Chhahari, A Multidisciplinary Peer-reviewed Research Journal, Vol. 3, No. 1: 2026
TUTA, Butwal Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Constructive Alignment in Higher Education: Curriculum Design, Assessment and Inclusive Practices in Nepal

Anju Kumari Chaudhary
anju14dhary@gmail.com

Abstract

Constructive alignment, a pedagogical concept proposed by John Biggs, has emerged as a foundational framework for improving teaching, learning, and assessment in higher education. Rooted in constructivist learning theory, it emphasizes the alignment of learning outcomes, instructional strategies, and assessment tasks to promote deep learning. This article examines the relevance and application of constructive alignment within the context of Nepalese higher education, with special reference to Tribhuvan University (TU). It highlights how curriculum design, formative and summative assessment, and inclusive practices can be restructured to foster learner-centered education, enhance employability, and ensure equity. Using a qualitative review of literature, educational policies, and institutional practices, the paper identifies gaps between theoretical principles and actual implementation in Nepal. It argues that integrating constructive alignment into TU's curriculum and assessment systems can help overcome traditional rote learning tendencies, improve feedback culture, and advance the goals of inclusive, outcome-oriented higher education in Nepal.

Keywords: Constructive alignment, curriculum design, higher education, Tribhuvan University, formative assessment, inclusive learning, Nepal

Introduction

Higher education across the world is undergoing a paradigm shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered approaches. Constructive alignment, first articulated by John Biggs (1996, 1999), provides a systematic framework for designing curricula that integrate teaching, learning, and assessment in a coherent manner. The fundamental idea is that teaching methods and assessment tasks must align with clearly defined intended learning outcomes (ILOs), allowing students to construct meaning through active engagement rather than passive reception of information.

In the Nepalese context, this framework holds particular importance. Tribhuvan University (TU), the oldest and largest university in Nepal, enrolls more than 80 percent of the nation's higher education students. However, TU's curriculum and assessment systems have long been criticized for being examination-driven, content-heavy, and insufficiently aligned with intended learning outcomes (UGC, 2020). The traditional lecture-based pedagogy often prioritizes memorization over critical thinking, creativity, and application. In such a

setting, constructive alignment offers a means to bridge the gap between policy-level aspirations for quality education and classroom-level realities.

The principle of constructive alignment is rooted in constructivist epistemology, which posits that learners construct knowledge through experience and reflection (Piaget, 1972; Vygotsky, 1978). It also resonates with Nepal's educational reforms, such as the National Education Policy (2019) and Higher Education Policy (2021), which emphasize student-centered learning, inclusion, and competency-based assessment. TU's recent curriculum reform initiatives, particularly in the Faculty of Education and Management, reflect a gradual move toward outcomes-based frameworks. Yet, gaps persist in practical implementation, assessment design, and feedback systems.

This article therefore explores how constructive alignment can serve as a guiding framework for redesigning curriculum and assessment practices in Nepal's higher education institutions, particularly within TU. It also analyzes how inclusive education principles—addressing linguistic, cultural, gender, and disability-related diversity—can be embedded within this framework to achieve equity and lifelong learning goals.

Objectives

This study aims to analyze the role of constructive alignment in enhancing curriculum design, assessment, and inclusive practices in Nepalese higher education. The specific objectives are:

1. To examine the use of constructive alignment in Nepalese higher education, particularly at Tribhuvan University.
2. To identify challenges and suggest improvements for inclusive curriculum, teaching, and assessment alignment.

Statement of the Problem

Despite policy-level commitments to quality and inclusion, Nepal's higher education still faces persistent challenges in aligning curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment. Most programs at TU and other universities remain dominated by summative examinations that assess recall rather than higher-order thinking skills. Intended learning outcomes are either vaguely stated or not operationalized in teaching and evaluation.

Furthermore, many teachers lack professional development opportunities to design aligned assessments or implement formative feedback mechanisms. This misalignment results in surface learning, where students aim to pass examinations rather than engage deeply with concepts. The disconnect between academic learning and employability skills further widens the gap between university education and the labor market.

Inclusive education presents additional challenges. While national policies emphasize equity and access for students from diverse linguistic, ethnic, and disability backgrounds, assessment practices often fail to accommodate diverse learning needs. For example, students with visual impairments or from non-Nepali-speaking regions face barriers due to standardized assessment systems and limited assistive technologies.

