Supporting Change in Practice

Case Studies on the Use of the ACER-APCEIU Global Citizenship Education Monitoring Toolkit

Country Case: **Republic of Korea**

Su Yeon Park, Sunmi Ji and Yoon-Young Lee

unesco Centre Under the auspices of UNESCO

APCEIU Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding
유네스코 아시아태평양 국제이해교육원

Supporting Change in Practice

Case Studies on the Use of the ACER-APCEIU Global Citizenship Education Monitoring Toolkit

Country Case : **Republic of Korea**

Su Yeon Park, Sunmi Ji and Yoon-Young Lee

unesco
Centre
Under the auspices
of UNESCO

APCEIU
Asia-Pacific Centre of
Education for
International Understanding
유네스코 아시아태평양 국제이해교육원

Supporting Change in Practice:
Case Studies on the Use of the ACER-APCEIU Global Citizenship Education Monitoring Toolkit
Country Case: **Republic of Korea**

The Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding under the auspices of UNESCO (APCEIU) is a UNESCO Category 2 Centre established in 2000 by the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Korea and UNESCO. APCEIU is mandated to promote Education for International Understanding (EIU), currently referred to as Global Citizenship Education (GCED), as it seeks to build a culture of peace in collaboration with UNESCO Member States.

Recommended citation
Park, S. Y., Ji, S., & Lee, Y. Y. (2025). Supporting Change in Practice: Case Studies on the Use of the ACER-APCEIU Global Citizenship Education Monitoring Toolkit (Country Case: Republic of Korea). Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding under the auspices of UNESCO (APCEIU).

Disclaimer
The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the researchers and do not necessarily represent the views of the APCEIU. The researchers are responsible for the choice and presentation of facts contained in this publication. The maps, pictures, and symbols presented do not imply any opinion on the part of APCEIU.

An electronic copy is available on the APCEIU website.

Table of Contents

Supporting Change in Practice

Case Studies on the Use of the ACER-APCEIU Global Citizenship Education Monitoring Toolkit

List of Tables

Foreword

Global citizenship education (GCED) offers a powerful response to complex global challenges by cultivating empathy, responsibility, and a shared sense of humanity. Yet, while its values are widely embraced, there has been a pressing need for practical frameworks that can guide its monitoring. The Australian Council for Educational Research-Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (ACER-APCEIU) GCED Monitoring Toolkit, published in 2024, sought to address this gap by providing a structured framework. Still, there was a continued need for concrete examples of how the Toolkit could be adapted across varied educational contexts. This study was designed to address this gap by examining its practical application in real-world educational settings.

By applying the Toolkit in Australia and the Republic of Korea, the two case studies explore how teachers, school leaders, and system leaders collaboratively engage in monitoring and enhancing GCED across different levels of the education system. They offer an in-depth examination of how the Toolkit can guide collective reflection, action, and improvement across diverse educational contexts. The findings highlight the Toolkit's capacity to bring coherence and shared purpose to GCED monitoring practice, while also pointing to opportunities for greater effectiveness and usability. The study found that the Toolkit offers valuable opportunities for self-assessment and reflection among educators and system leaders; however, there was a demand for additional practical examples to inform its application across varied educational settings—a need that this publication directly addresses through contextualised cases.

This report serves as a valuable guide for teachers, school leaders, and system leaders seeking to systematically reflect on and strengthen their own GCED practice. It provides concrete illustrations and practical insights to help educators identify strengths and areas for improvement, set goals, monitor progress, and refine their approaches through the inquiry cycle. Practitioners and policymakers will also find it an inspiring resource for building capacity and advancing the transformative vision of GCED. Beyond its findings, the study shows that when educators engage collaboratively in monitoring and reflection, they contribute to building learning communities that foster justice, empathy, and global responsibility.

This project was made possible through the collaborative efforts of research teams in Australia and the Republic of Korea. On behalf of APCEIU, I extend my sincere gratitude to all those who contributed their time, expertise, and insights to this research on the application of the ACER-APCEIU GCED Monitoring Toolkit. I would like to express my deep appreciation to the Australian

research team—Rachel Parker, principal consultant at Global Play Lab, and Dr Karena Menzie-Ballantyne, senior lecturer at CQUniversity, for their outstanding contribution and collaboration throughout all phases of the study. My sincere thanks also go to Suyeon Park, adjunct professor at Yonsei University, who provided invaluable insights throughout the implementation and reporting of the Korean component of this research. I am also grateful to Hwanbo Park, professor at Chungnam National University, for his thoughtful review on the Korean report, which helped strengthen the quality and clarity of this study.

Above all, I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation to the teachers, school leaders, and system leaders who participated in the study in both countries. Their openness in sharing experiences, reflections, and practices made this research possible and enriched its findings. Their active participation in GCED monitoring and their commitment to advancing GCED within their schools and communities exemplify the values at the heart of this work. Through their engagement, the project gained authentic insights into how the Toolkit can inform and strengthen GCED monitoring across policy and practice.

I also acknowledge with sincere appreciation the leadership and coordination of Sunmi Ji and Yoon-Young Lee, who guided the overall direction of the project and oversaw its meaningful implementation and dissemination. My sincere thanks further go to Eunji Kim, Jihyun Lee, Yujin Jo, and Yoonji Chae for their professional and seamless support in preparing and facilitating the Korean workshops. I would also like to acknowledge Jaehong Kim and Seulbee Lee for their support in the recruitment of participants for the Korean research, and Richard Harris for his careful proofreading. Their collective efforts were instrumental in ensuring the smooth operation and fruitful completion of the key research activities, and the preparation of this report

Let this report inspire continued dialogue and collaboration among teachers, school leaders, and system leaders as we work together to ensure that GCED becomes a lived reality across the globe.

LIM Hyun Mook
Director of APCEIU

I. Introduction

This study builds on three phases of the Asia-Pacific Global Citizenship Education (GCED) Monitoring project to strengthen monitoring and evaluation of GCED in the Asia-Pacific region. The overarching initiative aims to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation of global citizenship education and enhance reporting on progress toward Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4.7 in the region.

Building on the findings of the three phases (2022–2024)[1], which identified enabling conditions, validated the GCED framework, and developed the ACER-APCEIU GCED Monitoring Toolkit, this research focuses on the practical application of the Toolkit within real educational settings. While previous phases established the conceptual and technical foundation of the Toolkit, this study explores its applicability, sustainability, and effectiveness in guiding GCED implementation across multiple levels of the education system.

This report presents the action research of the Republic of Korea using the GCED Monitoring Toolkit. The study aimed to examine how the Toolkit could be used to support collaboration among key education stakeholders—teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors[2]—in goal setting, planning, implementing, and reflecting on GCED practices. Through this process, the research sought to understand how the Toolkit could help strengthen the connection between policy commitments and everyday educational practice, supporting schools and regional offices to embed GCED more systematically and sustainably within their existing frameworks.

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How does the GCED Monitoring Toolkit support key stakeholder groups to collaboratively embed GCED in policy and practice?

    a. What aspects of the Toolkit enable or challenge stakeholders to achieve their GCED goals and objectives?

    b. How do key stakeholders perceive its usefulness?

2. Are there any aspects of the Toolkit that stakeholders would change to improve its usefulness in supporting the implementation and contextualisation of GCED in policy and practice?

---

1) The reports for each phase can be found here: Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III.

2) While the term system leaders in the ACER–APCEIU GCED Monitoring Toolkit can refer to several groups of stakeholders, this study identifies education supervisors from Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education as the representative system leaders within the Korean context, in accordance with the purpose of this study.

II. Context of the Korean Education System

In the Republic of Korea, the national curriculum has a strong influence, with most processes—from curriculum development to textbook production—directed by the central government. Traditionally, education supervisors at the Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education (MPOEs) acted as key mediators, delivering the national curriculum to schools, while schools and teachers were mainly responsible for implementation (Korean Educational Development Institute [KEDI], 2019). In recent decades, greater emphasis has been placed on strengthening decentralisation and school autonomy (So & Kang, 2014). Authority over curriculum development and implementation has gradually been devolved to education supervisors and schools, highlighting the importance of closer partnerships among education supervisors, schools, and teachers. The 2022 Revised National Curriculum, enacted in 2024, reinforced this trend by requiring schools to secure dedicated time for their own curriculum development (Kim, 2024). With respect to GCED, the Republic of Korea has pursued various initiatives to embed global and civic values into school curricula and teacher training systems.

Among these, the GCED Lead Teachers Programme, launched in 2015, has served as a core mechanism for promoting GCED in Korean schools. Jointly implemented by the Korean Ministry of Education (MOE), APCEIU, and MPOEs, the programme selects and trains both national and regional GCED Lead Teachers who serve as facilitators of GCED practice and peer learning. As of 2024, over 6,500 teachers nationwide have participated through workshops, mentoring, and research networks, contributing to the localisation and sustainability of GCED (Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea, 2024). The initiative emphasises teacher leadership, collaborative inquiry, and continuous professional development, positioning teachers as both learners and change agents within the national education system.

Despite growing attention to GCED, its institutionalisation in the Republic of Korea remains limited. Only a few MPOEs have established dedicated GCED units or related ordinances, while in most regions, GCED responsibilities remain fragmented across departments such as character education, moral education, or future education. As Cho (2017) notes, educators often perceive GCED as a top-down initiative driven by national projects rather than a sustained educational framework. Consequently, while many teachers and schools are deeply committed to GCED, their efforts often remain dependent on short-term funding and individual passion rather than institutional support. This fragmented governance structure constrains GCED from evolving beyond temporary projects toward an integrated and sustainable educational agenda.

