

AI in schools

Considerations for policymakers

October 2026

This explainer draws on emerging evidence to provide considerations for policymakers on using artificial intelligence (AI) in schools.

Introduction

AI – particularly generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) – is becoming increasingly prominent in Australian schools. As its use expands, AI presents opportunities to support teaching and learning while also raising important questions about how AI tools can be designed, implemented and used safely, equitably and effectively.

Currently, there's limited evidence on the impact of AI use in schools (Fesler et al., 2026). As the evidence on AI continues to develop, the well-established evidence base on [how students learn](#) provides an important foundation for considering the role of AI in education. Decisions about AI use should be informed by the extent to which AI supports the cognitive processes that underpin learning and aligns with the evidence-based practices known to improve educational outcomes.

This explainer provides an overview of the emerging evidence base and identifies key considerations for policymakers regarding the use of AI in schools. The Australian Education Research Organisation (AERO) has also developed a complementary explainer with [considerations for teachers and school leaders](#). We'll continue to monitor the evidence and provide updated guidance as the evidence base strengthens and matures.

Understanding AI and its use in Australian schools

AI is a broad term that refers to a range of existing and emerging technologies, with attributes that distinguish it from previous technologies and computer systems (Lodge & Loble, 2026). AI has been used in schools for many years through technologies such as speech-to-text, predictive text and accessibility supports.

A more recent development, GenAI is a subset of AI that can produce content that resembles what humans can produce such as text, images, audio, and video (Australian Government Department of Education, 2023). GenAI tools are trained on large amounts of data to recognise patterns and generate outputs, enabling GenAI to produce increasingly sophisticated content and perform complex tasks. AI and GenAI tools can be both general-purpose technologies, such as conversational chatbots, and education-specific technologies designed to support teaching, learning and assessment, including department-approved platforms in some jurisdictions.

In this explainer, AERO uses AI as a broad term encompassing a range of AI-enabled technologies, including GenAI tools, agents and platforms. Definitions and terminology for AI and GenAI vary across sources and communities (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2025a), and research doesn't always clearly distinguish between different types of AI technology.

AI use in Australian schools

Across Australia, AI is increasingly being used by students, teachers and school leaders to support teaching, learning, assessment and administrative tasks (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA], 2026; Friedman et al., 2025). AI tools are widely accessible both within and beyond schools and, increasingly, AI is embedded within everyday digital tools, including web browsers, search engines and productivity applications such as word processors. Students and teachers may interact with AI-enabled features without necessarily recognising them (OECD, 2026a) and teachers may not always know if, when, where or how students are using AI (Pearson & Jensen, 2026).

Student-facing AI tools include conversational chatbots, adaptive tutoring systems and personalised learning platforms that can provide explanations, generate feedback and personalise instruction. Teacher-facing AI tools include technologies to support lesson planning, resource generation, assessment, learning analytics, instructional planning and administrative efficiency.

Survey evidence indicates that AI use is becoming more frequent in teaching and learning across Australian schools. In the 2025 National Assessment Program – Information and Communication Technology literacy assessment, more than 30% of Year 6 students and 60% of Year 10 students reported using AI tools to generate written content for schoolwork at least monthly (ACARA, 2026). A 2026 survey of nearly 2,000 children aged 10 to 17 years found that 78% had used an AI tool (such as ChatGPT, Gemini or Copilot) and nearly half of those children were using AI tools daily or a few times a week (Office of the eSafety Commissioner, 2026). The most common uses of AI were to receive help with schoolwork, organisation or problem-solving, including using AI to find information, support learning or translation, and for writing or editing.

Australian teachers are also adopting AI to support their work. In the 2024 OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS), 66% of Australian lower secondary teachers reported using AI in the previous year. This was substantially higher than the OECD average of 36% for lower secondary teachers (Friedman et al., 2025). Teachers reported mainly using AI to generate lesson materials, summarise curriculum content and adapt resources to meet students' learning needs. Consistent with the TALIS results, a 2025 survey of teachers and school leaders in New South Wales found that 75% had used AI for work, primarily to develop curriculum resources and support administrative tasks (Pearson & Jensen, 2026).

