GCED

LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT

An Analysis of Four Case Studies in Asia

GCED
LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT

An Analysis of Four Case Studies in Asia

Contents

List of tables, figure and boxes

Tables

Figure

Boxes

Foreword

As part of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), SDG target 4.7 and Global Citizenship Education (GCED) play an important role in enabling all learners to be equipped with relevant competencies for this rapidly changing world to contribute to building a more peaceful, inclusive and sustainable society.

For the past twenty years, the Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU) has relentlessly made the efforts to promote the implementation of GCED at regional and global levels together with our partners. Especially, APCEIU has been working closely with UNESCO Bangkok and members of the Asia-Pacific Regional GCED Network to enhance GCED implementation in the region, such as through capacity building of educators and publication of GCED teaching and learning materials.

Although assessment is perceived as critical to ensure an effective learning process, it has been identified that there is still limited assessment on how GCED learning is conducted in this region. In order to address these issues, APCEIU is proud to work together with UNESCO Bangkok and the Asia-Pacific Regional GCED Network in the development of *GCED Learning and Assessment: An Analysis of Four Case Studies in Asia.*

As this publication examines how GCED is integrated and assessed in the region through examples from Japan, India, the Republic of Korea, and Viet Nam, we hope that this material will provide lessons for countries in the Asia-Pacific region to further integrate GCED into their respective education systems and strengthen their efforts to assess GCED learning. We also look forward to more regional dialogues and cooperation among member countries, which in return will strengthen the overall GCED implementation in the region.

Hyun Mook Lim
Director of APCEIU

Acknowledgements

Acronyms

ESD	Education for Sustainable Development
ESDGC	Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship
GCED	Global Citizenship Education
LiFE	Learning in Fostering Environment
LTLT	Learning to live together
MoET	Ministry of Education and Training (Viet Nam)
ROK	Republic of Korea
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SEA-PLM	Southeast Asian Primary Learning Metrics
TVC	Transversal Competencies
NCF	National Curriculum Framework
QFT	Question Formulation Technique

Executive summary

Global Citizenship Education (GCED), as part of SDG4.7, is a transformative educational approach which enables learners to become responsible global citizens to contribute to more inclusive, peaceful and sustainable societies. GCED has been promoted in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond, however, the practices and assessments of GCED learning vary in different countries/schools. Therefore, this analysis aims to collect examples of how GCED is being implemented and how the GCED learning outcomes are assessed in some schools in the region, to share good practices and lessons learned.

In 2019 the Asia-Pacific Regional GCED Network carried out four case studies in Japan, India, the Republic of Korea (ROK) and Viet Nam to examine how some Asia-Pacific countries integrate GCED learning and competencies into educational practices, and how these practices are assessed at school level. The researchers from academic institutions and education authorities in respective countries collected school-based assessment resources for this analysis, which highlights the readiness of countries and the potential of GCED learning assessment in the region while hoping to draw attention to the need for systematic GCED learning assessments, curricular guidance, as well as school leadership.

The cases studies from aforementioned countries were developed based on the four areas of the whole-school approach integrating GCED, which include:

- School management (e.g. school curriculum/syllabus, governance of school – school leadership and support given to/participation of teachers, teacher/staff capacity development)

- Teaching and learning (e.g. pedagogical activities/approaches)

- Learning environment (e.g. infrastructure, environment surrounding schools)

- Collaboration with community (e.g. efforts made by school to collaborate/link with the local community)

Based on these categories, the researchers found first, schools which have strong leadership in promoting GCED integrated GCED learning throughout the curricula, whereas schools have little knowledge thus less leadership of GCED, integrated GCED learning into a supplemental subject solely. Second, mainstreaming GCED integration in the curricula helps students to obtain competencies and knowledge for the rapid changing world. Also, auxiliary activities like creating 'notice board' on the hallway can help to illustrate themes of GCED learning like climate change and sustainable development. Fourth, the involvement of communities or other partners outside of school can strengthen the connection between students and the 'real-world', which is a critical component of GCED.

Overall, the research notes that current and traditional forms of learning assessments do not always effectively address GCED learning. Even if the teaching and learning content includes GCED elements, assessments may not have been designed to address these. The research from the case studies highlighted five key findings for creating and implementing GCED learning assessments. First, specific evaluation systems designed with GCED in mind are helpful for educators to assess GCED learning. Second, researchers found that the process-oriented approach enabled educators to best evaluate GCED learning. Third, well-designed rubrics can help educators to measure the learning objectives and outcomes associated with GCED activities. Fourth, assessing affective learning can help educators to understand students' attitudes and beliefs of GCED learning, therefore improving the quality of GCED learning. Finally, the researchers found that competency-based assessment is a great model for GCED learning assessment, as this approach assesses skills and attitudes in addition to the curriculum subjects.

A few suggestions can be drawn in terms of GCED implementation based on the findings. First, to better equip teachers with pedagogical skills in GCED teaching and to further promote GCED learning in classrooms, mainstreaming GCED learning throughout the curriculum is critical. Second, school leadership is critical in implementing a whole-school approach in GCED learning and school leaders must enable teachers to explicitly incorporate GCED learning.

In terms of assessing GCED learning, the suggestions are firstly, ensure that assessments tools and methods are aligned with the desired outcomes for GCED and make assessment practices relevant to the school contexts. Schools and educators can promote assessment for learning by creating specific evaluation systems, developing rubrics, and using alternative modes such as affective assessments or competency-based assessments that can capture GCED learning outcomes.

Introduction

Global citizenship refers to a sense of belonging to a common humanity and a respect for diversity and solidarity (UNESCO, 2014a). It promotes interdependence and interconnectedness between the local, the national, and the global based on universal values and respect for diversity. Global citizenship education (GCED) consists of three core domains of learning: cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioural. It aims to equip learners with knowledge, values and skills to contribute to a more just, inclusive and peaceful world through a multi-faceted approach.

The relevance of GCED to achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is highlighted in SDG Target 4.7, which calls on all learners to acquire knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, the promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship, and the appreciation of cultural diversity and of cultures contribution to sustainable development by 2030 (UNESCO, 2016a).

GCED is a key component of the global indicator 4.7.1, and it is also critical for the measurement of the thematic indicator 4.7.4: 'Percentage of students by age group (or education level) showing adequate understanding of issues relating to global citizenship and sustainability' (UNESCO, 2017). Furthermore, GCED also contributes to addressing other SDGs, such as poverty eradication, environmental preservation, health, and peace. GCED has an important role to play in the effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. As a result,

assessing GCED learning contributes to the monitoring of the global indicator 4.7.1, which further contributes to the achievement of SDG Target 4.7.

Many of the competencies that Global Citizenship Education aims to impart, such as collaboration, critical thinking, compassion, and communication, have not historically been studied to the same extent as imparting literacy and numeracy skills and so less is known about how to assess them (UNESCO Bangkok, 2016). The need for further research on developing measurement frameworks and the effective use of learning assessments is key for strengthening quality education. As a result, the Asia-Pacific Regional GCED Network[1] commissioned a short study to build the knowledge base on GCED learning assessment.

This report highlights some of the efforts made by schools and teachers in response to Sustainable Development Goal 4.7. The purpose of the study is to examine more closely how lower-secondary schools both implement and assess GCED learning in their efforts to improve the quality and relevance of learning. The study showcases both good practices in the implementation and assessment of GCED, as well as recognising the gaps of GCED learning assessment. This study also helps to clarify the perception of GCED at the school level, and suggests synergies and commonalities that can mutually reinforce other holistic education initiatives, such as Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), human rights, and peace education.

1.1 Global Citizenship Education skills and competencies

Global Citizenship Education, as a key pillar of SDG4 (especially its Target 4.7), is a means to improve the quality and relevance of learning. While countries have made significant progress in integrating the concepts and approaches promoted through GCED in policy and curricula, it remains a challenge to assess these learning dimensions, especially socio-emotional and behavioural learning (UNESCO, 2018; UNESCO, 2019). The three core conceptual dimensions of GCED are based on, and include, aspects from all three domains of learning: cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural. They are interrelated and are presented below,

---

1   The Asia-Pacific Regional GCED network was established in 2018, composed of various organisations and partners which committed to the realization of GCED towards Education 2030, and it synergises the diverse regional efforts from partners who have been active in implementing GCED and GCED related programmes and activities.

each indicating the domain of learning on which they focus most throughout the learning process (UNESCO, 2015):

Box 1: Core conceptual dimensions of Global Citizenship Education

Cognitive:

To acquire knowledge, understanding and critical thinking about global, regional, national and local issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations.

Socio-emotional:

To have a sense of belonging to a common humanity, shared values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity.

Behavioural:

To act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world.

Source: UNESCO, 2015.