Thus, the central problem addressed in this study is the lack of effective constructive alignment among curriculum design, assessment strategies, and inclusive pedagogical practices in Nepal's higher education system—particularly within Tribhuvan University. Without such alignment, the goals of quality, equity, and lifelong learning remain unattained.

Literature Review

Conceptual Foundations of Constructive Alignment

The concept of constructive alignment (CA) is derived from the constructivist theory of learning, which argues that learners actively build knowledge based on experiences, prior understanding, and interaction with their environment (Piaget, 1972; Vygotsky, 1978). In this paradigm, learning is viewed not as the passive transmission of information from teacher to student, but as an active, self-regulated process of constructing meaning.

John Biggs (1996, 1999, 2003) transformed this constructivist philosophy into a practical model for curriculum design in higher education. According to him, effective learning happens when all components of the teaching system—intended learning outcomes (ILOs), teaching and learning activities (TLAs), and assessment tasks (ATs)—are intentionally aligned. Constructive alignment thus combines two core ideas:

1. Constructivism: Students construct their own knowledge through relevant learning activities.
2. Alignment: Teachers design learning and assessment methods that are aligned with the ILOs.

This model emphasizes that what students learn depends largely on how they are assessed. Therefore, assessment should directly reflect and measure the competencies outlined in the learning outcomes. When ILOs, TLAs, and ATs are aligned, students are encouraged to engage in deep learning—seeking meaning, applying knowledge, and developing critical thinking—rather than surface learning, which focuses merely on memorization (Biggs & Tang, 2011).

Biggs' framework also implies that curriculum design is an ethical and professional act: educators must ensure that teaching and assessment genuinely promote the intended outcomes. This requires clear communication of learning goals, diverse assessment methods, and feedback mechanisms that empower students to monitor their progress.

Constructive Alignment in Curriculum Design

Constructive alignment reshapes curriculum design by emphasizing outcomes over content coverage. Traditional curricula, especially in developing countries, often prioritize extensive subject matter without clarifying what students should be able to *do* with that knowledge. Biggs (2003) argues that curriculum design should begin with specifying Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs), categorized according to cognitive complexity, such as the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001).

After defining ILOs, teachers must plan learning activities that allow students to achieve them such as case studies, problem-based learning, seminars, and projects. Assessments then serve as mechanisms for validating whether the outcomes have been achieved. The entire process ensures that curriculum design is *learner-centered*, *transparent*, and *accountable*.

Ramsden (2003) supports this approach, noting that constructive alignment promotes coherence between what is taught, how it is taught, and how learning is assessed. Similarly, Cohen (2018) emphasizes that aligned curricula enhance academic integrity and institutional quality by linking classroom instruction with program and institutional objectives.

In the Nepalese context, curriculum design in higher education has historically been centralized and content-heavy. The Tribhuvan University Curriculum Development Centre (CDC, 2022) still largely follows subject-based models inherited from traditional pedagogy. However, recent reforms have sought to introduce Outcome-Based Education (OBE) and Competency-Based Curriculum (CBC), which resonate with Biggs' constructive alignment principles. The University Grants Commission (UGC, 2020) has encouraged universities to integrate learning outcomes into course structures and adopt more participatory, student-centered methods.

Despite these policy reforms, many curricula in Nepal remain misaligned—where ILOs are vaguely stated, teaching remains lecture-dominated, and assessments still rely on terminal examinations. This demonstrates the gap between theoretical ideals and practical realities, making constructive alignment an urgent reform agenda for institutions like TU.

Constructive Alignment and Assessment

Assessment is the cornerstone of constructive alignment. It determines how and what students learn. Biggs (1999) argued that assessment must directly measure how well students have achieved the ILOs, not just their ability to recall information.

Two major forms of assessment support alignment:

- Formative Assessment (Assessment for Learning): Provides feedback during the learning process, helping students and teachers adjust strategies.
- Summative Assessment (Assessment of Learning): Evaluates achievement at the end of a course or program.

Sadler (1989) emphasizes that formative feedback helps students close the gap between their current performance and the desired standard. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) identify feedback as a dialogic process—students must interpret, internalize, and act upon it to improve their learning.

In the context of constructive alignment, assessment tasks are not isolated tests but integral learning activities. Dunn (2002) and Wee (2004) stress that innovative assessment methods—like portfolios, case analyses, presentations, and peer evaluations—encourage reflective and applied learning.

