

THE WORLD BANK

"CURRICULA, TEXTBOOKS, AND
PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES AND THE
PROMOTION OF
PEACE AND
RESPECT FOR DIVERSITY"

BREAKOUT SESSION

"NATURE AND STRUCTURE OF CURRICULA"

9:07 a.m.

Wednesday, March 26, 2003

Westbury Rooms A, B, and C
Jurys Washington Hotel
Washington, D.C.

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. TAWIL: We've got an hour and a half. Perhaps we can start with seeing if we are clear about what it is we're supposed to do, and then I'd suggest perhaps a way that we can proceed and see if you agree with that based on what was said yesterday. So it's really a question of perhaps beginning with what has been learned over the last two days in relation to education to promote peace and respect for diversity. We have talked about the three dimensions: textbooks--learning materials, teacher training--pedagogy, and curriculum.

So what has been learned, how to operationalize some of these ideas for aid agencies, and we're not talking specifically of the World Bank. What are the implications, operational implications, how agencies can be supportive of processes that help to promote respect for diversity and help to promote peace, Tia had just said earlier on, and stressing that it's in terms of very, very practical ideas or recommendations.

I would suggest--and then I'd just see how you react to that. I think one thing--the three dimensions we've been discussing are clearly interrelated, and I would hope that in the second part of the morning we would try to bring those together within, as Alan was suggested in his

presentation, which I think is very good, a holistic and integrated sort of approach, and so that we take advantage this morning at looking at each one of those dimensions in a little more detail.

But perhaps before focusing in on curricula specifically, we could start with just what--you know, to ensure that we capture all the ideas, we could start with perhaps what we feel we've learned over the last two days, just take a few moments and jot down a few ideas. And I think we can feel free at this initial stage not to be focused particularly on curriculum, just what we have learned. And they can be kind of general type principles or, you know, generic sorts of ideas, or they could be very specific to a dimension of education in the context of promoting respect for diversity and--or it could be also related to specific types of contexts in which an agency would be working.

So I think we should--I would suggest as a first step that we just take, you know, perhaps five or ten minutes to look at our notes and perhaps jot down a few ideas in terms of what we think we've learned in a very unrestrained way, and then that we could in discussing those try to then see the range of ideas and comments and try to begin perhaps to organize those, and in a third phase, then

to focus in on what we see as related particularly to curricula, to processes of curricula development and implementation, and then look at, you know, specific implications, operational implications in specific contexts, et cetera.

So this is my suggestion on how to proceed.

MR. SOCKNAT: Just a little housekeeping issue. Have you agreed on who is scribe for reporting out to the plenary group?

MR. TAWIL: Any volunteers?

MR. SOCKNAT: The suggestions and ideas and so forth, because I think it's important to capture this to get it. I know it's being recorded for posterity, but--

MR. TAWIL: It would be good to--

MR. SOCKNAT: --in the shorter term...

MR. TAWIL: Any volunteers?

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I'll take on doing it.

MR. TAWIL: Okay.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: You just want a short summary of the key points.

MR. SOCKNAT: Almost like bullet points.

MR. TAWIL: Yes, okay. And just technically, as was pointed out, since this is being recorded, that we do

our best to speak only one person at a time; otherwise, it gets difficult for the transcription.

Okay. Do you feel comfortable with that way of proceeding? So I would say really we could start with perhaps five, ten minutes looking back at notes, jotting down, refining a few ideas in a very free way, just looking back at the two days. And then we can share those ideas and begin to look at how we can organize them.

Is that all right with everyone? Okay. So let's take ten minutes then.

[Recess.]

MR. TAWIL: Maria, how about using the board?

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: That's a good idea.

[Pause.]

MR. TAWIL: One or two more minutes?

MR. BERRY: Yes.

[Pause.]

MR. TAWIL: Okay. If we're ready, I think we can start. Do you feel comfortable with just throwing things out right now? And as a second phase, we'd try to organize those thoughts a little bit. Again, I think some are--at least in my notes, some are sort of general sorts of principles, some of these generic type issues we mentioned, and then others are more specific, context-specific or in

terms of, you know, dimensions of curricula, curricula development.

Who would like to go? Go ahead, Christina.

MS. McDONALD: So there were several points that stick in my mind as sort of pulsating exclamation points for a change, for more equitable systems. The first is the political will. That came through very strongly in many presentations, and I know that my organization has often had sort of conflictual relationships with politicians and government, and at other times better working relationships. But I feel that we have to address this component very directly if we want to see the kinds of changes happening in the curriculum. So that's the first thing.

The second is actually based on your presentation, and I was very, very struck by the process of reflection and critical analysis of existing curriculum and how that can influence changing. And so the process itself is important, and providing those reflections back to policymakers and people who write--create curriculum and write textbooks, somehow that process has to be more established and the reflection head back to those people in power, the people who are making the curriculum. Of course, that is related back to the first point, which is political will.

The woman who spoke on Sri Lanka education, that question she said really struck me. They have to be willing to ask these key questions, and unless they're in the mental state to ask those questions, can we really move anywhere? That really struck me.

The third is a general awareness raising of diversity, issues of diversity, issues of peace, the core groups of people who are creating curriculum, writing textbooks, writing teaching materials, and that's a little bit different from the second point. I mean just awareness raising in the sense of having discussions such as those we've had here over the past three days, less the reflective critical analysis of existing curriculum but more discussions on diversity and how that can and could be reflected in teaching materials, curriculum and textbooks. So awareness raising. I find that sometimes it's not even on people's agenda. It's just not on the radar screen; therefore, it gets left out.

And publishers, that really struck me, how much publishers can make or break something. They're a very powerful group, and they control a lot of what's actually going to in the end get published and get out there. And I feel that that has to be a target group in this whole process. And that was one thing that I learned. I think I

wasn't aware of how much they control and how powerful they are in the whole process.

Those were my sort of big points that really stuck in my mind over the past few days.

MR. TAWIL: Does someone want to add to those or build on those? I mean, I have a few reactions.

MR. BERRY: The political will thing, I'm just reflecting on Bob's comments on FDI the first morning on the cross-tracking--

MS. McDONALD: Right.

MR. BERRY: This could be a key element similar to what we do in DFID. It seems to me that it's problematic where there is no--where there is no political will, which is commonly the case in the kind of context we're talking about, what are the mechanisms for the work? So I think to me it's absolutely--

MS. McDONALD: Absolutely.

MR. TAWIL: I think that's related to the issue of ownership, which we also said was important. There's also a fundamental question about what authority is promoting change. I mean, this is a question very generally in international development work, and your question, Chris, if there is no national or local political will, is there a legitimate authority outside of, you know, the local or

national authorities that one is working with to push for anything?

MS. McDONALD: Right.

MR. BERRY: Absolutely.

MR. TAWIL: My initial reaction to that question is perhaps--I mean, are there mechanisms--in the absence of political will, are there practical mechanisms to be able to do work? I would think not at a systemic level, but perhaps in the sense of--

MS. McDONALD: Underground movements.