In this regard, applying the GCED Monitoring Toolkit carries significant implications. First, the Toolkit links the multi-layered structure of MPOEs, schools, and teachers within a single cyclical process, contributing to the formation of a shared learning ecosystem that facilitates continuous

dialogue, reflection, and collaborative improvement across levels. In a centralised system such as that of the Republic of Korea, where gaps often emerge between policy decisions and classroom implementation, the Toolkit helps to structurally bridge this divide. Second, the Toolkit transforms the abstract values of GCED into actionable tasks. The tools used for this research, such as a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis, implementation plans, and student reflection journals provide educators with concrete frameworks to connect GCED to educational planning and assessment practices across different levels of educational practice. Third, the Toolkit creates momentum to shift GCED policy from a "programme-oriented" approach toward an outcomes- and evidence-based approach. By jointly engaging in the cycle of goal setting, planning, implementing, and reflecting together, teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors collectively laid the groundwork for institutionalising GCED as a sustainable structure rather than a one-time initiative.

Accordingly, this study applied the GCED Monitoring Toolkit through an action research design in three selected regions of the Republic of Korea, engaging MPOEs, schools, and teachers as primary stakeholders. In addition to exploring how key stakeholder groups collaboratively embed GCED using the Toolkit in policy and practice, the study also examined the Toolkit's enabling factors and challenges. It particularly focused on how different actors—teachers, school leaders, and local education supervisors—perceived the Toolkit, what aspects they found useful, and what difficulties they encountered. Through this, the study seeks to provide implications for embedding GCED more effectively into both policy frameworks and educational practice within the Korean context.

III. Methodology and Research Design

Research Design

This study employed an action research design. Action research is a cyclical, reflective, problem-solving methodology in which practitioners and researchers iteratively plan, act, observe, and reflect to improve educational practice (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2014; Drummond & Themessl-Huber, 2007). Unlike conventional research approaches, action research positions the researcher not as an external observer but as a facilitator who collaborates with practitioners to co-produce practical knowledge and foster change (McNiff, 2013; Avgitidou, 2009).

The GCED Monitoring Toolkit aligns closely with this framework, as it is structured around four phases: (1) discovery and goal setting; (2) designing and defining a plan; (3) implementing and evidence gathering; and (4) reflecting and evaluating. This cyclical process mirrors the core principles of action research. In this study, each stage of the Toolkit was applied within the action research cycle to ensure that participants—teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors—actively engaged in both practice and reflection.

In particular, the research team designed and facilitated two structured workshops held in June and September. These workshops were intentionally organised to allow participants at all three levels to directly engage with the full cycle of the Toolkit. Throughout this process, the researchers assumed the role not of passive data collectors but of facilitators, thus creating opportunities for participants to share experiences, engage in joint inquiry, and critically reflect on their practices.

This design enabled the Toolkit to function not only as a monitoring instrument but also as a mechanism for multi-level learning across classrooms, schools, and local education authorities. Importantly, it encouraged stakeholders to ask, "How can this tool be improved to better serve practice?"— thereby underscoring the participatory and knowledge-generating nature of action research in the education sector.

Research Procedure

This study applied the GCED Monitoring Toolkit through a structured action research process. The Toolkit is organised into four cyclical phases—Discovery and Goal Setting, Planning and Definition, Implementation and Evidence Collection, and Reflection and Evaluation—which correspond to the plan–act–observe–reflect cycle of action research.

In this study, these four phases were used as the organising framework for both the research design and participant activities. Each regional team first identified its context-specific goals and

challenges (Phase 1), designed and planned GCED initiatives (Phase 2), implemented activities and collected evidence (Phase 3), and, finally, reflected on outcomes and shared lessons across regions (Phase 4). The Toolkit not only structured the process but also provided a shared framework linking classroom practice, school-level strategies, and policy initiatives.

Table 1 below outlines the four phases of the GCED Monitoring Toolkit, with corresponding guidelines and practical examples at the classroom, school, and policy levels.

Table 1 - Global Citizenship Education Monitoring Toolkit Phases: Guidelines and Illustrative Applications

Phase	Teacher	School leader	Education supervisor
Phase 1: Discovery and Goal Setting	Diagnose GCED at the classroom level (teaching capacity and students' baseline knowledge) and set goals (e.g., brainstorming topics with students, conducting surveys)	Diagnose GCED at the school level (existing practices and institutional support) and set goals (e.g., collecting teacher/ student feedback, conducting school-level SWOT analysis)	Diagnose GCED at the national/regional level (policies, indicators, and stakeholder engagement) and set goals (e.g., reviewing current education policies/indicators, stakeholder workshops)
Phase 2: Planning and Definition	Develop lesson plans and strategies to achieve goals (e.g., project-based learning, learner participation strategies)	Develop school-level implementation plans; identify and allocate required resources (e.g., annual activity plan, securing budget/ partnerships)	Formulate policy implementation plan; define scope and indicators (e.g., drafting a roadmap, designing monitoring tools)
Phase 3: Implementation and Evidence Collection	Conduct lessons and collect evidence of student change (e.g., classroom observation, student portfolios, interviews)	Support teachers during implementation; collect evidence of outcomes (e.g., teacher education, monitoring progress, collecting performance data)	Pilot programmes and gather field evidence (e.g., implementing pilot initiatives, collecting national/ regional data)
Phase 4: Reflection and Evaluation	Analyse student learning outcomes and reflect on next steps (e.g., reflection journals, peer consultations)	Conduct school-level reflection and identify areas for improvement (e.g., feedback meetings with teachers, students, parents; adjusting plans)	Evaluate policy outcomes and set future directions (e.g., preparing policy reports, international comparison/ sharing)

The research was implemented as follows:

1. **Orientation (5 June 2025)** – Online session introducing the Toolkit's objectives, structure, and research process to ensure participant readiness.

2. **Workshop 1 (27 June 2025)** – Face-to-face session guiding participants through SWOT analysis (Phase 1) and the drafting of initial monitoring plans (Phase 2).

3. **Implementation Phase (July–September 2025)** – Participants applied their monitoring plans in each level, integrating GCED activities, collecting student outputs (portfolios, journals), and administering surveys (Phase 3).

4. **Workshop 2 (18 September 2025)** – Participants shared implementation outcomes, engaged in Toolkit-based reflection activities, and participated in semi-structured focus group interviews (FGIs) to evaluate both practice and the Toolkit itself (Phase 4).

This structured sequence ensured that each stakeholder group engaged in the full cycle of the Toolkit, while also generating multi-level evidence of GCED practice (See Annex 1 for further details). By integrating four phases within a single research design, the study demonstrated how the Toolkit can serve not only as an instrument to support GCED implementation but as a mechanism for continuous improvement and systemic feedback across classrooms, schools, and MPOEs.

Participants

This study purposefully selected participants from three metropolitan/provincial regions. Each regional team generally comprised one education supervisor, one school leader, and one teacher to represent different levels of the educational system. However, in one region, two education supervisors and two school leaders participated due to personnel changes and scheduling constraints during the research period. This variation did not affect the overall balance of representation across regions. To capture perspectives across different school stages, each region represented a different level: Hasan (primary), Wonchun (lower secondary), and Minan (upper secondary). To ensure anonymity, pseudonyms were assigned. To enhance clarity and readability, the names of Education Supervisors begin with E, those of School Leaders with S, and those of Teachers with T. In addition, to indicate participants' regions, the final syllable of each pseudonym corresponds to the first syllable of the city name, ensuring that participants from the same city share the same ending. The sampling strategy was designed to include diverse perspectives across roles and school levels; however, the findings are illustrative rather than generalisable. Thus, each region corresponds to a different school level by design, not by representativeness.

Table 2 - Participants List

Participants	Region	Title	School level
Eunha	Hasan	Education supervisor	n/a
Euiha	Hasan	Education supervisor	n/a
Soha	Hasan	School leader	Primary
Suha	Hasan	School leader	Primary
Taeha	Hasan	Teacher	Primary
Euiwon	Wonchun	Education supervisor	n/a
Sowon	Wonchun	School leader	Lower secondary
Taewon	Wonchun	Teacher	Lower secondary
Emin	Minan	Education supervisor	n/a
Somin	Minan	School leader	Upper secondary
Taemin	Minan	Teacher	Upper secondary

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection for this study was undertaken through workshop outputs, surveys, classroom artefacts, and FGIs. At each stage of the research process, evidence was gathered to capture participants' perspectives and experiences. Workshop presentations and FGIs were audio-recorded and later transcribed for analysis. The collected data were analysed using qualitative thematic analysis in line with the cyclical process of action research.

The data collection process unfolded as follows:

1. **Workshop 1 (27 June 2025, 3 hours)** – A face-to-face session where participants engaged in SWOT analyses (Phase 1) and drafted monitoring plans (Phase 2). Outputs included SWOT worksheets, draft monitoring documents, and transcripts of group discussions.

2. **Implementation Phase (July–September 2025)** – Teachers implemented GCED lessons and collected student outputs (portfolios, reflection journals), school leaders documented school-level practices, and education supervisors conducted surveys and monitoring activities. This phase generated student artefacts, survey results, and monitoring reports.

3. **Workshop 2 (18 September 2025, 2 hours)** – Participants shared implementation results, engaged in Toolkit-based reflection activities (e.g., before/after comparisons, self-assessment of achievement), and identified areas for improvement. Outputs included presentation materials, reflection worksheets, and transcripts of group discussions.

4. **Focus Group Interviews (September 2025, approx. 50 minutes each)** – Semi-structured FGIs with teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors captured differentiated perspectives on Toolkit use. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed (See Annex 2 for the FGI questionnaire).

