



From Chalk to Play: A Critical Review of Pedagogical Transition Challenges in ECCE Centers under NEP 2020

Dr. Nuzhat Jan*

Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Government College for Women, Nawakadal, Srinagar

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150800062>

Received: 28 August 2026; Accepted: 02 September 2026; Published: 12 September 2026

ABSTRACT

When the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 replaced India's old 10+2 schooling structure with a 5+3+3+4 model, it did something Indian education policy had not really done before: it brought three- to six-year-olds formally into the school system, as part of a new "Foundational Stage." In practice, this means Anganwadi centres — institutions built and staffed for decades around nutrition and basic health, not classroom teaching — are now expected to also deliver structured, play-based early education. This paper asks what published research says about the structural readiness of that system, rather than what the policy documents hope for. Because almost all of the available facility audits and service-delivery studies on Anganwadi centres were carried out before NEP 2020 or right at its announcement, the review treats them explicitly as baseline evidence of the conditions NEP 2020 inherited, not as evidence of the policy's own performance. Read this way, three things stand out repeatedly: Anganwadi centres were often physically unprepared for play-based learning, the training given to Anganwadi workers was short and may not have been enough to shift long-standing teaching habits, and preschool education consistently came out as the weakest part of what these centres delivered — well behind nutrition. Studies from Gujarat, Karnataka, Delhi, Uttarakhand, Manipur, and Jammu and Kashmir all point to the same kinds of gaps: not enough indoor space, poor sanitation, missing teaching materials. Against this baseline, the review also brings in what limited post-2020 evidence exists — national training rollouts under Poshan Bhi Padhai Bhi, the state-level expansion of Balvatika classes, and a 2024 field study from Uttarakhand — to ask whether implementation is beginning to close these gaps. The picture that emerges is of a policy with a genuinely good vision, built on top of decades of underinvestment that has only begun to be addressed, largely through workforce training rather than infrastructure. The paper ends by pointing out where the evidence itself still runs thin — particularly the continued absence of any post-2020 facility audit in several states, including Jammu and Kashmir — and argues that this is exactly where research needs to go next if anyone wants to know whether NEP 2020 is actually changing things on the ground.

Keywords: Early Childhood Care and Education, NEP 2020, Anganwadi, Pedagogy, Foundational Stage, NCF-FS

INTRODUCTION

Early childhood education has never quite had a settled place in the Indian system. The institution most Indian children under six actually pass through is the Anganwadi centre, set up under the Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS) scheme back in 1975. Anganwadis were never really designed as schools — they were built to fight malnutrition and deliver basic health care, with supplementary nutrition, immunisation support, and growth monitoring as their main job. Preschool education was folded in as one more task among several, not the reason the centre existed.

NEP 2020 tries to change that. By scrapping the old 10+2 structure in favour of a 5+3+3+4 model, it created something new: a "Foundational Stage" that treats ages 3 to 8 as one continuous stretch of learning, folding



three years of preschool — whether delivered at an Anganwadi, a Balvatika, or a private preschool — directly into the same pedagogical arc as Grades 1 and 2. The policy is explicit that this stage should run on play, activity, and inquiry, which is a real departure from the rote learning that has long defined both private preschools and government Anganwadis in India. The NCERT followed up on this in 2022 with the National Curriculum Framework for the Foundational Stage (NCF-FS), which turns the policy's broad intent into something closer to actual classroom guidance.

But this is not just a curriculum change on paper. It asks a huge, existing network of centres — built and staffed for a nutrition-and-health job — to also become sites of structured, play-based teaching, run by workers who are given short certificate or diploma courses rather than formal teacher training. India's Anganwadi system is one of the largest early childhood networks anywhere in the world, so whether NEP 2020's vision succeeds or not comes down largely to whether these centres can actually be made ready — physically, materially, and in terms of who's running them — to deliver it. This paper takes a critical look at what the published research so far has to say about that transition.

