students to negotiate the challenges, mobilize the available resources, and remain engaged in meaningful learning (Patra, 2021). This process is shaped according to the personal characteristics as well as the social, educational, and environmental conditions that surround the learner (Kotzé & Kleynhans, 2013).

### **2.2 Core Psychological Dimensions of Resilience**

Resilience among the students with disabilities operates through a set of interconnected psychological dimensions. Here, self-efficacy plays a central role by influencing whether the learners believe that they can manage academic demands and social challenges (Amitay & Gumpel, 2015; Sabouripour et al., 2021). Despite the encountered setbacks, a higher possibility of continuance of learning process has been observed in the students who perceive themselves as socially and physically capable (Popa-Velea et al., 2021). Similarly, another crucial dimension is the emotional regulation where the students with disabilities often experience heightened psychological stress levels due to the exclusion, stigma, and repeated academic difficulties faced (Silván-Ferrero et al., 2020). The ability to manage emotions helps them cope with the emerging anxiety, frustration, and uncertainty; thereby supporting sustained engagement in education (Sabouripour et al., 2021). Coping and problem-solving skills further strengthen the resilience by enabling the students to respond actively to barriers (Rahimi & Aliakbari, 2015). These skills allow the learners to identify challenges, seek support, and adapt by strategies rather than disengaging from learning (Ordway et al., 2020).

### **2.3 Resilience within Inclusive Educational Environments**

Resilience does not develop in isolation. It always grows within the supportive and inclusive educational environments that recognize learner's participation as a right rather than a privilege (García-Parra et al., 2021). Here, inclusive classroom settings provide the students with disabilities the space to build the coping capacities through everyday interactions, academic tasks, and peer engagements (Shochet et al., 2022). The inclusive settings also demonstrate how material support alone is insufficient. The teachers play a decisive role in this process. Beyond the scope of merely subject instruction, they contribute in fostering the emotional growth, encouraging the peer networks, and responding flexibly to the diverse learning needs of students (Klutsey et al., 2025). For example, facilitating the assistive resources such as Braille textbooks for the students becomes meaningful only when they develop the confidence and the skills to utilize them effectively in the daily learning process (Ordway et al., 2020). In this manner, the inclusive education transforms the resilience from an individual struggle into a shared educational responsibility, where the schools actively support both the coping methods and long-term flourishing of learners with disabilities (Kotzé & Kleynhans, 2013).

## **3. DISABILITY INCLUSION IN INDIAN EDUCATION: POLICY CONTEXT**

### **3.1 Evolution of Disability Rights and Inclusive Education in India**

The inclusion status of the disabilities in the Indian education has evolved gradually through a series of legal and policy-based interventions. An early foundation of these interventions was laid by the Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI) Act, 1992. The RCI act sought to professionalize the special education by formalizing the training requirements for the educators working with the students facing different disabilities. Building on this foundation, the National Policy for Persons with Disabilities (2006) marked a policy shift by introducing the integrated and inclusive education as a national priority (Vyas, 2021). Despite these policy-oriented efforts, the implementation gaps remained visible on grounds in disability education. At this point, the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016 attempted to address these shortcomings through measures such as guaranteeing free education, reserved seats, and accessible infrastructure for disabled students. These measures strengthened the legal framework for inclusion, yet challenges in translating rights into practice persisted (Vyas, 2021; Kumar & Singh, 2022).

### **3.2 National Education Policy 2020 and Disability Inclusion**

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 embeds the disability inclusion within the expansive agenda of the educational reforms by further building upon the earlier legal foundations (Aithal, 2020; Kumar & Singh, 2022). Unlike the fragmented approaches of the past, the NEP 2020 explicitly recognizes inclusion as central to the educational equity. It emphasizes upon barrier-free school environments, individualized support mechanisms, flexible curricula, cross-disability sensitivity, and the integration of assistive technologies in regular teaching process (Vyas, 2021). The policy aligns itself with the constitutional guarantees and the international commitments under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD). It also reinforces the provisions of the RPwD Act, that include free education and access to higher education (Kumar & Singh, 2022). By framing inclusion as a systemic responsibility, the

NEP 2020 moves beyond viewing the disability as a marginal concern, and places it within the mainstream educational planning and governance (Aithal, 2020).