These core dimensions of GCED then provide a solid framework for the types of skills, values attitudes that we want our learners to embody. In other words, beyond tradition and foundational skills of literacy and numeracy, education provides an opportunity to impart competencies, such as collaboration, critical thinking, compassion, and communication, so-called 'transversal competencies' or '21st Century Skills' (UNESCO Bangkok, 2016). UNESCO has been promoting the transversal competency framework (*see Figure 1*) in research, policy and advocacy since 2015 (UNESCO Bangkok, 2016).

These skills and competencies, regardless of the names used by each country and their respective focuses (e.g. GCED, ESD, human rights and peace education, etc.), provide the opportunity for transformative pedagogies to place importance on social-emotional, cognitive, and behavioural learning for just, peaceful, sustainable, and tolerant societies.

Figure 1: Transversal competencies

Source: UNESCO Bangkok, 2016.

1.2 Assessing GCED learning: Importance and challenges

When it comes to the assessment of GCED learning, one major challenge is the lack of understanding of 'a learning domain' as well as 'what increasing levels of competency in a skill look like… without [which] designing assessment frameworks and tasks are impossible' (Care, et al., 2019). Implementing GCED is a complex process that requires in-depth discussions among education stakeholders and requires a close look at how to incorporate these skills and competencies through the curriculum, teaching and learning, and assessment.

Assessing GCED learning — as a holistic development of cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioural learning — requires adapted pedagogy and learning environments. Moreover, traditionally, assessment in education has focused on academic achievements. In GCED learning, educators often focus on the development of student competencies and not their recall of facts. This means that assessment techniques for this learning must be adapted, moving from assessing facts to how students would employ and interpret the facts they learn. In order to do so, educators must shift from identifying well-defined goals to ill-defined goals. In the context of classroom assessment, educators 'move from a "closed" question where correct answers are prioritized, to "open" questions or prompts, which require a student to demonstrate cognitive and/or social processing' (UNESCO Bangkok, 2016).

In many countries, learning assessments hardly address GCED learning, or if they do, they follow the traditional path of measuring students' knowledge on global issues (UNESCO Bangkok, 2016). Several large-scale standardized assessments at the global and regional levels (i.e. International Civic and Citizenship Education Study and Southeast Asian Primary Learning Metrics [SEA-PLM]) partially address socio-emotional and behavioural skills. At the national level, some countries in Asia, such as Bhutan, Mongolia, and Pakistan, use formative or classroom-based approaches to assess these types of skills and competencies (UNESCO Bangkok, 2019).

Despite the conceptual and methodological challenges, the issue of learning assessments remains important for learners to realize what and how they learn, and for teachers and school leaders to identify areas for improvement in curricula, teaching practices, and learning environments. Teachers are key beneficiaries of the development of the framework for accessing GCED learning outcomes, since they are at the heart of GCED implementation. Teachers play a crucial role

in creating a desired learning environment to develop the capacity of students (UNESCO Bangkok, 2018a). They are expected to have a strong knowledge base and pedagogical skills, show effective classroom management skills, and be inclusive and flexible to meet the diverse needs of students (UNESCO Bangkok, 2018b).

Previous studies (e.g. UNESCO Bangkok, 2019) show some measurement techniques are used in different settings such as classroom observations, rubrics that lay out indicators of GCED competencies, student journal entries, and peer-assessments. Teachers incorporate these classroom assessment techniques to understand students' behavioural changes and to improve their instructional methods to better meet students' needs. These often vary in practice and tend to be small-scale, but these practices have a great potential to further improve GCED. The case studies in this report hope to contribute to the study of different assessment tools that educators can employ to assess GCED and transversal competencies.

1.3 Scope of the study

The research developed out of discussions of the Asia-Pacific GCED Network, at its September 2019 meeting in Seoul, Republic of Korea. The members agreed to select India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and Viet Nam as pilot countries for this study. For each country, one researcher (either an individual or institution) was recruited to conduct a qualitative study of one or two schools implementing GCED learning. This report is based on these four case studies, which captured some assessment approaches and techniques for measuring GCED learning outcomes and competencies in Asia, and offered insights into assessing GCED learning for policymakers, teachers, and education leaders.

The scope of study is not limited to the definition of Global Citizenship Education, but also looks more broadly into the learning and teaching of *transversal competencies* and elements of a whole-school approach. It examined the assessment practices of those schools and countries promoting transversal competencies under Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), Human Rights Education, Peace Education, and Education for International Understanding. We recognize that the specificities of these education initiatives have different foci and different international frameworks supporting them; however, to simplify the language, the study uses the title of 'GCED learning assessment.'

The aforementioned case studies examine the purpose, approaches and techniques of learning assessments in the broader context of SDG 4 (in particular Target 4.7 through GCED), and contribute to objectives, methods and approaches to improve the assessment of GCED. Particular attention is paid to the assessment methods applied in schools where a whole-school approach is adopted to promote GCED. Previous projects have shown the effectiveness of the whole-school approach in achieving GCED, which recognizes that all aspects of the school, including school management, teaching and learning, infrastructure environment, and collaboration with community, can positively impact the learning outcomes of students.

The original research framework for the case studies is listed below (*see Table 1 and Table 2*). Table 1 outlines the approaches of GCED integration at the school level and Table 2 indicates the areas of GCED assessment that researchers investigated at the schools.

Table 1: Research framework for GCED integration

Whole-school approach at integrating GCED
Area 1: School management (e.g. school curriculum/syllabus, governance of school, school leadership and support given to/participation of teachers, teacher/staff capacity development)
Area 2: Teaching and learning (e.g. pedagogical activities/approaches)
Area 3: Learning environment (e.g. infrastructure, environment surrounding schools)
Area 4: Collaboration with community (e.g. efforts made by school to collaborate/link with the local community)

7

Table 2: Research framework for GCED assessment

GCED assessment
Area 1: School/classroom-based assessment methods used by teachers (e.g. assessment items, assessment criteria, assessment methods)
Area 2: Assessment method/tool development process (e.g. when, who, development background, etc.)
Area 3: How assessment is conducted and used to improve quality of learning and students' welfare
Area 4: Relevance of assessment factors to the whole school approach
Area 5: Areas for further improvement

Note: This research framework was developed by UNESCO Bangkok. However, the case study researchers were free to adapt it to their local context.

1.4 Methodology

The researchers each selected one or two lower secondary schools as sites for their studies. They selected schools that were active in GCED learning, where possible. The schools included institutions from both the public and private school systems, as well as co-educational and single-sex schools.

All the country researchers conducted interviews with teachers, administrators, and leaders of GCED learning. Some researchers used additional surveys for students to evaluate how the school implemented GCED learning assessments. In the case of the school in Japan, the researchers carried out the study over a period of four years, using questionnaires to measure students' consciousness for global citizenship and social participation and track any transformation over time. They also asked teachers to reflect on their activities and they wrote graphs on how their motivation changed during the research period. In the case of the school from Viet Nam, researchers studied the school programme, curriculum and assessment documents and guidelines while they also other conducted observations of lessons.

Table 3: Schools selected for research

Country	Schools	Type of school	Students	Research method
Republic of Korea	Osan Middle School	Private; All Boys school	395 students	Interviews with 2 teachers; Collected 8 survey responses from students.
Japan	Ageo Higashi Junior High School	Public; Co-ed	662 students 334 Boys 328 Girls	Interviews with 4 teachers; Conducted surveys among 1000 students (progressively in four years).
India	S.D Public School	Public; Co-ed	School 1: 237 students 173 boys 64 girls	Classrooms observations; Interviews with students and teachers.
	Rajkiya Pratibha Vikas Vidyalaya	Private; Co-ed	School 2: 206 students 113 boys 93 girls	
Viet Nam	Olympia Middle School	Private; Co-ed	957 students 190 boys 180 girls	Interviews with 6 teachers (2 English, 2 Civil Education, and 2 Science).

1.5 Limitations

The case studies are not intended to be representative of all Global Citizenship Education efforts in Asia or even within the respective countries. The researchers had a limited sample and scope (i.e. five schools in four countries participated). However, the case studies enable readers to have an in-depth understanding of how GCED is being implemented through the whole-school approach and especially the explicating approaches that schools are employing to assess GCED learning.

As each school integrates GCED differently, the findings from different schools based on the research framework are not equally reflected in this analysis. The data from each case study are not exhaustive, and the common areas of GCED implementation which could be extracted are school leadership, curriculum, collaboration with community and pedagogical approaches. In addition,

the information available from different cases under these areas also vary. As a result, not all the cases are discussed in each section.

This variation of knowledge and experience with Global Citizenship Education allowed for an analysis of a wide range of the schools' experiences with GCED learning assessments. In the cases of schools from Japan, the Republic of Korea, and Viet Nam, the researchers selected educational institutions that were familiar with GCED learning. In the case of India, the school was unfamiliar with GCED learning per se, and the researchers conducted their research by identifying existing aspects of GCED learning that the school was already implementing. Owing to the different contexts of each school, the range of research period varied: in some cases, the research spanned years and in others, months. In the case of Japan, the researchers built the case study based on some existing survey results over the years, while researchers from the other three countries developed the case studies from scratch.

