

Impact of the Indian Knowledge System on the Contemporary Education System: Opportunities, Challenges and an Evidence-Informed Integration Framework

Dr. Vikas Sharma¹, Mr. C. K. Pandey²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Bareilly College, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Sitapur Shiksha Sansthan, Resora, Sitapur, Uttar Pradesh, India

doi.org/10.64643/IJIRT210041

Abstract—The Indian Knowledge System (IKS) has gained renewed policy attention following the National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) and subsequent guidance issued by the University Grants Commission (UGC). Yet policy recognition does not itself establish educational effectiveness. This paper examines the potential contributions and implementation conditions of IKS in contemporary education through a qualitative, descriptive-analytical review of policy documents, institutional guidance and selected scholarly literature. It treats IKS as a plural and historically evolving field comprising textual, oral, practical, regional and community-based traditions. The analysis considers five potential educational contributions: ethical reflection and holistic development; critical reasoning and dialogic learning; curriculum enrichment and interdisciplinarity; cultural and linguistic plurality; and place-based sustainability learning. It also considers barriers involving teacher preparedness, source validation, curriculum overload, representation, community participation and assessment. A recent exploratory stakeholder study on integrating Ayurveda and IKS into higher-education health and nutrition curricula is used as a bounded empirical example of implementation concerns, not as evidence for all IKS domains or all educational levels. The paper's principal contribution is an evidence-informed integration framework linking source provenance, learning activity, intended outcome, assessment indicator and safeguards. The analysis concludes that IKS should be approached neither as an unquestionable body of authority nor as a category to be dismissed wholesale. Its educational value must be established case by case through accurate contextualisation, inclusive representation, critical inquiry and transparent evaluation. Since this study does not collect primary data or conduct a systematic review,

it proposes a research agenda rather than claiming causal effects.

Index Terms—Indian Knowledge System; contemporary education; NEP 2020; curriculum integration; teacher preparedness; knowledge diversity; experiential learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

Contemporary education is expected to support intellectual development, reasoning, communication, creativity, ethical judgement, social participation and the capacity to respond to changing circumstances. In India, the National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) places emphasis on holistic and multidisciplinary education, experiential learning, Indian languages, arts, culture and knowledge traditions. It also states that relevant knowledge of India—including tribal knowledge and indigenous and traditional ways of learning should be incorporated across curriculum areas in an accurate and scientific manner (Ministry of Education, Government of India, 2020). This policy direction has strengthened interest in the Indian Knowledge System (IKS) and its possible contribution to contemporary teaching and learning.

IKS is used in this paper as an umbrella term for diverse bodies of knowledge and practice developed, adapted and transmitted across the Indian subcontinent over time. These include philosophy, logic, mathematics, astronomy, linguistics, literature, arts, crafts, health-related traditions, agriculture, water management, ecological practices and community-based knowledge. The category is neither uniform nor

static. Its traditions differ in language, social location, methods of transmission, evidentiary status and historical context. A responsible educational approach must therefore ask what a particular source claims, how it came to be preserved, what evidence supports it, who is represented, and how it relates to a defined learning objective.

Policy development provides an institutional basis for integration. The UGC has issued guidance for incorporating Indian knowledge into higher education curricula and separate guidance for faculty training and orientation (University Grants Commission [UGC], 2023a, 2023b). These initiatives highlight both curricular design and faculty capacity. However, the existence of a policy, guideline or course does not by itself show that students learn more effectively, reason more critically or develop particular values. Those outcomes require evaluation.

The debate can be weakened by two opposite assumptions. One assumes that traditional knowledge is inherently superior or scientifically confirmed simply because it is old; the other treats traditional knowledge as educationally irrelevant before examining it. Neither position is adequate for academic inquiry. Historical importance, cultural meaning, practical usefulness and scientific validity are distinct dimensions. A practice may be historically significant but ineffective in a new context; a community practice may be locally useful without being universally generalisable; and a philosophical text may be valuable for reasoning even when it is not a scientific manual.

