

**Structures of support for curriculum implementation:
A comparative view across continents**

Marlo S. Imbong*

Lo-ok Senior High School
Caltex Road, Looc, Lapu-Lapu City
Email: marlo.imbong@deped.gov.ph

Regina P. Galigao

Cebu Technological University – Main Campus
M.J. Cuenco Cebu Cit, Philippines
Email: reginpgaligao@yahoo.com

Grethel F. Desales

Langtad Elementary School
Langtad, City of Naga, Cebu
Email: grethel.desales@deped.gov.ph

Rolando R. De Guzman III

Lahug National Highschool -Night
Gorrordo Avenue Lahug, Cebu City
Email: rdg_319781@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

A persistent and global challenge in education is the gap between intended curriculum policy and actual classroom practice. This study argues that successful implementation hinges on three interconnected support structures: high-quality teacher professional development, equitable resource allocation, and coherent leadership and policy. Through a qualitative comparative analysis of literature and case studies from six continents, this research examines how these structures are conceptualized and operationalized in diverse contexts. The findings reveal that effective systems synergistically integrate these three pillars into a cohesive support architecture, whereas struggling systems treat them in isolation. Crucially, the study identifies that equitable resource distribution and contextually adaptive leadership are fundamental to translating professional development and policy into sustainable practice. The research concludes that there is no universal blueprint; instead, bridging the implementation gap requires diagnostically building

*Corresponding author

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0404657>

Recommended citation:

Imbong, M. S., Galigao, R. P., Desales, G. F., & De Guzman III, R. R. (2025). Structures of support for curriculum implementation: A comparative view across continents. *Pantao (The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 4 (4), 7186-7200. <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0404657>

and aligning these support structures to address the specific constraints and needs of each educational context.

Keywords: Curriculum implementation, educational policy, teacher professional development, resource allocation, educational leadership, comparative education, educational change, equity in education

Date Submitted: November 13, 2025

Date Accepted: November 26, 2025

Date Published: December 22, 2025

INTRODUCTION

A persistent global challenge in education lies in the enduring gap between intended curriculum policy and actual classroom practice, a disconnect that continues to undermine the objectives of large-scale systemic reform. International analyses have consistently shown that well designed curricula frequently fail to achieve their intended impact because the conditions required for enactment are unevenly developed or poorly aligned across levels of the education system (OECD, 2015). This study advances the position that effective curriculum implementation cannot be attributed to isolated interventions or singular reforms. Instead, it depends on the dynamic and mutually reinforcing interaction of multiple support structures that collectively shape teachers' capacity to translate policy into meaningful instructional practice.

Central to this argument is the integration of three core structures of support. Sustained and high-quality teacher professional development is essential in enabling educators to understand curricular intent, deepen pedagogical content knowledge, and adapt instructional strategies to diverse learner needs (Darling Hammond et al., 2017). Equally important is equitable resource allocation, which ensures that schools possess the material, financial, and human resources necessary to operationalize curricular demands in consistent and effective ways (Darling Hammond, 2010). These supports must be further anchored in coherent leadership and policy frameworks that provide clear direction, alignment across system levels, and continuous feedback mechanisms to guide implementation over time (Fullan, 2015). When these elements operate in isolation, reform efforts remain fragmented. When they function in synergy, they create enabling conditions for sustained instructional improvement.

Guided by a comparative perspective on global education reform, this study examines how these interrelated support structures are designed and aligned across educational systems spanning six continents. Drawing on international reform experiences and contextual analyses (Altinyelken, 2010), the research explores both high-capacity systems and contexts characterized by limited resources in order to surface shared principles as well as context responsive adaptations. Through this comparative lens, the study seeks to identify how different systems construct the foundational architecture that supports curriculum enactment. By synthesizing common patterns and localized strategies, the research aims to offer a practical framework for strengthening the structural supports required to transform curricular aspirations into durable and effective classroom practice.

