ROUNDTABLE SUMMARY REPORT

Exploring the emerging impacts of children's use of AI in education at school and at home.

Introduction

On 28 January 2026, Demos and the National Education Union (NEU) convened a roundtable discussion on the emerging impacts of AI on children's learning. The focus was on children's use of AI in school and at home, on evidence of impact (or identifying where evidence is currently lacking) and on what tools or interventions are needed to ensure positive outcomes.

The roundtable convened and facilitated discussion between teacher practitioners, researchers, and policy experts in the field of AI in education. This summary document presents the key points that emerged.

The roundtable explored three questions:

- What are the positive and negative ways in which AI is being used by children in the classroom and at home (for coursework and homework) at the moment?
- What are the emerging positive and negative impacts of AI on children's learning outcomes in education?
- What guidance, support or policy intervention is needed from government, local authorities, tech providers, schools, teachers, or parents to ensure positive impacts for learning and to mitigate any risks?

Attendees

The roundtable was convened by Hannah Perry (Interim Director of Demos Digital), Sofia Lyall (Senior Researcher, Demos), Flynn Devine (Lead Researcher, Demos), and Elizabeth Seger (Associate Director, Digital Policy and AI) who chaired the discussion.

There were brief presentations from Sam Lovatt (Senior Lecturer at St Mary's University), Renate Samson (Independent Expert on AI and Education), Megan Ennion (Digital Education Futures Initiative (DEFI) and PhD researcher at the University of Cambridge), Tom Richmond (Education Policy Analyst at Social Market Foundation), Tim Davies (Director of

Research and Practice for Connected by Data), and Julaan Govier (Class Teacher, Wider Curriculum Leader & Digital Champion, LEO Academy Trust).

The roundtable was attended by the following experts and partners:
Andrew Field, Senior Product Ideation Manager, International Education, Cambridge University Press & Assessment; Ann Kristin Glenster, Minderoo Centre for Technology and Democracy; Billy Huband-Thompson, Sutton Trust; Emily Goodacre, Uni of Cambridge; Kevin Martin, Uni of Cambridge, Cambridge Digital Education Futures Initiative (DEFI); Kim Sylwander Ringmar, LSE Digital Futures; Jen Persson, Defend Digital Me; Jon Shahab, Arts and Media School Islington; Lyndsay Grant, University of Bristol; Rebecca Montacute, Social Market Foundation; Rhiannon Tuckett-Jones, Policy Connect; Sally Thomas, NEU; Ros McNeil, NEU; Andrew Baisley, NEU; and Oliver Mawhinney, NEU.

1. Existing uses of AI by students in the classroom and at home

A nascent evidence base

While the evidence base for existing uses of AI for learning by students in the classroom and at home is still nascent, multiple studies quantifying the prevalence of AI in student learning were referenced by roundtable participants. For example, the Oxford University Press found that 80% of students aged 13-18 are now using AI in schoolwork,[1] researchers at St Mary's University found that 60% of year 9-12 students are using AI for learning,[2] and evidence from the National Literacy Trust suggests that 66% of young people aged 13 to 18 use generative AI to support literacy.[3]

Importance of nuance in understanding use cases for AI in learning

Participants noted, however, that AI use cases in education are varied and should not be collapsed into one category. Instead, categorising AI use cases in education depends on which tools are used, in which contexts, for which purposes, from which technology providers, by which children. Multiple participants raised that we cannot simply think about AI in education through either directly visiting AI-powered chatbots (like ChatGPT) or the frontier of bespoke EdTech tools - we must also think about the integrations into other everyday products and services, like Google's AI Overview, the growing integrations into tools like Microsoft Word or Google Docs, or on social media platforms.

---

[1] Tomescu, A. (2025). *Teaching the AI-native generation*. Oxford University Press. https://corp.oup.com/spotlights/teaching-the-ai-native-generation/

[2] Lovatt, S. et al. (2024). *Perceptions of Generative Artificial Intelligence from the classroom. Student and staff views and experiences, and implications for future practice.* St Mary's University, Twickenham. https://www.stmarys.ac.uk/partnerships/docs/cpd-docs/perceptions-of-generative-ai-from-the-classroom-full-report.pdf

[3] National Literacy Trust. (2025). *Young people and teachers' use of generative AI to support literacy in 2025.* https://literacytrust.org.uk/research-services/research-reports/young-people-and-teachers-use-of-generative-ai-to-support-literacy-in-2025/.