This paper develops a critical and practical account of IKS integration. It analyses the policy setting, synthesises relevant conceptual literature, considers potential educational mechanisms and challenges, and proposes a framework that makes the logic of integration explicit and assessable. Its contribution is not a claim that IKS has a uniform positive impact. Rather, it proposes a way to identify, teach and evaluate particular IKS materials with academic rigour.

1.1 Research Problem

The central research problem is the gap between policy-level support for IKS integration and the practical decisions required to implement it meaningfully. Educators need to select appropriate sources, relate them to disciplinary outcomes, represent knowledge traditions fairly, prepare teachers

and assess learning. Without such design, integration may become tokenistic, historically inaccurate, exclusionary or difficult to evaluate. The paper therefore asks under what conditions selected IKS materials may responsibly enrich contemporary education.

1.2 Objectives

1. To clarify the scope and plural character of IKS as an educational category.
2. To examine the policy and institutional context for IKS integration in contemporary education.
3. To analyse potential pedagogical contributions of selected IKS traditions to reasoning, curriculum enrichment, cultural understanding and sustainability learning.
4. To identify epistemic, pedagogical, institutional and ethical challenges in implementation.
5. To propose an evidence-informed framework connecting sources, learning activities, intended outcomes and assessment.

1.3 Research Questions

1. What forms of knowledge and practice may be included within the broad category of IKS?
2. How do national policy and higher-education guidance frame the integration of IKS?
3. Through which pedagogical mechanisms might selected IKS materials support contemporary learning?
4. What challenges affect the accuracy, inclusiveness and evaluability of IKS integration?
5. How can an integration framework help educators design and assess IKS-based learning activities?

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH GAP

The relevant literature is interdisciplinary and contains sources with different purposes. Policy documents describe institutional goals and recommendations; historical and philosophical works interpret traditions; educational theory offers concepts for designing learning activities; and empirical studies can examine how stakeholders experience specific interventions. These source types should not be treated as interchangeable. Policy intent is not evidence of classroom effectiveness, while historical significance

does not automatically establish a contemporary pedagogical benefit.

NEP 2020 calls for Indian knowledge, languages, arts and cultural traditions to be included across relevant areas of education, while specifying that this should be done accurately and scientifically (Ministry of Education, Government of India, 2020). The UGC's guidelines on incorporating IKS in higher-education curricula provide an institutional roadmap for curricular inclusion and research; its faculty-orientation guidance acknowledges the need to familiarise teachers with IKS and strategies for discipline-specific classroom integration (UGC, 2023a, 2023b). These policy sources are central to understanding the current reform context, but they do not independently demonstrate improved student outcomes.

Mahadevan et al. (2022) provide a broad conceptual introduction to IKS and its applications across multiple domains. Such a reference can help educators identify topics for curricular exploration, but individual claims still require disciplinary scrutiny and source-specific verification. Sen's (2005) account of Indian intellectual history foregrounds debate, argument and internal diversity. This is relevant to an educational framework that treats Indian traditions as plural and contested rather than as a single, homogeneous worldview.

Educational theory provides a second analytical strand. Dewey (1938) argued that experience is not automatically educative; its value depends on the relationship between an experience and subsequent growth. Kolb (1984) conceptualised experiential learning as a process involving experience, reflection, conceptualisation and experimentation. These theories were not developed specifically to test IKS. They are used here as pedagogical lenses for designing activities in which historical problems, local practices, crafts or philosophical debates become objects of observation, reflection and analysis.

A relevant empirical contribution is the exploratory study by Moitra and Madan (2025), which examined stakeholder perspectives on integrating Ayurveda and Indian IKS into higher-education health and nutrition curricula. The study used interviews, focus-group discussions and a panel discussion involving 22 participants across these activities. Its reported themes included educators' interest but limited confidence in content and pedagogy, learners' uncertainty about

relevance, and administrators' concerns about the relationship between traditional and modern scientific perspectives. The authors identified capacity building, curricular design, experiential approaches, resource development and interdisciplinary collaboration as implementation strategies. These findings are useful because they bring stakeholder experience into a debate often dominated by policy and conceptual claims. However, the study is exploratory, focused on Ayurveda and health/nutrition education, and based on a small, context-specific participant group. It cannot be generalised to all IKS domains, institutions or school settings.

