

Regional Capacity building workshop on curriculum alignment, teacher training and learning assessments



Final report

25-27 July, 2018

Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Introduction

The present report provides a summary of contributions and support to the Teaching and Learning Educators' Network for Transformation (TALENT) led by UNESCO Dakar, to improve alignment of assessment, curriculum and teacher training in sub-Saharan Africa.

Summary of work performed to fulfill the mission's Terms of Reference:

- a. *Ensure the general coordination of thematic facilitators' team:* an agenda and a concept note were prepared through exchanges with the Dakar Office to define the tasks of the facilitators' team, as well as coordination meetings with facilitators in preparation for the in-person workshop.
- b. *Coordinate face-to-face activities:* an in-person workshop was held in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania between 25 and 27 July 2018. The main activities were sharing expertise and organizing participant hands-on practice and conceptual production. A dedicated website was created to share information between participants and their draft roadmaps were uploaded to an exchange platform.
- c. *Deliver presentation on curriculum trends:* an overview on curriculum processes and their connection to assessment and teacher training. A PowerPoint presentation was prepared and delivered to participants during the in-person workshop, including pauses for hands-on work on specific concepts.
- d. *Design the online activities and ensure overall supervision of the online training:* facilitators met to discuss the tutoring goals; subsequently, an online learning experience was prepared that combined team activities and reading assignments. The materials were selected and uploaded to the platform and help was given to participants in collaboration with Open University Tanzania platform manager.
- e. *Draft a final report that highlights issues discussed during the in-person workshop as well as areas selected for online training:* main aspects are included within this consultancy report.

Personal conclusions and lessons learned (consultant: Hugo Labate)

The process for improving alignment between assessment, curriculum and teacher training in Africa is still in early development. It is my personal opinion that the country teams need further coaching and learning opportunities to achieve the objectives of TALENT.

- Participants from the Ministries of Education and related agencies from each country seemed to understand the concept of alignment, but challenges persist on how to achieve a shared vision at the local level, as seen by the difficulties that arose in collaborative work across ministry agencies in each country. As such, the first training session has been an opportunity to familiarize participants with the concept; however, the long-range implications of how to turn the *concept* into *actions* needs dedicated work at each country level, with international support.
- A follow-up for participants should be devised, involving them into a series of continuing activities, e.g. webinars. The first wave of activities needs to be supported by TALENT's sustained efforts as everyday workload tends to dampen enthusiasm unless some stimulus comes from outside.
- The concept of alignment still must go through a process of "buy-in" by the highest officials in country Ministries and be promoted by the National Commissions for

UNESCO in a proactive way, including the organization of local level workshops and/or discussion forums. The leadership, in promoting alignment, should involve stakeholders in dialogues to “align” the perspectives of the society regarding the role of assessment as a tool for improving the quality of learning instead of a tool for selecting students to be promoted to higher education levels. An assessment system sustained in meritocratic and competitive values is particularly difficult to reform into a more inclusive perspective unless an extended social conversation takes place regarding the benefits of inclusion.

- The envisaged process of capacity building of participants needs to be scaled to include other stakeholders and their own ministry teams; thus forming a community of practice around the concept of alignment and allowing it to take root in the policies and practices of African education systems. To enable this discussion with stakeholders, several challenges must be addressed to find feasible strategies. Traditional, face-to-face, capacity building activities are costly and political engagement of several pressure groups might impede or divert discussions. Alternatives, such as social media campaigns and e-forums, can be considered to respond appropriately to each national and local context.
- In the current discussion about the concept of alignment, a fourth element is still missing: the issue of school governance, whereby existing culture in each individual school (including the leadership, organization and shared ideas) define “good schooling”. Teachers, as the last instance decision makers, must solve a complex equation: navigating the different “external”-and often conflicting-guidelines offered by curriculum and assessment bureaus, their own training background and the unspoken rules about what can or cannot be done in each particular school setting. As an example, schools where the principal prefers a strong orientation to discipline and order, often are ill at ease with an atmosphere of freedom within faculty members to create “lively” classrooms, as most Teacher Training Institutions advise, and this kind of mindset usually translates into a higher emphasis on testing and promoting grade competition rather than on formative assessment. A specific training directed to school principals and administrators should be conceived as a second-wave, following the training of high-level officials. It could include methodologies to enable principals to discuss with local stakeholders and involve the community in understanding the structure of modern quality education.
- Regarding the training structure of the TALENT programme, the combination of face-to-face activities and platform work was found useful; however, the process of selecting tutors and facilitators needs to be improved in future iterations to ensure that they have enough time and training beforehand to read and conceptualize the ideas, to feel confident in leading specific sessions with the country participants and to guarantee they understand and can deliver the process of online tutoring to high-level country officials. This process is different to tutoring “normal” students, as high-level officials are busy people and often require friendly, informal follow-up to ensure they complete the training.