In the classroom, students currently use AI products in education for: search, work feedback, breaking down complex content into easier digestible content, self-testing on learnt knowledge, companionship, chatbots, recommendations, and more. The tools may be designed for wider societal usage, for example search products or AI integrated into social media platforms, or specifically for educational contexts, for example:[4] Grammarly; MagicSchool AI (MagicStudent); and Microsoft Copilot which is embedded into the Microsoft 365 Education platform. Participants stressed the growing presence of Google EdTech products in the classroom and raised longer-term systemic questions about what such high influence from private companies in education could mean.[5]

At home, students might use AI to support learning for: finding information and checking what they already know; as part of social media sites; generating images and recipes; and seeking advice instead of from a trusted adult.[6]

For students with special educational needs (SEND), AI products are increasingly used to reduce barriers to learning and support accessibility and inclusion through assistive writing, speech-to-text, adaptive pacing, alternative explanations, lesson differentiation, and multi-modal learning approaches.

1.1 Distinctions in student AI use across socioeconomic and educational contexts

The roundtable discussed whether students' use of AI for learning was equal across different contexts, such as socioeconomic background and state or private school. Participants agreed that greater evidence and research on the unevenly distributed uses of AI in education, and that deepening digital divides, whereby AI is used differently according to socioeconomic background, was a concern.

Access to AI tools

Some participants suggested that students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds who may be digitally excluded (i.e. with limited internet data or access to digital devices at home) would use AI for learning less than their more affluent peers who may have greater access to the internet and the latest digital devices.

---

[4] Atabey, A., Ringmar Sylwander, K., Livingstone, S. (2025) *A child rights audit of GenAI in EdTech: learning from five UK case studies. Technical Report.* Digital Futures for Children centre, 5Rights Foundation, London, UK. https://www.digital-futures-for-children.net/our-work/genai-edtech

[5] Kingkade, T. (2026). *Google's work in schools aims to create a 'pipeline of future users,' internal documents say.* NBC. https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/social-media/google-schools-aims-pipeline-future-users-internal-documents-rcna255175

[6] Lovatt, S. et al. (2024). Perceptions of Generative Artificial Intelligence from the classroom. Student and staff views and experiences, and implications for future practice. St Mary's University, Twickenham. https://www.stmarys.ac.uk/partnerships/docs/cpd-docs/perceptions-of-generative-ai-from-the-classroom-full-report.pdf

However, one participant suggested that in some respects we may see the inverse – whereby parents from more affluent backgrounds may ensure that their children continue to access human- rather than AI-enabled learning by paying for human tutoring. Whereas students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, whose parents cannot afford human tutoring, may increasingly access learning and education through AI tools rather than human teaching. To underscore this point, the participant cited the example of affluent parents paying for human tutoring during the COVID-19 lockdowns whilst others moved to more online learning. Similarly, another participant stated that often campaigns among parents to put systems in place to limit student screentime are coordinated by more affluent parents.

Despite differing views on whether students use of AI for learning will be greater or less according to socioeconomic background, the discussion concluded that, either way, students from more affluent backgrounds will be more likely to experience the positive benefits: "in the medium term, either better-off families will realise [AI for student learning] is not good and take their kids off it, or they will see it's good and provide kids with more access."

Oversight and guidance in state vs private schools

Roundtable participants also discussed how students' use of AI for learning may differ according to state and private school settings. Participants stated that in private schools, where there is more resourcing, there is more policy and guidance in place to oversee student AI use. Indeed, the Sutton Trust's 'Artificial Advantage' report found that private schools are three times as likely to have a clear school-wide staff strategy on using AI, and private school teachers are more than twice as likely to have had formal AI training than state school teachers.[7] In private schools, teachers have more time to spend on learning about the frontiers of this technology and devising effective AI strategy and policy to support student learning, and more resources to purchase higher tier and safer AI products that run on local rather than external servers, and so data is controlled within the schools and therefore more secure. One participant stated that, when discussing AI in education, the notion of a 'digital divide' exists "at the level of infrastructure in schools", whereby policy and oversight infrastructure is more likely to be in place in private schools rather than state schools.

Roundtable participants stated that this difference in policy, guidance and oversight for AI in education between state and private schools has led to more 'substitutive' introduction of AI in state schools and more 'augmentative' introduction of AI in private schools. In state schools, AI may be more likely to replace student learning processes or contact with teachers, whereas in private schools, AI may be more likely to support or bolster student learning processes.