Table 3 - Data Collection and Sources

Stage	Methods	Details	Outcomes
Workshop 1 (27 June 2025, 3 hours)	Group activities, presentations, recordings	SWOT analysis and drafting of initial monitoring plans	SWOT worksheets, draft monitoring plans, transcripts of group presentations/discussions
Implementation Phase (July–September 2025)	Lesson implementation, surveys	Teachers implemented GCED lessons and collected student output; education supervisors gathered survey and monitoring data	Student portfolios, reflection journals, survey data
Workshop 2 (18 September 2025, 2 hours)	Presentations, Toolkit-based reflection, recordings	Sharing of implementation outcomes, before/after comparisons, self-assessment, and future recommendation	Presentation materials, reflection worksheets, photos, transcripts of activities
Focus Group Interviews (18 September 2025, 50 minutes)	Semi-structured group interviews	Conducted separately with teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors to deepen understanding of Toolkit use	Transcripts of audio recordings

After data collection, thematic analysis was conducted following Braun & Clarke's (2006) procedures: (1) familiarisation with the data and initial coding, (2) generation of preliminary themes, (3) review and refinement of themes, and (4) finalisation of thematic categories.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to good practice guidelines for conducting research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2023). Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from all participants, who voluntarily agreed to take part in the study. Participation was based on voluntary involvement, and measures were taken to ensure anonymity, confidentiality, and minimal participant burden throughout the process.

IV. Research Findings

1. Toolkit Application by Phase

Data for each phase were collected in alignment with the cyclical process of action research, drawing on workshop outputs, planning documents, and implementation reports to capture participants' practices and reflections.

Phase 1: Discovery and Goal Setting

During the first workshop, participants from each region conducted SWOT analyses as part of an action research process to diagnose their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in implementing GCED at the classroom, school, and policy levels. The SWOT activity was not part of the Toolkit itself, but was used to facilitate goal setting and reflection during the workshop. The results are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4 - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis Results by Region

Category	Hasan	Wonchun	Minan
Strengths	(Teacher) Strong individual commitment and interest (School) Enthusiastic classroom atmosphere (Policy) Interest from the superintendent, partial financial support (Community) Historically open to multiculturalism	(Teacher) Rich experiences in international exchanges (School) School Leader's active support, one-to-one tablet distribution (Policy) Education supervisor's extensive professional and interpersonal networks, designation of GCED schools	(Teacher) Teachers' self-initiated implementation of GCED (School) Diverse school-level programmes across grades (Policy) Inclusion of "fostering global citizenship" in provincial education indicators
Weaknesses	(School) Over-reliance on individual teachers, limited student understanding of GCED (Policy) Frequent turnover among education supervisors, lack of systematic support	(Teacher) Limited pedagogical ideas (School) Overcrowded classrooms, difficulty securing time	(School) Heavy reliance on specific subjects (e.g., English) (Policy) Lack of vertical articulation across school stages
Opportunities	(Teacher) Commitment of "GCED Lead Teachers" (Policy) Establishment of related facilities under consideration (Community) Support centres for community-based curriculum	(School) Active professional learning communities (Policy) Various training opportunities (Community) Rich local resources	(Teacher) Accumulated expertise (School) Collaboration between senior and novice teachers, regular lesson-sharing and peer learning activities (Policy) Regional GCED teaching materials developed and distributed

Threats	(School) Insufficient parental support, limited diversity of GCED themes, limited depth of implementation	(Teacher) Shortage of accessible teaching and learning resources (School) Limited diversity of GCED themes across the curriculum, absence of structured teaching strategies and instructional frameworks, limited teacher engagement (Policy) Lack of consensus and support from the wider local community	(School) Difficulty in securing time for GCED due to exam-oriented curriculum (Policy) Declining financial resources for GCED-related initiatives

Hasan

According to participants' SWOT analysis, the most prominent strength identified in Hasan was the commitment and personal dedication of individual teachers. The region has historically maintained a relatively high level of openness toward multiculturalism, and this sociocultural climate was viewed as an important educational asset. Within classrooms, the presence of highly committed teachers fostered an atmosphere of enthusiasm and engagement. However, participants also noted a major limitation: such practices had not yet expanded into a school-wide culture. They observed structural vulnerability whereby GCED initiatives were often discontinued when a responsible teacher was transferred to another school. In addition, students' overall levels of interest in and understanding of GCED were regarded as relatively low, which was also identified as a weakness.

At the policy level, the strong interest of the superintendent was considered a notable strength. Nevertheless, participants emphasised that actual budgetary support had been gradually reduced. They further pointed out that the frequent turnover of education supervisors had made it difficult to ensure consistency in policy implementation, thereby highlighting a significant gap in institutional support mechanisms. The absence of a systematic and stable framework for sustaining GCED was therefore emphasised as a critical weakness.

Wonchun

In Wonchun, participants highlighted the strong mobilisation of both human and material resources. The wide professional networks and expertise of the education supervisor, combined with internationally experienced teachers and a school leader actively supportive of GCED, were regarded as critical assets. The provision of a digital learning environment—including one-to-one tablet distribution—was also noted as a valuable resource enabling students to engage more readily with global issues and international exchanges.

At the policy level, the designation of GCED schools, budgetary support, and diverse professional training opportunities were seen as structural enablers that moved beyond ad hoc assistance, providing a stable foundation for the institutionalisation of GCED. However, participants also pointed to limitations: overcrowded classes of around 35 students, insufficient instructional time, a lack of concrete pedagogical guidance, and limited teacher engagement beyond a small committed group. These constraints were recognised as significant barriers to the broader diffusion and deeper integration of GCED.

Minan

In Minan, participants identified the voluntary and enthusiastic engagement of teachers, together with the explicit inclusion of "fostering global citizenship" in the MPOE's performance indicators, as clear strengths. This provided both legitimacy and encouragement for teachers to pursue GCED initiatives. Furthermore, the development and dissemination of region-specific GCED teaching materials were highlighted as practical resources that enabled teachers across primary, lower secondary, and upper secondary schools to readily apply GCED in their classrooms.

At the same time, several limitations were noted. GCED practices were often confined to specific subjects, particularly English, which constrained cross-curricular integration and limited broader student exposure. In addition, the absence of systematic linkages across school levels led to fragmented learning experiences for students. The structural constraints of an upper secondary school context—most notably the dominance of entrance-exam-driven curricula—further restricted the allocation of time for GCED. Nonetheless, participants also emphasised opportunities, particularly in the form of regular lesson-sharing and peer learning activities that brought together both senior and junior teachers. These practices were seen as promising avenues for sustaining and expanding GCED within the region.

Cross-Regional Synthesis

Across all three regions, the commitment of individual teachers emerged as the primary driver of GCED implementation. However, recurring structural limitations, including insufficient institutional support, limited instructional time, and lack of policy continuity, revealed the fragility of relying solely on personal dedication. These findings highlight the need to move beyond teacher-dependent practices and to strengthen organisational and institutional foundations at the policy levels to secure the sustainability and systemic integration of GCED.

Phase 2: Planning and Definition

During the first workshop, participants in each region developed the monitoring plans and then submitted the final version after the workshop. Building on the SWOT analyses conducted in Phase 1, these plans were designed to address identified strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, and to outline strategies for implementation at the classroom, school, and policy levels. The finalised plans included concrete strategies at each level, and participants were explicitly requested to utilise the GCED Monitoring Toolkit in formulating these plans.

Hasan

Participants in Hasan developed a monitoring plan that emphasised community-based learning as a key approach to GCED. Drawing on the results of their SWOT analysis, they sought to mitigate structural limitation of excessive reliance on individual teacher capacity by establishing a set of minimum guidelines to support continuity. In addition, to counteract the tendency of primary students to perceive GCED as "distant" or unrelated to their daily lives, the plan prioritised neighbourhood-level learning that links global issues with local and everyday contexts.

At the school level, participants proposed recruiting interested teachers to collaboratively develop a "Neighbourhood Textbook" aligned with the social studies curriculum. This process was to be supported by collaboration with the local Urban Support Centre to collect resources and data. At the classroom level, student surveys, interviews, performance assessments, and analysis of student outputs were identified as tools for monitoring changes in student awareness. At the policy level, the MPOE committed to providing budgetary support and fostering partnerships with local institutions to ensure sustainability.

Wonchun

Participants in Wonchun formulated a monitoring plan that leveraged regional resources to strengthen GCED. At the policy level, the education supervisor proposed conducting a survey of GCED-designated schools to assess teachers' perceptions of current practices, the effectiveness of community-based GCED, and the adequacy of support structures. These findings were intended to guide policy refinement and future improvement.

At the school level, FGIs with GCED teachers were planned to examine their understanding of GCED and perceptions of institutional support. At the classroom level, lessons were designed to link the SDGs to local contexts, with reflection journals, performance assessments, and survey data used to monitor student learning and awareness. Together, these efforts reflected the local education authority's orientation toward strengthening the curriculum integration of community-based GCED and monitoring it across classroom, school, and policy levels.

Minan

Participants in Minan developed a monitoring plan focused on the use of region-specific GCED teaching materials. At the policy level, the MPOE planned to conduct surveys to assess the utilisation and effectiveness of these materials, as well as to observe pilot lessons to gather teachers' feedback.

At the school level, pilot lessons were designed to provide opportunities for lesson-sharing and to facilitate discussions on future support measures. At the classroom level, the teacher proposed implementing lessons using the regional GCED materials and conducting pre- and post-surveys to analyse shifts in student perceptions. Lesson-sharing sessions were also intended to assess how teachers' awareness of GCED might evolve through direct engagement with these resources. Collectively, these strategies aligned with the MPOE's policy orientation toward expanding GCED through localised curriculum materials and monitoring it across classroom, school, and policy levels.

Cross-Regional Synthesis

In Phase 2, participants demonstrated how each region translated the results of the Phase 1 SWOT analysis into actionable monitoring plans, explicitly linking them to the classroom, school, and policy levels. Across all three regions, participants sought to connect implementation and reflection within a multi-layered structure that engaged teachers, schools, and MPOEs. Taken together, these differentiated strategies illustrated how the GCED Monitoring Toolkit could be flexibly adapted to diverse regional contexts while fostering coherence and systemic alignment across all three levels of practice.

