โรงเรียนในฐานะชุมชนแห่งการเรียนรู้คืออะไร: ความหมาย ตัวบ่งชี้ และแนวปฏิบัติ
What is School as Learning Community: Definition, Expectation, and Implications

Eisuke Saito[1], สิริพันธุ์ สุวรรณมรรคา[2], อรรถพล อนันตวรสกุล[3], วรเชษฐ แซ่เจีย[4*]

Eisuke Saito[1], Siripaarn Suwanmonkha[2], Athapol Anunthavorasakul[3], Vorachet Saejea[4*]

บทคัดย่อ

นับตั้งแต่ พ.ศ. 2560 เป็นต้นมา ประเทศไทยได้รู้จักกับแนวคิดการปฏิรูปโรงเรียนตามแนวทางโรงเรียนในฐานะชุมชนแห่งการเรียนรู้ (SLC) และมีการพัฒนาเป็นโรงเรียนนำร่องทั่วประเทศ ในช่วงเวลาที่ผ่านมา กรุงเทพมหานครได้นำแนวคิด SLC เข้ามาเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของนโยบายด้านการศึกษา อย่างไรก็ตาม เมื่อมีแนวทางการปรับเปลี่ยนการทำงานมากกว่าหนึ่งรูปแบบอาจทำให้ครูสับสนได้ หากหน่วยงานของกรุงเทพมหานครได้ติดตามและประเมินความก้าวหน้าของ SLC อาจทำให้ศึกษานิเทศก์ไม่เข้าใจในแนวคิดและไม่สามารถปฏิบัติของ SLC ได้ เพื่อหลีกเลี่ยงสถานการณ์ดังกล่าว ดังนั้น บทความนี้จึงมีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ (1) สำรวจคุณลักษณะเฉพาะของแนวคิด SLC โดยเปรียบเทียบกับแนวคิดชุมชนการเรียนรู้เชิงวิชาชีพ โรงเรียนแห่งการเรียนรู้ (Schools That Learn) และการศึกษาและพัฒนาบทเรียนร่วมกัน และ (2) พัฒนาตัวบ่งชี้สำคัญที่ช่วยทำความเข้าใจการเติบโตของโรงเรียนโดยใช้ประสบการณ์ของผู้เขียนคนแรก ผู้ทำงานกับแนวคิด SLC มาตั้งแต่ พ.ศ. 2549 ในหลายประเทศ

__คำสำคัญ:__ โรงเรียนในฐานะชุมชนแห่งการเรียนรู้, การปฏิรูปโรงเรียน, ชุมชนการเรียนรู้เชิงวิชาชีพ, โรงเรียนแห่งการเรียนรู้, การศึกษาและพัฒนาบทเรียนร่วมกัน

[1] Lecturer (Ph.D.), School of Education Culture & Society, Faculty of Education, Monash University

[1] Lecturer (Ph.D.), School of Education Culture & Society, Faculty of Education, Monash University

[2] รองศาสตราจารย์ ดร., คณะครุศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

[2] Associate Professor (Ph.D.), Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University

[3] ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์, คณะครุศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

[3] Assistant Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University

[4] นักวิจัย, ศูนย์วิจัยและพัฒนาการศึกษาเพื่อการพัฒนาที่ยั่งยืน คณะครุศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

[4] Researcher, Education for Sustainable Development Centre, Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University

*Corresponding Author e-mail: v.saejea@gmail.com

Abstract

In 2017, Thailand introduced the School as a Learning Community (SLC) reform that has since been practised in pilot schools across the country. Recently, the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA) decided to introduce SLC as a part of its education policies. However, the prior practices of multiple reforms risk causing confusion among teachers. Should the BMA monitor and assess the progress of SLC, it may be that supervisors possibly fail to understand the SLC or how to implement it. To avoid such a situation, this study, therefore, aims to address (1) the uniqueness of the SLC approach with reference to professional learning communities, schools that learn, and lesson studies; and (2) indicators of importance to understand the progress in schools based on the experience of the first author, who has worked on SLC since 2006 in multiple countries.

Keywords: school as learning community (SLC), school reform, professional learning communities (PLC), schools that learn (STL), lesson study (LS)

Introduction

Many Asian countries have implemented the reform of Schools as Learning Communities (SLC), or Lesson Studies for Learning Communities (LSLC). In this paper, SLC is consistently used. SLC originated in Japan and was advocated by Manabu Sato, an Emeritus Professor of the University of Tokyo. Pilot schools were established in 1998 in Japan and later in Korea (Shin & Son, 2019), Taiwan (Huang, 2019, 2020), China (Sato, 2019), Vietnam (Khong, 2019), Indonesia (Suratno et al., 2019), Cambodia, and Thailand (Luanrit et al., 2022). Thailand began implementing SLC in 2017, much later than in other Southeast Asian countries such as Indonesia and Vietnam, where the practices commenced in 2006.