REPORT CONTENTS

SECTION 1 – Capacity building strategy to improve alignment between curriculum, teacher training and learning assessments in Africa Workshop agenda and proceedings

SECTION 2 – Workshop agenda and proceedings

SECTION 3 – Conceptual discussions and results from the face-to-face workshop

SECTION 4 – Description of the online activities

Attached files:

- Presentations used in the in-person workshop
- Country proposals for an action roadmap

Documents intended for the distance learning phases are available for download from the site of the Open University of Tanzania: <https://elms.out.ac.tz/course/view.php?id=3282>



SECTION 1 - Capacity building strategy to improve alignment between curriculum, teacher training and learning assessments in Africa

The Regional Coordination Group on SDG4-Education 2030 set up TALENT in June 2016 as a Task Team to serve as the coordination platform of stakeholders engaged in regional programmes to address the learning crisis. UNESCO coordinates TALENT with the support of a Steering Group composed at this stage of: ADEA-NALA, ANCEFA, CONFEMEN and its PASEC Programme, REESAO and UNICEF.

Since its creation, TALENT has focused its activities on learning assessment systems as key processes to support learning as well as orient education quality reform in teacher standards and professionalization pathways in order to improve teachers' capacity to support learning. TALENT does not intend to replace the many specialized organizations working in sub-Saharan Africa countries, but rather to bring them together in a collaborative framework with a mission to improve the synergy of their interventions and to share knowledge and experience.

The findings of a previous regional needs assessment workshop, held in December 2017 with delegates from a set of 17 sub-Saharan African countries and about 15 regional and international development agencies including major learning assessment initiatives, indicated that:

- Teachers lack adequate training and support to carry out the various learning assessment tasks (diagnostic, formative or summative assessments) included in the curriculum.
- learning assessments (school-based, examinations and large-scale) have become more prevalent in sub-Saharan African countries but they tend to focus on exams, cover only limited domains of the curriculum and generate limited data intended to support learning.

As a result, a training was organized by the TALENT team with national officials to explore opportunities to improve education quality from a system alignment perspective, by discussing the extent to which learning assessment, learning goals, standards, curriculum and pre- and in-service teacher training are all aligned at the country level, and if/how they concur to form a coherent system¹ that fosters effective learning.

The training process was devised around a cycle of reflection→learning→contextualized application, including:

- preparation study
- in-person capacity-building workshop
- distance learning with country team activities
- preparation of a draft policy report on improving alignment

¹ Adapted from "Clarke, Marguerite. 2012. What Matters Most for Student Assessment Systems: A Framework Paper. Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) student assessment working paper no. 1. World Bank, Washington, DC"

Training objectives and expected outcomes:

National teams from sub-Saharan African countries were identified; the ideal composition included the three national top officers with responsibilities in the different components (e.g. the national directorates of curriculum, teacher education and learning assessment) and, whenever possible, representatives of the education sector partner associations such as development agencies active in Local Education Groups. During the three days of the face-to-face workshop, the participants were engaged in activities such as plenary presentations, group discussions and hands-on activity sessions.

