Unlocking High-Quality Teaching: A Synthesis and Analysis of the OECD 2025 Framework

Full version of the report

Section 1: A Renewed Focus on Classroom Practice

The Impetus for Change: Stagnating Student Achievement

The international education landscape is at a critical juncture. Despite decades of reform initiatives and significant investments in technological innovations, large-scale assessments, most notably the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), reveal a persistent and troubling trend: stagnating or even declining student performance across many participating countries.[1] It is within this context that the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has published its 2025 report,

Unlocking High-Quality Teaching. The report serves as a direct and timely response to this global challenge, arguing that the path to significant and sustainable improvement in education does not lie in the pursuit of "sweeping educational fads" or the "latest trends or technologies".[1]

Instead, the OECD posits a more powerful and "potentially safer" approach: a return to the fundamentals of instruction through the systematic enhancement and refinement of existing, evidence-based teaching practices.[1] This perspective represents a strategic intervention in the often-turbulent market of education reform. It implicitly critiques the cycle of politically driven, top-down initiatives and the proliferation of technological solutions that frequently fail to deliver lasting impact. By grounding its recommendations in the "current realities of classrooms," the report champions a more sustainable, professional-led model of change that empowers educators rather than imposing external, and often disconnected, solutions.[2] This marks a deliberate shift from a paradigm of revolutionary, disruptive change to one of

evolutionary, incremental, and professionally grounded improvement.

Deconstructing Teaching: A Synthesis of Science, Art, and Craft

At the heart of the report is a sophisticated and multifaceted conceptualisation of teaching that moves beyond simplistic definitions. It presents a three-dimensional model that respects the inherent complexity of the profession by integrating three critical, interwoven dimensions.[1]

- **Teaching as a Science:** This dimension asserts that instructional practices must be firmly grounded in rigorous empirical evidence from cognitive science and educational research. It emphasises the importance of understanding what has a demonstrated causal impact on both cognitive and non-cognitive student outcomes.[1]
- **Teaching as an Art:** This dimension acknowledges that the classroom is an unpredictable and dynamic environment. Effective teaching, therefore, requires immense creativity, intuition, and emotional intelligence. Teachers must be able to adapt in real-time to diverse student needs, navigate complex social dynamics, and respond fluidly to the chaotic realities of daily instruction.[1]
- **Teaching as a Craft:** This dimension frames teaching as a discipline in which mastery is achieved not through innate talent alone, but through deliberate practice, continuous collaborative reflection, and the iterative refinement of skills over time. It requires experiential wisdom and a commitment to ongoing professional learning.[1]

This "Science, Art, Craft" model is a crucial strategic element designed to bridge the persistent gap between academic research and classroom practice. The validation of teaching as an "art" and a "craft" serves to respect and legitimise the professional wisdom and contextual judgment that educators develop through experience. This framing prevents the report's framework from being perceived as another rigid, top-down mandate based solely on "science." It creates a common ground where researchers' evidence can meet teachers' experiential knowledge, fostering a "dynamic process where professional experience and scientific knowledge enrich one another".[3] This approach is essential for securing the trust and active participation of the teaching profession, which is indispensable for any meaningful and lasting improvement.

Methodological Rigor

The credibility of the report's framework is underpinned by a robust, multi-stakeholder methodology that blends quantitative evidence with rich qualitative insights. The findings are

not purely theoretical but are the product of a collaborative and iterative process that integrates multiple streams of data.[2]

The methodology includes:

- **Extensive Research Synthesis:** The framework is built upon a foundation of meta-analyses of peer-reviewed education studies, randomised trials, and findings from global teaching video studies.[5]
- **Qualitative Insights from Practice:** The report draws heavily on direct input from the field, including structured interviews, lesson reflections, and case studies from over 150 schools across more than 40 countries. This grounding in practice provides a deep understanding of the "complex realities of implementing these practices" in diverse, real-world settings.[3]
- **Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration:** The project was further enriched through the OECD's "Schools+ Network," which involves 50 countries and organisations. This network ensures that the report reflects a wide range of perspectives from policymakers, school leaders, and researchers, enhancing its global relevance and applicability.[2]

A Paradigm Shift: From Pedagogical Labels to Universal Practices

Perhaps the report's most significant contribution is its deliberate move away from the polarising and often unproductive debates that have long characterised educational discourse—such as "traditional vs. progressive" or "direct instruction vs. inquiry-based learning".[1] Instead of promoting a particular pedagogical philosophy, the report focuses on identifying the concrete, observable *practices* that are the building blocks of effective instruction across various models.