To elaborate on Thai journey with the SLC concept, its first appearance was through a YouTube video published in 2013 (TEACHERS as LEARNERS, 2013). The video focused on the joint observation of and reflection on a class in one SLC school in Indonesia, with reference to Masaaki Sato, one of the pioneer practitioners of SLC in Japan as a consultant to Indonesian teachers. This video attracted much attention from some teacher educators and teachers to SLC. Based on this, SLC was further discussed through a speech by the first author in EDUCA 2015, an educational

annual congress. The following years, in 2016, Professor Manabu Sato, the advocate of SLC, came over to Thailand at the joint event of the SLC international Conference and EDUCA 2016 to substantially elaborate this concept to the Thai educators. Subsequently, numerous initiatives and campaigns emerged nationwide across both the private and public sectors. Despite this, sustained high-quality SLC practices remain limited to a handful of pilot schools, largely due to the serious challenge of school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic, as described by Luanrit et al. (2022).

Southeast Asian governments often implement multiple projects or policies simultaneously, which increases the possibility of teachers and teacher educators experiencing confusion in understanding SLC. As Spillane et al. (2002) put, then, the concern is that misconceptions or misunderstandings about SLC may lead teachers, schools, and even teacher educators to insufficiently practice SLC, which eventually diminishes the momentum of the practice. In Bangkok, SLC will now officially become a part of the policy under the metropolitan government (The Nation, 2023), requiring monitoring officers to assess and evaluate the progress of SLC practice in pilot schools. However, these officers might themselves have insufficient understanding of SLC, which can distort practices and eventually discourage teachers and school leaders from continuing the reform. In other words, the sustainability of SLC at the school level could be compromised given that schools are subject to various projects and reforms and policies.

The aim of this paper

This paper, therefore, aims to clarify (1) the SLC in relation to other representative approaches to education reform, (2) factors of importance based on the school visits of the first author, who has two decades of experience in SLC practice, and (3) the means to make SLC sustainable over the long term.

The remaining paper is organised as follows: After this introduction, there will be an explanation about what SLC is. Then, we discuss the differences between SLC and other approaches in the next section, particularly the professional learning community (PLC), schools that learn (STL), and lesson studies (LS), which are actively run in schools in Bangkok and other parts of Thailand. Expectations on SLC practices are discussed in the next section, followed by a discussion on how to sustain SLC practice over the long term. The last section concludes.

What is SLC?

The SLC consists of three pillars: vision, philosophy, and activity systems (Sato, 2012b). Vision includes providing high-quality learning opportunities to every student, teacher, and as many parents and local communal members as possible. Schools are places for students to learn; therefore, providing high-quality learning opportunities is required. To do so, teachers must keep learning throughout their professional lives; this means that they need to receive opportunities for high-quality learning as well (Darling-Hammond et al., 2024; Larsen & McCormick, 2021; Song et al., 2017). The provision of such opportunities to students and teachers can be stated through many reform approaches, but the involvement of parents or local community members may be less emphasised. Indeed, parents or local community members are considered important allies in school reform under the SLC (Saito, 2021b).

The philosophies included three items: publicness, democracy, and excellence. Publicness refers to the principle that each teacher needs to open their practices to other teachers at least once a year (Sato, 2012b) to provide an opportunity for learning to other teachers and learn from interactions about their own practices. This must be done with a sense of security, and school leaders and teachers must generate such climates in their own schools.

Second, in relation to a sense of security, the SLC emphasises democracy; that is, anyone from any background – even those with different or conflicting ones – shares space and learns from the other based on rapport and trust (Dewey, 1916). This can also be applied to students and even local communities, regardless of their socioeconomic status or level of scholastic achievement; they learn to learn together in classrooms and schools.

Third, excellence is required. Here, the authenticity of learning is pursued, reflecting the nature of parental discipline through high-quality, authentic and challenging tasks (Saito & Fatemi, 2022; Sato, 2012b; Schwab, 1964).

Three pillars also exist in activity systems: collaborative learning, professional learning communities and collegiality, and local participation. Collaborative learning is a consultative activity by students regarding problems or questions that they cannot solve, where the key is self-initiative to ask about those questions or challenges, known as help-seeking (Saito & Fatemi, 2022; Webb, 2013; Webb et al., 2019). This takes place mainly in the form of groups but can also happen in the whole-class session, which will be discussed further in another section.