The regional capacity-building workshop was aimed at enhancing the capacities of national delegates to address alignment issues in national learning assessment systems, with the following specific objectives:

1. Identify the main weaknesses in their respective learning assessment system (at basic and/or secondary education levels) with respect to curriculum prescriptions
2. Learn about best practices in assessment system alignment with curriculum and teacher training
3. Develop a draft of a national work plan to improve the alignment of curriculum, teacher training and learning assessment systems in their country
4. Network with a group of practitioners, experts and education cooperation institutions with experience and expertise in their respective fields

Participants were engaged in distance learning activities after the workshop; with the intention to help them further develop their understanding about system alignment and to generate the input for discussing policy options with their own authorities.

SECTION 2 – Workshop agenda and proceedings

Workshop proceedings

Day 1

Group introduction

Participants gave a short personal introduction and a quick description of the main challenges and features of their education system.

Introductory Presentation

The presentation discussed the TALENT objectives: Building a shared vision about the alignment of curriculum, training and evaluation as well as participation in distance-learning and network sharing process. Additionally, an overview of the workshop proceedings was shared with the participants regarding the specific objectives of the in-person training and following.

Presentation: International Curriculum trends.

A presentation on international curriculum trends was delivered as a starting point to share a common line of argument to discuss the issue of alignment in a broader perspective. Common trends in international curriculum include the inclusion of competencies/21st Century skills and

the integration of content from several subjects into interdisciplinary experiences as well as how these trends impact the proposed assessment strategies.

Group discussion: The participants were divided into breakaway groups to discuss the following issue: “What strategies do we have in place to ensure that learning outcomes are achieved?” Assessment efforts for checking curriculum progression and grade promotion was discussed as well as existing weaknesses to achieve the national curriculum vision. Participants presented their conclusions to the group in a graphic format.

Presentation: International assessment trends

A presentation was delivered on assessment trends in the international and African contexts to pinpoint gaps and challenges as well as to identify the possible methods of improvement. The notion of formative assessment as a way to describe the complex and non-linear learning process was discussed, explaining the challenges it implies for schools and teachers who are more used to summative assessment practices, and the positive effect it has on the learning process.

Plenary discussion:

A plenary discussion was facilitated to share perspectives on the tension between high-stakes and formative assessment as well as the implicit rationale behind assessment/testing, ultimately exploring which national needs are filled by each kind of assessment in use. Comments by participants included perspectives of assessment teams who need to use assessment data to regulate the access to higher levels of education and to hold schools accountable, while the curriculum teams expressed how their vision for learning and the introduction of new content and teaching practices somehow compete with the exam-based content; specifically in cases where the assessment and curriculum departments do not work together.

Panel session: Best practices in system alignment in sub-Saharan Africa and other regions

Facilitators coming from the United Arab Emirates and Senegal presented country-level case studies explaining the relationship between curriculum, assessment and teacher training in their countries, the existing challenges and promising practices. A Q&A session was facilitated after the presentations, whereby country representatives reacted to the information and expressed their own national situation and concerns.

Day 2

Opening session:

The morning activity was opened by a welcome speech delivered by the Director of UNESCO Nairobi and the Dean of OUT, followed by recap of Day 1 activities.

Interactive session: Systemic interactions between Teacher Training, Curriculum and Assessment: Strategies, tools and actors.

Participants were engaged in a series of hands-on exercises to facilitate the country-level dialogue. The opening session included a plenary reflection to visualize the interrelated nature of the educational process, where different stakeholders interacted to form a web of micro-decisions that have a profound impact on learning, mediated by regulations from the national level.

Group activity: Map of actors and relationships. Who are the key stakeholders?

Small groups involving participants from different countries used a list of possible stakeholders to configure a map of actors involved in the decision-making process, as well as the level of power and influence they might have.

Group activity (mixed countries): The teacher as a stakeholder in curriculum implementation

Small groups debated on suitable interventions directed to teachers and principals for improving curriculum implementation and evaluation results. The process implied:

1. Stating goals
2. Clarifying the need: why do we need to discuss alignment?
3. Defining possible elements for a set of training materials (booklets, sample tests, videos, radio emissions, television and mobile applications).

