Below is a **document-based** response (TUA-DSE / LearningPlanet + Appendices). **The provided materials do not contain a comprehensive, country-by-country inventory of "domestic legislation" governing curriculum/pedagogy/assessment across all levels and both public/private sectors.**They do, however, give **concrete, "domestic-law" examples from the German context** (constitutional/administrative principles) and propose **governance-style policy mechanisms** that can be embedded in national systems—especially relevant for **compulsory education** implementation (e.g., Grade 9 example; structured project work).

# Examples of domestic legislation / policy instruments referenced or operationalised in the documents

1. **Constitutional safeguards (Germany)**

- Reference to **Article 5(3) of the German Basic Law (academic freedom)** as a benchmark for avoiding indoctrination and protecting plurality in education content and methods.
- Repeated **rule-of-law constraints**: educational discourse **cannot override law**, reforms remain democratically controlled.

2. **Administrative-law "systematicity / Planmäßigkeit" as a policy standard**

- A **draft administrative regulation** is proposed to show that **iterative/emergent, self-organising educational processes can still meet administrative-law requirements** if they are rule-governed, documented, verifiable, and justifiable.
  This functions like a **domestic policy instrument** for approving/monitoring curriculum innovations (incl. project-based models) in a legally robust way.

3. **Institutional governance rules (policy design) to prevent undue influence**

- Proposed safeguards: separation of discourse vs decision-making; conflict-of-interest transparency; public registers; external evaluation; early-warning systems for influence attempts/polarisation.

**TUA-DSE in short**:

The conscious shift in perspective, through which people learn to better understand others, is not merely aesthetic art for art's sake, a mental exercise in its own right, or "mental Chi Gong." Rather, it represents a central civilizational skill: a fundamental prerequisite for peaceful cooperation, for sustainable understanding, and ultimately for peace on Earth. Shifting perspectives makes it possible to recognize the motives, constraints, and logics of others as meaningful, even if one does not share them. This is precisely where its ordering and de-escalating power lies. For this reason, the conscious, methodically practiced shift in perspective is at the heart of the TUA-DSE initiative—not as a decorative addition, but as a fundamental structural competence for individual learning, institutional practice, and global responsibility. Its playful structure is fractal and equally accessible to pupils, students, and adults. Modeled after Monkey Island, the structure demonstrates how easily shifts in perspective can be developed and deepened from a young age, while maintaining the necessary academic rigor.

In this way, TUA-DSE deliberately bridges play and seriousness, imagination and analytical depth. The Monkey Island–inspired structure serves not as nostalgia or metaphor alone, but as a didactic architecture that lowers thresholds of access while preserving conceptual precision. It invites exploration, trial and error, and narrative engagement, while embedding these experiences in a robust framework of reflection, documentation, and transfer. Learners are not merely entertained; they are guided to observe how their own assumptions shift, how meaning changes with context, and how understanding emerges through relational thinking.

Because of its fractal design, TUA-DSE scales naturally across age groups, disciplines, and cultural contexts. The same core principles apply whether the learner is a child encountering difference for the first time, a student navigating disciplinary boundaries, or an adult operating within institutional, legal, or political systems. At every level, the method cultivates the capacity to hold multiple perspectives simultaneously without collapsing into relativism or rigid certainty. In doing so, TUA-DSE contributes to a form of learning that is not only cognitively robust, but ethically grounded and socially stabilizing—preparing individuals and institutions alike to act responsibly in an increasingly interconnected and tension-filled world.
…

# 1. Conception, design and implementation of the curriculum

**1a) Extent to which curriculum addresses contemporary challenges + life skills; key challenges**

**Orientation:** The curriculum is framed around a dual imperative:

- respond to contemporary challenges (ecological crisis, technological change/AI, social polarisation, uncertainty) and
- build competencies (self-efficacy, creativity, problem solving, cooperation, responsible action).

**How this is operationalised (esp. relevant to compulsory education):**

- "Structured freedom": learners choose topics/methods within boundaries (e.g., SDG topic constraint; project/problem-based format).
- Emphasis on self-directed project work supported by teacher-as-coach, reflection and documentation (journals/portfolios).

**Key challenges identified in the documents:**

- balancing **learner agency and relevance** with **academic rigor, coherence and safety**.
- risks of autonomy if poorly implemented (overload, off-task behaviour, unequal group contribution) → need scaffolding and formative assessment.

---

**1b) Intercultural understanding, local languages/knowledge, parallel knowledge systems**

The curriculum approach explicitly allows plural knowledge:

- integration of intercultural perspectives, local languages, local/community knowledge and "parallel knowledge systems" through context-based, learner-led inquiry.
- LearningPlanet frames this as moving away from one "hierarchical canon" toward conditions supporting diversity, dignity, and inclusion.

---

## 1c) Restrictions regarding specific subjects; why

The documents do **not** propose banning subjects. Instead they propose **standards** applicable across subjects:

- evidence-based, dialogical handling of sensitive/contested topics; avoidance of prescriptive ideological instruction; safeguards against misuse (political/ideological/commercial).

Where "restrictions" appear, they are **process restrictions**, not topic bans (e.g., transparent sourcing, bias disclosure, multi-perspective analysis).

## 1d) Flexibility/adaptability of curriculum design; reflection of emerging challenges; challenges

**Flexibility is built in** via iterative project cycles rather than constant top-down revisions:

- openness of project themes + learner-led inquiry + continuous reflection and periodic review.
- administrative-law "Planmäßigkeit" is used to argue that emergent processes can still be legitimate if rule-governed and documented.

**Challenges (explicit/implicit):**

- ensuring stability/legal certainty while staying responsive;
- ensuring teacher capacity/resources for sustained reflective adaptation (time, class size, systemic pressures).