This approach creates a shared, universal language that allows educators and policymakers to talk across different systems and contexts about teaching and learning.[4] The emphasis is firmly placed on "what teachers do," not simply "what they believe".[1] By deconstructing different pedagogies into their component practices, the report provides a practical and non-ideological framework for professional development and school improvement, focusing on the actions that have been shown to make a difference for a wide range of student outcomes, including academic achievement, social-emotional well-being, and creativity.[4]

Section 2: The Architecture of Effective Instruction:

Five Goals and Twenty Practices

The operational heart of the *Unlocking High-Quality Teaching* report is its comprehensive framework, referred to as the Schools+ Taxonomy. This architecture organises the complexities of high-quality teaching into five central, overarching goals. Each goal is, in turn, supported by four specific, evidence-based instructional practices. This 5x4 structure provides a clear, actionable, and non-prescriptive map for educators, school leaders, and policymakers. It is designed to be universally relevant across different age groups, subject areas, and educational contexts, serving as a common reference point for professional dialogue, reflection, and growth.[1]

The table below provides a consolidated overview of this foundational framework, outlining the five core goals and the 20 associated practices that define the OECD's vision for high-quality teaching.

Table 1: The OECD Framework for High-Quality Teaching Practices

Core Teaching Goal	Associated Instructional Practices
1. Fostering Sustained Cognitive Engagement	1.1 Providing cognitively demanding tasks and ensuring appropriate levels of challenge. 1.2 Linking new content to students' prior knowledge and real-world contexts. 1.3 Using mistakes as learning opportunities and facilitating first-hand experiences. 1.4 Nurturing students' metacognition and self-regulation skills.
2. Crafting and Delivering High-Quality Subject Content	2.1 Giving well-structured, explicit explanations and using strong examples. 2.2 Helping students build deep and lasting conceptual understanding. 2.3 Making connections within and across subjects (interdisciplinary connections). 2.4 Promoting disciplinary thinking and anchoring learning in real-world contexts.
3. Providing Foundational Social-Emotional Support	3.1 Building trusting, respectful, and strong teacher-student relationships. 3.2 Promoting a positive, safe, and inclusive

	classroom climate. 3.3 Recognising and actively supporting students' emotional needs. 3.4 Explicitly teaching social-emotional skills and facilitating positive peer relationships.
4. Enhancing Dynamic Classroom Interaction	4.1 Encouraging and structuring productive peer collaboration. 4.2 Structuring and guiding rich, whole-class discussions. 4.3 Giving students space and opportunities to express their thinking. 4.4 Maintaining dynamic teacher-student dialogue through open-ended, probing questions.
5. Integrating Formative Assessment and Feedback	5.1 Using formative assessment strategies to continuously gauge student understanding. 5.2 Adapting instruction in real-time based on assessment data. 5.3 Providing timely, specific, and constructive feedback that is usable for students. 5.4 Helping students develop self-assessment and self-regulation skills.

2.1 Goal 1: Fostering Sustained Cognitive Engagement

This goal centres on creating the conditions for students to invest sufficient and sustained mental effort to understand complex ideas or solve challenging, unstructured problems.[2] It moves beyond mere behavioural compliance to active, persistent, and challenging thinking. The report acknowledges that cognitive engagement can be "enigmatic" and difficult to observe directly, requiring teachers to skillfully manage the cognitive load of learning opportunities while simultaneously stretching student thinking and nurturing their ability to reflect on and manage their own learning processes.[2] The four associated practices are designed to achieve this delicate balance.[1]

2.2 Goal 2: Crafting and Delivering High-Quality Subject Content

This goal focuses on the imperative to deliver subject matter in a way that is clear, coherent, and meaningful, with the ultimate aim of building deep conceptual understanding rather than achieving superficial curriculum coverage.[1] Its complexity lies in the teacher's ability to look "backwards to students' prior learning to build sound, robust understanding that lasts, but also how to look outwards to ensure that connections and patterns in the subject matter are steadily built and enriched".[3] This involves not just transmitting information, but carefully crafting explanations, making connections, and interrogating the nature of the discipline itself.[3]

