

As much as some of us may wish for the contrary, we all know that you can't choose the family you're born into. And yet, the characteristics of the family in which we're raised have an enormous effect on the kinds of formative experiences we have as children, which, in turn, direct the trajectory of the remainder of our lives in dramatic ways. Children born into wealthy families have access to rich formative experiences, which lead to a greater variety of opportunities during adult life than children born into poorer families. But this hardly seems fair: Why should opportunity for success in adult life depend so much on the luck of birth, irrespective of natural ability or personal motivation? In recent decades, the international community has pushed for universal schooling as a means of equalizing, in part, the formative experiences of children in richer and poorer families. Unfortunately, we have not only richer and poorer families, but also richer and poorer nations, and many states find themselves in the unhappy position of having too few resources to provide every child with the lavish education they might desire. As a result, it has become increasingly important for states and other educational providers to seek out ways of maximizing educational benefit given limited resources, while still achieving the opportunity-equalizing function we assign to schooling.

This suggests the question I'd like to take up this morning: Is there some guideline curriculum planners can use to reduce the cost incurred by a given curriculum without jeopardizing the power of their schools to reduce the opportunity gap between rich and poor? Is there some minimal set of content to which everyone ought to have educational access?

As it turns out, the international community has yet to establish a detailed answer to this question. International discussions about education have certainly underscored the great importance of educational and curricular quality, but descriptions of what counts as quality *content* have remained rather vague.

Consider, for example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that education should be free and compulsory for everyone in the elementary stages, accessible based on merit in the advanced stages, and directed to the full development of the human personality. This makes it clear that all people should have access to education, but it gives little indication of what that education should look like, exactly.

The World Declaration on Education For All of 1990 gives a slightly more concrete picture of curriculum, stat-

ing that a sufficient education meets students' basic learning needs by providing "essential learning tools (such as literacy, oral expression, numeracy, and problem solving) and the basic learning content (such as knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes) required by human beings to be able to survive, to develop their full capacities, to live and work indignity, to participate fully in development, to improve their quality of their lives, to make informed decisions, and to continue learning." This description gives a general direction for curricular planning, names a few key subject areas, and provides a statement of purpose for the curriculum, but the international development community hasn't operationalized the description into concrete tools that planners can use to study and improve curricula.

This is particularly notable in the most common indicators of progress in educational development, which include enrollment rate, public expenditures, literacy rate, primary school completion rates, student-teacher ratios, number of textbooks, and percent of teachers that completed certified teacher training.

While all of this information is important in building effective educational systems, none of these indicators examine what students are intended to learn during their

school career.

Given the importance of the quality of curriculum for the overall success of educational development efforts, description and analysis of curricula merit more international attention that is currently given. Although a number of nations and development projects have endeavored to examine and improve local curricula, international discussion and monitoring of the content of the education being provided has remained at the level of broad generalities. The quality of the curriculum is just as important to achieving quality Education For All as enrollment, quality teachers, and adequate materials that the indicators I mentioned just a moment ago measure. So, just as we monitor international progress of these other characteristics of education, we need to monitor progress in developing quality curriculum as well.

We need an analytical device, a kind of curricular schema, that can be used to monitor progress in curricular development and facilitate international comparison of curricula. The schema would have to be specific enough allow “apples-to-apples” comparisons, and yet general enough to account for the diversity seen in different parts of the world.

The schema would describe in a systematic way the essential minimum kinds of content necessary for any sufficient educational system,

and could therefore be used as a heuristic tool to identify specific areas of weakness in given curricula and thus guide future development projects to fill the gaps.

But how to arrive at such a device? Perhaps the idea of a human right could help guide the development of such a schema.

Thomas Pogge, a philosopher at Columbia interested in poverty and justice, has a particularly useful institutional understanding of human rights.

He says that a human right is “a moral claim *on* social institutions and therefore a moral claim *against* all those who participate in the . . . upholding of such institutions. The postulate of a human right to [something] is tantamount to the demand that social institutions are to be (re)designed in such a way that all persons affected by them have [reasonably] secure access to [the thing].” These institutions include formal institutions such as civic organizations and government as well as informal ways of interacting—everything that forms the “rules of the game” as far as the functioning of society is concerned.

This conception of human rights is particularly useful in that it clearly identifies that all people who participate in the upholding of a social order bear some responsibility in ensuring the fulfillment of human rights.

