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COVID-19 has reminded us all that schools are not solely places for academic learning, but also places that support students’ development in their relationships with the wider world, as well as with their peers and families and those closest to them. Schools are communities where students can safely learn new knowledge, acquire a lifelong learning mindset, regulate their emotions and learn about how to behave in their societies. The role of the teacher is thus not solely to develop academic learning, but also, as with many initiatives and strategies highlighted during the crisis, to support them in this holistic approach to learning.

Published in April 2021 by the OECD and Education International, the *Ten Principles for Effective and Equitable Educational Recovery* (hereinafter Principles) were intended to facilitate the collaboration of education authorities and the teaching profession, and their organisations, navigate the health crisis effectively and reshape education systems after the pandemic. The *Principles* emphasised that learning and teaching were not just a transactional service but a relational and social experience (OECD and Education International, 2021).

The Principles have been distributed widely and provided background for the US-hosted International Summit on the Teaching Profession (ISTP) in 2021. The main themes of ISTP 2021 focussed on the development of education of the whole child and its relationship to achieving equity, teacher professionalism and well-being. The Summit recognised that what was needed was intentional collaboration at system level to achieve this goal. This position paper seeks to elaborate on these themes. It explores the connection between student and teacher well-being and their relationship with schools as communities. It summarises current OECD and Education International perspectives. They complement each other in many aspects and often use a mutual evidence base. Both the 2021 ISTP and the *Principles* have contributed to a new and more concerted focus on these areas in many education jurisdictions and have fed into this paper.

The paper opens with summaries of evidence and perspectives from the OECD and Education International. It then identifies within the *Principles* proposals relevant to the issues of education for the whole Child, student and teacher well-being. The paper concludes with a set of questions which are intended to carry on forward discussion on this vital area of learning.

**The OECD perspective***

The results from OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (OECD, 2019) show that students differ greatly in how satisfied they are with their lives, their motivation to achieve, how anxious they feel about their schoolwork, their expectations for the future, and their perceptions of being bullied at school or treated unfairly by their teachers both between and within countries. Students in some of the
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1 This section is based on the following reports and working paper: Schleicher (2021), OECD (2020), OECD (2017), OECD (2020), Viac and Fraser (2020) and Thorn and Vincent-Lancrin (2021).
countries that are high performing according to PISA 2018 results report comparatively low satisfaction with life. However, others show that it is possible to combine good learning outcomes and high student satisfaction with life (Schleicher, 2021[3]).

Students’ well-being is often described as the result of interactions among four inter-related domains: cognitive, psychological, social and physical. Each dimension can be considered both as an outcome and as an enabling condition with respect to the other dimensions, and ultimately with students’ overall quality of life. Students need cognitive well-being to participate fully in today’s society, as lifelong learners, effective workers and engaged citizens. Psychological well-being refers to self-esteem, motivation, resilience, self-efficacy, hope and optimism (and low levels of anxiety, stress, depression and distorted views of the self and others). Students’ relationships with their family, their peers and their teachers, and their feelings about their social life in and outside of school are also key elements of their well-being. Finally, students’ health and the adoption of a healthy lifestyle contribute to their physical well-being.

**Students’ life satisfaction**

On average across OECD countries, 67% of students reported being satisfied with their lives (students who reported between 7 and 10 on the PISA life-satisfaction scale). Some 68% of students across OECD countries agreed that their life has a clear meaning or purpose. However, between 2015 and 2018, the share of students satisfied with their lives shrank by five percentage points on average across OECD countries. There is considerable variation within countries: girls and disadvantaged students were less likely to report being satisfied with their lives than boys and advantaged students, respectively. Students with the least exposure to bullying reported an average of 7.5 on the 10-point life-satisfaction scale; students with the greatest exposure to bullying averaged 6.3 on the scale. PISA learning outcomes were higher among students who reported they are “somehow satisfied” and “moderately satisfied” with their lives and lower among students who reported they are “not satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their lives.