International work on local and Indigenous knowledge offers a further point of comparison. UNESCO's work on intangible cultural heritage and local knowledge describes ways that community knowledge can be connected with education and sustainability learning, while stressing the importance of participation and cultural diversity (UNESCO, n.d.). This comparative perspective supports place-based learning, but it does not mean that all local practices should be presumed effective or transferable. Community knowledge should be studied in context, with appropriate attribution and evaluation.

Taken together, these sources show that policy support, conceptual arguments and emerging stakeholder research all point to opportunities as well as implementation challenges. The specific gap addressed by this paper is operational: discussions of IKS integration need a clear bridge between a selected knowledge source and the learning outcome it is intended to support. The paper proposes a framework requiring each application to specify (1) source provenance and context, (2) learning activity, (3) intended outcome, (4) assessment indicator, and (5) ethical and evidentiary safeguards. This is a proposed design contribution; its effectiveness has not been tested by the present study.

III. CONCEPTUAL SCOPE OF IKS

IKS is best understood as a plural and evolving field rather than a closed canon. It includes written texts and formal disciplines as well as oral traditions, apprenticeship, craft, performance, ecological observation and community-based practice. Some knowledge is attributed to named authors or schools; other knowledge is held collectively and transmitted

across generations. An inclusive account should not equate IKS exclusively with classical textual traditions, a single language, one region or one social group.

Illustrative domains include philosophy, logic and epistemology; mathematics and astronomy; grammar and linguistics; literature, music and performing arts; architecture and craft; agriculture, water management and ecological practice; health-related traditions and yoga; and ideas about governance, ethics and social life. The boundaries between these domains are often porous. A local water system, for example, may involve hydrology, engineering, ecological observation, customary rules, collective labour and economic organisation.

A critical framework distinguishes at least four kinds of claims. Historical claims concern what people did, knew or recorded in a particular context. Cultural claims concern meaning, identity, continuity and social practice. Practical claims concern whether a method works under specified conditions. Scientific claims require methods and evidence appropriate to the proposition being tested. These categories can overlap, but none should automatically be substituted for another. The cultural significance of a practice does not establish every factual claim associated with it; similarly, lack of universal applicability does not make local knowledge irrelevant.

Plurality also means that traditions may disagree about valid knowledge, ethics, social order, medicine or metaphysics. Such disagreements are educationally valuable when presented accurately. Students can examine who produced a source, how it was transmitted, what methods it uses, what assumptions it makes, and whose perspectives are missing. In this sense, critical inquiry is not an external corrective imposed on IKS; it is a necessary method for studying any complex knowledge tradition responsibly.

IV. POLICY CONTEXT: NEP 2020 AND HIGHER EDUCATION

NEP 2020 provides the principal policy context for the current attention to IKS. It promotes holistic development, multidisciplinary education, experiential learning, Indian languages and cultural knowledge. Paragraph 4.27 specifically states that knowledge of India, including tribal knowledge and indigenous and traditional ways of learning, should be

incorporated across relevant subjects in an accurate and scientific manner (Ministry of Education, Government of India, 2020). The emphasis on accuracy is important: integration should involve interpretation and evaluation, not simply the inclusion of heritage-related content.

The UGC's guidelines for incorporating IKS into higher-education curricula provide a framework for institutions to include relevant knowledge domains in undergraduate and postgraduate study (UGC, 2023a). The UGC's faculty training/orientation guidance identifies teacher familiarity and capacity building as important conditions for implementation (UGC, 2023b). These documents suggest that integration requires both curricular planning and professional development. The IKS Division also supports research and educational initiatives, although specific institutional activities should be described only when supported by the relevant official source.

