International Journal of innovative inventions in Social Science and Humanities

ISSN(print): 3050-6921, ISSN(online): 3050-693X

Volume 03 Issue 04 April 2026

DOI: 10.58806/ijiissh.2026.v3i4n17

Page No: 477-483

Rethinking Science Education for Innovation: Challenges, Opportunities, and Future Directions

Esenowo, Aniebiet Jackson[1], Iwejor, Chimaroke Orguchialu[2], Okechukwu, Promise Ibuchim[3], Tortor Blessing[4]

[1,2,3,4]Department of Science Education, Faculty of Education, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Science education stands at a critical juncture in the twenty-first century. As societies grapple with pressing challenges—climate change, public health crises, artificial intelligence transformation, and energy security—the capacity to produce scientifically literate citizens and innovative researchers has never been more urgent. Yet science education remains largely anchored to twentieth-century paradigms: content-heavy curricula, high-stakes assessments that reward recall over understanding, and pedagogies that position students as passive recipients rather than active inquirers. This conceptual paper argues that fundamental rethinking is required to align science education with the demands of innovation economies and democratic participation in technological societies. It critically examines three interrelated challenges: the persistence of what Michael Von Maltitz terms "broken proxies" in assessment, the equity gaps that pervade access to authentic scientific practice, and the disruptive potential—and peril—of artificial intelligence in science learning. The paper then explores emerging opportunities: the mainstreaming of active learning pedagogies, the integration of data science and computational thinking, the promise of phenomena-based and project-based instruction, and the potential for AI-augmented personalized learning when guided by robust pedagogical frameworks. Finally, it proposes future directions organized around four pillars: reimagining assessment systems, investing in teacher capacity and professional formation, embedding authentic research and innovation in curricula, and constructing ethical governance frameworks for AI in education. The paper concludes that the transformation of science education requires not piecemeal innovation but systemic reconceptualization—one that places inquiry, equity, and human flourishing at its centre.

ARTICLE DETAILS

Published On:
23 April 2026

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence, Assessment, Educational Equity, Science Education, Stem Education, Teacher Professional Development.

Available on:
https://ijiissh.com/

INTRODUCTION

Education is universally acknowledged as the foundation upon which societies build economic prosperity, social stability, and technological advancement. Beyond formal schooling, education serves as a dynamic process that nurtures human potential and equips individuals with the knowledge and competencies needed to transform their environment. In the twenty-first century, its significance has intensified as nations strive to compete in a global knowledge economy driven by rapid scientific and technological change (OECD, 2018). At the center of this transformation lies science and science education, which function as major drivers of innovation, productivity, and sustainable development.

Science, as both a body of organized knowledge and a systematic method of inquiry, enables humanity to understand natural phenomena and develop solutions to complex societal challenges. Breakthroughs in medicine, agriculture, engineering, and environmental sustainability are products of sustained scientific research and experimentation (UNESCO, 2021). However, scientific advancement depends largely on effective education systems that stimulate curiosity, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills among learners. The National Research Council (2012) emphasizes that science education should not only transmit content knowledge but also engage students in scientific practices that reflect how knowledge is generated and applied.

Despite its strategic importance, science education continues to face significant challenges globally. In many contexts, teaching methods remain examination-oriented and focused on rote memorization rather than inquiry and innovation. Research shows that traditional lecture-based approaches are less effective in promoting deep understanding and higher-order thinking skills compared to active learning strategies (Freeman et al., 2014). Consequently, learners may possess theoretical knowledge but lack the practical competence and innovative mindset required in a rapidly evolving technological era characterized by artificial intelligence,

biotechnology, and digital transformation (Schwab, 2016).

The urgency to rethink science education has therefore become evident. Transforming science education for innovation requires shifting from teacher-centered instruction to learner-centered, inquiry-based approaches that promote experimentation, collaboration, and interdisciplinary integration (National Research Council, 2012). According to OECD (2018), future-oriented education systems must cultivate creativity, adaptability, and critical thinking to prepare students for emerging industries and unpredictable global challenges. By integrating science with technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), as well as entrepreneurial skills, education can better align with the demands of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (Schwab, 2016).