Groups shared their insights using poster boards. The discussion on the training materials showed diverse strategies based on local constraints and the participants were somehow limited in their ability to indicate the most appropriate kind of material without knowing the concrete setting.

Group activity (mixed countries): Planning an effective approach

A second part of the exercise implied discussing reasonable features of a programme to achieve consensus within the educational community and choosing cost-effective strategies for in-service training to carry out the message.

1. Choosing a scale (pilot programme with a few schools, regional programme, full roll-out)
2. Deciding on setting (school, group of schools)
3. Financial aspect (cost and budgeting).

The elements of this exercise were used later to work on a national draft plan. The scale generally chosen was a pilot, as the participants thought that designing a bigger scale approach would be hard in the beginning, as they still do not know if they can secure the financial commitment of top management.

Groups activity (by country): Convincing top management

The country participants discussed the first draft ideas for a national plan to improve alignment. A basic template of a policy document was shared with the participants, including rationale, actors and necessary steps. Main issues discussed were:

1. What would be the features of a program to improving curriculum and assessment alignment?
2. What conversations would be necessary? With whom?
3. What do the decision makers need to understand?
4. What cost would be feasible to manage? What would be the strategies for funding?

As a partial product, groups were asked to deliver a concise presentation on the ideas that could be used to convince the top management. The exercise was carried on to the following day, to continue refinement and development.

Day 3

Groups by country: Elements for a National Roadmap: Refined version

Country groups continued working on a Roadmap for improving alignment as a resource to start policy processes at the country level. The groups were asked to share their proposals through an interactive format, using the Padlet tool. Most of the Roadmaps included elements similar to:

1. Setting up of a steering committee on the alignment of curriculum, teacher training and assessment to oversee the process
2. Setting up a technical working group to review curriculum standards, objectives, content and assessment procedures
3. Conducting advocacy for different stakeholders to disseminate the need to achieve better alignment
4. Establishing partnerships with local and international cooperation agencies for funding, capacity building of the technical working group and implementation.

It is remarkable that the element of Teacher Education has received relatively little attention in the draft roadmaps, which could suggest that the linkages between Teacher Education and the everyday management of schools (led by the forces of curriculum and assessment) are yet to be understood with more depth.

Plenary discussion

The poster presentations of the group work on national workplan/roadmap were projected from the Padlet app and the groups were encouraged to pay attention to interesting features from other Roadmaps that they might have failed to include. Common main included in several roadmaps were:

1. Needs analysis studies and research
2. Production or renewal of a Teacher Training Framework
3. Sensitization of stakeholders regarding the role of curriculum and assessment
4. Review and adjustment of curriculum frameworks, especially to include a competency-based approach
5. Review of the assessment design process to include expertise from curriculum and teacher training sectors.

Presentation of the KIX funding Initiative

The participants were engaged in a presentation about the KIX funding initiative that helped them to identify the global goods available for sharing. The tools are conceptual and practical strategies that might help countries promote education improvement agendas. Participants were then asked to participate in an interactive session to explore available global goods and to find what tools and training schemes that might be useful to their countries in moving forward the alignment agenda.

Introduction to the distance-learning phase

The distance learning activities were discussed with participants, with the help of the platform manager so as to ensure that they all received the passwords and were familiarized with the platform structure. Tutors provided an overview of the distance learning activities.

Workshop evaluation

Participants used an evaluation form to give feedback on the workshop structure and content as well as the organization aspects.

SECTION 3 – Conceptual discussions and results from the face-to-face workshop

MAIN CONCEPTUAL ELEMENTS DISCUSSED IN THE IN-PERSON WORKSHOP

The need: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all (Sustainable Development Goal 4).

MAIN POINT: Disjointed efforts in educational policy mean a loss of coordination in producing the desired results and a bad returns on investment. Therefore, the need to achieve alignment.