MR. TAWIL: Yes, and pilot projects and grass-roots-type initiatives which could, you know, create some discussion and possibly, you know, inform policy at a future time when the political will is there.

MS. McDONALD: Exactly. But in the case of Croatia, for example, our strategy before the political change was an underground movement, and we worked through people who were brave enough in institutions, networks of--informal networks of educators. When the political change happened, they were then put in positions of power and authority, and, therefore, all of the investments we have made in that grass-roots underground movement suddenly were in a position of authority.

Of course, it's not all, you know, a bed of roses, but that's an example of--I think there are strategies to do it. But if politics don't change and the new government isn't put in power, it's going to remain underground.

MR. BERRY: For an organization like DFID, which is a bilateral government agency, we've got real problems in working--

MS. McDONALD: Underground.

MR. BERRY: --like that.

[Laughter.]

MS. McDONALD: That's the benefit of being Soros.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I think there's also that danger of it being a boutique program because it is (?) among small NGOs or small grass-roots in some cases the transition country we have been lucky-- (?) have been lucky because they were the future power brokers, most of them working in the Ministry of Education.

MS. McDONALD: Like in Serbia, for example.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: And Bulgaria.

MR. BERRY: When we're talking about--I was thinking about this last night. The comments that we're making are really interesting. Are we thinking in terms of hot conflicts or--it seems to me these things are affected by those kinds of complex factors, whether--you know, what

stage is the conflict? We talk about pre-conflict environment, for example.

MS. McDONALD: Right.

MR. BERRY: So Wolfgang's kind of presentation I thought was really stimulating, these complex--

MS. McDONALD: Yes, I agree with that. That was another point that I didn't write down, but it struck me that when it's so hot, you can't bother to do anything. That really struck me.

MR. BERRY: In terms of you can't do anything in relation to some of the diversity issues, but certainly I think the protection angle.

MS. McDONALD: Yes.

MR. BERRY: But maybe that's not--I don't know if that's part of our agenda here. I'm not sure.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I've certainly got comments on that because I think what we're really talking about is conflict prevention, and I think all donor agencies, indeed, all development agencies usually come in a bit too late. Certainly with Kosovo, the organization I worked for, and many other NGOs, for about ten years it was a series of cases of crying wolf and saying, well, we don't anything because it probably won't happen. And when this actually did happen, we were still saying, oh, we won't do anything

because it probably won't happen, because we have one of these every year.

So it's almost as if by the time the international community wakes up to the fact there's a crisis, it's almost got too hot, in Wolfgang's scheme of things, to really stop anything. So my thoughts then went into, well, then, we've almost got to start working with the refugee and the IDP children, the principle that you get one shot at childhood and possibly one shot at education, and the conflict that could happen in 20 years' time because these people are still burning with resentment can maybe be prevented in that immediate post-conflict phase.

MR. TAWIL: On that point, I think Alan's argument about looking at--using the lens of conflict-sensitive is very useful. In what I presented, we were looking at post-conflict, and not immediate post-conflict, internal conflict. It's true that there is what some term a window of opportunity because there is change. But there is also something to learn, you know, from the critical examination that they may undertake. It is prevention work. I mean, it's post-conflict, but it's trying to consolidate peace and really put in place mechanisms that would prevent such a thing in the future. So there is something to learn for what we're calling pre-conflict or tense-type situations.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Am I right in understanding that you're saying post-conflict reflection on what the causes of the previous--

MR. TAWIL: Is one important source of lessons to learn for other contexts.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Can I jump in on that?

MR. TAWIL: Go ahead.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: One of the things--and I actually had thought of this last night, so I started (?) this morning, but--and let me just read what I thought of in terms of this. Clearly, in trying to focus on respect for diversity and peace requires an understanding of the contextual conditions of countries where these education initiatives on the issue of curriculum, textbooks, pedagogy have to be addressed and implemented. So the respect for diversity and peace can't be easily channeled in those contexts, and that means that the contextual terrain for any implementation has to be tempered by the receiving context that is going to receive any change possibilities and requires an analysis of the readiness and conditional acknowledgment, even at a minimalist level of their importance to and in education, meaning that if there's no tie-in that's made readily between respect for diversity and peace with education, you don't have any ground to stand on

because one over--you know, focusing on respect for diversity is just too tenuous and too volatile, but focusing on education embedded with respect and diversity is doable, it's manageable.

And so getting at these contextual variables requires not only in-country descriptions of willingness but also outsiders' ability to decode the meanings and interpretation of respect and diversity that may be latently found within those countries, because I'm sure that there are ways that people have thought about these issues but may not have the channels to vocalize or to have them rise. And a good example of this is what has happened in Mexico with the Zapatistas, the issue of the rights of Indians has been decried for centuries, and the only way to get noticed is by creating a rebellion. But before it got to that point, the rebellion was a necessity for all Mexicans to become even aware of their own racism towards Indians.

So I think you have to kind of tap into what's already culture present in order to be able to enhance it, and that means having some know-how, working with social scientists, anthropologists, community people as well. And then this then becomes a prerequisite for any intervention and an analysis of what is the curriculum in such contexts, what textbooks are you for and what purposes they have and

how they are representative of that context, and how pedagogical practices are identified or described, because, otherwise, you can't begin to project what those may be. You're inserting, quote, your model, whatever that model may be, on a group of people that already have some ideas of where they want to go, but they haven't been able to really own them or work them through. So that to me is a very critical piece.

The second piece--and that deal with where we are--is the whole notion of the state of the educational system in terms of its structure, delivery, and quality meanings, because quality to me is one of the most diffused term, and we use it all the time--excellence, quality--without really understanding what the value-added piece of that may mean.

To me, the organizational structures are based on how culture of organizations is defined, meaning that we need to understand what is it that supports education in those cultures. Is education, for example, for socializing people into a national character? Is education for--like (?), it's to get on the fast pace of learning all about technology so that you have productive, which means people who will be managing and working in factories right away. That's really their educational culture.

So I think we need to understand what's that linkage of organizational cultures to the structure, delivery, and quality meanings, but also to the types of policies, and to me, policies are that ground where they may be explicit because they're--explicit statements doesn't mean that they're really carried out. To me, it may be more important to look at the implicit issues that drive such systems, and the implicit systems may be the old boys' network that gets together and decides or whatever. I'm going too fast.

MR. TAWIL: There was a lot in there.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Flames coming off the--

[Laughter.]

MR. TAWIL: Could I just add to that, and perhaps on a practical level. Coming back to what we've learned, Barbara put her finger on it very well yesterday in the morning, the sort of gap--you know, feeling this gap between theory practice, between policy and actual implementation. And I was feeling that as well. And on the basis of what you're saying, I think, you know, perhaps in terms of a more practical orientation, I think having a team at the national level that would examine these sorts of questions or the sorts of questions we've tried--or that Alan has presented in his, or that we have done in our project of case study,

but a national team that would be mixed in terms of constituencies, social, ethnic, or whatever, but also in terms--and this is what you're saying about also implicit policies--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes.