Statement of the problem

Guided by this framework, the present study is structured by three specific research objectives. First, it aims to analyze the design and delivery of teacher professional development programs that underpin curriculum implementation across diverse international contexts. Secondly, it seeks to evaluate models of resource allocation—including funding, technology, and materials—with a focus on equity and efficiency in supporting curricular change. Finally, the research will assess the role of educational leadership and policy coherence in creating enabling environments for sustainable implementation. Through these objectives, this comparative analysis works to identify the essential, cross-contextual principles of effective support systems capable of bridging the gap between policy and practice.

METHODOLOGY

This study will employ a qualitative research design centered on a comparative case study approach through systematic literature review and document analysis. This design is chosen for its capacity to provide an in-depth, contextual understanding of complex social phenomena within their real-world settings (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Rather than generating new primary data, the research will utilize a qualitative data mining technique to analyze and synthesize existing literature, published case studies, policy documents, and government reports from selected countries across different continents. This method allows for a cross-continental exploration of how support structures for curriculum implementation are conceptualized, enacted, and experienced in diverse contexts.

The data analysis will follow a systematic procedure guided by thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The process will begin with the identification and collection of relevant academic publications, institutional reports, and detailed case studies from various national and international databases. Following collection, the coding process will commence, where the gathered documents will be systematically reviewed to identify initial codes related to the three core pillars of the study: teacher professional development, resource allocation, and leadership/policy. These initial codes will then be grouped into potential themes in a process of theme development, looking for patterns of similarity and difference across the cases. Finally, a comparative analysis will be conducted, where the developed themes will be analyzed across the different continental contexts to identify overarching facilitators, barriers, and unique contextual configurations that define effective support structures for curriculum implementation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents a global comparative analysis of the three core support structures for curriculum implementation: Teacher Professional Development, Resource Allocation, and Leadership & Policy. Drawing on evidence from six continents, each pillar is systematically examined through three analytical dimensions: the dominant models and approaches adopted, the critical systemic enablers that sustain them, and the persistent contextual challenges that impede their effectiveness. This structured, thematic framework facilitates a focused comparison across diverse regions, moving beyond descriptive accounts to interpret how different systems architect—or fail to architect—the necessary conditions for translating policy into sustainable classroom practice. The following analysis thereby establishes the evidentiary foundation for identifying the principles of effective support systems.

Teacher Professional Development Programs

Teacher professional development (TPD) is universally acknowledged as the critical linchpin for translating curricular policy into classroom practice. However, a global comparative analysis reveals that its effectiveness is not a function of intention, but of specific architectural choices. The efficacy of TPD is determined by the convergence of three interconnected dimensions: the models of learning employed, the systemic enablers that support them, and the contextual challenges that constrain implementation. Examining these dimensions across continents clarifies the foundational principles for moving from isolated training events to integrated professional learning ecosystems.

Models of learning

A consistent global shift in teacher professional development is the move away from brief workshops toward sustained, collaborative, and practice-based learning models (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017), a principle underscored by research highlighting the need for interactive training paired with ongoing coaching (OECD, 2024). This trend is evident worldwide: in Europe through structured programs like Erasmus+ Teacher Academies and the collaborative eTwinning initiative (European Commission, 2021, 2023); in Asia through models such as Malaysia's Professional Learning Communities and China's blended programs using AI tools (Ali & Arof, 2022; Zhu & Liu, 2023); and in Africa through long-term networks like the Teacher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa programme (Wolfenden & Buckler, 2020; TESSA, 2023). A notable contrast exists in North America, where the United States often employs a reactive, market-driven model focused on immediate needs like AI training (U.S. Department of Education, 2024), while Canada adopts a more systemic approach aligned with enduring national priorities (CMEC, 2022; Government of Canada, 2023). Together, these diverse examples reinforce that effective development is a continuous process, not a one-time event.

