

Report on a One-Day Workshop for Faculty on “Designing and Implementing Learning Outcomes-Based Curriculum (LOCF) Framework”

Organisers: Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) and School of Education Studies (SES), Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University Delhi.

Date and Venue: Wednesday, 24 September 2025, 10 am-4 pm, Room 306, Swami Vivekananda Bhawan, Karampura Campus

Participants: 70 faculty members of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar University Delhi

Programme Schedule (Annexure A)

Workshop Report:

The Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) and School of Education Studies, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University jointly organised a day-long workshop on 24 September 2025, at the Swami Vivekananda Bhawan of the University's Karampura Campus. The theme of the workshop was “Designing and Implementing Learning Outcomes-Based Curriculum (LOCF) Framework”. 70 faculty members of the University attended the workshop.

The Workshop was conceptualised in alignment with National Education Policy (NEP 2020)'s focus on comprehensive reforms in curricular and assessment practices. The NEP emphasises shift from a rote-learning-focused assessment approach to a continuous, formative, competency-based, and holistic assessment system that emphasizes "assessment for learning" and “assessment as learning”.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University Delhi (AUD) adopted a continuous and comprehensive evaluation approach to student assessment in higher education since its inception, and the NEP 2020 has reinforced the vision of meaningful learning adopted at AUD. The workshop aimed to further sensitize faculty members to the core principles, theoretical underpinnings, best practices, and significance of the learning outcomes based curriculum framework. Through this faculty development workshop, the University aims to revisit and initiate review of existing programmes and course syllabi to align the content and assessments to the programme outcomes and course outcomes.

The day-long workshop began with the inaugural session with Dr. Urfat Anjem Mir, Director, IQAC, welcoming the guests and participants and explaining the objective of the workshop. Prof

Satyaketu Sankrit Dean Academic Affairs highlighted the transformatory context of the New Education Policy 2020 and how the Bhartiya Gyan Parampara and Learning Outcomes based Curriculum Framework (LOCF) are an opportunity for the university community to align the existing curriculum. Prof. Kartik Dave, Dean Planning and School of Management, set up the stage for the workshop discussion highlighting the need for implementing Outcome Based Learning in his address. Prof Dave emphasised how at AUD, the exercise of reviewing the existing curriculum from the LOCF perspective was initiated in 2019. A set of workshops were conducted for School Deans and Programme Coordinators to familiarise them and deliberate on the idea of learning outcomes and how to frame programme and course learning outcomes meaningfully in context of social sciences and humanities. He signposted the critical need of engaging with Bloom's Taxonomy to align assessments with POs and COs and create a learning loop where we comprehensively understand student attainment from a holistic perspective.

Hon'ble Vice Chancellor Prof. Anu Singh Lathers' presidential address highlighted that instead of just focusing on content and what is taught, the learning outcomes approach requires thinking about how HEIs can equip students with knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, leadership readiness/qualities and prepare them for 21st century skills and values. Prof. Lather referred to the experience of leading international universities and their best academic practices to highlight how academics must evaluate their existing courses and quality of content from the perspective of their societal relevance in contemporary times. She observed that central to this approach is the envisioning of graduate attributes of any academic programme; what is it that a graduating student demonstrates as having achieved-content, skills, competencies and values, on completion of their academic degree. The fundamental premise of LOCF is, thus, to specify demonstrable learning achievements/outcomes on completion of a programme of study for greater transparency and accountability to diverse stakeholders including the employers. Prof Lather emphasized that quality is a continuous process and encouraged faculty members to view the LOCF based programme revisions aligned with the relevance for local context as well as international parity. The inaugural session concluded with a formal vote of thanks by Prof. Arun Kumar, Dean School of Education Studies.

The other sessions of the programme saw experts from University of Delhi, Delhi Technological University, and Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University Delhi discussing the theoretical underpinnings of LOCF. The first technical session focused on ways of mapping programme outcomes (PO) and course outcomes (CO) and its significance for learner centric practices and constructive