Second, professional learning communities and collegiality are key elements of SLC, but the focus in this activity system is for teachers to learn from each other by observing and reflecting on student learning (Sato, 2012b). This joint observation and reflection often occurred 80–100 times per year at the school level in SLC pilot schools in Japan (Saito, Watanabe, et al., 2015; Sato & Sato, 2003). Note that in SLC schools in Japan, activities are organised by year groups, whichever subject the teacher teaches – in which they observe and reflect on the classes[5].

Third, in Japanese SLC schools, there is an activity system regarding local participation: schools invite parents or local community members to participate in learning processes as learners (Saito, 2021b; Sato, 2012b). Parents are often concerned with school reforms because the educational approaches are naturally different from those they received. To help parents and local community members understand and support the new approaches, it is important for schools to organise local participation opportunities.

Differences between SLC and other approaches

Subsequently, a comparison was made between SLC and other approaches, namely PLCs, STL, and LS. The main conclusions of this study are presented in Table 1 as below.

---

[5] For further details, refer Saito, E., Murase, M., Tsukui, A., & Yeo, J. (2015). *Lesson study for learning community: A guide to sustainable school reform*. Routledge.

Table 1

Comparison between LS, PLC, STL, and SLC

	LS	PLC	STL	SLC
Aims	• Teacher learning	• Teacher learning	• School reform	• School reform
Activities	• Professional development and learning • Collective discussions on curriculum design • Trying out pedagogical reform	• Professional development and learning • Pedagogical reform • Data collection and analysis	• Professional development and learning • Collaborative learning	• Collaborative learning • Professional development and learning • Local participation • Administrative reform
Participants	• Teachers	• Teachers	• Mainly teachers • Students • Locals	• Students • Teachers • Locals

Based on Table 1, the differences between SLC and the other approaches are elaborated in the following order: PLCs, STL, and LS.

LS and SLC

LS is an activity for professional development and learning that covers the joint development of curricula, lesson observation, and reflection on observed lessons. It is also widely used in Thailand (Bunlang et al., 2023; Inprasitha, 2022). In the current form of worldwide practice, much emphasis is placed on learning through discussions of joint curriculum development (An et al., 2022; Cheng, 2019; Craney et al., 2020). Since jointly develop curricula among members is

emphasised, there is a tendency to focus on specific subjects such as mathematics (Erickson & Makowski, 2023; Groth & Follmer, 2021). In addition, emphasis may be placed on how the lesson was conducted, particularly how it was taught and how the lesson achieved the goals from the perspective of the teachers, rather than how the students could or could not learn (Inagaki & Sato, 1996; Saito, 2012). In identifying clues on how to proceed with the classes, information on student learning is critical (Saito & Fatemi, 2022; Saito et al., 2022) and this is more orally and visually handed over from seasoned teachers to younger ones (Saito, 2012); but in the curriculum-focused LS would not necessarily benefit the teachers in this regard because their attention tend to go to whether teaching was successful, not focusing much on individual student learning (Inagaki & Sato, 1996; Saito, 2012).

Regarding SLC, as previously discussed, there is an element of professional development and learning. While the joint curriculum is the main activity in LS, each teacher is supposed to be responsible for their own curriculum development – in other words, the curriculum, inclusive of the teaching plan – is a matter of the authorship of each teacher (Inagaki & Sato, 1996; Saito, Murase, et al., 2015; Sato, 2005). This is because, even if multiple teachers share the same teaching plan, there is no guarantee, and actually no need, for the students to have the same experience of the curriculum. The intentions, strengths, and interests are indeed different from teacher to teacher, and they should utilise those unique elements rather than standardise their practices (Inagaki & Sato, 1996; Sato, 2003). Then, because of the nature of joint curriculum development in LS, this approach tends to be conducted with a focus on particular subjects, as mentioned earlier. However, in the case of SLC, the main activity is joint observation and reflection across the subjects, and the unit organisation is a year group (Saito, Murase, et al., 2015; Sato, 2005, 2012b; Sato & Sato, 2003). In contrast to conventional LS, the aim of joint observations and reflections under SLC is to understand how students would or would not learn and to obtain ideas from the actual conditions of curriculum design or interventions in their own daily practices from the next day.

PLCs and SLC

PLCs have been widely practiced in Thailand (Meesuk et al., 2021; Vasinayanuwatana et al., 2020). PLCs are characterised by three key principles (DuFour et al., 2016; Ryan, 2022). First,

emphasis is placed on student learning. In other words, for students to learn effectively, teachers must also engage in high-quality learning. Second, PLCs emphasise collaborative cultures and collective responsibilities within professional communities. In other words, teachers are expected to work in teams. Third, PLCs are result-oriented: teachers use the data as evidence to understand the situation regarding student learning and work to improve student learning outcomes. In summary, PLCs are collaborative activities where groups of teachers work together to improve student learning, with progress measured by data.