In Nepal, however, assessments remain predominantly exam-oriented. The Tribhuvan University Examination Reform Report (TU, 2019) noted that over 80% of university programs rely on final examinations as the primary measure of achievement. Continuous and formative assessments are underutilized, and feedback mechanisms are minimal.

Some faculties, such as the Faculty of Education (FoE), have piloted Continuous Assessment Systems (CAS), which integrate quizzes, assignments, and class participation. Early evaluations (Adhikari & Subedi, 2021) suggest improved student engagement and reduced exam anxiety, but challenges persist due to large class sizes, limited faculty training, and logistical constraints.

Thus, Nepal's higher education institutions are at a transitional phase: moving from assessment of learning to assessment for learning, yet struggling to institutionalize the necessary teacher competencies and administrative support.

Constructive Alignment and Feedback Culture

Feedback connects assessment with learning. A well-aligned system ensures that students receive timely, specific, and actionable feedback that guides their progress. Butler and Winne (1995) describe feedback as an essential element in self-regulated learning—it helps students monitor and control their cognitive processes.

Nicol (2004) extended this model by developing the "Seven Principles of Good Feedback Practice," which include clarifying expectations, encouraging dialogue, and facilitating self-assessment. Biggs (2003) similarly argued that alignment is incomplete without

feedback loops, as they enable students to reconstruct their understanding and teachers to adjust their methods.

In Nepal, feedback practices are still limited. TU's traditional examination structure offers only numerical grades, providing little insight into students' learning gaps. As a result, students rarely understand *why* they performed poorly or *how* to improve. Studies (Paudel & Pant, 2022) highlight that most teachers provide feedback verbally or informally, and institutional policies rarely require systematic feedback documentation.

Incorporating digital learning management systems (LMS) such as Moodle and Google Classroom, introduced during the COVID-19 pandemic, has improved feedback opportunities. Online quizzes, rubrics, and peer review tools can make feedback more immediate and transparent, aligning well with Biggs' model of continuous learning improvement.

Constructive Alignment and Inclusive Education

Constructive alignment and inclusive education share common philosophical ground. Both emphasize student diversity and the need to design learning experiences that accommodate different abilities, backgrounds, and learning styles.

Globally, frameworks such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Inclusive Pedagogy have influenced higher education practices. UDL advocates designing curriculum components—content, activities, and assessments—that are accessible to all learners from the outset (Rose & Meyer, 2002).

In Nepal, inclusion is embedded in the Inclusive Education Policy (2017) and the Education Act (2020 Amendment). However, implementation in higher education remains limited. Sharma (2020) and Koirala (2021) observe that universities often interpret inclusion narrowly as access for marginalized groups rather than as systemic pedagogical reform.

Constructive alignment provides a bridge between inclusion and pedagogy. It ensures that intended learning outcomes recognize diverse learner needs, teaching methods include multimodal strategies, and assessment tasks offer multiple means of expression (e.g., oral presentations, visual projects, written reports).

For instance, a visually impaired student in TU's B.Ed. program can demonstrate mastery through an oral presentation or digital recording instead of a written test—if such flexibility is designed in the curriculum. However, rigid assessment systems often deny this

opportunity. Aligning inclusive practices with curriculum design and evaluation is thus crucial for achieving equity and quality in higher education.

Assistive technologies also play a growing role. Studies (Ali, Hamid, & Hossein, 2008) show that e-accessibility tools such as screen readers, voice recognition software, and digital Braille can significantly enhance participation for students with disabilities. TU and Kathmandu University have initiated limited e-learning initiatives, but infrastructural and financial barriers remain.

Incorporating these technologies within the framework of constructive alignment ensures that inclusivity is not treated as an add-on, but as an integral part of curriculum design, teaching, and assessment.

Constructive Alignment and Quality Assurance

Constructive alignment is also closely tied to quality assurance (QA). In fact, the University Grants Commission (UGC) Nepal includes alignment of ILOs, assessment, and feedback as a key criterion in its Quality Assurance and Accreditation (QAA) framework (UGC, 2020).

According to the QAA manual, programs must demonstrate that learning outcomes are measurable, that assessment tools correspond to these outcomes, and that results are used for continuous improvement. Universities that successfully adopt constructive alignment tend to perform better in accreditation evaluations.

Tribhuvan University, which has several accredited constituent campuses such as Padma Kanya Multiple Campus and Patan Multiple Campus, has begun aligning its program review processes with these standards. The Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) now requires each department to specify course-level learning outcomes and match them with assessment tools.

