FIELD BRIEF

Three-phase analytical assessment of the Philippine Reframed General Education Curriculum, condensed.

DOC B · LINKEDIN-PRIMED

DOC ID · **Reframed-GE-2026-Analysis**
VERSION · **1.1**
DATE · **9 May 2026**
AUTHOR · **Jess Victoria**
BASIS · **Doc A canonical study**

PREFACE

About this brief

This document presents an analytical assessment of the Philippine Commission on Higher Education's (CHED) Draft 2026 Reframed General Education Curriculum, dated 16 April 2026. The analysis runs three sequential passes: a comparative benchmark of the draft against fourteen international tertiary general-education systems on six lenses; an AI-era stress test of the five mandated core courses against medium- and long-term labor forecasts for the 2027-2032 graduating cohort; and an implementation-realism review of whether the system that has to deliver the draft can.

THREE PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

1. The draft scores **11 of 18** against international comparators. It sits cleanly above the ASEAN regional cohort (Indonesia, Vietnam, Malaysia), at parity with CUHK and SNU, one step below India's CCFUP, and well below the Asian flagships and US benchmarks. The shape of the score is more telling than the total: PH has elevated AI awareness, civic-global balance, and future-of-work framing above ASEAN regional peers but has held the quantitative floor at floor.

2. The course-level AI-era fit composite is **9 of 15**. The universal disclosure clauses produce the appearance of AI integration without the underlying skill formation. Course 5 (Labor Education) is the most concerning gap relative to cohort exposure: the structural sector that has employed Filipino college graduates at scale for twenty-five years (BPO/IT-BPM, 1.8 million jobs, 8.2% of GDP, 64% of services exports) is the single most automation-exposed sector in the country.

3. The implementation infrastructure scores **8 of 18**. Faculty pipeline, library and digital-tool resources, assessment infrastructure, and typology equity all score 1 of 3. Three implementation requirements are not addressed anywhere in the public-policy stack: an Institutional GE quality-control framework, a post-CMO 22 s.2021 digital-infrastructure standard, and a Reframed-GE-specific SUC/LUC support program.

The reform is in active public contestation as of early May 2026. The intervention window is open.

SNAPSHOT

Three-phase score

COMPARATOR
11/18
Mid-pack. Above ASEAN, below Asian flagships.

AI-ERA FIT
9/15
Course-level composite. Course 5 most concerning.

REALISM
8/18
Designed, not resourced.

COHORT EXPOSURE
~33%
PH workers highly AI-exposed (IMF 2025).

PHASE A · COMPARATOR MATRIX

15 systems × 6 lenses

PH lands at 11/18, mid-pack. Above ASEAN regional cohort. At parity with CUHK and SNU. One step below India CCFUP, the most relevant peer (shared SHS-strand handoff). Substantially below Asian flagships and US benchmarks.

System	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	Total /18
HKU (Hong Kong)	3	3	3	3	3	3	18
NUS (Singapore)	3	3	3	3	3	3	18
NTU (Singapore)	3	3	2	3	3	3	17
MIT	3	3	3	3	1	3	16
Harvard	2	3	2	2	3	3	15
UTokyo Komaba	2	3	3	2	1	3	14
India CCFUP	2	2	2	2	2	3	13
UCL BASc (UK)	2	3	2	2	1	3	13
SNU (South Korea)	1	2	3	2	1	2	11
CUHK (Hong Kong)	1	2	2	1	2	3	11
PH PSG-GE 2026 Draft	2	2	1	2	2	2	11
Tsinghua (China)	1	2	2	1	1	2	9
Malaysia MPU	0	1	0	1	1	1	4
Indonesia MKWU	0	1	0	0	1	1	3
Vietnam MOET PT	0	1	0	0	1	1	3

L1 Future-of-work **L2** Cognitive density **L3** Quant floor **L4** AI-digital depth **L5** Civic-global **L6** SHS articulation

SYNTHESIS

Three shape problems

The draft is thoughtful and structurally improved. The risk is in three coherent shape problems that compound.