There are commonalities and differences between PLC and SLC, even regarding the three big ideas (DuFour et al., 2016; Ryan, 2022). Regarding student learning, SLC, like PLC, aims to provide high-quality learning opportunities. Regarding teacher collaboration, again, teacher works in groups with reference to particular observation of and reflection on classes in SLC (Saito, Murase, et al., 2015). Note that the unit of teachers is grouped by year level, such as those who teach year-7 or year-8 across subjects, rather than by subject departments. (Saito, Murase, et al., 2015; Sato, 2012b; Sato & Sato, 2003).

Regarding learning outcome orientations, there are key differences between PLC and SLC. PLCs emphasise student cognitive achievements both as a means of obtaining evidence and as an ultimate goal, while in SLC achievement scores are considered secondary outcomes (Saito, Watanabe, et al., 2015; Sato, 2012b). Rather, teachers in successful SLC schools focus more on real-time assessment of which students are learning and which are struggling during class; in other words, their assessment of students is much more immediate and *live*, and they quickly adjust their teaching strategies and practices once they identify issues in student learning (Saito & Fatemi, 2022; Saito et al., 2022).

STL and SLC

STL (Senge, 2012) is based on the concept of a learning organisation (Kaiser & Peschl, 2020; Reese, 2020; Senge, 2006). The concept consists of (1) systems thinking, which emphasises interdependency between the sub-teams for the systematic change; (2) mental models, which encourage the development of productive and constructive mindsets; (3) shared vision, which refers to a common purpose throughout the organisation; (4) personal mastery, which involves developing individual goals; and (5) team learning, which is based on group interactions and

dialogues. In comparison with PLCs, STL emphasises a broader, organisation-wide approach to school reform, centred on shared visions for learning.

In SLC, elements of systems thinking exist. Particularly in secondary schools, teachers are likely to interact within their subject groups but rarely across them (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2007). At Gakuyo Junior High School, the first SLC pilot at the secondary level, Masaaki Sato realised the need to break these barriers and create forums for cross-disciplinary learning (Sato & Sato, 2003; Suzuki, 2022). This approach is shared among many schools where teachers practice SLC. Thus, systems thinking is actively practised within the SLC. Regarding mental models, many of the successful pilot schools of the SLC started their reforms by accepting challenging contexts, such as recognising and embracing the facts of their schools with low functioning (Saito, Watanabe, et al., 2015; Sato & Sato, 2003) or students from challenging socioeconomic backgrounds (Sato, 2003, 2005). In other words, reform based on SLC would be one of the last resorts for teachers in difficult contexts. Masaaki Sato and his colleagues worked based on a vision to provide high-quality learning for everyone in the school. For personal mastery, in some pilot schools, such as Hamanogo Primary School, the staff – including teachers, administrative personnel, and school nurses – have their own personal visions (Hamanogo Primary School, 2008). For team learning, as discussed above, joint lesson observations and reflections have been emphasised in SLC; therefore, this element also exists. As mentioned above, because of the nature of STL as an approach to school reform emphasising organisational learning, it has many commonalities. However, while STL relies heavily on teachers to drive reform, SLC underlines the active involvement of all stakeholders – teachers, students, and community members – in driving the momentum of school reform. That is, not only teachers but also students or local communal members have their roles to participate in the process of school reform.

Expectations

Since SLC was introduced as a policy of the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA) (The Nation, 2023), officers can visit schools to monitor and evaluate the progress of SLC activities. However, there have been few attempts to guide officers who visit and check with schools on the progress of SLC practices. As a tentative proposal based on the experiences of the first author, a framework of progress observations can be established, as shown in Table 2. Each item under

vision, philosophy, and the activity system is defined, along with guidelines on how to observe and reflect on it.

Among all issues and items, the first step is to understand what happens in the classroom. When the first author steps into a school to observe the progress of SLC, the primary observation is whether collaborative learning, especially help-seeking, is occurring in the classroom. Help-seeking is a small act but has various critical implications. That is, if it takes place, students who seek help openly show their lack of understanding and trust in their peers. If those who are asked for support actually support those who have asked for help, it indicates that their relationship would be highly reciprocal and caring (Noddings, 2013) – in this way, all students can learn. Moreover, the task needs to be challenging enough, particularly the tasks which are called 'jumping tasks', for the student to become confused and naturally feel urged to ask another student questions. It is important that help-seeking also occurs during easier tasks, known as 'sharing tasks,' to check basic understanding. The number of the tasks should be limited too – to allow sufficient thinking time, ideally no more than three tasks per class.