However, as Pokharel (2022) notes, the implementation remains procedural rather than transformative. Many institutions prepare alignment matrices for documentation rather than genuine pedagogical reform. Teachers often see QAA requirements as administrative burdens rather than opportunities for reflective practice.

Embedding constructive alignment authentically into QA frameworks can therefore help bridge the gap between compliance and quality enhancement—turning accreditation from a formality into a developmental process.

Constructive Alignment in the Digital Era

The rapid expansion of digital technologies has reshaped the landscape of higher education. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated online learning adoption, forcing universities, including TU, to rethink pedagogy and assessment. Constructive alignment offers a guiding principle for designing technology-enhanced learning (TEL) environments.

Laurillard (2012) argues that digital tools can support constructivist learning by allowing interactive, reflective, and collaborative activities. However, technology itself does not guarantee alignment; teachers must purposefully integrate online tools with learning outcomes and assessment methods.

In TU and other Nepali universities, online platforms like Moodle, Zoom, and Microsoft Teams have been adopted, but their pedagogical use varies. Some faculties use them for content delivery only, while others incorporate online quizzes, discussion forums, and digital assignments aligned with specific ILOs. Research (Bista, 2021) found that when teachers linked online activities to course outcomes, student engagement and retention improved significantly.

Digital learning also enhances inclusion, especially for students from remote areas or with mobility challenges. Yet, the digital divide limited internet access and device availability continues to hinder equitable participation. Hence, digital alignment must include considerations of accessibility, adaptability, and affordability.

Constructive Alignment and Employability

A crucial dimension of higher education reform in Nepal is employability. Employers often complain that graduates lack practical skills, communication competence, and critical thinking abilities. Constructive alignment directly addresses this issue by ensuring that intended learning outcomes include transferable competencies relevant to the labor market. Yorke (2006) and Knight (2001) emphasize that employability-oriented curricula must integrate experiential learning such as internships, community projects, and problem-solving tasks aligned with both disciplinary and professional outcomes.

In Nepal, the Higher Education Policy (2021) explicitly calls for aligning university programs with market needs. However, most programs at TU and its affiliates remain theoretical. Constructive alignment can help bridge this gap by making employability a deliberate learning outcome and aligning assessments (e.g., capstone projects, case studies) to evaluate practical application.

The Faculty of Management (FoM) at TU has begun integrating soft skill training and entrepreneurship projects into the Bachelor of Business Studies (BBS) curriculum—an encouraging step toward outcome-based alignment. Similar approaches in education,

health, and technology faculties could enhance graduate readiness for Nepal's evolving labor market.

Synthesis of Literature

The reviewed literature collectively indicates that constructive alignment provides a coherent framework for linking curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment. It supports deeper learning, inclusivity, and employability while enhancing institutional accountability.

Globally, its success depends on institutional leadership, teacher competence, and continuous professional development (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Nicol, 2004). In Nepal, constructive alignment aligns well with national policies emphasizing quality, inclusion, and relevance, yet its implementation remains limited due to traditional mindsets, limited infrastructure, and weak monitoring mechanisms.

Tribhuvan University's gradual shift toward outcome-based frameworks represents an opportunity to institutionalize alignment principles across programs. For this, a robust feedback culture, teacher training, digital integration, and inclusive assessment reform are essential.

Constructive alignment is not merely a technical framework—it is a transformative educational philosophy that can help Nepalese higher education transition from rote learning to reflective, inclusive, and globally competitive systems.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research approach, specifically a documentary and literature-based analysis, to examine how constructive alignment can strengthen curriculum design, assessment, and inclusive practices in Nepalese higher education, with a focus on Tribhuvan University (TU). The method emphasizes interpretation and synthesis of secondary sources rather than primary data collection, which suits the paper's conceptual and policy-oriented nature.

Research Design

The design is descriptive-analytical. It involves a systematic review of global and national literature on constructive alignment, constructivist pedagogy, assessment reforms, and inclusion policies. The study analyzes how these concepts have been theorized and operationalized internationally and how they correspond—or fail to correspond—to Nepal's higher-education practices.