The educational implications differ by stage and discipline. At school level, carefully chosen examples may be embedded in language, mathematics, environmental studies, arts and project work. In higher education, students may examine primary sources, compare interpretations, assess historical claims and relate a tradition to a disciplinary problem. In both cases, IKS should serve a defined learning purpose and complement core disciplinary learning rather than displace it without justification.

Policy documents establish aims and recommended directions; they do not prove implementation quality. Evaluation should therefore consider teacher preparation, source quality, curricular fit, student learning and inclusion. Institutions should also monitor unintended outcomes, such as tokenistic inclusion, overload, exclusion of marginalised traditions or presentation of contested claims as settled fact.

V. POTENTIAL EDUCATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

5.1 Ethical Reflection and Holistic Development

Selected philosophical, literary and community traditions can provide material for discussing responsibility, ethical choices, self-discipline, social relations and the consequences of action. Students may compare positions, analyse dilemmas and justify decisions using reasons. This can enrich value-oriented education when discussion is open and

reflective. It should not be assumed that exposure to a tradition automatically produces ethical behaviour; values are also shaped by institutional culture, relationships, social context and opportunities to practise them.

Evaluation should focus on observable learning rather than claiming to measure inner character. Possible indicators include the ability to identify competing values, justify a position, consider consequences, engage respectfully with opposing views and reflect on a decision. Such indicators are limited proxies. A reflective essay or classroom discussion can show reasoning at a particular moment but cannot by itself establish lasting moral transformation.

5.2 Critical Thinking and Dialogic Learning

Indian traditions of logic, debate and philosophical argument can be used to examine claims, premises, inferences, objections and responses. A classroom activity might ask students to reconstruct an argument, identify its assumptions and evaluate whether the conclusion follows. The purpose is not to imply that all Indian schools used the same method, but to use well-documented examples to make reasoning visible. Students should encounter disagreement and alternative interpretations rather than a simplified, uniform account.

Dewey's (1938) emphasis on the quality and continuity of experience and Kolb's (1984) experiential-learning cycle offer general design principles. A learning sequence could begin with a source or problem, move through observation and discussion, compare competing explanations, and end with a revised interpretation or application. Whether this improves reasoning must be assessed. Possible indicators include the quality of evidence use, the handling of counterarguments, and transfer to a new problem.

5.3 Curriculum Enrichment and Interdisciplinarity

IKS materials may help connect subjects that are often taught separately. A documented mathematical method can be compared with a method in the current syllabus; a local water-management system can connect environmental science, geography, economics and civic organisation; a craft process can link design, measurement, materials, history and livelihoods. Such examples can illustrate how knowledge is produced in social and practical contexts. Interdisciplinarity,

however, must not dilute disciplinary accuracy. Each activity should state which concept or skill students are expected to learn.

Possible evaluation methods include concept questions, comparative explanations, problem-solving tasks, project portfolios and applications to unfamiliar cases. Pre- and post-assessment or comparison groups may be appropriate for some classroom studies, but causal claims require a design capable of supporting them. The present paper does not report such data.

5.4 Cultural and Linguistic Plurality

Engagement with regional languages, oral histories, local arts and community practices may help students recognise that knowledge is produced and transmitted in multiple settings. It can broaden representation in the curriculum and make selected topics more locally meaningful. However, cultural understanding should not depend on claims of uniformity or superiority. A responsible curriculum acknowledges disagreement, historical change, interaction among traditions and exclusion from formal knowledge institutions.

Curriculum review should ask which regions, languages and communities are represented; whether oral, tribal and occupational knowledge appears; whether women's contributions are visible; and whether difficult or contested historical questions are acknowledged. Student work can be assessed for accurate description, comparison of perspectives and respectful reasoning. These indicators measure learning about diversity, not conformity to a prescribed identity.

5.5 Sustainability, Local Knowledge and Practical Skills

Local agriculture, water systems, crafts and ecological observations can provide case material for sustainability education. Students might document a practice, establish its local context, consult knowledgeable community members with appropriate consent, and compare the practice's intended purpose with available technical or environmental evidence. This approach can combine community knowledge with disciplinary analysis. It should neither presume that every traditional practice is environmentally beneficial nor dismiss a practice merely because it is locally transmitted.