If such help-seeking does not take place, either the task is too easy, the teacher keeps teaching in a one-way lecture, the student relationship may be strained, or the climate of reciprocity or care has not developed in the classroom or school. In Southeast Asia, including Thailand, students often engage in informal discussions about what they do not understand, even though the teacher does not instruct them to consult each other (Saito et al., 2020). As a classroom culture in Southeast Asia, this practice may have unexpected potential. However, ensuring that this informal practice occurs intentionally at the whole-class level remains a challenge, as there is no guarantee that teachers and students will be able to do so consistently.

Table 2 *Main points and expectations for observing progresses of SLC practices*

	Items	Main points	Expectations
Vision	Learning of pupils	• Do all the children participate in and engage themselves with high-quality learning activities?	• In the task designs there are sharing and jumping tasks • Students show <u>deep</u> and sustained engagement with tasks and activities

Items	Main points		Expectations
			• Students seek help when they encounter something they do not know
Learning of teachers	• Do all the teachers participate in and engage themselves with high-quality learning activities?		• Lesson observations and reflections should occur at least 30 times per year, ideally 80-100 times at the school level • The teachers have professional discussions about teaching and learning and their students • Teachers can are able to allocate time for reading and professional development
Learning of parents/ locals	• Do many parents or local community members participate in learning activities?		• Parents, carers and local community members have opportunity to join classes as learners • Parents, carers and local community members contribute to daily classes as resource persons
Philosophy	Publicness	• Do all the teachers open their classes for joint observations and reflections at least once a year?	• Each teacher has their colleagues to observe their classes at least once a year
	Democracy	• Do all the students learn together regardless of their backgrounds? • Do all the teachers learn together regardless of their ideas or backgrounds? • Do parents/locals learn together regardless of their backgrounds?	• Collaboration for learning in classes among the students is observed in each class regardless of their backgrounds or achievements • Collaboration for learning among the teachers is observed on a daily basis regardless of their backgrounds • Collaboration for learning among the parents/locals is encouraged regardless of their backgrounds

	Items	Main points	Expectations
	Excellence	• Do the tasks for classes have high-quality challenges? • Do the teachers learn to provide high-quality challenges to their students?	• In the task designs there are jumping tasks • Students show <u>deep</u> and long engagement with tasks and activities • Students collaborate and engage in mutual help-seeking about what they do not know • Teachers discuss ways to improve task quality during joint reflections
Activity system	Collaborative learning	• Do all the students collaborate with each other to learn?	• Students collaborate and seek help from each other about what they do not know
	Professional communities	• Do all the teachers learn together regardless of their ideas or backgrounds?	• The frequency of lesson observations and reflections should be at least 30 times per year, with 80-100 times being preferable at the school level. These activities are organised within year groups as the unit of observation • School leaders eliminate unnecessary administrative tasks and meetings • Principals observe all classes daily and consult with teachers about student learning
	Local participation	• Do many parents or local community members participate in learning activities	• Parents, carers and local community members have opportunity to join classes as learners • Parents, carers and local community members contribute to daily classes as resource persons

They should reverse this view – a class must be based on problems, questions, or confusion of the students because the process through which students grasp what they do not yet understand or discover what they do not yet know (Saito & Fatemi, 2022). For this to happen, the nature of classroom discussions should be changed not only within groups or pairs but also at the entire class level. That is, teachers need to call on students who seem to struggle to understand the content and to share their questions. Through such sharing, whole-class discussions can become more collaborative, ensuring that no student is left out of the learning process.

Sustainability

Reforming a school is an arduous process; it is not a matter of enduring a semester or two simply to showcase efforts of the public. SLC, however, aims to allow the school to be a place for everyone to learn. To achieve this, teachers must be able to concentrate on their core mission of high-quality instruction. To do so, they need more time to observe and reflect on classes together, read books or papers, and engage in other developmental activities. Time is critical to sustaining SLC practices. One of the current biggest issues that teachers in Thailand and anywhere else in Asia face is overwhelming burden of administrative chores (Thailand Development Research Institute, 2024). This situation mirrors that of Japan, where pioneers of SLC pilot schools significantly reduced the administrative load on teachers by streamlining unnecessary documentation and eliminating duplicate meetings (Ose & Sato, 2001; Sato & Sato, 2003). School reform, particularly SLC, is not a matter of addition or multiplication, but of subtraction or division. This aspect also needs to be addressed by the MBA (see professional community in Table 2).

Second, principals must commit to strong leadership by reforming daily practices in their schools. For this, the principal must visit every classroom and stay there for several minutes every day. This was rigorously done by the pioneers of SLC in Japan, but in fewer Southeast Asian SLC schools. We have one case in Vietnam (Mon & Saito, 2017; Saito, 2021a), where the principal and the first author had a severe disagreement after the school visit, and the first author realised that the situation in the school was extremely problematic; no one was learning, and the first author urged the principal to take responsibility. Despite the initial disagreement, the principal later decided to visit each classroom and agreed with the first author. Remarkably, the principal

decided to have daily observations of and reflections on the daily practices of the teachers. This shift resulted in dramatic improvements. This practice should be implemented in Thailand.