Phase 3: Implementation and Evidence Collection

Based on the monitoring plans established in Phase 2, each region proceeded to Phase 3, the implementation stage. In this phase, teachers designed and delivered lessons informed by the Toolkit, school leaders facilitated collaboration among teachers and provided administrative support, and education supervisors systematically conducted surveys and programme monitoring to track progress. The implementation process generated tangible outcomes while also exposing recurring structural challenges. These results were evident across all three levels—classroom, school, and policy—highlighting both the potential of the Toolkit to guide practice and the institutional limitations that continue to constrain GCED.

Hasan

In Hasan, implementation centred on the "Neighbourhood Textbook" project. Volunteer teachers collaborated with the local Urban Regeneration Support Centre, while the school leader provided both space for teacher collaboration and flexible time within the timetable. The curriculum content was structured on the basis of the national curriculum standards in social studies and science, and organised into three units:

(1) Exploring the natural and human environment of the neighbourhood;

(2) Investigating the community's history and cultural heritage;

(3) Examining local economic activities and identifying and solving community problems.

At the same time, the MPOE conducted a survey of GCED lead Teachers from 35 schools across the region, securing 140 responses. The results showed that while nearly all teachers (98.6%) strongly agreed on the importance of GCED, fewer reported confidence in specific areas such as teaching methods (65%), classroom integration strategies (67.1%), assessment methods (53.6%), and preparedness from pre-service training (47.1%). This revealed a consistent gap: teachers acknowledged the high importance of GCED, but lacked sufficient practical capacity and resources to implement it effectively. School leaders also emphasised that embedding GCED within the school curriculum, without placing additional burdens on teachers, was considered essential for its sustainability.

Wonchun

In Wonchun, implementation of GCED was implemented primarily in a lower secondary school context, with a strong emphasis on linking global issues to the local context.

At the classroom level, student learning was monitored through exit tickets, reflection journals, and performance assessments. As part of an English class project, students investigated local buildings related to the SDGs and presented their findings in English. Pre- and post-survey results indicated positive growth in knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours. Notably, students expressed a clear shift in perception, reporting that "GCED had moved from being an abstract discourse to a practice connected to everyday life."

At the school level, the school leader directly facilitated a FGI with 10 teachers, including club advisors engaged in GCED and teachers from special needs classes. Teachers highlighted GCED's effectiveness in raising students' awareness of international issues and cultivating a sense of communal responsibility. At the same time, they identified several challenges, including the weak alignment with entrance examination requirements, limited thematic scope, and difficulties in linking GCED to students' everyday practices.

At the policy level, the MPOE conducted a survey of 285 teachers across 72 schools. While 68% of respondents had official responsibility for GCED, 92% reported having implemented GCED-related lessons. This finding demonstrated that a substantial proportion of teachers were voluntarily practising GCED, regardless of formal assignment, underscoring its grassroots uptake and significance as an emerging trend in the region.

Minan

In Minan, implementation focused on the utilisation of GCED teaching resources that had been developed and distributed by the MPOE. Prior to the lessons, two learning resources—Becoming a Global Citizen in the Classroom and the regional GCED workbook—were distributed to students to help them explore potential areas of interest and select a theme most relevant to them. Based on students' expressed preferences, particularly their request for a focus on human rights education, the teaching team selected Universal Design (UD) as the central theme, positioning it as a practical entry point to explore inequality and accessibility.

At the classroom level, students engaged in three sequential tasks: (1) identifying and documenting cases of inequity in their daily lives and communities; (2) searching for examples of universal design in their local community; and (3) developing and presenting new ideas for UD. As a follow-up activity, students also examined their school environment to identify elements that could be redesigned according to UD principles. They planned to present these proposals to the school leader, thereby extending GCED beyond the classroom and linking it directly to school-level improvement.

At the school level, teachers who observed the pilot lessons expressed strong interest in the applicability of the teaching resources. Through lesson-sharing sessions, they discussed ways of expanding GCED practices across different grades and subject areas, highlighting the potential for broader diffusion.

At the policy level, the MPOE monitored implementation through teacher surveys, classroom observations of the pilot lessons, and follow-up consultation meetings. This process enabled the collection of feedback and improvement suggestions, thereby ensuring institutional support for sustainability. Taken together, these activities suggested the potential for a "resource dissemination–lesson implementation–teacher diffusion–policy feedback" cycle, illustrating a promising model for strengthening GCED through localised curriculum development.

Cross-Regional Synthesis

Across the three regions, participants demonstrated distinct strategies in implementing their

Phase 2 monitoring plans while adhering closely to the GCED Monitoring Toolkit. Hasan effectively mobilised local resources through the development of a neighbourhood-based textbook, demonstrating how community assets can be integrated into curriculum design. Wonchun showed strong fidelity to the Toolkit's implementation stage, employing concrete tools such as exit tickets and reflection journals to systematically monitor student learning and perception changes. Minan highlighted the importance of student-centred planning by reflecting learners' expressed interests in the design stage, as exemplified by the adoption of UD as the thematic focus. Importantly, in all three regions, MPOEs conducted teacher surveys to assess the current status of GCED implementation, underscoring their role in generating system-level data to guide future improvements.

Phase 4: Reflection and Evaluation

Phase 4 was conducted during the second workshop. After presenting their implementation results, participants engaged in three activities using the Toolkit: (1) a self-assessment of achievement, rating the extent to which their plans had been realised; (2) a before-and-after reflection, describing changes in students, teachers, schools, and MPOEs compared to the pre-implementation stage; and (3) sharing personal reflections and future plans. These activities positioned Phase 4 as both an evaluation of outcomes and a collective exercise in planning for sustained GCED practice.

Hasan

In Hasan, participants highlighted their experience of actively utilising local resources at the classroom level. Teachers collaborated with the Urban Regeneration Support Centre, which provided financial, material, and human resource support, and also engaged with faculty members from the university nearby, whose academic advice contributed to enhancing the professionalism in developing the teaching material. Reflecting on this support, the teacher in Hasan remarked, "I had been trying to implement GCED alone in my classroom all the time, but through this project I was able to carry it forward with full-scale institutional support." This illustrates a strong sense of satisfaction derived from collaborative experiences.

At the school level, participants underscored the significant support provided by administrators, both materially and logistically. Whereas in the past administrators had primarily required teachers to only focus on conventional subject teaching, this initiative led them to recognise the importance of GCED themselves. The school leader also reported becoming more proactive in engaging with external linkages, such as participation in international organisations. At the same time, she expressed concern that GCED would not be sustainable unless it was more firmly embedded within

the school curriculum, warning that otherwise it might place additional burdens on teachers.

At the policy level, participants acknowledged a limitation: financial support could not be secured due to failure in the budget reallocation process. Nevertheless, the education supervisors reaffirmed that GCED is a theme capable of encompassing all subject areas. They reported recognising the necessity of establishing a dedicated organisational structure to ensure systematic implementation. They also noted that this process helped them realise the importance of integrating GCED with related policy domains such as multicultural education, highlighting the need for more coherent and organic policy alignment.

Wonchun

In Wonchun, classroom-level reflection emphasised the use of varied instructional strategies to explore and monitor students' shifts in awareness. Students participated in GCED lessons designed around the SDGs and recorded their experiences through reflection journals, performance assessments, and exit tickets. The participating teacher expressed that observing these activities convinced them of the positive effects of GCED on students, adding that she had gained confidence in the effectiveness of her own teaching practice.

At the school level, the school leader noted that teachers' understanding of local resources had improved and that examples of effectively linking these resources into classroom practice had become more common. She further remarked that she had confirmed the possibility of cultivating global citizenship competencies among students even within their own local context. This was viewed as evidence that community-based GCED could be meaningfully embedded into formal lessons, rather than remaining as a supplementary or extracurricular activity.

At the policy level, the MPOE reflected positively on its ability to systematically assess the current status of GCED by conducting surveys of teachers in GCED-designated schools supported by budget allocations. Through this process, the education supervisor reported that the office was able to clarify its support strategies for community-based GCED while also gaining a more concrete understanding of teachers' practical needs. They emphasised that this would provide important foundational data for future policy design.

Minan

In Minan, classroom-level reflection emphasised the clear cognitive and behavioural changes observed among students. Previously, students had been indifferent to global or local issues because of the heavy emphasis on entrance exam preparation. After participating in GCED activities, however, they reported developing the belief that even small individual actions could

contribute to creating a better world. The teacher, in presenting these outcomes, stressed that the significance of GCED lay in moving beyond abstract value education to stimulate students' concrete motivation for action. The follow-up activities run by students themselves were also highlighted as a meaningful outcome.

At the school level, participants confirmed that securing dedicated time within the curriculum for GCED was essential. Both teachers and administrators came to recognise that GCED should not be treated as an optional activity, but rather as an integral part of the formal curriculum to be implemented over the long term. This recognition itself was seen as a substantial shift.

At the policy level, survey results revealed teachers' requests for follow-up professional development. While the MPOE had initially assumed that its distributed materials were being adequately utilised, findings indicated that teachers needed additional opportunities to strengthen their instructional capacity. Education office representatives reflected that policy support should not stop at the mere distribution of materials but must also include continuous professional development for teachers. This was identified as an important lesson for strengthening policy design and support mechanisms moving forward.

2. Feedback on the Toolkit

This section presents findings from the FGIs, and is organised around three key areas:

(1) How the GCED Monitoring Toolkit supported collaboration across policy and practice;

(2) Which aspects of the Toolkit enabled or challenged participants; and

(3) How stakeholders perceived its usefulness and suggested ways to enhance its effectiveness.

2.1. Collaborative Embedding of Global Citizenship Education in Policy and Practice

Beyond its function as a monitoring instrument, the GCED Toolkit served as a catalyst for collaborative and reflective learning. Teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors used it not only to reflect on their own practices but also to gain new insights from peer and cross-regional exchange. In this way, the Toolkit broadened perspectives, encouraged self-growth, and fostered professional dialogue across regions, demonstrating its value as a platform for collective learning and collaboration.