Chapter 2

School-level approaches at integrating GCED

This chapter examines the results of the case studies in demonstrating how a whole-school approach to GCED, from school leadership, curriculum and pedagogical approaches,[2] can support the mainstreaming of GCED learning.

The approaches of GCED integration at each selected school are applied differently. Table 4 shows a snapshot of the different approaches and methods of integrating GCED at the different schools in the case studies.

To summarize, the case study of Japan showed that the school took leadership in designing GCED classes, and integrated the classes in the Grade 7 to Grade 9 curriculum. The teachers also used various pedagogical approaches (e.g. participatory learning)[3] to encourage students to gain an understanding that global issues are relevant to themselves. Furthermore, the school also involved the city officials to provide feedback on students' GCED action plan for city development. In the two schools in India, teachers and school principals are not familiar with the concept of GCED as promoted by UNESCO, therefore the school leadership for GCED integration was not evident. However, even without teachers'

---

2   The researchers did not necessarily define the various categories of pedagogical approaches, so the examples listed in this report are based on the individual researcher's categorization. For example, participatory, experiential, learner-centred etc.

3   According to the researchers in Japan, participatory learning is employed for all types of learning content, using all methods at hand to allow students to connect themselves with the world, and gain an understanding of global-scale issues as personal.

awareness of GCED, the school curriculum still has GCED elements embedded (*see Table 4*). Teachers guided students to create 'notice boards' for the hallways to showcase examples of tolerance and non-violence, which reflected students' learning process and outcome on such topics. The school in the Republic of Korea took the leadership role in supporting teachers in learning and implementing GCED. The school also ensured that GCED elements are integrated at all levels of the school, with curricular subject and co-curricular activities. Extracurricular activities like GCED student clubs are also supported by the school, teachers and non-profit organisations. The school in Viet Nam integrated GCED through equipping students with 21st century skills, hence to prepare them to be ready and resilient with future challenges. The school developed extracurricular activities like 'LiFE' program to help students to become responsible and competent global citizens.

Table 4: GCED/whole-school approaches examined by case study

	School Leadership and Awareness	Curriculum	Pedagogical Approaches	Collaboration with Community
Ageo Higashi Junior High School (Japan)	● Presence of active school leadership in promoting GCED. ● Teachers are well aware of GCED.	● Contextualised curriculum integrating GCED is developed.	● Participatory GCED learning is emphasised (e.g. student council).	● City officials are invited to the school to give lectures on city policies and plans.
S.D Public School and Rajkiya Pratibha Vikas Vidyalaya (India)	● School leadership in promoting GCED is not evident. ● Teachers are not aware of GCED.	● GCED elements found in curriculum (Table 5).	● Extracurricular and auxiliary activities (e.g. notice boards).	● Not reflected in the country report.
Osan Middle School (Republic of Korea)	● Presence of active school leadership in promoting GCED. ● Teachers are well aware of GCED.	● GCED was integrated at all levels of the school curriculum.	● Experiential GCED learning is applied (e.g. environment club, GCED club).	● Civil Society Organizations are invited to collaborate with student clubs.
Olympia Middle School (Viet Nam)	● School leadership in promoting GCED is not evident. ● Teachers are aware of GCED.	● GCED elements were integrated in the curriculum.	● Learner-centred approach (e.g. Question Formulation Technique).	● The school provides community service activities for students involvement.

2.1 School leadership and awareness

In analysing the case studies, we found that the schools whose leadership demonstrated a commitment to GCED tended to integrate GCED learning through multiple aspects of their curriculum. The schools whose leadership had little knowledge of GCED learning tended to restrict GCED to an auxiliary subject to be implemented apart from other components of the curriculum.

For example, in the Republic of Korea, the researchers selected a school, Osan Middle School, that was designated and operated by the Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education as a 'GCED Special Support School' and as a 'Multicultural Policy Research School'. The principal held an interest in the concept, and as such they applied for the school to be a GCED special support school. This commitment to GCED by school leadership is demonstrated by the support that the school gives to its teachers in implementing GCED. The school supports a 'Teacher Learning Community for GCED' with nine participating teachers as well as support from all teachers in the school for GCED learning. The principal's encouragement for GCED learning ensured that GCED learning and multicultural education was integrated at all levels of the school in conjunction with curricular subjects and co-curricular activities (i.e. club activities). For example, GCED learning was integrated into subject specific classes (such as history) as well as extra-curricular activities (such as volunteer and club activities).

Furthermore, the school leadership support ensures that GCED learning works hand in hand with a whole-school approach. The school also operates programmes related to GCED in cooperation with the local district office of Yongsan-gu, the Health and Family Multicultural Support Centre, as well as other related organizations and individuals such as Foreign Embassies (Kuwait, India, Netherlands, etc.), international students based in Seoul, and UNESCO related organizations; demonstrating a wide-ranging inclusion of various members of the wider community in support of GCED learning.

The support of school leadership in the case of the Osan school in the Republic of Korea could be contrasted to the case of two schools in India (one public and one private). Researchers in India found that the teachers as well as the principals were not familiar with the concept of GCED as promoted by UNESCO. Yet, they found that despite their unfamiliarity with the concept, elements of what would be determined to be GCED learning were identified by the researchers as part of the schools' curriculum.

Comparing the findings from four case studies, one conclusion that can be drawn is that strong school leadership can deepen the level of GCED implementation. Therefore, teachers and school leaders should understand GCED and recognise the importance of GCED first in order to establish a strong base for GCED implementation.

2.2 Curriculum

The researchers found a wide array of examples of how GCED learning is implemented in the curricula of the schools, demonstrating the benefits of a mainstreamed approach to GCED learning. Mainstreaming Global Citizenship Education is vital if students are to possess the abilities, skills, and knowledge needed to tackle sustainability and moral issues of the future (Glover, et al., 2012).

For example, in one Indian school the curriculum had elements of both GCED and Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) embedded in them, highlighting environmental and social issues. It is an interesting example of teaching about challenges related to both People and Planet. An overview of the school curriculum is presented in Table 5.

In the case of Ageo Higashi Junior High School from Japan, GCED learning is part of the school's Integrated Studies, which amounts to 50 class hours a year for Grade 7 students and 70 hours a year for Grade 8 and Grade 9 students. GCED learning is designed with a view of the students' interests and the learning content ranges from localized issues such as town and school planning through global-scale issues such as the environment, global conflicts, refugees, and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In GCED classes, the SDGs form the basis of learning and appear in every aspect of the curriculum for each grade, promoting each individual to consider how they can contribute to achieving the SDGs by 2030 and cultivating leaders who can create a sustainable society. Tying SDGs into lesson units enables different subjects to be linked, creating interdisciplinary study.

Table 5: Integration of GCED awareness and values in various subjects (India)

Subject	Grade	Title of Textbook	Chapter	Integration of GCED
English	VII	Honeycomb	The Ashes that Made Trees Bloom.	Importance of trees and plants for environment
English	VIII	Honeydew	This is Jody's Fawn	Co-existence of all living creatures
Mathematics	VIII	Mathematics	Unit 3: Data Handling	Logical presentation of global issues like population distribution, income disparities, climate variations, etc.
Mathematics	VIII	Mathematics	Introduction to Graphs	Graphs from regional, local, national levels leading to comparisons within a global perspective
Science	VII	Science	Unit 16: Water: A Precious Resource	Importance of water for all living beings
Science	VII	Science	Unit 18: Wastewater story	Re-cycling of wastewater
Science	VIII	Science	Unit 5: Coal and Petroleum	Air Pollution and Global warming
Science	VIII	Science	Unit 18: Air and Water Pollution	Greenhouse effect and global warming
Geography	VII	Our Environment	Life in the Desert	Conservation of natural resources, tribes of the desert, hardships faced
History	VII	Our Pasts	Tribes, Nomads and Settled Communities	Diversity of human life and livelihoods

Source: National Council of Educational Research & Training (NCERT), India.

Box 2: GCED curriculum – social studies (Japan)

GCED class: 'The practice of education which cultivates citizens'

The junior high school curriculum includes a civics component within Grade 9 social studies and student-centred activities aimed at creating better schools, such as instituting a student council and student committee activities within special activities. These approaches have constituted practice aimed at developing citizens. However, conventional approaches to citizenship have focused on knowledge alone and overlooked the experiential aspect which can cultivate citizens. In recognition of the need for a model of education which cultivates citizens within the junior high school curriculum (i.e. citizenship education), this GCED class was established and social participation was incorporated into the research purposes.

The class is configured in the hope that, upon graduation, students will become able to take action in society as individual and global citizens.

Source: Ageo Higashi Junior High School, Japan.

