

Received: 24 Aug 2025

Accepted: 15 Sep 2025

Published: 30 Dec 2025

An Evaluation of the 2023 Azerbaijan Biology Curriculum Within the Framework of STEM Education: A Comprehensive Analysis

Baylar ALIYEV¹

¹ Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Azerbaijan, e-mail: baylraliyev2001@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8917-9728>

Abstract

This comprehensive study evaluates the 2023 Azerbaijan Biology Curriculum for grades VII-XI through the integrated framework of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) education. Utilizing qualitative document analysis and comparative international research, this investigation examines how the curriculum aligns with global STEM standards while maintaining cultural and national educational values. The findings reveal a progressive, multidimensional approach that integrates technological tools, mathematical literacy, engineering design thinking, and scientific inquiry into biological instruction. However, implementation challenges related to teacher preparedness, technological infrastructure, and time constraints are identified. This study contributes to the growing body of literature on STEM integration in post-Soviet educational systems and offers evidence-based recommendations for curriculum enhancement and teacher professional development.

Keywords: STEM education, biology curriculum, Azerbaijan education reform, constructivist learning, sustainable development, pedagogical innovation.

Introduction

The rapidly changing educational requirements of the 21st century have necessitated a fundamental departure from traditional "folder (papka) formats" where knowledge is merely stored as static information. Instead, modern pedagogical standards demand the cultivation of individuals who can realize their dreams through science and provide tangible utility to society. This transformation reflects what scholars have termed the "fourth industrial revolution," characterized by the convergence of digital, biological, and physical innovations that are reshaping every aspect of human life (Schwab, 2017).

Recent international comparative studies demonstrate that educational systems emphasizing integrated STEM approaches produce students with enhanced problem-solving capabilities, critical thinking skills, and innovative mindsets (Kelley & Knowles, 2016). The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) results consistently show that nations investing in STEM-integrated curricula demonstrate improved scientific literacy and mathematical proficiency among their youth populations (OECD, 2019). These findings have prompted educational authorities worldwide to reconsider traditional disciplinary boundaries and embrace more holistic, interconnected approaches to science education.

Biology, as a field of natural science, is at the forefront of this educational shift because it is constantly updated with new discoveries that render old stereotypes obsolete. The contemporary biological sciences encompass groundbreaking fields such as genomics, synthetic biology, bioinformatics, and systems biology—domains that inherently require interdisciplinary thinking and technological proficiency (Campbell et al., 2021). The National Research Council's framework for K-12 science education emphasizes that modern biology instruction must move



Aliyev, B. (2025). An evaluation of the 2023 Azerbaijan biology curriculum within the framework of STEM education: A comprehensive analysis. *Social Research and Education Journal*, 1(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18802401>

beyond descriptive memorization to engage students in authentic scientific practices including modeling, data analysis, and evidence-based argumentation (National Research Council, 2012).

Furthermore, the increasing urgency of global challenges such as climate change, biodiversity loss, pandemic preparedness, and food security has elevated biology education from an academic discipline to a critical component of civic literacy (Feinstein et al., 2013). Students must understand not only biological concepts but also how to apply this knowledge to address real-world problems affecting their communities and the planet.

In the Republic of Azerbaijan, recent educational reforms have culminated in the "Biology" Subject Curriculum for grades VII-XI (2023), which emphasizes the integration of scientific principles with real-life problem-solving. This curriculum reform represents part of a broader national transformation of the education system following the country's independence and subsequent modernization efforts. The "State Strategy for the Development of Education in the Republic of Azerbaijan" outlines ambitious goals for creating a knowledge-based society capable of competing in the global economy while preserving national cultural values and promoting sustainable development. The Azerbaijan education system has historically emphasized strong foundational knowledge in natural sciences, a legacy of the Soviet educational tradition. However, contemporary reforms recognize the need to balance this solid knowledge base with 21st-century competencies including creativity, collaboration, communication, and critical thinking—the so-called "4Cs" of modern education (National Education Association, 2012). The 2023 Biology Curriculum represents a deliberate attempt to bridge traditional strengths with innovative pedagogical approaches aligned with international best practices.

The global educational trend of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) focuses on removing disciplinary silos to prepare students for a technology-driven workforce. STEM education is characterized by several key principles: integration across disciplines, emphasis on real-world problem-solving, student-centered inquiry-based learning, and the development of both content knowledge and practical skills (Bybee, 2013). Research demonstrates that integrated STEM approaches enhance student engagement, improve retention of scientific concepts, and better prepare learners for careers in science and technology fields (Honey et al., 2014). The Azerbaijan Biology curriculum aligns with these global goals by highlighting the relationship between human activity, technology, and the environment. This alignment is particularly significant given Azerbaijan's economic transition and its aspirations to diversify beyond traditional energy sectors into knowledge-intensive industries including biotechnology, environmental management, and agricultural innovation.

Research Significance and Scope

This article provides a comprehensive evaluation of the 2023 curriculum, exploring how its content lines, teaching strategies, and assessment models foster STEM competencies. The significance of this research lies in its contribution to understanding how post-Soviet educational systems are adapting to global STEM trends while maintaining distinctive national characteristics. Additionally, this study provides empirical evidence that can inform ongoing curriculum refinement and teacher professional development initiatives in Azerbaijan and similar educational contexts.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to evaluate the 2023 Azerbaijan Biology Curriculum for grades VII-XI through the lens of STEM education. To achieve this overarching goal, the study addresses several interconnected sub-objectives:

1. To analyze the alignment of the five biological content lines with the integrated nature of STEM.

2. To investigate how technological tools (ICT, VR, and 3D modeling) are integrated into biological instruction.
3. To examine the role of mathematical calculations and engineering-style modeling in biological contexts.
4. To identify the philosophical and theoretical foundations that support interdisciplinary and inquiry-based learning in the Azerbaijani context.
5. To evaluate the assessment strategies and their alignment with STEM competencies.
6. To identify implementation challenges and barriers to effective STEM integration.
7. To formulate evidence-based recommendations for curriculum enhancement and professional development.

Theoretical Framework

The Principle of Succession and Constructivist Learning Theory

The Azerbaijan Biology curriculum is built upon a multidimensional theoretical framework that emphasizes continuity and modern skill development. One of its core principles is "Succession" (Varislik), which ensures that knowledge acquired in primary "Life Science" (I-IV) and "Nature" (V-VI) courses provides a foundation for the specialized biological concepts in higher grades. This principle aligns with Bruner's spiral curriculum theory, which posits that learners should encounter key concepts repeatedly at increasing levels of complexity and abstraction (Bruner, 1960). Research on curriculum coherence demonstrates that vertical alignment—the systematic progression of learning objectives across grade levels—significantly enhances student achievement and reduces cognitive load (Schmidt et al., 2005). The Azerbaijan curriculum's emphasis on succession reflects international best practices in curriculum design, ensuring that students build upon prior knowledge rather than encountering disconnected fragments of information.