MR. TAWIL: --of levels of expertise.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes.

MR. TAWIL: We're trying to do it at a very small scale, but it remains at that official explicit policy level where we're trying to have, you know, policymakers and researchers. But, you know, we could have a more practical orientation, say a team that would have these sorts of profiles, but also teachers, teacher trainers, community representatives, representatives of young people as well.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes.

MR. TAWIL: Because we're getting a sense of--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Exactly.

MR. TAWIL: --you know, in some of the cases that there's a completely different vision about what education should be doing in those societies and what it might be capable of doing--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes.

MR. TAWIL: --which could be--so a mixed constituency in terms of, you know, expertise or

professional profile, but also in terms of representative of the different, you know, makeup of the society.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: And I'd add to that one thing that was stated yesterday, which I disagreed with very profoundly, and that is because in working in diversity, yes, we went through this issue about only the people from that culture understand their culture, so they are the only ones that can look at their culture and define it, so they don't need outsiders, kind of the nationalistic stance.

On the other hand, we went through the other vision, which was you will do as I tell you to do, the imposition model and the development model, which has pervaded much of our international development.

Well, between those tensions, I think it's a combination of issues because if you're embedded in a system, how do you begin to think in creative ways if you have no other opportunity to think about what may be happening in other contexts, bring--you know, finding out what is happening in Chiapas may, even as foreign as it may seem, Indians from Chiapas may seem to be incredibly relevant to people in Bosnia or other places where you're dealing with the same kinds of issues of certain deprivations in your educational system.

So why assume that you can't learn from kind of horizontal kinds of learning, which is one of the assumptions that needs to be made, because there may be other filters, such as the religious filter in the case of Israel and Palestine. There may be other--Arab, you know, Western world. But I think the key issue here is: How do you really learn, well, if we want to model that whole notion, learn in connection with others? And others who may be totally different from who you are.

MR. TAWIL: I would again, just in terms of perhaps a practical suggestion, I think the fact putting national teams together, I mean, we spoke about study visits, but I would think--I mean, again, what we're trying to do in the case studies, I think, of having people address the same sorts of questions, you know, in a coordinated sort of fashion and the ability--the opportunity to exchange is a positive, enriching experience. It might actually also contribute to creating that world to do it, because others are doing it. I mean, in a way, it's opening yourself--I mean, there's a level of sort of international transparency. We talked about not--you know, you can't force things down people's throats. If there's no political will, you cannot do it. But as you're saying, in this horizontal sort of fashion, people are opening up to very sensitive issues

about their education systems, about their curricula, about the way their textbooks are designed, approved.

So I think in terms of a suggestion--and it comes to that issue of process. I think a lot of it is in the process of what can be done, and there's a methodology perhaps of addressing a certain number of questions by, you know, this sort of mixed national team, but in a coordinated fashion where they can be exchanging with other national teams that are doing similar exercises in very specific contexts with specific challenges.

I think there just in terms of a role of a UN-type agency, I think this is typically the role that a UN agency could have. UNESCO in this case is supposed to be a catalyst in this case. It is not a bilateral agency. It's not a development agency. But I think they're a catalyst for that kind of dialogue, and that dialogue is perhaps a positive contribution to addressing issues of respect for diversity and peace, without it being imposed, enforced, or...

MS. McDONALD: Are we getting on to very practical suggestions, or are we still on the open flow of ideas? Because I have a practical suggestion for political will as well.

MR. TAWIL: I think we can go back and forwards. I mean, listening to some of the general types of issues, I think that there are--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Would you just mind adding one thing there because it's important?

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Sure.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: One of the first things that the UN will say is it's too costly to get people across the country. But the Zapatistas are fantastically adept with a computer. In fact, that's how they communicate worldwide. So it seems to me that if we can put the Internet as one of the ways to keep the costs low for that kind of communication vehicle, that's all. I didn't mean to interrupt you.

MS. McDONALD: No, that's fine. That's what's going off in my mind, is no one wants to pay for study visits. No one.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: The other thing on study visits is that sometimes the wrong people get to go.

MS. McDONALD: The whole process of choosing the delegation is very--you get very political--

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Yes. I've had situations where we wanted to bring teachers over, and suddenly we end

up with various boards for the ministry, oh, super, a trip to the U.K.

MR. TAWIL: Christina?

MS. McDONALD: Back to political will, because this for me is crucial, I don't know what agency or who could take responsibility for something like this, but if there was a general orientation with ministries and government on the economic benefits of access to education and equity in education, I think it would be useful to emphasize that at the very beginning so that, you know, money is used as the carrot to get governments to buy into and to give the political will to change curriculum in this case--that's the topic--to be more equitable and to reflect diversity. We're trying to use economic evidence and economic arguments right now, working with ministries in the case of the Roma, and we've undertaken some analysis to show that when you invest in education, when you invest in people, when you invest in social cohesion, your country will benefit economically. So this could be an incentive for governments and to break down political resistance.

Now, you know, what that--would that be sort of a policy forum, a workshop such as this, where the economic benefits could be discussed, I'm not sure what the nature of that would be. But I think it's key.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: It's powerfully persuasive.

MS. McDONALD: It's very persuasive. So I think that that could be a very practical suggestion for gaining political...

MR. BERRY: What does the evidence base look like that you've been using?

MS. McDONALD: Well, we did--we contracted a consultant whose name is Ben Levine who's from Canada, and he did a cost/benefit analysis looking at restructuring special--the system of special education and what would happen if the money that's invested in special education, when all that money's spent on keeping Roma kids in special education, if it were redistributed--and I don't even know what calculations to use, but it was clear after he did this analysis that governments would benefit if they considered restructuring and redirecting their finances in other places, and they wouldn't have to spend that much money on supporting a system that's oppressive and segregatory.

MR. BERRY: It interests me because I think it's similar to a lot of contexts that I've worked in. One reality that you've got to win is I think a lot of experiences have been educating people, children, and then having problems with employing them. So there is some work there on--some conceptual work on what should schooling be

about in order to link into, you know, this kind of economic audience? So I think you're absolutely right. I mean, I'm not--you're absolutely right in terms of I think it's a very convincing argument. But I think this has a lot of implications for curricula in terms of what is--what does the curriculum look like, what does it focus on, where is the content. We've talked a lot about, for obvious reasons, peace-building and diversity issues, but what's the relationship between the curriculum and work, school and work.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes, equity.

MR. BERRY: Technical vocational issues, I mean, this is a whole huge area.

MS. McDONALD: Yes, I have to--I'm completely in agreement with that. It's something we've been talking a lot about in Open Society. Again, if children are graduating and they can't get jobs because the curriculum is totally irrelevant to what's happening in the world, what good is it?