assessment perspective that is critical to the process of mapping POs and COs meaningfully. Prof Jyoti Sharma, University of Delhi, discussed constructivism, a learning theory perspective, that informs the theoretical basis of the outcomes based approach to assessment and curriculum. Her session titled, "Aligning Course Content, Pedagogy and Assessment: A Constructivist Assessment Perspective", drew upon examples from curriculum revision initiatives in the University of Delhi. She emphasised the significance of stakeholder consultation for need assessment towards arriving at graduate attributes and for inclusion of content and specific skills acquisition as part of curriculum. Dr Sharma shared how such a consultation exercise enabled inclusion of relevant internships, modification of content, conceptualisation of course specific projects as well as stand alone projects in the curriculum structure. She highlighted that since real world knowledge application is seldom compartmentalised, there is a need to actively engage students in multidisciplinary contexts, and making disciplines converse through meaningful and relevant academic programme design. Adopting the outcome based approach to curriculum planning requires deliberation on multidisciplinary, interdisciplinarity and possible learning trajectories for students. Curriculum, teaching and assessment, therefore, are to be thought through in an integrated manner within the outcome based approach. Dr Sharma highlighted that within the IOCF framework, it is critical to recognise and integrate in HE practice: a. Assessment of Learning (dominant tradition in higher education), b. Assessment for Learning, c. Assessment as Learning. Focus on Assessment for Learning and Assessment as Learning require faculty to recognise students as partners in the learning process. Outcomes based approach signifies the need to recognise that assessment is not just to sort, rank and categorise students, but focus on how feedback can be used to improve learning, and create opportunities for students to reflect, self regulate and make progress. From this lens, summative / high stakes assessments need to be complemented substantially with formative learning strategies. Panel discussions, viva voce, open book tests, poster presentations, seminar/symposium can become integral part of learning and assessment design enabling teachers and students to focus on skills that are not narrowly focused on memory and recall. Dr Sharma discussed assessment rubrics based on Bloom's Taxonomy that can help faculty and students to think about student achievement in a graded manner focusing on levels of performance/achievement, instead of just a score. She concluded her session by encouraging faculty members to realign their course design and assessment practices, connecting university vision and mission with student competencies and focus on ways of achieving graduate attributes.

Second technical session by Dr. Sunita Singh, Associate Professor and Former Dean, School of Education Studies at Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University Delhi, focused on “Mapping POs, COs and their Relevance for Learner Centered Practices”. Dr Singh problematised the idea of curriculum as being simply discipline or content centric, wherein faculty designed the course only from the point of view of faculty or disciplinary concerns. There is a need to focus on a broader set of knowledge and skills in the 21st century context of learning and work and academic programmes are increasingly expected to find a way to integrate the 21st century skills such as critical thinking, problem solving, communication, digital literacy, etc. within the course design. This requires curriculum planning and conceptualisation of programme outcomes (of Bachelors, Postgraduate programmes for instance) and graduate attributes are to be developed in active consultation with a wider set of stakeholders, including future employers. Dr. Singh discussed how programme specific outcomes on the other hand are specific to a particular domain/ disciplinary area and should highlight and accurately reflect what graduates of this particular discipline/area should be able to do or demonstrate competencies in. Curriculum design and course outcomes should specify how it contributes to the programme specific outcomes. As faculty members frame the learning outcomes, it is important to check, “Is the outcome measurable?; Is the outcome appropriate?; Is the outcome specific?”. Dr. Singh observed that course objectives, learning activities and assessments are based on how teachers respond to these questions in the context of their courses. Dr. Singh emphasized that the larger objective of undertaking this OBE approach is to understand students’ potential and ability with a growth mindset, as discussed in Carol Dweck’s work. Even as course outcomes are framed using active verbs, describing what the students are expected to demonstrate on completion of the learning module, the teachers focus is not limited to one time achievement but ways in which learning dispositions can be strengthened. She discussed ‘backward course design’ based on alignment between learning activities and assessment, chosen course level outcomes and unit level objectives. Mapping of course outcomes is at the heart of learner centric practices, where thinking through specific learning from courses helps engender a more transparent and meaningfully scaffolded plan of learning for students. Clearly defined course learning outcomes, can help make for vertical cohesion and integrated curriculum, offering clear linkages graduate attributes as well as programme specific outcomes. Dr Singh asked faculty members to think through ways we can ensure students graduate not just with content knowledge but with the ability to share ideas, work in groups, and experience holistic learning. Dr. Singh shared the experience of discussion of LOCF in the School of Education Studies at AUD, which began with faculty identifying and articulating three aspects: *Knowing* (what students should know); *Doing*

(what students should be able to do); and *Being* (who the students become) on the completion of the programme. She reiterated that this approach to LOCF integration could do justice to the practice of interdisciplinary and innovative academic programmes conceptualised at our University.

The afternoon session was chaired by Prof Lawrence Liang, Dean School of Legal and Socio Political Studies and Chair, National Credit Framework Committee at AUD. Prof. Liang situated the macro policy context of academic reforms in the context of NEP and its recommendations for reforming assessment practices in higher education. The first presentation in the session by Dr. Jyotirmoy Bhattacharya, Dean AES, AUD focused on how reforming assessments is central to quality enhancement of the academic experience of learners. While the policy guidelines may run the risk of imposing the faulty construct of “one size fits all”, as an academic community we need to actively explore what is of relevance to pedagogic practices and approach at AUD. The challenge is to balance between the focus on quantifiable outcomes and the intangible qualitative processes that do not render themselves into neat quantifiable metrics. The project of rethinking assessment practices then is to also conceptualise how to adapt the outcomes framework to our practices in the context of a social science, humanities and liberal arts focused university. What unfolds in a classroom is not simply a function of curriculum blueprint but also of the students that inhabit it, the imagination of discipline/content, and new imaginaries of learning. If the curriculum is to be imagined creatively / innovatively it cannot happen in the absence of creativity and innovation in assessment. The current moment of academic reforms ought to be taken in this spirit where the NEP emphasizes significance of formative learning and internal assessments which echoes closely with the vision of assessment and learning at AUD. Dr Jyotirmoy at the same time highlighted the importance of creating transparency and accountability and making the system work. While rigour in course framing is achieved through a robust process of peer review, accountability in student learning is mapped through student attendance and performance on assessments. NEP also signifies scientific, criterion based evaluation, and there needs to be a discussion within faculty about core principles and the criterion for evaluation. Dr Jyotirmoy brought attention to the larger concern with how to now reduce HE learning to mere instrumental ends and purposes, and simultaneously critically reflect on and revisit traditions of disciplinary knowledge that have shaped canons of learning. Such an exercise, will require faculty collectives to ask “how is this going to enrich our students”, what is relevant, what is obsolete, what are the new ideas/practices that do not find space in existing designs, and how do we curate the curriculum, teaching and assessments in a way that higher