In the case of the Osan Middle School in the Republic of Korea, GCED learning is integrated into subject-specific classes, as well as extra-curricular activities. When carried out in subject-specific classes, GCED is linked to the units of the 2015 Revised National Curriculum dealing with its related topics. Extra-curricular activities are conducted through club activities, volunteer activities, and the 'Exam-free school year' programme (*see Box 3*). Classes and activities under the 'exam-free school year' programme focus on theme-centred learning, career path exploration, club activities, arts and sports. These activities are implemented throughout the school year, with students selecting one GCED-related theme for each semester to develop a project, amounting to two GCED themes a year.

Box 3: Exam-free school year - project themes (Republic of Korea)

Exam-free School Year is a system that enables students to explore their dreams and talents, free from exams and competition-oriented education for one year in the middle school curriculum. Alternatively, learning outcomes are measured by a process-oriented assessment linked to students' participation.

Project Themes	● Sustainable Development Goals ● Water story ● Fair Trade ● Refugees ● Peace ● Campaign ● The World We Live Together

Source: Osan Middle School, Republic of Korea.

The club activities include an environment club supervised by the science teacher and a GCED club supervised by the social studies teacher. Both clubs meet once or twice a week (34 hours a year), and focus on various environmental and GCED issues, respectively (*see Box 4 for project examples*). Currently, these projects led by both clubs are carried out in collaboration with a non-profit organization called 'World Together', which has a Memorandum of Understanding with Osan Middle School. Both clubs carry out programmes, such as field experience, visits to related agencies, guest talk, and events to present the results of the club projects.

Box 4: Club activities - project themes (Republic of Korea)

Clubs	Environment Club	GCED Club
Project Themes	● Exploring Natural Plants in School ● Exploring Natural Plants Outside of School ● Pollution Problem ● Environmental Protection Campaign ● Climate Change Problems	● Cultures of Religions in the World ● Global Citizens, Taking Action ● World Food Culture ● Korean History/Cultural exploration ● World Art and Culture Tour ● Refugees, Having the Same Dream as Us

Source: Osan Middle School, Republic of Korea.

The Olympia school in Viet Nam mainstreams GCED learning through its LiFE – Learning in Fostering Environment programme, which aims to develop humanists who are independent in making decisions and bear responsibilities in various contexts based on a fundamental system of values and scientific evidence. The LiFE – Learning in Fostering Environment programme focuses on stimulating a process of personal development. The ability to communicate and maintain positive relationship on the basis of respect and compassion is emphasized in the programme, which encourages the whole community of member students to devote themselves to the common development of their surrounding environment.

Implemented by help of in-class learning activities, advisors, school events, workshops and seminars with parents, LiFE aims to promote:

● Ability to make decisions: students examine issues from an objective viewpoint and take action as active members of the community.

● Safety: students always bear in mind safety issues (physically, verbally and emotionally) of themselves and others when making decisions.

● Mindfulness: students take full control of their mind in the present (including but not limited to themselves: body, language, action, thoughts, emotions, work and communication).

The examples from these schools show how GCED learning can be integrated throughout the curriculum, ranging from science and math to social studies and history to extra-curricular and after-school activities. Of especial note is that the schools involve nearly all teachers in GCED learning, regardless of their subject

expertise. In this sense, GCED learning is not constrained to a specialized subject but rather is mainstreamed throughout subject specific courses and materials.

2.3 Pedagogical approaches

In addition to the curriculum, there were aspects of GCED learning in auxiliary activities, such as the creation of notice boards that exemplified themes of GCED learning, and lessons related to Sustainable Development Goals, such as global warming, air pollution, recycling, water management and the diversity of human life. For example, in the schools in India, the students created notice boards for the hallways on Mahatma Gandhi and emphasized his values of tolerance and non-violent resistance. The notice board demonstrates the students' understanding of a particular theme, such as ESD and peace. It reflects the learning process as well as the product. The initial activity of collecting pictures, drawing illustrations, and creating narratives and collages develops a sense of aesthetics, which gradually coheres to express a perspective. It also enables a dialogue and comparison of ideas, beliefs, and values, which is conducive to GCED.

In Viet Nam, the Olympia Schools' teachers utilize a profound technique in summoning student inquiry. The Question Formulation Technique (QFT), developed by Dan Rothstein and Luz Santana (2011), offers a straightforward, rigorous process that helps all students to learn how to develop and to improve their questions, and to strategize on how to use their questions. Students strengthened their thinking abilities during the process.

In Osan Middle School in ROK, the teachers conduct experiential learning activities (e.g. environment club, GCED club) that are themed on GCED, and the students can select learning topics based on their area of interests.

Similarly, in Japan, participatory learning is stressed and teachers use a variety of methods to encourage students to gain an understanding that global issues are personally relevant to them. In addition, each unit of GCED learning consists of a single student-centred learning process in which students notice new issues and world situations, think about resolutions, discover the connections with their own experiences, and act towards resolution. A notable characteristic of this class is that all staff members are involved in its practice, which means that the class is conducted by all teachers who handle GCED regardless of their subject areas.

Yet, the researchers found that in general, because GCED learning was focused on certain textbooks and notice boards, it was not integrated into all aspects of the curriculum and instead remained more focused on the cognitive aspects of GCED. Furthermore, the researchers noted that there were other areas, such as math and science, where the school could further integrate GCED learning, and yet the teachers were unsure about how to incorporate GCED in their lessons as they understood mathematics to be abstract and GCED to be focused on human factors. Finally, the researchers found that a whole-school approach could be fostered by looking beyond GCED concepts in textbook learning. Educators could identify GCED issues from their immediate surroundings or from local or regional events and link these with concepts in various fields found in the textbooks to make connections to the wider community.

2.4 Collaboration with community

As evidenced by the case study from Japan, school leadership can implement GCED through the whole school by incorporating community leaders, educational stakeholders, and policymakers in investing in global citizenship education. At the Ageo Higashi school, city officials not only visited the school to give lectures on city policies and plans but they also made GCED assessment an aspect of a whole-school approach by giving students feedback on their action plans for the city. This connection to civic learning and collaboration with civic leaders has real-world implications for students, especially considering that the age of suffrage was recently lowered to 18 in Japan, making participation in politics relevant to young learners. In addition, the school often invites outside participants such as NGOs, companies, guest teachers, students from the local university, and external researchers to attend and sometimes lead their teacher training initiatives. In this sense, the school collaborates with and shares its findings with the wider community.

The aforementioned four approaches of GCED integration are the areas that the selected schools focused on and can continue to improve. We could find from both good practices and practices that need to improve that strong leadership is needed. When a school has strong leadership in integrating GCED, the teachers will be more prepared, more supported, and GCED integration can be implemented at all levels, for instance in curriculum. Whether the school leadership or teachers are aware of GCED, the elements of GCED like similar concepts or related competencies can be found throughout the curriculum. Therefore, raising the awareness of teachers and school leaders on GCED is also critical.

Furthermore, integrating GCED throughout the curriculum will help students to better understand GCED and to be better equipped with GCED related competencies. Schools collaborating with communities will help the students to understand the real-world challenges.

Chapter 3

Assessment of GCED learning

This chapter examines some of the lessons learnt from implementing GCED assessments. In particular, the case studies highlight several domains that can assist in assessments: specific evaluation systems designed with GCED in mind, process orientated approaches, rubrics for assessing GCED learning, assessing affective learning, and competency-based assessments.

However, the implementation of these learning assessment methods in each case study varies (*see Table 6*). For instance the schools in Japan and the Republic of Korea case studies created specific evaluation systems for GCED learning, but not the schools selected in India and Viet Nam. The schools in India, Japan and Viet Nam developed specific rubrics for assessing the learning of GCED components. When assessing, both schools in the Republic of Korea and Viet Nam focused on a process-oriented approach whereas the schools in Japan and India did not. Furthermore, the schools in Japan and Viet Nam adopted competency-based assessments while the schools in India and the Republic of Korea chose to assess affective learning.

Table 6: GCED learning assessment methods examined by case study

GCED methods	Japan	India	Republic of Korea	Viet Nam
Creating specific evaluation systems designed for GCED learning	√	X	√	X
Focusing on a process orientated approach	X	X	√	√
Developing specific rubrics for assessing GCED learning	√	√	X	√
Assessing affective learning	X	√	√	X
Competency based assessments	√	X	X	√

3.1 Specific evaluation systems designed with GCED in mind: 'Evaluation for better practice'

Owing to the fact that Global Citizenship Education learning typically incorporates a range of topics and subjects (from Sustainable Development Goals to human rights) and these topics feature social-emotional learning, it is often a challenge for teachers to feel they have adequately assessed GCED learning. In India, where the schools the researchers worked with had little experience with GCED learning, researchers noted that conceptual clarity on GCED learning and assessment methods was lacking. The researchers reported that teachers were assessing the content of different subjects using various techniques such as periodic paper pencil tests, assignments, and projects, and while they noted that the classroom content included elements of GCED, the assessment process did not focus on GCED. This lack of focus on GCED learning negatively impacted the teachers' ability to assess students' comprehension of the GCED components. Furthermore, researchers remarked that when assessment had been completed, a follow-up plan was lacking. In fact, the teachers seemed to think that the assessment was an end in itself. It was not apparent that the assessment results could be utilized as a basis for further pedagogic action.

