Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A Catalyst for Transformative Learning in the NEP 2020 Era

Mr. Pranjit Sukla Baidya

Guest Lecturer, Ramthakur College, Agartala, Department of Education

ARTICLE DETAILS	ABSTRACT
	Artificial Intelligence (AI) has rapidly evolved as a transformative force within global higher education, influencing teaching, learning, and institutional administration. Within India, the **National Education Policy (NEP) 2020** envisions a technology-empowered, flexible, and inclusive education system. This research paper critically examines AI's potential as a catalyst for transformative learning in line with NEP 2020's vision. It analyses how AI-driven pedagogical tools foster innovation, personalization, and efficiency, while also evaluating the ethical, socio-economic, and pedagogical challenges emerging from its adoption. The study concludes that AI's integration in higher education must be guided by human-centric ethics, teacher agency, and equitable access to truly fulfill the transformative vision of NEP 2020.

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become one of the most profound technological shifts influencing higher education globally. It is transforming how knowledge is created, disseminated, and assessed (Luckin, 2018, p. 12). In the Indian context, the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 calls for "technology use and integration to improve multiple aspects of education at all levels" (Ministry of Education [MoE], 2020, p. 56). This vision aligns with AI's potential to enhance teaching, promote inclusive access, and cultivate research-driven universities.

However, while AI offers the promise of personalization and efficiency, it also raises pressing questions of ethics, privacy, and digital inequality. As scholars note, transformative learning depends not only on technological innovation but also on critical reflection and human engagement (Mezirow, 1991, p. 22). Hence, AI's role in higher education must be examined through a critical and ethical framework aligned with NEP 2020's goals of holistic, equitable, and multidisciplinary education.

2. Theoretical Framework: Transformative Learning and NEP 2020

The concept **of transformative learning**, introduced by Jack Mezirow (1991), serves as a foundational theory in contemporary educational philosophy. Mezirow defines transformative learning as the process by which individuals revise and reinterpret their experiences through **critical reflection, rational discourse, and emotional awareness**, leading to a profound shift in worldview (Mezirow, 1991, p. 44). It is a process that goes beyond the mere accumulation of information — it represents a **deep structural change in the basic premises of thought, feeling, and action.** In this sense, transformative learning is not simply about what we learn, but *how* we learn, interpret, and apply knowledge to our lives and society.

In the context of higher education, transformative learning emphasizes that students should not be passive recipients of knowledge but **active participants in their own intellectual development.** It challenges the traditional "banking model" of education criticized by Freire (1970, p. 72), where knowledge is deposited into learners without critical engagement. Instead, transformative learning cultivates the capacity for **critical self-reflection**, encouraging learners to question assumptions, engage in dialogue, and connect knowledge to real-world experiences. Through this process, education becomes not just a means to employability but a **vehicle for personal and social transformation.**

2.1 Transformative Learning as a Pedagogical Paradigm

Mezirow's transformative learning theory rests on ten core stages, which begin with a "disorienting dilemma" — an experience that challenges one's existing beliefs or assumptions — and culminate in the reintegration of new perspectives into one's life (Mezirow, 1991, pp. 168–169). These stages include critical assessment of assumptions, recognition of shared transformation among peers, exploration of new roles, and building competence to implement one's new understanding. Within higher education, this theoretical framework translates into **teaching practices that prioritize reflection, dialogue, problem-solving, and collaboration.**

This pedagogical approach aligns closely with what the **National Education Policy (NEP) 2020** envisions for India's higher education landscape. NEP 2020 recognizes the limitations of rote memorization and exam-centric systems, calling instead for a "complete overhaul and re-energizing of higher education" to create "vibrant multidisciplinary institutions of high quality" (Ministry of Education [MoE], 2020, p. 34). The policy emphasizes the creation of an education system that nurtures curiosity, creativity, and critical thinking — values that are essential for transformative learning to occur.

2.2. NEP 2020's Vision of Transformative Education

The NEP 2020 articulates a vision for an education system that is holistic, multidisciplinary, and grounded in the **ethos of experiential and flexible learning**. It aims to "foster critical thinking and encourage creativity through discovery-based, discussion-based, and analysis-based learning" (MoE, 2020, p. 7). These objectives mirror Mezirow's core principles of transformation through dialogue and reflection.

The policy identifies several structural and pedagogical changes necessary to achieve this transformation:

1. **Encouraging Multidisciplinary and Experiential Learning:**

   NEP 2020 advocates for a departure from rigid disciplinary boundaries. It calls for the establishment of large, multidisciplinary universities where students can engage in cross-disciplinary learning (MoE, 2020, pp. 9–10). This reflects the transformative principle that learning should connect diverse knowledge systems, enabling learners to integrate perspectives from science, humanities, and the arts. Experiential learning — through internships, research, and community engagement — ensures that learning is not confined to the classroom but rooted in lived experience, a core tenet of transformative pedagogy.