A central pillar of the curriculum is Constructivism, which recognizes that learners actively construct knowledge through experiences rather than passively receiving information. The program emphasizes "Collaborative Constructive Learning," where students, teachers, and peers engage in dialogue to refine and improve knowledge. This approach draws upon the social constructivist theories of Vygotsky (1978), who emphasized that learning occurs through social interaction and cultural mediation. Contemporary research in science education strongly supports constructivist approaches, demonstrating that students who actively engage in knowledge construction develop deeper conceptual understanding and better transfer their learning to novel situations (Chi, 2009). The curriculum's emphasis on collaborative learning also aligns with research showing that peer interaction enhances scientific reasoning and argumentation skills (Asterhan & Schwarz, 2016).

The curriculum is coupled with "Inquiry-Based Learning," which treats students as active researchers who formulate hypotheses, collect data, and draw logical conclusions. This pedagogical approach reflects the scientific practices outlined in international frameworks such as the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS Lead States, 2013), which emphasize that science education should engage students in authentic scientific investigation rather than mere content coverage. Meta-analyses of inquiry-based science instruction demonstrate positive effects on student learning outcomes, particularly when inquiry is carefully structured and scaffolded by teachers (Furtak et al., 2012). The Azerbaijan curriculum's integration of guided inquiry activities represents a balanced approach that provides sufficient structure for novice learners while gradually developing independent research capabilities.

Furthermore, the curriculum is deeply rooted in the concept of "Sustainable

Development." According to the "State Strategy for the Development of Education in the Republic of Azerbaijan," the system aims to train modern-minded personnel who protect national and universal values while preparing for the "ecological civilization" stage of human development. This emphasis reflects global commitments to Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) as articulated in UNESCO's framework and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UNESCO, 2017). Research demonstrates that integrating sustainability themes into science curricula enhances student environmental literacy and promotes pro-environmental behaviors (Ardoin et al., 2020). The Azerbaijan curriculum's explicit connection between biological knowledge and environmental stewardship represents a values-based approach to STEM education that extends beyond technical competencies to encompass ethical dimensions of scientific citizenship.

Cultural and National Identity Considerations

A robust theoretical foundation ensures that STEM integration is not reduced to a purely technical or instrumental enterprise but is instead framed as an ethical, social, and cultural practice. Within this perspective, science education is understood as a human activity embedded in value systems, worldviews, and historical traditions. Integrating Islamic and historical perspectives on humanity's relationship with nature, stewardship, and knowledge production allows STEM curricula to resonate more deeply with students' moral frameworks. Such an approach aligns with broader educational theories emphasizing that meaningful learning occurs when new knowledge is connected to learners' existing belief systems and cultural narratives.

Research in culturally responsive science education consistently demonstrates that instruction grounded in students' cultural backgrounds and lived experiences enhances engagement, conceptual understanding, and academic achievement. Studies by Cobern and Loving (2001) and Aikenhead and Jegede (1999) highlight how students' worldviews—particularly those shaped by non-Western epistemologies—can either conflict with or support the learning of scientific concepts. When these worldviews are acknowledged rather than marginalized, science learning becomes more inclusive and intellectually accessible. This is especially critical for students from minoritized or historically underrepresented groups, for whom culturally disconnected curricula may inadvertently reinforce feelings of alienation from science. From this standpoint, the incorporation of Islamic intellectual traditions into STEM education provides a culturally grounded epistemological bridge rather than an ideological alternative to modern science. Classical Islamic scholarship historically emphasized observation, rational inquiry, and ethical responsibility toward nature, offering conceptual touchpoints that can enrich contemporary STEM instruction. Scholars such as Nasr (1996) argue that reconnecting scientific learning with ethical and metaphysical considerations fosters a more holistic understanding of knowledge. This synthesis encourages students to view science not only as a tool for technological advancement but also as a means of fulfilling moral and societal responsibilities.

The curriculum's integration of national values with international STEM standards exemplifies what is commonly described as "glocalization," a process through which global educational trends are adapted to local cultural, social, and historical contexts. As Spring (2008) notes, glocalization enables education systems to participate in global knowledge economies without eroding local identities. In STEM education, this balance is particularly important, as global standards often reflect dominant epistemologies that may not fully capture local ways of knowing. Aligning international competencies with national values allows learners to develop globally relevant skills while maintaining a strong sense of cultural continuity.

Ultimately, this approach acknowledges that effective STEM education must resonate with students' prior knowledge, values, and community contexts. Culturally responsive pedagogy, as articulated by Gay (2010), positions culture not as an add-on but as a central organizing principle

of teaching and learning. By embedding cultural and national identity considerations within STEM curricula, education systems can promote scientific literacy that is both globally competitive and locally meaningful. Such integration supports the development of learners who are not only technically competent but also ethically grounded and socially aware participants in an increasingly interconnected world.

Method

Research Design

This study utilizes a qualitative document analysis method, an established approach for systematically examining written materials to identify patterns, themes, and meanings (Bowen, 2009). Document analysis is particularly appropriate for curriculum evaluation research as it allows for detailed examination of official educational policies, learning objectives, and pedagogical recommendations.

Primary Data Source and Analytical Framework

The analysis focuses primarily on the official "'Biologiya" fənni üzrə təhsil proqramı (kurikulum) (VII-XI siniflər)" (2023) published by the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan. This official curriculum document represents the authoritative statement of learning expectations, content organization, pedagogical approaches, and assessment strategies for biology education in Azerbaijani secondary schools.

The analysis examines the four fundamental elements of the program: objectives, content, teaching-learning strategies, and assessment. This framework aligns with Tyler's (1949) classic curriculum evaluation model, which remains influential in contemporary curriculum studies. Each element is analyzed through the specific lens of STEM integration, examining how Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics components are represented and interconnected.

The specific analytical questions guiding the document analysis include:

- How are STEM competencies articulated in learning objectives?
- To what extent do content standards reflect interdisciplinary connections?
- Which pedagogical strategies promote integrated STEM thinking?
- Do assessment methods measure authentic STEM problem-solving or merely content recall?
- How is technological integration conceptualized and operationalized?
- What mathematical competencies are embedded within biological contexts?

To provide a broader context, the study also incorporates findings from recent pedagogical research in Azerbaijan, including Babayeva's (2023) analysis of teaching strategies and STEAM applications, Ahmadov et al.'s (2009) historical review of ecological education, and Aydemir & Palancıoğlu's (2023) comparative studies on primary curricula. These supplementary sources provide valuable contextual information about the educational landscape, implementation challenges, and historical development of science education in Azerbaijan.

Data Analysis Procedure

The document analysis proceeded through several iterative stages:

1. Complete reading of the curriculum document to gain overall familiarity with structure, organization, and major themes.