---

[7] Latham, K. and Montacute, R. (2025). *Artificial Advantage? AI in the classroom and the inequality gap.* The Sutton Trust. https://www.suttontrust.com/our-research/artificial-advantage/

2. Evidence on impacts of AI on student learning outcomes

At the opening of the second session, participants emphasised distinctions between student 'learning' and 'performance' when discussing AI in education – whereby performance refers to what can be measured in a test, and learning refers to longer-term knowledge transfer and retention that is more nuanced, messy, individual, and non-linear and therefore harder to measure. Participants noted that learning can happen without performance, and that performance can happen without learning, and therefore performance is not always a valid measure of learning. The growing prevalence of generative AI in student learning has brought these distinctions to the surface because AI may support student performance, but simultaneously limit or reduce student learning.

However, concrete evidence on the impacts of AI on student learning outcomes is thin, with existing research broadly limited to smaller studies rather than more systematic, population-wide evaluations. Evidence that is available also shows mixed findings.[8] This is likely because in some use cases and contextsAI in education can provide a scaffolding that beneficially supports student learning , but in others it might substitute key learning processes in detrimental ways. Again, participants stressed that AI's impact on learning is not fixed: "We can't think about AI as good or bad, because it depends on which AI in what form, for which tasks, under which conditions, by which children". However, participants broadly agreed that, under the current regulatory conditions of AI in education, the risks of AI for student learning outcomes outweigh the benefits. As one participant put it: "Pen and paper and people thinking really hard are looking pretty good right now".

2.1 Positive impacts of AI on student learning outcomes

When implemented in pedagogically and developmentally appropriate ways, AI can meaningfully enhance student learning outcomes – especially for second language learners and disabled and neurodivergent students.

AI can have beneficial impacts on student reading and writing.[9] For student reading, AI tools can help students with linguistic foundations such as vocabulary knowledge and syntactic understanding, and individualise learning such as by asking personalised feedback to students, and thereby supporting greater student engagement.[10] For student writing, AI can support students to develop arguments, organise their thoughts, support with editing and rewriting, and with grammar.[11] One participant noted that AI tools can be particularly beneficial for second language learners' reading and writing.

---

[8] https://www.smf.co.uk/publications/ai-and-learning/
[9] Burns, M. et al. (2026). *A New Direction for Students in an AI World: Prosper, Prepare, Protect.* Centre for Universal Education at Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/A-New-Direction-for-Students-in-an-AI-World-FULL-REPORT.pdf
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] *Ibid.*

Additionally, participants noted that AI tools can improve access to learning for neurodivergent and disabled students. A teacher practitioner responsible for the AI strategy across their Academy Trust noted the "amazing" impact in terms of learning speed, and providing greater dignity and equity. One participant, who runs a charity called the Lightyear Foundation that supports disabled and neurodivergent children into STEM, stated: "These supports [e.g. assistive writing, speech-to-text, adaptive pacing, alternative explanations, lesson differentiation, and multi-modal learning approaches] can be particularly valuable for neurodivergent learners who are often least well served by standardised, one-size-fits-all models."

2.2 Negative impacts of AI on student learning outcomes

Despite the stated potential for positive impacts, the roundtable discussion noted the negative implications of AI on student learning outcomes, in terms of: misleading information, reduced critical thinking abilities, and weakened relationships.

Misleading information

Firstly, participants cited the impacts of misinformation on student learning, whereby inaccurate information from generative AI products used by students may mislead them.[12] This can take place in the classroom and at home, though participants noted additional risks at home where students are more likely to be unsupervised – for example, if children are provided with an inaccurate helpline phone number to seek advice from support services.

Weakened critical thinking skills

A key area of emerging research is the impact of AI on students' critical thinking skills, with growing evidence that increasing reliance on AI for learning leads to poorer critical thinking. One participant shared research stating that generative AI can weaken neural activity in users' brains, and undermine foundational processes about how we form memories.[13] Indeed, research by Cambridge Assessment found that people are much more likely to retain information when undertaking notetaking by hand, instead of with LLMs.[14] The participant quoted Professor Robert Coe who said: "Learning happens when people think hard". These impacts may be greater depending on prior attainment, whereby students

---

[12] Atabey, A., Ringmar Sylwander, K., Livingstone, S. (2025) A child rights audit of GenAI in EdTech: learning from five UK case studies. Technical Report. Digital Futures for Children centre, 5Rights Foundation, London, UK. https://www.digital-futures-for-children.net/our-work/genai-edtech