**Students’ social connections**

Across OECD countries, the majority of students reported that they felt socially connected at school. For instance, three out of four students agreed or strongly agreed that they could make friends easily at school. The majority of students in all countries that participated in PISA reported that they feel they belong to the school community. However, also here in the vast majority of countries, students’ sense of belonging at school has weakened since 2003. Students who reported that they feel like outsiders at school were, on average across OECD countries, about three times more likely to be unsatisfied with their lives compared with students who did not report so. Students who reported that they feel like outsiders scored 22 points lower in PISA than students who did not report so. On average across OECD countries, students who reported a greater sense of belonging scored higher in the PISA reading assessment after accounting for socio-economic status. Students reported a greater sense of belonging when they also reported higher levels of co-operation among their peers, whereas students’ perception of competition was not associated with their sense of belonging at school. Students who reported a greater sense of belonging were also more likely to expect to complete a university degree even after accounting for socio-economic status, gender, immigrant background and overall reading performance.

**Peers’ possible negative influence on well-being (bullying)**

While peers do usually have a positive influence on student well-being, they can also be part of a distressing threat to it through bullying. Bullying can have serious consequences for the victim, the bully and the bystanders. Bullying can be inflicted directly through physical (hitting, punching or kicking) and verbal (name-calling or mocking) abuse. And then there is relational bullying, where some children are
ignored, excluded from games or parties, rejected by peers, or are the victims of gossip and other forms of public humiliation and shaming. PISA highlights a significant prevalence of all these forms. On average across OECD countries, around 11% of students reported that they are frequently (at least a few times per month) made fun of, 7% reported that they are frequently left out of things, and 8% reported that they are frequently the object of nasty rumours in school. And around 4% of students – roughly one per class - reported that they are hit or pushed at least a few times per month, a percentage that varies from 1% to 9.5% across countries. Students who are frequently bullied may feel constantly insecure, on guard, and have clear difficulties finding their place at school. They tend to feel unaccepted and isolated and, as a result, are often withdrawn.

On average across OECD countries, 42% of students who reported that they are frequently bullied – but only 15% of students who reported that they are not frequently bullied – reported feeling like an outsider at school. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to preventing bullying, but schools must work for more effective anti-bullying programmes, follow a whole-of-school approach that includes training for teachers on bullying behaviour and how to handle it and strategies to provide information to and engage with parents. Teachers need to communicate to students that they will not tolerate any form of bullying; and parents need to be involved in school planning and responses to bullying.

**Teachers influence on student well-being**

Teachers have a major influence on students’ feelings of belonging at school. In (OECD, 2017[4]), students tended to report more positive relations with and much higher levels of support from their teachers in “happy” schools (schools where students’ life satisfaction is above the average in the country) than in “unhappy” schools. Students were also less likely to report anxiety if their teacher provided individual help when they are struggling.

On average across countries, students who reported that their teacher is willing to provide help and is interested in their learning were also about 1.3 times more likely to feel that they belong at school. When students feel they have negative relationships with their teachers, their well-being is negatively affected. Students who reported some (perceived) unfair treatment by their teachers were 1.7 times more likely to report feeling isolated at school. Teenagers look for strong social ties and value acceptance, care and support from others.

Adolescents who feel that they are part of a school community are more likely to perform better academically and be more motivated in school. There are also big differences between countries on these measures. An average of three-quarters of students feel they belong at school, and in some of the highest performing education systems in terms of cognitive outcomes, including Chinese Taipei, Japan, the Netherlands, Vietnam, Finland, Korea, Estonia and Singapore, that share was even higher. But in France it was just 41%. In some countries, there were also large differences among students from different home backgrounds and in 23 countries and economies, students without an immigrant background reported a stronger sense of belonging than immigrant students, even after accounting for socio-economic status.