Third, the Vietnamese case shows that school reform based on SLC is not a matter of opening classes once or twice a semester. It requires continuous effort and engagement. This applies not only to SLC but to any type of school reform. Indonesia also has a long history with this approach and continues to implement it: it started in 2006 (Saito et al., 2007) and still being run (Suratno et al., 2019). In Japan, the first pilot schools were established in 1998 (Sato, 2012a). There is a risk of becoming repetitive in activities over such long periods, even while the context of each student may change in each class. If teachers are sensitive to these nuanced, small differences day by day and hour by hour, they can continually refresh and restart running SLC on a daily basis.

Last, in the case of Thailand, BMA aims to largely scale up the number of SLC schools in 2024 (The Nation, 2023) via professional development programmes and supervisions. To achieve that expectation with quality, there is a need to clarify the criteria and indicators of SLC to provide effective consultancy and support for schools. For this aim, Table 2 above can guide BMA officials, the school leaders and teacher educators on where to focus their attention. Additionally, further efforts are needed to develop a concrete understanding of the SLC vision, philosophy, and activity system among these stakeholders. are responsible for leading, and BMA officials and teacher educators provide support for school reform based on SLC. Their deep and thorough understanding is crucial.

Concluding remarks

This paper discusses (1) the difference between SLC and other representative approaches to education reform, (2) indicators of importance gleaned from the first author's long experience with SLC, and (3) the sustainability of SLC. For the first aim, SLC was compared with PLCs, STL, and LS, and the foremost difference was that all stakeholders within the school, not just teachers, played the role of protagonists. For the second aspect, while all the indicators are listed in Table 2, primary attention is given to whether collaborative learning based on help-seeking will occur. The quality of learning experiences by the students will be further strengthened through their mutual help and support – indeed, learning is a process to understand what they did not know

or understand before. If other peers support those who would not understand well, not only would the student facing confusion learn better and appreciate their peers providing support also refine their own understanding by explaining key concepts, theories, or skills. Third, SLC is a continuous process that can only be accomplished by restructuring and streamlining teachers' daily tasks, increasing school leaders' involvement with teachers' daily practices, and a commitment to sustain the effort from other countries.

For BMA schools, there are three recommendations for BMA schools, where SLC is practised. First, BMA should recognise that they are ultimately responsible for each student learning in their region. When they visit schools, they should pay attention to how students are learning in the observed schools, how principals are leading SLC and how both student and teacher learning is being supported, as guided in Table 2. BMA has a unique role to play: they should empower principals to reduce administrative tasks in their schools, freeing up more time for SLC and other professional activities. Reform is not a venture of addition, but the one of subtractions. By reducing these burdens, the teachers have more time to engage in professional activities, and BMA should encourage principals to continually review and reduce administrative duties of the teachers.

Second, the principals should deeply understand that they are ultimately most responsible for the learning of every single student in their schools. SLC is designed for this purpose, and principals should not simply endorse it but lead it. Then, principals have to visit every classroom even for some minutes every day to observe how the students learn and discuss their observations with the teachers. The principals' working space is not the office; it is the entire school and each classroom. Obviously, the teachers may feel uncomfortable for this at the <u>initial</u> stage; therefore, the principals should avoid punitive and penalising attitudes and instead adopt an approach of 'thinking together.' If they do not have solutions for certain challenges in student learning, it is acceptable for them not to know. However, the key is to think together with teachers and maintain a collaborative approach.

Third, for the teachers, it is recommended that teachers should observe whether students are seeking help from each other. If they are not, it may indicate that the task is too easy or that students have given up on learning. The point is to provide an engaging, yet challenging task and encourage the students to think more together. In many cases, the teachers just finish with

dividing roles within the students and providing rewards. However, these methods of group learning do not promote deep learning. Deep learning starts with puzzlement, which necessarily results in mutual consultation and help-seeking. If students are not seeking help from each other, the tasks should be changed. Task formulation is an ongoing process, and teachers must continuously grow their professional expertise through reflections, conversations, observations and reading.