In Osan Middle School (ROK), methods and tools for GCED learning are developed by a curriculum committee composed of teachers in charge of subject curricula. For the GCED linked to subject-specific curricula, assessment methods and tools are developed based on the achievement standards of the 2015 Revised National

Curriculum. In case of the extra-curricular activities (e.g. club activities and an exam-free school year programme), the assessment methods and tools are selected and developed by the teachers responsible for GCED learning. In this way, assessment tools are developed by the teachers who develop and implement GCED learning, allowing them to further refine the assessment tools and learning based on their experience with the tools and results.

In the school from Japan, teachers and administrators created specific evaluations systems to assess GCED learning. Much of the learning in the GCED class involved task work in groups, each of which worked toward the resolution of a selected issue through exploratory activities. Among the learning activities were guest lectures and group visits with community organizations to conduct interviews. The final stage of learning was the preparation of reports, proposals and plans in groups, after which there were opportunities for communication through presentations on their content.

A number of questions were raised regarding how to evaluate this kind of project-based participatory learning with educational evaluation at the school involving considerable trial and error as well. Evaluation for this class took place on the premise that 'evaluation is done in order to realize better practice'. By evaluating how students approached learning and what results (reports, posters, etc.) they produced, the teachers in charge worked to evaluate them so as to create materials with which to reflect on unit design and methods of instruction.

For example, reading students' worksheets enabled confirmation of whether they were learning what the class aims and intents were. Additionally, listening to student presentations (poster presentations, etc.) enabled an understanding of the extent to which the students understood the learning aims and issues required for the unit. In this way, evaluation in class was not simply based on students' results and activities, but took place under the common understanding that its purpose was also for teachers to reflect on and improve their own methods of questioning the students, providing class materials, and reflecting on their approach to the class in general.

Furthermore, teachers used descriptive evaluations of students' activities and changes observed in students on report cards. Yet, a common understanding of the purpose of evaluation for this class was that the evaluation was not carried out for the purpose of filling in report cards, and that evaluation was to be done in accordance with the evaluation plan created along with each unit plan, rather than being performed as it typically was for non-GCED classes.

Therefore, having an evaluation system that's specifically for GCED is much more effective to assess GCED learning. The evaluation system can vary in approaches and be adaptable for teachers based on different needs and contexts. However, creating a special evaluation system is not the end of assessment. Follow-up actions/plans should also be included as part of the assessment.

3.2 Assessment tools and methods: A process-oriented approach

In creating tools and methods for assessing GCED learning, researchers found an approach that focused on the process of learning allowed educators to best evaluate how GCED learning was meeting its goals.

In the Republic of Korea case study, the learning assessment of GCED-related contents is composed of a process evaluation performance outcome. In general, multiple choice questions cover almost 50 per cent of school assessment in local middle schools. However, the assessment of GCED in Osan Middle School focuses on the process and outcome of the students' performance when carrying out the assignment. The students are assessed based on their submitted material and written self-evaluation in narrative or essay format. In particular, within the exam-free school year programme club activities and volunteer activities are assessed by describing the outcomes of the project and the contents of students' activities. Overall, this is an assessment of the students' knowledge of what they have learned and their ability to perform the assignments.

This approach focuses on the process of the students' learning experiences, which helps refocus the assessment not only on the end result but also on the journey, the inquires, failures, and successes that students experience throughout their learning process. This allows teachers to better understand the nuances of how their students are learning. The self-assessment is also key as it allows students to play an active role in their assessment and to reflect on their learning process.

The Olympia School in Viet Nam takes the approach of creating one-on-one advisors, with teachers as advocators and advisors for support. Students receive daily assessments from the teachers on their performance in each class, weekly grades and reports to chart their progress, as well as flexible guidance and structure as they begin to internalize the skills necessary for success. Students see their advisors daily and meet with them regularly, and this 'real time' feedback is offered so students can immediately make the corrections necessary to redirect

their efforts. Teachers are seen as trusted mentors, and students soon realize that they themselves are the most important contributors to their own education. The school's 'Conference Period,' which takes place every day, allows for one-on-one tutoring time between the teacher and student, thereby assuring sustained growth and daily guidance when needed. Much as during professor office hours at the university level, students soon learn to take advantage of this resource.

Using a consistent, process-oriented approach, teachers instruct in a multi-sensory, multi-activity, collaborative style, facilitating discussion in seminar-style classes. As students internalize these academic skills, they gain confidence and become willing to take risks in their thinking and invest more of themselves into their learning.

Box 5: Assessing GCED learning – multiple approaches (Viet Nam)

Government and Civil Education

In this subject, Grade 6 students are invited to explore international conventions regarding child rights through class discussion, role play, film content analysis and personal reflection. Assessment methods for this subject involve mainly 45-minute paper-based tests with questions asking for students' understanding and application of knowledge about this content. In addition, learners take part in a musical show of a related theme in which they are assessed based on their constructed plot, acting, and effects of the core message of the play. This form of assessment is in line with the interactive process of teaching and learning in which students are encouraged to actively explore and apply the content of the lesson as well as master the necessary skills at their own plan and pace.

Source: Olympia School, Viet Nam.

Teachers at the Olympia School pointed out that although paper tests are a convenient and time-saving form of assessment to implement on a large scale, this type of assessment lacks the ability to fully understand students' processes. The teachers further highlighted a lack of time and opportunities for assessing the in-depth application, expression of personal opinions or creative exhibition of art products. The possibility of extending classroom time for this subject is limited so they observed that it might be more practical to combine a verbal, process-oriented assessment with advising activities to enable students to explore this topic in more depth and for teachers to assess it using verbal feedback.

3.3 Developing rubrics for assessing GCED learning

While rubrics are often used for non-GCED subjects, the researchers found that schools that used rubrics for GCED learning were better able to map out and quantify aspects of the learning results. In India, SD Public school runs an ECO Club, which carries out activities like teaching students how to compost. Facilitators use assessment rubrics to assess the competencies, such as observation and recording, discussion, making logical connections, classification, cooperation, and analysis. Teachers use verbal assessment to complement the rubric. For example, they ask students, 'What do you understand by biodegradable waste substances? Give some examples. How does your family manage waste at home?'

In Viet Nam, Olympia Middle School uses assessment rubrics in their project-based science class to measure components of GCED learning; for example, on sustainable management of natural resources. Throughout the course of the project, students are assessed on multiple components, based on their performance in the preparation phase, collaboration and group work, oral and written report. For each of the components, teachers use a detailed rubric with specific criteria covering a variety of competencies concerning GCED such as awareness, group work and communication, problem-solving skills, and research and sharing of information. This method of learning and assessment is considered effective in motivating students and testing their application of skills and knowledge at a deeper level. Students are evaluated not only on their knowledge and understanding but also on their behaviour, application and evaluation of knowledge.

At the Ageo Higashi School in Japan, teachers developed a rubric for assessing GCED learning. Evaluating GCED is mainly based on 'performance tasks'. Performance tasks include a diverse variety of work such as reports, presentations, and theatrical pieces, which bring together knowledge and skills and cannot be graded based on clear right answers. The rubric displays indices for evaluation, with characteristics of each competency or performance level (e.g. A, B, C, etc., *see Table 7*).

The rubric is not only used for the final evaluation, but is also presented and explained by teachers at the beginning of the learning activity to share learning objectives. In this way, students are able to deepen their understanding of the learning goals and content based on the rubric and to grasp the scope of the activity.

Table 7: GCED learning rubric (Japan)

Criteria/Grading levels	A	B	C
Theme (e.g. are the topics clear and well developed?)	● Student clearly identifies the needs for researching the theme/topic. ● Student clearly identifies discussion points.	● Student identifies the topic/theme, but is not clear on the reason or need for researching. ● Ideas for discussion are not well presented.	● Student cannot identify a theme on their own.
Critical thinking (e.g. student can share various points of view, student shows critical thinking)	● Student shows research skills by using different sources. ● Student can observe, reflect and share different points of view. ● Student can generate their own opinions on the project.	● Student only presents limited points of view. ● Student only reproduces what they have read.	● Student does not present various points of view.
Learning content or subject knowledge	● Student shows ability to understand the content, shows self-reflection and self-evaluation on the content. ● Student shows interests in acquiring more knowledge about their theme. ● Student shows motivation to learn on their own (i.e. self-directed learning).	● Student shows ability to grasp most of the information/content, but does not show self-reflection/self-evaluation.	● Student has difficulty to understand the information/ content.

Source: Ageo Higashi School, Japan.

The rubric was created with the notion of an ideal student in mind and the qualities and capacities that students need to acquire. Teachers involved with this subject have developed a common understanding of what kind of student and what kind of qualities and capacities they wish to cultivate.