However, structural and systemic barriers continue to impede reform efforts. Many schools lack adequate laboratory facilities, digital resources, and well-trained science teachers. Inequalities in access to quality science education, especially between rural and urban communities further widen the innovation gap (World Bank, 2020). UNESCO (2017) also highlights persistent gender disparities in STEM participation, which limit inclusive innovation and sustainable development. Addressing these challenges requires deliberate investment, policy reforms, and multi-sectoral collaboration.

At the same time, there are significant opportunities for advancing science education. The expansion of digital technologies, virtual laboratories, and open educational resources has created new possibilities for interactive and experiential learning (OECD, 2019). Active learning, project-based instruction, and research-driven collaboration between educational institutions and industry partners have proven effective in enhancing student engagement and performance (Freeman et al., 2014). Such approaches ensure that scientific knowledge is not only acquired but also applied in meaningful and innovative ways.

Furthermore, fostering a culture of innovation within educational institutions is essential. Innovation thrives in environments that encourage questioning, experimentation, and resilience. Assessment systems must therefore evolve beyond measuring factual recall to evaluating problem-solving, creativity, and teamwork (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020). By redefining academic success to include innovation competencies, education systems can nurture learners who are capable of generating transformative ideas and solutions.

Looking toward the future, science education must be responsive to global challenges such as climate change, public health crises, food insecurity, and sustainable energy demands. UNESCO (2021) underscores the importance of engineering and scientific literacy in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Preparing learners for such challenges requires flexible curricula, ethical awareness, environmental responsibility, and a commitment to lifelong learning.

Education, science, and science education are deeply interconnected pillars of development. As technological advancements accelerate, rethinking science education for innovation is no longer optional but imperative. By addressing systemic challenges, leveraging digital and pedagogical opportunities, and adopting forward-looking strategies, nations can cultivate scientifically literate and innovative citizens prepared to shape a sustainable and prosperous future. This conceptual paper addresses a central question: How must science education be reconfigured to serve innovation, equity, and human flourishing in an era of artificial intelligence and global challenges?

CHALLENGES: DIAGNOSING THE PRESENT

❖ *The Tyranny of Broken Proxies*

The most fundamental challenge facing science education may also be the most invisible: the substitution of measurable proxies for educational purposes, and the subsequent collapse of means into ends. Von Maltitz (2025) offers a devastating diagnosis of this phenomenon, which he terms "broken proxies" . In education, grades and degrees once served as indicators of knowledge and understanding. Over time, however, the incentives attached to these indicators—merit bursaries, university admissions, awards—have made them the actual objects of student effort. "The only things that are important to students are grades and degrees," Von Maltitz observes, "because the incentives are linked to grades and degrees, and so, obviously, all effort will go towards grades and degrees" .

The consequence is a systematic distortion of educational purpose. Students learn to optimize performance on assessments rather than to understand scientific concepts deeply. Knowledge that is not assessed is neglected. When generative AI tools offer shortcuts to acceptable assessment performance, they are eagerly adopted—not because students are dishonest, but because the system has taught them that grades matter and understanding does not. A recent MIT study cited by Von Maltitz found that after four months of AI use, participants' brains became "systematically less active" when asked to perform cognitive tasks independently—they had, in effect, become "significantly 'dumber'" than their peers who had not relied on AI (Von Maltitz, M., 2025).

The broken proxies problem extends beyond individual classrooms to the architecture of educational systems. High-stakes assessments shape curricula, squeezing out inquiry, experimentation, and the exploration of students' own questions in favour of content coverage and test preparation. Practical science—the hands-on investigation that is the life blood of authentic scientific work—has been progressively marginalized.

The Equity Gap in Authentic Science

A second challenge concerns who gets access to authentic scientific experience. The language of science education reform often invokes universality—"science for all," "scientific literacy for every citizen." Yet the reality is starkly stratified. Access to advanced

science courses, well-equipped laboratories, and teachers with strong science backgrounds is distributed unevenly, tracking lines of socioeconomic advantage, race, and geography .

The Institute for Research in Schools (2025) response highlights a telling example: the policy of making "triple science" (the study of biology, chemistry, and physics as separate subjects) an entitlement for all students in English schools. On its face, this appears progressive—an expansion of access to rigorous science. Yet as IRIS notes, "availability...is the bare minimum in terms of inclusion. Even where it is offered, uptake is not equally accessible to all" . Girls and students from underrepresented groups participate at lower rates, even when courses are nominally available. Without active efforts to address the cultural, pedagogical, and structural barriers these students face, formal access masks continued exclusion.