Moreover, it doesn't require every person to participate in the fulfillment of the right first hand, as long as they help uphold some social institution that provides access to the right. For example, if we say there is a human right to personal safety, not everyone is required to act as a policeman, but can fulfill the human right by supporting an institution such as a police force, through political or economic means.

Now, if a human right is a kind of moral claim, then understanding moral responsibility could help understand the right to education.

The English philosopher Peter Strawson in his seminal essay entitled "On Freedom and Resentment"

explains that moral responsibility develops from an expectation we have that others maintain a regard of goodwill toward us and third parties, or at least that they maintain the lack of a regard of ill-will.

When we believe that people express goodwill, we re-

act with gratitude and praise; and when people seem to express ill-will, we react with resentment and indignation.

To see how education can be viewed as a moral responsibility, consider the example of a woman who moves to a new village and who knows that water-borne illnesses are prevalent in the area. She knows that boiling water kills bacteria, but she notices that none of the other villagers boil their water, and that many of the villagers have symptoms of various water-borne diseases. We would call the woman selfish or unkind if she purposefully withheld the knowledge she had about disease prevention through boiling water. Put another way, the woman has a moral responsibility to share her knowledge about boiling water since doing so would relieve the unnecessary suffering of her neighbors.

This idea generalizes in a way that can serve as the foundation for a universal schema for basic education curricula. Namely, people who possess knowledge that has the potential to reduce suffering bear a responsibility to share that knowledge with those who need it.

This suggests a criterion we can use to determine what should be included in the schema, namely, knowledge

that can reduce suffering. Now, this is phrased negatively in terms of suffering. I would much rather speak positively about increasing quality of life, or something along those lines. However, it's difficult to see how anyone has an arbitrary responsibility to increase the quality of life of others when that increase isn't linked with suffering. For example, someone who has enough wealth to own a vacation home might have a better quality of life if I helped him obtain a leisure yacht as well, but I doubt anyone would say that I have a *responsibility* to do so. Speaking of the responsibility in terms of suffering, as unpleasant as it may sound, provides a reasonable mechanism for judging the limits of a responsibility to share one's knowledge.

With this criterion, then, we can follow the relatively straightforward procedure of examining the different areas of life to determine what knowledge and skills are necessary to reduce suffering in each area. Now, this could quickly become very detailed and cumbersome, since human lives are complex, and there is a great deal of information that can be used to reduce suffering.

We can introduce a principle, however, to limit the number of details included in the curriculum without diluting the curriculum's potential to reduce suffering. The

principle goes along the same lines as the old adage “Give a man a fish, and he eats for a day; teach a man to fish and he’ll eat for a lifetime.” In other words, the curriculum could spell out every detail the every student will need to know to get through life (“giving a fish”); or alternatively, the curriculum could equip students to obtain for themselves the knowledge they’ll need (“teaching to fish”). This would involve some minimal set of basic skills and knowledge necessary to analyze problems and to locate and make sense of sources of knowledge to help solve those problems. Even though such a curriculum wouldn’t provide *all* the knowledge necessary to reduce suffering, it would empower students to tackle the problems of their own human suffering themselves through continual self-improvement and improvement of their communities.

The preliminary schema that I have drafted is divided into three categories:

foundational skills, disciplinary content, and community.

Foundational skills encompass the most basic communication and reasoning skills that are used in all areas of life and permit and facilitate further learning. If, due

to resource constraints, a curriculum must be stripped to its bare bones using the principle of empowering self-improvement, the content areas in this category will be least affected, since they constitute the core skills that enable students to analyze and solve problems and continue learning on their own once the provided instruction has ended. They form the essence of “teaching the student to fish,” so to speak.

The disciplinary content category includes knowledge and skills related to specific areas of life. In the situation of scarcity of resources, the content areas in this category will include fewer actual details and act more as orientations to the field so that students will know where to find more information in that domain when the circumstances of their lives demand it.

Finally, content in the community category helps students establish a sense of group identity and addresses how to live harmoniously with others, as well as certain practical questions about navigating life in the community, such as how to find housing or make use of available means of transportation. There is a more detailed outline of the schema in the handout, and I’ll be going through the content areas in more detail in a moment.