2. **Promoting Flexibility in Curriculum Design:**

3. NEP 2020 emphasizes academic flexibility through mechanisms such as the **Academic Bank of Credits (ABC)** and multiple entry-exit options, allowing learners to personalize their educational journeys (MoE, 2020, p. 37). This flexibility recognizes that transformation occurs at different paces for different individuals. It respects learner autonomy and provides space for critical reflection and self-direction — two of the central features of Mezirow's transformative learning cycle.

4. **Integrating Technology for Inclusivity and Accessibility:** The policy acknowledges the transformative potential of **digital and artificial intelligence (AI) technologies** in democratizing education. By promoting online platforms, open educational resources, and digital classrooms, NEP 2020 seeks to make quality education accessible to all, especially to marginalized communities (MoE, 2020, pp. 9–10). This technological integration, when ethically implemented, can empower learners to engage in personalized, reflective, and inclusive learning experiences.

AI, therefore, becomes not merely a technological tool but a pedagogical enabler for NEP 2020's transformative goals. When aligned with ethical and human-centered values, AI can drive a paradigm shift toward reflective, adaptive, and inclusive education.

3. The Role of AI in Transformative Higher Education

The integration of **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** into Higher Education marks a paradigm shift in how knowledge is created, accessed, and managed. Within the vision of India's **National Education Policy (NEP) 2020,** which aspires to make education more inclusive, flexible, and research-oriented, AI functions as a **transformative catalyst** that strengthens the connection between innovation and learning. AI's influence extends beyond classroom teaching—it reshapes the entire educational ecosystem, encompassing **personalized learning, intelligent tutoring, research facilitation, and institutional governance.** Each of these domains contributes distinctly to realizing the NEP's vision of a learner-centered, equitable, and globally competitive higher education system.

In the context of **transformative learning,** as proposed by Mezirow (1991), AI's integration fosters critical self-reflection, individualized engagement, and data-driven feedback mechanisms that enhance both learner autonomy and institutional efficiency. However, while AI introduces efficiency and precision, its transformative capacity depends on whether it complements human pedagogy rather than replaces it. This section critically examines how AI impacts higher education across four primary domains: personalization, tutoring and assessment, research and analytics, and institutional governance.

3.1. Personalized and Adaptive Learning

AI-powered personalized learning systems represent one of the most significant developments in higher education. These systems utilize algorithms and data analytics to track learner performance, preferences, and behavioral patterns, adapting content to suit individual learning styles. This adaptability ensures that

learners can engage with educational material at their own pace and in their own way (Holmes et al., 2019, p. 67).

Such AI-driven personalization embodies the **transformative learning principle** of self-directed reflection, allowing students to take ownership of their learning process. Instead of one-size-fits-all teaching, AI creates **dynamic learning pathways**—each tailored to a student's abilities, progress, and goals. For example, **Coursera's adaptive feedback system** and **Duolingo's reinforcement learning models** demonstrate how AI adjusts the difficulty of content based on learner performance, thereby fostering **intrinsic motivation and sustained engagement.**

This technological development resonates strongly with NEP 2020's emphasis **on individualized learning trajectories and flexible academic frameworks** (MoE, 2020, p. 36). The policy's call for flexibility—such as multiple entry and exit points, credit accumulation systems, and multidisciplinary choice-based learning—finds its practical realization through AI-driven platforms that allow continuous and modular learning. Furthermore, AI tools can accommodate diverse learning needs, including those of students with disabilities, by offering **voice recognition, translation, and text-to-speech features** that make education more inclusive.

Nevertheless, while personalization enhances accessibility, it also raises ethical concerns about **data privacy and algorithmic bias.** When AI systems track and analyze student data, institutions must ensure transparent data governance to protect learner privacy. If designed responsibly, however, personalized learning powered by AI aligns perfectly with NEP's transformative agenda—empowering students as **active co-creators of knowledge** rather than passive recipients.

3.2. Intelligent Tutoring and Automated Assessment

AI-based tutoring systems have revolutionized the concept of **student-teacher interaction** by simulating real-time mentorship. Such **Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS)** leverage natural language processing, sentiment analysis, and predictive analytics to provide personalized feedback and learning guidance (UNESCO, 2021, p. 41). These systems can detect when a learner struggles with a concept and immediately adjust the teaching strategy—emulating the responsiveness of a human tutor.

