**Annex 1: Pilot instrument of the UNESCO General Education Quality Analysis/Diagnosis Framework (GEQAF)**

**Analytic Tool, Curriculum**

**Paramount Question:**  **Does the curriculum we have in place enable us to impart on our learners the kinds of competencies (i.e. knowledge, skills and attitudes that are underpinned by values) we require for the type of society we envision to build and the challenges people have to face now and in the future?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Diagnostic question** | **A brief summary of responses to the diagnostic question from a Team of national education policy makers, planners, managers and experts conducting the diagnosis and analysis**  | **Priority actions and knowledge gaps identified in the process of addressing the diagnostic question** |
| **Development relevance of curricula**  |
| 1. What does the country/community want to achieve with regard to the personal development of learners and societal well-being and advancements? And how well the curriculum reflects that education vision?
 |  |  |
| 1. What are the mechanisms for making the curricula to respond to national development policies and strategies? Is there evidence that the mechanisms work effectively?
 |  | Teachers not having national development vision |
| 1. How well are the key/core/cross-cutting competencies identified in the curricula aligned to education policy goals? Is there evidence that such key competencies have been at the core of curriculum development? **[Link to Analytical Tool** **on Competencies ]**
 |  |  |
| 1. How are education stakeholders (teachers, learners, private sector, civil society) involved in developing the curriculum vision and appropriate curriculum policies? Is there evidence of their involvement having made a difference? **[Link to Analytical Tool on** **Governance]**
 |  |  |
| **Curriculum planning, design and content**  |
| 1. Is there evidence of curriculum development being effectively led and guided in accordance to the set education/curriculum vision and quality standards (i.e. Are there publicly-known and recognized curriculum institutions/agencies and leaders of curriculum processes; Are there guidelines developed for guiding the process of curriculum design, writing, piloting, implementation and revision? Are those guidelines taking into account the results of curriculum evaluation processes? Is the curriculum laid down in a set of public documents, such as curriculum frameworks; syllabuses (subject curricula); textbooks, teacher guides; assessment guides? How are stakeholders involved? (Promising practice VIII.1, Bosnia and Herzogovina)
 |  |  |
| 1. What evidence exist that curricula are grounded on up-to-date concepts of, and approaches to learning and that the learning content is well selected and organised? (i. e. Is there an emphasis on learner-centredness and comprehensive/holistic learning; Are there broad Learning Areas and subjects that cater for meaningful continuity and inter-linkages, balance and curriculum integration; appropriateness to age / stage of development; core curriculum and differentiated curricula; How are ICTs and e-learning considered for improving the quality of curricula and learning) **[Link to** Analytical Tools **on Teaching, Learning, Equity and Inclusion] (Technical note VIII.2, What makes a quality curricula?)**
 |  |  |
| 1. How well are cross-cutting & emerging issues covered in the curriculum? (i.e. What are “current” issues to be addressed; How to incorporate issues such as gender equality; HR and citizenship education; ESD; LTLT – peace education, intercultural understanding; HIV and AIDS; Life skills; preparation for life and work; How to keep the curriculum open and flexible in addressing new/emerging issues… ) (Promising practice VIII.2, Vietnam)
 |  |  |
| 1. How do you keep a balance between the need of providing basic skills (i.e. reading, writing, numeracy); the need of imparting relevant knowledge in different subject areas; and the need of addressing cross-cutting and emerging issues, such as LTLT and ESD? (Technical note VIII.3, Defining the curriculum content), (Promising practice VIII.3 Botswana)
 |  |  |
| **Curriculum implementation, monitoring and evaluation**  |
| 1. What is the evidence that teachers and students play an effective role in defining and implementing the curriculum (i.e. how well teachers are trained and understand the curriculum; whether teachers can participate in curriculum development processes; whether teachers are prepared to take on new roles, i.e. teachers as facilitators; advisors, moderators; curriculum developers; students as participating in selecting and structuring their learning activities)
 |  |  |
| 1. What is evidence that curriculum implementation is supported by enabling learning environments? What is evidence that schools make efforts to improve their learning environments? (i.e. Communication strategies; Student participation; Enhanced access to learning facilities and resources; Counselling; School ethos and Aesthetic) **[Link to Analytical Tool on**  **Learning Environment]**
 |  |  |
| 1. How well are assessments aligned to the goals of the curriculum? What elements pertaining to assessment have hindered curriculum implementation and hence education quality? **[Link to Analytical Tool on Assessment]**
 |  |  |
| 1. Is there evidence of a country-wide system of monitoring and evaluation of curriculum processes? Has it been used for continuous development of the curricula? What is the evidence that evaluation of curricula and associated textbooks have influenced curriculum & textbook revision? **[Link to Analytical Tools on teaching and learning]**
 |  |  |
| 1. What actions are taking place to frame future developments in the realm of learning and curriculum? (i.e. National and/or international curriculum research projects; National curriculum conferences; Forums and Task forces set up to define forward-thinking curriculum policies)
 |  |  |

The diagnosis and analysis above should culminate into identifying critical problems requiring urgent attention and the necessary information and knowledge for addressing them. It is also necessary to clearly formulate action plan and clear identification of roles and responsibilities and timelines as well as required human, financial and organizational resources which the action plan might entail. At this stage it is a question of prioritizing the priorities and knowledge gaps identified in the right most column of the table above to focus action on those areas severely hampering progress.

|  |
| --- |
| **Priorities for action (Curriculum)** |
| 1. What are the key areas and binding constraints to be addressed urgently to achieve major improvements in the quality of our curricula?
 |  |
| 1. What are the knowledge gaps which need to be filled for an evidence-based policy and practice of curriculum development?
 |  |
| 1. What are the required actions to deal with the priority constraints and the identified knowledge gaps?
 |  |

**Annex 2: Format for feedback on the piloting of the individual Analytic Tool of GEQAF**

***To be completed at the end of the discussion of each Analytic Tool***

|  |
| --- |
| **Analytic Tool: Curriculum** |
| 1. Which questions did you find unclear or hard to understand? If so how would you suggest they be reformulated?
 |  |
| 1. Which of the questions did you find less relevant in your context? Why?
 |  |
| 1. Which questions of critical importance in your context are missing in the toolkits?
 |  |
| 1. Which questions did you find too demanding on data and information relative to the significance of the issue for ensuring quality education?
 |  |
| 1. Would you have preferred more and detailed question or were the set of questions in the toolkit adequate to discuss the issues in depth?
 |  |
| 1. To what extent did this toolkit help you analyze the issues raised comprehensively?
 |  |
| 1. What kind of further support materials you would have needed for a more in-depth analysis?
 |  |
| 1. How much time was allocated for the discussion of this toolkit? Would it have required more or less time and if so how much?
 |  |
| 1. Would you use this toolkit in the future? Is so, how often?
 |  |

**Annex 3: Summative evaluation of GEQAF and the guidelines for piloting**

To be completed by the pilot Core Team with inputs from Heads of Departments and/or agencies

|  |
| --- |
| **The procedure of implementation** |
| 1. What significant adjustments did you make to the procedure suggested for piloting by UNESCO and why?
 |  |
| 1. What further improvements to the UNESCO guideline and piloting instrument would you suggest?
 |  |
| 1. To what extent do you think the results from applying the UNESCO education quality framework have been worth the time and resources you have invested in the exercise?
 |  |
| 1. Do you think you would use the framework (or parts of it) from time to time to check the pulse of your education system? If so, how often?
 |  |
| 1. What next steps were agreed or proposed to address major challenges identified during the diagnostic exercise?
 |  |
| 1. Who will be responsible and for what in following up on actions agreed or proposed
 |  |