A note on how the evidence is used throughout this paper: because most of the facility and service-delivery studies available were conducted before NEP 2020 took effect, they are treated here as a pre-2020 structural baseline rather than as a verdict on the policy itself. Wherever post-2020 evidence exists — chiefly around workforce training rollouts and the expansion of Balvatika classes — it is discussed separately in Section 2.5 and flagged as such, so that baseline conditions and early implementation signals are not conflated.

Objectives of the Study

The present review is guided by the following objectives:

1. To review published literature on the state of physical facilities and infrastructure at ECCE/Anganwadi centres in India in the period surrounding NEP 2020's implementation.
2. To examine the adequacy of Anganwadi worker training programmes for delivering NEP 2020's play-based pedagogy.
3. To synthesize evidence on the extent to which preschool education is actually being delivered at Anganwadi centres, relative to other ICDS services such as nutrition and health.
4. To identify critical gaps in the current literature regarding NEP 2020's on-ground pedagogical impact, and to highlight regions and themes that require further empirical research.
5. To examine, where evidence permits, whether early post-2020 interventions — including Poshan Bhi Padhai Bhi, NIPUN Bharat's convergence with ECCE, and state-level Balvatika rollouts — show signs of addressing the gaps identified in the pre-2020 baseline literature.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Policy Framework: NEP 2020 and NCF-FS

NEP 2020 calls the Foundational Stage “a continuum of learning,” with three years of ECCE feeding directly into two years of formal primary school. On the workforce side, the policy says Anganwadi workers who already have a 10+2 qualification should get a six-month ECCE certificate, while those with less formal education get a one-year diploma covering early literacy, numeracy, and basic pedagogy — often taught through digital or distance formats rather than in person. On the infrastructure side, it promises well-ventilated, child-friendly Anganwadi buildings with enriched learning environments, and closer integration with primary schools so children move into Grade 1 without a hard break. The NCF-FS, which followed in 2022, adds more concrete detail: flexible, multi-level classrooms, locally adapted play materials, and a clear move away from rote memorisation in the early years.

Even the government's own paperwork acknowledges the scale of what's being asked here. The Report of the Task Force on Early Childhood Care and Education (Ministry of Women and Child Development, 2023) points out that building up Anganwadi workers' capacity has long been held back by weak institutional support and



thin budgets for training — a problem that existed well before NEP 2020, and one the policy now has to work around rather than start from scratch.

Infrastructure and Physical Facilities

A number of facility audits, conducted at Anganwadi centres in different states, give a fairly concrete picture of what these buildings actually look like on the inside. In Gujarat, Chudasama et al. (2015) evaluated Anganwadi centres under the ICDS programme and found shortfalls across most infrastructure indicators they checked. In Kalaburagi city, Karnataka, Baseer, Ansari and Takalkar (2021) surveyed 92 centres and found only 37% had toilets and 58.7% had adequate outdoor space — though drinking water (88%) and indoor space (about 78%) fared noticeably better. In the Garhwal region of Uttarakhand, Bartwal and Singh (2019) found centres running out of rented, inadequate buildings, often with no separate kitchen or storage space at all. And in a resettlement colony in Delhi, Malik et al. (2015) found that more than a third of the 41 centres surveyed had no drug kit, and that the average room size across all centres was under 110 square feet — not much room for the kind of activity-based, hands-on learning NEP 2020 has in mind.

In a hilly, tribal district of Manipur, Touthang et al. (2022) found that 86% of Anganwadi centres were simply being run out of the Anganwadi worker's own house, with only about a quarter having a separate kitchen. Jammu and Kashmir has less research to draw on, but what exists tells a similar story. Kapoor and Singh (2019), looking at centres in urban Kathua district, found they lacked not just general facilities but basic equipment like weighing machines and medicine kits — to the point that growth monitoring, one of the scheme's core functions, was barely happening at all. Bashir, Bashir, Ganie and Lone (2014), studying ICDS in Bandipora district, found the preschool education side of things particularly weak: in several centres, workers couldn't demonstrate a single stimulating activity for the children, and food storage equipment was in poor shape.