But first, I would like to stress that this schema is *not* a curriculum itself, but only the outline of what to think about when designing the curriculum. I'm not trying to be nit-picky with words here—the distinction schema and curriculum is important: Since it's intended to be universal, the schema simply cannot specify context-dependent details, which are necessary in any curriculum. Instead, the schema is like a skeleton or a set of cubby-holes for the curriculum: The content areas define a minimum set of slots that the curriculum planners must fill with context-appropriate content.

Moving from schema to curriculum therefore requires local contextualization. For each content area, curriculum planners will need to identify the knowledge and skills that have the potential to reduce suffering in the students' particular context.

Preferably, this would take place through a participatory process by people closest to the group of intended recipients, who are most familiar with the intricacies of the students' context.

The schema thus acts as a kind of heuristic tool to guide planners' thinking about curriculum in a systematic way so that the resulting curriculum covers all the

bases required by the responsibility to educate. By matching existing curricula with the schema, planners can identify areas that need to be expanded; and in times of resource scarcity, the schema can help planners determine which areas of the curriculum can, regrettably of course, be reduced without imperiling students' overall ability to continue learning beyond what can currently be provided.

In these unhappy cases, it is important to keep in mind that what remains in the curriculum must support the goal of training students to use their learning, critical thinking, and research skills for solving problems, which will require an awareness of the fields of knowledge and tools available to them in creating potential solutions, as well as an orientation to the resources available to them to continue learning in the future.

The goal of a universal basic education schema is, of course, to improve the quality of students' actual learning.

However, the schema is largely ignorant of the eventual delivery method for the curriculum. Planners will want to be aware of formal, non-formal, and informal learning opportunities and capitalize on each. [For ex-

ample, in some regions that use informal personal loans instead of a bank system for providing entrepreneurial capital, students may absorb the customs of borrowing and lending automatically at home; whereas, in regions with more opaque banking systems, students will more likely need formal training in how money lending takes place.]

One should also note that the schema and the curricula that may be developed with it are not sufficient to produce learning by themselves. Curriculum, though extremely important, is only one of a number of factors necessary for effective education.

Instead, the schema would usually form only one part of larger projects to improve the quality of education in a developing region.

Furthermore, even though I've spoken about reducing suffering, education may not be able to achieve this goal on its own in some areas where systemic problems hinder development efforts. In these cases, a comprehensive development strategy will be necessary to break down these barriers so that the improved education can realize its full effect.

Moreover, simply teaching students isn't enough to

guarantee a desired change in behavior that could reduce their suffering and improve their quality of life, unless the students are also *motivated* to apply what they've learned, which is not necessarily a trivial task.

Finally, aligning curricular content with the schema's content areas facilitates structured, qualitative monitoring of progress in curricular development that permits international comparisons despite variation in local learning needs. Such comparisons would evaluate how well the curricula in each nation have fulfilled the requirements of each area in the schema, given the local context, and thus render diverse educational systems comparable.

These evaluations would ideally be conducted in a kind of dialog between local stakeholders and external observers who through sharing their unique perspectives can discuss how well the curriculum meets students' actual learning needs.

I would like to spend the remainder of my time illustrating the schema and its use with an example monitoring application. This example won't be very detailed but will hopefully give you a general idea of how the schema can facilitate curricular evaluation and cross-cultural comparison. Originally I wanted to provide several examples

side-by-side from both highly developed and underdeveloped nations, but it turns out that obtaining curricula for underdeveloped nations can be quite challenging.

So instead, we'll take a look at the national curriculum from Cambodia, and I'll point out in a few places how the curricular evaluation might look a little different in other countries. First, a few general notes about Cambodia.

Cambodia in south-east asia is home to the Khmer people, and was under French colonial rule until 1953 and is now governed by democratic constitutional monarchy. Its Human Development Index rank is 131, which places it toward the bottom of the UNDP's "medium human development" category. Finally, the national curriculum in Cambodia that we'll examine was recently revamped under a project funded by USAID.

So, to jump in. Please feel free to follow along with the outline in the handout. The fundamental skills category contains the content areas of communication, numeracy, reasoning, and research. The communication area has to do with transmitting and receiving information in a verbal form, and contains the components of language, reading, verbal expression, and communication tools, and includes everything the students would

need to communicate in their given context.

So in the case of language, some places are particularly monolingual—you need only one language to participate in nearly all aspects of life. But, in other places you may encounter multiple languages—you might have a maternal language, you might have a different language used for commerce, you might have yet another language that the government uses. Students would need to be conversant in all of these languages to get along in life.