2.3 Goal 3: Providing Foundational Social-Emotional Support

This goal underscores the critical importance of creating a safe, respectful, and inclusive classroom environment that actively supports student well-being.[1] The report positions social-emotional support not as an add-on, but as a fundamental prerequisite for effective academic learning and cognitive engagement.[5] This involves fostering a supportive atmosphere, building strong and positive relationships, and explicitly teaching the skills students need to navigate their emotional and social worlds.[6]

2.4 Goal 4: Enhancing Dynamic Classroom Interaction

This goal aims to elevate the quality of dialogue within the classroom, moving beyond simple, surface-level exchanges to facilitate rich, substantive interactions. This applies to both teacher-student dialogue and peer-to-peer collaboration.[1] The objective is to create a classroom where students are encouraged to express their thinking, engage in collaborative problem-solving, and participate in structured, whole-class discussions that deepen collective understanding.[1]

2.5 Goal 5: Integrating Formative Assessment and Feedback

This goal reframes assessment not as a final judgment of learning, but as an ongoing process integrated directly into instruction. The core purpose is to continuously monitor, diagnose, and

support student learning *during* the learning process.[1] Teachers use real-time insights to adapt their instruction to meet student needs, while providing feedback that guides student progress.[1] A key caveat highlighted in the report is that feedback must be carefully managed; when misapplied, it can be demotivating. To be effective, feedback must be timely, specific, constructive, and focused on the task, not the student.[1]

Section 3: From Theory to Practice: Implementation Gaps and Research Needs

The OECD report extends beyond the presentation of an ideal framework by providing a candid assessment of its real-world implementation. The "Taxonomy in Action" reveals a significant and uneven gap between the 20 evidence-based practices and the current realities of many classrooms. This analysis of implementation challenges and remaining research questions provides a powerful diagnostic tool for education systems seeking to enact meaningful improvement.

The "Taxonomy in Action": A Diagnosis of Classroom Realities

The report's analysis of data from over 150 schools indicates that not all five dimensions of high-quality teaching receive equal attention or are implemented with equal fidelity. This creates an imbalance that can hinder overall instructional effectiveness. The key findings on this implementation gap are [5]:

- **Cognitive Engagement: Undervalued and Underutilised.** Practices designed to promote deep and challenging thinking, such as prompting metacognition or encouraging student elaboration, are often marginalised. The report finds that in many contexts, these practices are squeezed out by the pressures of rigid curriculum pacing guides and a narrow focus on preparation for standardised tests.[5] Only 43% of observed classrooms consistently displayed high levels of cognitive engagement.[5]
- **Quality Subject Content: Strong Intent, Weak Support.** While there is a widespread intention among educators to deliver high-quality content, the systemic support needed to do so is often lacking. This includes insufficient time for deep planning, a lack of high-quality curriculum materials, and limited professional development focused on building deep conceptual understanding.[5]
- **Social-Emotional Support: Missing from Metrics.** Despite a strong and growing

evidence base linking social-emotional well-being to academic outcomes, this dimension remains under-prioritised in many school policies, evaluation frameworks, and daily routines.[5] Many teachers report feeling unprepared to meet the diverse emotional needs of their students, indicating a critical need for targeted professional development in this area.[1]

- **Formative Assessment: High Impact, Low Uptake.** The report identifies formative assessment and feedback as the most underused yet potentially most transformative dimension of teaching.[5] While its impact on student learning is well-documented, its systematic and effective implementation remains a significant challenge, often due to a lack of training, appropriate tools, and time for teachers to analyse data and adapt their instruction accordingly.[5]

These diagnostic categories—"undervalued," "weak support," "missing from metrics," and "high impact, low uptake"—are more than just descriptive findings. They constitute a ready-made audit framework that system leaders can apply to their own contexts. A school principal or ministry official can use this structure to ask critical questions: "Where in our professional standards and evaluation rubrics is 'cognitive engagement' explicitly defined and valued?" or "Why does our system profess a commitment to subject quality ('strong intent') yet provide inadequate resources and training ('weak support')?" This transforms the report from a static document into a dynamic instrument for systemic self-assessment and strategic planning.