Teachers care about having positive relationships with their students, but some teachers may be insufficiently prepared to deal with difficult students and classroom environments. Effective classroom management consists of far more than establishing and imposing rules, rewards and incentives to control behaviour. It involves practices and instructional techniques to create a learning environment that facilitates and supports active engagement in learning, encourages co-operation and promotes behaviour that benefits other people. A stronger focus on classroom and relationship management in professional development may give teachers better means to connect with their students and support their engagement at school. Teachers also need to collaborate and exchange information about students’ difficulties, character and strengths with their colleagues so that they can collectively find the best approach to make students feel part of the school community.
By contrast, negative teacher-student relations seem to undermine students’ confidence and lead to greater anxiety: On average across countries, students were about 62% more likely to get very tense when they study, and about 31% more likely to feel anxious before a test if they perceived that their teacher thought they are less smart than they thought they really are. Such anxiety may be students’ reaction to, and interpretation of, the mistakes they make – or are afraid to make. Students may internalise mistakes as evidence that they are not smart enough. So teachers need to know how to help students develop a good understanding of their strengths and weaknesses, and an awareness of what they can do to overcome or mitigate their weaknesses. They also need to ensure that mistakes are de-dramatised as part of the learning process, especially when education systems have to develop students’ higher-order skills such as creativity or critical thinking, which require students to deal with failure and uncertainty in a positive way.

**Parents’ influence on student well-being**

Parents also have a big influence on student well-being and should be a key partner of the school community.

Students whose parents reported “spending time just talking to my child”, “eating the main meal with my child around a table” or “discussing how well my child is doing at school” daily or nearly every day were between 22% and 39% more likely to report high levels of life satisfaction. “Spending time just talking” is the parental activity most frequently and most strongly associated with students’ life satisfaction. And it seems to matter for performance too: students whose parents reported “spending time just talking” were two-thirds of a school-year ahead in science learning, and even after accounting for social background, the advantage remains at one-third of a school year. The results are similar for eating meals with the children. The strength of this relationship is well beyond the impact of most school resources and school factors measured by PISA.

Students’ perceptions of how interested their parents are in them and in their school life is also related to their own attitudes towards education and their motivation to study, and those relationships are particularly strong among low-performing students. A clear way to promote students’ well-being is to encourage all parents to be more involved with their children’s interests and concerns, show interest in their school life, and be more aware of the challenges children face at school.

**Teachers’ well-being**

(Viac and Fraser, 2020[5]) propose a conceptual framework to analyse teachers’ occupational well-being and its linkages with quality teaching that mirrors the student well-being framework. Four key dimensions capture teachers’ well-being: physical and mental, cognitive, subjective and social. Working conditions, at both system and school levels, can impact and shape teachers’ well-being, both positively and negatively. Teachers’ well-being can yield two types of outcomes: 1) reduced levels of stress and intentions to leave the profession; 2) and greater teaching quality teaching in terms of classroom management and greater student well-being and learning outcomes.

As noted in OECD (2020[6]), education systems should provide teachers and school leaders currently employed in schools a sense of well-being, intellectual fulfilment and satisfaction. This is critical to retain them in their schools and in the profession, but also for attracting new entrants to the profession in the future. Attrition among teachers has become a severe problem that threatens the stability of several educational systems across the world – and the problem may have amplified after the COVID pandemic. Keeping experienced teachers motivated and retaining them in the profession is critical to instructional quality. Research shows that experienced teachers tend to be better at managing their complex jobs and relating to their students, and that they are, on average, more effective than novice teachers at promoting student learning (OECD, 2020[6]).
Results from the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2018 (OECD, 2020) show that, on average across OECD countries, 18% of lower secondary teachers reported experiencing a lot of stress in their work, albeit with a great deal of variation across countries. Among the top sources of stress reported by teachers ("quite a bit" or "a lot"), "having too much administrative work to do" (49%), "being held responsible for students' achievement" (44%) and "keeping up with changing requirements from local, municipal/regional, state or national/federal authorities" (41%) are prominent. The sources of stress reported by school leaders include "having too much administrative work to do" (69%), and "keeping up with changing requirements from local, municipal/regional, state or national/federal authorities" (55%) (Schleicher, 2021).

 Teachers who reported experiencing a lot of stress in their work are more likely to report a wish to leave their work within the next five years in almost all countries and economies participating in TALIS. But the same analyses show that schools can moderate the relationship between stress and attrition. Indeed, teachers reporting satisfaction with their terms of employment apart from their salary (e.g. work schedule) are less likely to state they would leave teaching in the next five years. The analyses also show how teachers' tendency to report being satisfied with their terms of employment is related to staff participation in school governance and support for continuous professional development.