Some Australian education systems have developed department-approved AI platforms for teacher and/or student use, including EdChat in South Australia, NSWEdUChat, Corella in Queensland and ClassmAlte in Western Australia. Compared to general-purpose tools, purpose-built AI platforms and tools may better align with the curriculum and include pedagogical guardrails that scaffold and guide how the tools respond to support learning. For example, AI tools that include pedagogical guardrails may be designed to prompt students to explain their reasoning or ask questions, rather than providing an answer directly.

Given that AI, and particularly GenAI, is increasingly being used for schoolwork, systems have a responsibility to look beyond what these technologies can do and actively shape how they're used in schools. This includes using evidence-based policy levers and providing guidance around AI use that supports – rather than undermines – teaching and learning.

The emerging evidence base

Evidence on the impact of AI in schools is still emerging and there's limited research examining AI use and student learning outcomes in school settings (Fesler et al., 2026). While some studies suggest AI can improve student performance or schoolwork in the short term, results are mixed when students are later assessed without access to AI tools. For example, a large study of nearly 1,000 high school maths students found that students who had unrestricted access to AI for study sessions performed higher in practice problems than the control group who didn't have access to AI. However, when both groups were assessed in an unassisted exam without access to AI, the students who had previously used AI achieved lower results than the control group (Bastani et al., 2025). The same study found that a separate group of students who had access to AI with pedagogical guardrails for study sessions achieved similar results to the control group in the unassisted exam, suggesting that the scaffolded version of AI didn't affect performance. Another large study of over 400 secondary students found that students using AI had poorer reading comprehension and retention compared to students using traditional note-taking or a combination of AI and note-taking (Kreijkes et al., 2026).

There's very little experimental evidence on the effects of AI on student learning and findings vary considerably depending on the educational context, study design, duration of implementation and the outcomes being measured (Fesler et al., 2026; Han et al., 2025). Several limitations of the current evidence base make it difficult to draw firm conclusions about the long-term impacts of AI tools on teaching and learning, particularly as AI tools may be used in many different ways:

- Much of the research is recent, short term, exploratory and conducted outside Australia (Arthars et al., 2026; Fesler et al., 2026) and there's limited research on the durability of student learning when AI is removed.
- Many studies focus on student engagement or perceptions rather than robust measures of learning (Weidlich et al., 2025).
- Much of the current evidence comes from higher education and secondary school settings (Fesler et al., 2026). Very limited, if any, research comes from primary school settings.
- AI technologies continue to evolve rapidly, meaning research findings may become outdated as new tools and capabilities emerge (Lodge & Loble, 2026).

Research examining the implications of AI use for First Nations students, educators and communities is even more limited, with existing literature focusing on Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property, Indigenous Data Sovereignty, self-determination, cultural responsiveness, bias and the governance of First Nations knowledges in AI systems (Leaver & Srdarov, 2025; McMaster et al., 2026; Perera et al., 2025). Although this evidence base is still developing, the issues identified in the literature highlight the need for systems to consider how AI can be used in ways that support culturally responsive and reflexive practice, and how First Nations leadership and governance can inform decisions about the use of AI in education.

Taken together, the emerging evidence suggests that the educational impact of AI isn't yet fully understood and is likely to depend on how AI tools are designed, implemented and used (Arthars et al., 2026). While the evidence on AI is still developing, the evidence on [how students learn](#) is well-established and robust. There's a strong body of research identifying the cognitive processes that underpin learning and the teaching practices that most effectively support students to acquire, retain and apply knowledge (AERO, 2023). AERO's [model of learning and teaching](#) summarises 4 key principles about how students acquire, retain and apply knowledge:

1. Learning is a change in long-term memory.

2. Students process limited amounts of new information.

3. Students develop and demonstrate mastery.

4. Students are actively engaged with learning.

In the absence of a mature evidence base on AI, the evidence on how students learn provides an important foundation for interpreting emerging evidence about AI and its use in schools to support learning and teaching.

Potential opportunities and risks to learning and teaching

Emerging evidence on AI points to both potential opportunities and risks for learning and teaching. The evidence suggests that the educational value of AI likely depends on how it's designed and used, including whether it supports or replaces the cognitive processes that underpin learning (Arthars et al., 2026; Fesler et al., 2026).