The equity gap is not only about who studies science, but about what kind of science they experience. Students in well-resourced schools engage in authentic investigation: designing experiments, analyzing data, grappling with open-ended questions. Students in under-resourced schools encounter science as a body of received knowledge to be memorized and reproduced. The former experience science as a verb—something one does. The latter experience science as a noun—something one studies (Victor et al, 2025; Kusmawan, U. 2025). These divergent experiences reproduce not only educational inequality but also the broader stratification of who becomes a scientist, who shapes technological development, and who benefits from scientific progress.

Equity also intersects with the digital divide in consequential ways. As science education increasingly incorporates digital tools, data science, and AI applications, students without reliable internet access, modern devices, or home environments conducive to digital learning fall further behind. The pandemic-era shift to remote learning exposed and exacerbated these divides; without deliberate intervention, the integration of technology into science education will widen rather than narrow gaps.

❖ ***The Ambivalent Arrival of Artificial Intelligence***

Artificial intelligence presents both profound opportunities and significant dangers for science education. A comprehensive bibliometric analysis of AI in science education (2015–2024) identifies four major thematic clusters in the research literature: intelligent tutoring and adaptive learning systems; virtual and remote laboratories; generative AI applications and their ethical implications; and teacher professional development for AI integration. The meta-analysis included in this study finds a significant positive effect of AI on science learning outcomes (Hedges' g = 0.63), with stronger effects in higher education and in low- and middle-income country contexts—suggesting that AI might, under the right conditions, serve equity goals (Doğan, O. K., et al 2025).

Generative AI tools like ChatGPT can facilitate conceptual learning and support inquiry tasks, but they also raise concerns about epistemic authority and accuracy. When students ask AI systems scientific questions, they receive fluent, confident-sounding answers that may be partially or entirely wrong. The capacity to distinguish reliable from unreliable information—already a challenge in the pre-AI information environment—becomes both more difficult and more essential.

More fundamentally, AI threatens to accelerate the broken proxies dynamic. If assessment systems continue to reward outputs that AI can easily generate—essays, problem solutions, lab reports—then students have powerful incentives to outsource their thinking to machines. The MIT study cited earlier suggests that this outsourcing has cognitive consequences: brains that are not exercised become less capable . The danger is that AI, rather than augmenting human intelligence, will supplant it—leaving students less able to think scientifically than they were before.

The ethical challenges are equally significant. AI systems trained on existing data embed the biases of their training data, potentially reinforcing rather than disrupting patterns of exclusion. Data privacy concerns arise when student interactions with AI systems are harvested for commercial purposes. The "black box" nature of many AI systems makes it difficult to understand how they arrive at their outputs, complicating efforts to use them transparently in educational settings (Doğan, O. K., et al 2025).

These challenges are not reasons to reject AI—they are reasons to approach it thoughtfully, with clear ethical frameworks and robust teacher preparation. The question is not whether AI will be part of science education's future, but under what conditions and to what ends.

OPPORTUNITIES: EMERGING POSSIBILITIES

➢ ***The Active Learning Revolution***

If assessment dysfunction represents the most entrenched problem in science education, the active learning movement represents its most promising response. Over the past two decades, research has accumulated compelling evidence that pedagogies engaging students in doing science—rather than passively receiving science instruction—produce superior learning outcomes. (Treibergs, K. A., et al 2025; Victor, P., et al 2025).

The active learning revolution extends beyond higher education to secondary and even primary settings. For instance, project-based learning (PjBL) instructional model has the potential to promote meaningful learning in various school contexts.

What distinguishes active learning from traditional instruction is not merely the presence of hands-on activities, but the cognitive demands placed on students. In well-designed active learning environments, students generate questions, construct models, test hypotheses against evidence, and revise their understandings in light of new information (Klein, K. 2025). They learn that scientific

knowledge is not a collection of settled facts but an ongoing human endeavor—tentative, evidence-based, and subject to revision. This epistemological insight is itself a form of scientific literacy, perhaps more important than any particular factual knowledge.

- ***Data Science and Computational Thinking***

This major opportunity concerns the integration of data science and computational thinking into science curricula. Data science skills is seen as essential skills that are currently not taught to most young people and called for a new post-16 qualification to address this gap (Institute for Research in Schools , 2025). The IRIS response welcomed this development while urging that data science concepts be integrated before age 16, so that every young person develops a foundation in these areas.