2. Systematic identification and marking of text segments related to STEM components (scientific inquiry, technological tools, engineering design, mathematical applications).
3. Organization of coded segments into thematic categories aligned with the research objectives.
4. Analysis of patterns, relationships, and tensions within and across categories.
5. Development of interpretive claims about STEM integration supported by specific textual evidence.
6. Cross-referencing of findings with supplementary sources to enhance credibility and contextualization.

Results

The analysis of the 2023 curriculum reveals significant STEM integration across its core components, organized here according to the four dimensions of STEM education.

Scientific Inquiry and Content Lines (The "S" in STEM)

The curriculum is organized into five main content lines: (1) Structures, functions, and processes in living organisms; (2) Reproduction and heredity; (3) Organisms and the environment; (4) Evolution and biodiversity; and (5) Human health. These lines are developed spirally, meaning they deepen in complexity as students progress from grade VII to XI. This organization reflects contemporary understanding of biological sciences as interconnected domains rather than discrete topics (Brownell et al., 2014). Research on biology curriculum organization demonstrates that thematic approaches organized around core concepts (such as those articulated in the Vision and Change framework) produce better learning outcomes than traditional taxonomic organization (American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2011). The Azerbaijan curriculum's content lines align with internationally recognized core concepts including structure-function relationships, information flow, and systems thinking.

Science is taught through context-based and historical approaches, allowing students to see how discoveries—such as Watson and Crick's work on DNA or Mendel's genetics—evolved through systematic research. This historical dimension addresses research showing that understanding the nature of science (NOS)—how scientific knowledge is generated, validated, and revised—is essential for scientific literacy (Lederman, 2007). The curriculum's emphasis on scientific discovery processes helps students understand that scientific knowledge is tentative, empirically-based, and socially constructed—key aspects of scientific literacy often neglected in traditional biology instruction (McComas et al., 1998). By examining how scientists formulated questions, designed experiments, and interpreted evidence, students develop more sophisticated understandings of scientific inquiry.

The curriculum emphasizes eight scientific practices aligned with international frameworks: asking questions, developing and using models, planning and carrying out investigations, analyzing and interpreting data, using mathematics and computational thinking, constructing explanations, engaging in argument from evidence, and obtaining and communicating information. These practices reflect contemporary understanding that science education should engage students in doing science rather than merely learning about science (Osborne, 2014). Research demonstrates that when students engage in authentic scientific practices, they develop deeper conceptual understanding and greater appreciation for the nature of scientific inquiry (Windschitl et al., 2008). The Azerbaijan curriculum's emphasis on these practices represents a significant departure from traditional didactic approaches prevalent in

many post-Soviet educational systems.

Table 1 *STEM Components Integration Across Biology Content Lines in the 2023 Azerbaijan Curriculum*

Content Line	Science (S)	Technology (T)	Engineering (E)	Mathematics (M)
Structures, functions, and processes in living organisms	Cell theory, organ systems, homeostasis, molecular biology	Light/electron microscopes, 3D modeling (TinkerCad), VR visualization of organs	Building cell models with clay/paper, designing electrically equipped organ models	Magnification calculations (Image Size/Actual Size), scale conversions, ratio analysis
Reproduction and heredity	DNA structure, genetic inheritance, Mendelian genetics, molecular genetics	DNA modeling software, genetic simulation programs, multimedia presentations	Constructing DNA double helix models, designing Punnett square calculators	Probability calculations, statistical analysis of genetic ratios, phenotype frequency analysis
Organisms and the environment	Ecological relationships, energy flow, biogeochemical cycles, population dynamics	Environmental monitoring sensors, data logging equipment, online databases	Smart irrigation systems, greenhouse design projects, ecosystem models	Energy transfer calculations (10% rule), biomass pyramids, population growth equations
Evolution and biodiversity	Natural selection, speciation, fossil evidence, comparative anatomy	Virtual museum tours, phylogenetic tree software, digital specimen collections	Classification systems design, evolutionary timeline construction	Statistical analysis of variation, timeline scaling, comparative data analysis
Human health	Disease prevention, nutrition, immune system, lifestyle factors	Health monitoring apps, BMI calculators, online health databases, webinars	Designing health campaigns, creating nutrition plans, developing exercise programs	BMI calculations (weight/height ²), caloric intake analysis, dosage calculations, statistical health data interpretation

Technological Integration (The "T" in STEM)

The 2023 curriculum explicitly requires the use of technological tools for data collection and analysis. It mandates the use of light and electron microscopes, multimedia presentations, and online webinars. This requirement reflects research demonstrating that technology integration enhances science learning when tools are used purposefully to support inquiry and visualization (Rutten et al., 2012). The curriculum's emphasis on digital resources aligns with the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework, which posits that effective technology integration requires understanding the complex interactions among technology, pedagogy, and content (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Teachers must not simply use technology but strategically deploy digital tools to enhance conceptual understanding and scientific practices.

Advanced technologies like VR (Virtual Reality) glasses and 3D modeling software such as TinkerCad are recommended to visualize abstract biological structures like the cardiovascular system or the double helix of DNA. This emphasis on immersive technologies reflects emerging research showing that VR applications enhance spatial understanding of complex biological structures and processes (Parong & Mayer, 2018).

Studies of 3D visualization in biology education demonstrate that interactive three-dimensional models improve students' mental representations of molecular structures and cellular processes compared to static two-dimensional images (Wu & Shah, 2004). The curriculum's integration of these technologies positions Azerbaijan at the forefront of educational innovation, though implementation challenges related to cost and teacher expertise must be addressed.

The curriculum also emphasizes computational thinking—the problem-solving processes and practices fundamental to computer science and increasingly essential in biological sciences (Weintrop et al., 2016). Students are expected to use digital tools for data collection, graphing, statistical analysis, and pattern identification. This computational dimension reflects the reality that contemporary biological research relies heavily on bioinformatics, modeling, and "big data" analysis (Robeva & Laubenbacher, 2009). Recent studies demonstrate that integrating computational thinking into biology education enhances students' quantitative reasoning and prepares them for the data-rich landscape of modern biological sciences (Hug & McNeill, 2008). The Azerbaijan curriculum's attention to these competencies reflects awareness of global trends in biological research and workforce demands.