**Decreased social connections during the pandemic**

Overall, most existing studies on parents reporting on their school age children feelings during the pandemic highlight the lack of motivation to work as a big impediment to studying, the fact that students missed their friends and suffered from boredom (Thorn and Vincent-Lancrin, 2021). While parents tended to have a relatively positive (or unchanged) view of the well-being of their children during the first wave of school closures, studies asking students themselves had more contrasted results.

A majority of French school children surveyed at the start of the 2021 school year (September 2020) regarding the experience of confinement over April-June 2020 reported that the period of confinement had been too long (63% of children in grades K-1, 70% in year 5 and 54% in year 9) and that they had been affected by the absence of contact with their friends (75% of children in grades K-1, 82% in year 5 and 80% in year 9). Between 25% and 39% (depending on grade) had experienced a fear of Coronavirus and between 38-51% had experienced boredom. At the same time, a majority appreciated the ease of studying at home (57-61%) and between 36-56% expressed satisfaction at being able to remain at home all the time ((Direction de l’évaluation and Ministère de l’Education nationale, 2021), Tables 1-3).

In the Netherlands, almost all (90%) children (aged 8-18 years) reported that the COVID-19 lockdown had a negative impact on their daily life. The issues most often mentioned were: 1) missing contact with friends, 2) not being allowed to go to school, 3) missing freedom, 4) not being allowed to participate in sports, 5) missing joyful activities (e.g., birthdays, holidays, parties, shopping), 6) difficulties with homeschooling 7) missing extended family, and 8) boredom ((Luijten et al., 2021), Table 5). Broadly similar results were found in Germany (Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2021). Nearly two-thirds (71%) of German children (aged 11-17 years) stated that they felt burdened by the COVID-19 pandemic. Four out of five (83%) reported fewer social contacts during the pandemic, 64% found schooling and learning to be more difficult than before the pandemic and 39% reported that their relationships with their friends had been impaired. Children and adolescents also reported depressive symptoms: 62% had trouble concentrating, 58% had little interest or joy in activities, and 34% felt sad.

In contrast, a study in England found a more mixed appreciation of the period of lockdown with 43% of 11-16 year-olds reporting that it had made their life worse, 30% reporting that it had made no change and the remaining 27% reporting that it had made their life better (NHS Digital, 2020, p. 45). Some 55% of children reported that they were hardly ever or never lonely with only 5% stating that they were often or always lonely during lockdown ((NHS Digital, 2020) Table 3.6).
Clinical (mental) studies using specific health scales also point to a decline in children’s quality of life, even though this did usually not translate into severe mental disorders. The proportion of school age children experiencing serious or severe symptoms of mental or psychological disorders appears to have risen during the period of lockdown. However, the proportion of children concerned was relatively small. Most, both before and during the period of lockdowns, did not display such symptoms. Those may relate both to the isolation that they felt during the lockdowns and the need for in-presence social connections that had been severed and to the general social anxiety that related to the spread of the disease and its risks for relatives and the population as a whole.

The Education International perspective

**Equity and students’ needs**

System wide assessment and diagnosis of students’ needs remain vital if educational recovery is to work for every student. EI has urged that the effects of the disruption caused by COVID on student learning and well-being should be investigated. It has described these processes as equity audits and has urged countries to carry them out in partnership with school communities, their representatives and researchers (Education International, 2021[12]). Indeed, many countries have carried such investigations, but they need to be strengthened and diversified so that the information on student learning, well-being, disadvantage and equitable entitlement to education can be rich and relevant (OECD and Education International, 2021[1]).

Inequities in learning opportunities have been exposed by COVID and can be complex. For example, gender disparities may have become sharper. Many countries have also experienced waves of refugees displaced by war and economic collapse. The intensity of displacement has been accentuated by recent crises such as those in Afghanistan and Ukraine. This makes the call for action more urgent than ever. Schools in disadvantaged areas need targeted support including:

- providing sufficient learning resources to address disadvantage without penalising other communities;
- ensuring teaching professions reflect students’ demography;
- preparing teachers on how to respond to the needs of students from disadvantaged backgrounds;
- making sure that working conditions and career structures encourage the most experienced teachers to work in disadvantaged schools and encouraging teachers to stay by guaranteeing job security.