The Toolkit as a Learning Opportunity: Cross-*Regional* Exchange

In particular, the Toolkit created significant opportunities for professional learning through cross-regional exchange. Participants noted that one of the most valuable elements of the project was the chance to engage in structured dialogue with peers from other regions. Unlike existing education supervisor meetings or teacher networks, which often focused narrowly on administrative updates, these workshops provided a rare and intentional platform for substantive professional learning.

Through these workshops, results showed that teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors observed and critically discussed authentic examples of GCED implementation at the classroom, school, and policy levels. This enabled participants to identify similarities and differences across contexts, benchmark their own practices, and generate practical strategies for adaptation. For many, it was the first opportunity to engage with a comparative, multi-level perspective on GCED.

Taemin, a teacher from Minan, noted:

> Hearing what teachers in other regions were doing—at both primary and lower secondary schools—was very helpful. In the classroom-level GCED monitoring case from Wonchun, the subject English is the same as myself. I realised we could do that, too. It gave me new insights. (Taemin)

Education supervisors also emphasised this benefit. One noted:

> The best part was realising, for the first time, what other provinces were actually doing. I hadn't known the numbers or the details before. Seeing their practices was eye-opening. (Eunha)

Beyond the workshops, participants valued the shared project drive (an online shared folder), which provided access to lesson plans, reports, and other resources from across regions. They also stressed the benefit of seeing GCED applied at different school levels, noting that such exposure sparked new approaches for curriculum design and programme planning in their own contexts.

Taken together, these experiences demonstrate that the workshops were not mere dissemination events but genuine spaces for mutual learning and professional growth. By enabling participants to see how GCED was interpreted and enacted in diverse institutional and regional settings, the project deepened understanding, broadened perspectives, and strengthened the educators' ability to situate GCED within their own schools and education systems. In this sense, the Toolkit's role extended beyond a technical guide to become a catalyst for sustained growth and cross-regional collaboration.

2.2. Enabling and Challenging Factors of the Toolkit

The Toolkit as an Enabler: Providing a Common Language

In this study, the GCED Monitoring Toolkit functioned as more than a procedural guide. Teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors each drew on the Toolkit to reflect on their practices and to establish clearer benchmarks. Above all, it provided a common language that enabled diverse education stakeholders to engage in more coherent and effective collaboration across classroom, school, and policy levels.

Practical Support Through Examples and Resources

Teachers adapted the Toolkit's suggested activities and tools to their own needs. Taewon, a teacher from Wonchun, explained that the Toolkit's section on "methods for collecting evidence of change" was particularly useful for evaluating classroom practice:

> Because the Toolkit included options like exit tickets, self-assessments, reflective journals, and performance tasks, I realised I could choose and adapt what fit best. It gave me concrete options to try out in my classroom. (Taewon)

She collaborated with fellow teachers in her year group to ensure that performance tasks were formally embedded in the official curriculum. As part of this process, students completed reflective journals twice—once before and once after the lesson. This allowed her to directly track changes in their learning. This experience demonstrated that the Toolkit acted not merely as an abstract set of guidelines, but as a practical repertoire from which teachers could selectively apply methods in collaboration with their peers.

Beyond classroom-level practice, education supervisors also found the Toolkit useful in their policy-related roles. In particular, its appendix of survey items proved highly valuable when designing instruments to assess GCED practices. The examples offered a ready-made framework that could be tailored to local contexts, reducing the burden of designing new tools from scratch:

> On page 61, it lays out the key characteristics of global citizenship. I used those five categories directly to construct the survey. Without that reference, I would have struggled. Because it was there, I could also ask teachers how they were linking these dimensions to the curriculum. For me, this Toolkit was indispensable. (Euiwon)

Another education supervisor, Eunha, initially tried to develop a survey tool by consulting academic papers, but eventually concluded that it was more efficient to adapt the Toolkit's sample instruments directly. Likewise, Emin reported that when she struggled to formulate indicators, the Toolkit's survey examples helped her set a clear direction. Together, these accounts highlight that this guidebook reduced the burden of tool development and provided adaptable, ready-to-use

resources that supported GCED implementation across different contexts.

Objective Evidence of Instructional Effectiveness

Teachers noted that, prior to this project, they had few opportunities to evaluate whether their GCED activities truly impacted students. By applying the Toolkit, they were able to systematically capture changes through objective data.

Taewon reflected on her experience using pre- and post-surveys alongside reflective journals:

> The survey results gave me strong evidence. Honestly, I didn't expect to see much difference, but between the first and second rounds, I noticed a big change—even more than I anticipated. That was really rewarding. (Taewon)

Through this process, teachers came to realise that GCED's effects could be demonstrated not just through subjective impressions, but through measurable outcomes and visible change in student responses.

The pre- and post-class surveys helped teachers observe meaningful growth in students' understanding of global issues and participation in GCED-related discussions and activities.

Taemin described her reaction to these findings:

> When I ran the t-test, I was shocked. I kept asking myself, can this be real? A significance level of 10^{-7}? Numerically, the results showed a very strong effect. (Taemin)

These testimonies highlighted the Toolkit's value as an evidence-based instrument—supporting practice while legitimising and substantiating the impact of GCED activities. Overall, the Toolkit encouraged teachers to move beyond anecdotal impressions, enabling them to present GCED's effectiveness with measurable evidence that could be shared within schools and with policymakers.

Opportunities for Self-Assessment

Participants emphasised that the Toolkit enabled not only the monitoring of student change, but also reflection on their own roles as teachers and policymakers.

Eunha found the Toolkit's survey component especially meaningful:

> For me the easiest part to use was the survey. After analysing the results, I realised something important: I assumed that GCED Lead Teachers would strongly influence their colleagues, but in reality, many activities stayed at the individual level. That made me reflect and think about what more we need to do. (Eunha)

This remark illustrates how the Toolkit enabled education supervisors to recognise, through survey data, the limits of GCED when confined to individual teachers. More importantly, it allowed them to articulate future directions, highlighting that sustainable progress requires moving beyond personal commitment toward structural change at the school and regional levels. Similarly, Emin emphasised that the Toolkit offered credible evidence for policy assessment:

> It gave us a real basis for reflection and adjustment. When we design policies, we are often uncertain whether they will truly work. In reality, once a policy is established it is difficult to revise, and we have rarely had reliable ways to know whether something is not working as intended. The Toolkit provided data that gave us confidence in our direction. (Emin)

Emin went on to note that prior policy reviews had been limited to satisfaction surveys or ad hoc task force meetings, but the Toolkit offered a more structured foundation for long-term planning. This suggests that, when properly utilised, the Toolkit can serve as a credible basis for policy evaluation at the system level.

Taewon also highlighted the value of the initial SWOT analysis exercise. She explained that it helped her recognise that what she had been practising intuitively—community-based GCED—was in fact a local strength worth developing. This demonstrates that the Toolkit not only addressed weaknesses but also enabled participants to articulate their strengths more explicitly and reframe them as resources for future strategy. Through this process, teachers came to see what they had previously taken for granted as distinctive strengths, and by naming them as such, they were able to reconceptualise their practice and set concrete goals at the classroom, school, and policy levels. In the Korean cultural context, where self-promotion is often discouraged, the SWOT tool proved especially effective in encouraging educators to verbalise and claim their strengths. Taken together, these reflections show that the Toolkit fostered a culture of self-assessment, encouraging both teachers and education supervisors to critically examine their own practices while linking personal insight to institutional learning and policy design.

Limitations of the Toolkit: Necessary but Incomplete

While the GCED Monitoring Toolkit provided participants with a meaningful framework, several limitations emerged in the course of actual implementation. Participants commonly perceived the Toolkit as a "necessary but incomplete instrument," pointing in particular to its lack of concrete guidance for use, the additional burdens for teachers and schools, and the practical challenges of applying it in real educational settings.

A Tool That Remains Abstract and Vague

Participants repeatedly emphasised that the Toolkit leaned too heavily on general principles and lacked the specificity needed to guide actual practice. Although it outlined step-by-step processes and tools, it did not provide ready-to-use manuals or concrete examples that could be immediately implemented. As a result, teachers and school leaders reported that even after reading the Toolkit, it was difficult to determine what specific activities should be carried out:

> Because it was called a Toolkit, I expected something much more concrete and detailed—step-by-step strategies we could follow. But in Toolkit 3, for example, the only option given was a survey, which is just a general research method. It felt insufficiently specific. (Taewon)

> When I tried to put it into practice, I realised that the measurement tools for analysis were insufficient. (Somin)

> When I first participated, I honestly didn't know what I was supposed to do. I only realised later that this was about setting up a monitoring process. Looking back, I think the guidance was simply too vague. (Taemin)

These reflections highlight the Toolkit's limited practicality for direct classroom use. Teachers in particular wanted to connect GCED with subject teaching, creative experiential activities, or student clubs. Yet in the absence of concrete examples or simple "ready-to-follow procedures," they were left to rely once again on their own capacity and to shoulder additional burdens individually.

A Tool That Requires Interpretation and Reframing

Another limitation identified was that the Toolkit was written in an overly academic style, relying heavily on abstract concepts that were difficult for teachers and novices to grasp. Teachers and school leaders reported that even after reading the Toolkit multiple times, the content "did not immediately resonate." Education supervisors likewise noted that "it ultimately had to be reconstructed before it could be used," underscoring that the document required substantial interpretation and adaptation rather than being directly applicable:

> The guidebook is difficult. Its applicability to practice is not very strong. As a Toolkit, everything should be presented as step by step, but here the introduction merely exists, and it suddenly starts in the middle with the main content. That made it quite hard to follow. (Somin)

> Before coming here, I read the school leader's section again. It does outline stages, but when ordinary teachers read it, I think it would not be easy to apply. Teachers want something more concrete to follow. (Soha)

A manual should function like a manual. But this was not a manual, I felt—it was too difficult. You need a lot of background knowledge and must spend time re-defining and reorganising it by yourself. But not every education supervisor or teacher has that kind of prior experience. As you said, it really should be presented in a manualised form: clearly structured, with visible examples, so that it can actually be used. (Euiwon)

It's a good resource, but in some ways I wished it gave clearer role guidance. For school leaders who are engaging with GCED for the first time, the document may feel too difficult. It would help to have something that even a beginner could immediately apply. (Emin)

In sum, while the Toolkit served as a reference for experts and experienced educators, it was not accessible enough for the majority of frontline teachers to read and immediately apply. Users often had to "reinterpret" or "reprocess" the content themselves, which demanded additional time and effort. As a result, despite being labelled a "guidebook," the Toolkit was widely perceived as a complex document that required further translation and adaptation before it could be put to practical use in schools.