Key enablers

The success of these modern teacher development models relies on three key enablers: clear policy, strong collaboration, and smart use of technology. Supportive policy provides direction, as seen in Africa's Continental Education Strategy (African Union, 2024) and Asia's regional plans (ADB, 2021), or in national models from Australia and the European Union (Australian Government Department of Education, 2022; European Commission, 2021). Collaboration forms the second pillar, whether through structured Professional Learning Communities in places like Malaysia and South Africa (Salleh & Tan, 2021; Department of Basic Education, 2021) or through cross-border teacher networks like Europe's eTwinning (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2023). Finally, technology is now a vital tool for delivering training itself, not just a topic to be taught. Examples include Africa's use of webinars and AI to assist teachers (UNESCO, 2023), Asia's experiments with AI for personalized feedback (Zhu & Liu, 2023), and North America's drive for digital tools and infrastructure (U.S. Department of Education, 2024). Together, coherent policy, collaborative structures, and technology create the essential foundation for continuous, large-scale professional learning.

Persistent challenges

Effective teacher development faces consistent systemic obstacles and deep inequities across the globe, regardless of promising models (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2022). A universal barrier is the gap between ambitious goals and scarce resources, seen in contexts like Laos and much of Africa where overwhelming teacher workloads, limited funding, and weak institutional support severely hinder progress (UNESCO, 2023; World Bank, 2022). In South America, broader economic conditions, such as reliance on commodity exports and high informal labor, limit public investment and shape the focus of professional development (ECLAC, 2022). Significant disparities persist even in wealthier nations: Australia shows uneven investment between its territories and records relatively low government spending per student (Productivity Commission, 2023), while Canada explicitly directs teacher development to help close a large attainment gap between socioeconomic groups (CMEC, 2022; Statistics Canada, 2021). In the United States, access to quality training on topics like artificial intelligence depends heavily on a local district's technological capacity, creating stark inequalities in support (ISTE, 2023; U.S. Department of Education, 2024). These examples underscore that without tackling fundamental issues of fair resources, manageable workloads, and economic realities, even the best models for teacher development will struggle to make a difference in the classroom.

In conclusion, the global evidence converges on the principle that effective professional development must be a sustained, empowered process of professional learning. The comparative analysis demonstrates that high-performing systems synergize collaborative, continuous models with robust policy and technological enablers, while actively working to mitigate resource and equity challenges. Regions facing structural constraints, such as Africa and South America, counter these through strategic continental frameworks and innovative, technology-aided networks. Ultimately, the goal is to transform TPD from a periodic intervention into a cornerstone of the educational ecosystem—equipping teachers not just with new strategies, but with the ongoing support, community, and autonomy to adapt and generalize them, thereby closing the enduring gap between curricular ambition and classroom reality.

Resource allocation: Funding, technology, and material support

Resource allocation—the strategic distribution of financial capital, technological tools, and learning materials—serves as the critical backbone for translating curriculum from policy into practice. It determines the tangible "how" of implementation, directly influencing whether reforms are sustained or stagnate. A global comparative analysis reveals that the efficacy of resource allocation is not merely a function of total expenditure but is defined by three interdependent dimensions: the governance models guiding distribution, the strategic enablers that amplify impact, and the persistent systemic challenges that threaten equity and sustainability. Examining these dimensions across continents clarifies the principles necessary to build resilient resourcing systems that bridge the gap between ambition and reality.

Models of distribution

The way resources are governed, ranging from strict central control to school-level management, fundamentally shapes how effectively they are used (OECD, 2020). Europe employs a multi-layered approach, where significant EU strategic funding supports shared goals like digital transition, yet individual nations retain control over their own spending (European Commission, 2021). In Oceania, a developed needs-based model in Australia, which allocates extra funds for equity, contrasts with the Pacific Islands' collective model, where 15 nations pool resources through a shared regional framework (NSW Department of Education, 2022; Pacific Community, 2023). North America, particularly the United States, has a fragmented system where heavy reliance on local property taxes creates inherent inequalities, though federal grants aim to support specific groups (Baker & Corcoran, 2023; U.S. Department of Education, 2023). Asia presents varied national models, from China's top-down, strategic budget increases to the dependence of some Southeast Asian nations on unpredictable international aid (Ministry of Education of the PRC, 2022; UNESCO, 2021). These diverse models reveal a core tension: centralized systems can ensure alignment with broad goals but may be inflexible, while decentralized models can be more responsive but often worsen inequities without strong mechanisms to ensure fairness (OECD, 2020).