In Cambodia, 95% of the population speaks Khmer, which is also the official language of the government, so the curriculum planners chose to forego the colonial language of French in favor of the more relevant Khmer.

A couple of examples from the curriculum: defining a noun and knowing vocabulary appropriate for addressing the royal family. Notice how knowing about nouns might be something that has wide applicability, but that knowing royal language is particular to Cambodia and other monarchies. I would also note that the parenthetical indications of grade level are there only by way of citation and aren't meant to figure into the evaluation.

Next we have reading. More and more knowledge and other information is available through access to written

documents. As a result, literacy is crucial even for cultures with rich oral history and oral literature traditions.

From the curriculum, we see that students will practice reading documents they might encounter in real life, such as newspapers, instructions, and timetables.

Moreover, here in the reading curriculum we see a good example of how the curriculum planners have implemented the principle I mentioned earlier of providing tools that empowering self-improvement instead of supplying every single detail students may need. Instead of trying to teach students every possible word, the students learn strategies for understanding new words and are oriented to tools such as dictionaries to help them find the information they need (namely the meaning of words) in the future.

I'll skip next to reasoning. This is what some people will consider one of the most important aspects of the curriculum since this is the part of the curriculum in which students learn to take apart a problem, think about solutions to the problem, make arguments for those solutions, and evaluate arguments and sources of information—not necessarily in any dry formal-logic sense, but in a way useful for discussing ideas intelligently with others

and coming to sound conclusions. So this will be key to helping students continue their learning further in the future and work on solutions to the problems of their communities.

A few examples from Cambodia: For evaluating data, students need to “distinguish between facts and opinions”, and “evaluate information . . . for relevance, persuasiveness, and clarity.”

For identifying potential solutions, students look for “possible approaches” to solve a small problem, construct different possible responses to a given scenario, and discuss how to overcome challenges to problems.

For predicting potential outcomes, students “identify potential consequences” of risky behavior and discuss “potential consequences of different choices.”

And under making arguments, students “justify answers” with evidence, “distinguish between propaganda and reasoned argument,” and “evaluate the validity of conclusions.”

The fourth fundamental skills content area is research. Now, this sounds kind of like dusty libraries—it isn’t: “research” merely means being able to find the infor-

mation you need—being able to recognize that you have an information gap and then being able to come up with strategies for finding a way to fill that gap, whether it’s finding a person who can teach you, finding a book you can read from, or finding an agency that can help you.

Some examples from the Cambodian curriculum: students learn how to conduct surveys to collect information, use experiments to test possible solutions, and identify useful and unhelpful information.

This curriculum also has a very interesting standard that synthesizes the reasoning and research content areas and highlights their purpose of promoting students’ problem-solving capacities:

Namely that students “investigate [. . .].” I would mention here that even though the schema breaks all of these knowledge and skill areas into different components for systematic analysis, this doesn’t imply that instruction itself has to be compartmentalized in such a way. In fact, in some instances, an integrated approach to instruction may produce better results.

Moving on, as I mentioned earlier, the second category, Disciplinary Content, includes knowledge and skills related to specific aspects of life, and includes health,

government, economics, and employment. Health includes habits for healthy living, ways in which health can go awry, and what to do when that happens. Some examples from Cambodia—remember that these examples are *not* exhaustive:

Under nutrition, students should know the “importance of eating a variety of foods.”

For first aid, students identify common accidents and how to reduce the risk of accidents.

For disease awareness, students learn about hand washing, proper use of toilets, avoiding and treating common illnesses, and diseases transmitted through unclean food and water. Note the list of food-related illnesses. While food safety is important for everyone in the world, the specific illnesses linked with food are contextually driven. While intestinal worms and typhoid, for example, may be prevalent in Cambodia, appropriate examples in, say, the United States might be *E. coli* and *Salmonella*. These are the kinds of decisions that curriculum planners make during the contextualization process.

For sexual health, students know about safe and high-risk behaviors, as well as common STDs.

The curriculum also includes caring for infants, which falls under the maternal/infant health rubric.

For personal safety, student “identify dangerous places” on the roads, “explain why helmets should be worn,” and “describe safe behavior in landmine areas.” Landmines are another good example of local contextualization. Given Cambodia’s history with conflict, landmine awareness would be something curriculum evaluators would want to check for in the personal safety component of the health content area. In the U.S., for example, landmines wouldn’t be as important in the personal safety component as, say, internet safety. [VA eg]

Finally, an important component of the health content area is an orientation to the medical facilities that are available in the area. Now, medical facilities aren’t available in all areas, or to the same extent. In some areas you have well-developed hospitals, but it isn’t necessarily intuitive how you make use of them.