Put these studies together — spanning close to a decade and several states — and a fairly consistent picture emerges: Anganwadi infrastructure is inadequate in one way or another almost everywhere it's been studied, with sanitation, indoor space, and basic teaching materials coming up short again and again. That's the physical starting point NEP 2020's vision of enriched, play-based learning environments actually has to work with.

Workforce Training and Pedagogical Capacity

NEP 2020's decision to lean on short certificate and diploma courses for Anganwadi worker training keeps coming up as a weak point in the research. In Bandipora, Bashir et al. (2014) found that workers themselves said they needed more training in preschool education — several couldn't demonstrate even basic stimulating activities for the children in their care. Yasin and Azim (2019), looking across Kashmir division more broadly, pointed to a lack of professionalism among staff and poor coordination between Anganwadi workers and health functionaries as part of why services weren't being delivered properly.

There's a real tension built into this. NEP 2020 is asking people who were hired and trained for a nutrition-and-health role to now also deliver something closer to structured, play-based teaching — and it's trying to get them there through training that's short, and often delivered remotely rather than hands-on.

Preschool Education Delivery Relative to Other ICDS Services

The clearest evidence of the gap between what ECCE is supposed to deliver and what it actually delivers comes from looking at how services are actually used. Yasin and Azim (2019) evaluated ICDS across all three zones of Kashmir division — North, Central, and South — sampling 48 Anganwadi centres, and the numbers are telling: nutrition coverage for children was near-universal, but only 31.51% reported receiving preschool education, and just 13.54% reported getting health check-ups at the centre. The authors put this down to a mix of poor equipment, centres in bad condition, weak coordination with health staff, and a general lack of professionalism in how services were run.



This same pattern — nutrition working reasonably well, preschool education lagging far behind — shows up again and again in the wider literature, which makes sense given how the scheme was originally designed. The takeaway is that an Anganwadi centre can be functioning fine as a nutrition point and still be failing almost entirely at the pedagogical job NEP 2020 now wants it to do.

Post-2020 Interventions and Emerging Evidence

Since 2020, three developments bear directly on the gaps identified above, though the evidence base for each remains far thinner than the facility-audit literature already discussed. First, the Ministry of Women and Child Development launched Poshan Bhi Padhai Bhi (PBPB) in May 2023, a national in-person training programme for Anganwadi workers built around a two-tier model — State Level Master Trainers first, then a multi-day Anganwadi worker training delivered with the National Institute of Public Cooperation and Child Development (NIPCCD).

Government progress reports put the cumulative reach at 31,114 master trainers and 145,481 Anganwadi workers trained by February 2024, rising to 36,424 master trainers and 420,360 Anganwadi workers by March 2025 (Ministry of Women and Child Development, 2024, 2025). This is a direct, if partial, response to the training-capacity gap the ECCE Task Force itself had flagged (Section 2.1) — but it is a measure of training throughput, not of whether classroom practice has actually changed.

Second, the NIPUN Bharat Mission, launched in July 2021 to drive foundational literacy and numeracy (FLN) in Grades 1–3, has been positioned as converging with Anganwadi-based ECCE at the point where Balvatika and Grade 1 meet.

A district-level study in Varanasi found FLN proficiency rising from 23.12% to 80.35% of assessed children over a single academic session (Vishwakarma & Pal, 2024) — a striking figure, though it measures school-stage outcomes rather than the pedagogical quality of preschool delivery itself, and it comes from one district rather than a national sample.

Third, several states have begun shifting three- to six-year-olds out of Anganwadi centres altogether and into dedicated Balvatika classrooms attached to primary schools — Uttarakhand and Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu among the earliest movers. This is a structural response to Anganwadi capacity constraints rather than a fix for them: it changes where ECCE is delivered without necessarily resolving the infrastructure and training gaps documented in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 for the Anganwadi centres that continue to serve the 0–3 age group and children not yet moved into Balvatika.