### **3.3 From Legal Entitlements to Lived Educational Experiences**

While the NEP 2020 provides a comprehensive policy architecture for the disability inclusion, the legal entitlements alone do not ensure the meaningful educational outcomes (Aithal, 2020). The students with disabilities continue to encounter practical barriers related to the social exclusion, academic pressure, and the limited institutional support (Vyas, 2021; Kumar & Singh, 2022). In this gap between the policy intent and on-ground experience, the pedagogical approaches become critical. Here, resilience-oriented frameworks offer a complementary dimension by addressing the daily adversities faced by learners. They shift the focus from a deficit-based understanding of disability toward the strengths-based perspective that values participation, dignity, and adaptive capacity (Masten & Reed, 2002; García-Parra et al., 2021). By integrating resilience within the inclusive policy structures, the education systems can move beyond the formal compliance and support students in translating their legal rights into the genuine educational participation and long-term engagement (Shochet et al., 2022; Klutsey et al., 2025).

## **4. RESILIENCE-DRIVEN EDUCATIONAL INTERVENTIONS**

### **4.1 Types of Interventions and Pedagogical Approaches**

The resilience-driven educational interventions for the students with disabilities operate across multiple settings, thus reflecting the diverse contexts in which the learning and development occur (García-Parra et al., 2021). Here, the school-based programs remain the most visible form of such interventions. These programs integrate the resilience-building activities within the classroom instruction and the school routines. Drawing on the cognitive-behavioral and the strength-based approaches, they focus on helping the students to manage stress, reframe challenges, and develop adaptive responses to the academic and social demands (Shochet et al., 2022). Evidences from the schools indicates that such interventions improve the attendance, classroom participation, and the emotional well-being of students, particularly those facing chronic illness or disability (Kotzé & Kleynhans, 2013; Sabouripour et al., 2021). Healthcare-linked approaches represent another important category of educational interventions. These approaches are often implemented in the hospitals, rehabilitation centres, or in coordination with the medical services. For the students whose education is disrupted by the long-term health conditions, healthcare-linked programs support continuity in learning while addressing the psychological adjustments. The community-oriented interventions extend the resilience-building measures beyond the institutional settings. These interventions involve the families, caregivers, and the local organizations in supporting the students with various disabilities. These interventions are implemented through community-based programs that emphasize peer mentoring, caregiver workshops, and the inclusive activities that promote the social connections. Such interventions are based on the fact that the resilience is not built solely within the classrooms. It develops through the broader social networks that reinforce the participation and belonging (Klutsey et al., 2025; García-Parra et al., 2021).

### **4.2 Developmental and Disability-Specific Considerations**

---

The resilience-driven interventions discussed above vary in the effectiveness according to the developmental stage and the type of disability (Masten & Reed, 2002). Here, the resilience programs designed for the younger children often emphasize the early emotional regulation, social interaction, and adaptive play, for laying the foundation for the coping skills required in later stages of life. However, for the adolescents and young adults, such interventions are more inclined to focus on the self-efficacy, identity formation, and the problem-solving skills required in the academic and social contexts (Amitay & Gumpel, 2015; Patra, 2021). Students with sensory impairments, learning disabilities, or chronic illnesses, face different barriers and require the tailored pedagogical responses (Radovanovic et al., 2020; Rahimi & Aliakbari, 2015). The interventions therefore need the flexibility to accommodate the diverse needs rather than simply applying uniform strategies. Similarly, evidences from the Indian and global contexts show that when the resilience programs are culturally relevant, and sensitive to the disability-specific challenges, the students demonstrate improved engagement, emotional stability, and social participation (Marwaha & Anand, 2019; Singh & Wani, 2020).