Data Sources

Data were drawn from:

- Scholarly literature: peer-reviewed journals, books by Biggs and Tang, Ramsden, Nicol, and others.
- National policy documents: *National Education Policy 2019*, *Higher Education Policy 2021*, *Inclusive Education Policy 2017*, *Education Act (Amendment) 2020*, and *UGC Quality Assurance and Accreditation (QAA) Guidelines 2020*.
- Institutional reports: TU Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) guidelines, TU Examination Reform Committee reports (2019), and UGC evaluation documents.
- Digital sources: reputable online repositories, databases (ERIC, Google Scholar), and Nepal-based academic publications.

Data Analysis

Texts were reviewed thematically using a three-step process:

1. Coding: identification of recurring themes—constructive alignment, curriculum design, assessment, feedback, inclusion, and quality assurance.
2. Categorization: grouping themes under conceptual, institutional, and policy perspectives.
3. Interpretation: relating international theories to Nepalese realities, highlighting gaps, challenges, and potential reforms.

The findings were triangulated through cross-reference of multiple sources to ensure credibility. The study relies on qualitative content analysis, emphasizing interpretive depth rather than statistical generalization.

Ethical Considerations

Since the research is based on secondary data, no direct ethical risks were involved. However, due acknowledgment of all sources was maintained following APA 7th edition citation standards. The study upholds academic integrity by accurately representing others' work and avoiding misinterpretation.

Discussion and Analysis

Application of Constructive Alignment in Nepalese Curriculum Design

Nepal's higher-education system historically emphasizes knowledge transmission rather than knowledge construction. TU curricula are centrally developed and revised infrequently, leaving limited flexibility for teachers to adapt to local learning contexts. Constructive alignment demands a paradigm shift from content-based syllabi to outcome-oriented frameworks.

In the current TU model, courses often specify broad objectives such as "to understand educational theories" or "to apply management principles." These statements are vague

and not measurable. Constructive alignment requires precise Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) for instance, "Students will be able to design learner-centered lesson plans using constructivist strategies" or "Students will evaluate case studies using appropriate management models." Such clarity enables both teachers and students to recognize the competencies expected.

International models provide direction. For instance, the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and European Higher Education Area (EHEA) require that each program align learning outcomes with national qualification descriptors. If TU were to adopt a similar model, curriculum committees would define program-level outcomes first, then map them to course-level outcomes and assessments. This mapping ensures vertical and horizontal consistency within and across faculties.

A pilot project under TU's Faculty of Education (2021–2023) attempted this through an Outcome-Based Curriculum (OBC) for B.Ed. programs. Early evaluations indicate improved clarity in course objectives and integration of field-based practice teaching. However, the absence of comprehensive teacher training and assessment rubrics limits the full realization of alignment.

Thus, TU needs a curriculum governance framework where departments continuously review learning outcomes, teaching strategies, and assessments based on student feedback and tracer studies. This iterative process mirrors Biggs' (2003) principle of *"alignment through reflection."*

Assessment Reform: From Summative to Formative Integration

The existing examination-dominated culture in Nepalese universities is one of the most significant barriers to constructive alignment. Students often focus on passing final exams rather than developing conceptual understanding or transferable skills.

Formative assessment, a core component of constructive alignment, helps address this issue. It allows teachers to monitor learning progress through short quizzes, reflective journals, class discussions, or group projects. More importantly, it offers feedback loops that inform both teaching and learning.

At TU, a few departments have begun integrating continuous assessment systems (CAS). For instance, the Faculty of Management (FoM) uses internal assessments weighted at 40% of total marks, including case presentations and practical projects. The Faculty of Education (FoE) applies formative evaluation in micro-teaching and practicum courses. Nevertheless, many teachers still perceive formative work as "extra load" rather than integral pedagogy.

Constructive alignment reframes assessment as *learning itself*. When students engage in aligned tasks such as designing research proposals, analyzing community issues, or producing digital projects they learn by doing. The assessment not only measures outcomes but also facilitates deeper engagement.

To institutionalize this, TU could adopt a three-tier assessment model:

1. Diagnostic assessment at the beginning of the course to identify learner readiness.
2. Formative assessment throughout the semester to support progress.
3. Summative assessment aligned with authentic, real-world tasks.

Furthermore, assessment rubrics should be standardized and transparent so that students clearly understand performance criteria. When these rubrics are shared in advance, learners can self-evaluate and aim for higher achievement a hallmark of self-regulated learning.

Feedback and Reflective Practice

Feedback is the lifeblood of alignment. Without it, learning outcomes remain abstract. Yet in Nepal, the culture of providing and receiving feedback is weak. Teachers rarely return evaluated work with written comments, and students seldom request clarification.