[13] Richmond, T. (2025). *EducAItion, educAItion, educAItion: Could Generative Artificial Intelligence pose a risk to educational standards?* Social Market Foundation. https://www.smf.co.uk/publications/ai-and-learning/

[14] Kreikjes, P. et al. (2026). *Effects of LLM use and note-taking on reading comprehension and memory: A randomised experiment in secondary schools.* Computers & Education, Volume 243. https://blog.cambridgeinternational.org/note-taking-vs-using-an-ai-chatbot-which-is-most-helpful-for-learning/

with lower prior attainment may over-rely on AI outputs without developing foundational critical thinking skills.[15]

Weakened student-teacher relationships

Participants placed particular emphasis on the negative relational impacts of students using AI. They suggested that AI in education may lead to weakened relationships between students and teachers, and between students and their peers. A recent survey in the US found that 50% of students think that AI in the classroom is weakening their relationship with their teachers.[16] Similarly, research by the Brookings Institute found that the increasing use of AI in education, both by students and teachers, is creating an erosion of relational trust between teachers and students, whereby teachers increasingly doubt that students produce authentic work, while students think the same about their teachers.[17] The authors noted how this "adversarial dynamic" can undermine how teachers and students collaborate or work towards a shared vision of how students can better learn, grow, and thrive.[18]

The same research found that increasing AI usage may reduce student interactions with each other – such as for assistance, collaboration, or consultation – weakening the reciprocal intellectual exchanges that constitute a healthy learning community.[19]

The key underpinning question that emerged during discussions on the negative impacts was whether AI is being used to substitute or augment student learning. One participant noted that, instead of approaching the changes AI is bringing to pedagogical practices creatively, and using the technology as an opportunity to augment student learning processes, education settings are largely rooting it in existing pedagogies. They noted: "We keep trying to fit AI into existing pedagogies that have been largely unchanged for 2000 years. We're trying to shoehorn AI into it."

3. Policy, guidance, and future interventions

Although there was some divergence in the room around the impacts of this technology on children's learning, there was generally high consensus on some of the future directions needed if we are to ensure this technology best serves the children it is designed for. Sentiments generally focused on the need for further research and experimentation that

---

[15] Atabey, A., Ringmar Sylwander, K., Livingstone, S. (2025) A child rights audit of GenAI in EdTech: learning from five UK case studies. Technical Report. Digital Futures for Children centre, 5Rights Foundation, London, UK. https://www.digital-futures-for-children.net/our-work/genai-edtech

[16] Laird, E. et al. (2025). *Hand in Hand: Schools' Embrace of AI Connected to Increased Risks to Students*. Centre for Democracy and Technology. https://cdt.org/insights/hand-in-hand-schools-embrace-of-ai-connected-to-increased-risks-to-students/

[17] Burns, M. et al. (2026). A New Direction for Students in an AI World: Prosper, Prepare, Protect. Centre for Universal Education at Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/A-New-Direction-for-Students-in-an-AI-World-FULL-REPORT.pdf

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] *Ibid.*

could inform stronger policies and standards for how we roll this technology out. Above all, it was clear that while the government has a strong role to play in this, there is a need for the 'front-line' voices of teachers and students to be foundational in this thinking.

3.1 Rigorous research and stronger definitions

Of vital importance to this debate is more detailed and real-world tested research to explore the many elements of the impacts of AI on student learning. As a start, we need to strengthen systemic definitions to guide this work. Right now, 'AI' is a general term used to cover all sorts of technological integrations into education - from information searching, to writing assistants, recommender systems in e-learning tools, personalised AI tutors, and much more. Without explicit definitions for different use cases, we will struggle to gain nuanced understandings of impacts on student learning across contexts, and develop effective policies accordingly.

Once we have stronger definitional foundations, we require more real-world and longitudinal research to understand the impacts of AI on learning. It was felt that we have a strong academic foundation for what good learning looks like but we are yet to totally understand how AI maps onto this – particularly in emerging areas such as the impacts on students' critical thinking, relationships with teachers and peers, and emotional dependencies. One participant stated that Education Unions such as the NEU could play an important role in understanding the relational impacts of AI between students and teachers.

Additionally, this research should focus on the similarities and differences in effect across the various forms of AI and background contexts – whether school type, learning context, children's age and prior attainment, subject, and other factors such as socio-economic background, language, and disability or neurodiversity. Effective policy for AI in education should recognise that not all manifestations of AI have the same impact and therefore not treat broad-based policy as a panacea.