## **5. ALIGNING RESILIENCE WITH NEP 2020**

### **5.1 Curriculum Flexibility, Teacher Preparation, and Well-being**

The National Education Policy 2020 focuses inclusive pedagogy and cross-disability sensitivity as a central concept towards educational reforms (Aithal, 2020; Kumar & Singh, 2022; Vyas, 2021). This focus aligns closely with the resilience-oriented goals, particularly through the curriculum-based flexibility and the teacher preparation. The NEP promotes approaches such as the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and the differentiated instruction, that enable teachers to design lessons that accommodate learners of diverse abilities. The flexibility of learning materials and the assessment methods reduces the academic stress for students and improves their engagement, in turn supporting their psychological well-being (Kotzé & Kleynhans, 2013). The teacher education reforms under NEP 2020 further strengthen the resilience-student alignment discussed above (Aithal, 2020). The policy mandates the disability pedagogy within the pre-service and in-service training programs that recognize teachers as the key agents in the inclusive classrooms (Kumar & Singh, 2022). However, while the policy outlines the broad training requirements, the concerns still remain regarding the depth and quality of preparation. The teachers are expected to address the diverse range of the student needs across the sensory, cognitive, and the developmental disabilities (Amitay & Gumpel, 2015).

### **5.2 Assistive Technologies and Institutional Support**

The NEP 2020 underscores the role of the assistive technologies as the critical enablers of the inclusive education (Aithal, 2020). The policy calls for the provision of the Braille textbooks, screen readers, audio-visual aids, and the customized digital platforms (Kumar & Singh, 2022). The institutions such as the National Institute of Open Schooling (NIOS) are tasked with developing the Indian Sign Language curricula and the set of relevant digital resources. These measures aim to enhance the access and the autonomy for the students with sensory impairments (Vyas, 2021). However, the access to assistive tools alone does not guarantee the meaningful participation. Students must also develop the confidence and the problem-solving abilities required to use these resources effectively (Patra, 2021; Ordway et al., 2020). At this

point, the institutional support systems like the disability-specific resource centres proposed under the NEP 2020, play a significant role. These centres can act as the specialized support hubs for the disabled learners, coordinate with the rehabilitation professionals, and offer guidance to the families of disabled learners.

### **5.3 Bridging Policy Intent and Classroom Practice**

The NEP 2020 provisions a comprehensive policy framework for the inclusion of the disabilities in formal education. However, the gap between the policy intent and the everyday ground realities of the classrooms (Aithal, 2020) still persists. The legal frameworks of the policies and the available institutional facilities often struggle to translate the disability inclusiveness into a consistent practice, particularly in the under-resourced social settings. Here, the infrastructure related challenges, preparation levels of the teachers and trainers, and the social attitude continue to model the survived experiences of the disabled learners (Vyas, 2021). Therefore, the resilience-based strategies can help to bridge-up this gap by aligning the structural support with the adaptive capacities. Here, the policies guarantee only the access and the accommodations, while the resilience also enables the students to engage actively with the learning process, manage social pressures, and to sustain their participation (Rahimi & Aliakbari, 2015).

## **6. OUTCOMES, IMPACT, AND PROMISING PRACTICES**

The resilience-driven educational interventions prove their strongest value through the outcomes which they generate for the learners managing chronic illness or any kind of disability (García-Parra et al., 2021). These outcomes extend beyond the short-term coping and reflect the changes in academic engagement, psychological well-being, and the social participation (Shochet et al., 2022). Across all the reviewed initiatives, the students demonstrate improved classroom involvement, better emotional balance, and a growing sense of confidence in handling the educational demands (Kotzé & Kleynhans, 2013). Such changes suggest that the resilience-focused support does not remain an abstract goal, but translates into the observable gains in daily learning experiences (Silván-Ferrero et al., 2020).