MR. BERRY: What you create then--

MS. McDONALD: And, therefore--

MR. BERRY: --is a very--people are very, very angry at having invested in this, and the other issue to me, very strongly in curriculum terms, is your own--the extent

to which there's sensitivity to different attainment levels, you know, in terms of how does the curriculum deal with those issues and how does schooling deal with those issues. So, yes, otherwise, you get an underclass of people who--

MS. McDONALD: And then that creates more conflict in the country.

MR. BERRY: Precisely.

MS. McDONALD: So not only does the reflection of diversity in various perspectives need to be in the curriculum, but it has to be useful to get jobs.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: But more than jobs, also, what happens to those? What is the cost to the society at large when you have, in Spanish, deserters they are called; in English they're dropouts, or school leavers. And, for example, for Latinos, I can tell you, in the United States the cost of a Latino dropping out of high school, in fact, means \$1,750,000 of lifelong earnings that are lost. It also means that the ratio in terms of Social Security becomes reduced to one for every three persons, when it was in 1950 17 for a ratio of one person.

So when you begin to look at what that means, the implications are so great that it's actually cheaper to focus on education and actually understand how it will help that individual not only take but profit from that education

than it is to lose that person. So I think if we could have formulas that show cost and fairness of social services, in the Netherlands, you know, will they be able to contribute 51 percent or not, you know, for 50 years and for the system, all of these issues. I think that hits right--

MS. McDONALD: I think so, too.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: So you're talking about an opportunity cost of excluding certain groups of children that otherwise would be earning or contributing to--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: The economic audience that work for governments are not that interested in peace and stability and--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: But it gets at that. It really does.

MR. BERRY: Well, I think they're interested in social unity. The economic stuff is one thing, but I think the social unity arguments they're very convinced by. So, I mean, I think this is one of the nations want to build--to have that kind of unity.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I think we're talking about underclasses, and I think it is the case that if the underclass is not that big, then I think most governments

say that it's not actually an effective investment. I think most countries do have underclasses, and they're usually the ones that--

MR. BERRY: Yes.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: --are starting the wars.

MR. BERRY: If they're small enough, yes.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Or they are eating too much of the pie.

MR. TAWIL: I'd just like to make a comment on the last one. I think this--I mean, these sorts of considerations can fit into a holistic approach to the education system and to this--you know, conflict-sensitive or not, this critical examination. You know, the way Alan was presenting it, I mean, there are issues of inequalities in access or inequalities in allocation of educational resources. There are dimensions of the educational system, administration--I mean, Alan had pointed some of these out from the issues paper--of governance, of administration, of allocation of resources, which, you know, can be contributing to inequalities, to social division, to frustration gaps, which can be a catalyst to--you know, for recourse to violence, et cetera.

So I think there is a case for a framework to be examining education systems at these different levels, and

there are structural, governance, administrative issues, even before we get into textbooks, pedagogy, and curriculum. And I would, you know, strongly recommend, I think in the second part, that we have a generic sort of framework of issues at that level and then--you know, and from that then we can be looking at implications at the level of curricula, teacher training, and pedagogy.

MR. BERRY: What do you mean in the second part of it?

MR. TAWIL: Second part of the morning.

MR. BERRY: Of this morning.

MR. TAWIL: Yes.

MR. BERRY: So fitting this into kind of a broad, strategic conflict assessment kind of exercise.

MR. TAWIL: Exactly. I think this is--I mean, so far this is--we are at that level. I mean, I don't think we have got really into curricula issues. And the question of how--you know, curricula relevance, how that relates to the world of work, yes, but there are also issues of unequal access, of unequal distribution, allocation of resources to education that, you know, tie into or can be explained through ethnic--you know, criteria of gender, along the lines of a gender bias or ethnic or--

MR. BERRY: Poverty.

MR. TAWIL: Exactly, or socioeconomic status, et cetera, which are beyond curricula.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Yes, schools can't cure poverty.

MR. TAWIL: No.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: They can--gender bias is actually one point that I've got in there, which is it seems that--I'm not sure if anyone's actually looked at the causality of it, but the more girls you have in school, the more economically prosperous, the more peaceful. The two just seem to be linked in our research. So that may be part of your basic framework to look at girl children's participation.

MR. TAWIL: Maria, I sort of cut you off. You wanted to add a few things?

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Yes. Probably someone's probably already said it by now. It's great because I don't have to do--

[Laughter.]

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: School leadership, I think that's key, because we're talking about the disassociation between the policymakers, the ministries, the whole aspect there, and what's really happening on the ground. Now I'm not sure--I think the interesting context where there is a

high level of political commitment, but because the ground that has to be covered, all of those thousands of teachers and schools. Ministries have a great deal of difficulty in getting their principals, once they've adopted them, down to the level of the individual classroom. And it struck me that key in there is the school principal, because you can have teachers that are committed, and the ministries, you could have a principal standing there and preventing that training from going down.

MS. McDONALD: I thoroughly agree with that.

MR. TAWIL: I'm in total agreement with that, particularly if we're thinking of, you know, school management, co-curricular activities, which are actually extremely important in fostering, you know, attitudes, you know, conducive to respect for diversity and peace and what have you.

You know, perhaps as strongly--I mean, there's an argument that they can be as powerful, if not more powerful, than explicit curricula content, you know, in textbooks. The way school is managed, the role model that the principal is, in fact, and the ability--the leadership ability to create a school environment that will be promoted through extracurricular or co-curricular activities, I think that's very important.

Just in--

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Could I make a comment?

MR. TAWIL: Yes.

MR. BERRY: Can I--just before you, can I pick up just a bit more on that? Because I think this is important in relation to issues around, say, decentralization. From an organizational perspective, you know, like DFID, say, the question then is: What kind of--operationally, what would you want to be--would you want to be then somehow in certain contexts promoting decentralization? If you're doing that, then what mechanisms do you have in place at this level in order to enhance the operation of the school, of the teachers, of the--you know, increasing maybe accountability and those kinds of issues? This is, I think, a really important set of issues operationally.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Well, we've tried to do principles in leadership training, which is the part that's usually left out because we do institution building at the ministry level, and we do teacher training. And we've actually typically included school leaders in training as well. Basically they have to go to everything. They get twice as much training as everyone else because they're attending things at the ministry level and also at the teacher level. But I think accountability is key work that

we need to underline. With decentralization, a certain trend, we can have a terrific policy and nothing on the ground.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: This goes back to something we had talked about--authority. And in the school leadership training, it seems to me one of--I'm becoming specific because I was simply--yes, what kind of school leadership? You could have reinvention of the same model. You could have participatory leadership models, which may in many cases be unknown, especially if you haven't had a chance to use them. You could have community-based leadership models that emanate from nascent leaders.

So it seems to me that the kinds of exploration that leadership has, again, gets bound to a contextual meaning and a time meaning, because, depending on where that country is, you know, they may be very comfortable going back to an authoritarian model rather than a participatory model, which would already begin to infuse more of the respect for diversity.