3.2 Stronger centralised policies and standards

There was consensus within the room that stronger centralised policies from the Department for Education (DfE), underpinned by guiding educational standards, are needed to ensure that the increasing use of AI tools for student learning leads to positive educational outcomes.

The roundtable acknowledged the progress by the Department for Education to release safety standards for generative AI products in educational settings in January this year.[20] These safety standards followed the DfE's 2025 policy paper on generative AI in education,

[20] Department for Education. (2026). *Generative AI: product safety standards.* https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/generative-ai-product-safety-standards/generative-ai-product-safety-standards

which was accompanied by free online support materials to help with the safe and effective use of AI in education, by staff and students.[21]

However, participants noted that there remain uncertainties about who will be liable for complying with the recently released safety standards, and whether and how they will be enforced. Indeed, one participant suggested that, while these standards are helpful, no products on the market at the moment would currently meet them. Other participants raised concerns that responsibility may be placed on teachers and schools to meet the standards, which they considered unreasonable expectations given existing challenges around resourcing and workload. Participants suggested that the government should ensure that technology developers and providers meet the standards set out by the DfE.

Additionally, participants stated a need for centralised policies on safety audits for products before they are introduced into schools, sharing existing and emerging policy research in the area. It seemed clear from the room that the current state of affairs has individual education institutions being left with evaluating safety of products pre-procurement. This not only means far from standard rollouts across the country, which will have disproportionate impacts on certain sections of the student population, and disparities between more and less resourced schools, but leaves liability and success solely in the hands of staff. Participants stated that there is a big role for government and education unions to play in ensuring that AI products are properly audited before being deployed in educational settings. Pre-procurement auditing should include mandatory child rights impact assessments (CRIAs) and data protection impact assessments (DPIAs) – as outlined in recent case studies by the LSE's Digital Futures for Children centre,[22] and Defend Digital Me's manifesto for a rights respecting digital environment in state education.[23] The roundtable also discussed the need for policies to include clear options for opting-out of data-gathering for AI training and other applications.

3.3 Transparency and access

There was a clear call in the session for public authorities to provide a centrally maintained database with an updated list of EdTech products and their impacts – where schools can clearly see all the most prominent EdTech tools and platforms and see what technology is being used inside them, as well as assessments on how they match up against different safety, child rights and data protection standards and educational practices.

---

[21] Department for Education. (2025). *Generative artificial intelligence (AI) in education: policy paper.* https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/generative-artificial-intelligence-in-education/generative-artificial-intelligence-ai-in-education?pStoreID=intuit/gb-en/shop ; Department for Education. (2025). *Using AI in education settings: support materials.* https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/using-ai-in-education-settings-support-materials

[22] Atabey, A., Ringmar Sylwander, K., Livingstone, S. (2025) A child rights audit of GenAI in EdTech: learning from five UK case studies. Technical Report. Digital Futures for Children centre, 5Rights Foundation, London, UK. https://www.digital-futures-for-children.net/our-work/genai-edtech

[23] Defend Digital Me. (2024). Labels Last a Lifetime: Commitments for a rights respecting digital environment in state education. https://defenddigitalme.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Defend-Digital-Me-manifesto-2024-v3.0.pdf

It was clear in the discussion that not all thinking, experimentation, and learning is evenly distributed amongst the schooling system, with some schools being in very different places to others. We should take advantage of the learnings from early-movers and those with affordances to experiment and openly share what is working and what is not. One participant from the LEO Academy Trust outlined how they are now openly sharing the learnings from their experiments in schools since it was clear this could be valuable to informing the policies of other institutions. This shared learning would not only accelerate our understanding of this technology's impact, but mean more institutions have access to frontier insights.

3.4 AI literacy education and training for teachers and students

Whilst many teachers seemed interested in learning more about this technology so they could make informed choices, there was clearly not only a general lack of certainty on skills but also a highlight that this is also unevenly distributed. Some more traditional teachers who already push back against technology in their classroom may be further behind than, typically younger, more experimental teachers who would be more likely to test this new technology.

As outlined above, there was also very clear sentiment around the divides across schools, with administrators and teachers in private schools having much more time and resources to upskill, test, and ultimately procure tools that they felt best served the needs of their students. Public schools, on the other hand, tend to have more ad hoc processes around these sorts of decisions. To produce the best learning outcomes for students across the board, the room felt clear that we must work to educate and upskill all teachers in the UK.