The Evidence Gap

The report is commendably transparent about the current state of educational research, acknowledging that the strength of the evidence base varies across the five goals. The best available evidence for a direct causal impact on student outcomes is strongest for practices related to **classroom interaction** and **formative assessment**. The evidence base is less developed and more correlational for **cognitive engagement, quality subject content, and social-emotional support**.[3]

This discrepancy is partly due to the inherent difficulty of conceptualising and measuring these more complex domains in controlled research settings.[3] The report thus calls for further research to better understand what works, where, for whom, and under what specific conditions these practices are most impactful.[3] By openly identifying these evidence gaps, the OECD is performing a subtle but powerful act of agenda-setting for the global education research community. It signals to funding bodies, universities, and research institutes where future efforts should be directed. This constitutes a strategic call to action to move away from research conducted in sterile "laboratories" and toward more complex, practice-led, and

participatory research designs capable of capturing the nuances of these harder-to-measure, yet critically important, domains of teaching.[4]

The Challenge of Translation and Adaptation

A final and critical challenge identified in the report is the difficulty of translating research into widespread and effective classroom practice. This is not a simple matter of information dissemination. It requires a complex process of interpretation, professional reflection, and a willingness to re-evaluate long-established habits and routines.[3]

Crucially, the report emphasises that context is paramount. A practice that is effective in one setting may need significant adaptation to work in another, given differences in student populations, available resources, and school culture.[4] Therefore, the framework is intended to be used as a guide for professional reflection, not as a rigid script for standardisation. Teachers must retain their professional judgment and autonomy to select and adapt strategies to meet the specific needs of their students.[5] This underscores the importance of viewing teachers not as passive recipients of "best practices," but as active co-designers of pedagogy who skillfully blend scientific evidence with contextual insight.[1]

Section 4: The Ecosystem of Excellence: Cultivating School-Level Conditions for Success

A central thesis of the *Unlocking High-Quality Teaching* report is that excellent teaching cannot be cultivated or sustained in isolation. The report emphatically states that achieving high-quality instruction is "not a solitary pursuit" but is profoundly dependent on the broader school environment, culture, and leadership.[2] This perspective shifts the focus of improvement efforts from the individual teacher to the organisational conditions that enable all teachers to thrive.

Beyond the Individual Teacher

The report argues that even the most talented, knowledgeable, and dedicated teachers will

struggle to implement high-impact practices effectively if the school environment hinders rather than supports their work.[1] Systemic factors such as class size, curriculum design, assessment policies, and the wider school climate play a decisive role in shaping the types of practices a teacher can enact in the classroom.[3] This reframes the concept of "teacher quality" itself. Instead of viewing it solely as a set of individual attributes a teacher possesses, the report presents it as an outcome of the system in which the teacher works. This implies that investing in the improvement of school-level systems and culture may yield a higher return on investment for improving teaching quality at scale than a narrow focus on recruiting or removing individual teachers. It makes the cultivation of high-quality teaching a collective, organisational responsibility.

The Critical Role of School Leadership

Within this educational ecosystem, school leaders are identified as the most critical agents of change. Their role extends far beyond administration and management; they are the primary architects of the school's professional culture and the key enablers of instructional excellence.[2] It is the school leader who navigates the external pressures and internal dynamics to create the conditions that allow teachers to excel in their craft.[3] They are responsible for translating system-level policies into supportive school-level practices and for buffering their staff from initiatives that detract from the core work of teaching and learning.

Essential School-Level Enablers

The report moves beyond generalities to identify a specific set of "enabling instruments" that school leaders must cultivate to create an environment where the 20 high-impact instructional practices can flourish. These essential school-level conditions are [1]:

- **A Collaborative and Reflective Culture:** High-quality teaching is rarely built alone. Effective schools institutionalise routines that make instructional dialogue and collaborative inquiry the norm. This includes providing structured time for shared lesson planning, peer observation with developmental feedback, instructional rounds, and co-teaching.[1]
- **Development-Oriented Feedback and Evaluation:** The report calls for a fundamental shift in teacher appraisal, moving away from systems focused on administrative compliance and accountability toward developmental models. In such models, evaluation is a tool for professional growth, utilising coaching, peer review, and formative observation to help teachers reflect on and refine their practice in a low-stakes,

supportive environment.[1]