For instance, AI-enabled chatbots and virtual teaching assistants are increasingly being integrated into university portals to assist students with academic queries, scheduling, and even emotional support. This

ensures that learning extends beyond classroom boundaries, supporting NEP 2020's goal of **lifelong and flexible learning** (MoE, 2020, p. 34).

Moreover, AI facilitates **automated assessment systems**, which can grade objective assignments, essays, and even presentations using machine learning models. Such systems reduce teacher workload and ensure **consistency and fairness** in evaluation, thus enabling educators to focus more on mentoring, research, and innovation. According to Luckin (2018, p. 112), the automation of administrative and grading tasks through AI can significantly enhance teacher productivity and institutional efficiency.

However, Paulo Freire's (1970, p. 72) critique of the "banking model" of education serves as a crucial warning. Over-reliance on AI tutors and assessment systems risks creating a mechanistic model of learning, where human dialogue and emotional engagement are replaced by algorithmic interactions. True transformation in learning occurs through critical discourse, empathy, and contextual understanding—dimensions that AI cannot fully replicate.

Thus, AI-based tutoring and assessment should complement, not substitute, **the humanistic dimension of teaching.** In line with NEP 2020's principles, educators must act as facilitators who interpret AI-generated feedback within broader social and ethical contexts, guiding students toward **reflective and meaningful learning.**

3.3. AI in Research and Academic Analytics

AI's application in academic research has emerged as a transformative force, reshaping how knowledge is produced, organized, and disseminated. With the exponential growth of data and scholarly publications, AI enables **efficient data mining, predictive analytics, and literature synthesis—** processes that empower researchers to make informed decisions faster.

Tools such as **Semantic Scholar** and **Scite.ai** utilize AI to map citation patterns, identify influential studies, and detect research gaps, helping scholars navigate vast information ecosystems (World Economic Forum [WEF], 2022, p. 33). Similarly, plagiarism detection tools powered by AI ensure **academic integrity** by identifying similarities across millions of documents within seconds.

This advancement aligns with NEP 2020's proposal to establish the **National Research Foundation (NRF)**—a body aimed at strengthening the research ecosystem in higher education (MoE, 2020, p. 46).

The integration of AI in research supports NEP's emphasis on promoting **interdisciplinary inquiry and innovation-driven education,** bridging gaps between technology, social sciences, and humanities.

Additionally, AI enables **predictive trend analysis,** allowing universities to identify emerging research areas and societal challenges. For example, AI can forecast publication trends in fields like climate change or biotechnology, thereby directing funding and academic attention toward pressing global issues. In this way, AI facilitates the kind of **reflective and forward-looking scholarship** envisioned by transformative learning theory.

Nevertheless, the use of AI in research raises concerns about the **over-standardization of inquiry** and the **commodification of knowledge.** When algorithms begin to dictate research relevance based on citation counts or trends, creativity and critical diversity may suffer. Hence, while AI enhances research efficiency, scholars must remain critically aware of its **epistemological limitations** to preserve the human depth and originality essential to academic inquiry.

3.4. Institutional Administration and Decision-Making

Beyond the classroom and laboratory, AI is reshaping the **administrative and governance structures** of higher education institutions. Through **predictive enrolment analytics, student retention modeling,** and **resource optimization,** AI enables data-driven decision-making that enhances institutional effectiveness (Luckin, 2018, p. 89).

For instance, AI can predict student attrition by analyzing attendance, grades, and engagement data, allowing universities to intervene early with targeted support systems. Similarly, AI-powered dashboards can optimize resource allocation, faculty workload, and classroom scheduling, thus improving operational efficiency.

NEP 2020 emphasizes governance reforms that promote **transparency, accountability, and autonomy** in higher education institutions (MoE, 2020, p. 58). AI supports these goals by providing real-time data analytics that inform policy-making and quality assurance. For example, institutional leaders can use AI insights to evaluate program effectiveness, enhance accreditation processes, and monitor institutional performance against national benchmarks.

Moreover, AI can assist in **admissions and outreach**, ensuring fairness and efficiency through merit-based and data-driven decision-making. It can also help universities maintain compliance with policy frameworks, reducing administrative burdens and human error.

However, this digital transformation must be guided by ethical and regulatory frameworks. Excessive automation of governance risks **bureaucratic centralization** or the erosion of academic autonomy. Institutions must therefore ensure that AI remains a **supportive tool** rather than a controlling mechanism. As UNESCO (2021, p. 53) cautions, digital governance must always uphold human rights, transparency, and inclusivity.