So the question of decisionmaking becomes one of that's very tied to knowing how to set up those very timing experiences. That allows for them to experience what it means to participate rather than to be dictated upon.

MR. BERRY: Yes, so it's a context--you're coming back to context sensitivity.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes, very much so.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I think that's a really important point, because there's a lot of fear about participatory levels, indeed terror, particularly people in positions of authority, school directors, that their authority would be threatened by consulting children.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: There will be classroom management because I said so.

[Laughter.]

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Absolutely.

MR. TAWIL: Maria, did you want to add something?

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Yes, just before it leaves my mind, the role of the media. I don't know how we get that into a discussion of strategic plan that's basically about education, but thinking about Rwanda and the fact that media, the radio, played an enormous role, and it seemed that nothing that was happening in schools could prevent that wave of hate thought, of hate speech that was coming out of the media. How can we equip teachers to do that? Because, clearly, the teachers were helpless to get us that as well, and were swept up--how do we--

MR. TAWIL: This also relates to, Christina, what you were saying about raising awareness more generally about issues of respect for diversity in society.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Different program in a different part of the Bank that needs to be talking about this, but it can sweep away so much.

MS. McDONALD: Well, if I could just make a small remark on that, one of the--as you know, I've been buzzing around talking about this resource pack concept which (?) more openly with everyone. One of the resources packs we're creating is called "Communicating Education Reform," and it's targeted specifically to media. And it's to give them practical tools to be able to communicate with society and what's happening as the education system undergoes transition, and I think diversity and equity issues can be embedded in that. So Open Society has already developed this pack, and I'll bring to everyone's attention and you can plug into it.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: So this is "Communicating"--

MS. McDONALD: It's called "Communicating Education Reform," and it's working with journalists on how they can communicate to society what's happening as education systems undergo transition.

MR. BERRY: But your point was more about--your point was more about how to--was it about kind of being able to critique--I mean, you're saying--what you're saying is the media was used to engender the violence, and there seemed to be no--

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: No inoculation at--

MR. BERRY: Yes, no way--so is it--is what you're saying then that perhaps schools need--if schools can do anything, what they need to be doing is to enable people to critically engage with the media and to be able to deconstruct what the media is telling them so that they can then--

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Yes.

MR. BERRY: Okay. Well, these messages--

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I think so. I think it makes--

MR. BERRY: That's a curriculum issue, perhaps.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Curriculum issue, yes.

MR. SOCKNAT: That's exactly what really writing for critical thinking was supposed to do, giving the students the ability to recognize propaganda and to deconstruct it--

MR. BERRY: Engage with that.

MR. SOCKNAT: Yes.

MR. TAWIL: I have a suggestion that--we have 25 minutes. We have been more at the level of some of the more general considerations, some which have, you know, relevance to curricula, but I think we should focus in the remaining 20, 25 minutes on curricula. I mean, this is also what we should be bringing specifically from our discussion to the plenary session in the second part of the morning.

As an initial statement, I would--and this I found also interesting in some of the presentations. If we say nature and structure of curricula--Alan was mentioning this, you know--is this a relevant thing to look at in terms of, you know, respect for diversity? Or is it more issues of curricula implementation or curricula policy formulation at an explicit level? Also when we're saying curricula, I mean, it's not to get into, you know, an issue of definitions. But I think if we are to propose very specific, you know, operational sorts of suggestions, then we should also be quite clear about what aspect or what level of curricula.

We have in the title of our workshop "curricula." There are wide discussions about how broad that definition is or how narrow. I mean, Bosnia and probably some of the countries in the Balkans would have it as limited as lists

of subjects. Others would get into, you know, a more all-encompassing co-curricula, hidden curricula, whatever.

That's not so much the issue, but I think one thing is--the process--and this was, you know, just one of the general statements, and it has implications at a different level. Process is important, and in this case, the process of curricula development, the process of official explicit curricula policy formulation is one thing, you know, I looked at in my presentation, but it's not the only aspect of policy. Curricula implementation at different levels. So I think it's--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Curriculum evaluation.

MR. TAWIL: And curricula evaluation. So if we are talking about curricula that it might be useful that we, you know, begin to look at these different dimensions of curricula, which is something we perhaps did not have enough time to do in the past two days.

Martha, do you want to add to that?

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Well, I had some ideas on it, and I think that if we--in order to look across countries in terms of curricula, I thought if we thought of curricula--because curricula has over 1,000, 3,000 definitions, depending on who uses it. But to me, what makes sense is the intended curricula. That's what

officials, policymakers might think about. The implemented curricula that actually does happen in the classroom, and then the experience curricula as a cut, because that's what--you can get the feedback from the kids, the feedback from the parents, the actual--you know, what is it that a child is gaining from those experiences that have been part of that curricula process and product.

So, to me, that's kind of the general cut I would make across the other--all of the countries, and I do that because it helps me to understand that under the intended curricula, it could be explicit, explicit policy formulation, the hidden curriculum, the vision, mission of curriculum, the intended goals, kind of the goals for understanding, knowledge base, skills, all of these pieces that are part of the curricular structure.

The informatics curricula is where you then begin to really see how it is implemented--delivered, implemented, and seized, acknowledged, and put into practice, and that would inculcate then the notion of pedagogy as well.

MR. TAWIL: Absolutely.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Because if you can't have something that's manageable by the teacher, then what are you saying? So that's where that implement--and the third level for me--

MR. TAWIL: The experience--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: --the experience curriculum, then would be basically much closer linked to the issues of respect for diversity, because that is--if a child is being taught about democracy but as the example I gave I think last night where, you know, immediately a child that comes in without shoes is being put down or told that their work was--then what is really the outcome of a curriculum that doesn't begin to deconstruct that kind of behavior and ways of thinking. And that to me is the real essence of learning how to be in a classroom setting.

So I would probably think in terms of those...

MR. TAWIL: Yes. Christina?

MS. McDONALD: Just something you said got my brain going, which is always a good thing. I'm thinking about the process of textbook publishers responsible for authors' creating textbooks. Authors are the link between curriculum and the textbook, right?

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Mm-hmm.

MS. McDONALD: And then I was thinking about this process we were talking about, this reflection on the system and how you should bring together different stakeholder groups to monitor.

MR. TAWIL: Right.

MS. McDONALD: I wonder if we could somehow influence or negotiate with publishers to do a similar process, to bring together those stakeholder groups with the textbook authors, who then are supposed to be interpreting the curriculum through the books, and that's a way to ensure some level of diversity reflected in the textbooks. Again, it's a process question.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: But the product is their tool.

MS. McDONALD: Well, of course, the products would help ensure that all those differences are somehow--I don't know if that's a feasible suggestion, but, you know, it seems to be--that's what's missing. I mean, in the experience I've had with working in countries developing textbook writing and developing new materials, there's just no--those writers are so focused on writing their topic that they don't get in those other perspectives. That's my experience.

[Simultaneous conversation.]

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I don't know. Do I--how do I state this? It's about consultation, review, participation.