In the Cambodian curriculum, we see that students should know “the location of the nearest community health centre” and explain its function. What might be some examples appropriate to the United States? [911, clinic vs. emergency room, kinds of health insurance, medi-

care/medicaid, generic vs. name brand prescription drugs]

The second disciplinary content area is government. Given the authority of government over students' lives, students will need to understand how they can influence and interact with government, and not just in democratically based governments. This interaction is in two directions—how government services and policies affect students, and how students can affect government services and policies.

The Cambodian curriculum includes “duties of the local government,” “roles of the Royal Government,” “processes of the Parliament,” participating in mock class elections, and how to be vocal about the integrity of the electoral process.

The third disciplinary content area is economics. This includes financial literacy and entrepreneurship.

Students need to know how to use their finances wisely, including how to borrow money and when it is appropriate to carry debt—all of this will depend, of course, on the financial systems in use in the students' context, whether formalized institutions or informal social protocols.

Here are a few examples from Cambodia.

Entrepreneurship consists of recognizing opportunities for a business or some other kind of activity—identifying some need—and coming up with strategies and actions to meet the need or capitalize on the opportunity. Entrepreneurship is important even for people who don't run their own business, because entrepreneurship involves problem analysis and risk analysis skills that can be applied in job settings and in communities to solve problems and improve lives.

In Cambodia, students set goals, analyze what needs to be done for a task, plan a class event, and practice making advertisements.

Even though students should receive entrepreneurial training, not everyone is going to be self-employed, so students will need to know how employment works—the local customs for obtaining a job and so forth.

For example, students interview adults to describe skills they need to perform their job, identify how those skills are acquired, consider possible career options, investigate training requirements and educational opportunities to prepare for those careers, and enumerate work habits and ethics necessary for employment. I would like to

highlight this excellent illustration of the principle of orienting students to a given field. It isn't feasible to teach students everything they would need to know about every possible career option. Instead, the Cambodian curriculum gives students an *orientation* to possible careers and *empowers* them with the tools they'll need to fill in the gaps in their learning after schooling is complete.

Finally, to end the Disciplinary Content category of the schema, we have Technical Skills. This area is meant to broadly cover the technical knowledge and skills that would be used in employment and other subsistence activities. I've grouped a few examples from the Cambodian curriculum according to the industry in which they would be applied.

First agriculture, including knowledge about plants and plant growth, different kinds of soil, sowing and harvesting common crops, and animal growth and development.

Food preparation, including boiling, frying, grilling, and safety concerns.

Couture, including machine and manual sewing, safety in cutting and darning, and producing simple clothes and ornaments.

And various fields of science, including some physics (pushing and pulling forces), some astronomy (planets and the solar system), and some chemistry (solutes, solvents, and solutions).

So much for disciplinary content. The third broad category of the schema is Community, including the content areas of Group Identity, Interpersonal Relationships, and Communal Living. Group Identity is important for the psycho-social development of students and could include elements of history and fine arts that help the students identify themselves as members of a community.

To foster a Cambodian identity, the Cambodian curriculum includes standards that promote nationalism, such as learning the National anthem and flag along with the meaning of national festivals,

as well as elements of Cambodian history,

and several typically Khmer arts, such as traditional dances, decorative patterns, and musical instruments.

The second content area under Community is Interpersonal Skills. This includes getting along with others, as well as knowing that every person comes to a situation with a unique perspective and that being aware of those

perspectives can help facilitate mutual understanding in cases of conflict or disagreement.

Examples from the Cambodian curriculum include listening to and working cooperatively with others, proper greetings for parents, gestures of respect for elders and monks, characteristics of good friendship, and ways to resolve conflict without violence. Notice the inclusion of monks in the list of people to whom one learns to show respect. This fits in well in Cambodia, which is 95% Buddhist; whereas, say, an animistic society in Africa wouldn't have monks, but could have ways of respecting elders or community leaders.

Finally, we have Communal Life—this is a practical orientation to the community, including how to find housing, how to make use of available transportation, and the rights and responsibilities of living in the community.

A few examples: observe how classmates travel to school, give the reason for having laws and rules, respecting others' property, and understanding rights and responsibilities.