Thus, while AI strengthens the structural and administrative efficiency of higher education, its success ultimately depends on **human oversight, contextual understanding, and ethical accountability—** principles deeply embedded in NEP 2020's vision of responsible institutional autonomy.

4. Ethical and Pedagogical Challenges

While Artificial Intelligence (AI) has immense transformative potential in higher education, its implementation also presents **complex ethical, cultural, and pedagogical challenges** that warrant careful scrutiny. The integration of AI into teaching, learning, and institutional management introduces dilemmas concerning **data privacy, algorithmic bias, digital inequality, and the diminishing human dimension of education.** To align AI applications with the **National Education Policy (NEP) 2020's** vision of inclusive, equitable, and value-based education, universities must navigate these challenges through ethical foresight, regulatory compliance, and pedagogical balance.

4.1. Data Privacy and Student Surveillance

AI technologies rely extensively on **large-scale data collection,** encompassing learners' behavioral patterns, academic performance, and even emotional engagement. This reliance raises significant ethical concerns regarding the ownership, storage, and use of student data. According to UNESCO (2021, p. 53), the proliferation of AI in education risks creating surveillance-oriented systems that monitor and evaluate learners continuously, often without transparent consent mechanisms. When such data is used for purposes beyond education—such as targeted marketing, political profiling, or institutional ranking—it undermines the very ethics of academic freedom and personal autonomy.

In India, the **Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023)** establishes a legislative foundation for protecting individual data rights (Government of India, 2023, p. 4). However, the enforcement of these regulations within higher education institutions remains limited. Many universities lack clear frameworks for **data governance, anonymization, and consent protocols,** leaving them vulnerable to data breaches and misuse.

Moreover, AI-driven learning management systems often outsource data processing to global cloud platforms, raising cross-border privacy concerns. This poses challenges to **digital sovereignty,** especially in the context of Indian education, where policy and technological infrastructure must align with national data protection standards.

To uphold the ethical integrity of AI-driven education, institutions must adopt **transparent data management practices**—including informed consent, minimal data retention, encryption, and student control over personal information. Ethical data governance is not merely a technical necessity but a **pedagogical responsibility,** ensuring that learners trust the systems meant to empower them. Only by embedding privacy principles into institutional culture can AI serve as a tool for transformation rather than surveillance.

4.2. Algorithmic Bias and Digital Inequality

A central ethical challenge in AI adoption lies in its susceptibility to **algorithmic bias**—a phenomenon where machine learning systems inherit prejudices from the data on which they are trained. As Holmes et al. (2019, p. 102) argue, AI models reflect existing societal inequities, thereby reinforcing discrimination in education if unchecked. For example, automated grading systems trained on limited datasets may undervalue unconventional writing styles or linguistic variations, disproportionately affecting students from marginalized or non-English backgrounds.

In the Indian context, **digital inequality** compounds this issue. Access to reliable internet, digital devices, and AI-based learning resources remains highly uneven across rural and urban regions. The NEP 2020 recognizes this disparity and calls for the creation of "robust digital infrastructure to ensure equitable access to quality education for all" (MoE, 2020, p. 62). Yet, despite policy acknowledgment, infrastructural and linguistic barriers persist. AI platforms often privilege English or dominant regional languages, marginalizing indigenous and tribal learners whose languages are underrepresented in digital databases.

Algorithmic bias also manifests in academic admissions and scholarship recommendations when AI systems use historical data that reflects entrenched inequalities. Consequently, AI can inadvertently reproduce exclusion under the guise of neutrality. Therefore, the principle of **algorithmic fairness** must become central to educational AI design.

To mitigate such biases, universities and ed-tech developers should invest in **inclusive data practices**—ensuring diversity in datasets, incorporating local languages, and applying bias-detection audits. Open-access AI tools and community-based digital programs can help bridge the digital divide. Ultimately, the ethical imperative is not merely to correct biased algorithms but to build an **equitable digital ecosystem** where technology supports social justice and inclusive education, as envisioned by NEP 2020.

4.3. The Human Element in Learning

Beyond technical and policy concerns, the most profound challenge posed by AI in higher education is **pedagogical.** Paulo Freire (1970) famously critiqued the "banking model of education," where students are treated as passive repositories of information (p. 58). AI-driven automation, if uncritically adopted, risks reinforcing this model by emphasizing content delivery and efficiency over reflection and dialogue. When algorithms determine learning pathways, evaluation criteria, and engagement metrics, education risks becoming **mechanistic and instrumental,** detached from human experience and moral reasoning.