- **Protected Time and Space for Professional Work:** One of the most significant barriers to instructional improvement is the lack of time. The report argues that providing and protecting non-contact time for teachers to engage in deep pedagogical reflection, collaborative planning, and professional learning is not a luxury but a necessity. This call to "protect time" is a direct challenge to prevailing policy trends that often increase teacher workload with administrative tasks. It reframes the debate about workload by arguing for the strategic reallocation of teacher time toward the high-leverage activities that are the true engine of instructional improvement.[1]
- **Professional Autonomy and Trust:** The framework is intended to guide professional judgment, not replace it. School leaders must foster a culture of trust that respects teachers' expertise and empowers them with the autonomy to adapt evidence-based practices to the unique needs of their students and contexts. Evidence should be used to spark reflection and inform decisions, not to enforce a rigid, one-size-fits-all approach to teaching.[1]

Section 5: A Roadmap for Systemic Advancement: Recommendations for Key Stakeholders

The *Unlocking High-Quality Teaching* report culminates in a clear and actionable roadmap for systemic change. It translates its extensive analysis into a coherent set of recommendations tailored to the distinct roles and responsibilities of three key stakeholder groups: policymakers, school and district leaders, and the research community. The report's ultimate message is one of systemic alignment; lasting improvement requires coordinated and simultaneous action across all levels of the education system. The recommendations are not a menu of discrete options to be selected from, but an interconnected system of reforms that must work in concert to recalibrate the entire educational enterprise to support the craft of teaching.

The table below summarizes the core recommendations for each stakeholder group, providing a concise overview of the proposed path forward.

Table 2: Summary of Recommendations for Systemic Improvement

Stakeholder Group	Recommended Action	Rationale / Objective
National and Regional	1. Integrate the Schools+ Taxonomy into professional	To align system-wide expectations for teacher

Policymakers	standards.	licensure, evaluation, and career progression with research on effective practice.
	2. Fund tools and training for high-impact practices.	To provide the necessary resources, particularly for formative assessment, to translate policy into tangible classroom change.
	3. Shift evaluation from compliance to learning.	To transform teacher appraisal from an administrative exercise into a meaningful process of professional growth and development.
	4. Protect time and autonomy for professional work.	To ensure teachers have the necessary time and capacity to engage in the collaborative reflection and planning required to refine their craft.
School and District Leaders	1. Champion a culture of instructional dialogue.	To make collaborative inquiry, peer observation, and shared planning the standard operating procedure within schools.
	2. Foster emotionally supportive learning environments.	To prioritize student and staff well-being as a foundational prerequisite for academic success.
	3. Use evidence to empower, not standardize.	To promote the framework as a tool for professional reflection while respecting teacher autonomy and

		contextual judgment.
	4. Prioritize equity in pedagogical innovation.	To ensure that high-quality teaching practices and support are scaled equitably, especially in underserved communities.
The Research Community	1. Fill the causality and context gap.	To strengthen the evidence base for all five teaching goals and understand how practices work in diverse, real-world settings.
	2. Develop participatory, practice-led research designs.	To make research more relevant and useful by co-designing studies with educators and centering classroom realities.
	3. Investigate how systems enable practice.	To shift focus from studying isolated interventions to understanding the systemic conditions that support or hinder improvement at scale.

5.1 Imperatives for National and Regional Policymakers

Policymakers are responsible for creating the "infrastructure of quality" that enables effective teaching to flourish system-wide. Their actions must align policies on standards, funding, evaluation, and working conditions with the report's evidence base. Key recommendations include:

- **Integrate the Schools+ Taxonomy into Professional Standards:** National and regional bodies should revise teacher competency frameworks, licensure requirements, and career advancement criteria to explicitly embed the five dimensions of high-quality

teaching. This ensures that system-wide expectations are aligned with robust research.[5]

- **Fund Tools and Training for High-Impact Practices:** Policy must be backed by resources. This includes allocating specific funding for high-quality professional development, digital diagnostic tools, and collaborative planning platforms, with a particular emphasis on building capacity in formative assessment, the most underutilized dimension.[5]
- **Shift Evaluation from Compliance to Learning:** Teacher appraisal systems that are perceived as purely administrative or punitive should be reformed. Policies should encourage and support the adoption of developmental models that prioritize coaching, peer review, and formative observation to make evaluation a genuine driver of professional growth.[5]
- **Protect Time and Autonomy for Professional Work:** Policies should address the chronic issue of teacher workload. This can be achieved through mandates for protected, non-contact time for collaborative work and pedagogical reflection, as well as through system-level workload audits designed to eliminate low-impact tasks and prioritize quality instruction.[5]