### **6.1 Academic, Psychological, and Social Outcomes**

At the academic level, the resilience-oriented programs are associated with the increased participation, sustained attention, and the improved persistence in the learning tasks (Amitay & Gumpel, 2015). Psychologically, the learners show improvements in traits such as the self-efficacy, emotional regulation, and the adaptive coping, which together help them to respond more constructively towards the stress causing factors related to the health and schooling (Kotzé & Kleynhans, 2013; Rahimi & Aliakbari, 2015). Socially, these interventions support the interpersonal functionality, that enables the students to engage more comfortably with the peers and the educators (Sabouripour et al., 2021; Patra, 2021). The combination of these academic, psychological, and the social outcomes reflects a broader enhancement in the overall life satisfaction.

### **6.2 Inclusive Classrooms and Peer Dynamics**

The environments of the inclusive classrooms play a central role in shaping the impact of the resilience-based interventions (Shochet et al., 2022) at school level. When the educational settings actively accommodate the diverse needs, the students experience a greater acceptance and belonging in their groups (Klutsey et al., 2025). Here, the positive peer dynamics improve as the learners participate more confidently in the group activities and the collaborative tasks. Such environments reduce the feelings of isolation often linked to the chronic conditions and the disabilities (Radovanovic et al., 2020). Therefore, the peer interaction, in this sense, becomes both an outcome and a reinforcing mechanism, that further strengthens the resilience and engagement within the classrooms acting as the supportive social contexts.

### **6.3 Emerging Best Practices and Scalable Models**

Our review highlights the practices that promise to enhance the sustainability of the resilience-focused initiatives for disability inclusiveness. The programs grounded in the clear pedagogical frameworks and adapted to the developmental stages, tend to show more consistent outcomes (Popa-Velea et al., 2021). The attention to the contextual factors, especially in the under-resourced settings, emerges as the critical parameter for the effective implementation. At the same time, the need for the scalable and enduring models is repeatedly emphasized, as the isolated or short-term efforts limit the long-term impacts (Shochet et al., 2022). Together, these observations point towards the practices that balance the structured design with the contextual flexibility, supporting their wider adoption across the educational systems.

## **7. CHALLENGES, GAPS, AND LIMITATIONS**

Despite the growing recognition of the resilience-oriented educational initiatives, several challenges still persist to limit their effective implementation (García-Parra et al., 2021; Shochet et al., 2022). These challenges appear at multiple levels, ranging from the material resources to the human capacity and the broader social conditions (Klutsey et al., 2025; Silván-Ferrero et al., 2020). Together, they shape how the inclusive and sustainable such interventions can actually become in practice.

### **7.1 Resource and Infrastructure Constraints**

A recurring limitation across the resilience-based programs relates to the uneven access to the resources and infrastructure (Vyas, 2021; Kumar & Singh, 2022). Many interventions operate within the school, healthcare, or the community settings that face material shortages, particularly in the under-resourced regions (García-Parra et al., 2021). Here, limited funding, inadequate physical facilities, and a restricted access to the supportive services often limit the scale and the continuity of these initiatives (Aithal, 2020). As a result, the programs that demonstrate positive outcomes in the controlled or well-supported environments, often struggle to achieve a wider or long-term implementation (Shochet et al., 2022). These constraints directly affect the learners, as the inconsistent delivery weakens the sustained psychosocial support that the resilience education seeks to provide (Sabouripour et al., 2021).

### **7.2 Teacher Training and Capacity Gaps**

Another significant challenge lies in the preparation and the capacity of the educators responsible for delivering the resilience-focused curricula (Aithal, 2020; Kumar & Singh, 2022).

While the interventions emphasize adaptive traits such as self-efficacy, emotional regulation, and problem-solving (Masten & Reed, 2002; Amitay & Gumpel, 2015), the educators may not always receive the sufficient training to integrate these dimensions into the everyday teaching practices (Vyas, 2021). This gap limits the depth and the consistency with which the resilience principles are translated into the classroom interactions among the disabled learners (Kotzé & Kleynhans, 2013). In such cases, the well-designed curricular frameworks do not fully reach the learners, thereby reducing their potential impact on the psychological well-being and their academic engagement (Popa-Velea et al., 2021; Ordway et al., 2020).