Strategic levers

The ultimate impact of any resource depends not just on its amount, but on how strategically it is deployed through key enablers. A primary strategy, especially in lower- and middle-income regions, is forming international partnerships. In Africa, coalitions like the Global Partnership for Education and UNICEF help strengthen local funding and direct support toward proven methods like structured teaching (GPE, 2023; UNICEF, 2022). Similarly, in South America, partners including UNESCO and the World Bank help create fiscal space through innovative tools and fund national programs such as Argentina's Literacy Plan (IDFC, 2023; UNESCO et al., 2022; Ministry of Education, Argentina, 2023). A second key enabler is technology, though its purpose varies: in Europe, it is a strategic investment for modernizing systems (European Commission, 2022), while in South America and Africa, it is often a tool for efficiency and equity, such as digital hubs that share teaching resources (World Bank, 2021; Pacific Community, 2024). Finally, targeted, evidence-based investment is crucial. This can be seen in China's focused funding for vocational education (Ministry of Finance & Ministry of Education, PRC, 2022), North America's federal grants for specific student groups (U.S. Department of Education, 2023a, 2023b), and South America's push to direct money toward foundational skills based on learning data (UNESCO, 2022). These approaches show that the strategy behind the spending is just as important as the resources themselves.

Systemic challenges

Every region grapples with profound systemic challenges in education funding that create a persistent gap between resources and their effective use (World Bank, 2024). A universal issue is the shortfall in adequate and fair funding. In Africa, many governments spend less than the recommended 4-6% of GDP on education, leading to severe shortages like a lack of textbooks (UNESCO, 2024). In North America, heavy reliance on local property taxes locks in inequality between rich and poor districts (Baker & Corcoran, 2023), a problem worsened by the end of pandemic-era aid and political instability affecting budgets (U.S. Department of Education, 2024;

Camera, 2024). While South America meets spending targets as a percentage of GDP, its actual per-student spending remains critically low, which is directly tied to poor learning outcomes (OECD/UNESCO, 2023). A second major challenge is demographic and political pressure. Europe and South America must shift focus from expanding systems to improving quality as student numbers fall and populations age, all while competing for public funds (European Commission, 2023; ECLAC, 2022). North America also struggles with declining enrollment and widespread teacher shortages (U.S. Department of Education, 2023). Finally, unequal access to technology remains a stark barrier. In Asia, the growth of educational technology often excludes rural, disabled, and indigenous learners (UNESCO, 2023). In Africa, geographic divides mean schools in rural or conflict-affected areas lack the digital tools available in cities (World Bank, 2021). These overlapping challenges show that unless core issues of adequate funding, fairness, and stability are tackled, even the best strategic plans will fall short.

In conclusion, the global landscape of resource allocation reveals that successful support for curriculum implementation hinges on more than financial volume. It requires governance models that balance strategic direction with equitable distribution, whether through national formulas, regional cooperation, or equalized multi-level systems. Its impact is amplified by strategic enablers—international coalitions, technology leveraged for efficiency and access, and investments targeted by evidence. Yet, these are perpetually tested by systemic challenges of funding gaps, demographic shifts, and deep-seated inequities. The comparative analysis underscores that the most resilient systems are those that consciously design allocation models to mitigate these very challenges, ensuring that resources—financial, technological, and human—directly and reliably reach the point of learning. Only then can resource allocation truly fulfill its role as the backbone of sustainable educational change.

Leadership and educational policies

The successful translation of curriculum from policy into practice is ultimately determined by the quality of educational leadership, which acts as the essential linchpin between top-down mandates and classroom reality. While resources and professional development provide the tools, it is leadership that orchestrates their use, interprets policy within specific contexts, and builds the culture necessary for change. A global analysis reveals that effective leadership in curriculum implementation is defined by three core, interconnected dimensions: the adaptive models and approaches leaders employ, the policy frameworks and supports that enable or constrain them, and the persistent systemic challenges they must navigate. Examining these dimensions across continents clarifies how leadership can either bridge or widen the enduring gap between curricular ambition and educational outcomes.