Potential opportunities

AI tools may be able to support teaching and learning when they're designed and implemented in ways that align with evidence-based teaching and are used to support students to build, consolidate and apply knowledge over time. AI tools may also be useful to support teachers with planning, preparation and administrative tasks.

AI has the potential to support student learning

There are some indications that AI tools may be able to support student learning when they're designed and used to complement existing evidence-based practice, although limited school-based research has been undertaken. Well-designed AI tools with pedagogical guardrails – such as those using Socratic questioning to prompt students' thinking and reasoning rather than those that simply provide answers – show more promise than general-purpose AI tools (Fesler et al., 2026). AI tools with guardrails can be designed to scaffold opportunities for students to review and retrieve learning, consolidate knowledge, practise applying knowledge in varied ways and extend students' thinking. Teachers can also support students in engaging with AI tools in ways that support learning – for example, by preparing a starting prompt for an AI chatbot that connects to students' prior knowledge and explicitly guides them towards a learning intention (Tanti et al., 2026).

AI tools may also support human-delivered instruction. For example, adaptive tutoring systems may be able to support teachers in identifying student learning needs, tailoring instruction, generating explanations and providing immediate feedback, enabling more individualised learning support for students (OECD, 2026b). Studies of AI-supported tutoring suggest it can improve the quality of real-time tutoring – particularly for less experienced tutors – and may assist teachers in monitoring learning and making more informed instructional decisions (Fesler et al., 2026). AI tutoring systems, if effective, could provide scalable opportunities to support student learning. However, important aspects of effective teaching – such as responsive scaffolding and professional judgement – remain difficult to replicate through AI alone and international guidance highlights the need for continued human oversight (Miao & Holmes, 2023; OECD, 2026a, 2026b; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2025).

AI has the potential to support teacher workload reduction

AI has the potential to reduce the time teachers spend on tasks such as lesson planning, resource development and administrative work (Pearson & Jensen, 2026; Roy et al., 2024). It may also assist teachers in developing tailored resources, scaffolds and worked examples that support evidence-based instruction. These efficiencies could create more time for teachers to focus on activities that have the greatest impact on student learning, including planning high-quality instruction, monitoring student understanding, providing feedback and responding to students' individual learning needs.

However, workload reduction isn't automatic, and there's limited evidence that time saved on individual tasks translates into meaningful reductions in teachers' overall workload. The time saved will depend in part on the quality of AI training data and suitability of AI outputs, including alignment with curriculum requirements and evidence-based teaching practices. If AI training datasets contain educational materials that reflect ineffective pedagogical approaches, the outputs are likely to reproduce or amplify these approaches at scale (Oakley et al., 2026; UNESCO, 2025). Teacher oversight and professional judgement therefore remain essential for evaluating AI outputs and ensuring they're accurate, pedagogically sound, aligned with curriculum requirements and appropriate for students and their teaching context (Bastani et al., 2025).

Potential risks

Emerging research on AI highlights several risks that warrant careful policy consideration with reference to the well-established evidence on how students learn. AI may affect the cognitive processes that enable students to acquire, retain and apply knowledge, and create new challenges for student assessment. AI also presents broader risks around privacy, governance and equity.

AI may undermine student learning

The established evidence on [how students learn](#) highlights that learning depends on students engaging in the cognitive processes needed to build knowledge and develop increasingly sophisticated understanding. These processes underpin students' ability to build mental models, retain and consolidate knowledge, and transfer learning to new situations. When students use AI to generate responses, solve problems and produce content on demand, it can reduce the cognitive effort required to complete learning tasks and reduce opportunities for students to consolidate knowledge in long-term memory (Bastani et al., 2025). This may create a 'performance paradox', where students perform better on a task when using AI but learn less in the process (Yan et al., 2025).

The key concern isn't simply whether AI improves students' immediate performance, but whether AI use supports or displaces the cognitive processes required for learning. This is closely related to the concept of **cognitive offloading**, which refers to the outsourcing of cognitive processes to external technologies (Lodge & Loble, 2026; Risko & Gilbert, 2016; Skulmowski, 2023). While cognitive offloading can sometimes be beneficial when it reduces unnecessary demands on working memory and allows students to focus on learning tasks (e.g., using a calculator for complex calculations), it can become detrimental when students outsource cognitive processes and expend less cognitive effort, undermining learning.