A Tool Perceived as Burdensome in Application

Teachers reported that in applying the Toolkit, they experienced not only practical difficulties but also psychological burdens. They worried that their activities might create additional responsibilities for school leaders, fellow teachers or education supervisors:

What was difficult for me was worrying that by doing this, I might be placing another burden on my school leader. (Taemin)

Together with the two limitations highlighted earlier—the abstract and vague explanations, and the complex structure requiring interpretation—the Toolkit posed even greater barriers for teachers who were already pressed for time:

Teachers are so busy that even if you gave them ready-made, printable materials, many would still not use them. But if it's made this complicated, then of course they won't. (Soha)

These testimonies indicate that, rather than encouraging voluntary uptake, the Toolkit often risked being perceived as "an additional task to complete." In other words, instead of serving as a tool to support teachers' practice, in the field it could easily be seen as another layer of obligation and workload.

This points to two important implications. First, unless the Toolkit is developed in a more user-friendly and practice-oriented form, it risks undermining teachers' autonomy and motivation. Second, sustained use of the Toolkit requires that it be embedded not only in individual practice but also in the structural support of schools and MPOEs. In short, the effective application of the

Toolkit depends both on the internal coherence of the tool itself and on institutional mechanisms that can transform it from a burden into an opportunity for meaningful practice.

2.3. Stakeholders' Perceptions on Toolkit Usefulness

In exploring stakeholders' perceptions of the GCED Monitoring Toolkit, the focus group discussions captured how teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors viewed its functions and impact. Their reflections revealed that the Toolkit's usefulness extended beyond monitoring, serving as a catalyst for collaboration, professional learning, and institutional growth.

The Toolkit as a Catalyst for Expansion

Beyond supporting individual practice, the Toolkit demonstrated its potential to drive expansion at both the school and systemic levels. It not only validated the efforts of pioneering teachers but also created entry points for broader engagement across colleagues and school communities. At the same time, the Toolkit acted as a structural mediator, fostering collaboration among teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors who rarely had opportunities to work together on GCED. In doing so, it transformed isolated practices into shared initiatives and encouraged clearer role definition and coordinated planning. Together, these dynamics underscore the Toolkit's potential to function as a catalyst for both the diffusion of GCED within schools and the alignment of diverse stakeholders around common goals.

Teachers emphasised that the Toolkit helped GCED spread beyond individual classrooms. At an upper secondary school in Minan with over 100 teachers, only one teacher had previously been practising GCED. However, when a pilot lesson was shared with colleagues, the potential for expansion became visible:

> Many of my colleagues had never thought about GCED. After observing the lesson, they said it opened their eyes to a new perspective. That feedback was really encouraging. (Taemin)

The school leader of the same school echoed this observation, noting that the school regularly held "lesson-sharing sessions" where teachers observed one another's classes—often two or more times a month. On this occasion, when GCED lessons were shared using the new materials, the response from teachers was particularly positive, confirming the potential for school-wide diffusion:

> Our school was, frankly speaking, something of a small circle of teachers. Only the teacher who had previously shared lessons was really engaging with GCED. But this time, when we held an open lesson as part of our regular lesson-sharing sessions, many teachers came—and even education supervisors from the MPOE attended. Through that experience, colleagues at

our school broadened their perspectives on the field. I realised that we need to create more opportunities like this, so that more teachers can be exposed to GCED. (Somin)

This illustrates that the Toolkit experience went beyond confirming the effects of individual teachers' practice; it also stimulated interest and engagement among colleagues, thereby extending its impact to the level of the school community. Whereas GCED had often been regarded as the activity of only a few enthusiastic teachers, the workshops and open lessons created opportunities for other teachers to observe, experience, and discuss it directly. This process fostered collective learning and professional growth across the teaching body, showing how the Toolkit could transform individual commitment into institutional possibilities and school-level collective action.

The Toolkit also facilitated collaboration among different stakeholder groups. The design of the workshops encouraged teachers to broaden their perspectives to the school and system levels:

The Toolkit divided things into teacher, school, and MPOE perspectives. That helped me expand my own understanding of GCED beyond the classroom. (Taewon)

This indicates that the Toolkit functioned not merely as a tool for improving classroom instruction, but also as a framework for situating GCED within a multi-level governance structure. Teachers emphasised that the workshops provided rare opportunities to cooperate with school leaders and education supervisors:

Normally we never get to discuss GCED with school leaders or education supervisors. But here, we all shared the same direction and felt a sense of consistency. (Taemin)

In this way, the Toolkit functioned as a structural mediator, opening a "space for dialogue" where stakeholders could confirm shared goals and align their efforts, while also creating momentum for pursuing a coherent and consistent direction across different roles.

School leaders also reported that the Toolkit helped clarify their roles:

Because the Toolkit was divided into teacher, school leader, and education supervisor sections, I could clearly see what was expected of me. It was a meaningful guide in that respect. (Soha)

Consequently, teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors each came to clearly recognise their own responsibilities and authority. Collaboration therefore went beyond mutual support and was translated into explicit role-sharing and joint implementation. Euiwon recalled that from the very beginning of the project, they developed plans together with teachers and school leaders by dividing responsibilities. Education supervisors recalled that the project even facilitated explicit division of labour from the start:

We agreed early on: the teacher would run the lessons, the school leader would handle the focus group interviews, and I would manage the surveys. (Euiwon)

Ultimately, the Toolkit facilitated collaboration in four concrete ways: (1) expanding teachers' perspectives to include the school and system levels; (2) enhancing dialogue and mutual understanding among teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors; (3) enabling practical role-sharing for joint implementation; and (4) strengthening collective agency through the establishment of common goals. Taken together, these experiences suggest that GCED can move beyond reliance on the passion of individual teachers and become embedded within collaborative governance at both school and regional levels.

Professional and Institutional Growth

The Toolkit also provided opportunities for learning and growth not only for teachers but also for school leaders and policymakers. Emin highlighted the change she observed in a school leader:

> The school leader in my region is a highly capable leader, but he had not been particularly engaged with GCED before. Through this project, however, I saw a genuine shift. As he himself said, the Toolkit gave him a chance to study and to rethink his approach. For administrators whose primary focus had not been GCED, it offered concrete guidance on how to integrate it into school practice. (Emin)

This illustrates how the Toolkit functioned as a professional learning resource even for school leaders, who typically concentrate on school management and policy agendas rather than new pedagogical paradigms. As was also evident in the Phase 4 reflections, many school leaders prefer that teachers focus on existing classes rather than launching "new projects." The Toolkit nevertheless provided a structured pathway for them to expand their perspective, moving beyond personal priorities to recognise GCED as a key curricular issue.

Somin, an upper secondary school leader, further explained how the Toolkit informed his planning:

> It's difficult to artificially fit GCED into the curriculum for the whole year. But this Toolkit gave us a way to think in terms of selection and focus. As we plan for next year's curriculum, it is helping us realistically anticipate where and how GCED can be embedded. In that sense, the Toolkit touched on exactly the issues we needed to address. I also thought this kind of initiative should be scaled up more widely. (Somin)

This example shows that the Toolkit stimulated school leaders to consider concrete curricular strategies even under the strong constraints of exam-driven schooling at the upper secondary school level. Somin emphasised that the Toolkit moved GCED beyond being treated merely as an "abstract good value" and prompted him to explore practical ways of embedding it into the formal curriculum through strategic planning. This indicates the Toolkit's significance in fostering practical thinking that takes into account the structural constraints of educational contexts.

Teachers likewise noted that the Toolkit gave them new perspectives and opportunities to apply these insights directly in their classrooms (FGI teacher interviews). In this way, the Toolkit functioned not merely as a manual but as a catalyst for self-reflection and professional learning across roles—teachers, education supervisors, and school leaders alike. It laid the foundation for positioning GCED as a sustainable priority within both schools and education offices.

2.4 Recommendations for Further Development

Building on the insights gained from the FGIs, this section consolidates participants' suggestions for improving the applicability, sustainability, and policy relevance of the GCED Monitoring Toolkit. The recommendations focus on enhancing the Toolkit's practicality, accessibility, and integration into existing education systems so that it can serve as a sustainable mechanism for advancing GCED.

1. Provide concrete implementation examples.

Participants emphasised the need for tangible and context-based examples that demonstrate how the Toolkit can be applied in practice. Each stage of the Toolkit should be supported by concrete cases drawn from classrooms, schools, and regional education offices, helping educators to connect its principles with everyday teaching and management. Practical samples such as lesson plans, reflection templates, or local case studies would make the Toolkit more relatable and actionable.

2. Simplify and customise the Toolkit for diverse users.

Given the differing roles of teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors, participants recommended preparing tailored manuals for each group. Clear step-by-step guidance with visual tools such as flowcharts, checklists, or sample documents would help reduce complexity and enhance accessibility. By providing concise and role-specific materials, the Toolkit could function more effectively as a practical field manual rather than a theoretical reference.

3. Ensure institutional support and long-term integration.

Participants stressed that the Toolkit should not be perceived as an additional task but as part of ongoing professional learning and school management processes. Institutional measures—such as linking Toolkit use to annual school planning, providing training and administrative support, and aligning it with regional education policies—would reduce the burden on practitioners. Embedding the Toolkit within the curriculum cycle and policy frameworks would further enable sustainable implementation and long-term policy continuity.