Leadership approaches

Educational leadership is shifting worldwide from top-down management toward more collaborative, instructional, and adaptive approaches (Fullan, 2015; Hargreaves & Shirley, 2022). In Europe, with many systems now granting schools greater autonomy, principals are increasingly expected to be instructional leaders—innovators in teaching, guides using data, and cultivators of professional teamwork, a role supported by networks like European Schoolnet (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2023; European Schoolnet, 2023). Similarly, across Asia, there is

a move away from simple inspection toward coaching and collaborative models that build trust and empower teachers, positioning leaders as key facilitators of national digital reforms in their schools (OECD, 2018; UNESCO, 2022). The most distinct adaptation is in Oceania, where leadership is explicitly shaped by Indigenous knowledge. Concepts like the Samoan *tautai* (wayfinder) and the practice of *talanoa* (inclusive dialogue) inspire an approach centered on relationships, cultural identity, and community partnership, ensuring global educational standards are woven with local values (Fa'avae et al., 2021; Ministry of Education, New Zealand, 2022; Sanga & Houma, 2020). These evolving models show that successful implementation requires leaders who are not just administrators, but skilled and responsive mediators of change.

Policy support

The success of any leadership model in education depends largely on the clarity and quality of the surrounding policy, which can set the direction and create opportunities for collaboration (Fullan & Quinn, 2016). For example, Europe's European Education Area establishes shared goals for digital and inclusive education, providing funding that helps align efforts from the national level down to individual schools (European Commission, 2020, 2021). In Africa and Oceania, regional frameworks like the African Union's Continental Assessment Framework and the Pacific's PacREF help harmonize standards and pool resources, giving leaders a common set of tools and a collective vision (African Union, 2022; Pacific Community, 2023). Policy can also act as a directive tool for quality, as seen in North America's push for high-quality instructional materials and aligned teacher training. These policies aim to reduce inequality by ensuring all teachers have access to excellent, well-vetted resources, directing school leaders to focus on effective implementation (CCSSO, 2021; Tennessee Department of Education, 2023). Whether by providing a strategic vision, enabling cooperation, or setting quality standards, coherent policy is essential to empower leaders so they can concentrate on improving teaching rather than managing uncertainty or scarcity alone.

Key constraints

Educational leaders across the globe operate under severe systemic constraints that create a persistent gap between policy and practice, even with supportive models in place (Fullan, 2015). A universal and overwhelming challenge is the burden of administrative duties combined with severe resource scarcity. In Africa, principals spend most of their time on management tasks, hindered by chronic underfunding, teacher shortages, and a lack of basic materials, which undermines the implementation of even well-designed curriculum reforms (UNESCO, 2021; World Bank, 2018). Similarly, in South America, leaders confront some of the world's worst educational inequality and infrastructure gaps, where policies promoting equity fail due to a fundamental lack of resources and practical understanding (UNESCO IESALC, 2022). A second major constraint is political volatility and fragmented policy. In North America, leaders must navigate a politicized landscape of changing federal funds, curriculum debates, and the end of pandemic-era aid, often forcing them into the role of crisis manager instead of instructional guide (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2023; RAND Corporation, 2023). Finally, leaders everywhere struggle to bridge global standards with local realities. This is seen in Asia, where teachers in centralized systems like Indonesia find a disconnect between national multicultural policy and their classroom needs (Raihani, 2021), and in Oceania, where leaders must balance postcolonial legacies and global benchmarks with community needs and geographic isolation (Sanga & Houma, 2020). Ultimately, these systemic dysfunctions consume leaders' capacity, leaving too little focus for the core work of improving teaching and learning.