Cognitive offloading becomes a concern when AI, and particularly GenAI, reduces the need for students to engage in the thinking required to acquire and retain knowledge. For information to be learned, students need to process and store it in long-term memory. Knowledge stored in long-term memory provides the foundation for subsequent thinking, retrieval, reasoning and application. However, when students rely on AI to retrieve information, generate ideas or produce written responses, it may reduce opportunities for students to demonstrate, extend and apply their learning (Lodge & Loble, 2026; Tanti et al., 2026).

Importantly, effective use of AI depends on students having sufficient content knowledge (Oakley et al., 2026). AI tools may produce content that's inaccurate, incomplete or fabricated, and may reproduce biases present in their training data or generate outputs that disadvantage particular groups (Miao & Holmes, 2023; OECD, 2026b). Students therefore need sufficient background knowledge to evaluate AI responses, identify inaccuracies and refine prompts (Tanti et al., 2026). These considerations may be particularly important for younger students. The evidence base for AI in education is drawn predominantly from secondary and higher education settings, with comparatively little research involving younger students (Fesler et al., 2026). Younger students are still developing the foundational knowledge and metacognitive strategies needed to critically evaluate AI outputs, recognise inaccuracies and use these tools independently in ways that will support learning (Miao & Holmes, 2023; Tanti et al., 2026).

Systems should therefore encourage a more cautious approach to AI use in the primary years, with consideration of age restrictions for AI tools and greater emphasis on teacher guidance and oversight for younger students (Miao & Holmes, 2023).

For all students, developing strong content knowledge, metacognitive strategies and self-regulated learning techniques can help them recognise when AI use is reducing rather than supporting their cognitive engagement. Without these foundations, students may become increasingly dependent on AI while becoming less able to question or verify its outputs (Tanti et al., 2026).

AI presents new challenges for assessment

AI also creates significant new challenges for assessment. As AI is increasingly used within and beyond classrooms, it can become more difficult to determine what students know and can do independently, potentially affecting the integrity of assessment (Pearson & Jensen, 2026).

Assessment serves an important purpose in both measuring student learning against curriculum expectations and providing opportunities for students to engage with and consolidate what they've learned. However, the availability of AI and the lack of reliable AI detection tools mean teachers can't confidently determine whether students have used AI in take-home or unsupervised online assessments. A New South Wales survey reported that only 21% of teachers had received direction from their school on how to approach assessment, and about half were concerned about not knowing how to prevent the use of AI in assessments (Pearson & Jensen, 2026). Many teachers reported moving towards pen and paper assessments conducted at school and/or using other approaches, such as collecting evidence of the process students followed to complete a task, student declarations or oral defences of their work. This highlights a large shift in how schools and teachers are approaching assessment and reflects an important area for systems to provide guidance to protect assessment integrity and student learning as AI use becomes more widespread.

AI introduces privacy and governance challenges

Beyond its implications for learning and assessment, the use of AI raises broader policy challenges relating to privacy and governance. The increasing integration of AI into educational technologies raises important questions about privacy, transparency and accountability. Many AI tools rely on large volumes of training data, creating challenges around data governance, ownership and appropriate collection and use of student, school and system data. While some purpose-built educational AI tools and platforms may be designed to protect student data, many students and teachers may be unaware that general AI tools are collecting and drawing personal data and materials to train systems and inform outputs (Miao & Holmes, 2023).

These privacy considerations are particularly significant for First Nations communities, as Indigenous Data Sovereignty recognises the right of First Nations Peoples to govern the collection, ownership and application of data relating to their communities, cultures and knowledge (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2019). As AI systems increasingly draw on large-scale datasets, there's a risk that Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property may be used without appropriate consent or authority (Martinez-Maldonado et al., 2026; Perera et al., 2025). AI systems are predominantly trained on Western datasets and knowledge systems and may misrepresent or decontextualise First Nations knowledges, cultures and languages, reinforce biases and stereotypes, and overlook the cultural protocols and collective rights that govern how Indigenous Knowledges are held, accessed and shared (Alterator et al., 2025; Leaver & Srdarov, 2025; McMaster et al., 2026).