Transformative learning theory, however, as articulated by Mezirow (1991), insists that genuine education involves **critical reflection, discourse, and emotional engagement**. These dimensions cannot be fully captured or replicated by AI systems, no matter how sophisticated their algorithms. While AI may facilitate personalization and accessibility, it cannot substitute the **empathy, ethical judgment, and cultural understanding** that teachers bring to the learning process.

Therefore, educators must assume the role of **ethical facilitators**—interpreting AI outputs within the broader human and social context. Instead of replacing teachers, AI should **augment their capacities** by automating repetitive tasks and providing analytical insights that free them to focus on mentorship, critical discussion, and value-based learning. In this regard, AI should be conceptualized not as a teacher but as a **pedagogical collaborator**, complementing the human aspects of creativity, intuition, and empathy.

The NEP 2020 underscores this vision by calling for the cultivation of "humanistic and ethical values in education" (MoE, 2020, p. 14). Thus, integrating AI into higher education must go hand in hand with fostering digital ethics, emotional intelligence, and moral awareness among both educators and learners. The goal is not a replacement of human intellect by machine intelligence, but a **partnership that enhances human potential** while preserving education's moral and emotional depth.

5. AI and NEP 2020: Convergence and Contradictions

NEP 2020 explicitly acknowledges technology's transformative power in education. The policy advocates "digital learning platforms that are inclusive, equitable, and accessible" (MoE, 2020, p. 74). The following table summarizes the alignment and tensions between NEP 2020's goals and AI integration:

NEP 2020 Vision	AI's Contribution	Critical Limitation
Multidisciplinary Education	AI fosters cross-domain knowledge through simulations and virtual labs.	May prioritize technical over humanistic learning.
Equity and Inclusion	Adaptive AI tools can support students with disabilities and linguistic diversity.	Digital divide may exclude rural learners.
Research and Innovation	AI aids in data analysis, publication mapping, and knowledge networks.	Risk of over-reliance on algorithmic curation.
Skill Development	AI-driven platforms enhance employability through continuous learning.	Could marginalize soft skills and creativity.

AI thus aligns with NEP's transformative aims but must be integrated critically and contextually to avoid technological determinism.

6. Toward an Ethically Grounded Framework for AI in Higher Education

For AI to genuinely catalyze transformative learning in India, policy and practice must converge around ethical governance, teacher empowerment, and inclusive access.

1. **Ethical Governance:** Institutions should create AI ethics committees to oversee data use, algorithm transparency, and student consent (UNESCO, 2021, p. 69).

2. **Teacher Agency:** Faculty must be trained to integrate AI tools pedagogically without losing their interpretive and mentoring roles (Luckin, 2018, p. 113).

3. **Inclusive Design:** AI tools must support regional languages and accommodate learners with varied technological access (MoE, 2020, p. 70).

4. **Continuous Review:** AI systems should undergo regular impact audits to ensure fairness, privacy, and accessibility (WEF, 2022, p. 55).

Such measures would ensure that AI serves as a human-centered technology, aligned with NEP's holistic educational vision.

7. Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence (AI) today stands at the critical juncture of **technological innovation and educational ethics.** Its integration into higher education holds the potential to revolutionize learning through personalization, flexibility, and inclusivity—core aspirations of the **National Education Policy (NEP) 2020.** However, the transformative capacity of AI is not determined solely by its technological sophistication but by the **ethical consciousness and pedagogical wisdom** guiding its use.

When implemented responsibly, AI can enhance critical thinking, creativity, and learner autonomy, turning higher education into a space of innovation and reflective growth. Yet, without ethical oversight, inclusive design, and human-centered governance, it risks deepening inequalities and depersonalizing education.

Thus, the future of higher education in India must prioritize a **humanistic approach to AI**—one where technology complements human intellect rather than replaces it. AI should serve as an instrument to **empower educators, democratize access, and cultivate compassion and critical inquiry.** In doing so, it can truly fulfill NEP 2020's transformative vision of building an equitable, value-based, and forward-looking educational ecosystem grounded in both innovation and humanity.

References:

- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Herder and Herder.

- Government of India. (2023). *Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.* Ministry of Law and Justice, New Delhi.

- Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence in Education: Promises and Implications for Teaching and Learning.* Center for Curriculum Redesign.

- Luckin, R. (2018). *Machine Learning and Human Intelligence: The Future of Education for the 21st Century.* UCL Press.

- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Ministry of Education (MoE). (2020). *National Education Policy 2020.* Government of India.

- UNESCO. (2021). *AI and Education: Guidance for Policy-makers.* Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

- World Economic Forum (WEF). (2022). *Transforming Education with AI: A Global Framework for Learning Equity.* Geneva: WEF.