5.2 Strategic Priorities for School and District Leaders

School and district leaders are tasked with translating policy into practice and creating "cultures that support the craft" of teaching. Their focus must be on building the organizational capacity for continuous improvement. Key priorities include:

- **Champion a Culture of Instructional Dialogue:** Leaders must actively institutionalize routines for professional collaboration. This means scheduling and protecting time for shared lesson planning, peer observation, and instructional rounds, making them a non-negotiable part of the school's culture.[5]
- **Foster Emotionally Supportive Learning Environments:** Recognizing that social-emotional support is under-prioritized, leaders should conduct audits of school policies, discipline procedures, and classroom routines to ensure they actively contribute to an environment where every student feels safe, seen, and supported.[5]
- **Use Evidence to Empower, Not Standardize:** Leaders must skillfully use the Schools+ Taxonomy as a framework for professional dialogue and reflection, not as a rigid checklist for compliance. They must protect teachers' autonomy to adapt practices to their specific contexts, thereby fostering a culture of empowered professionalism.[5]
- **Prioritize Equity in Pedagogical Innovation:** Innovation efforts often benefit well-resourced schools the most. Leaders have a responsibility to ensure that high-quality teaching practices are scaled equitably by directing additional support, coaching, and resources to underperforming or underserved schools and communities.[5]

5.3 Future Directions for the Research Community

The research community is called upon to "close the gaps that matter most" by producing evidence that is more relevant, causal, and useful for practitioners and policymakers. This requires a shift in research paradigms. Future directions include:

- **Fill the Causality and Context Gap:** Researchers should prioritize experimental and longitudinal studies to strengthen the causal evidence base, especially for cognitive engagement and social-emotional support. Furthermore, research must move beyond aggregated findings to investigate how practices work differently in various contexts, with a focus on marginalized and under-resourced communities.[3]
- **Develop Participatory, Practice-Led Research Designs:** The report advocates for a move away from a top-down model where researchers study teachers, toward a collaborative model where researchers work *with* teachers. Co-designing studies and centering the expertise of practitioners will ensure that research questions and findings are relevant to the complex realities of the classroom.[5]
- **Investigate How Systems Enable Practice:** There is a need for more research that examines the bigger picture. Instead of focusing on isolated teaching practices, studies should investigate the systemic conditions—including leadership behaviors, policy environments, and organizational structures—that enable or constrain the implementation of high-quality teaching at scale.[5]

Works cited

1. Unlocking High-Quality Teaching. A Comprehensive Analysis Based on the OECD 2025 Report. - FESIN - Finnish Education System Institute, accessed on August 22, 2025, https://www.fesin.fi/unlocking-high-quality-teaching-a-comprehensive-analysis-based-on-the-oecd-2025-report/
2. Unlocking High-Quality Teaching - OECD, accessed on August 22, 2025, https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/unlocking-high-quality-teaching_f5b82176-en.html
3. OECD Unlocking High-Quality Teaching - ISIS Europa, accessed on August 22, 2025, https://www.isiseuropa.edu.it/oecd-unlocking-high-quality-teaching/
4. The Research Files Episode 99: Unlocking high-quality teaching - Teacher Magazine, accessed on August 22, 2025, https://www.teachermagazine.com/au_en/articles/the-research-files-episode-99-unlocking-high-quality-teaching
5. What Makes High-Quality Teaching in 2025? - Sustainability, accessed on August 22, 2025,

https://www.winssolutions.org/what-makes-high-quality-teaching-in-2025/
6. OECD Report Offers 5 Goals + 20 Strong Practices for Teaching - Sustainability, accessed on August 22, 2025, https://www.winssolutions.org/teaching-5-goals-and-20-practices/
7. Unlocking high quality teaching - Analysis & Policy Observatory, accessed on August 22, 2025, https://apo.org.au/node/330332
8. Unlocking High-Quality Teaching, accessed on August 22, 2025, https://www.cnaes.edu.cn/en/post/30454
9. Unlocking the Potential of Teacher Feedback - OECD, accessed on August 22, 2025, https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/unlocking-the-potential-of-teacher-feedback_5jxwvhjc0ghj-en.html