Preparation for teacher training professional development should include how to respond to the needs of students from disadvantaged and diverse backgrounds.

**Schools as communities inspiring student optimism and well-being**

Both the OECD and EI have emphasised that the pandemic has highlighted the essential role of schools as communities in the education of children and young people (OECD and Education International, 2021[1]). Closures have led to a greater understanding among the public and policy makers that schools are essential for the development of student interaction. The importance of social interaction extends beyond schools into their local communities. Most schools are integral to their communities. The quality of the social basis of learning in schools is enhanced by their outward facing relationships with their local communities. The value that parents and students place on schools is mirrored by the communities that surround them. Communities that lose their schools are impoverished by their loss. In socially divided and economically impoverished areas, schools represent order and calm. They create for students an ethos of mutual respect and optimism for the future while providing them with a sense of security and a safe space to learn.
A ground-breaking study at the end of the last decade emphasised how important schools were encouraging among students a sense of agency and optimism for the future. In 2007, (Alexander, 2021[13]) conducted an exhaustive evidence collection exercise entitled “Community Soundings” for a national review of primary education (ISCED 1 and 2).

Many of its findings have a global significance and remain relevant. He found that children were under intense and perhaps excessive pressure from the policy-driven demands of their schools and the commercially driven values of wider society. Family and community life were breaking down. Respect and empathy both within and between generations were in decline. Life for young children outside the school gates was increasingly insecure and, and in many areas, dangerous (though for many parents the perceived danger was traffic). The wider world was changing rapidly and in ways that were not always easy to comprehend, though on balance the changes gave cause for alarm, especially in respect of global warming, environmental sustainability, and geo-political stability.

However, his conclusions were not pessimistic. His research found that pessimism turned to hope when children felt they had the power to act. The children who were most confident that climate change might not overwhelm them were those whose schools had replaced unfocussed fear of climate change by factual information and practical strategies for energy reduction and sustainability. His research showed that the ability of schools to continue to inspire optimism was critical, which was probably true during lockdowns. In short, schools as optimistic communities are vital for encouraging optimistic agency among young people and thus, their well-being. An understanding of the community and social roles of schools in fostering student well-being should be factored into any reviews by education jurisdictions or schools of the curriculum, its assessment and support provided to schools.

However, the policy implications of recognising that schools are at the centre of their communities need far greater exploration by educational jurisdictions. Despite examples of developments in community and extended schools in the United States, the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), Belgium (Flemish Community), Portugal, Finland and Japan (Schleicher, 2018[14]), more countries should take the initiative to think hard about how to support schools in enhancing the well-being of their students within their communities and to emphasise this role in their mission.

**Focusing on the whole child**

Many school communities believe they now need to have an enhanced focus on students’ well-being as a result of the pandemic. Globally the effects on children’s emotional and emotional development of the pandemic have yet to be quantified but it is a reasonable assumption that those effects are significant. Certainly, student behaviour has a major effect on the self-efficacy and capacity of teachers to teach, with the pandemic having its specific influence on student behaviour.

There is a strong argument for education jurisdictions with teachers and their organisations to explore a reorientation of the curriculum and its assessment alongside an examination of whether student counselling and support is sufficient. Curriculum objectives are most effective and relevant when schools believe them to be essential for student learning. Inflexible, over-detailed and imposed curriculum and assessment arrangements are far less likely to be relevant to schools than flexible curricula which enable and give space to schools to develop and innovate. The understanding that schools must have the capacity to meet the needs of every child’s social, emotional and academic needs (the needs of the whole child) can only be successfully realised if teachers’ professionalism to meet those needs is trusted and supported.