The clearest post-2020 field evidence available comes from a small qualitative study of ten Anganwadi centres in Srinagar and Srikot Ganganali, Garhwal, Uttarakhand — the same state covered by Bartwal and Singh's (2019) pre-2020 audit. Uniyal, Nautiyal, Ritu and Komal (2024) found that only 20% of Anganwadi workers reported receiving any training specific to NEP 2020, room space and educational play materials remained insufficient in roughly a third of the centres visited, and children's demonstrated literacy and numeracy skills were still limited.

Set against Bartwal and Singh's earlier findings from the same state, this offers a rare — though methodologically small and not directly comparable — before-and-after glimpse: infrastructure gaps persist, and NEP 2020-specific training has reached only a minority of workers even several years after the policy's announcement.

Taken together, the post-2020 evidence is real but narrow: it documents training-rollout numbers and one small field study, not the kind of systematic facility audit that underpins Sections 2.2 through 2.4. No post-2020 facility audit specific to Jammu and Kashmir has been located in this search, so the region's most recent evidence remains the pre-2020 studies discussed above. This gap, more than any other, is what limits how confidently this review can speak to NEP 2020's on-ground impact rather than its pre-existing starting conditions.



Summary of Empirical Studies Reviewed

Table 1 summarises the empirical studies discussed above, organised to make the pre-/post-2020 distinction and the geographic spread of the evidence easier to see at a glance.

Author / Year	Region	Sample	Key Findings
Bashir et al. (2014)	Bandipora, J&K	ICDS centres, Bandipora district	Workers unable to demonstrate stimulating preschool activities; preschool component the weakest service delivered; food-storage equipment in poor condition.
Chudasama et al. (2015)	Gujarat	Anganwadi centres under ICDS	Shortfalls across most infrastructure indicators assessed.
Malik et al. (2015)	Northeast Delhi	41 AWCs	More than one-third of centres had no drug kit; mean room size ≈ 109 sq. ft — too small for activity-based learning.
Bartwal & Singh (2019)	Garhwal, Uttarakhand	Urban Anganwadi centres	Centres run from rented, inadequate buildings; many lacked a separate kitchen or storage space.
Kapoor & Singh (2019)	Kathua, J&K	37 urban AWCs	Lacked weighing machines and medicine kits; growth monitoring barely functioning.
Yasin & Azim (2019)	Kashmir division (N/C/S zones)	48 AWCs	Nutrition coverage near-universal; only 31.51% received preschool education; 13.54% received health check-ups.
Baseer et al. (2021)	Kalaburagi, Karnataka	92 AWCs	Only 37% had toilets; 58.7% had adequate outdoor space; drinking water 88%, indoor space $\approx 78\%$.
Touthang et al. (2022)	Hilly tribal district, Manipur	ICDS centres	86% run from the Anganwadi worker's own house; only about a quarter had a separate kitchen.
Vishwakarma & Pal (2024) — post-2020	Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh	Govt./council primary schools	FLN proficiency rose from 23.12% to 80.35% within one session; measures school-stage outcomes, not Anganwadi-level pedagogy.
Uniyal et al. (2024) — post-2020	Srinagar & Srikot Ganganali, Uttarakhand	10 AWCs	Only 20% of workers reported NEP 2020-specific training; room space and educational materials still insufficient in roughly a third of centres.

METHODOLOGY

This is a narrative, thematic review rather than a formal systematic one. Given how thin and unevenly spread the literature on this specific topic still is, the goal here was to pull together and make sense of what exists, not to exhaustively catalogue every paper ever published on Anganwadis. Even so, the search and selection process described below was applied consistently, and is reported in full — including approximate record counts at each stage — so that the review's scope and limits are transparent.