AI may exacerbate educational inequities

AI also has the potential to reinforce existing educational inequities. Access to high-quality tools, digital infrastructure, educator capability and implementation support varies across systems, schools, teachers and students. Inequities can be exacerbated by the quality of AI tools available to students and teachers. Free general-purpose AI tools have lower capabilities than subscription models and are less likely to align with the curriculum than purpose-built or department-approved AI tools. These differences may be particularly significant for students living in rural and remote or disadvantaged communities where access to quality digital technologies and/or reliable connectivity may be more limited. Differences in students' access to AI tools, digital capability and support may also create inequities in how students use AI for assessment.

In addition, students who have developed stronger background knowledge and metacognitive strategies may be better positioned to benefit from AI than those requiring additional support (Lodge & Loble, 2026). On the other hand, students who are still developing self-regulated learning techniques and metacognitive strategies may be more likely to rely on the convenience of AI (Lodge & Loble, 2026). This may further widen the gap between students over time, as those with the knowledge and capabilities to use AI effectively may have access to greater opportunities as they complete their schooling and navigate an increasingly technology-enabled labour market. Without deliberate policy action to promote equitable access to quality AI tools, as well as the knowledge, skills and support needed to use them effectively, AI may widen existing educational disparities rather than help reduce them.

Emerging policy and quality assurance approaches

Across Australia, governments have developed national and jurisdictional guidance to support the safe, responsible and effective use of AI in schools. [The Australian Framework for Generative Artificial Intelligence \(AI\) in Schools](#), the 2024 Framework Review (endorsed by Education Ministers in 2025) and the Australian Government [National AI Plan](#) outline principles and actions to support the responsible adoption of AI while encouraging innovation. Jurisdictions are also developing AI policies and guidance that reflect their educational contexts, including Victorian guidance on the appropriate use of AI tools and the planned NSW Education Standards Authority review of the impact of AI on student learning and assessment.

Alongside policies and guidance, quality assurance approaches are emerging to assess whether AI tools are safe, responsible and fit for educational purposes. In Australia, the [Safer Technologies 4 Schools \(ST4S\)](#) initiative is piloting a Responsible Artificial Intelligence (RAI) Standard and Evaluation to assess AI-enabled digital products against consistent ethical and governance principles. Complementing this work, AERO and Education Services Australia have developed and are currently piloting national quality standards for education technology to ensure digital tools – including AI-enabled applications – are aligned with evidence-based teaching practices, educationally effective and safe for use in schools.

Internationally, organisations such as UNESCO (n.d.) and the OECD (n.d.) have similarly emphasised the importance of establishing appropriate conditions for AI use in education, with a focus on maintaining human oversight, protecting equity, providing appropriate guardrails, strengthening understanding of AI and ensuring AI complements evidence-based teaching practices (Miao & Holmes, 2023; OECD, 2023, 2026a). Together, these policies, guidance and quality assurance approaches provide a foundation for systems to support responsible AI use and assess and manage potential risks.

Policy considerations

Policymakers face significant challenges in creating the conditions for AI to support learning and teaching while managing potential risks, particularly as AI use increases and the evidence base continues to develop.

AERO has identified 3 broad considerations for policymakers around the use of AI in schools. These are:

- developing clear, evidence-informed policies and guidance to inform decisions about AI use
- supporting effective implementation through access to quality AI tools and building capability
- strengthening the evidence base through ongoing research, monitoring and evaluation.

1. Develop clear, evidence-informed policies and guidance to inform decisions about AI use

In the absence of a comprehensive evidence base on the impacts of AI in education, system policies and guidance should be underpinned by the well-established evidence base on how students learn and effective teaching practices. This provides a consistent foundation for decisions about how AI can support teaching and learning while protecting the cognitive processes required for students to acquire, retain and apply knowledge. Guidance should address both the potential benefits of AI – including opportunities to reduce teacher workload – and potential risks to student learning and assessment.

In addition to the Australian Framework, clear policies, guidance and practical examples can support school leaders and teachers in making informed decisions about when, how and why AI should be used. This includes clarifying where AI can support teachers and where professional judgement and oversight remain essential across lesson planning, classroom teaching and learning, assessment, feedback and administrative activities.