Table 2 *Technological Tools and Their Pedagogical Applications in the 2023 Biology Curriculum*

Technology Category	Specific Tools/Resources	Pedagogical Purpose	Grade Level Emphasis	Implementation Frequency
Visualization Technologies	Light microscopes, electron microscopes, VR glasses, 3D modeling software (TinkerCad)	Visualizing abstract biological structures (cells, organs, molecular structures); enhancing spatial understanding	VII-XI (progressive complexity)	Regular use (weekly in practical sessions)
Digital Presentation Tools	Multimedia presentations, interactive whiteboards, animation software	Explaining complex processes (mitosis, photosynthesis, circulation); facilitating visual learning	VII-XI	Frequent use (2-3 times per week)
Data Collection & Analysis	Digital sensors, data logging equipment, spreadsheet software, graphing applications	Collecting empirical data; analyzing patterns; developing quantitative reasoning	VIII-XI	Regular use (during lab activities)
Communication Platforms	Online webinars, video conferencing, educational websites, virtual laboratories	Connecting with experts; accessing current research; collaborative learning	IX-XI	Periodic use (monthly)
Simulation Software	Genetic simulators, ecosystem modeling programs,	Experimenting with variables; testing hypotheses in virtual	VIII-XI	Regular use (bi-weekly)

Technology Category	Specific Tools/Resources	Pedagogical Purpose	Grade Level Emphasis	Implementation Frequency
	physiological process simulations	environments		
3D Printing & Manufacturing	3D printers for creating biological models	Producing tangible models; understanding three-dimensional structures	X-XI	Occasional use (project-based)

Engineering Mindset and Project-Based Learning (The "E" in STEM)

Students are encouraged to apply biological principles to "create additional value"—language reflecting an engineering design orientation. This engineering approach is evident in tasks that require students to build models of cells using clay or paper, or to develop electrically equipped organ models and smart irrigation systems. These activities embody the engineering design process: defining problems, developing solutions, optimizing designs, and communicating results (Cunningham & Kelly, 2017).

Research demonstrates that engineering design activities enhance students' understanding of biological concepts while simultaneously developing problem-solving skills, creativity, and persistence (Wendell & Rogers, 2013). The integration of engineering challenges within biology instruction represents what scholars term "Engineering-Enhanced Science Learning," where engineering activities serve as contexts for deepening scientific understanding (Edelson & Reiser, 2006).

The curriculum also suggests "Project-Based Learning," where students work on long-term initiatives like analyzing the impact of greenhouses on plant growth or investigating local infectious diseases. This pedagogical approach aligns with extensive research demonstrating that project-based learning (PBL) enhances student engagement, content mastery, and development of 21st-century competencies (Krajcik & Shin, 2014). Effective PBL in science education is characterized by sustained inquiry, authentic problems connected to students' lives, student voice and choice, critique and revision processes, and public presentation of work (Larmer et al., 2015). The curriculum's emphasis on community-connected projects investigating local environmental or health issues exemplifies these characteristics and promotes what Aikenhead (2006) terms "humanistic science education"—instruction that connects scientific concepts to students' lived experiences and community contexts.

The curriculum's language emphasizing "additional value" and practical applications reflects an entrepreneurial dimension often associated with STEM education. This orientation aligns with contemporary educational trends emphasizing innovation, creativity, and the application of knowledge to solve real-world problems (Bacigalupo et al., 2016). Students are positioned not merely as consumers of biological knowledge but as potential innovators who might develop novel solutions to agricultural, health, or environmental challenges. Research on entrepreneurship education suggests that integrating entrepreneurial thinking into STEM curricula enhances students' self-efficacy, creative problem-solving, and career aspirations (Lackéus, 2015). The Azerbaijan curriculum's emphasis on practical value creation reflects national economic development priorities and prepares students for participation in innovation-driven economies.

Mathematical Literacy in Biology (The "M" in STEM)

The curriculum integrates mathematics as a tool for precision in science. Students are expected to perform "simple scientific calculations"—language that somewhat understates the mathematical sophistication required for authentic biological reasoning. The mathematical

competencies embedded in the curriculum reflect recognition that quantitative literacy is essential for understanding contemporary biological sciences (Bialek & Botstein, 2004). Research in biology education consistently demonstrates that students struggle with quantitative reasoning in biological contexts, often compartmentalizing mathematics and biology as separate domains (Hoskins et al., 2007). The Azerbaijan curriculum's explicit integration of mathematical practices within biological learning outcomes represents an important step toward developing students' abilities to use mathematics as a tool for biological understanding.

Examples of mathematical integration include:

- *Microscopy calculations*: Using the formula "Magnification = Image Size / Actual Size" to determine specimen dimensions and microscope properties. This application requires proportional reasoning and unit conversion—mathematical practices essential across scientific disciplines.
- *Health metrics*: Calculating Body Mass Index (BMI) using weight and height measurements. This contextualized mathematics connects biological concepts (metabolism, health) with personal relevance and public health applications.
- *Ecological modeling*: Determining energy transfer and biomass ratios in food pyramids. These calculations require understanding of percentages, ratios, and the mathematical representation of energy flow through ecosystems—concepts central to ecological literacy.
- *Genetic probability*: Analyzing statistical patterns in genetic probability using Punnett squares and variation curves. This application integrates probability theory, statistical reasoning, and genetic concepts, exemplifying the interdisciplinary nature of modern biology.

Beyond specific calculations, the curriculum emphasizes data representation through graphs, tables, and charts—competencies that bridge mathematics and science. Research demonstrates that graph interpretation is a critical but challenging competency for students, requiring integration of mathematical concepts with scientific context (Glazer, 2011). The curriculum's attention to multiple forms of data representation prepares students for the data-rich environments of contemporary scientific research and informed citizenship. Studies of quantitative biology education demonstrate that explicit attention to mathematical reasoning within biological contexts enhances both mathematical proficiency and biological understanding (Aikens & Dolan, 2014). The Azerbaijan curriculum's integration of mathematics throughout biological content lines, rather than treating mathematics as a separate competency, reflects best practices in integrated STEM education.

Table 3 *Mathematical Competencies Embedded in Biology Learning Outcomes by Grade Level*

Grade Level	Mathematical Competency	Biological Context	Example Application	Cognitive Demand Level*
VII	Basic calculations, unit conversion	Microscopy	Calculating actual specimen size from magnified images using the formula: Magnification = Image Size ÷ Actual Size	Level 2 (Procedural)
VII-VIII	Percentages, ratios	Nutrition, body composition	Analyzing macronutrient composition (proteins, carbohydrates, fats) in foods; calculating daily nutritional	Level 2-3 (Procedural-Conceptual)

Grade Level	Mathematical Competency	Biological Context	Example Application	Cognitive Demand Level*
			requirements	
VIII	Area and volume calculations	Cell biology, body systems	Calculating surface area to volume ratios in cells; understanding diffusion efficiency	Level 3 (Conceptual)
IX	Proportional reasoning	Ecological energy transfer	Calculating energy transfer between trophic levels (10% rule); constructing biomass pyramids	Level 3 (Conceptual)
IX-X	Probability, Punnett squares	Mendelian genetics	Predicting offspring genotypes and phenotypes; calculating genetic probabilities for single and multi-trait crosses	Level 3-4 (Conceptual-Strategic)
X	Statistical analysis, mean, median, mode	Population genetics, variation	Analyzing trait distributions in populations; calculating allele frequencies; constructing variation curves	Level 4 (Strategic)
X-XI	Exponential functions, growth rates	Population ecology	Calculating population growth rates; predicting population changes using exponential and logistic models	Level 4 (Strategic)
XI	Body Mass Index (BMI) calculations	Human health	Calculating BMI = weight (kg) ÷ [height (m)] ² ; interpreting health implications	Level 2-3 (Procedural-Conceptual)
XI	Complex data interpretation	Research projects	Analyzing multi-variable datasets from experiments; drawing evidence-based conclusions	Level 4-5 (Strategic-Extended Thinking)