The urgency of this integration reflects the transformation of scientific practice itself. Contemporary science is data-intensive science. Biologists work with genomic sequences, climate scientists with global circulation models, astronomers with petabyte-scale sky surveys. The capacity to work with data—to clean it, visualize it, model it, interpret it—is as fundamental to modern scientific literacy as understanding the periodic table or the principles of evolution .

Computational thinking—the conceptual foundation underlying programming and data science—offers particular promise for science education. It involves not only coding but also decomposition (breaking complex problems into manageable parts), pattern recognition, abstraction, and algorithm design. These cognitive tools are valuable across scientific disciplines and beyond. Moreover, they align with the broader goals of science education: producing students who can think systematically, solve novel problems, and adapt to changing circumstances (Zhang, Y., and Zhao, Z. (2025) .

The integration of data science into science education also opens possibilities for addressing equity concerns. Data science draws on real-world problems that students find meaningful—health disparities, environmental justice, social media dynamics—potentially engaging students who have been alienated by traditional science curricula. When students analyze data about their own communities, they see science as relevant to their lives and concerns. This relevance, in turn, supports persistence in STEM pathways.

- ***Phenomena-Based and Place-Based Pedagogies***

Anothrr cluster of opportunities centers on pedagogical approaches that root science learning in compelling phenomena and authentic contexts. The Fort Thomas Independent Schools in Kentucky provide an instructive example. Their sixth-grade science team, dissatisfied with traditional "copy-and-paste" instruction, adopted OpenSciEd, a curriculum built around "coherent scientific phenomena that build knowledge through investigation and talk" (Klein, K. 2025). The shift transformed both teaching and learning. Teachers reported increased confidence in leading discussions, guiding student model development, and keeping lessons student-centered. Students began generating their own questions, building and revising models, and treating "wrong answers" as learning opportunities rather than failures.

Phenomena-based instruction connects to broader movements in science education: place-based education, which uses local environments and issues as contexts for learning; problem-based learning, which organizes instruction around authentic problems requiring investigation; and project-based learning, which engages students in extended inquiries culminating in tangible products . What these approaches share is a commitment to positioning students as active investigators rather than passive recipients—as people who do science, not merely study it.

The evidence base for these approaches continues to grow. A systematic review of project-based learning in STEM education found consistent positive effects on student engagement, conceptual understanding, and problem-solving skills.

- ***AI-Augmented Personalized Learning***

Artificial intelligence offers opportunities for personalizing science learning at scales previously unimaginable. Intelligent tutoring systems can adapt to individual students' knowledge levels, providing targeted instruction and practice where needed. Learning analytics can identify students who are struggling before they fail, enabling timely intervention. Virtual laboratories can provide access to experiments that would be impossible, dangerous, or prohibitively expensive in physical settings.

The key to realizing these opportunities lies in pedagogical frameworks that center human flourishing rather than technological efficiency. The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework, which emphasizes the integration of technology, pedagogy, and disciplinary content, offers guidance for thoughtful AI integration (Çelik, 2025). The 5E instructional model—engage, explore, explain, elaborate, evaluate—provides a structure within which AI tools can support inquiry without displacing it. When AI is positioned as a tool for augmenting human intelligence rather than replacing it, the dangers of cognitive atrophy are mitigated.

Emerging research also suggests that AI might serve equity goals when deliberately designed for inclusion. In low- and middle-income country contexts, where access to well-prepared science teachers and well-equipped laboratories is limited, AI-augmented learning environments can expand opportunities (Doğan, et al, (2025). Programs targeting underserved youth in developed countries similarly show promise. The condition, however, is deliberate design: AI systems must be developed with equity as a primary goal, not an afterthought.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS: TOWARDS TRANSFORMATION

The challenges and opportunities surveyed above suggest not a single path forward but a set of interconnected directions for rethinking science education. This section articulates four pillars for transformation: reimagining assessment systems, investing in teacher capacity and professional formation, embedding authentic research and innovation in curricula, and constructing ethical governance frameworks for AI in education.

- ***Reimagining Assessment Systems***

The broken proxies problem cannot be solved by tinkering with existing assessments; it requires fundamental reconceptualization of what assessment is for and how it operates. Von Maltitz (2025) proposes alternatives to traditional examinations: portfolios that document learning over time, interviews that probe understanding in depth, peer assessment that engages students in evaluating one another's work, and real-world problem-solving that demonstrates competence in authentic contexts. These approaches share a commitment to assessing what matters—understanding, capability, judgment—rather than what is easiest to measure.