In conclusion, leadership is the dynamic catalyst that determines whether policy becomes practice. The comparative analysis demonstrates that effective systems foster adaptive leadership models—instructional, collaborative, or culturally mediated—that empower teachers and contextualize change. These models are most effective when underpinned by coherent policy frameworks that provide clear vision, enabling resources, and professional support. However, leadership's potential is consistently tested by deep-seated systemic challenges of resource scarcity, administrative overload, political instability, and equity gaps. Therefore, building effective support structures for curriculum implementation requires a dual focus: developing leaders who can navigate complexity and mediate change, while simultaneously addressing the systemic conditions that currently overwhelm them. Only through this dual approach can leadership fulfill its role as the essential linchpin in bridging the gap between the ambition of policy and the reality of the classroom.

Findings

This research shows that closing the gap between curriculum plans and actual classroom teaching depends on how well a system combines three key supports: teacher training, fair distribution of resources, and strong leadership. Where these elements work together, implementation succeeds. Where they are disconnected or weak, reforms stall.

A clear global consensus exists on what makes teacher professional development effective: it must be ongoing, collaborative, and directly connected to teachers' daily work, not just one-off workshops. However, most systems struggle to provide this ideal model because they fail to give schools the necessary time, funding, and supportive leadership to make it happen.

The study also found that how resources are distributed matters more than how much is spent overall. Systems that fund schools based on student need help level the playing field. Systems that rely on local wealth or unpredictable aid often worsen inequality, especially in access to technology, creating a new kind of disadvantage between schools.

Leadership is the crucial factor that ties everything together. Effective leaders are not just managers; they act as translators, adapting national policies to their local school's context, protecting teachers' time for collaboration, and targeting support where it's needed most. Their ability to play this role is often hampered by overwhelming administrative tasks and a lack of real autonomy.

Finally, there is no one-size-fits-all solution. The best way to strengthen these support structures depends on a system's specific challenges. In places with limited resources, the priority is better coordination and policy at the national level. In places with uneven funding, fixing unfair distribution is the first step. In well-resourced systems, the focus should be on deepening teacher collaboration and empowering instructional leaders. The key is to strategically align training, resources, and leadership to address each context's unique barriers.

CONCLUSION

This research set out to understand why there is so often a frustrating gap between what a curriculum promises and what actually happens in classrooms. By comparing support structures across different parts of the world, a central lesson emerges: this gap is not an accident, but a result

of how education systems are built. A great curriculum document alone cannot change teaching and learning; it needs a strong, interconnected support system to bring it to life.

The evidence consistently shows that three elements are non-negotiable: meaningful teacher training, fair allocation of resources, and adaptive leadership. The most successful systems don't just have these three things—they weave them together so that each one makes the others stronger. For example, good leadership ensures teachers get the right resources and collaborative time, and that training is directly relevant to their needs. Where these supports are disconnected—like when a new curriculum is announced without training or materials—failure is almost guaranteed.

Ultimately, this study argues that there is no universal blueprint for success. What works in one country may not work in another because each context has unique challenges, whether it's limited funding, deep inequality, or rigid bureaucratic structures. Therefore, the goal for policymakers and school leaders shouldn't be to copy another system, but to carefully diagnose their own. The task is to consciously design and align their own version of the three pillars—professional development, resources, and leadership—so they work in sync. By doing this, we can move beyond writing ambitious curricula and start reliably creating the classroom experiences that all students deserve.

REFERENCES

African Union. (2022). *Continental assessment framework for teaching and learning in Africa (CAF Africa): A tool for harmonizing measurement and improving learning outcomes*. African Union Commission.

African Union. (2024). *Continental education strategy for Africa 2026–2035 (CESA 2026–2035)*. African Union Commission.

Ali, N. S., & Arof, Z. M. (2022). Professional learning communities in Malaysian schools: A review of current practices and impacts. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 12(1), 45–59.

Altinyelken, H. K. (Ed.). (2010). *Global curriculum reforms: Implications for teachers*. Springer.

Asian Development Bank. (2021). *Teachers and teaching in Asia: Strategies for excellence and equity*. Asian Development Bank.