MR. TAWIL: Yes, my feeling again about process-- and if we were to make these sort of general suggestions, there is--I mean, as much in textbook writing and approval

that that whole process should, you know, be transparent, reflect, you know, the different stakeholders and their interests and the constituencies in a society, we could say exactly the same, again, with a focus on process about curricula policy formulation, that that should also be a broad, transparent process, you know, reflecting stakeholders and--but there is something about, you know, just that participative, transparent process at different levels.

MS. McDONALD: At different levels.

MS. MULATU: What do you do about countries that don't have that kind of power? I think it's wrong to say that this can't work or this should work. But very few countries that I've worked in have the kind of power that will force large textbook publishers to integrate local stakeholder points of view and sort of transversal values such as diversity and quality and tolerance. You have to deal with the practical issue of developing countries and their capacity and especially lack of power to push for that kind of sensitivity towards--I mean, and the willingness of publishers to do that spontaneously is probably not--

MS. McDONALD: Well, exactly.

MS. MULATU: They don't have any (?) doing that. They only have the market.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: We actually have that sort of climate in our tender dossiers. The bidder has to have a process of review.

MS. MULATU: Right.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I think in a free market you're absolutely right, it's not likely to happen, is it? But--

MS. MULATU: Oh, no, I'm not talking about free markets. I'm talking about developing country situations where the bid documents may say that, but if you have one major publisher who has published the mathematics textbook for the last 20 years, you--

[Laughter.]

MR. BERRY: Well, I think the Sri Lankan--I mean, it's--I think the Sri Lankan case that we had on the second day is really instructive in this regard. I think that's absolutely right. There is no--the context that I know of, there's just no--there is no textbook--we're not talking about textbook capacity. There isn't choice. But I think the Sri Lankan case is interesting in the way in which this multiple textbook option I think actively developed, you know, some kind of process lab to try to develop a choice element is interesting. So this is textbooks, anyway, so--

MR. TAWIL: All right.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: They're supposed to be going upstairs.

I think the same could actually be true of the process of curriculum development. Unless there's some kind of conditionality, the dirty C word, people are not going to spontaneously do that. This is what a donor agency can say. It's conditional on the grant that you have three reviews and the process of doing the curriculum really is documented. We're doing textbooks because we know (?) state that as a requirement.

MS. MULATU: But then you get to the question of ownership, which you had raised. Who is pushing for--

MR. TAWIL: I would be more--I think that's important, and I would be more modest. And, you know, coming back to the initial idea of if there is an interest to constitute a group which is, you know, diverse in expertise and level of intervention and, you know, educational reform, and, you know, to be at least addressing these questions. I mean just looking at them. As you say, there are conditions, political conditions, economic conditions, which may not allow, you know, much of what we might want to recommend.

But I think, you know, that is a modest but important starting point.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: But the donor agency can also inject. For example, in Costa Rica, all the textbooks were private. Textbook companies produced them, et cetera. Textbooks were actually not yielding much achievement for students. So within the Ministry of Education, the donor-- in this case it was USAID--basically said we'd like you to consider adding to your curriculum department people in the textbook area.

It was really interesting. The moment they made that correlation, the textbook people then went back to teachers at the grass-roots level to identify the areas of content that they felt were important. And they brought in experts. They spent three years in the process of wading through information.

Then they finally came back with the recommendations, with inputs from a lot of people pilot testing that allowed them to develop some textbooks that are incredibly well written. And what's nice about the textbooks, even though every six years the government changes, the textbooks are--were generated in such a way that the core knowledge was sustained from one political party to the other, but additive resources were changing-- were changed, and so you didn't have that much of a lost investment.

And it seems to me that when donor agencies can influence the tie-in between curriculum and textbooks is knowledge production and you incite the notion that it is in your best interest for your national capacity building and for your future citizens, then it begins to have a very different echo than simply this is the text that will teach you skills that you'll need. It has to be tied into economic productivity. It has to be tied into citizenry. It has to be tied into also how that person will use the textbook as an advantage.

In some cases, quite honestly, I think that textbooks for the weight and paper they consumer are not worth it. I, in fact, have gone the way of thinking of modular structures with comic book strips that do the same things as the textbook might because the kids can take it home. They can actually even destroy them, but in the process of destroying it, they've read it and they begin to play with those ideas.

So I think there's a whole range within the textbook production that would lead to this.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Yes. I'm not sure how we should--are we stealing the ground of the upstairs debate?

MR. TAWIL: Right.

MR. BERRY: I think we are.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Because I think that's-- hopefully they're having a big discussion about who uses textbooks and how and how accessible they are.

I'm just going to try and make sure that I've actually taken your point correctly, which is on conditionality, we know the drawbacks of imposing conditions. What do we do if there's no willingness, no incentive to consult? So you've actually given us an example of where suasion, reasoned argument was more successful and clearly sustainable, as you're saying. But what was interesting to me is that you said it took--three years?

MS. MULATU: And that's Costa Rica.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: And that's very interesting because a lot of donor funds have got a disbursement by date, which is certainly something we could not--in projects ongoing, we could not spend three years. But this is something I've come across repeatedly.

If you want to do consultation and you really want to involve stakeholders, it will take three times as long as the average disbursement period. And I think that's a key point to get across to donors.

MR. BERRY: Yes, I think that's right. I think the more programmatic approach being taken, the poverty

reduction strategy type approaches, I think there is a long-
-I think there is a thinking generally amongst donors that a
longer time frame--but I think that's what--that needs to be
stressed.

MS. MULATU: Yes, and very few donors have a
longer time frame for financing. I think there's agreement
on long-term objectives. But you're still on the four- to
five-year financing schedule for most of the donors that I
work with.

And I also--can I just say--I just want to provoke
ideas because I haven't participated in the conference. As
somebody who has to manage budgets, with specific reference
to curriculum, there are three issues of critical importance
for us. It's the pace at which you employ--you have--you
change the timing of that change and the sequence of
activities along the curriculum. So those are three issues
that are for us really very important.

A second set of issues are the choice of
curriculum drives the choice of teaching method. Or does
it? If you have a badly or untrained teaching course and
you have a very complex and knowledge-intensive curriculum,
how do you deal with the disconnect as is the case--
curricula are becoming much more complicated for very good
reasons, but teacher training--which is not what I want to

focus on. But in terms of your choice of curriculum, how do you place it within the context of the country that you are in?

So I just want to throw those two--

MR. TAWIL: All right. Can I suggest, we're soon having to wrap up. Could we just take a couple of minutes and each one try to propose--

MS. McDONALD: Something concrete?

MR. TAWIL: --one concrete curricula-related suggestion and then we could list those, and then I think we should go back and just see that we agree about--you know, just review all the points that we have discussed.

Let's just take a couple of minutes and just one operational or practical type of recommendation at whatever level.

[Pause.]

MR. TAWIL: All right.

MS. McDONALD: I'd rather go last on this one, if that's okay with you.

MR. TAWIL: That's fine.