Success should be measured by active efforts to increase participation among students (girls or boys) and under-represented groups, supported by investment in teacher capacity, lab resources and equitable access to meaningful practical science across all schools. Here, assessment shifts from the individual to the system—from measuring students to evaluating whether schools are fulfilling their equity commitments. This systemic perspective is essential; individual students cannot succeed in systems designed for their failure.

Assessment reform also requires addressing the role of AI. If assessments can be gamed by AI systems, they are not assessing human capability. This suggests the need for assessment designs that are AI-resistant—oral examinations, practical demonstrations, collaborative projects—or that explicitly assess students' capacity to use AI tools appropriately. The latter approach, while promising, requires careful attention to equity: students with less access to AI tools or less guidance in their use will be disadvantaged unless support is universal.

- ***Investing in Teacher Capacity and Professional Formation***

No reform in science education can succeed without investment in teachers. Real progress will rely on sustained support and training for teachers, as well as policies that strengthen teacher retention and recruitment, recognising that a vibrant and supported workforce is central to reform. This means not one-off professional development workshops but ongoing, job-embedded learning opportunities; not generic pedagogy training but discipline-specific support for teaching science effectively .

Teacher preparation programs must also evolve. Pre-service teachers need experience with active learning pedagogies, not just as students in traditional lecture courses but as practitioners learning to implement them. They need exposure to data science and computational thinking, both as content to teach and as tools for teaching. They need preparation for working with AI systems—understanding their capabilities and limitations, guiding students in their use, and protecting student privacy .

Critically, teacher development must address the affective dimensions of teaching science. Many teachers, particularly at elementary and middle school levels, lack confidence in their own science knowledge and capabilities. Building this confidence—through content deepening, collaborative planning, and supportive coaching—is essential if teachers are to lead the kind of inquiry-based instruction that reform envisions.

- ***Embedding Authentic Research and Innovation***

The most ambitious vision for science education reform positions authentic research not as enrichment for the few but as a core component of education for all. When opportunities for real research are built into the curriculum, students are more engaged, more confident, and more likely to pursue STEM pathways, and teachers report higher motivation and job satisfaction. Student-led research, integrated into the curriculum rather than offered as optional extra, would support skill development and critical thinking, link the classroom to careers and foster the next generation of scientists.

Curriculum frameworks must create space for open-ended investigation alongside content coverage. Assessment systems must value the products of research—questions, designs, analyses, arguments—as legitimate evidence of learning. School-university partnerships, such as those facilitated by IRIS, can connect classrooms with working scientists and authentic research questions. Investment in laboratory infrastructure and supplies is essential; students cannot conduct investigations with broken equipment .

The equity implications are profound. When authentic research is reserved for the fortunate few—students in well-resourced schools, students with family connections to science—it reproduces existing patterns of advantage. When it is integrated into the curriculum for all, it becomes a mechanism for broadening participation. The question is not whether to offer research experiences, but to whom and under what conditions.

- ***Constructing Ethical Governance Frameworks for AI***

The final pillar concerns governance. As AI systems become ubiquitous in education, frameworks must be developed to ensure their ethical use. The bibliometric analysis identifies several necessary elements: AI literacy curricula, certification standards for educational AI applications, and ethical governance guidelines for data use and privacy (Doğan, et al 2025). AI literacy curricula would ensure that students understand how AI systems work, what their limitations are, and how to use them responsibly. This is

not merely technical education but civic education: in an AI-mediated world, citizens must be able to evaluate AI-generated information, recognize bias, and advocate for appropriate regulation.

Certification standards for educational AI applications would provide quality assurance, helping educators and systems select tools that are effective, unbiased, and privacy-protecting. The proliferation of AI tools with minimal oversight creates risks of harm, particularly for already-marginalized students. Certification, while not a complete solution, would establish minimum standards and create accountability mechanisms. Ethical governance guidelines must address data use and privacy comprehensively. Student interactions with AI systems generate data that is valuable for research and product development but also sensitive and potentially exploitable. Clear rules about data collection, storage, and use—developed with input from students, families, educators, and privacy experts—are essential.