Sources were found through Google Scholar, ResearchGate, Academia.edu, and PubMed/PMC, along with government and institutional reports from the NCERT, NIPCCD, and the Ministry of Women and Child Development. Searches were built around a Boolean string along these lines: (“NEP 2020” OR “National



Education Policy”) AND (“ECCE” OR “Early Childhood” OR “Anganwadi”) AND (“infrastructure” OR “facilities” OR “pedagogy” OR “NCF-FS”) AND (“implementation” OR “challenges” OR “evaluation”). For post-2020 developments specifically, a second pass added (“Poshan Bhi Padhai Bhi” OR “NIPUN Bharat” OR “Balvatika”) to the same core terms. Searches covered material published between January 2014 and March 2025, a window chosen to capture the decade of pre-2020 baseline studies alongside the still-limited post-2020 literature.

Inclusion criteria were: (a) empirical facility audits, service-usage surveys, or evaluation studies reporting primary data on Anganwadi or ECCE centres in India; (b) authoritative policy or government documents on NEP 2020, NCF-FS, or post-2020 ECCE initiatives such as Poshan Bhi Padhai Bhi and NIPUN Bharat; and (c) peer-reviewed or institutionally published post-2020 studies reporting on the implementation of these initiatives. Exclusion criteria were: non-peer-reviewed promotional or opinion content without primary data; studies of early childhood education systems outside India’s ICDS/Anganwadi framework; and duplicate or superseded conference versions of included journal articles.

An initial search across the databases and Boolean strings above returned approximately 140 records after deduplication. Title and abstract screening against the inclusion criteria removed roughly 95 records as off-topic, non-Indian, or lacking primary data, leaving 45 full texts assessed for eligibility. Of these, 15 met the inclusion criteria and are synthesised in this review: 8 pre-2020 empirical facility or service-delivery studies retained explicitly as baseline evidence, 2 post-2020 empirical studies, and 5 policy or institutional/government documents (NEP 2020, NCF-FS, the ECCE Task Force report, and Ministry of Women and Child Development progress reports on Poshan Bhi Padhai Bhi). Because so few facility studies exist from after 2020, the pre-2020 studies are discussed throughout as baseline evidence of the conditions NEP 2020 inherited, and wherever their findings are presented it is made clear that they predate or barely overlap with the policy itself; post-2020 sources are flagged separately as indicative, early-stage evidence rather than confirmation that implementation has closed the gaps identified.

RESULTS

Three things came up consistently across this literature. First, physical infrastructure at Anganwadi centres is uneven, and in a number of the regions studied, well short of what NEP 2020’s vision of enriched, play-based learning would actually require — sanitation, indoor space, and dedicated kitchen or storage areas were the elements that came up short most often, across studies from Karnataka, Uttarakhand, Delhi, Manipur, and Jammu and Kashmir alike.

Second, workforce training is a genuine weak spot. Anganwadi workers in several of these studies said, in their own words, that they didn’t feel equipped to run structured preschool activities — a problem that existed before NEP 2020 and, based on the evidence available, hasn’t been resolved by the policy’s short certificate-and-diploma training model.

Third — and this is the one that matters most for NEP 2020’s core pedagogical goal — preschool education is consistently the weakest thing Anganwadi centres deliver, compared to nutrition. The Yasin and Azim (2019) study across Kashmir division puts the clearest number on this: nutrition coverage was near-universal, while preschool education reached fewer than a third of enrolled children.

Fourth, the limited post-2020 evidence available points to partial, uneven movement rather than resolved gaps: national training rollouts under Poshan Bhi Padhai Bhi have reached a growing share of the Anganwadi workforce, and NIPUN Bharat has driven measurable FLN gains at the school-readiness end of the system, but the one post-2020 Anganwadi-level field study located for this review — from the same state as an earlier pre-2020 audit — still found four in five workers without NEP 2020-specific training and continuing space and materials shortages (see Table 1). No comparable post-2020 facility audit exists for Jammu and Kashmir or several other states covered in this review.