MR. BERRY: Okay. Well, I--

MR. TAWIL: I can go with what--I mean, the point I tried to make, perhaps not clearly enough in my presentation. So it's at the level of curricula policy

formulation. It's at the level of official prescribed curricula. That in the process of reviewing or beginning to reform curricula policy, to be addressing the issue of how schooling and, within the different dimensions of schooling, how curricula has had or may have had a negative or is having a negative effect on issues of social cohesion. In what way is it a catalyst to social divisions, tensions? That's one.

Asking that question, regardless of the context, and here I'm not speaking necessarily of, you know, post-civil strife, whatever.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: So negative influences--

MR. TAWIL: On--yeah, on social division, social tensions, you know, discrimination. Examining that question is, I think a useful insight into initial curricula policy reform in any context.

The second aspect of that would be what we were saying earlier, that this be done by a team at the national level that is representative of different profiles, I mean educational expertise, you know, going from policymakers, curricula development people, teacher training people, teachers, perhaps even youth, a team that would cut across these different levels of professional expertise, and that

could represent the different social, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, whatever constituencies.

MS. McDONALD: I have a clarification question. When you say reflect, the result of that process would be this case study or some sort of a written description based on a framework that you've outlined, right?

MR. TAWIL: Yeah, yeah.

MS. McDONALD: Okay.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: And then what?

MR. TAWIL: And then what I think is going to depend very much on each case. I mean, we began with the issue of political will and the fact that nothing can be imposed. I would as a second recommendation methodologically say to link up these teams across countries, and this is what an international agency can do. And this reduces--you know, this reduces the issue of imposing, and it might actually help encourage to develop some political will by saying that others might be doing this and others are open or are willing to--you know, to open up on these critical issues in an international forum.

It's at a limited level. I mean, what next might not be much. But I think beginning there is--it is very much in the peace-building approach and this sort of conflict-sensitive--

MR. BERRY: I agree entirely. I think you have to understand--I think you have to understand that in order--if you're really going to get on board. But I think then my point would be--my own point would be that if you--if you are going to engage in curriculum reform, I think the points you've been making about participation are broad participation in the process and an attempt to get--if we can ever do this--some kind of agreement around what the curriculum is for is an absolutely essential component of that process. And it takes time.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: And if I could just add one thing, I think we tend to become very obsessed with the idea that you have to have consensus in order to move ahead. Contrary to that, my practice has taught me that you don't have to assume that the consensus is your first step. You go to the actions. You go to implementation. The consensus derives from working together. That's where you build it. It isn't like an a priori that you have to have consensus in order to move ahead.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I'll just add, particularly (?) consensus.

MR. TAWIL: Yes.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Then when we get to the classroom level, I have a little something.

MS. McDONALD: I'm going to stick on my point about publishers, and I think that there needs to be some sort of an organized advocacy or awareness-raising workshop focused on publishers together with perhaps ministry officials, policymakers, on raising awareness around the issue of diversity and as a reflection in materials and trying to come up with a convincing argument on what--why will they gain from perpetuating that in the system and supporting that in the system.

So it's an advocacy, policy workshop or training focused on publishers around these issues and trying to get them to support it, because I really see them as a key stakeholder group that can block it.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: As you're saying this, I just wanted to--this is kind of a sideline, but I think it's an interesting one. In English, we use the word "framing," right? I was thinking, in Spanish, the word is make more competent what is already there.

MS. McDONALD: Great.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: "Capacitar." It is to make more capable what is already there, and it's not a different formulation theoretically. You train a dog.

MS. McDONALD: Yeah, pejorative. It is. The basic--I agree.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I have to say that (?) a wonderful trainer who talked about how she did (?). No, no, we want a trainer. The words are quite interesting, but they do--they have--they're nuanced.

MR. TAWIL: Christina, you wanted to add something to that?

MS. McDONALD: I just wanted to emphasize the content of this advocacy workshop or--

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: So gains to supporting diversity, kind of enlarge on that a bit.

MS. McDONALD: Just emphasizing the gain--the benefits that they could receive by supportiveness. That really has to be shown to them; otherwise, they won't support it.

MR. TAWIL: So this relates to your point before of sometimes--

MS. McDONALD: Economic arguments.

MR. TAWIL: --of economic--all right.

MS. McDONALD: Because it's not--the humanitarian arguments aren't going to work, unless you have some very enlightened people. It's economically based, so that's--really emphasize that.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: I'll get up there because--

MR. TAWIL: Okay, good.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Great. I'll sit down.

MR. TAWIL: So this is at the level of implemented experience--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: This is at the level of actual curriculum design. That means changing the way that curriculum is thought of in the classroom setting. So I'll step to the other side first because it's a diagram, and then we'll--

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Oh, wow. Okay.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: If we assume--first of all, I think we have to get away from this notion that curriculum is really--when you think about it, curriculum is really about teaching and learning combined, teaching and learning, the combination approach. So I think our whole repertoire should be about you are teaching and learning. Why? Because teacher and student--at some point the teacher becomes the student and the student becomes the teacher, if you really want to engage. And if we can change that kind of notion that teaching is a separate act from learning, I think that's the first one.

The second is that we basically have been living with what I call traditional structures of curriculum, and the traditional curriculum is really this--I mean, it's an imposition model which Ralph Tyler and other people have

lived with since the 1920s. But the issue is this: If we think about it, we usually start with goals of knowledge, goals of education, or objectives. And then those goals or objectives are supposed to somehow lead to the kind of activities that students do in the classroom and, you know, the methods and performances that are--and then the last thing is, of course, the evaluation, which is the test, et cetera, or the assessment.

But if we think about this model, this is such a linear model which basically say I, the teacher, am doing all the thinking for you, my student, and you will do what I'm saying you ought to be doing so that I can then generate an evaluation for you. But it has nothing to do with learning. When you think about it, it has very little to do with learning.

So I'd like to suggest models that have been (?) now not only by the Harvard group on understanding for design but understanding for design people in--in fact, you didn't have to go to Harvard. You've figured this out if you've been around teachers for a long time. And that is, if you really think about what is our goal, our goal is understanding, but understanding not meaning just knowledge. It's knowledge, it's basically skills, but it's also about changing attitudes, which we leave out, because if I'm

training or capacitating someone at the Harvard Medical School to be a sensitive doctor and I teach him all the knowledge and technical know-how and I teach him how to be a good surgeon, but he's lousy in terms of his bedside manners, what have I produced? I have not produced an ethical doctor or one that is morally attuned to his patient.

So, to me, the understanding that I'm thinking of and most people I think would want to see this is kind of lifelong learning. And that means things that will prepare you after you leave that school or classroom to continue to learn, whether it's informally or formally.

Now, that means that if we accept this, then you would have a very different sense, because then a teacher would have to really think about what are the intended results in terms of learning and teaching, meaning what is it that I want as kind of understanding issues that my students and I can really construct in that fashion. It's a different kind of thinking here.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Martha, can I just say we need to have a concrete--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes, I'm getting to it. I'm getting to it.