The ideal situation would include all components of the education system are aligning when in a *systemic* way:

- The design of the tests, the performance levels are in accordance with the curriculum and the curriculum describes qualitatively the different stages in learning in a way helping to devise assessment practices
- The teacher training curriculum is aligned to school curriculum and training helps teachers to use assessment in a productive way to improve learning
- Test results are shared and useful to neutrally and precisely monitor the achievement of curriculum learning goals over the course of time. Furthermore, there are formal mechanisms to use test results for learning improvement and for the periodical revision of school and teacher training curriculum.

Proposing a *policy framework* for alignment means to achieve coherence between:

- National Teacher policy (Teacher recruitment and retention, Teacher education (initial and continuing)' Deployment, Career structures/paths, Teachers' employment and working conditions, Teacher reward and remuneration, Teacher standards, Teacher accountability, School governance)
- National Curriculum policy
- Policy on learning assessments (inclusive and supports learning).

Improving alignment requires:

- *Challenging theoretical and political perspectives:* Learning capacity of human beings is not in crisis; it is probably augmented by ICT. Why do we use indicators to instill a sense of crisis? To what vision is linked the curriculum and the assessment policy? Who is setting the agenda? To satisfy what objectives?
- *Challenging epistemic and pedagogic theories-in-action:* curriculum organized around old structures, privileging the storing of facts instead of understanding, the memorization of procedures instead of problem solving, and an evaluation system that reinforces this view.
- *Redefining ends and means:* Competency orientation: What students need to be able to do, instead of know. Rethink: curriculum structure, learning experiences, teaching strategies, assessment systems. What does a person need to understand the complex world, adapt and act in a context that shifts permanently? How can we measure if we are achieving this?
- *Redefining the roles:* The teacher as a stakeholder, not an implementer. Discussing the teachers' theory-in-action.

1. THE ASSESMENT ELEMENT

There is no shortage of large-scale learning assessment in Sub-Saharan Africa:

- 52% have their own national learning assessment
- 41% have participated in the latest cycle of a cross-national assessment

... in addition to public examinations and classroom/formative assessments for informing teaching strategies.

The evidence models learning outcomes relative to socio-economic and demographic conditions as well as practices or experiences, given:

- SACMEQ data shows learning achievement by sex, region, school location and socioeconomic status
- PASEC by sex, school location, type and environment (teaching resources, health and hygiene, infrastructure), teacher qualifications, parental literacy and home environment, disability, and practices outside school.

Cross-national learning assessments in Africa currently:

- measure cross-curricular knowledge, skills and competencies in a limited number of domains
- provide feedback on the comparative performance of the system at particular grades or for a particular age or age-group
- are generally sample-based, uniform and standardized in terms of content, administration process, timing, scoring and analysis

The existing data analysis can help progress toward SDG4 by:

- raising awareness on key issues
- identifying priority issues for reform
- adding depth and perspective to the analysis of education systems
- stirring public debate and placing educational issues on the policy agenda
- informing further research studies.

The evidence can be made more useful for improving teaching and learning in the context of alignment in different ways:

System-level

- Allocating resources
- Implementing programmatic reforms
- Outlining goals for curricular achievement

Curriculum-level

- Advocating curriculum development
- Supporting curricular content and methods
- Guiding curriculum design

School-level

- Setting faculty priorities
- Improving student support services
- Enriching school environment

Teacher-level

- Securing resources for professional development or improving pedagogical practices
- Revising courses and assignments.

Limitations and challenges of large-scale learning assessments for improving teaching and learning:

- Frequent misalignment between assessment, curriculum and pedagogy
- High cost (US \$500,000+ per large-scale assessment)
- Technical expertise not always available - design, administration, analysis
- Data on contextual factors often absent/not analyzed with learning data (child, family, school characteristics)
- High emphasis on public examinations and low emphasis on continuous (classroom) assessments
- Data often not used to make improvements.

When tests are too narrowly focused, they do not adequately assess the broad range of competencies, nor the breadth of knowledge within a given domain:

WITHIN A DOMAIN: e.g. Language Literature, Writing Skills, Listening and Comprehension are often disregarded/not measured

LIMITED DOMAINS & COMPETENCIES: Arts, Music, Citizenship and Environmental Responsibility are rarely assessed.