### **7.3 Socio-Cultural Barriers and Regional Inequalities**

In addition to the institutional limitations, socio-cultural factors continue to shape the effectiveness of the resilience-driven educational efforts (Silván-Ferrero et al., 2020; Singh & Wani, 2020). Variations in the social attitudes toward the disability, differences in the community awareness, and the regional inequalities influence how the inclusive practices are perceived and supported (Marwaha & Anand, 2019). These conditions can restrict the participation and reduce acceptance of the interventions, particularly for the children and young people managing the chronic illnesses or disabilities (Radovanovic et al., 2020). Consequently, the lived educational experiences of learners often diverge from the policy intentions or the program objectives.

### **7.4 Methodological and Evidence Gaps in Existing Research**

Finally, the existing body of this research reflects certain methodological limitations (García-Parra et al., 2021). While the indicators such as psychological well-being, academic involvement, and life satisfaction are commonly used (Patra, 2021; Sabouripour et al., 2021), the evidence remains uneven across the contexts and populations (Klutsey et al., 2025). Here, many of the studies focus on the specific settings or the developmental stages, leaving the gaps in the comparative and the longitudinal understandings (Shochet et al., 2022). These limitations highlight the need for the more context-sensitive and scalable evidences to strengthen the future program design and the policy alignment (Aithal, 2020; Kumar & Singh, 2022).

## **8. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

According to the discussion across the previous sections, the disability inclusion under the NEP 2020 cannot rely on the structural reforms alone (Aithal, 2020). On one side, the policy framework establishes the legal entitlements and the institutional provisions, its long-term impact depends on how effectively the resilience-oriented approaches will be implemented within the educational practice grounds (Kumar & Singh, 2022; Vyas, 2021).

### **8.1 Strengthening the Resilience Integration under NEP 2020**

The NEP 2020 already provides a supportive policy environment through its emphasis on the inclusive pedagogy, the Universal Design for Learning, the assistive technologies, and the cross-disability teacher training (Aithal, 2020; Kumar & Singh, 2022). However, as discussed earlier, these measures still remain largely infrastructural and procedural unless accompanied by the systematic efforts to develop the adaptive capacities among the targeted learners (Sabouripour et al., 2021; Popa-Velea et al., 2021). The resilience-oriented strategies strengthen

this gap by equipping the students with the psychological skills such as the self-efficacy, the emotional regulation, and the problem-solving attitude, which enable them to utilize the supports offered by the policy in effective manner (Popa-Velea et al., 2021). Our review suggests that integrating the resilience into the everyday classroom practices can transform the inclusion from mere accommodation to the actual empowerment (Amitay & Gumpel, 2015). For instance, while the NEP mandates the provision of assistive tools like the Braille materials or the digital readers (Kotzé & Kleynhans, 2013), the resilience-focused interventions can further help the students to develop the confidence and the problem-solving abilities required to use these tools effectively (Ordway et al., 2020; Radovanovic et al., 2020). Similarly, the teacher preparation reforms outlined in the NEP gain a practical depth when the educators are trained not only in the inclusive pedagogy but also in supporting the emotional and the social development of students. In this way, the resilience integration aligns closely with the NEP's broader objective of the holistic education (Shochet et al., 2022; García-Parra et al., 2021).

## 8.2 Research Priorities and Evaluation Frameworks

Our analysis also reveals the significant gaps in the existing research and the evaluation practices. Although the global and the Indian studies demonstrate the positive outcomes of the resilience-based programs, the Indian evidence base still remains limited in the scale and scope (Singh & Wani, 2020). There is a need for the systematic research that evaluates the resilience interventions across the diverse educational settings, the disability types, and the socio-economic contexts, particularly in the under-resourced and the rural regions (Patra, 2021). Equally important is the development of the robust evaluation frameworks. The current assessments often focus on the access, enrolment, or infrastructure, while overlooking the psychosocial indicators such as the well-being, the classroom engagement, and the social participation (Sabouripour et al., 2021). The reviewed literature emphasizes that the future evaluations must incorporate these dimensions to capture the true impact of the inclusive education policies (Shochet et al., 2022). Without such frameworks, the resilience risks to remain an implicit concept rather than a measurable educational outcome. Taken together, these directions underline that the future policy efforts must move beyond the symbolic inclusion. Strengthening the resilience integration under the NEP 2020 and refining the research and the evaluation priorities are the essential steps toward ensuring that the disability-inclusive education in India translates into the sustained participation, dignity, and meaningful learning outcomes.

