

INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION OF SCHOOL CURRICULUM: MODERNIZATION ASPECT

**Olena LOKSHYNA, Doctor of Sciences in Education,
Professor Head of the Department of Comparative Education,
Institute of Pedagogy, National Academy of Educational Sciences
of Ukraine**

Abstract. *School curriculum as a translational model of public experience is sensitive to the transformations that occur in a society. It leads to a permanent modernization of the curriculum. The movement to modernize it is characterized by progressiveness – from using A vertical model to enriching it with additional levels (regional/local) and attracting new agents (schools, teachers, parents, the public, mass media). In the 21-st century under globalization and increasing the role of international organizations in curriculum development one can trace unification of approaches to its modernization. However its frequency and character are defined by the national peculiarities of each country.*

The progressive development of societies leads to a change in its expectations from education, which makes it necessary to modernize the curriculum in order to increase its effectiveness. The reasons for the modernization of the curriculum scholars (Вл. Гучу, Ал. Кришан) [1], group into two categories:

Category of external factors:

- Social causes: the organization of the education system is determined by specific socio-historical conditions, the nature of social relations, national traditions, the level of material and spiritual culture;
- Economic reasons: the level of development of the economy, the labor market;
- Cultural reasons: the relationship of the individual with the ethnic group, cultural values;
- Scientific: the evolution of knowledge.

Category of internal factors consists of the factor of evolution of pedagogical science and factors that inhibit the development of curriculum:

- learning objectives do not respond to changes in society, interests and needs of students;
- existing curricula and textbooks are in conflict with the new structure of the education system;
- programs and textbooks are overloaded with information.

The phenomenon of curriculum modernization is characterized by permanence and global scope, although a particular time imposes its own characteristics. In particular, scholars (A. Lewy) [3] believe that:

- The movement to modernize the curriculum in the late 1950s was centralized. Examples of this were the creation of special bodies in different countries responsible for modernizing the curriculum (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA); National Council for Educational Programs in France – Conseil national des programmes (CNP); National Curriculum Development Institute in the Netherlands (SLO); National Education Agency in Sweden – Skolverket);
- In the late 1980s, the curriculum modernization movement was enriched by the participation of regional and local levels: the wide participation of local authorities and schools became a reality.

Developing the idea of a staged movement of the curriculum modernization and projecting it to modern conditions, we believe that in the third millennium, the process of curriculum modernization is characterized by a global dimension. In particular, in Europe, following the adoption by the European Union of the European Reference Framework of Key Competencies for Lifelong Learning (2008, 2018), curriculum upgrades are being implemented in all EU and European countries.

Today, in the context of the multidimensional development of societies, several curriculum modernization scenarios are being actively used (M. Neary) [4]:

- a “top down” scenario – curriculum modernization is initiated by central authorities, and teachers (teachers, principals) act as implementers of the ideas proclaimed. Such a model is vertical and includes a central level (national ministry of education / authorities created by the ministry for curriculum modernization); expert level (experts, teachers, scientists, representatives of education departments, inspectorates); regional / local level (representatives of regional / local education authorities; school level (schools and teachers who are key agents of change); level of the public (parents, media, non-governmental organizations);
- the “on-the-ground” scenario is implemented in the context of a decentralized approach to education governance. In this case, the teacher is the initiator, as well as the implementer of the modernization. This upgrade is typical of the local level;
- network upgrade scenario is possible at the regional level. The key role in such modernization belongs to educational institutions, which are combined on the basis of the general idea of modernization.

Thus, school curriculum as a translational model of public experience is sensitive to the transformations that occur in a society. It leads to a permanent modernization of the curriculum. The movement to modernize it is characterized by progressiveness – from using a vertical model to enriching it with additional levels (regional / local) and attracting new agents (schools, teachers, parents, the public, mass media).

In the 21-st century under globalization and increasing the role of international organizations in curriculum development one can trace unification of

approaches to its modernization. However its frequency and character are defined by the national peculiarities of each country.

References:

1. Гуцу Вл., Кришан Ал. *Проектирование базового курикулума: метод. пособ.* In: Виклик для України: розробка рамкових основ змісту (національного курикулума) загальної середньої освіти для 21-го століття: матеріали Всеукр. наук.-практ. конф. (Київ, 26-27 черв., 2007 р.) / Акад. пед. наук України, Держ. установа „Директорат програм розвитку освіти” М-ва освіти і науки України. К., 2007, с. 153-221.
2. European Commission (2018) Annex to the Proposal a Council Recommendation on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning as of January 17, 2018, Brussels, COM (2018) 24 final [Online] <https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/annex-recommendation-key-competences-lifelong-learning.pdf> [13 October 2018].
3. Lewy A. *National and School-Based Curriculum Development (Fundamentals of Educational Planning)*. Paris: UNESCO – International Institute for Educational Planning, 1991.
4. Neary M. *Curriculum Studies in Post-compulsory and Adult Education. A Teachers' and Student Teacher's Study Guide*. Cheltenham: Nelson Thornes, 2002.
5. *Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning (2006/962/EC)*. Official Journal of the European Union, 30.12.2006, L 394/10-394/18 EN [Online] <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32006H0962&from=EN> [14 October 2018]

КУРРИКУЛЯРНАЯ СИСТЕМА: СТАНОВЛЕНИЕ И СЛОЖНОСТИ НА ПРИМЕРЕ НЕКОТОРЫХ ПОСТСОВЕТСКИХ СТРАН

Виктория КРИШМАРЕЛ, к. филос. н.,
старший научный сотрудник, Институт педагогики НАПН Украины

Abstract. *The report highlights the specifics of becoming the curriculum system in Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova and Estonia. Countries selected by criteria: the post-Soviet space, differences in geography, economic development, indicators of students PISA. The analysis focuses on the features of understanding and functioning of curriculum in these countries. As a result of this, the realities of the modern system of general secondary education in Ukraine are correlated with the curricular achievements of these countries. The main difficulties in the formation of the curricular system in education are highlighted on the basis of the derived trends.*