order skills can be cultivated. The session concluded with the discussion on emerging challenges with use of AI, plagiarism which lead to frequent calls for external and independent evaluation of student learning, and NEP has created an opportune moment to revisit our academic programmes and learning designs to deliberate on impact of AI in the new forms and schemes of learning.

The final session of the workshop focused on the ways in which faculty can measure and quantify learning outcomes. Prof Shilpa Pal, Director IQAC at the Delhi Technological University (DTU) shared a detailed presentation on practices adopted at DTU for concretely mapping COs to PSOs and POs. The overall focus of her presentation was on outcomes based education in response to challenges in 21st century education, preparation of life-long learners, and how to measure achieved targets. Prof. Pal shared a model hierarchy of outcomes—related to vision and mission of Institution, programme educational outcomes, programme outcomes, and course outcomes, making a distinction between long term and short term outcomes. The long term outcomes she emphasized are captured in the graduate attributes and cannot be immediately assessed whereas we can attempt to evaluate achievement of short term goals. There is a continuum from outcomes to assessment which all the other sessions had also highlighted which is guided by the spirit of learning continuously from feedback and being improvement focused. Prof Pal shared detailed guidelines on how to frame vision and mission statements, their purpose and process of writing such statements, drawing on concrete examples from AUD's own published statements on the website. She then discussed with examples specific characteristics of programme educational objectives- which are aligned to mission, address stakeholders' needs, are achievable/manageable, assessable, programme specific etc. and discussed how to frame course outcomes aligned with Bloom's taxonomy. She shared examples of how to concretely map and assess how many of the course outcomes align with POs and ways to measure achievement of target COs and POs through direct assessment and indirect assessment through various forms of feedback such as faculty feedback, course feedback, exit survey etc.

The workshop concluded with a question and answer session and vote of thanks by the Director, IQAC.


Director
Internal Quality Assurance Cell
(IQAC)
Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University Delhi

Annexure A

Programme Schedule

Session	Timing	Detailed Plan
Session 1 Inaugural session	10:00 am-11:15 am	10:00 am: Inviting the dignitaries on the Dias 10:05 am: Lighting of lamp 10:10 am: Felicitation of the dignitaries 10:15 am: Welcome address: Director IQAC 10:20 am: Opening Remarks by Dean Academic Affairs, Prof. Satyaketu Sankrit 10.25 am: Introduction to the workshop: Prof. Kartik Dave, Dean Planning 10:30 am: Presidential Remarks: Prof. Anu Singh Lather, Hon'ble Vice Chancellor, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University Delhi. 11:00 am: Vote of thanks- Prof. Arun Kumar, Dean SES <i>Coordinator of the Inaugural Session: Dr Aakriti Grover</i> <u>Tea Break</u>



Director
Internal Quality Assurance Cell
(IQAC)
Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University Delhi

Session 2	11:15 am - 1:30 pm	NEP-2020 and the Significance of LOCF Chair: Prof Kartik Dave 11:15 am: Aligning Course Content, Pedagogy and Assessment: A Constructivist Assessment Perspective: Prof Jyoti Sharma, DU 11:55 am: Mapping POs, COs and their Relevance for Learner Centered Practices: Dr Sunita Singh, former Dean SES 12:35 pm: Q&A session <i>Coordinator of the Session: Dr Pratima, Associate Director IQAC</i> <u>Lunch Break</u>
Session 3	2:30 pm - 3:40 pm	Assessment Practices in Higher Education Chair: Prof Lawrence Liang, Dean, School of Legal and Socio Political Studies 2:30 - 3 pm: NEP-2020 and Assessment Practices at Higher Education: Dr. Jyotirmoy Dean, AES 3 - 3:30 pm: POs and COs Mapping in Curriculum Design with focus on Quality Enhancement: Prof. Shilpa Pal, DTU 3:30 pm: Q&A session 3:40 pm: Vote of thanks: Dr. Rishabh Kumar Mishra <i>Coordinator of the Concluding Session: Dr. Manasi Thapliyal Navani, Associate Director, IQAC</i>