References

TEACHERS as LEARNERS. (2556, 27 กันยายน). *Reflection in Lesson Study : อินโดนีเซีย (Lesson Study)* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l6QuoboUu1U

An, G., Chen, Y., Fang, Y., & Liu, J. (2022). How does lesson study promote district education reform? – A case study of a district in Shanghai. *International Journal for Lesson & Learning Studies, 11*(2), 106-120. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlls-01-2022-0003

Bunlang, S., Inprasitha, M., & Changsri, N. (2023). Students' mathematization in mathematics classrooms using the Thailand lesson study incorporated open approach model. *International Journal for Lesson & Learning Studies, 13*(1), 14-27. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlls-06-2023-0077

Cheng, E. C. K. (2019). *Successful transposition of lesson study: A knowledge management perspective*. Springer. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2472-7

Craney, C. L., Lau, T., Nelson, W. T., Ghomeshi, A., Rust, J. M., de Groot, R. M., Dennis, D. P., Robertson, E., & Kissel, J. (2020). Collaborative Middle School Science Outreach Project Using the Japanese Lesson Study Model. *Journal of Chemical Education, 97*(5), 1256-1265. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jchemed.9b00780

Darling-Hammond, L., Wechsler, M. E., Levin, S., Leung-Gagné, M., Tozer, S., & Campoli, A. K. (2024). *Developing expert principals: Professional learning that matters*. Routledge.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. The Macmillan company.

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., Many, T. W., & Mattos, M. (2016). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work (3rd ed.)*. Solution Tree.

Erickson, A., & Makowski, M. (2023). What's the lesson? Using lesson study to develop curriculum for preservice secondary mathematics teachers. *Primus, 33*(10), 1135-1153. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511970.2023.2248975

Groth, R. E., & Follmer, D. J. (2021). Challenges and benefits of using Toulmin's argumentation model to assess mathematics lesson study debriefing sessions. *Investigations in Mathematics Learning, 13*(4), 338-353. https://doi.org/10.1080/19477503.2021.1989188

Hamanogo Primary School. (2008). *Manabiau manabi wo motomete* [Seeking for mutual learning]. Hamanogo Primary School.

Huang, Y. (2019). The challenge of School as Learning Community in Taiwan: Late start and rapid spread. In A. Tsukui & M. Murase (Eds.), *Lesson study and schools as learning communities: Asian school reform in theory and practice* (pp. 59-73). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315690322-5

Huang, Y. (2020). The implementation of SLC in Taiwan: a new chapter in education of democracy. In M. Ueno (Ed.), *School reform and democracy in East Asia* (pp. 68-80). Routledge.

Inagaki, T., & Sato, M. (1996). *Jugyo kenkyu nyumon* (Introduction to lesson study). Iwanami.

Inprasitha, M. (2022). Lesson study and open approach development in Thailand: a longitudinal study. *International Journal for Lesson & Learning Studies, 11*(5), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlls-04-2021-0029

Kaiser, A., & Peschl, M. F. (2020). The role of self-transcending knowledge in Senge's understanding of learning organizations towards an interdisciplinary taxonomy of self-transcending knowledge. *The Learning Organization, 27*(6), 527-539. https://doi.org/10.1108/tlo-06-2020-0110

Khong, T. D. H. (2019). *Dialogical pedagogy: Teacher professional learning in the Vietnamese context* [The University of Queensland]. Brisbane. https://doi.org/10.14264/uql.2020.895

Larsen, S., & McCormick, K. (2021). Fostering professional responsibility through high-quality professional learning opportunities. *Teacher Development, 26*(1), 117-134. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2021.1982759

Luanrit, T., Saito, E., & Saejea, V. (2022). School leadership to prevent collateral damage: A case study of a Thai principal during the COVID-19 pandemic. In S. Chitpin & R. E. White (Eds.), *Leading under pressure* (pp. 121-144). Emerald. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80117-358-220221008

McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2007). Building professional learning communities in high schools: challenges and promising practices. In L. Stoll & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Professional Learning Communities* (pp. 151-165). Open University Press.

Meesuk, P., Wongrugsa, A., & Wangkaewhiran, T. (2021). Sustainable teacher professional development through professional learning community: PLC. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability, 23*(2), 30-44. https://doi.org/10.2478/jtes-2021-0015

Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education*. University of California Press.

Ose, T., & Sato, M. (2001). *Gakko wo tsukuru* [Establishing a school]. Shogakkan.

Reese, S. (2020). Reflecting on impacts of Peter Senge's Fifth Discipline on learning organizations. *The Learning Organization, 27*(1), 75-80. https://doi.org/10.1108/tlo-01-2020-244

Ryan, B. (2022). *The brilliance in the building: Effecting change in urban schools with the PLC at work process*. Solution Tree Press.