UNESCO's work on living heritage and local knowledge provides examples of connecting

community knowledge with education and sustainability, while stressing cultural diversity and community participation (UNESCO, n.d.). In classroom projects, safeguards should include consent, attribution, respect for sensitive knowledge and clarity about what may be recorded or shared. Assessment can focus on the quality of field notes, source evaluation, understanding of ecological context, practical demonstration and reflection on limitations. Across these five areas, the central proposition is conditional: selected IKS materials may support learning when they are relevant to the curriculum, accurately represented, taught through appropriate methods and assessed transparently. This paper does not claim that the potential benefits have been demonstrated uniformly across educational levels or subject areas.

VI. CHALLENGES AND CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES

6.1 Curriculum Overload and Tokenism

Curricula are constrained by time, learning outcomes and assessment requirements. Adding content without removing duplication or identifying a clear purpose may increase workload without improving understanding. Tokenism is another risk: a cultural anecdote or isolated reference may be presented as integration even when it does not support the stated learning objective. Each module should specify the objective, curriculum connection, activity and assessment method.

6.2 Teacher Preparedness and Resources

Teachers may be experts in their disciplines without having specialised preparation in the history, languages or methods needed to teach particular IKS materials. The UGC's faculty-orientation guidance explicitly recognises the need to familiarise faculty with IKS and strategies for classroom use (UGC, 2023b). The exploratory study by Moitra and Madan (2025) similarly reports interest alongside uncertainty among stakeholders in the specific context of Ayurveda and health/nutrition education. This provides a reason to prioritise continuing training, reviewed resources, peer collaboration and subject-specific examples, while recognising that one study cannot represent all institutions.

6.3 Validation, Translation and Source Criticism

IKS materials may be transmitted through different languages, editions, translations, oral versions and contemporary summaries. A translation can obscure nuance, while a summary can omit historical context. Teachers should identify the source and its provenance and, where feasible, compare interpretations. Claims about practical or scientific effectiveness require evidence appropriate to the claim. Cultural significance should be acknowledged without being used as a substitute for verification.

6.4 Representation, Access and Community Rights

An IKS curriculum can reproduce exclusion if it privileges elite textual traditions or a narrow geographical and linguistic range. Oral, tribal, regional, occupational and women's knowledge may be less visible in formal archives. Inclusion requires deliberate source selection, consultation with knowledge holders, attribution and sensitivity to community protocols. It also requires recognising that not all knowledge is intended for unrestricted publication or classroom reproduction.

6.5 Assessment and Institutional Accountability

Counting courses, credits or syllabus references measures implementation activity, not necessarily learning. More meaningful indicators include conceptual understanding, reasoning, project quality, source evaluation and transfer to a new context. Assessments should align with the module's purpose and should not reward uncritical agreement with a particular interpretation. Institutions should report what was taught, how it was evaluated and what the evidence can and cannot support.

VII. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

7.1 Research Design

The paper adopts a qualitative, descriptive-analytical documentary design. It synthesises selected policy documents, institutional guidance and scholarly literature to clarify concepts, analyse potential pedagogical mechanisms and develop an integration framework. It is not an empirical classroom study and does not claim to measure the effect of IKS on student outcomes.

7.2 Source Base and Selection

The core source base comprises NEP 2020; UGC guidelines on incorporating IKS in higher-education curricula and on faculty training/orientation; the UGC's official page describing its faculty-orientation initiative; selected scholarly works on IKS and educational theory; UNESCO material on living heritage and local knowledge; and the exploratory empirical study by Moitra and Madan (2025). Sources were selected for direct relevance to policy, conceptual framing, pedagogical design or implementation challenges. This was a focused documentary review, not an exhaustive systematic search; no claim is made that all relevant publications were identified.