## REFERENCES

1. Masten, A. S., & Reed, M. G. (2002). *Resilience in development*. Handbook of Positive Psychology, 74, 88–108.
2. Sabouripour, F., Roslan, S., Ghiami, Z., & Memon, M. A. (2021). Mediating role of self-efficacy in the relationship between optimism, psychological well-being, and resilience among Iranian students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 675645.
3. Radovanovic, V., Šestic, M. R., Kovacevic, J., & Dimoski, S. (2020). Factors related to personal resiliency in deaf and hard-of-hearing adolescents. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 25*(4), 430–437.

4. Silván-Ferrero, P., Recio, P., Molero, F., & Nouvilas-Pallejà, E. (2020). Psychological quality of life in people with physical disability: The effect of internalized stigma, collective action and resilience. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(5), 1802.
5. Singh, P., & Wani, M. A. (2020). Study on self-esteem and resilience among locomotor disabled persons in Kashmir division. *Annals of Tropical Medicine & Public Health*, 23.
6. Marwaha, R., & Anand, P. V. (2019). Understanding happiness, meaning in life, hope and resilience amongst youngsters with and without visual impairment: A comparative study. *Indian Journal of School Health and Wellbeing*, 5(1), Jan–April.
7. Amitay, G., & Gumpel, T. (2015). Academic self-efficacy as a resilience factor among adjudicated girls. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 20(2), 202–227.
8. Popa-Velea, O., Pîrvan, I., & Diaconescu, L. V. (2021). The impact of self-efficacy, optimism, resilience and perceived stress on academic performance and its subjective evaluation: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(17), 8911.
9. Rahimi, R., & Aliakbari, M. (2015). Relationship between resilience and academic achievement in students with hearing impairment. *Journal of Modern Psychological Researches*, 10(38), 119–133.
10. Patra, S. (2021). Self-efficacy and resilience: Correlates of happiness and well-being among adolescents with disability. In *Emotion, Well-Being, and Resilience* (pp. 145–159). Apple Academic Press.
11. García-Parra, M., Negre, F., & Verger, S. (2021). Educational programs to build resilience in children, adolescent or youth with disease or disability: A systematic review. *Education Sciences*, 11(9), 464.
12. Shochet, I. M., Saggars, B. R., Carrington, S. B., Orr, J. A., Wurfl, A. M., Kelly, R. L., & Duncan, B. M. (2022). A school-based approach to building resilience and mental health among adolescents on the autism spectrum: A longitudinal mixed methods study. *School Mental Health*, 14(3), 753–775.
13. Klutsey, D. A., Chinto, A. L., Rockson, G. N., Avi, G., Foba-Engmen, J. K., Korkukorkor, P., & Kankam, J. (2025). Perceived social support and academic resilience as predictors of psychological distress and wellbeing among students with disabilities in the University of Education, Winneba. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 25(1), 94–102.
14. Kotzé, M., & Kleynhans, R. (2013). Psychological well-being and resilience as predictors of first-year students' academic performance. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 23(1), 51–59.

15. Aithal, S. (2020). Analysis of the Indian National Education Policy 2020 towards achieving its objectives. *International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences*.
16. Kumar, D., & Singh, M. (2022). India's new education policy (NEP) 2020: Catering for children with disabilities. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology*.
17. Vyas, D. (2021). National education policy, 2020 and disability rights. *International Journal of Research in Special Education*, 1(2), 18–20.