Assessment cannot possibly respond to the range of expectations from diverse stakeholders, including governments, schools, teachers, partners and the students themselves. For schools to use the assessment results to improve the school environment, they need to access data at the school level. For teachers to improve their practice with disadvantaged students, scores need to be given to them at an item-by-item level and to show the specific student level - which happens rarely as items are not made public and the anonymity of students is protected. For students to benefit from their learning experience, they need to receive individual feedback on their performance, which is unlikely when data are analysed at an aggregated level. In addition, data analyses are not generally presented in ways that enable targeting interventions at a classroom level as national-level trends are not necessarily applicable to each particular classroom context.

Despite limitations, there is increased pressure to improve ranks on cross-national initiatives' league tables, resulting in large-scale learning assessments becoming more high-stakes. Evidence shows that high-stakes examinations can lead to:

- Narrowing curricular content only to areas that can be measured
- Teaching to the test

- Neglecting a broad range of competencies for personal development.

2. THE CURRICULUM PERSPECTIVE

DRIVERS OF CHANGE IN EDUCATION: Job markets are changing fast, demanding less “school knowledge” and more “generic skills” and adaptability for lifelong learning. ICTs make access to knowledge easy, unpredictable and almost trivial. School is no longer the place where knowledge provision can be managed. Tensions to agree on how, what and why educate are increasing.

A CURRICULUM FOR UNIVERSAL LEARNING, an INCLUSIVE CURRICULUM: A VISION EMBRACING QUALITY AND EQUITY

Lifelong learning opportunities are necessary for all, therefore educational equity and quality must go hand in hand with societal aspirations toward equitable distribution of opportunities and the elimination of poverty and marginality. This perspective necessitates gearing educational policy components (curriculum, teacher training, school administration, supervision and assessment) to the achievement of inclusive *learning environments* which encourage the active role and participation of learners, their families and their communities. Inclusive environments require flexible *frameworks* (in curriculum and assessment) to accommodate local contexts and to diversify pedagogical practices, agreed through *participation* and consultation of all stakeholders in decision-making processes.

This can be stated as a dilemma, as society seems to demand two contradictory things at the same time: “Give me an education that I can understand, control, measure and relate to (classical, academic, graded), but also ensure that it prepares children for the unpredictable future”.

Revision of curriculum content and objectives for alignment

Avoid too much emphasis on academic content with its narrow definition of learning and learning outcomes, as well as restrictions on teaching practices and finally, the pressure on teaching staff to create academic content.

Avoid investing in “school knowledge” that is unusable out of school: skills and knowledge learned in school can lack relevance for the current lives of many students, especially those that come from non-academically oriented socio-cultural backgrounds. Content areas with little relation to the skills sought by the job market due to rapid technical development, international competition, as well as demographic changes, have to be reconsidered in new versions of curricula and avoided in the assessment process.

The linkages between CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

Assessment must be used to *support* learning, not for penalizing learners - especially those who are most disadvantaged. Standardized tests are good for measuring academic learning outcomes, making other types of valuable knowledge (e.g. informal knowledge and skills) to remain out of view. Tests, which are time-bound, create pressures for both teachers and students, especially those for whom (because of dyslexia, intellectual disability and low language

proficiency) reading and writing take more time than for average students. As research suggests, success in summative assessment does not necessarily correlate with adult success in social, vocational or other indicators of quality of life.

The danger lies in 'MEASURING WHAT WE VALUE' instead of 'VALUING WHAT WE CAN MEASURE'

WHEN ASSESSMENT 'REPLACES' CURRICULUM:

- teaching is geared into preparing students for the examinations rather than guiding and supporting students to learn what is described in the curriculum
- the standardized assessment given at the end of the year or a phase of schooling is used to infer the efficiency of the teaching in a school
- students who face individual barriers to learning may become a risk factor for school performance, which may lead to the exclusion of such learners
- learning outcomes are evaluated by centralized exams and very little room is left for adjusting curriculum goals locally.