Finally, governance must be international. AI systems cross borders; students in different countries use the same tools. Fragmented national regulations will be less effective than coordinated international frameworks. Organizations like UNESCO and the OECD have roles to play in developing guidance that respects national contexts while establishing global norms.

CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that science education must be fundamentally rethought to serve innovation, equity, and human flourishing in the twenty-first century. The challenges are significant: assessment systems that reward performance over understanding, persistent inequities in access to authentic science, and the ambivalent arrival of artificial intelligence that may either augment or atrophy human capability. Yet the opportunities are equally significant: the active learning revolution, the integration of data science and computational thinking, the promise of phenomena-based and place-based pedagogies, and the potential for AI-augmented personalized learning when thoughtfully implemented.

The future directions proposed here—reimagining assessment, investing in teachers, embedding authentic research, constructing ethical governance frameworks—are not independent initiatives but interconnected elements of systemic transformation. Assessment reform without teacher development will fail; teachers cannot implement new assessments without support. Authentic research without equitable access will reproduce inequality; inclusion must be deliberate. AI integration without ethical governance will create harm; governance must precede adoption.

The work of rethinking science education is urgent. The generation now in schools will inherit challenges—climate change, technological disruption, social transformation—that demand scientific literacy and innovative capacity. They will need not only knowledge but judgment; not only skills but wisdom; not only individual capability but collective capacity to address problems that transcend borders and generations.

Yet urgency must not license superficiality. The rethinking called for here is fundamental, not cosmetic. It requires questioning assumptions that have structured science education for a century: that curriculum is primarily about content coverage, that assessment is primarily about ranking students, that science is primarily for those who will become scientists. It requires building new institutions, new practices, and new forms of professional formation. It requires, above all, commitment to the proposition that every young person deserves an education that reveals the world they will inherit and the possibilities they can create within it .

The path forward is not yet fully visible. It will be built through collective effort: teachers in classrooms, researchers in laboratories, policymakers in ministries, students in schools—all working to imagine and create science education worthy of the name. The work is difficult. It is also essential.

REFERENCES

1) Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140.
2) Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development.
3) Doğan, O. K., Yilmaz, A., & Çelik, S. (2025). Bibliometric analysis and predictive modeling map the role of artificial intelligence in science education from research trends to classroom integration. *Discover Education, 4, 464.*
4) Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111(23), 8410–8415.*
5) Institute for Research in Schools. (2025). IRIS' response to the Curriculum and Assessment Review. https://researchinschools.org/curriculum-and-assessment-review/
6) Klein, K. (2025, September). Fort Thomas Independent: Phenomena-based science promotes vibrant learning in middle school. KYstandards. https://kystandards.org/fort-thomas-independent-phenomena-based-science-promotes-vibrant-learning-in-middle-school/
7) Kusmawan, U. (2025). The dual frontier: AI, equity, and the re-engineering of global STEM education. *International Journal of Research in STEM Education, 7(2), 114–120.*
8) National Research Council. (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core

ideas. *National Academies Press.*

9) OECD. (2018). The future of education and skills: Education 2030. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
10) OECD. (2019). PISA 2018 results (Volume I): *What students know and can do.* OECD Publishing.
11) Schwab, K. (2016). The fourth industrial revolution. World Economic Forum.
12) Treibergs, K. A., Smith, M., Stetzer, M. R., & Couch, B. A. (2025). A scoping review of published lesson plans showcases two decades of change in undergraduate life science education resources. *Life Sciences Education. Advance online publication.*
13) UNESCO. (2017). Cracking the code: Girls' and women's education in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.*
14) UNESCO. (2021). Engineering for sustainable development: *Delivering on the sustainable development goals.* UNESCO Publishing.
15) Victor, P., Santos, C., Martins, J., & Monteiro, F. (2025). Promoting scientific literacy through integrated project-based learning and reverse engineering pedagogy. *Physical Review Physics Education Research, 21,*
16) Von Maltitz, M. (2025). Rethinking science education in the age of AI [Keynote address]. *Inaugural NAS Research Conference,* University of the Free State, South Africa.
17) World Bank. (2020). Realizing the future of learning: *From learning poverty to learning for everyone, everywhere.* World Bank Group.
18) Zhang, Y., & Zhao, Z. (2025). Global STEM education reform: Major trends. *Chinese Academy of Educational Sciences.*