Hargreaves and Shirley (2022[15]) have explored the emerging issues around incorporating a well-being approach to pedagogy and school life. They argue that, without proper teacher training and support, or if implemented in a non-consistent or non-collective way, taking a whole child approach could become as unsuccessful as any other badly implemented strategy.
This is also true for the use of digital technology in schools. (Hargreaves and Shirley, 2022[15]) believe that, in a post-pandemic world, digital learning can and should become as routine, effortless and seamless as all other learning resources – no more and no less. Digital resources must become available to everyone who has the skills to use them, alongside and with a status equivalent to other tools and activities, such as books, pens, science equipment, whiteboards, paint, sports resources, and educational and physical activities including sporting activities and learning about bio-diversity and the environment outdoors. They believe that digital technology in schools should be used in a prudent way that will make a difference, not in a profligate manner that displaces higher-value activities that are central to investing a sense of optimistic agency among students (Hargreaves and Shirley, 2022[15]).

**Teacher well-being**

There is a consensus around the definition of teacher well-being. The core definition defines teachers’ well-being as having four main dimensions: mental and physical well-being, cognitive well-being, subjective well-being and social well-being (Education Support, 2021[16]). For some time it has been clear that there is a positive correlation between teacher well-being and student progress. Schleicher (Schleicher, 2021[3]) highlighted research which pointed to positive associations between teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction and student self-efficacy, motivation and achievement. The evidence points to a strong correlation between student well-being and teacher well-being.

EI and OECD research as well as research from individual countries show that many teachers suffer from poor, stress-related mental health and that their access to mental health services is uneven. Excessive administrative demands, variable and inadequate professional development, particularly in ICT, being held responsible for student achievement and keeping up with changing requirements are key triggers for poor teacher well-being. Beginning/novice teachers are vulnerable to poor well-being particularly since disproportionately large numbers of new teachers start teaching in disadvantaged schools. (OECD, 2020[6]); (Education Support, 2021[16]). EI commissioned a survey of its member organisations, the Global Report on the Status of Teachers, which identified teacher attrition, workload, stress, and well-being as key issues for the reform of conditions facing the school workforce globally (Education International; Thompson, G., 2021[17]).

There is a seamless relationship between teacher well-being, teacher self-efficacy and teacher leadership. An Education International study commissioned from Cambridge University reviewed the evidence on the links between teacher well-being, motivation, efficacy, and leadership and set out seven dimensions for an enabling policy environment which creates the conditions for teacher leadership to flourish (Education International with Cambridge University, 2012[18]). It concluded that systemic teacher policy should:

- lead to the provision of opportunities and support for teachers to exercise leadership in the development and improvement of professional practice;
- establish the right to be heard and to be influential at all levels of policy making including the content and structure of the curriculum;
- protect and enhance teachers’ right to determine how to teach within the context of collegial accountability;
- support teachers in setting the direction of their own professional development and in contributing to the professional learning of their colleagues;
- recognise the key role that teachers play in building collaborative relationships with parents and the wider community;
- promote the role of teachers in pupil assessment, teacher appraisal, and school evaluation;
- enable teachers to participate in activities which lead to the creation and transfer of professional knowledge.
A subsequent discussion paper on teacher leadership and whole child education asserted that top-down school leadership is out of sync with the new normal of collective social capital which teachers have had to develop during the pandemic (Berry, Darling-Hammond and Mackay, 2021[19]). The developing discourse on how to achieve high levels of teacher self-efficacy, leadership and well-being lends weight to the argument that educational jurisdictions should consider providing guidance on distributed leadership and distributed decision making at system level (OECD, 2014[20]). The focus of the 2021 ISTP on how to create the conditions for positive teacher well-being lent weight to the argument that teacher well-being is integrally related to high levels of teacher self-efficacy and leadership. To echo the 2018 ISTP background report (Asia Society, 2019[21]); teacher well-being is an issue whose time has come.

OECD and Education international: Principles for effective and equitable educational recovery

Based on the initiatives during and lessons learnt from the pandemic, the OECD’s and Education International’s Principles for an Effective and Equitable Educational Recovery (OECD and Education International, 2021[1]) highlighted effective practices and principles that supported both student and teacher well-being during the pandemic and which could be amplified during post-pandemic recovery. This section summarises and expands some of these principles.

Student and teacher well-being and the education of the whole child

Beyond continued academic development, a holistic approach to education focusing on students’ socio-emotional learning and agency needs to be a central part of education, with students’ physical development and mental health needs met by co-ordinated services liaising with schools. Curricula should go beyond academic development and recognise that education systems should develop students’ knowledge, skills, attitudes and values. All students should continue to receive a broad and balanced curriculum tailored to their learning needs, including support for their social and emotional needs. This involves the provision of professional learning and development for teachers on socio-emotional learning and mental health.