System guidance should also address broader considerations associated with AI use, including student privacy and safety, Indigenous Data Sovereignty and Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property, and equitable access to high-quality AI tools. As technologies and the evidence base evolve, systems will need to regularly review and update policies and guidance, while providing schools with the time, resources and support needed to implement changes effectively and avoid change fatigue (Lind et al., 2026).

2. Support effective implementation in schools through access to quality AI tools and building capability

The impact of AI will depend on how it's implemented in practice. While systems are responsible for designing and developing AI tools, policies and guidance, schools are the site of change and school leaders and teachers enact these changes in practice (Lind et al., 2026).

Systems should equip schools with the resources and supports needed to effectively implement AI in their local contexts, including access to high-quality tools that meet safety and quality standards, align with the curriculum and are informed by the evidence base on how students learn. Differences in access to appropriate digital infrastructure, connectivity and AI tools across schools and communities may create barriers to equitable access and effective implementation. Given the variation in the quality of AI tools available to schools, teachers and students, systems should prioritise equitable access to AI tools that are fit for purpose and support – rather than undermine – student learning.

Effective implementation also depends on building capability across the education workforce. Teachers and school leaders require access to knowledge-building activities, resources and ongoing support to develop the knowledge, skills and professional judgement needed to use AI tools effectively and critically evaluate their outputs. This includes professional learning to build a technical understanding of AI and strengthen capability to use AI in ways that support effective teaching practice, student learning and culturally responsive practice. This is particularly important to ensure AI complements, rather than replaces, respectful engagement with First Nations knowledges and acknowledges students' diverse cultural identities, experiences and perspectives.

3. Strengthen the evidence base through ongoing research, monitoring and evaluation

Sustained system investment in research, monitoring and evaluation is necessary to strengthen the evidence base on AI use in schools and inform future policy decisions as AI tools and technologies continue to evolve. While emerging research suggests potential opportunities for AI to support teaching and learning and reduce teacher workload (Fesler et al., 2026), significant questions remain about its long-term impact on learning, teaching and educational equity. Evidence on the implications of AI for First Nations students, educators and communities is particularly limited, highlighting the need for research that is driven by First Nations leadership and perspectives.

As governments invest in and trial AI in education, internationally and in Australia, there are important opportunities to learn from research, implementation experience and evaluation findings to drive improvements. For example, New Zealand is exploring the use of AI in assessment to help improve the quality, consistency and speed of marking (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 2025), while the United Kingdom is evaluating AI-supported teaching tools and examining the implementation conditions needed for successful adoption (United Kingdom Government, 2026). Sharing findings from these and other initiatives can help systems identify what works, under what conditions, and the lessons that may be relevant to their own contexts.

Investment in research – together with ongoing monitoring and evaluation – can help systems understand how AI is being used in schools, assess its short- and long-term impacts on teaching and learning, identify emerging opportunities, risks and unintended consequences, and determine whether existing safeguards and approaches to managing these risks remain effective. This can provide an evidence base for refining policy, guidance and implementation approaches, and identifying where additional safeguards or support may be needed. As AI tools and technologies continue to evolve at a rapid pace, ongoing collaboration and sharing of evaluation findings across systems can fast track a more robust evidence base and support the improvement of AI tools, policies and guidance for effective use in schools.

Conclusion

The increasing use of AI in Australian schools presents both potential opportunities and important challenges for education systems to address. While there's very little evidence on AI use in school education and outstanding questions about the long-term impact of AI on learning and teaching, the prevalence of AI use by teachers and students necessitates system responses to safeguard learning and teaching.

AERO has identified 3 broad considerations for policymakers from the emerging evidence on AI:

1. Policies and guidance on AI should be underpinned by the well-established evidence base on how students learn to ensure AI use complements, rather than compromises, effective learning and teaching. This includes guidance on AI use for teachers and school leaders that addresses opportunities for workload reduction and protects student learning and assessment.
2. The benefits of AI will depend on systems supporting effective implementation in schools. This includes supporting equitable access to high-quality AI tools and building capability to strengthen teacher understanding of AI in line with the evidence on how students acquire, retain, consolidate and apply knowledge.
3. Ongoing research, monitoring and evaluation are essential for strengthening the evidence base and ensuring policy guidance continues to evolve alongside technological change. This includes research on how AI impacts teacher workload, teaching practices and student learning – particularly long-term impacts – and ongoing monitoring of the implications for student equity and safety.