SHAPE PROBLEM 1

Quantitative floor held at floor

PH non-STEM students get ~3 units of quantitative work. MIT 72. NUS 8. HKU 9+. India 9. Single largest divergence from any peer above PH on the table. Structurally incongruent with an AI labor forecast where rising-premium skills are heavily quant/oversight-flavoured.

SHAPE PROBLEM 2

Disclosure governance, capability gap

Universal AI/integrity disclosure architecture is ethically sound. It produces the appearance of AI integration without underlying skill formation. Disclosure tells you what was used; it does not teach capability.

SHAPE PROBLEM 3

Designed, not resourced

OBE-aligned, three-level-scaffolded program at the autonomous HEI standard does not exist at the SUC/LUC standard. Plausible outcome: rebadged compliance with the old curriculum under new labels.

The 2027-2032 cohort enters the labor market the curriculum was designed for, not the one that exists.

INTERVENTIONS

Three high-leverage moves

Where the gap analysis points to concentrated leverage. Not opinion.

INTERVENTION 1

Funded faculty-development annex

Two-year national bridging program for current GE faculty into Course 2 and Course 3. Funded, certificated, pre-pilot completion required. AI-tool fluency, current quantitative pedagogy, applied research ethics. Without this, AY 2027-28 ships the courses but not the capability.

INTERVENTION 2

Course 3 unit reweighting

Three units cannot carry data + descriptives + qualitative + ethics + AI transparency + inquiry + reporting. Expand to 6, split into 3a/3b, or partner with major-specific quant-methods. Option (c) likely most realistic.

INTERVENTION 3 · MOST TIMELY

Labor Education modernisation directive

CHED clarifying memo updating Course 5 to include AI/automation reality. Sectoral exposure mapping; reskilling pathways; labor rights in AI-augmented workplaces; career-building under task substitution. RA 11551 IRR is fresh; window is live.

QUIET STRENGTHS

Three findings the analysis elevates

STRENGTH 1

Course 4 (Rizal) is among the most AI-era durable

Hermeneutic interpretation, defended civic advocacy, culturally-rooted judgment under public scrutiny. All rising-premium per WEF, Autor, McKinsey. The national-identity anchor is future-proof, not vestigial.

STRENGTH 2

Civic-global balance is well-calibrated

Few systems achieve it. Tsinghua, Indonesia, Vietnam, Malaysia skew national. MIT, UCL, UTokyo skew light on civic. PH joins the small group with Harvard and HKU.

STRENGTH 3

OBE constructive-alignment is sophisticated

GEO-CO-ILO three-level scaffolding, aligned TLAs, diagnostic-formative-culminating progression, CQI evidence. Best-practice OBE design. The architecture is sound.

SOURCES

Source attribution

Primary: CHED Draft CMO 16 April 2026. **PH public record:** EDCOM II Final Report "Turning Point" (Jan 2026); NatPlan 2026-2035; CHED hearing 5 May 2026; Ateneo position letter May 2026; Tribune 7 May 2026; CMO 22 s.2021; RA 1425; RA 10931; RA 11551 + IRR. **Comparators (university handbooks accessed 9 May 2026):** NUS, NTU, HKU (incl. AILT1001), CUHK, UTokyo Komaba, SNU, Tsinghua, India CCFUP, Indonesia MKWU, Vietnam MOET, Malaysia MPU, Chulalongkorn, Harvard, MIT, UCL BASc. **AI labor forecast:** WEF Future of Jobs 2025; OECD Future of Education and Skills 2030; OECD AI Literacy Framework 2025-2026; IMF SDN/2024/001 (Cazzaniga et al.); IMF WP 2025/043 (Cucio & Hennig); ILO WP140 2025; Anthropic Economic Index Mar/Jan 2026, Sep 2025; McKinsey MGI 2024 + Agentic Organization 2025; Goldman Sachs 2023/2025; Eloundou et al. arXiv 2303.10130; Acemoglu NBER 32487; Autor NBER 32140; Stanford Digital Economy Lab Nov 2025; AMRO Philippines IT-BPM 2025; BSP Gen AI 2025. **Frameworks:** OECD Learning Compass 2030; UNESCO Reimagining Our Futures Together 2021; WEF Education 4.0.

Full source detail and analytical depth in Doc A canonical study.