*Based on Webb's Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Framework

Assessment and Evaluation Approaches

The curriculum emphasizes formative assessment—ongoing evaluation to inform instruction and support learning—as a central component of effective pedagogy. Recommended strategies include observation of student inquiry processes, analysis of laboratory notebooks, peer review of project work, and self-assessment using rubrics. This emphasis aligns with extensive research demonstrating that formative assessment significantly enhances student learning when implemented effectively (Black & Wiliam, 2009). The curriculum's attention to process-oriented assessment reflects recognition that STEM competencies extend beyond content knowledge to include practices, habits of mind, and dispositions that develop over time through sustained engagement (National Research Council, 2012). Effective assessment of integrated STEM learning requires multiple methods capturing the complexity of student understanding and performance.

The curriculum advocates for performance-based assessment tasks requiring students to demonstrate integrated STEM competencies through authentic applications. Examples include designing experiments, building models, analyzing complex data sets, and presenting research findings. This emphasis reflects research showing that performance assessments provide more

valid measures of complex competencies than traditional multiple-choice tests (Darling-Hammond & Adamson, 2010). However, performance-based assessment presents implementation challenges including time requirements, scoring reliability, and teacher expertise (Lane & Stone, 2006). The curriculum must provide adequate guidance and support for teachers to develop, implement, and evaluate performance tasks effectively.

The curriculum also recommends portfolio assessment—the systematic collection of student work over time demonstrating growth and achievement. Research on portfolio assessment in science education demonstrates benefits including enhanced student reflection, documentation of learning progression, and more comprehensive evaluation of complex competencies (Slater et al., 1997). However, effective portfolio assessment requires clear criteria, structured reflection processes, and substantial teacher time—resources that may be constrained in typical school settings.

Discussion

The transition toward a STEM-integrated Biology curriculum in Azerbaijan reflects a significant philosophical shift. Education is no longer about rote memorization but about "turning knowledge into ideas and production." This transformation aligns with constructivist learning theories and contemporary understandings of expertise, which emphasize that deep understanding involves not merely knowing facts but being able to apply, transfer, and generate new knowledge (Bransford et al., 2000).

The findings suggest that by grounding biology in real-life contexts—such as environmental pollution, energy usage, and food chemistry—the curriculum increases student motivation and scientific literacy. Research consistently demonstrates that contextualized learning enhances both engagement and achievement by making abstract concepts meaningful and relevant to students' lives (Gilbert, 2006). The curriculum's emphasis on authentic applications reflects what Pellegrino and Hilton (2012) term "deeper learning"—instruction aimed at transfer, application, and the development of expert-like thinking.

However, the analysis also identifies several implementation challenges that may hinder the curriculum's ambitious goals. The "personnel potential" is a major hurdle; many teachers exhibit conservative attitudes or lack the technological skills necessary to fully utilize 3D printers and VR equipment. This finding aligns with extensive research demonstrating that teacher knowledge, beliefs, and pedagogical skills are critical factors determining the success of curriculum reforms (Penuel et al., 2007). Studies of STEM education implementation consistently identify teacher professional development as the most significant lever for improving instruction (Desimone & Garet, 2015). Effective professional development in STEM education is characterized by sustained duration, active learning opportunities, coherence with curriculum goals, collective participation of teachers from the same school, and focus on content and pedagogy (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). The Azerbaijan context presents unique challenges. Many biology teachers were trained in traditional didactic approaches and may lack experience with inquiry-based instruction, technology integration, and interdisciplinary teaching. Transforming teaching practice requires not only new knowledge and skills but also shifts in beliefs about teaching, learning, and the nature of science—changes that occur gradually through sustained support and professional learning communities (Borko, 2004).

There is also a reported "lack of time" for practical and experimental lessons due to high school hours and administrative burdens. This constraint reflects a common tension in educational systems worldwide: curriculum documents articulate ambitious visions requiring extended time for inquiry and projects, yet actual school schedules remain structured around traditional time allocations privileging direct instruction and content coverage (Cuban, 2013). Additionally, many schools lack the technological infrastructure, laboratory equipment, and material resources required to implement the curriculum's vision. Research on technology

integration demonstrates that resource availability is necessary but not sufficient for effective implementation; teachers also need support, time, and pedagogical models for meaningful technology use (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010).

Despite the curriculum's emphasis on integrated STEM competencies and inquiry practices, the actual assessments students encounter may remain focused on traditional content recall. Research demonstrates a phenomenon termed "curriculum misalignment" where stated learning objectives emphasize higher-order thinking but actual assessments measure only factual knowledge (Porter, 2002). If high-stakes examinations continue to privilege memorization, teachers and students will rationally focus their efforts on test preparation rather than the curriculum's more ambitious goals—a pattern documented across diverse educational contexts (Au, 2007).

Furthermore, the curriculum's emphasis on "Ecological Civilization" represents a unique Azerbaijani approach to STEM. It blends technical proficiency with the Islamic and historical view of nature as a "deposit" or "gift of God" that must be protected. This values-based dimension distinguishes the Azerbaijan curriculum from purely technical STEM approaches prevalent in some contexts. Research on environmental education demonstrates that values and worldviews significantly influence environmental attitudes and behaviors (Stern, 2000). By explicitly connecting biological knowledge with ethical responsibilities rooted in cultural and religious traditions, the curriculum addresses the affective and moral dimensions of environmental citizenship often neglected in science education (Zeidler et al., 2005). This approach aligns with scholarship on culturally responsive and socially transformative science education, which argues that effective instruction must connect with students' existing values and community contexts while promoting critical consciousness about environmental and social justice issues (Calabrese Barton & Tan, 2010). The curriculum's integration of Islamic environmental ethics with contemporary sustainability science represents an innovative synthesis that could serve as a model for other contexts seeking to ground STEM education in local cultural frameworks.