Australian Government Department of Education. (2022). *National teacher workforce action plan*. Australian Government.

Australian Government Productivity Commission. (2023). *Report on government services 2023: Part B – School education*. Australian Government.

Baker, B. D., & Corcoran, S. P. (2023). *The stealth inequities of school funding: How state and local school finance systems perpetuate inequitable student spending*. The Century Foundation.

Camera, L. (2024, January 23). Congress's budget delays wreak havoc on K–12 schools. U.S. News & World Report.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (2023). States are using robust tax growth to help schools recover from pandemic. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2021). High quality instructional materials and professional development: A research review. CCSSO.

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. (2022). CMEC summit on pre elementary and elementary secondary education: Summary report. CMEC.

Darling Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. Teachers College Press.

Darling Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (2022). Recruiting and retaining teachers: Reimagining education's front door. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 103(8), 8–15.

Darling Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.

Department of Basic Education, Republic of South Africa. (2021). *The professional learning communities: A guideline for South African schools*. Department of Basic Education.

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. (2022). *The 2030 agenda for sustainable development and the challenges for a transformative recovery in Latin America and the Caribbean*. United Nations.

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. (2022). *Social panorama of Latin America and the Caribbean 2022*. United Nations.

European Commission. (2020). *Communication from the Commission on achieving the European education area by 2025 (COM(2020) 625 final)*. European Union.

European Commission. (2021). *Erasmus+ teacher academies: Guidelines*. Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission. (2021). *The EU's long term budget 2021–2027 and NextGenerationEU*. Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission. (2023). *Demographic change in Europe: A toolkit for teachers*. Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission. (2023). *eTwinning: Annual report 2022*. European Union.

Structures of support for curriculum implementation: A comparative view across continents by Marlo S. Imbong, Regina P. Galigao, Grethel F. Desales, and Rolando R. De Guzman III

European Commission, Directorate General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. (2021). Strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training towards the European education area and beyond (2021–2030). Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission, Directorate General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. (2022). Digital education action plan 2021–2027: Resetting education and training for the digital age. European Union.

European Commission, European Education and Culture Executive Agency, & Eurydice. (2023). Supporting teacher professional development: Schemes and structures in Europe. Eurydice.

European Schoolnet. (2023). Annual report 2022: Connecting schools, transforming education. European Schoolnet.

Fa'avae, D., Jones, A., & Manu'atu, L. (2021). Talanoa: A Tongan conceptual framework for meaningful educational research. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 17(2), 243–252.

Fullan, M. (2015). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., & Quinn, J. (2016). *Coherence: The right drivers in action for schools, districts, and systems*. Corwin Press.

Global Partnership for Education. (2023). *Results report 2023*. Global Partnership for Education.

Government of Canada. (2023). *Budget 2023: A made in Canada plan: Strong middle class, affordable economy, healthy future*. Government of Canada.

Hargreaves, A., & Shirley, D. (2022). *Well being in schools: Three forces that will uplift your students in a volatile world*. ASCD.

HolonIQ. (2023). *Europe EdTech 1000*. HolonIQ.

International Development Finance Club. (2023). *Debt for education swaps: A primer*. IDFC.

International Society for Technology in Education. (2023). *State of EdTech: Leadership perspectives*. ISTE.

Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2022). *Statistical report on China's education funding 2021*. Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education, Argentina. (2023). *National literacy plan "Learn together" 2022–2027*. Government of Argentina.

Ministry of Education, New Zealand. (2022). *Tapasā: Cultural competencies framework for teachers of Pacific learners*. Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Finance & Ministry of Education, People's Republic of China. (2022). Notice on improving the funding system for local universities. Government of China.

New South Wales Department of Education. (2022). Resource allocation model guide for schools. Government of New South Wales.

Organisation for Economic Co operation and Development. (2015). Education policy outlook 2015: Making reforms happen. OECD Publishing.

Organisation for Economic Co operation and Development. (2018). Teaching and learning international survey 2018: Insights and interpretations Asia report. OECD Publishing.