Constructive alignment promotes bidirectional feedback: from teacher to student and vice versa. Teachers use feedback to improve instruction; students use it to improve understanding. Biggs and Tang (2011) note that good feedback closes the gap between current and desired performance.

In the context of TU, developing a feedback culture requires structural and behavioral change. Practically, digital platforms such as Moodle, Google Classroom, and MS Teams introduced during the COVID-19 pandemic can be institutionalized for this purpose. These platforms allow online rubrics, comment banks, and reflection logs that encourage interactive learning.

Moreover, peer feedback should be promoted. Students can evaluate one another's assignments based on defined criteria, fostering critical judgment and collaboration. Such peer assessment aligns perfectly with constructivist principles and reduces teachers' workload in large classes.

Inclusivity through Constructive Alignment

Inclusion remains a major challenge in Nepalese higher education. Despite legal frameworks the *Inclusive Education Policy (2017)* and *Disability Rights Act (2017)*

practices often exclude students with disabilities, linguistic minorities, or socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

Constructive alignment can operationalize inclusivity by embedding flexible learning pathways and assessment choices. For example, the same ILO ("Demonstrate understanding of population-education issues") can be achieved through multiple activities: group discussion, written essay, or audio presentation. This flexibility respects learner diversity while maintaining academic standards.

TU has initiated some inclusive practices, such as providing extra exam time or alternative question formats for visually impaired students. However, these measures are reactive rather than systemic. A truly aligned inclusive system requires universal design for learning (UDL) principles: multiple means of representation (visual, auditory, textual), multiple means of engagement, and multiple means of expression.

Technological interventions screen readers, text-to-speech software, and online resources should be integrated into curriculum planning. Teacher education programs must also include training on inclusive pedagogy and assessment design. Constructive alignment ensures these efforts are coherent rather than fragmented.

The Role of ICT and Digital Learning

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) plays a dual role in alignment: as a delivery tool and as an assessment enabler. During the COVID-19 lockdowns, TU adopted digital platforms for remote teaching, which inadvertently introduced new possibilities for alignment.

For instance, in online courses, ILOs such as *"collaborate effectively in virtual teams"* or *"produce digital presentations"* can be directly aligned with tools like Zoom breakout rooms and Google Slides assignments. These activities serve both learning and assessment purposes.

However, digital divide issues persist. Students from rural regions face internet disruptions, limited device access, and electricity shortages. To ensure equitable digital alignment, TU must collaborate with local governments to expand e-learning infrastructure and design hybrid modes that combine online and in-person assessment.

Moreover, digital tools can enhance transparency in assessment. Automated grading, online rubrics, and feedback dashboards provide students with immediate insights into their performance. Aligning these tools with course outcomes ensures both efficiency and accountability.

Employability and Lifelong Learning

Constructive alignment also connects academia with the world of work. In Nepal, graduate unemployment remains high despite rising enrollment. One key reason is the mismatch between academic learning and job-market skills (Poudel, 2019).

When universities define learning outcomes that include professional competencies communication, teamwork, problem-solving and align assessments accordingly, employability improves. TU's new Bachelor of Education (ICT) and Bachelor of Business Management (BBM) programs integrate project work and internships as aligned assessment tools. Such experiential learning enhances both understanding and practical readiness.

Additionally, constructive alignment nurtures lifelong learning by encouraging reflection and adaptability. Students learn *how to learn*, a skill vital for continuous professional development in an evolving knowledge society.

For Nepal, where higher education must serve development needs, aligning curricula with national priorities such as digital literacy, entrepreneurship, sustainable development, and community engagement will make graduates more socially and economically relevant.

Challenges to Implementation

Despite clear theoretical advantages, several contextual challenges hinder constructive alignment in Nepal:

1. Faculty Capacity: Many teachers lack training in outcome-based curriculum design and formative assessment. Professional-development programs are sporadic.
2. Resource Limitations: Large class sizes, limited ICT infrastructure, and scarce learning materials make active learning difficult.
3. Institutional Rigidity: Centralized curriculum control leaves little room for innovation at departmental level.
4. Assessment Culture: A long-standing dependence on final exams discourages experimentation with alternative assessments.
5. Policy–Practice Gap: Although national policies mention quality and inclusion, mechanisms for monitoring alignment remain weak.

Addressing these challenges requires a comprehensive strategy involving teacher capacity-building, institutional autonomy, and integration of quality assurance processes.