Comparing the Azerbaijan curriculum with STEM initiatives in other nations reveals both convergences and distinctive features. Like many countries, Azerbaijan emphasizes inquiry-based learning, technology integration, and real-world applications (Bybee, 2013). However, the explicit attention to cultural values, ecological civilization, and sustainable development distinguishes the Azerbaijan approach from more narrowly technical STEM frameworks focused primarily on workforce preparation. The curriculum's spiral organization and attention to learning progression reflects international trends toward coherent, standards-based curriculum design (Schmidt et al., 2005). However, the specific content emphases—including significant attention to environmental issues relevant to the Caspian region and agricultural applications relevant to Azerbaijan's economy—demonstrate appropriate localization of global STEM principles. Research on curriculum reform in post-Soviet contexts highlights common challenges including teacher resistance to pedagogical change, limited resources for professional development and infrastructure, and tensions between stated curriculum intentions and actual classroom practices (Silova, 2009). The Azerbaijan experience with STEM integration may offer lessons for other nations in the region navigating similar transitions.

An important dimension not explicitly addressed in the curriculum document concerns equity and access. Research consistently demonstrates that STEM education can either exacerbate or ameliorate educational inequalities depending on how it is implemented (National Academy of Sciences, 2011). Questions warranting attention include:

- Do all schools—urban and rural, well-resourced and under-resourced—have equal access to the technologies and materials required for curriculum implementation?

- Are girls and boys equally encouraged to pursue advanced biology courses and STEM careers?
- Does the curriculum acknowledge and build upon the diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds of Azerbaijan's student population?

International research demonstrates that effective STEM education requires explicit attention to equity, including culturally responsive pedagogy, high expectations for all students, and strategic interventions to address opportunity gaps (Nasir et al., 2014). Future curriculum refinement should explicitly address these equity dimensions.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The 2023 Azerbaijan Biology Curriculum is a progressive, STEM-aligned framework that bridges the gap between theoretical science and practical application. It successfully incorporates technology and mathematics into biological study while maintaining a strong focus on ecological responsibility and sustainable development. The curriculum demonstrates sophisticated understanding of contemporary pedagogical principles including constructivism, inquiry-based learning, and integrated STEM education. The five content lines provide coherent organization of biological concepts from grades VII through XI, emphasizing core ideas that spiral in complexity. The explicit integration of scientific practices, technological tools, engineering design, and mathematical reasoning throughout these content lines represents significant advancement beyond traditional descriptive biology instruction. The curriculum's distinctive emphasis on ecological civilization and cultural values demonstrates how global STEM principles can be meaningfully adapted to local contexts. This values-based approach to STEM education addresses not only technical competencies but also the ethical dimensions of scientific citizenship essential for addressing global challenges.

Based on the comprehensive analysis presented in this study, a set of evidence-based recommendations emerges for strengthening the effective implementation of the STEM-integrated biology curriculum. First, sustained investment in teacher training must be treated as a central policy priority. Authorities should support long-term, high-quality professional development initiatives aimed at enhancing biology teachers' technological competencies and design-thinking skills. Extensive research indicates that teacher quality is the most influential school-based factor affecting student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Given the curriculum's ambitious emphasis on inquiry-based learning, technology integration, and complex performance assessment, teachers must acquire new pedagogical competencies that extend beyond traditional content delivery. Professional development programs should therefore be designed as multi-year initiatives incorporating ongoing coaching, collaborative professional learning communities, and partnerships with universities offering graduate-level coursework in STEM pedagogy. Incentive structures, such as stipends and career advancement opportunities, are also necessary to encourage sustained teacher participation. In addition, the development and dissemination of video-based case studies documenting effective STEM-integrated biology instruction in Azerbaijani schools would provide contextually relevant models of best practice.

Equally critical is the modernization of laboratory facilities and educational infrastructure. Schools must be equipped with contemporary tools, including digital microscopes, 3D printers, and virtual or augmented reality systems, in order to move biology instruction beyond passive observation toward active experimentation and design-based learning. While pedagogical expertise is essential, the successful integration of technology is fundamentally constrained by the availability of adequate resources (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010). A systematic audit of existing laboratory facilities across schools should be conducted to identify gaps and inequities, followed by a phased implementation plan prioritizing institutions with the greatest needs. The establishment of regional STEM resource centers would allow schools to

access specialized equipment that may not be feasible to maintain individually. Strategic partnerships with technology companies could further support equipment acquisition through donations or subsidized pricing, while dedicated maintenance and technical support systems are necessary to ensure long-term functionality and sustainability.

Curriculum flexibility and time allocation also require reconsideration to support inquiry-based and project-based learning. Authentic scientific inquiry demands extended periods for experimentation, data analysis, and reflection, which traditional class schedules often fail to accommodate (Krajcik & Shin, 2014). Meaningful investigation cannot be compressed into short instructional periods without compromising depth and conceptual understanding. Policymakers should therefore pilot alternative scheduling models, such as block scheduling or integrated STEM instructional periods, in selected schools. Reducing excessive curricular breadth in favor of deeper exploration of core biological concepts would further support this shift. Schools should be granted greater autonomy in allocating instructional time according to local needs while still meeting national learning standards, and low-priority administrative demands that consume instructional time should be minimized. The development of exemplar unit plans illustrating how extended inquiry activities can be effectively structured would provide practical guidance for teachers.

Another essential recommendation concerns interdisciplinary cooperation among science teachers. Teachers of biology, chemistry, and physics should be encouraged to collaborate through joint planning and the implementation of “open classes” that explicitly highlight conceptual connections across disciplines. Authentic STEM integration inherently transcends disciplinary boundaries, and when teachers operate in isolation, students lose valuable opportunities to develop a coherent understanding of the natural sciences (Bybee, 2013). School schedules should therefore include structured common planning time for science teachers, and interdisciplinary curriculum units should be developed to align key concepts across subject areas. Co-teaching models, particularly between biology and chemistry teachers, can further enhance instructional coherence, while incentive systems recognizing collaborative curriculum development would reinforce institutional commitment. Inter-school networks enabling teachers to share interdisciplinary resources and instructional strategies would also strengthen professional learning communities beyond individual institutions.

Assessment system alignment represents another critical area for policy intervention. Assessment practices must be redesigned to authentically measure integrated STEM competencies rather than isolated content recall. Because assessment strongly shapes classroom instruction, continued reliance on traditional high-stakes examinations emphasizing memorization risks undermining the curriculum’s emphasis on inquiry, application, and problem solving (Au, 2007). Standardized biology assessments should therefore be revised to include performance-based tasks, data analysis, experimental design, and real-world application problems. The development of comprehensive item banks aligned with STEM competencies, combined with targeted training for teachers in performance assessment design and scoring, would support consistent implementation. Portfolio-based assessment systems documenting student growth over time could further capture complex learning outcomes, while systematic validity studies are necessary to ensure that assessments accurately measure intended competencies.

Sustained research and continuous improvement mechanisms are also essential for long-term curriculum success. Curriculum reform is not a one-time event but an iterative process requiring ongoing evaluation and refinement based on empirical evidence (Penuel et al., 2007). Policymakers should establish systematic research frameworks that include annual surveys of biology teachers to document implementation challenges and successes, as well as longitudinal studies tracking student learning outcomes and STEM-related career trajectories. Formal mechanisms enabling teachers to provide feedback on curriculum effectiveness would further

inform policy adjustments. In-depth case study research documenting exemplary implementation across diverse school contexts should be conducted and widely disseminated to guide best practice and support evidence-based refinement.