Organisation for Economic Co operation and Development. (2020). Education governance in action: Lessons from case studies. OECD Publishing.

Organisation for Economic Co operation and Development. (2024). Teaching for the future: Building a high quality digital teaching profession. OECD Publishing.

Organisation for Economic Co operation and Development, & UNESCO. (2023). Education in Latin America and the Caribbean: Key indicators. OECD Publishing.

Pacific Community. (2023). Pacific regional education framework implementation report 2022. SPC.

Pacific Community. (2024). Waka moana: The Pacific regional education resource hub. SPC.

Raihani, R. (2021). Policy and practice of multicultural education in Indonesia: A case study of school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 53(3), 294–310.

RAND Corporation. (2023). The American instructional resources survey: 2023 findings. RAND Education and Labor.

Salleh, H., & Tan, C. (2021). Professional learning communities in Malaysia and Singapore: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Educational Change*, 22(2), 201–223.

Sanga, K., & Houma, S. (2020). Wayfinding leadership: An antecedent to authentic leadership in the Pacific. *Pacific Dynamics: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 4(1), 92–105.

State Council of the People's Republic of China. (2021). Implementation plan for vocational education reform. Government of China.

Statistics Canada. (2021). Education indicators in Canada: An international perspective 2021 (Catalogue No. 81 604 X). Statistics Canada.

Structures of support for curriculum implementation: A comparative view across continents by Marlo S. Imbong, Regina P. Galigao, Grethel F. Desales, and Rolando R. De Guzman III

Teacher Education in Sub Saharan Africa. (2023). About TESSA. <https://www.tessafrica.net/about-us>

Tennessee Department of Education. (2023). Cycle 1 high quality instructional materials and curriculum based professional learning guide. Tennessee Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education. (2023). Individuals with disabilities education act part B grants to states. U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education. (2023). Office of English language acquisition grant programs. U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education. (2023). Raising the bar: Strengthening the educator pipeline and profession. U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education. (2023). Title I part A program. U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education. (2024). Fact sheet: The urgent need to maintain American rescue plan funds to support students. U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2024). Advancing digital equity for all. U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2024). Artificial intelligence and the future of teaching and learning: Insights and recommendations. U.S. Department of Education.

UNESCO. (2021). Curriculum on the move: Emerging perspectives on curriculum implementation in Africa. UNESCO IICBA.

UNESCO. (2021). Financing education in Southeast Asia: Progress and challenges. UNESCO Bangkok.

UNESCO. (2022). Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education. UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2022). The state of learning poverty in Latin America and the Caribbean. UNESCO Institute for Statistics & World Bank.

UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023: Southeast Asia Lao PDR country profile. UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2023). GPT 4 and artificial intelligence in African education: Perspectives and readiness. UNESCO Regional Office for Southern Africa.

UNESCO. (2023). Technology in education: A tool on whose terms? UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2024). Financing education in Africa: Meeting the challenges of expansion equity and quality. UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

UNESCO International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean. (2022). Inclusive and equitable education in Latin America and the Caribbean: The long road ahead. UNESCO IESALC.

UNESCO, World Bank, & Inter American Development Bank. (2022). The commitment to educational recovery in Latin America and the Caribbean: A path forward. UNESCO.

UNICEF. (2022). Transforming education in Africa: An evidence based overview and recommendations for long term improvements. UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office.

Wolfenden, F., & Buckler, A. (2020). Reaching teachers: The legacy of the TESSA open educational resources programme. *Journal of Learning for Development*, 7(3), 345–361.

World Bank. (2018). Facing forward: Schooling for learning in Africa. World Bank.

World Bank. (2021). Reimagining human connections: Technology and innovation in education at the World Bank. World Bank.

World Bank. (2024). World development report 2024: Financing education for the future. World Bank.

Zhou, Y., & Liu, F. (2022). Fiscal decentralization and education spending in China. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 15(3), 345–362.

Zhu, J., & Liu, F. (2023). Exploring a blended teacher training model based on a large language model in under resourced regions: A case study in Northwest China. *Computers & Education*, 205, 104890.