V. Conclusion

This study examined how the GCED Monitoring Toolkit, developed over a three-year process, could be applied within the Korean educational context. The research was conducted over a four-month period in three selected regions. In each region, education supervisors from MPOEs worked with one school level—primary, lower secondary, or upper secondary—together with the respective teachers and school leaders.

The findings reveal that the Toolkit not only provided a shared structure for collaboration but also functioned as a bridge connecting policy and practice across multiple levels of the education system.

First, the Toolkit provided a common analytical framework and shared language for teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors to assess GCED practice. Participants selectively applied the Toolkit's suggested tools according to their specific contexts. For example, one teacher followed the guideline to identify student needs by granting students greater agency in topic selection, while another applied exit tickets as a method for collecting evidence of change. In addition, student and teacher surveys and reflective journals conducted in line with the Toolkit offered objective evidence on both the effectiveness of GCED lessons and the realities of policy implementation. For teachers who had previously relied on the assumption that GCED was simply "a good thing," this offered a means to substantiate outcomes, while for policymakers it provided an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of education policy and identify future directions. This demonstrates that the Toolkit has the potential to meet longstanding demands from the field for concrete GCED indicators and tools for structured reflection.

Second, participation in the action research itself, along with the application of the Toolkit, created new opportunities for learning. In particular, participants repeatedly emphasised that the two cross-regional workshops, where cases from other provinces were shared in detail, offered some of the most meaningful learning experiences. Among participants were teachers and education supervisors with long-standing experience as GCED leaders, as well as school leaders and education supervisors encountering GCED for the first time. Notably, one education supervisor (Eunha) who had been assigned to GCED responsibilities without prior experience described the process as an "eye-opening" moment. For him, the Toolkit not only clarified his role but also, by showcasing exemplary practices from other regions, provided a concrete pathway to follow.

Third, the Toolkit distinguished the respective roles of teachers, school leaders, and policymakers, prompting each to reflect on their own responsibilities. In practice, GCED had largely depended on the voluntary commitment of individual teachers, while the role of school leaders and MPOEs was often limited to providing emotional, administrative, or financial support. In this sense, GCED

implementation had been primarily teacher-driven. By contrast, the Toolkit explicitly outlined what teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors should each do, offering a procedural basis for building cooperative and more balanced relationships among the three actors. This is significant in that it demonstrated a pathway for GCED to expand beyond individual commitment toward institutionalised practice.

At the same time, participants identified several areas for improvement to enhance the Toolkit's field applicability. They recommended (1) incorporating concrete examples of practice; (2) simplifying and customising materials for different user groups: and (3) ensuring institutional support for sustained use. These refinements would make the Toolkit not only more user-friendly but also more deeply embedded within the routine processes of curriculum design, school planning, and policy implementation.

In sum, the participants suggested that the GCED Monitoring Toolkit needs to be restructured as both a learning resource and an operational manual that enables teachers, school leaders, and education supervisors to understand and act upon their respective roles. They proposed that the Toolkit should clearly outline the specific steps and actions required by each actor at different stages, and be presented in a form that is directly usable in the field without extensive reinterpretation. Most importantly, the participants called for a Toolkit that would minimise the burden on practitioners and make learning outcomes more visible.

Finally, careful attention must also be given to the mechanism for distribution and uptake. In an environment already saturated with learning materials and manuals, the Toolkit's effectiveness will depend on its capacity to be embedded within the curriculum rather than remaining as an additional resource. It should function as a resource that aligns with regional policy directions, school-level curriculum management, and teachers' curriculum adaptations, thereby supporting curriculum reorientation as a whole. If provided in a form that can be integrated into the annual cycle of policy and curriculum planning, the Toolkit could become a powerful instrument for advancing sustainable GCED practice.

As an exploratory case study, the findings are context-specific and not intended for generalisation. Rather than offering prescriptive conclusions, this study aims to provide grounded insights into how GCED monitoring can be adapted and scaled within the Republic of Korea's decentralising education system, thus contributing to ongoing efforts to institutionalise GCED as a sustainable practice.

References

Avgitidou, Sofia. (2009). Participation, roles and processes in a collaborative action research project: a reflexive account of the facilitator. *Educational Action Research, 17(4),* 585–600.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3(2),* 77-101.

Cho, H. S. (2017). Issues and challenges of educators in implementing global citizenship education in South Korea. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, 14(2).* 21–39.

Drummond, J. S., & Themessl-Huber, M.J. (2007). The cyclical process of action research: The contribution of Gilles Deleuze. *Action Research, 5(4),* 430–448.

Kemmis, S. K., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research.* Springer.

Kim, J. (2024). Why do teachers not change while the national curriculum repeatedly changes?: The 'Hidden' resistance of teachers in the centralized system of education in South Korea. *International Journal of Educational Development, 109,* 103105

Korean Educational Development Institute. (2019). *A Window Into Korean Education.* Jincheon: Korean Educational Development Institute.

McNiff. J. (2013). *Action research: Principles and practice.* Routledge.

Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea. (2024). Plan for 2025 GCED Lead Teachers' Initiatives. Sejong: MOE

So, K., & Kang, J. (2014). Curriculum reform in Korea: Issues and challenges for twenty-first century learning. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 23(4),* 795–803.

Annex 1. Research Protocol

The section on Research Protocol is intended to present essential guidelines for conducting the study. It describes the composition of participants and the organisation of workshops designed to generate meaningful data. It also outlines the approaches and tools employed for data collection, ensuring that the procedures align with the overall objectives of the research.

1. Participant recruitment

Each of the three regions forms a group of three members: one system leader, one school leader, and one teacher. Each region may have more than three participants, but there needs to be at least one person representing each stakeholder group.

2. Timeline and preparation/materials

	Focus	Preparation/materials	Duration	Mode
A. Orientation	- Introduction to the GCED Monitoring Toolkit	- Slides	1 hour	Online
B. Workshop 1 (Phases 1&2)	- Phase 1 Discovery & Goal Setting (1 hr) - Phase 2 Designing & Defining a Plan (1 hr)	- Slides - Three easels and easel pads for SWOT Analysis and GCED Monitoring Plan - An audio recorder - A camera	2 hours	Face-to-face
C. Implementation (Phase 3)	- Phase 3 Implementing & Evidence Gathering	Each participant prepares relevant materials in their own settings (e.g., lesson plans, survey items, assessment forms, etc.).	Three months (Minimum)	In-field
D. Workshop 2 (Phase 4)	- Presentations on Phase 3 (1 hr) - Phase 4 Reflecting & Evaluating (1 hr) - Focus Group Interview (50 min)	- Slides - Three whiteboards and markers for group activities - Three audio recorders - A camera	3 hours	Face-to-face

A. Orientation: Introduction to the research and the Toolkit

- Objectives

a) To introduce the members of the research team, including the participants;

b) To introduce the research plan, timeline and research team; and

c) To introduce the ACER-APCEIU GCED Monitoring Toolkit and the inquiry cycle

- Duration: 1 hour

- Mode: Online

- Preparation/Materials: Slides, GCED Monitoring Toolkit

- Structure

Focus	Activity	Duration	Notes
Introduction	- Welcoming remarks - Researchers and the research team	5 min	
Research plan	- Introduction to the research project - Introduction to the research plan - Sharing the timeline	15 min	- The research aims, questions, and expected outcomes are presented and shared with the participants.
ACER-APCEIU Monitoring Plan	- Icebreaker questions : How would you define a global citizen? (What would your students say, think, feel, and do if they were global citizens?) - Introducing UNICEF and SEAMEO's definition of a global citizen - Three targeted stakeholders, depth continuum, and inquiry cycle - Phase 1 Discovery & Goal Setting - Phase 2 Designing & Defining a Plan - Phase 3 Implementing & Evidence Gathering - Phase 4 Reflecting & Evaluating	30 min	- Before introducing the Toolkit, the facilitator invites participants to share their own ideas about the meaning of "global citizen." - Then, the definition of global citizenship developed by UNICEF and SEAMEO, which served as the foundation for the Toolkit, is also shared. - Finally, the main contents of the Toolkit are explained.
Q&A		5 min	
Conclusion	- Sharing information on the next workshop - Closing remarks	5 min	

B. Workshop 1: Phases 1&2 of the inquiry cycle

- Objectives

a) To analyse the status of GCED practice at classroom, school, and system levels (Phase 1); and

b) To set GCED Monitoring Plans for each region, based on the analysis (Phase 2)

- Duration: 2 hours

- Mode: Face-to-face (in a conference room)

- Preparation/Materials: Slides, hard-copy informed consent forms, three easels and easel pads for group activities, a timer, an audio recorder, and a camera

- Structure

Focus	Activity	Duration	Notes
Introduction	- Welcoming remarks - Introduction to the research and timeline - Obtaining consent and discussion on anonymity	20 min	
Phase 1 Discovery & Goal Setting	[Group activity] GCED SWOT Analysis Each group, consisting of three stakeholders, analyses their region's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats at the classroom, school, and system levels.	15 min	Reference: [Workshop 1] Easel pad template 1 Participants can draw the template themselves.
	[Plenary] Sharing of the analysis	10 min	
Phase 2 Designing & Defining a Plan	[Group activity] GCED Monitoring Plan Each group develops a GCED Monitoring Plan based on their SWOT analysis at the classroom, school, and system levels.	20 min	Reference: [Workshop 1] Easel pad template 2 Participants can draw the template themselves. In case of limited time, participants may be instructed to fill in the first row (contents) and submit the remaining parts later as a written document.
	[Plenary] Sharing of the monitoring plans	20 min	
Instructions	[Instructions on Phase 3. Implementing & Evidence Gathering] Presentation and Submission Guidelines All outputs, such as lesson plans, photos, and survey results from Phase 3, along with the presentation slides, need to be submitted before Workshop 2.	10 min	For each region, three stakeholders will each speak for five minutes.
Conclusion	- Closing remarks	10 min	

C. Implementation phase: Phase 3 of the inquiry cycle

- Objectives: To implement the monitoring plan

- Duration: Minimum three months

- Mode: In-field

- Preparation/Materials: Each participant prepares relevant materials in their own settings (e.g., lesson plans, survey items, assessment forms, etc.)