So from this you actually--because it's a pretty good structure.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Absolutely.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: You get into what the evidence of that would be, and the evidence would be everything from performances--say you have kids who are disabled, if they flicker their finger, that's good enough. For performance you have a portfolio. You have all kinds of demonstration of what that evidence is, and only then--and only then do you then go into planning what those activities might be, what the performances might be, so that, in fact, what you end up doing is, when you get here, the way that you know that this is happening is that you have ongoing assessment all the time. That's your accountability factor. In other words, you don't wait until the very end or until the end of the test to figure out.

So, in a nutshell--

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I've got the same--

MS. McDONALD: So what is it? List--

[Simultaneous conversation.]

MS. McDONALD: But not on the national level, but on--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: No, that can go over here.

MR. BERRY: See, I think--just to intervene, I mean, okay, the compass (?) working, this kind of model, I mean, that's fantastic. It would be incredibly problematic to introduce. I mean, we're just talking about such a sea change in the attitude to examinations, to assessment, to curriculum structure, to teacher capacity. Well, I mean--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: You're changing--it's really changing the focus.

MR. TAWIL: Maria, do you want to add to that? Because you had a similar idea.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: My point is very, very similar to--I think. I think. I have to check with Martha, with what Martha's saying, which is I'm saying we need to audit the effectiveness of any attempted curricular initiative. And Martha just did it in a much more exciting way than I could ever do.

[Laughter.]

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Basically saying we've got to look at the evidence of the outcomes for children, you know, children's abilities in what they're doing. Because, otherwise--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: And the variability of--

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: --it is a huge waste of resources. So I don't know if you--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: I just would be careful with the word "effectiveness" because, again, that to me is very--effective by whose standards?

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: Exactly, yes. But it's the whole issue of deciding what the indicators are.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: But what we're really saying is what--think about it very simplistically. If I can think and I can say and I can do, then I have evidence of being able to expand my learning beyond this situation. And that's really what learning's about.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: And then my second point is we should build the capacity of ministries to do this, to derive indicators, because it's fine for us to go in there and say, la, la, la, participatory process, here's our indicators, let's all monitor, and then we go away and it's never--it's never done again, which rather defeats the objective of the exercise.

So, okay. If I say auditing of effectiveness and put a bracket in there saying how do we decide or something-

-

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Auditing of teaching, learning, you know, performances or understanding, because that's really what you're getting at.

MS. MULATU: I'm going to skip (?) .

MR. TAWIL: No, go ahead.

MS. MULATU: Okay. The reality check, that's what I would finish with. Have a very clear sense of what is required to make those curricular changes in terms of quality of godfathers, godmothers and so on, just reality check in terms of what is required to make it happen and at what pace and timing before introducing--at every step of the curriculum process. I think it's very--it's amazing to me that we can spend four years discussing what the new curriculum should look like, and once it's been adopted, there is absolutely no sense--that sort of caretaking will die. And the people who are really into the new curriculum are the ones who are just given the responsibility of making sure it happens.

So there's a lot of lead-up to the adoption of new curriculum, but it's rare to see the same intensity of effort on the other end.

MR. BERRY: Absolutely.

[Simultaneous conversation.]

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I like that phrase, intensity--saying intensity of effort in implementation and planning, because that was so...

MR. TAWIL: Okay.

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: I do apologize for my horrible handwriting.

MR. TAWIL: So we'll just review the suggestions to see if we're feeling comfortable with them. The first two or three are actual policy level, and the last two or three are in terms of implementation and, you know, ensuring that--so the first one, policy implementation is kind of encouraging a critical re-examination of the role of curricula, schooling largely in curricula within that and contributing to social division, to tensions, in order to inform the reform process. That's one the what.

And on the how, as a mixed team and possibly linking up these teams across countries.

MR. BERRY: Sobhi, I was wondering--certainly I would have--I don't know what other people think, but this first phase, we need to locate that also in the wider social, political, cultural context. It's not just about the curriculum, is it?

MR. TAWIL: No.

MR. BERRY: So maybe if this could draw attention to the fact--

[Simultaneous conversation.]

MR. BERRY: We mentioned it, but I wonder if that was--I don't know what we think. Is it--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Contextual assessment. You want to have a contextual assessment of what's there in order to be able to--

MR. BERRY: And this is embedded in it, isn't it?

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes.

MR. BERRY: Just draw attention to that.

MS. MULATU: And then wouldn't it be nice to have a way of saying this sort of process into the actual--again--

-

MR. TAWIL: Mm-hmm, mm-hmm.

MR. BERRY: That's right.

MS. MULATU: It's important but it's not sufficient. You have to--

MR. BERRY: That's a good point.

MR. TAWIL: This is the kind of discussions we've been having also with Martha and Barbara as well. I mean, the sort of--the implicit policy or the policy in practice and how to bring that back up to the same sort of discussion, but it should be ongoing. And as you say, not only end in the curricular policy reform, then, okay--

[Simultaneous conversation.]

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: --reality check.

MR. BERRY: Oh, yeah.

MR. TAWIL: The second point then was--I mean, broad participation, broad consultation, and to secure agreement on aims and goals in whatever direction of change, but that consensus is a--or that conflicting--right, okay. Conflicting views, you know, is a--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: That's already a starting point. I think conflict should not be, you know, shortchanged.

MR. TAWIL: Right. Still at the policy level then, the idea of awareness-raising workshops, bringing it together, like publishers, educational decisionmakers, and arguments for introducing respect for diversity and promotion of peace, arguments that would be evidence-based and largely economic-type arguments.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: And I think there's another piece that you said that didn't get up there, and that's that--because it becomes a lateral team building, a horizontal team building, because if you--

MR. TAWIL: Right.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: --for people you're going to have (?) people, you're going to have evaluators. So you're creating already a network of curriculum, you know, creators and--

MS. McDONALD: Creators.

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Yes.

MR. TAWIL: And then we had in terms of curricula implementation, I suppose, the idea of ongoing--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: Implementation and evaluation.

MR. TAWIL: And evaluation. Ongoing assessment, encouraging strong evidence that curricula implementation is actually happening and making a difference. Is that--

MS. MONTERO-SIEBURTH: You just said the word, making a difference.

MR. TAWIL: And to that you're adding, Maria, building capacities within Ministries of Education for defining indicators of--

MS. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ: To do--yes, I've got to do this, which is perhaps a little bit vague.

MR. TAWIL: And, finally, your last point on reality check, not stopping with curricula reform, and that, okay, agreement has been reached, there is a new curriculum, and that's the end of the story. But thinking perhaps already in that formulation phase of implementation of the pacing and timing of that and ensuring that there is as much effort, support, and funding that is going into that phase as to the policy reform. Is that sort of--okay. Well, I think it's time for coffee.

MS. McDONALD: I hope they're concrete enough.

[Whereupon, at 10:44 a.m., the session was
concluded.]