Targeted support for students could take different forms: the provision of in-school and after-school small group tutoring, summer schools, counselling for specific students according to their social and emotional needs, an enhanced emphasis on metacognitive and collaborative learning, on oral language interventions, but also on other forms of pedagogical interventions that are supported by evidence and seem appropriate in the local context.

Teacher well-being, agency and support

Recognising that teachers’ job satisfaction, well-being, beliefs and professionalism are inter-related and have an effect on student outcomes will have a positive impact on school culture and ultimately on students.

Many teachers have initiated micro-innovation during the pandemic, adapting to rapidly changing circumstances, including updating health protection, adapting their teaching and learning strategies, responding to the social and emotional learning needs of their students and attending to their own professional learning needs. Many teachers responded to the pandemic by creating their own just-in-time professional development despite the fact that, prior to the pandemic, teachers had identified the use of technology in teaching as a high priority for professional development.

Ultimately, teachers need to feel empowered to exert their professionalism in the use of technology as part of their teaching. While this involves the integration of technology in all teacher training courses, this will also be achieved through more collaborative platforms and professional learning projects enabling teachers to develop their digital pedagogical competences through a peer learning process. Jurisdictions
and education authorities in collaboration with teachers, their organisations and other relevant stakeholders should aim to create a systemic strategy for teacher learning and professional development drawing on the lessons of the pandemic.

This should lead to teachers’ multiple professional roles as instructors, coaches, mentors, peers and facilitators to be fully recognised, rewarded and endorsed. As key and active agents of change, it is teachers and school leaders themselves who can create the working environment where autonomy, collaboration with peers and continued professional learning can be exercised. International comparisons can help educational jurisdictions to better understand how teacher and student well-being intersect and in what conditions different teacher roles affect teacher well-being.

There is a strong argument for jurisdictions and education authorities to review teachers’ working conditions in order to identify the areas that need to be improved for teachers to be their most effective during post-pandemic recovery.

Engaging parents in student well-being

The pandemic has opened up many opportunities to engage parents in supporting student well-being, with many schools creating a new environment of co-operation with parents and communities. Teachers can be given better tools to enlist parents’ support, and schools can address some critical deficiencies of disadvantaged children, such as the lack of a quiet space at home for studying. If parents and teachers establish relationships based on trust, schools can rely on parents as valuable partners in the cognitive and socio-emotional education of their students.

For many parents, spending time just talking to their child is a rare occurrence; others find it difficult to participate in their children’s school life. These difficulties may be related to inflexible work schedules, lack of childcare services, or language barriers. But schools can do a lot to help parents overcome these barriers. They can first try to identify those parents who may be unable to participate in school activities. They can open flexible channels of communication such as scheduled phone or video calls, which are simple, but effective, solutions to accommodate busy parents who cannot easily leave work to attend school meetings. Governments can also take action by providing incentives to employers who adopt policies to improve the work-life balance.

Parents should also be helped to support their children’s learning and well-being, including effective guidance for on-line safety, which could be developed by jurisdictions with the input of teachers and parents.

Toward student and teacher well-being and the education of the whole Child: Some questions for future policy development

Here are a few questions for policy discussion and policy research:

- What steps can educational jurisdictions and teacher unions take to make sure that evidence on students’ needs, including on well-being, is gathered with the objective to feed into inclusive, practical, and effective policy on student and teacher well-being and education for the whole child?
- Could we create international learning spaces for educational jurisdictions and governments to agree on a joint approach to curriculum and evaluation reform supporting new approaches to the education of the whole child?
• Could international exchanges allow one to learn about curricula enabling students to learn and respond to the existential challenges facing the world?

• Is there an opportunity for teacher unions and governments to research and learn from the micro-innovations which took place in schools during the pandemic? Which one would be the most important ones?

• How can teachers’ roles as active agents of change be supported to help them create a working environment where autonomy, collaboration with peers and continuing professional learning can be exercised?
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