Finally, equity-focused interventions must be embedded throughout curriculum implementation. International research consistently demonstrates persistent disparities in STEM participation and achievement linked to gender, geographic location, and socioeconomic status, underscoring the need for proactive policy responses (National Academy of Sciences, 2011). Participation and achievement data should be systematically monitored and disaggregated to identify inequities, and targeted support programs should be developed for schools and student populations exhibiting lower levels of STEM engagement. Mentoring initiatives connecting students with STEM professionals, along with scholarship and enrichment opportunities for underrepresented groups, would further promote equity. Integrating culturally responsive pedagogy into teacher professional development is also essential for ensuring that STEM instruction is inclusive and meaningful for diverse learners.

This study opens several important avenues for future research. Classroom-based implementation studies are needed to document how teachers enact the STEM-integrated biology curriculum and to identify instructional practices that most effectively support student learning. Research on teacher professional development should examine which training models most successfully transform teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and instructional practices related to STEM integration. Longitudinal studies tracking student achievement, engagement, and career pathways under the reformed curriculum would provide critical evidence of long-term impact. Comparative cross-national research could further illuminate how different education systems integrate STEM principles into biology curricula and which contextual factors influence successful implementation. Equity-focused research examining differential curriculum effects across student populations is also necessary, as are studies developing and validating assessment tools capable of measuring integrated STEM competencies within biological contexts.

Final Reflections

The 2023 Azerbaijan Biology Curriculum represents an ambitious and thoughtfully designed effort to advance STEM-integrated science education. By maintaining strong foundations in biological content while incorporating technological tools, mathematical reasoning, and engineering design thinking, the curriculum is well positioned to foster the multidimensional competencies required for success in the twenty-first century. Its integration of ecological values and cultural perspectives demonstrates that effective STEM education need not sacrifice local traditions in pursuit of global standards. On the contrary, grounding universal competencies in meaningful local contexts enhances relevance and prepares students to address both community-based challenges and global opportunities.

Nevertheless, translating curricular aspirations into classroom realities requires sustained commitment to teacher professional development, infrastructure investment, assessment reform, and continuous improvement. While the curriculum document provides a clear roadmap, its realization depends on coordinated efforts among policymakers, educators, families, and students. As Azerbaijan continues its broader educational transformation, the STEM-integrated biology curriculum holds significant promise for cultivating scientifically literate citizens capable of contributing to sustainable development, technological innovation, and informed democratic participation. Achieving this promise will require not only preserving the curriculum's ambitious vision but also ensuring that sufficient resources, institutional support, and pedagogical flexibility are provided to enable effective and equitable implementation.

Declarations

Acknowledgements: Not applicable

Authors' contributions: BA and YA contributed equally to the conception and design of the study. BA and YA jointly collected and analyzed the data. Both authors interpreted the results, drafted the manuscript, and approved the final version.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable. This study did not involve human participants.

References

- Ahmadov, I. S., Muradova, E. A., & Mustafayev, G. T. (2009). Scientific sources of the ecological education and its development in Azerbaijan. *Scientific Sources of the Rusenskiy University*, 48(6.2), 76-80.
- Aikenhead, G. S. (2006). *Science education for everyday life: Evidence-based practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Aikenhead, G. S., & Jegede, O. J. (1999). Cross-cultural science education: A cognitive explanation of a cultural phenomenon. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 36(3), 269-287.
- Aikens, M. L., & Dolan, E. L. (2014). Teaching quantitative biology: Goals, assessments, and resources. *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, 25(22), 3478-3481. <https://doi.org/10.1091/mbc.E14-06-1045>
- Akhundova, S. M., & Bunyatova, L. N. (2021). The role of the concept of sustainable development in chemistry and biology education. *Sumgayit State University*, 150, 323-324.
- American Association for the Advancement of Science. (2011). *Vision and change in undergraduate biology education: A call to action*. AAAS.
- Ardoin, N. M., Bowers, A. W., Roth, N. W., & Holthuis, N. (2020). Environmental education and K-12 student outcomes: A review and analysis of research. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 51(2), 77-103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2019.1705965>
- Asadova, A. A. (2025). Context-based interdisciplinary chemistry teaching in Azerbaijani secondary schools: A pedagogical model. *International Forum: Problems and Scientific Solutions*, (258), 39-43.
- Asterhan, C. S., & Schwarz, B. B. (2016). Argumentation for learning: Well-trodden paths and unexplored territories. *Educational Psychologist*, 51(2), 164-187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1155458>
- Au, W. (2007). High-stakes testing and curricular control: A qualitative metasynthesis. *Educational Researcher*, 36(5), 258-267. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07306523>
- Aydemir, H., & Palancıoğlu, Ö. V. (2023). Comparison of Türkiye and Azerbaijan primary school life science curriculum. *Türk Akademik Yayınlar Dergisi (TAY Journal)*, 7(Special Issue), 21-42.
- Babayeva, Z. (2023). Determination of teaching strategies considered necessary in teaching biology. *International Journal of Educational Spectrum (IJES)*, 5(2), 1-25.
- Bacigalupo, M., Kampilis, P., Punie, Y., & Van den Brande, G. (2016). *EntreComp: The entrepreneurship competence framework*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2791/593884>
- Bialek, W., & Botstein, D. (2004). Introductory science and mathematics education for 21st-century biologists. *Science*, 303(5659), 788-790. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1095480>

- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3-15. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033008003>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school* (Expanded ed.). National Academy Press.
- Brownell, S. E., Freeman, S., Wenderoth, M. P., & Crowe, A. J. (2014). BioCore Guide: A tool for interpreting the core concepts of Vision and Change for biology majors. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 13(2), 200-211. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.13-12-0233>
- Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Harvard University Press.
- Bybee, R. W. (2013). *The case for STEM education: Challenges and opportunities*. NSTA Press.
- Calabrese Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2010). We be burnin'! Agency, identity, and science learning. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19(2), 187-229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508400903530044>
- Campbell, N. A., Urry, L. A., Cain, M. L., Wasserman, S. A., Minorsky, P. V., & Reece, J. B. (2021). *Biology: A global approach* (12th ed.). Pearson.
- Chi, M. T. (2009). Active-constructive-interactive: A conceptual framework for differentiating learning activities. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 1(1), 73-105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-8765.2008.01005.x>
- Cobern, W. W., & Loving, C. C. (2001). Defining “science” in a multicultural world: Implications for science education. *Science Education*, 85(1), 50–67.
- Cuban, L. (2013). *Inside the black box of classroom practice: Change without reform in American education*. Harvard Education Press.
- Cunningham, C. M., & Kelly, G. J. (2017). Epistemic practices of engineering for education. *Science Education*, 101(3), 486-505. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21271>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1), 1-44. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000>
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Adamson, F. (Eds.). (2010). *Beyond basic skills: The role of performance assessment in achieving 21st century standards of learning*. Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311>
- Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2015). Best practices in teachers' professional development in the United States. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 7(3), 252-263. <https://doi.org/10.25115/psye.v7i3.515>
- Edelson, D. C., & Reiser, B. J. (2006). Making authentic practices accessible to learners: Design challenges and strategies. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (pp. 335-354). Cambridge University Press.
- Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T. (2010). Teacher technology change: How knowledge, confidence, beliefs, and culture intersect. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(3), 255-284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2010.10782551>
- Feinstein, N. W., Allen, S., & Jenkins, E. (2013). Outside the pipeline: Reimagining science education for nonscientists. *Science*, 340(6130), 314-317. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1230855>