## 1e) Actors in curriculum decision making; participation; safeguards against undue influence (incl. private sector)

**Actors envisaged:** scientific community, educators, learners, parents, local communities—via consultative processes, feedback mechanisms, and transparent documentation.

**Concrete safeguard examples from the governance architecture:**

- **Separation of discourse and decision-making** (institutional safeguard).
- **Conflict-of-interest transparency**: public register including "funding & conflicts of interest" and change logs.

4

- **Epistemic Council / ScienceQuest Lab / Moderation Pool** to check scientific/legal accuracy, bias, and to prevent polarisation/misinformation.
- **Rule-of-law safeguards**: discourse cannot override law; reforms only via democratic procedures.

These are presented as protective measures against undue influence, including commercial/private capture.

# 2. Pedagogy and classroom learning

## 2a) Officially encouraged approaches; alignment with human-rights aims (inclusion, participation, dignity, non-discrimination, learner-centered)

Core approach: **learner-centered, project-based, autonomy-supportive pedagogy**, explicitly linked to inclusion, dignity, participation and non-discrimination.

LearningPlanet adds the developmental premise: regulation/psychological safety precede learning; neurodiversity is an asset; optimal conditions over standardisation.

## 2b) Pedagogical freedom; dialogue/feedback from students and parents without undue interference

Pedagogical freedom is framed as:

- professional autonomy for teachers to select instructional methods and learning formats, with structured feedback loops from students/parents aimed at quality improvement (not content capture).
  Governance separation (consultation vs formal decisions) is presented as the protection against undue interference.

## 2c) How alternative pedagogical models feed into mainstream

Proposed pathway:

- pilot phases → documentation → transparent evaluation → adaptation to context → scaling.

5

This is explicitly meant to work in both public and private settings without becoming an ad hoc, non-accountable "parallel system."

### 2d) Teacher training/support for learner-centered, inclusive, participatory pedagogy; limiting factors

Support elements named:

- professional development, mentoring systems, access to pedagogical and neuro-educational resources; training includes inclusive education, socio-emotional learning, mental health/well-being, trauma-informed approaches.

Practical teacher guidance in Appendix 1 includes:

- autonomy + structure; teacher as coach; formative assessment; peer review; reflection phases; role distribution and support for weaker learners.

Limiting factors acknowledged: time constraints, resources, class size, systemic pressures.

### 2e) Discrepancies between official curriculum and classroom practice; reasons

The documents anticipate gaps due to:

- structural constraints, stress and assessment pressures, insufficient support during implementation; they recommend iterative reflection and feedback-driven adaptation.

# 3. Student assessment

### 3a) Alignment with human-rights aims; balance formative/holistic vs standardised/high-stakes

Assessment is framed primarily as **for learning** (dignity, agency, inclusion), prioritising formative, holistic, flexible approaches; standardised/high-stakes used cautiously and only complementarily.

## 3b) Safeguards against discrimination/excessive standardisation/cultural assimilation; examples; local/community approaches

Measures explicitly encouraged:

- multiple ways to demonstrate learning (projects, portfolios, presentations, performances) to support linguistic, socio-economic, disability-related and geographic diversity.
- recognition of context-sensitive and locally/community-informed criteria where appropriate.

---

## 3c) Dignity, motivation, well-being; pressures/unintended consequences/stress

Assessment design aims to reduce fear of failure through feedback-oriented developmental assessment.
At the same time, the documents explicitly recognise that exam/inspection regimes can create stress and unintended negative effects, requiring stress-sensitive design and protective measures.
(Complementary rationale: focus on self-efficacy and salutogenesis as resilience-related foundations.)

---

## 3d) Teacher autonomy; alternative assessment models; adaptation to diverse needs

Teacher autonomy is explicitly supported, with alternative assessment models encouraged:

- portfolios, project-based assessment, performance tasks, exhibitions, self- and peer-assessment, with expectations of transparency and fairness.
  Appendix 1 provides concrete "mini-evaluation" ideas (creativity tasks pre/post, brief self-efficacy scale items, product-quality criteria grid).

---

## 3e) Budgets linked to student performance; safeguards against undue pressure (rankings, commercial tests, external actors)

The framework **cautions against linking institutional budgets directly** to student performance indicators and proposes governance safeguards to prevent pressure from rankings/commercial testing/external actors.

Related structural safeguards include transparency, conflicts-of-interest disclosure, external evaluation, and separation of consultative input from formal decisions.

### 3f) Recognition of socio-emotional learning, creativity, cooperation, problem solving; examples of meaningful evaluation

Competencies "hard to standardise" are assessed through qualitative/process-oriented methods:

- reflective portfolios, project evaluation, peer feedback, exhibitions of learning. LearningPlanet also frames these as "inner development capacities" (presence, self-awareness, regulation, empathy, dialogue, sensemaking, systems thinking) that should be cultivated and made visible through practice rather than purely test metrics.

# Note on "public vs private" and "compulsory education"

The documents position the framework as **usable across schools (including compulsory levels), universities, and adult education**, and compatible with public/private implementation provided rule-of-law, transparency, and equity safeguards are maintained.

If you tell me **which country/jurisdiction** you need the "domestic legislation" examples for, I can map these document principles to the **actual legal/policy instruments** used there (education acts, curriculum regulations, inspection frameworks, assessment ordinances, private-school regulations) and keep it in the same Q1–Q3 structure.

---

AuM Garatge Hermetic Portbou/Oberhausen

For further information see Learning Planet: https://projects.learning-planet.org/projects/tua-dse-or-how/resources

DRAGONFLY
ScienceQuests