Five aspects of the ideal student to be attained as of graduation were listed, with eight competencies to be acquired through GCED *(see Box 6 for the ideal student criteria and learning competencies)*, linked with other subjects. Each programme or

topic is linked with each competency so students can acquire those competencies through GCED lessons over three years.

The researchers at the Ageo Higashi School also found that the school could improve its use of the rubrics. They found that teachers need to ensure there is sufficient time to create the various rubrics. For example, the rubric for the final activity in the unit must be ready for display at the beginning of the unit. Therefore, based on class content and unit aims, with consideration of students' actual behaviour and learning progress, time must be allotted to discuss and formulate the rubric. Additionally, once the rubric has been formulated, multiple teachers in charge of the class must look over it and discuss whether the content is suitable. With limited time, it is not easy for the teachers in charge to assemble for continued discussions and find the time to put the rubric together. In response, the school created time within the monthly grade meetings to discuss evaluation among teachers, enabling information sharing in relation to evaluation using the rubric.

Rubrics need not be overly prescriptive. Because the rubrics show the standards, their content may be taken as a 'frame', from which further content fails to develop. The researchers found that the frame becomes smaller the more it includes specific numbers or phrasing, and student work tends to become overly similar.

Finally, Ageo Higashi School researchers found that there was little opportunity for reflecting the voices of students in the rubric. As a path forward, teachers at the school hope to discuss with students in an attempt to create evaluation standards together and to include students in the evaluation process.

Overall, the development of rubrics helps teachers to evaluate students more fairly and easily based on the standard evaluation criteria. While developing such rubrics, schools may also wish to consult students when developing rubrics, as students' involvement in decision making may result in active participation.

Box 6: Ideal student criteria and eight learning competencies (Japan)

Ideal students are:

● Students who can participate in society with their own ideas and well-supported opinions

● Students who respect diverse cultures, customs, and attitudes, and can live well alongside others

● Students who can identify their own tasks and think about things from different angles

● Students who can achieve critical thinking and actively investigate and communicate

● Students who can participate collaboratively in creating a better society as individual citizens

Eight learning competencies:

● ***Social participation:*** The ability to take part in activities to improve society as an individual citizen.

● ***Multicultural coexistence:*** The ability to understand diverse contexts (religion/language/history, etc.) and one another with mutual respect.

● ***Discovering and setting tasks:*** The ability to notice individual issues, perceive them as personal issues, and set tasks.

● ***Critical thinking:*** The ability to grasp the essence of things and interpret them from diverse perspectives.

● ***Collaboration:*** The ability to collaborate with diverse partners and use their skills to resolve issues.

● ***Gathering and using materials:*** The ability to gather materials suitable for resolving issues and put them to use with analysis.

● ***Expression/communication:*** The ability to sum up researched content and one's own opinions and convey them to others.

● ***Problem resolution:*** The ability to face problems or issues with integrity and continue working to resolve them.

Source: Ageo Higashi School, Japan.

3.4 Assessing affective learning in GCED

In assessing GCED learning quality, teachers at Osan Middle School in the Republic of Korea developed a survey to study the impact of GCED learning on students, which included their attitudes and beliefs. Researchers and educators designing Global Citizenship Education programmes for students often promote the affective elements of these courses, as manifested in students' individual and collective beliefs and attitudes (Sklarwitz, 2017). These beliefs and attitudes determine the ultimate success of the course and improve the quality of learning. Using a small sample size of eight students, the teachers at Osan School conducted a survey following a GCED class to determine how the class affected the students' beliefs and attitudes. The teachers also assessed how GCED learning was developing attitudes for mutual understanding, cultivated caring, and fostered reciprocal interactions.

Table 8: GCED learner attitudes (Republic of Korea)

Category	Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High
GCED has influenced my dream.			👥 (2)	👥 (3)	👥 (3)
GCED has influenced my learning methods.			👥 (2)	👥 (3)	👥 (3)
GCED has influenced me to increase my learning time.		👤 (1)	👥 (2)	👥 (2)	👥 (3)
GCED influenced me to understand the lives of my friends from different cultures.			👤 (1)	👥 (3)	👥 (3)
GCED influenced communication with people and friends from different cultures.				👥 (3)	👥 (3)
GCED has brought more attention to local, national and global issues.	👤 (1)			👥 (3)	👥 (3)
Equality, human rights, justice, and environment have become important in our lives.			👤 (1)	👥 (3)	👥 (3)

Source: Osan Middle School, Republic of Korea.

In India, researchers found that the school's 'Happiness Curriculum' could be categorized as Affective Learning. The national government introduced the Happiness Curriculum in 2019 to educate children to ensure harmony with their

inner self and discover themselves in the process of learning. This curriculum is a stepping-stone towards establishing a better, positive and vibrant society with happy individuals. This curriculum has the potential of inculcating GCED values.

At RPVV-Lajpat Nagar School in India the first period of every day is called the 'Happiness Period'. Students begin with a few minutes of mindfulness practice, followed by either a story-telling activity or a group discussion. Each child is given an opportunity to express his/her thoughts and feelings in the class freely. Several emotional issues of students are also addressed in the process.

Box 7: Happiness curriculum (India)

The objectives of the happiness curriculum:

- To develop self-awareness and mindfulness amongst learners

- To inculcate the skill of critical thinking and inquiry in learners

- To enable learners to communicate effectively and express themselves freely and creatively

- To enable learners to understand their expectations in relationships, develop empathy, and ensure healthy relationships with family, peers and teachers

- To enable learners to apply life skills to deal with stressful and conflicting situations around them

- To develop social awareness and human values in learners to engage in a meaningful contribution to society

- To develop holistic approaches to education in a universal context

Source: RPVV-Lajpat Nagar School, India.

3.5 Competency-based assessments

Competency-based assessment has been recognized as a fruitful model for GCED learning assessment. In terms of GCED competencies, these are 'competencies that make it possible to understand the social reality in which we are living, to cooperate, coexist and exercise democratic citizenship in a plural society, as well as undertaking to contribute to its improvement' (Pastor-García, et al., 2019). The purpose is to educate the students to recognize an increasingly interdependent global world and to value the enrichment that comes with opening up to different cultures and realities. Competency-based assessment provides a transversal vision of the evaluation of curriculum subjects because it assesses not only knowledge but also skills and attitudes.

In Viet Nam the Olympia Schools combine Vietnamese National Standards with Common competencies. The standards clearly demonstrate what students are expected to learn at each grade level so that parents and teachers can understand and support their learning. Standards on knowledge and competences are made by the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET, Viet Nam).

Box 8: Common competencies (Viet Nam)

Common competencies:

- Competency of self-control and self-development

- Competency of social relationships

- Competency of instrument and technology usage

Source: MOET, Viet Nam.

At Ageo Junior High School, teachers implemented competency-based assessments for GCED learning, signalling which competencies students should attain through their participation in the class. Before they design the classes, teachers take time to reflect and work together to define the meaning of each competency they want students to learn. See Table 9 for an example of the competency-based curriculum management sheet that teachers use. Researchers noted that through the GCED classes, not only students but also teachers might be able to acquire those competencies.

Table 9: Competency-based curriculum management sheet for Grade 7 (Japan)

Grade 7		Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
GCED	Themes/topics	GCED orientation/workshop experiences					Learning SDGs				SDGs in society		
	Subject content	Workshop (water/international cooperation / food /gender)					SDGs		Report		Social problems		
	Learning Competencies	Multicultural coexistence; Discovering and setting tasks					Discovering and setting tasks; Gathering and using materials; Expression/communication				Social participation; Problem resolution		
Science	Themes/topics	Plant world			Things around us				Light/sound		Power	Land	
	Subject content	Flowers	Photo-synthesis	Plant connections	Distinguishing plants		Gas aqueous solution	How things change	Light	Sound	Active power	Volcano	Earthquake
	Learning competencies	Gathering and using materials	Problem resolution	Discovering and setting tasks			Discovering and setting tasks; Expression/communication					Problem resolution	Problem resolution
Social studies	Themes/topics	The World	Lifestyle in the World	Ancient history	Ancient history in Japan		Asia	Europe	Africa	South and North America	Oceania	Japanese history (Kamakura era)	
	Subject content	World map	World weather	Ancient civilization	Politics in Japan	Their lives	Economic growth	EU	Life in Africa	Environmental issues	Connection between Asia	Life in the past	Namboku War
	Learning competencies	Expression/communication	Multicultural coexistence	Collaboration	Discovering and setting tasks		Discovering and setting tasks; Gathering and using materials; Expression/communication					Collaboration	Collaboration

Teachers also recognize that GCED classes do not stand alone in the curriculum, and to teach GCED competencies they also need other subjects' learning materials. Accordingly, teachers created a curriculum management sheet based on competencies. Teachers check the topics which they teach in each subject and find what competencies are connected in the lesson. Following that they try to connect those competencies between each subject and GCED classes. This type of assessment not only draws on a competency-based plan but also recognizes the importance of mainstreaming GCED throughout the curriculum and that classes not specifically designed as GCED classes can also serve to teach GCED competencies.

