

	Assurance of Learning Policy V1 June 2023
Document Type	Policy and Procedures
Administering Entity	AoL Committee, IIM Bodh Gaya

1. Purpose

This Assurance of Learning (AoL) Policy establishes a systematic, transparent, and continuous process for defining, measuring, evaluating, and improving student learning outcomes across programmes at the Indian Institute of Management (IIM). The policy ensures educational quality, aligns curricula with stated programme goals and stakeholder expectations, and supports accreditation, accountability, and evidence-based curricular improvement.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all academic programmes offered by the Institute (MBA, MBA-DBM, MBA-HHM, IPM (BBA), PhD) and covers:

- Programme-level Learning Goals and Learning Outcomes
- Course-level Learning Outcomes
- Assessment design and mapping
- Data collection, analysis, reporting, and use for improvement
- Roles and responsibilities of faculty, programme committees, AoL committee, and administration

3. Definitions

- Learning Goal: A broad statement describing what graduates of a programme should know, be able to do, or value in alignment the mission statement.
- Learning Outcome (LO): A specific, measurable statement of knowledge, skills, attitudes, or behaviours students should demonstrate.
- Direct Assessment: Evidence of student learning produced by the student (exams, assignments, capstones, projects, portfolios).
- Indirect Assessment: Perceptions or reflections about learning (surveys, alumni feedback, employer feedback).
- Benchmark: Pre-defined performance standards used to judge whether students have achieved the LO.



A.P.

Shashi Shankar Sharma

M. Mohan

Amal

Ap

- Closing the Loop: Using assessment results to design and implement improvements and then re-assessing for effectiveness.

4. Principles

1. Student-centred: Focus on demonstrable student learning.
2. Evidence-based: Use multiple measures (direct and indirect) and appropriate benchmarks.
3. Transparent: Publish programme learning goals/outcomes and AoL processes.
4. Continuous improvement: Regularly use assessment results to inform curricular, pedagogical, and assessment changes.
5. Inclusive and fair: Assessment methods should be accessible, unbiased, and culturally sensitive.
6. Proportionate and feasible: Align assessment effort with programme scale and resources.

5. Learning Goals and Learning Outcomes

5.1 Programme Learning Goals

- Each programme shall define 4–8 broad Programme Learning Goals (PLGs) describing graduate attributes (e.g., Mindfulness, Business Leadership, Social Responsibility, global perspective).

5.2 Programme Learning Outcomes

- Each PLG shall be translated into 6–12 specific, measurable Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs).
- PLOs must be written using clear action verbs (e.g., analyse, synthesise, design, evaluate).
- PLOs shall be publicly available in programme handbooks and on the Institute website.

5.3 Course Learning Outcomes

- Each course shall define 3–8 Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) aligned to one or more PLOs.
- CLOs shall be included in course syllabi and communicated at first class.

6. Curriculum Mapping

- Every course must be mapped to relevant PLOs indicating whether the course introduces, develops, or masters the PLO (Intro/Develop/Master).

- The curriculum map will be maintained centrally and reviewed annually by the Programme Committee and AoL Committee.



Amr

Shashi Shankar Singh

S

M. Mohan

Apurva

7. Assessment Strategy

7.1 Assessment Types

- Use a mix of direct and indirect assessment methods.
- Preferred direct assessments: examinations, case analyses, individual and group projects, capstone projects, internships assessments, oral defenses, portfolios.
- Indirect assessments: course evaluations, graduate exit surveys, alumni surveys, employer surveys, focus groups.

7.2 Direct Assessment Plan

- Each PLO must have at least one direct assessment measure each academic year; ideally multiple measures across years.
- For programmes with cohorts, rotate in-depth assessments so each PLO receives intensive direct assessment at least once every 2–3 years.

7.3 Rubrics and Standards

- Use clear analytic or holistic rubrics for performance-based assessments. Rubrics must specify criteria and performance levels.
- Benchmarks (performance targets) must be set for each assessment measure (e.g., 70% of students will score $\geq 3/4$ on rubric dimension X).
- Benchmarks must be realistic, challenging, and approved by the Programme Committee.

7.4 Reliability and Validity

- Assessment tasks and rubrics should be reviewed periodically to ensure alignment, reliability, and validity.
- Where possible, use multiple raters, inter-rater calibration, anonymised scoring, and moderation for subjective assessments.

8. Data Collection, Management & Security

8.1 Data Collection

- Assessment data (scores, rubric ratings, survey results) will be collected centrally in a secure AoL database managed by the Institute's academic office.

Faculty will submit assessment artefacts and rubric ratings per the schedule defined by the AoL Committee.

8.2 Data Quality

- Faculty must record contextual information for each data point (course name, cohort, instructor, assessment instrument, date).



Shakti Shankar Singh

Y. Dehman
A. K. Singh

- The AoL office will check for completeness, obvious errors, and missing metadata and request clarifications as needed.

8.3 Data Privacy and Security

- Student-level data will be stored securely and accessed only by authorised personnel.
- When reporting, data will be aggregated and anonymised to protect confidentiality.

9. Analysis, Reporting & Use

9.1 Analysis

- The AoL Committee, supported by the academic office, will analyse assessment results against benchmarks and trends.
- Analysis includes distribution of scores, meeting of benchmarks, cohort comparisons, and cross-year trends.

9.2 Reporting

- Each programme must prepare an Annual AoL Report that includes:
 - Summary of PLOs assessed that year and measures used
 - Results vs. benchmarks (with tables/visuals)
 - Interpretation of results and identified gaps
 - Improvement actions planned or implemented (closing-the-loop)
 - Timeline and responsibility for actions
- The AoL Committee will prepare an Institute-level summary for Academic Council and accreditation uses.

9.3 Use of Results

- Results must directly inform curricular changes, pedagogical strategies, assessment design, faculty development, and resourcing decisions.
- Programmes must document actions taken and monitor their effectiveness in subsequent assessment cycles.

10. Closing the Loop (Continuous Improvement)

10.1 Action Plan

For any PLO where benchmark is not met, the Programme Committee must develop a corrective action plan addressing root causes and specifying responsible persons and timelines.



Amr

Shashi Jha-Kar Amr

SP

M. Ullman

Amr



भारतीय प्रबंध संस्थान बोधगया Indian Institute of Management Bodh Gaya

10.2 Implementation & Follow-up

- Implementation of actions should occur within an agreed timeline (typically before the next offering of relevant courses).
- Follow-up assessment must include measures to evaluate the impact of changes.



A.12

Shashi Shekhar Sharma

S

M. J. Dehman

dl

Spurho