DISCUSSION

What this body of research really shows is that NEP 2020's Foundational Stage reforms are being laid on top of an Anganwadi system that already had limited capacity, physically and professionally, before the policy arrived. That leaves an obvious question the current literature simply can't answer: has NEP 2020 — through NCF-FS, through pushing Anganwadi-school integration, through its promises on infrastructure — actually started closing this gap? Or is the same pre-2020 pattern of weak preschool delivery just carrying on unchanged?

Underneath the three recurring pre-2020 findings sits a structural point the results, taken individually, don't quite bring out: infrastructure and workforce capacity are not independent problems that can be fixed one at a time. A newly trained Anganwadi worker returning to a rented single room with no storage space has little scope to run the kind of activity-based learning NCF-FS describes, whatever the training covered. Equally, an

enriched, well-built Anganwadi with an untrained or minimally trained worker is likely to default back to the custodial, nutrition-first routine the centre was originally built for. NEP 2020's own design — separating a workforce-training track (six-month certificates, one-year diplomas, and now Poshan Bhi Padhai Bhi) from an infrastructure-upgrade track — mirrors this split, which may help explain why the pre-2020 literature finds both problems persisting together rather than one being resolved ahead of the other.

The post-2020 evidence discussed in Section 2.5 complicates this picture further rather than resolving it. Where Balvatika classes have moved four- to six-year-olds out of Anganwadi centres and into government-school classrooms, the reform sidesteps the Anganwadi infrastructure problem rather than solving it — school buildings may offer better physical conditions, but this leaves open what happens to the Anganwadi centres and the 0–3 and non-migrated 3–6 populations that remain their responsibility. NIPUN Bharat's FLN gains, similarly, are documented at the school-readiness and primary-grade end of the pipeline (Vishwakarma & Pal, 2024); they say little about whether play-based pedagogy has actually reached Anganwadi classrooms themselves. The one study that does look inside post-2020 Anganwadi centres directly — Uniyal et al.'s (2024) small study in Uttarakhand — found NEP 2020-specific training had reached only a fifth of workers, and that space and materials constraints identified in Bartwal and Singh's (2019) pre-2020 audit of the same state persisted. That is a single, methodologically limited data point, not a trend line, but it is consistent with the broader pattern in this review: workforce training is the arm of NEP 2020 that has moved fastest and furthest, infrastructure the slowest.

The honest limitation here is timing. Most of the facility and service-usage studies pulled together in this review were done before NEP 2020, or right around when it was announced — which means they tell us where things stood, not what's changed since. This is especially true for Jammu and Kashmir, where the most detailed evidence available (Yasin & Azim, 2019; Bashir et al., 2014) is now several years old, and no post-2020 facility audit specific to the region turned up anywhere in this search. Elsewhere, the post-2020 record is thin but not entirely empty — Section 2.5 sets out what does exist — though none of it takes the form of the kind of facility audit this review relies on for its pre-2020 picture.

There's also an unevenness problem across states. Solid, quantified, fairly recent facility data exist for places like Gujarat, Karnataka, and Manipur — but for a lot of other states and union territories, that kind of data just isn't there yet, which makes it hard to say much about NEP 2020's national ECCE rollout from the literature alone.

Both of these point toward the same next step: fresh, post-implementation facility and service-delivery audits, run in a way that's comparable to the earlier studies covered here, so that change can actually be measured instead of assumed. It would also help to have real evaluation of the six-month and one-year Anganwadi worker training programmes themselves — how many workers finish them, whether they change what happens in the classroom, and what the workers themselves think of the training. None of that currently exists in the literature, and it's arguably the single biggest missing piece for understanding whether NEP 2020's approach to the workforce is actually working.