7.3 Analytical Procedure

The analysis was organised thematically around (a) policy and institutional context, (b) ethical reflection and holistic development, (c) critical reasoning and experiential learning, (d) curriculum and cultural plurality, (e) sustainability and practical knowledge, and (f) implementation safeguards. The framework was then constructed by mapping a knowledge domain and its source to an activity, outcome, indicator and safeguard. Empirical claims from the stakeholder study were treated as findings from that study's specific context rather than as general evidence about IKS.

7.4 Limitations

The paper does not collect primary data, evaluate an IKS intervention, or conduct a systematic review with predefined search strings and formal quality appraisal. It therefore cannot establish causal effects, estimate effect sizes or claim statistical significance. Its conclusions are analytical propositions and design recommendations. Future research should test particular modules in defined contexts and report sampling, implementation, assessment and limitations transparently.

VIII. PROPOSED EVIDENCE-INFORMED INTEGRATION FRAMEWORK

The proposed framework treats integration as a series of linked design decisions rather than as content addition alone. An educator first identifies a source and documents its provenance and context; then defines the learning objective and activity; specifies an intended outcome; selects an assessment indicator; and identifies safeguards related to accuracy, inclusion and community participation. Teacher capacity, resources and disciplinary relevance affect every stage. The framework is proposed for planning and evaluation; it has not been validated empirically in this paper.

Knowledge domain / source	Learning activity	Intended outcome	Possible assessment	Safeguard
Documented history of Indian mathematics	Compare a historical method with a current syllabus method	Conceptual understanding and historical awareness	Problem-solving task plus explanation	Verify chronology and context; avoid anachronism
Logic and philosophical argument	Reconstruct claims, premises, objections and responses	Reasoned argument and critical evaluation	Analytical response rubric	Represent multiple schools and interpretations
Local water or agricultural knowledge	Community-informed field study and source comparison	Ecological understanding and evidence evaluation	Field report with context and evidence	Obtain consent; avoid universalising local claims
Art and craft traditions	Demonstration, documentation and reflective practice	Practical skill and cultural understanding	Performance rubric or portfolio	Credit knowledge holders; respect community protocols
Regional or oral narratives	Compare versions, contexts and interpretations	Source awareness and cultural literacy	Comparative analysis	Do not treat one version as the only authoritative account

A practical implementation cycle can proceed in five stages: (1) source selection and contextual

verification; (2) alignment with an existing learning objective; (3) teacher preparation and activity design;

(4) assessment and feedback; and (5) review of inclusion, evidence and unintended effects. Institutions should begin with a small number of well-defined modules, gather feedback from teachers and learners, and revise the materials before wider implementation. Where community knowledge is involved, consultation, consent and attribution should be built into the process.

If a programme claims to improve learning, its evaluation should be designed accordingly. Depending on the question, this may involve rubric-based assessment, pre/post tasks, student interviews, classroom observation or a comparison design. The method should be proportionate to the claim. A positive student response can establish acceptability or perceived relevance, but it does not by itself prove improved learning; an increase in test scores may show change but requires an appropriate design before causal attribution.

XI. DISCUSSION

The analysis indicates that IKS integration is most defensible when knowledge content, pedagogy and assessment are designed together. Historical materials may enrich disciplinary learning when the source is reliable and the comparison is accurate. Dialogic traditions may provide material for reasoning exercises when students are asked to analyse arguments rather than memorise conclusions. Community knowledge may support place-based learning when it is documented respectfully and examined in context. Across domains, relevance and method are more important than antiquity alone.

The policy framework is necessary but insufficient. NEP 2020 and UGC guidance create a formal basis for curricular and faculty initiatives, but meaningful implementation depends on teachers, learning resources, assessment and institutional support. The stakeholder study by Moitra and Madan (2025) offers a concrete, bounded example: even where there is interest in IKS integration, stakeholders may express uncertainty about content, pedagogy and the relationship between traditional and contemporary scientific frameworks. Because their study focused on Ayurveda and health/nutrition education, its findings should be used to illustrate a possible implementation challenge, not to infer universal stakeholder attitudes.

