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Instructional coherence is important for learning
- e.g. Alignment of curriculum, materials, assessments, support, instruction
- (Crouch and DeStefano, 2017; Piper et al., 2018; Banerjee et al., 2016; Crouch, 2020; Smithson and Collares, 2007; Gamoran et al., 1997; Porter, 2002)

Teachers have many responsibilities – which may compete or be contradictory (Porter, 2002; Pritchett, 2015)
- Completing the curriculum, preparing children for exams, among others
Instructional coherence

• Instructional components may be incoherent with each other, and/or incoherent for learning
  • Separate agencies + poor coordination in development of curriculum and exams (GoU, 1973; GoU, 1983; World Bank, 2012; Munene, 2017; GoT, 1973; GoT, 1975; MoEST, 2018)
  • Overambitious curriculum (Pritchett & Beatty, 2012)
  • Exams poorly designed or designed for selection (Allen et al., 2016; Burdett, 2016)

• How to measure instructional coherence and diagnose incoherence?
  • This presentation will illustrate a tool for diagnosing and exposing systemic challenges to improving learning at scale
Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)

- Tools for academic content analysis, alignment analysis, teacher support (Blank, Porter, & Smithson, 2001; Smithson, 2013)
  - Facilitates teacher reflection and professional development and education content reform

- Systematically analyze and quantify the content and coherence of primary curriculum standards, national exams, and teacher instructional content in Uganda and Tanzania

- Implemented through partnership between Twaweza East Africa and Wisconsin Center for Educational Research/Center for Curriculum Analysis
Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)

SEC inputs - outputs

- Taxonomy of topics/subtopics
- Performance expectations for students learning
- Teacher or expert judgement of content & practices
- Descriptive content maps
- User-friendly marginal charts
- Alignment tables & indices

SEC data analysis & processing

- Analysis results reported as alignment indices on a 0 – 1 scale
- Avg. across all teachers or analysts.
- Measures of rel. emphasis produced.
- Indiv. data is processed into proportions, and normalized.
- Indiv. ratings are discussed in the subject-team.
Primary English in Uganda

Alignment measures:
Standards vs. Exams 0.36
Standards vs. Instruction 0.34
Primary Math in Tanzania

Alignment measures:
Standards vs. Exams 0.44
Standards vs. Instruction 0.44
Instruction vs. Exams 0.33
• Topic coverage skips around from year to year

• Omits foundational literacy skills like phonemic awareness, phonics and vocabulary
Primary 2 - 4 Mathematics Curriculum Standards in Tanzania

- Covers foundational skills in early years
- Extends level of cognitive demand in Standard 4
Alignment measures: Mathematics and English in Uganda and Tanzania

The graph illustrates the alignment measures between standards, exams, and teacher instruction for Mathematics and English in Uganda and Tanzania. The horizontal line at 0.50 indicates a reasonably well-aligned measure.

- **Standards vs. Exams**: Uganda Mathematics (0.57), Uganda English (0.36), Tanzania Mathematics (0.44), Tanzania English (0.44)
- **Standards vs. Teacher instruction**: Uganda Mathematics (0.65), Uganda English (0.11), Tanzania Mathematics (0.15), Tanzania English (0.32)
- **Exams vs. Teacher instruction**: Uganda Mathematics (0.33), Uganda English (0.11), Tanzania Mathematics (0.11)
• Important to emphasize: SEC methodology does not take a normative stance on what coverage *should* look like

• It is a positive diagnosis of what coverage *does* look like
• Tool for curriculum, assessment, and instruction experts to use to inform content reforms
Summary

• Generally low alignment across the three instructional components, though with variation

• In both countries the prescribed content structure is similar for both subjects:
  • Fairly smooth content progression for math, steeper stretches for English

• Teachers tend to cover broad swathes of content and cognitive demand levels, which is not well aligned with either curriculum or exams, but may be better aligned for children’s learning

• On national exams certain content areas tend to be over emphasized; exams are internally well-aligned year-to-year
Discussion

- Poorly structured curriculum standards likely **frustrate efforts to develop literacy** skills in early years of school and may constrain efforts to improve learning at scale.
- Low alignment between standards and exams likely placing **incoherent demands on teachers**.
- Low alignment between standards and instruction could indicate inadequacy of prescribed standards.
  - Suggests teachers are either in the dark about how well their teaching aligns with the prescribed curriculum or have deliberately opted to defy standards that are unrealistic to the demands of their classrooms.

- These findings reveal system components that may constrain or challenge efforts to improve learning at scale.
  - The impact of improvements to one component may be constrained by incoherence with another component.
  - Improving learning at scale may require dynamically improving multiple instructional components to bring them into alignment with each other.
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Instructional incoherence through a systems lens

- Teachers operate in a broader system

- The RISE systems framework characterizes the system through four relationships of accountability and five design elements

- Teachers may be **delegated** different tasks by different actors (curriculum body, exams body, parents) (B1 and B2 in figure)

- Teachers may or may not be adequately **supported** to perform tasks (A1, A2, A3)

---

**Figure 1. Education systems framework of accountability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five design elements</th>
<th>Principal-agent relationships of accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics (Citizens to Executive Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compact (Executive Authority to Education Authorities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management (Education Authorities to Front-line providers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voice/Client power (Citizens to Front-line providers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Delegation: A1, B1, B2
- Finance: 
- Support: A2
- Information: A3
- Motivation: 

---