So, that concludes our rapid overview of the schema. As an example monitoring application, we saw how different standards in the Cambodian curriculum fit into the

slots of each content area—that is, how the Cambodian curriculum fleshes out the skeleton that the schema provides. Of course, we looked only at a few brief examples. A formal evaluation would examine how the curriculum treats each of the content areas in detail, and this would provide a description of the strengths of the curriculum.

Once complete, the evaluation would then proceed to some of the curriculum's weaknesses—content areas that the curriculum did not adequately cover based on local context and the knowledge available to reduce suffering. Based on my cursory review of the curriculum, I'll give some examples of a few things I saw could be improved:

First, we saw a standard about caring for infants, but the curriculum neglected to say anything about the health of mothers, especially during pregnancy.

Next, the math curriculum included using currency, but there was no mention about borrowing and lending money.

Along the same lines, although there were some great preliminary entrepreneurial component skills included—such as identifying needs, organizational skills, planning, and advertising—the curriculum could perhaps use a bit more detail on practical business strategies.

Moreover, the curriculum didn't mention housing at all, as far as I saw. Here we have an example of how an external evaluator can begin a dialog based on the schema: I, plainly not a Cambodian, see that the formal school curriculum doesn't have anything to say about housing. As an external observer, I would then have a conversation with Cambodian curriculum planners in which I point out the lack of training about housing. They then might say "Oh, you're right; we'll add that in the next round of curriculum reform." Or, they could say "In Cambodia, most of our children live in small villages with simple houses that their families construct themselves. Children learn how to build these houses informally by watching their family and neighbors and helping out," in which case we could make a note that this aspect of the schema is satisfied through informal education. As an external observer, I might then say, "That's well and good for the rural population, but what about people who live in Phnom Penh [pnoom paign]?" The conversation between external observer and local curriculum planners could lead to a discussion of a number of different formal, non-formal, and informal options. For example, local curriculum planners might point to (or suggest starting) a housing information service in the big cities and explain how the service will be advertised.

Finally, a full evaluation would include a labor sector analysis to determine how well the curriculum prepares students to be employed in the kinds of jobs that are actually available in Cambodia.

After assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum by means of the schema, the evaluation would then identify excesses. These are curricular elements that go beyond the minimum established by the schema or that, while interesting or valuable in other ways, have little potential of reducing suffering. A few brief examples from Cambodia,

the literacy component included a fair amount of formal grammar—you'll recall the example standard we saw of giving the definition of a noun. There's nothing wrong with formal grammar, but it is possible to learn and use a language well without speaking about the language formally.

Next, some elements of the science curriculum go beyond the absolute minimum demanded by the schema's criterion. For example, knowing the planets in the solar system has little direct potential to reduce students' suffering.

Last of these brief examples, the curriculum also in-

cludes some non-local history, such as knowing about life in Ancient Greece, Egypt, and Rome. While interesting, this information has little direct impact on the daily lives of the Khmer people.

Now, I can't stress strongly enough that going beyond the absolute minimum is *not bad*—these excesses are fine things to learn. But, by identifying them as excesses, we have a list of areas that could be trimmed if we find that the resources available for education can't adequately cover the fundamentals. Ideally, we'd be able to keep all of these, and even expand the list of things students learn; but we don't live in an ideal world, and we have to face the reality of time and resource constraints. Given those constraints, we have to start with the absolute essentials, and then we can enrich the learning experience as much as you like as far as resources allow.

So, to wrap everything up: Starting with the idea that people have a responsibility to share knowledge if that knowledge has the potential to reduce suffering, I developed a universal schema for basic education curricula—that is, a way of thinking about, understanding, and analyzing curricula in terms of students' most fundamental learning needs. The schema consists of a set of content areas that every educational system, broadly understood,

must address—a kind of curricular skeleton—as well as a criterion, process, and principle to be used in developing and evaluating curricula with respect to the local context of their target student groups. Analysis via the schema organizes curricula into categories that are the same no matter the local context, and then compares the content in each category with the local context to determine how well the curriculum covers students’ local learning needs. Because the schema provides a common skeleton, it allows comparison of curricula from diverse contexts. In terms of next steps, I hope to investigate strategies for encouraging local curriculum planners in nations around the world as well as external observers in the international community to adopt the schema as a tool for analyzing and improving curricula as we push onward toward the goal of quality Education For All.