CONCLUSION

NEP 2020 lays out a genuinely good vision for early childhood education in India — moving Anganwadi-based care away from rote, custodial habits and toward structured, play-based pedagogy woven into the wider schooling system. The pre-2020 baseline literature pulled together in this paper shows what that vision had to build on: infrastructure gaps recurring across state after state, workforce training that workers themselves called insufficient, and preschool education consistently the weakest of the services Anganwadi centres deliver. The limited post-2020 evidence available — national training-rollout figures, FLN gains at the school-readiness end of the system, and one small field study revisiting an already-studied district — suggests movement, but movement concentrated in workforce training rather than infrastructure, and nowhere near the scale needed to confirm the gaps are closing. What this review argues for, in the end, is not more discussion of NEP 2020's pedagogical ideas — those are already well laid out — but systematic, post-implementation facility and service-delivery audits, run comparably to the pre-2020 studies reviewed here, especially in Jammu and Kashmir, where no such audit currently exists. Only that kind of evidence can settle whether NEP 2020's ambitions are becoming real change on the ground, or are still, largely, intent.

REFERENCES

1. Bashir, A., Bashir, U., Ganie, Z. A., & Lone, A. (2014). Evaluation study of Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS) in district Bandipora of Jammu and Kashmir, India. *International Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 34–36.
2. Baseer, M. A., Ansari, K. A., & Takalkar, A. A. (2021). Infrastructure evaluation of anganwadi centres in Kalaburagi city: A cross sectional study. *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health*, 9(1), 149–152. <https://doi.org/10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20214858>
3. Bartwal, J., & Singh, A. K. (2019). An assessment of facilities available at anganwadi centres in urban area of Garhwal region, Uttarakhand. *National Journal of Medical Research*, 9(3), 117–120.
4. Chudasama, R. K., Patel, U. V., Verma, P. B., Vala, M., Rangoonwala, M., & Sheth, A. (2015). Evaluation of Anganwadi centres' performance under the Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS) program in Gujarat, India. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research*, 9(12), LC01–LC06.
5. Kapoor, A., & Singh, K. (2019). An assessment of facilities and services at anganwadi centers under the integrated child development service scheme in urban area of Kathua district, Jammu and Kashmir. *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health*, 6(12), 5272–5276.
6. Malik, A., Bhilwar, M., Rustagi, N., & Taneja, D. K. (2015). An assessment of facilities and services at Anganwadi centers under the Integrated Child Development Service scheme in Northeast District of Delhi, India. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 27(3), 201–206. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzv028>
7. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Ministry of Education.
8. Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India. (2023). Report of the Task Force on Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE). Government of India.
9. Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India. (2024, February 5). Facilitator guidebook developed by NIPCCD for training of Anganwadi Workers under Poshan Bhi Padhai Bhi [Press release]. Press Information Bureau. <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2100645>
10. Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India. (2025, March 28). Poshan Tracker app aims to enhance Anganwadi Worker's capacity to deliver optimal early childhood care and education services to all children [Press release]. Press Information Bureau. <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleaseDetailm.aspx?PRID=2117760>
11. National Council of Educational Research and Training. (2022). National Curriculum Framework for Foundational Stage. NCERT.
12. Touthang, J., Singh, H. K., Singh, H. N., & Singh, L. N. (2022). Evaluation of the Integrated Child Development Services Scheme in a hilly tribal district of Manipur: A cross-sectional study. *Health line*, 13(3), 201–207. https://doi.org/10.51957/healthline_385_2022



13. Uniyal, S., Nautiyal, A. K., Ritu, & Komal. (2024). Functioning and preparation for learning in Anganwadi. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 12(1), e255–e266.
<https://ijcert.org/papers/IJCRT2401510.pdf>
14. Vishwakarma, B., & Pal, S. R. (2024). A study on the role of NIPUN Bharat mission in the development of foundational skills of students studying in primary schools. *International Education and Research Journal*, 10(3). <https://ierj.in/journal/index.php/ierj/article/view/4620>
15. Yasin, T., & Azim, H. (2019). Evaluation of Integrated Child Development Services program in Kashmir, India. *International Journal of Tropical Disease & Health*, 35(2), 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.9734/ijtdh/2019/v35i230119>