3. TEACHER TRAINING

Context analysis informs the situation of teacher education/training in Africa:

- The alignment of policies on teachers, curriculum and assessment is weak
- Training courses are mostly academic, with weak or no interconnections and a gap between theory and practice
- Teachers are not aware of the current reality in schools and classrooms as well as changes in the curriculum, as they work in an isolated manner, focusing only on their own courses; thus, some topics are found repeated and/or overlapping in different subjects

A Teacher Education Curriculum framework and a specific Teacher Development Policy aligned with the curriculum and assessment policies at the national level are suggested as an effective and feasible strategy to improve the quality of Teacher Education, to generate advocacy and to share good practices and to harmonize and standardize teacher education, all allowing to close the gap between the teachers' education programs and what happens in schools.

4. AVAILABLE GLOBAL GOODS TO IMPROVE ALIGNMENT

Global goods are knowledge and tools that are non-rivalrous, non-excludable, have positive externalities, are more efficiently produced collectively and are available across multiple countries. These can include research, standards of practice and measurement tools. There is a gap between the available tools and the needs of African countries, which can be considered as areas to improve and develop knowledge shareable across countries.

Global Good Gap 1: Building national capacity for assessment through knowledge transfer, capacity development and learning exchange, especially regarding:

- Cost-effective ways to build learning assessment systems
- How to use results to improve outcomes

- Technical capacity for assessment within countries and regions
- Diagnosis of current assessment system for strengths, weaknesses and alignment
- Peer learning on use of assessment
- Assessments in some of the most vulnerable countries

Global Good Gap 2: Building evidence and evaluation of what works, especially in terms of:

- Value for money of different assessments
- How large-scale assessments can improve learning in the classroom
- How to use data for multiple purposes, e.g. student certification and policy
- Reforming/finding alternatives to national examination systems
- Capacity among teachers and school leaders for continuous assessment

Global Good Gap 3: Innovations in Learning Assessment, specifically on ways to:

- Include special populations, e.g. children with disabilities and out-of-school
- Assess important yet under-assessed areas: 21st century skills, social and emotional learning, global citizenship
- Use data on learning systematically to test interventions and reforms
- Build an internationally comparable baseline to track progress toward SDG4

PARTICIPANTS REACTIONS TO THE CONCEPTS

Country representatives agreed that the case for alignment in their countries is still very much lagging behind or even completely missing in policy discussions.

- Agencies in charge of curriculum and assessment do not work together as a team. This meeting is considered very timely and joining the relevant people.
- Initial teacher training is provided by many institutions, under a policy that is not clear or is fragmented, with poor linkages to curriculum reforms under way.
- Investment in testing competes with investment in other activities, e.g. curriculum reform and in-service training, in the context of scarce funding.
- Top management at the ministry level should be exposed to these concepts.
- The circulation of information and knowledge goods is restricted and country teams are not familiar with the spectrum of studies and research available.

Annex I : Workshop Participants

Country	Nom et titre
Benin	Mr. Blaise Coovi Djihouessi, Director of Training Engineering and Capacity Building for Trainers
Burkina Faso	Mrs. Habibata TONE/OUEDRAOGO, Director of In-service Training for Education Personnel
	Mr. François COMPAORE, Director General of Educational Research and Pedagogical Innovation
Burundi	Mr. Patrice MANENGERI, Director of the Evaluation Office of the Educational System
	Mrs. Chantal BAJINYURA, Director General of Pedagogical Offices
	Mr. Herménegilde BURIKUKIYE, Inspector General of Education
Central African Republic	Mr. Gilbert SELONKOUÉ, Director General of Basic Education, General Secondary Education and Partnership
	Mr. Stéphane SERMALE, Director of Educational Innovation
Chad	Mr. Ali Korei Aboubaka, Director-General, National Curricula Centre (CNC) / Ministry of National Education and Civic Promotion of Chad
	Mr. Nicolas Vaibra, Deputy Director of Primary Education, specialist in teaching evaluation, member of the PASEC National Committee
Comoros	Mr. Said Housen SAID ABDOU NORO, Dean of the General Inspection of National Education. Curriculum Dept
	Mr. Ali MOHAMED ALI, Director General of Higher Education, Teacher Training Department
	Mr. Ali ABDOU, Director General of the Office of National Examination and Competition
Ethiopia	Mr. Yilikal Wondimeneh Demissie, Acting Director, National Educational Assessment Directorate
	Mrs. Asefash Tekalgne Tulu: Director, Teachers and Educational Leadership Development Directorate
	Mr. EshetuAsfaw Cheru: Director, Curriculum Development and Implementation Directorate
The Gambia	Mr. Momodou Jeng, Director, Science and Technology Education and In-service training
	Mr. Ousmane Senghor, Head of Assessment Unit
	Dr Burama Jammeh, Curriculum Research Evaluation and Development Directorate