Taken together, these considerations suggest that policy guidance, implementation and ongoing research and evaluation of AI use in schools should be grounded in the strongest available evidence on how students learn and the practices that best support effective student learning.

References

- Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. (2019, July 2). *Delivering Indigenous data sovereignty* [Presentation]. 2019 National Indigenous Research Conference. <https://aiatsis.gov.au/publication/116530>
- Alterator, S., Maddox, A., Southerton, C., & Schutt, S. (2025). Re-authorising colonialism or re-authorising Indigenous perspectives: The risks of generative AI in Indigenous education contexts. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2025.2586732>
- Arthars, N., Yang, H., Hill, M., Liu, D., & Markauskaite, L. (2026). *Young people, learning, and generative AI: A rapid literature review and implications for PreK–12 education*. Barker Institute; The University of Sydney. <https://barker.institute/news/young-people-learning-and-generative-ai-a-rapid-literature-review-and-implications-for-prek-12-education>
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2026). *National Assessment Program: ICT Literacy 2025 public report*. <https://www.nap.edu.au/nap-sample-assessments/results-and-reports>
- Australian Education Research Organisation. (2023). *Teaching for how students learn: A model of learning and teaching*. <https://www.edresearch.edu.au/guides-resources/practice-resources/teaching-how-students-learn-model-learning-and-teaching>
- Australian Government Department of Education. (2023). *Australian framework for generative artificial intelligence (AI) in schools*. Commonwealth of Australia. <https://www.education.gov.au/schooling/resources/australian-framework-generative-artificial-intelligence-ai-schools>
- Bastani, H., Bastani, O., Sungu, A., Ge, H., Kabakçı, Ö., & Mariman, R. (2025). Generative AI without guardrails can harm learning: Evidence from high school mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 122(26), Article e2422633122. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2422633122>
- Fesler, L., Martinez Claeys, J., Agnew, C., & Loeb, S. (2026). *The evidence base on AI in K-12: A 2026 review*. AI Hub for Education, Stanford University. <https://scale.stanford.edu/research-in-action/understanding-evidence-base-ai-k12-education>
- Friedman, T., Ainley, J., Schulz, W., & Dix, K. (2025). *TALIS 2024 Australian report: The Teaching and Learning International Survey*. Australian Council for Educational Research. <https://doi.org/10.37517/978-1-74286-801-1>
- Han, X., Peng, H., & Liu, M. (2025). The impact of GenAI on learning outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Educational Research Review*, 48, Article 100714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2025.100714>
- Kreijkes, P., Kewenig, V., Kuvalja, M., Lee, M., Hofman, J. M., Vitello, S., Sellen, A., Rintel, S., Goldstein, D. G., Rothschild, D., Tankelevitch, L., & Oates, T. (2026). Effects of LLM use and note-taking on reading comprehension and memory: A randomised experiment in secondary schools. *Computers and Education*, 243, Article 105514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2025.105514>
- Leaver, T., & Srdarov, S. (2025). *Children and generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in Australia: The big challenges*. Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for the Digital Child, Queensland University of Technology. <https://doi.org/10.5204/rep.eprints.257452>