D. Workshop 2: Phase 4 of the inquiry cycle

- Objectives

 a) To share the results of the GCED Monitoring in each region (Phase 3);

 b) To reflect on the Workshop (Phase 4); and

 c) To conduct Focus Group Interviews

- Duration: 3 hours

- Mode: Face-to-face (in a conference room and three meeting rooms for FGIs)

- Preparation/Materials: Slides, three whiteboards and markers for group activities, instructions for three stations, a timer, three audio recorders, a camera, and FGI questionnaires for each stakeholder group

- Structure

Focus	Activity	Duration	Notes
Introduction	- Welcoming remarks	5 min	
Presentations on Phase 3	[Presentations] Phase 3 in three regions Three participants from each region give a five-minute presentation on their implementation of GCED Monitoring at the classroom, school, and policy levels.	45 min	- Region A: 15 min - Region B: 15 min - Region C: 15 min
	[Q&A] The participants exchange Q&A and comments about the presentations.	10 min	
Phase 4 Reflecting & Evaluating	[Group activity] Reflection Carousel The facilitator introduces the activity before it begins. 1. Introduce the three whiteboards with templates as Stations 1, 2, and 3. 2. Form three regional groups and assign each group to one of the stations. 3. Participants carry out the activities based on the instructions provided at each station or with guidance from the researchers. 4. Rotate groups clockwise every 10 minutes until they have completed all three activities.	40 min	Reference: [Workshop 2] Whiteboard templates 1–3 Prepare the templates on three whiteboards prior to the workshop. - Station 1: Evaluation of Goal Attainment - Station 2: Before and After the GCED Monitoring - Station 3: Goals for the next cycle
	[Plenary] Sharing of group activity results	10 min	
	Break	10 min	
Focus group interview	Interviews with teachers, school leaders, and system leaders by stakeholder group	50 min	- Three researchers collect data with three audio recording devices
Conclusion	- Closing remarks	10 min	

Annex 2. Focus Group Interview Questionnaire

Teachers

Introductory question :

1. What were your initial impressions of the GCED Monitoring Toolkit?

Questions relating to Phases 1 and 2:

2. As a teacher, what aspects of the workshops or the Toolkit helped you to assess your starting point and identify and set appropriate goals for your global citizenship initiative? Can you give an example?

▶ Examine the teacher's knowledge and skills, the students' knowledge and skills, and the available resources and support systems during this process.

3. As a teacher, what aspects of the workshops or the Toolkit helped you to develop the plan for your global citizenship initiative? Can you give an example?

▶ Examine how students' interests were consolidated, how they participated in the goal-setting process, and whether the teacher established improvement goals for themselves and reflected on what was learned.

4. During Phase 2 (designing and defining a plan), what challenges did you anticipate, and what approaches did you take to address them?

▶ If needed, refer to Table 3 on page 40 ("List of potential challenges that may be encountered") to guide your questions.

5. During the planning process, in what ways did students participate, and how did their participation influence the final plan or its implementation?

Questions relating to Phases 3 and 4:

6. As a teacher, what aspects of the workshops or the Toolkit helped you to implement GCED and collect evidence of its outcomes?

▶ How was evidence of change collected (e.g., pre-test/post-test, self-evaluation, peer feedback, student reflection)? Examine how the monitoring guide supported the process.

Overarching questions:

7. How have you engaged and collaborated with students, colleagues or your school community regarding your GCED initiative goal setting, planning or implementation process?

8. What aspects of the Toolkit support collaboration among stakeholders (teachers, school leaders, system leaders, etc.)?

9. What aspects of the Toolkit did you find most useful and why?

10. What aspects of the Toolkit, if any, did you find most difficult, challenging, or confusing, and why?

11. What do you think is needed to improve the Toolkit as a resource that supports teachers in realising their vision for GCED while identifying the current status, planning, implementing, and monitoring GCED in the classroom?

12. To assist our work moving forward, do you have any other comments or suggestions?

School Leaders

Introductory question:

1. What were your initial impressions of the GCED Monitoring Toolkit?

Questions relating to Phases 1 and 2:

2. As a leader, what aspects of the workshops or the Toolkit helped you to assess your starting point and identify and set appropriate goals for your global citizenship initiative? Can you give an example?

▶ Examine how the level of awareness and interest in GCED among members of the school community (e.g., staff, parents, and students) was identified, and how this understanding was reflected in the goals or implementation.

▶ Examine what goals (intended change points) were set, what information or data were used to establish these goals, and with whom discussions were held during the process.

3. As a leader, what aspects of the workshops or the Toolkit helped you to develop the plan for your global citizenship initiative? Can you give an example?

▶ During Phase 2 (designing and defining a plan), what specific changes were designed at the whole-school or grade/team level? Examine how various stakeholders, such as students, teachers, and parents, were involved in the planning process.

4. During Phase 2 (designing and defining a plan), what challenges did you anticipate, and what approaches did you take to address them?

Question relating to Phases 3 and 4:

5. What aspects of the workshops or the Toolkit are helpful for systems or schools to implement

and gather evidence for their global citizenship initiatives?

▶ After the implementation, what positive changes were observed among the teaching staff or within the school? Conversely, what were the limitations or areas for improvement?

6. During Phase 3 (implementation), were there any school-level programmes or support mechanisms (e.g., common activity weeks, whole-school projects)? What are the perceived benefits and impacts of such school-level programmes beyond individual classroom practices?

Overarching questions:

7. How have you engaged and collaborated with students, colleagues, and or your school community regarding your GCED initiative goal setting, planning or implementation process?

8. What aspects of the Toolkit support collaboration among stakeholders (teachers, school leaders, system leaders, etc.)?

9. What aspects of the Toolkit did you find most useful and why?

10. What aspects of the Toolkit, if any, did you find most difficult, challenging, or confusing, and why?

11. What do you think is needed to improve the Toolkit as a resource that supports school leaders in realising their vision for GCED while identifying the current status, planning, implementing, and monitoring GCED at the school level?

12. To assist our work moving forward, do you have any other comments or suggestions?

System Leaders

Introductory question:

1. What were your initial impressions of the GCED Monitoring Toolkit?

Questions relating to Phases 1 and 2:

2. What aspects of the workshops or the Toolkit are helpful for systems or schools to identify and set appropriate goals for their global citizenship initiatives? Can you give an example?

▶ Examine what sources of information or feedback were used to determine the key goals and directions of the MPOE or the responsible team, and whether the monitoring guide was helpful in coordinating these efforts.

3. What aspects of the workshops or the Toolkit help systems or schools to develop plans for global citizenship initiatives? Can you give an example?

▶ During Phase 2 (designing and defining a plan), how did the MPOE support the requests of individual schools? Examine what efforts were made to encourage each school to autonomously plan and implement GCED.

4. During Phase 2 (designing and defining a plan), what challenges at the MPOE level were anticipated, and what approaches were taken to address them?

Questions relating to Phases 3 and 4:

5. What aspects of the workshops or the Toolkit are helpful for systems or schools to implement and gather evidence for their global citizenship initiatives?

▶ What positive changes has the education department's support brought to the school sites?

6. What specific efforts have been made to enhance the quality and depth of GCED, particularly in supporting teachers and school leaders?

7. What types of evidence (e.g., surveys, reports, post-training feedback) were collected by the MPOE during the implementation and monitoring process, and how have these data been, or are planned to be, utilised for policy improvement and decision-making?

Overarching questions:

8. How have local schools and the MPOE engaged and collaborated with students, colleagues or your school community regarding your GCED initiative goal setting, planning or implementation process?

9. What aspects of the Toolkit support collaboration among stakeholders (teachers, school leaders, system leaders, etc.)?

10. What aspects of the Toolkit did you find most useful and why?

11. What aspects of the Toolkit, if any, did you find most difficult, challenging, or confusing, and why?

12. What do you think is needed to improve the Toolkit as a resource that enables system leaders (education officers) to better identify the current status, plan, implement, and monitor GCED across the system?

13. To assist our work moving forward, do you have any other comments or suggestions?

[Phase 1] Discovery & Goal Setting

SWOT Analysis

Region: _____

S (Strengths)	W (Weaknesses)
- System level - School level - Classroom level	- System level - School level - Classroom level

O (Opportunities)	T (Threats)
- System level - School level - Classroom level	- System level - School level - Classroom level

[Phase 2] Designing & Defining a Plan

GCED Monitoring Plan

Goal: _____

Region: _____

Participants: _____

	System level	School level	Classroom level
Contents			
Methods			
Collaboration and support with other levels			
Timeline			

[Phase 4] Reflecting & Evaluating

Station 1: Evaluation of Goal Attainment

Region A	Region B	Region C
Goal: **(from Workshop 1)**	**Goal:** **(from Workshop 1)**	**Goal:** **(from Workshop 1)**
Level of goal attainment : ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆	**Level of goal attainment :** ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆	**Level of goal attainment :** ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆
Evidence:	**Evidence:**	**Evidence:**

[Phase 4] Reflecting & Evaluating

Station 2: Before and After the GCED Monitoring

	Before	After
Region A	Teachers (I)... School leaders (I)... System leaders (I)...	
Region B		
Region C		

[Phase 4] Reflecting & Evaluating

Station 3: Goals for the Next Cycle

	Goals for the next cycle	Areas for further support	Key takeaways
Region A			
Region B			
Region C			

Supporting Change in Practice

Case Studies on the Use of the ACER-APCEIU Global Citizenship Education Monitoring Toolkit

Country Case: **Republic of Korea**