Saito, E. (2012). Key issues of lesson study in Japan and the United States: A literature review. *Professional Development in Education, 38*(5), 777-789. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2012.668857

Saito, E. (2021a). The evolution of joint teacher observations and reflections as sites of heteroglossia and heteroopia: An actor–network theoretical discussion. *Reflective Practice, 22*(5), 682-696. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2021.1964946

Saito, E. (2021b). Parents as teaching allies: Some cases in Japanese schools. *In Transforming pedagogies through engagement with learners, teachers and communities* (pp. 233-244). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-0057-9_15

Saito, E., & Atencio, M. (2015). Pedagogical content knowledge in action: Its impromptu development by an expert practitioner. Pedagogy. *Culture & Society, 24*(1), 101-121. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2015.1087043

Saito, E., & Fatemi, G. (2022). *Enabling students to become co-makers of emergent curricula through authentic and collaborative learning*. Management in Education*, 0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/08920206221123177

Saito, E., & Khong, T. D. H. (2017). Not just for special occasions: supporting the professional learning of teachers through critical reflection with audio-visual information. *Reflective Practice, 18*(6), 837-851. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2017.1361921

Saito, E., & Tsukui, A. (2008). Challenging common sense: Cases of school reform for learning community under an international cooperation project in Bac Giang Province, Vietnam. *International Journal of Educational Development, 28*(5), 571-584. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2007.12.006

Saito, E., Mansfield, J., & O'Donovan, R. (2022). Information economics of teaching: A transactional perspective on pedagogical reasoning to provide a typology of pedagogical equilibrium. *Interactive Learning Environments, 32*(1), 20-33. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2076127

Saito, E., Takahashi, R., Wintachai, J., & Anunthavorasakul, A. (2020). Issues in introducing collaborative learning in South East Asia: A critical discussion. *Management in Education, 35*(4), 167-173. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020620932367

Sato, M. (2003). *Kyoshitachi no chosen* [Challenges taken up by the teachers]. Shogakkan.

Sato, M. (2005). *Gakko no chosen* [Challenges taken up by schools]. Shogakkan.

Sato, M. (2012a). *Gakko kaikaku no testugaku* [Philosophy for school reform]. University of Tokyo Press.

Sato, M. (2012b). *Gakko wo kaikaku suru* [Reforming a School]. Iwanami Shoten.

Sato, M. (2019). Spread and progress of school as learning community in Asia. In A. Tsukui & M. Murase (Eds.), *Lesson study and schools as learning communities* (pp. 3-13). Routledge.

Sato, M., & Sato, M. (2003). *Koritsu chugakko no chosen* [Challenge taken up by a neighbourhood lower secondary school]. Gyosei.

Schwab, J. J. (1964). Structure of the disciplines: Meaning and significance. In G. W. Ford & L. Pugno (Eds.), *The structure of knowledge and curriculum* (pp. 6-30). Rand McNally.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (Rev. ed.). Doubleday/Currency.

Senge, P. M. (2012). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education* (Rev. ed.). Nicholas Brealey.

Shin, J., & Son, W. (2019). School reform practices through building learning community in Korea. In A. Tsukui & M. Murase (Eds.), *Lesson study and schools as learning communities* (pp. 45-58). Routledge.

Song, K.-o., Hur, E.-J., & Kwon, B.-Y. (2017). Does high-quality professional development make a difference? Evidence from TIMSS. Compare: *A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 48*(6), 954-972. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2017.1373330

Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(3), 387-431. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072003387

Suratno, T., Joharmawan, R., Chotimah, H., & Takasawa, N. (2019). Harbinger of lesson study for learning community in Indonesia. In A. Tsukui & M. Murase (Eds.), *Lesson study and schools as learning communities* (pp. 74-89). Routledge.

Suzuki, Y. (2022). *Reforming lesson study in Japan: Theories of action for schools as learning communities*. Routledge.

The Nation. (2023, November 11). *BMA is boosting teachers' potential to promote Bangkok schools as learning community*. The Nation. https://www.nationthailand.com/blogs/thailand/40029253

Thitiratsakul, T. (2024, March 15). *Education woes aren't about funding*. Thailand Development Research Institute. https://tdri.or.th/en/2024/03/education-woes-arent-about-funding/

Vasinayanuwatana, T., Teo, T. W., & Ketsing, J. (2020). Shura-infused STEM professional learning community in an Islamic School in Thailand. *Cultural Studies of Science Education, 16*(1), 109-139. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-020-09990-8

Webb, N. M. (2013). Information processing approaches to collaborative learning. In C. E. Hmelo-Silver, C. A. Chinn, C. K. K. Chan, & A. O'Donnell (Eds.), *The international handbook of collaborative learning* (pp. 19-40). Routledge.

Webb, N. M., Franke, M. L., Ing, M., Turrou, A. C., Johnson, N. C., & Zimmerman, J. (2019). Teacher practices that promote productive dialogue and learning in mathematics classrooms. *International Journal of Educational Research, 97*, 176-186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.07.009