## ALIGN CASE STUDY

### DJIBOUTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETERS OF ALIGN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Components</strong></td>
<td>Curriculum, teaching and learning materials (TLM), teacher training, assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Areas</strong></td>
<td>Formal education, reading, grades 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Centralized under the Ministry of Education (MOE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
<td>Synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation/Goals</strong></td>
<td>Under USAID funding, a technical assistance partner supported the revision of the grades 1-5 reading curriculum and related curriculum standards in Djibouti. The partner’s mandate also included revising the TLM, teacher professional development, and preservice training. The MOE wanted to align all four components/subcomponents (curriculum, TLM, preservice training, and in-service training) to ensure a cohesive and coherent education system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readiness Indicators</strong></td>
<td>When the activity was co-designed between the MOE and the technical assistance partner, the Global Proficiency Framework (GPF) was still being finalized. The MOE was eager to engage in the global initiative, so ALIGN was included in the MOE sector plan and the USAID-funded activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPLEMENTATION OF ALIGN

1. **Timeframe for ALIGN:** Completed through an iterative process over three years.

2. **ALIGN-related activities:**
   a. Workshops for each aspect of the ALIGN process, including a review of the curriculum framework, lesson plan templates, TLM, etc.
   b. On-going working sessions and meetings with the MOE.
   c. Policy linking workshop.

3. **Experts:**
   a. MOE staff, including curriculum experts, training specialists, and data and evaluation specialists.
   b. International reading expert and MEL expert from technical assistance partner.

4. **Budget:**
   a. Workshops, consultant fees, data collection, MOE staff level of effort, and per diems.

5. **Outcomes:**
   a. Completed curriculum review and identified and incorporated new standards into the curriculum framework.
   b. TLM and teacher training were reviewed to identify gaps and opportunities for alignment with the GPF and updated curriculum framework for grades 1-5.
   c. Benchmarks were set for grade 2 and 5 assessments through the policy linking process.

6. **Follow-up steps completed as a result of the ALIGN diagnostic process:** Completed these activities through an iterative process over three years:
   a. Updated curricula and TLM for grades 1-5 with minimum proficiency reading skills incorporated.
   b. Aligned assessments for grades 1-5 that can be used for Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) reporting.
   c. Updated in-service and preservice teacher training on how to teach new reading skills for grades 1-5 in the classroom.

7. **Additional ALIGN processes could focus on:**
   a. ALIGN for reading, grades 6-9.
   b. ALIGN for math, grades 1-9.
8. **Lessons learned:**

   a. The entire alignment process was very hands-on and iterative, with strong collaboration between the MOE senior policymakers, relevant MOE departments, the implementing partners, USAID, and the World Bank.

   b. A critical piece of the work was ensuring that MOE technicians fully understood the knowledge and skills outlined in the GPF. The GPF is precise, and some technical language used to describe learners’ performance on skills can be unfamiliar to people. The implementing partner used practical examples and activities to help all involved develop a common understanding of grade-specific performance descriptors.