Teachers assess students' progress towards competencies through the one-on-one advising system. Advisors monitor and assess the programme to ensure that growth is occurring and participants are meeting expectations (academic and social). A checklist will be developed to monitor progress. Students are assessed on a variety of accomplishments, including their number of 'acts of kindness', course grades, individual awards, and amount of school activities and after-school-involvement.

Competency based assessment allows teachers to be clearly guided on what competencies that they need to focus on while teaching. It also allows students and even teachers to acquire the competencies that are set as learning objectives through teaching and learning.

To encapsulate the different GCED assessments method used in the five schools, we can find that creating a specific evaluation system can help teachers to assess GCED learning outcomes effectively, which helps teachers to better practice GCED. Using a process-oriented approach can monitor if GCED learning is meeting its goals. Furthermore, developing rubrics for assessing GCED learning helps to quantify the learning outcomes, and assessing affective learning usually results in improving the quality of GCED learning. Lastly, using competency-based assessments strengthens the links between GCED and the curriculum. It helps teachers and students to realize that GCED is not an isolated concept, and its competencies can be found in various subjects.

Chapter 4

Reflections on GCED learning assessment

In promoting GCED learning, the missing piece that educators and stakeholders often overlook is assessment. Understanding how to devise and implement meaningful assessment practices of Global Citizenship Education should move the broader picture of assessment from a focus on quantifying the skills student attain towards a more integrated educational approach focused on the affects, behaviours, and competencies students internalize to take meaningful action within their communities and globally. And yet, there remain gaps in the research in assessing Global Citizenship assessment methods and connecting them to real-world outcomes. Further research is needed on students who have participated in GCED learning to determine if the attitudes and behaviours GCED learning is said to cultivate have impacts on the decisions they make in their lives.

4.1 Cultural competencies

In implementing GCED assessments, educators first have to be aware of how the concept of GCED learning is specific to different cultural contexts. In setting indicators for reaching GCED learning outcomes, policymakers and educators need to think about how specific cultures interpret and understand universal concepts, such as human rights and sustainability. For example, UNESCO has set out a vision for GCED that sees education as going 'beyond the development of knowledge and cognitive skills to build values, soft skills and attitudes among learners that can

facilitate international cooperation and promote social transformation' (UNESCO, 2014a). Outcomes are often measured by indicators such as whether particular concepts, including human rights and gender equality, have been mainstreamed in the curriculum (UNESCO, 2016b). Critics of this approach argue that 'focusing on universal human values such as human rights, gender equality, cultural diversity, tolerance and environmental sustainability, can fail to recognize the liquidity, historicity, and evolution of difference' (Bamber, et al., 2018).

Yet, school systems and educators often interpret and understand universal values through their culturally specific lenses, making these values relevant to learners. As the researchers in India demonstrated, even in the case where educators and administrators were not familiar with GCED per se many elements of GCED learning were already present in the curriculum. In the case of the schools in India educators noticed that the schools' practice of promoting the Indian concept of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* (a Sanskrit phrase that means 'the world is one family') is in line with GCED learning and could be brought consciously to the forefront of creating GCED learning, specific to the Indian context.

Assessment practices also need to be relevant to the cultural and specific school contexts. For example, schools may teach affective behaviours in different ways, and may focus on different attitudes or beliefs. In creating affective learning surveys, schools need to adapt the specific behaviours they assess to their context, while being mindful of how specific behaviours are in line with the goals of GCED learning.

4.2 Structural inequalities

Global Citizenship Education needs to pay attention to both structural inequalities and intercultural competencies: 'GCED learning should not reinforce existing stereotypes and binaries, but challenge students' worldviews and lead towards the co-construction of knowledge' (Sklad, et al., 2016). For example, binaries of the Global South and Global North, or of developing and developed countries, can be unintentionally reinforced through programmes where students in one local learn about the 'other' in a way that can marginalize cultures and identities. Nor should the discourses on GCED be dominated by Western societies and by the type and form of knowledge they favour (Damiani, 2018). Further research is needed on how to bridge the local realities of students with global concerns while working to actively dismantle prejudices and misconceptions.

One suggested way forward to address inequalities is to move beyond affective-moral learning as an outcome in GCED learning towards a 'social-political' approach: 'this reframes the ideal global citizen as an autonomous, political subject, shifting the focus from the affective-moral to the social-political' (Nesterova & Jackson, 2016). In this approach, GCED would engender respect for diversity of views, legitimate conflicts of interests and the right to decide as well as recognition of autonomous individuals. As advocates of this approach explain, 'citizenship can be understood as a social-political concept, not only as affective-moral. If GCED from a moral perspective entails developing empathy and sympathy, the social-political citizen is more reflexive, proactive, and autonomous. He or she is not someone who tolerates the other and their differing worldviews because it is a moral thing to do. He or she sees that others have 'claims to liberty and equality,' and 'struggles to establish and secure [his/her] views and meanings,' just as he or she does' (Nesterova & Jackson, 2016).

The social-political approach to GCED learning highlights individuals as autonomous and attempts to demonstrate to students the pluralistic and equal value of diverse worldviews. Yet this should not mean that the affective learning of GCED should be forgotten. As the researchers from the case studies above have shown, in order to take action and stand for justice, students have to have a foundation of social-emotional learning to build the attitudes and affects needed for social action.

4.3 Formative and narrative assessment methods

There is an increasing need to refine methods for assessing GCED learning. While rubrics, qualitative surveys, and checklists have proven to be useful tools to quantify learning, self-assessments by students, formative assessments, and narrative assessments provide a more capacious approach to assessing students' attitudes and emotions. Formative assessments, which Black and Williams have defined as 'all those activities undertaken by teachers and/or by their students, which provide information to be used as feedback to modify the teaching and learning activities in which they are engaged' tend to better capture affective GCED learning because they emphasize dialogue between teachers and students, and educators and administrators (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Formative assessments often include four key elements (Priestley & Sime, 2005):

- Questioning. In particular, they advocated the use of 'wait time' during oral questioning to allow pupils time to process questions and answers.

- Feedback through marking. This involves the use of 'feedforward' (feedback targeted at improvement), through, for instance, an emphasis on comments rather than grades, and a greater reliance on oral feedback.

- Peer-assessment and self-assessment. Suggestions include the use of 'traffic lighting' to promote two-way communication in the classroom; for example, the use of red, amber and green colour coding to signify understanding.

- The formative use of summative tests. This approach includes suggestions that pupils be encouraged to redraft work and to set and mark summative questions.

Research that has focused on formative assessments and increased dialogue has found that it tends to change practice in the classroom and increases interactive learning (Priestley & Sime, 2005). In particular, the Olympia school in Viet Nam used narrative assessments through an advisory programme, which is an educational support programme that focuses on students' academic, social emotional, physical and ethical behaviour and progress. Through the process of narrative assessment and focus on dialogue, students at Olympia found they formed meaningful relationships with their instructors who also helped them meet high standards.

4.4 GCED assessment and the whole school approach

A whole-school approach involving school management, teaching and learning, infrastructure environment, and collaboration with communities can positively impact learning outcomes of students as well as GCED learning and assessments. In particular, researchers have found that implementing GCED across curricula and integrating it school-wide requires 'globally conscience school leaders' (Henck, 2018). School leadership shapes the vision of the school and can establish structures such as anti-discrimination policies, mentoring programmes, and assessment tools that are designed for GCED learning. Furthermore, school leaders can assist and integrate teachers who have less experience with GCED learning and assessment, scaffolding support to those teachers as they begin to engage with GCED.

In India, following the National Curriculum Framework (NCF) 2005, classroom processes have undergone a sea change in the past decade, along with formative assessments based on participatory and creative tasks which support GCED. In this regard, the researchers of the schools in India found that teacher training focused on assessing GCED learning should be an integral part of school management. For example, the creation of rubric for GCED assessments should not be left to main evaluators, such as management personnel or a few of the teachers, but conducted with all involved teachers, discussing what constitutes an A grade (i.e. what is the 'ideal') and sharing goals. In this sense, educators can work towards establishing a 'community of practice' within the school to foster GCED assessments as part of a whole-school approach (Henck, 2018). Moreover, as researchers in India pointed out, assessments are not an end in themselves. Assessments should be utilized as a basis for teachers to further inform pedagogy, the learning environment, curriculum, and teacher training, bolstering a whole-school approach to GCED learning.

Researchers at the Osan School in the Republic of Korea made several suggestions for incorporating GCED assessment in a whole-school approach. They suggested that for cross-subject classes on GCED themes, assessment methods should be formulated through consultation with other teachers handling related subject areas, and in this sense GCED assessments are not siloed but shared with teachers across subjects. Currently, assessment at schools in the Republic of Korea are based on achievement standards of the national curriculum. If assessment items related to GCED are included in the national curriculum, it will be easier to develop and assess classes related to GCED and to make GCED learning a priority throughout all schools.