- Lind, R., Davis, C., & Heenan, B. (2026). *Leveraging evidence for system support: Guidance report*. Australian Education Research Organisation. <https://www.edresearch.edu.au/research/research-reports/leveraging-evidence-system-support>
- Lodge, J. M., & Loble, L. (2026). *Artificial intelligence, cognitive offloading and implications for education*. University of Technology Sydney. <https://doi.org/10.71741/4pyxmbnjq.31302475>
- Martinez-Maldonado, R., Echeverria, V., Hawes, J., Kim, Y. J., Maddigan, Z., Milesi, M., Nelson, T., & Tsai, Y.-S. (2026). Relational AI in education: Reciprocity, participatory design, and Indigenous worldviews. In E. G. Blanchard, G. Chen, M. Chi, & S. Isotani (Eds.), *Artificial Intelligence in Education: Late Breaking Results, WideAIED, Practitioners, Industry and Policies, Blue Sky, Doctoral Consortium, FoL Workshops and Tutorials, FoL Invited Papers. Communications in Computer and Information Science* (Vol. 3032, p. 368–382). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-29791-4_29
- McMaster, N., Morrison, R., Jordan, R., & O'Chin, H. (2026). Generative AI and Australian First Nations representation: Ethical concerns and cultural implications. *Australasian Journal of Technology Education*, 11. <https://ajte.org/index.php/AJTE/article/view/122>
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. <https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535>
- New Zealand Qualifications Authority. (2025, August 27). *Embracing AI in student assessments*. <https://www2.nzqa.govt.nz/about-us/news/embracing-ai-in-student-assessments/>
- Oakley, B., Johnston, M., Chen, K.-Z., Jung, E., & Sejnowski, T. (2026). The memory paradox: Why our brains need knowledge in an age of AI. In M. Rangeley & N. Fairfax (Eds.), *The artificial intelligence revolution: Challenges and opportunities* (pp. 573–628). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-11814-1_22
- Office of the eSafety Commissioner. (2026). *Talking to machines: Children's experiences with AI assistants and companions*. Commonwealth of Australia. <https://www.esafety.gov.au/research/talking-to-machines-childrens-experiences-with-ai-assistants-and-companions>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (n.d.). *Artificial intelligence and education and skills*. <https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/sub-issues/artificial-intelligence-and-education-and-skills.html>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Opportunities, guidelines and guardrails for effective and equitable use of AI in education*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c74f03de-en>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025a). *OECD compendium of productivity indicators 2025*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/b024d9e1-en>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2026a). *Empowering learners for the age of AI: An AI literacy framework for primary and secondary education*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/65cd27d4-en>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2026b). *OECD digital education outlook 2026: Exploring effective uses of generative AI in education*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/062a7394-en>

Pearson, E., & Jensen, B. (2026). *AI use in schools: Taking action now*. Learning First.

<https://learningfirst.com/research/aiuseinschools>

Perera, M., Vidanaarachchi, R., Chandrashekeran, S., Kennedy, M., Kennedy, B., & Halgamuge, S. (2025). Indigenous peoples and artificial intelligence: A systematic review and future directions. *Big Data & Society*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517251349170>

Risko, E. F., & Gilbert, S. J. (2016). Cognitive offloading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(9), 676–688. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.07.002>

Roy, P., Poet, H., Staunton, R., Aston, K., & Thomas, D. (2024). *ChatGPT in lesson preparation: A teacher choices trial*. Education Endowment Foundation. <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/projects-and-evaluation/projects/choices-in-edtech-using-generative-ai-chatgpt-for-ks3-science-lesson-preparation-2024-teacher-choices-trial>

Skulmowski, A. (2023). The cognitive architecture of digital externalization. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(4), Article 101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09818-1>

Tanti, M., Maddox, A., & Phillips, E. (2026). *The science of learning and generative AI: A guide for secondary teachers*. La Trobe University. <https://doi.org/10.26181/32775462>

United Kingdom Government. (2026, April 16). *Edtech and AI companies invited to help build safe AI tutoring tools for disadvantaged pupils* [Press release]. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/edtech-and-ai-companies-invited-to-help-build-safe-ai-tutoring-tools-for-disadvantaged-pupils>

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.). *Artificial intelligence in education*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-education/artificial-intelligence>

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2025). *AI and the future of education: Disruptions, dilemmas and directions*. <https://doi.org/10.54675/KECK1261>

Weidlich, J., Gašević, D., Drachsler, H., & Kirschner, P. (2025). ChatGPT in education: An effect in search of a cause. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 41(5), Article e70105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.70105>

Yan, L., Greiff, S., Lodge, J. M., & Gašević, D. (2025). Distinguishing performance gains from learning when using generative AI. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 4(7), 435–436. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-025-00467-5>

Acknowledgement

AERO would like to acknowledge Professor Leslie Loble AM, Professor Jason Lodge, Emeritus Professor John Sweller and Professor Miriam Tanti, who provided expert review of this content. We would also like to acknowledge the guidance and feedback of members of the First Nations Expert Reference Group.