- Furtak, E. M., Seidel, T., Iverson, H., & Briggs, D. C. (2012). Experimental and quasi-experimental studies of inquiry-based science teaching: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 82(3), 300-329. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312457206>
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gilbert, J. K. (2006). On the nature of "context" in chemical education. *International Journal of Science Education*, 28(9), 957-976. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690600702470>
- Glazer, N. (2011). Challenges with graph interpretation: A review of the literature. *Studies in Science Education*, 47(2), 183-210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2011.605307>
- Honey, M., Pearson, G., & Schweingruber, H. (Eds.). (2014). *STEM integration in K-12 education: Status, prospects, and an agenda for research*. National Academies Press.
- Hoskins, S. G., Stevens, L. M., & Nehm, R. H. (2007). Selective use of the primary literature transforms the classroom into a virtual laboratory. *Genetics*, 176(3), 1381-1389. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.107.071183>
- Hug, B., & McNeill, K. L. (2008). Use of first-hand and second-hand data in science: Does data type influence classroom conversations? *International Journal of Science Education*, 30(13), 1725-1751. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690701506945>
- Kelley, T. R., & Knowles, J. G. (2016). A conceptual framework for integrated STEM education. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 3(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-016-0046-z>
- Krajcik, J. S., & Shin, N. (2014). Project-based learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 275-297). Cambridge University Press.
- Lackéus, M. (2015). *Entrepreneurship in education: What, why, when, how*. OECD. https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/BGP_Entrepreneurship-in-Education.pdf
- Lane, S., & Stone, C. A. (2006). Performance assessment. In R. L. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (4th ed., pp. 387-431). American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers.
- Larmer, J., Mergendoller, J., & Boss, S. (2015). *Setting the standard for project based learning*. ASCD.
- Lederman, N. G. (2007). Nature of science: Past, present, and future. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), *Handbook of research on science education* (pp. 831-879). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McComas, W. F., Clough, M. P., & Almazroa, H. (1998). The role and character of the nature of science in science education. In W. F. McComas (Ed.), *The nature of science in science education* (pp. 3-39). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-47215-5_1
- Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan. (2023). *"Biologiya" fənni üzrə təhsil proqramı (kurikulum) (VII-XI siniflər)*. Institute of Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017-1054. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x>
- Nasir, N. S., Rosebery, A. S., Warren, B., & Lee, C. D. (2014). Learning as a cultural process: Achieving equity through diversity. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 686-706). Cambridge University Press.
- Nasr, S. H. (1996). *Religion and the order of nature*. Oxford University Press.
- National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. (2011). *Expanding underrepresented minority participation: America's science and technology talent at the crossroads*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/12984>
- National Education Association. (2012). *Preparing 21st century students for a global society: An educator's guide to the "Four Cs."* NEA.

- National Research Council. (2012). *A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/13165>
- NGSS Lead States. (2013). *Next Generation Science Standards: For states, by states*. National Academies Press.
- OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 results (Volume I): What students know and can do*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en>
- Osborne, J. (2014). Teaching scientific practices: Meeting the challenge of change. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 25(2), 177-196. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-014-9384-1>
- Parong, J., & Mayer, R. E. (2018). Learning science in immersive virtual reality. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 110(6), 785-797. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000241>
- Pellegrino, J. W., & Hilton, M. L. (Eds.). (2012). *Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/13398>
- Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 921-958. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207308221>
- Porter, A. C. (2002). Measuring the content of instruction: Uses in research and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X031007003>
- Remillard, J. T., & Heck, D. J. (2014). Conceptualizing the curriculum enactment process in mathematics education. *ZDM Mathematics Education*, 46(5), 705-718. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-014-0600-4>
- Robeva, R., & Laubenbacher, R. (2009). Mathematical biology education: Beyond calculus. *Science*, 325(5939), 542-543. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1169637>
- Rutten, N., van Joolingen, W. R., & van der Veen, J. T. (2012). The learning effects of computer simulations in science education. *Computers & Education*, 58(1), 136-153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.07.017>
- Schmidt, W. H., Wang, H. C., & McKnight, C. C. (2005). Curriculum coherence: An examination of US mathematics and science content standards from an international perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(5), 525-559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027042000294682>
- Schwab, K. (2017). *The fourth industrial revolution*. Currency.
- Silova, I. (Ed.). (2009). *Post-socialism is not dead: (Re)reading the global in comparative education*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Slater, T. F., Ryan, J. M., & Samson, S. L. (1997). Impact and dynamics of portfolio assessment and traditional assessment in a college physics course. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 34(3), 255-271. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-2736\(199703\)34:3<255::AID-TEA4>3.0.CO;2-P](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(199703)34:3<255::AID-TEA4>3.0.CO;2-P)
- Spring, J. (2008). Research on globalization and education. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(2), 330-363. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308317846>
- Stern, P. C. (2000). Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(3), 407-424. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00175>
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
- UNESCO. (2017). *Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000247444>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

- Weintrop, D., Beheshti, E., Horn, M., Orton, K., Jona, K., Trouille, L., & Wilensky, U. (2016). Defining computational thinking for mathematics and science classrooms. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 25(1), 127-147. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-015-9581-5>
- Wendell, K. B., & Rogers, C. (2013). Engineering design-based science, science content performance, and science attitudes in elementary school. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 102(4), 513-540. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20026>
- Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., & Braaten, M. (2008). Beyond the scientific method: Model-based inquiry as a new paradigm of preference for school science investigations. *Science Education*, 92(5), 941-967. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20259>
- Wu, H. K., & Shah, P. (2004). Exploring visuospatial thinking in chemistry learning. *Science Education*, 88(3), 465-492. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.10126>
- Zeidler, D. L., Sadler, T. D., Simmons, M. L., & Howes, E. V. (2005). Beyond STS: A research-based framework for socioscientific issues education. *Science Education*, 89(3), 357-377. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20048>