Strategies for Strengthening Constructive Alignment in TU

1. Policy Integration: Embed alignment principles explicitly in TU's academic regulations and UGC accreditation criteria.
2. Capacity Development: Organize regular training on ILO formulation, rubric design, and feedback techniques for faculty members.
3. Curriculum Mapping: Require each department to maintain a course alignment matrix linking objectives, activities, and assessments.
4. Feedback Systems: Institutionalize digital feedback platforms and peer-review mechanisms.
5. Inclusive Assessment: Develop guidelines allowing alternative demonstration of learning outcomes for diverse students.
6. Monitoring and Evaluation: Establish alignment audits during program reviews to ensure sustained implementation.

These strategies collectively can transform constructive alignment from a theoretical aspiration into a lived institutional culture.

Conclusion

Constructive alignment represents both a philosophy and a practical framework for transforming Nepalese higher education. Rooted in constructivist theory, it ensures that learning outcomes, teaching methods, and assessment tasks operate in harmony to promote deep learning and inclusivity.

The analysis reveals that while Nepal particularly Tribhuvan University has taken initial steps toward alignment through outcome-based curricula and continuous assessment initiatives, substantial gaps remain. Most programs continue to emphasize summative examinations, and inclusive practices are not yet integrated systematically.

To move forward, TU and other universities must:

- Clarify and standardize learning outcomes across programs.
- Integrate formative feedback and reflective teaching into everyday practice.
- Train faculty in outcome-based design and inclusive pedagogy.
- Leverage ICT for aligned, accessible, and transparent learning environments.
- Connect academic outcomes with employability and national development goals.

Ultimately, constructive alignment offers Nepal an opportunity to reimagine higher education not as a process of information transmission but as a collaborative, inclusive,

and lifelong learning journey. Implemented authentically, it can strengthen quality assurance, equity, and global competitiveness of Nepal's universities, enabling students to become competent, reflective, and socially responsible citizens.

References

Adhikari, R., & Subedi, P. (2021). Continuous assessment practices in Nepalese higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Education and Development, 11*(2), 35–48.

Ali, L. (2018). The design of curriculum, assessment and evaluation in higher education with constructive alignment. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research, 5*(1), 72–78.

Ali, L., Hamid, J., & Hossein, J. (2008). *E-accessibility of higher education websites.* 7th European Conference on e-Learning, University of Cyprus.

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives.* Longman.

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education, 32*(3), 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871

Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university.* SRHE & Open University Press.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Bista, K. (2021). Online learning engagement during COVID-19 in Nepalese universities. *Higher Education Review Nepal, 4*(1), 55–68.

Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 65*(3), 245–281.

CDC-TU. (2022). *Curriculum design and reform guidelines.* Tribhuvan University Curriculum Development Centre.

Dunn, L. (2002). *Selecting methods of assessment: Thinking critically and making judgements.* Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Koirala, S. (2021). Inclusive higher education in Nepal: Challenges and prospects. *Nepalese Journal of Educational Studies, 6*(1), 77–92.

Laurillard, D. (2012). *Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology.* Routledge.

Nicol, D. (2004). Rethinking formative assessment in higher education: A theoretical model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 29*(2), 199–218.

Nicol, D., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 199–218.

Paudel, R., & Pant, S. (2022). Feedback practices in Tribhuvan University classrooms: A qualitative study. *Nepal Educational Review, 12*(1), 21–38.

Piaget, J. (1972). *The psychology of the child.* Basic Books.

Pokharel, R. (2022). Quality assurance and accreditation in Nepal: Implementation and challenges. *UGC Research Journal, 10*(1), 1–15.

Poudel, P. (2019). Employability of graduates from Tribhuvan University: A tracer study. *Tribhuvan University Journal, 34*(2), 65–78.

Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A. (2002). *Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal design for learning.* ASCD.

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science, 18*(2), 119–144.

Sharma, A. (2020). Inclusive policy implementation in Nepalese universities: A critical appraisal. *Journal of Inclusive Education, 3*(1), 40–56.

UGC. (2020). *Quality assurance and accreditation (QAA) manual for higher education institutions.* University Grants Commission, Nepal.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

Wee, Y. (2004). Constructive alignment of learning outcomes: A case study. *Monash University Malaysia Working Paper Series.*

Yorke, M. (2006). *Employability in higher education: What it is and what it is not.* Higher Education Academy.