A whole-school approach in concert with Global Citizenship Education advances learning that is participatory, democratic, creative, and inquiry-based. The above considerations represent several approaches for adopting a whole-school approach to GCED with particular regard for how assessments can further support integrating GCED learning throughout schools. There is an idea that 'GCED can — and should — be delivered not only via formal learning defined by the curriculum, but also via informal learning experiences embedded in every aspect of school life' (Henck, 2018). There also need to be corresponding methods for assessing GCED learning in a way that bolsters a whole-school approach so that assessments go beyond merely assessing GCED learning; instead, they should serve to improve the mechanisms of students, teachers, administrators, and community members working together to develop behaviours, affects, and skills that are globally conscious and oriented towards social justice.

When thinking about Global Citizenship Education, educators should consider assessments as a means for achieving a whole-school approach. Assessments can go beyond understanding how students are incorporating values and competencies and can examine how the school community, management, teaching and learning environment can all improve connections between each other in the pursuit of Global Citizenship Education. GCED is about social connections and interpersonal relationships and assessment has a key role in this context.

Conclusions and recommendations

The case study approach in India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and Viet Nam allowed researchers to dig deep into the fabric of the schools they studied, taking away both the successes and challenges of GCED learning as well as assessing GCED learning. The case studies revealed several key takeaways in regards to creating Global Citizenship Education learning environments and assessing GCED learning, including:

- The importance of school leadership for implementing a whole-school approach

- Mainstreaming GCED learning throughout the curriculum

- Creating specific evaluation systems designed for GCED learning

- Focusing on a process-orientated approach

- Developing rubrics for assessing GCED learning

- Assessing affective learning

- Competency-based assessments

All of these practices can be flexible enough to fit the different approaches schools take to approaching GCED learning. Yet, these practices require that schools think about assessment methods when designing GCED learning, and create GCED assignments and assessments in concert with each other. The following

recommendations, which are not intended to be conclusive, can serve as a first step for educators in approaching GCED learning and its assessment.

Enable school leaders and teachers to explicitly implement GCED learning. Buy-in from school leadership and teachers is key for both implementing and assessing GCED. Comprehensive understanding of GCED at the school level by teachers and learners is crucial. The school leadership plays an important part in making sure that the school has a coherent vision, as well as having teacher collaboration on various education approaches. As the case studies noted, curriculum, materials, and pedagogical approaches to GCED are often implicitly implemented. But in order to properly incorporate assessment of GCED, it is important to have a clear and united vision among school stakeholders.

Ensure that assessments tools and methods are aligned with the desired outcomes for GCED. Schools and teachers should align the desired GCED outcomes with the curriculum, materials and approaches that they will utilize in the school and classes. However, schools and teachers often do not have explicitly defined outcomes for GCED, causing conceptual and operational challenges. For example, in promoting both GCED and ESD as mutually reinforcing transformative pedagogies, UNESCO proposes four priority areas that act as foundational outcomes (UNESCO, 2014b), where students:

- Have acquired the knowledge, understanding and critical thinking about global problems and the relationship between countries and different peoples.

- Have a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values, responsibilities and rights.

- Show empathy, solidarity and respect for diversity and differences.

- Act efficiently and responsibly in local, national and global contexts to achieve a more peaceful and sustainable world.

Educators can adapt and modify these based on their local contexts, curriculum and materials in order to clearly align learning objectives and desired outcomes.

Utilize alternative modes of assessment, such as competency-based assessment and affective assessments, to capture GCED learning outcomes. Assessment of socio-emotional and behavioural learning is required. There is a predominance of assessment of the cognitive domain while the socio-emotional and behavioural domains are left by and large unassessed, or assessed cursorily. The adoption of competency-based assessments and affective assessments can be crucial in assessing students' attitudes and values in GCED

learning outcomes and highlighting transversal competencies. They add to the evaluation of the curriculum because they assess not only knowledge but also skills and attitudes.

Utilize Assessments for learning. Assessment tools (whether it be a process-oriented approach or rubrics, etc.) and results can be analysed by teachers to plan further instruction and learning interventions and to evaluate how the curriculum is impacting students' beliefs and behaviours. Teachers should use the assessment outcomes for planning pedagogical approaches, bolstering teacher education, and improving the learning environment.

Over the past decades, more and more institutions of higher learning have developed programmes destined to educate students for global citizenship who can understand global issues beyond traditional borders and act for social justice, sustainability, and global understanding. Such efforts pose considerable challenges: conceptually, pedagogically, and from the perspective of impact assessment. Pedagogically, this calls for transformative learning, with an emphasis on attitudes and skills, in addition to knowledge acquisition. Once objectives have been defined and translated pedagogically, such programmes call for an assessment of the degree to which they have been met (Sklad, et al., 2016).

These case studies have demonstrated a wide range of approaches to GCED learning and assessment methods, highlighting challenges as well as successes in effectively implementing GCED assessments. They have emphasized that GCED learning assessments can take a variety of forms to fit various cultural contexts and should be specific and targeted towards the goals of GCED learning, and support a whole-school approach. Moving forward, these case studies call for a renewed effort by school systems to engage deeply with the goals of Global Citizenship Education through applying transformative pedagogies, underscoring transversal competencies, and creating innovative ways to measure how students are cultivating the attitudes, affects, and skills to meet these goals.

References

Bamber, P., Lewin, D. and White, M. 2018. (Dis-) Locating the transformative dimension of global citizenship education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* Issue 2, pp. 204-230.

Care, E., Kim, H., Vista, A. and Anderson, K. 2019. *Brookings.* [Online] Available at: https://www.brookings.edu/research/education-system-alignment-for-21st-century-skills/ [Accessed 1 June 2020].

Damiani, V. 2018. Introducing Global Citizenship Education into Classroom Practice: A Study on Italian 8th Grade Students. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal,* 8(3), pp. 165-186.

Black, P. and Wiliam, D. 1998. Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education,* Volume 5, pp. 7-68.

Glover, A. et al. 2012. *Developing and Piloting a Baselining Tool for Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship (ESDGC) in Welsh Higher Education.* [Online] Available at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10755-012-9225-0 [Accessed 1 June 2020].

Henck, A. 2018. Looking Beyond the Classroom: Integrating Global Citizenship Education throughout Your Whole School. *Childhood Education,* 94(4), pp. 75-77.

Nesterova, Y. and Jackson, L. 2016. Transforming Service Learning for Global Citizenship Education: Moving from Affective-Moral to Social-Political. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada,* Issue 28, pp. 73-90.

Pastor-García, I., López-Toro, A. A. and Moral-Toranzo, F. 2019. *Iberoamerican.* [Online] Available at: http://ried.unizar.es/index.php/revista/article/view/326 [Accessed 1 June 2020].

Priestley, M. and Sime, D. 2005. *Formative Assessment for All: A Whole School Approach to Pedagogic Change.* [Online] Available at: https://dspace.stir.ac.uk/bitstream/1893/133/1/priestley-cj-2005.pdf [Accessed 1 June 2020].

Rothstein, D. and Santana, L. 2011. Teaching Students to Ask Their Own Questions. One small change can yield big results. *Havard Education Letter,* Volume 27, Number 5.

Sklad, M., Friedman, J. and Oomen, B. 2016. 'Going Glocal': a qualitative and quantitative analysis of global citizenship education at a Dutch liberal arts and sciences college. *Higher Education 72,* Issue 3, pp. 323-340.

Sklarwitz, S. 2017. *ScienceDirect.* [Online] Available at: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0885985X16300821?via%3Dihub [Accessed 1 June 2020].

UNESCO. 2014a. *Global Citizenship Education: Preparing Learners for the Challenges of the 21st Century,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2014b. *Developing New Ways of Measuring Educational Results- A Key to Success,* s.l.: s.n.

UNESCO. 2015. *Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2016a. *Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action for the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4 Ensure Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education and Promote Lifelong Learning Opportunities for All,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2016b. *Education for People and Planet: Creating Sustainable Futures for All, Global Education Monitoring Report, 2016,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2017. *Measurement Strategy for SDG Target 4.7 Proposal by GAML Task Force 4.7 Global Alliance for Monitoring Learning Fourth Meeting 28-29 November 2017* Madrid, Spain: UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2018. *Progress on Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2019. *Educational Content Up Close: Examining the Learning Dimensions of Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO Bangkok. 2016. *Assessment of Transversal Competencies: Policy and Practice in the Asia-Pacific Region,* Paris: UNESCO & UNESCO Bangkok.

UNESCO Bangkok. 2018a. *Asia-Pacific Regional GCED Network Meeting Final Report,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO Bangkok. 2018b. *Preparing Teachers for Global Citizenship Education: A Template,* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO Bangkok. 2019. *Assessment of Transversal Competencies: Current Tools in the Asian Region,* Paris: UNESCO.