Lesotho	Mr. Teboho Tsilane, Director - National Curriculum Development Centre
	Mrs. Methalali Khoarai, Director - Assessment
	Masoloja Motlomelo, Director - Teacher Training and Development
Liberia	Hon. Gayflor Washington: Assistant Minister for Teachers' Education
	Mrs. Mardia Herring – Mensah, Executive Director, Center for research & Curriculum Development
	Mr. Abdallah M. Housseini, Head of Assessment Unit
Malawi	Dr. Grames Chirwa, Curriculum Specialist Officer at MIE
	Ms. Lindiwe Chide, Department of Inspection Advisory Services - Ministry
	Mr. Rabson J Madi, Training Manager
Mali	Mrs. Fadimata Bintou TOURE DIALLO, National Director of Teacher Training
	Mr. Bagara Z. COULIBALY, Head of Division of School Programmes at the National Directorate of Pedagogy
Niger	Mrs. Roua Boukar Koura, Director of Curriculum and National Language Promotion
	Mrs. Zara Gaoh Bakingué , Director of Initial and Continuing Education
	Mr. Hassane Djibo Adamou, Director of School Evaluation and Professional Competitions
Senegal	Mr. Alioune Badara DIOP
	Mr. Amadou Moctar SY, Head of the Study and Curriculum Division of INEADE
	Mr. Mamadou Diop , representative of the Training and Communication Department
South Sudan	Mr. Scopus Lubang Soro, Director of Curriculum Development Centre
	Mr. Edward kokole Juma Maame, Director of Teacher Training
	Mr. Mike Mading Manyok Ajak, Secretary of Examinations

Uganda	Ms. Angela Kyagaba, Senior Curriculum Specialist at National Curriculum Development Centre
	Dr. Jane Egau, Commissioner Teacher Instruction Education and training Ministry of Education and Sports
	Mr. James Turyatamba, Principal Examinations Officer/Exam Management (Secondary)
Zimbabwe	Mr. Lazarus Nembaware, Acting Director, Zimbabwe Examinations Council
Tanzania	Phorosia Makhanda, Tanzania Institute of Education Curriculum Coordinator
	Mrs. Naomi Veraeli Swai, Pre-service Teacher Education coordinator
	Mr. Alfred Mdima, Head of Research and Evaluation Unit at the National Examination Council of Tanzania
Tanzania (Zanzibar)	Mr. Suleyman Yahya, Zanzibar Institute of Education Director
	Zubeir Juma Khamis, Zanzibar Examinations Council Director
	Maimuna Fadhil Abass, Head of Teacher Training Department
UNESCO Staff	Mrs. Valérie DJIOZE-GALLET, Education Programme Specialist, UNESCO Dakar
	Mr. Davide Ruscelli, Junior professional expert, UNESCO Dakar
	Mr. Jesus Perez-Campos, Junior professional expert, UNESCO Dakar
	Mr. Bruno Dzounesse, Project Officer at UNESCO Yaounde Office
Facilitator	Ms. Florence Ssereo, Education programme Specialist at UNESCO HQ (Paris)
Facilitator	Mr. Hugo Alberto Labate, Senior Curriculum Specialist
Facilitator	Mr. Baye Daraw Ndiaye, Expert in teacher training
Facilitator	Mrs. Enas Abulibdeh, Expert in teacher training