Pluralism is another central condition. A curriculum that includes multiple regions, languages, communities and intellectual positions is more faithful to the breadth of IKS than one that presents a single narrative. It should also allow historical criticism and disagreement. Critical scrutiny does not diminish cultural value; it protects academic credibility by separating a source's significance from the truth of every claim associated with it.

The framework's main contribution is operational. It requires educators to state what is being taught, why it belongs in the curriculum, what students are expected to learn and how the outcome will be assessed. This shifts discussion from general claims about impact to questions that can be investigated. Future studies should test specific modules across disciplines and educational levels, examine how implementation varies across contexts, and report both benefits and limitations.]

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Develop discipline-specific IKS modules that complement core learning objectives rather than adding content without a clear purpose.
2. Provide sustained faculty development in source criticism, historical context, inclusive representation and assessment design.
3. Prepare reviewed teaching resources with clear provenance, reliable translations and guidance distinguishing historical, cultural, practical and scientific claims.
4. Include regional, oral, tribal, occupational and community-based knowledge alongside well-documented textual traditions.
5. Use inquiry, debate, comparative analysis, field study and craft practice where these methods serve explicit learning objectives.
6. Assess conceptual understanding, reasoning, project quality, source evaluation and practical performance rather than relying only on recall.
7. Consult knowledge holders, obtain consent where appropriate, provide attribution and respect protocols for sensitive or restricted knowledge.
8. Evaluate pilots before scaling up and publish methods and outcomes transparently.
9. Support empirical research that examines specific IKS modules with appropriate qualitative, quantitative or mixed-method designs.

XI. CONCLUSION

The Indian Knowledge System offers a diverse range of historical, philosophical, linguistic, artistic, practical and community-based resources that may enrich contemporary education. Potential contributions include curriculum enrichment, dialogic learning, ethical reflection, cultural and linguistic understanding, and place-based sustainability education. These possibilities should not be mistaken for established or universal effects. The educational value of a particular resource depends on source quality, historical context, teacher preparedness, inclusiveness, curricular alignment and credible assessment.

This paper has proposed an evidence-informed framework linking source provenance, learning activity, intended outcome, assessment indicator and safeguards. Its contribution is methodological: it makes the purpose of integration explicit and provides a basis for evaluation. The study is documentary and does not examine classroom data, so empirical testing remains necessary. A balanced approach neither idealises all traditional knowledge nor dismisses it in advance. It treats IKS as a plural field for critical study, careful teaching and evidence-informed educational innovation.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Dewey, *Experience and Education*. New York, NY, USA: Kappa Delta Pi, 1938.
- [2] Indian Knowledge Systems Division, "About the Indian Knowledge Systems Division," Ministry of Education, Government of India. [Online]. Available: <https://iks.aicte-india.org/about.php>
- [3] D. A. Kolb, *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, 1984.
- [4] B. Mahadevan, V. R. Bhat, and R. N. Nagendra Pavana, *Introduction to Indian Knowledge System: Concepts and Applications*. New Delhi, India: PHI Learning, 2022.
- [5] Ministry of Education, Government of India, *National Education Policy 2020*, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf
- [6] P. Moitra and J. Madan, "Stakeholder perspectives on integrating Ayurveda and Indian Indigenous Knowledge Systems into higher education: An exploratory study," *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, vol. 11, Art. no. 101453, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101453.
- [7] Sen, *The Argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian History, Culture and Identity*. London, U.K.: Allen Lane, 2005.
- [8] UNESCO, "About living heritage and education," *UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage*. [Online]. Available: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/about-01159>
- [9] University Grants Commission, *Guidelines for Incorporating Indian Knowledge in Higher Education Curricula*, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.ugc.gov.in/pdfnews/6436045_Guidelines-IKS-in-HE-Curricula.pdf
- [10] University Grants Commission, *Guidelines for Training/Orientation of Faculty on Indian Knowledge System (IKS)*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ugc.gov.in/KeyInitiative?ID=bE9fWYDGqyYqwJ0y26Z4tg%3D%3D>