Alongside digital and AI literacy for educators, there was also clear support for more thorough and well-designed education for students on this technology. Without proper education on how to use AI, there are greater risks of negative impact on learning outcomes and beyond. One participant called for critical digital literacy to be integrated across primary and secondary curriculum beyond computing because of its relevance across subjects.[24]

3.5 Co-design and imaginative futures

Whilst many in the room may have some from a more cautious footing, there were a couple of attendees who felt much more strongly about the positive benefits of AI in the classroom. This wasn't only for the possible benefits for SEND students or those with additional needs, but a general view that this technology has given us the opportunity to overall reimagine pedagogy, schooling, and assessment for the 21st century. The most technologically ambitious in the room felt we should use this moment to return to first principles and think

[24] Lovatt, S. et al. (2024). Perceptions of Generative Artificial Intelligence from the classroom. Student and staff views and experiences, and implications for future practice. St Mary's University, Twickenham.https://www.stmarys.ac.uk/partnerships/docs/cpd-docs/perceptions-of-generative-ai-from-the-classroom-full-report.pdf

about how we can update this centuries old education system, with the current debate "steeped in this lack of creativity in what could actually be possible".

One thing that felt universally clear in the room was the need for co-design, no matter how ambitious the changes coming down the line. This should not only include vital spaces for teachers and educators in this discussion, but also for the students that will be using it. Some early work led by Connected by Data alongside the Department for Education has piloted some work engaging young people in these discussions and started to see what this process could look like.[25] This has resulted in valuable resources for teachers to lead informed and deliberative conversations about generative AI in education by providing a single or double lesson plan for discussing generative AI in education with 10 to 18 year olds.[26]

Vital to this imagined future is thoughts around learning quality, over the adoption of flashy new tools, and longer-term thinking around data, privacy, and the role of the private actors making up the EdTech sector, especially Big Tech companies like Google and Microsoft who are currently set to have a particularly large impact on this technology's trajectory.

4. Conclusion and key takeaways

Overall, AI is becoming increasingly prevalent in student learning processes, both in the classroom and at home. There are emerging questions about the impacts of student AI use on their learning outcomes, and the policy and guidance needed at national, local, and school levels to ensure that the ongoing digitisation of education supports rather than limits student learning. The roundtable highlighted the following points:

- In the classroom and at home, students use AI tools for the following purposes: search, work feedback, breaking down complex content into easier digestible content, self-testing on learnt knowledge, companionship, chatbots, recommendations, image generation, recipes, and seeking advice.

- There are disparities between state and private schools in terms of policy and oversight infrastructure for AI in education – whereby adequate training and guidance is more likely to be in place in private schools rather than state schools.

- AI in education can have both positive and negative impacts on student learning, though participants stated that, under current regulatory conditions, the risks outweigh the benefits.

- In terms of positive impacts:

---

[25] Connected by Data. (2026). *Generative AI in Education: Have Your Say Report.* https://connectedbydata.org/resources/generative-ai-in-education-report
[26] Connected by Data. (2026). *Generative AI in Education: Have Your Say Workshop in a Box.* https://connectedbydata.org/ai-in-education/toolkit/

    - AI tools in education can support student learning for reading and writing, especially for second language learners, by providing personalised feedback and support for key linguistic foundations.

    - AI tools in education provide particular benefit to SEND students, providing assistive and adaptive tools to support inclusion.

- In terms of negative impacts:

    - AI in education may mislead students because of inaccurate information provided by generative AI products.

    - There is growing evidence that students' increasing reliance on AI for learning weakens critical thinking skills, undermining foundational learning processes.

    - AI in education may lead to weakened relationships between students and teachers, and between students and their peers, by eroding trust and replacing relational educational interactions.

- Recommendations:

    - Research and evidence: More detailed and real-world tested research is needed to build the evidence base on the impacts of AI on student learning, and especially how they differ across contexts.

    - Stronger centralised policies: There is an urgent need for stronger centralised policies from the DfE. While the recently released generative AI safety standards are welcome, there remain questions about liability and enforcement to ensure that the responsibility for compliance is not placed on teachers.

    - Auditing and impact assessments: There is a need for centralised auditing mechanisms for AI tools in education based on rights-based and data protection impact assessments, taking place before products are procured.

    - Transparency and access: public authorities should provide a centrally maintained database with an updated list of AI products used in educational settings and their impacts.

    - AI literacy training for teachers and students: teachers must receive adequate training and guidance about AI in education, across all schools. Critical AI literacy should be integrated across secondary and primary curriculum subjects.

- Co-design: teachers and students should be at the heart of conversations about future directions for AI in education to ensure the ongoing digitisation of education supports and furthers student learning.