



Written Evidence Submitted to the Education Committee on the Use of Artificial Intelligence and EdTech in Education

3 June 2026

Professor Ann Kristin Glenster and Megan Ennion



This publication presents written evidence submitted by LOGOS, University of Cambridge, to the House of Commons Education Committee inquiry into the use of artificial intelligence and education technology in education.

The evidence examines the implications of AI for learning and assessment, future competencies, children's digital rights, accessibility and inclusion, and the institutional capacity required for responsible adoption. It proposes four recommendations for UK policy concerning regulation, professional training, procurement and research.

The written evidence was published by the House of Commons Education Committee under reference AIE0174.

Authors

Professor Ann Kristin Glenster
LOGOS, University of Cambridge

Megan Ennion
Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge

DOI: [to be added]

Official committee evidence is available [here](#).

© LOGOS 2026

Introduction

This submission, prepared by researchers at the University of Cambridge, sets out evidence on AI's impact on learning and assessments, children's digital rights, potential for accessibility and inclusivity, and institutional capacities and infrastructure.

We make four recommendations for UK policy on AI in Education:

Recommendation 1. Strengthen the regulatory environment to protect children and young people's digital human rights in education.

Recommendation 2. Work with national bodies, such as the National Education Union, to develop and deliver ringfenced digital and AI training in institutions and to build institutional capacities.

Recommendation 3. Explore potential for a mandatory procurement framework for AI tools, services and systems in education.

Recommendation 4. Support research into the consequences of and opportunities for AI in education.

About this Evidence

1. This evidence draws on University of Cambridge academic research on education and on epistemic rights as an emerging concept of human rights in the digital age by Professor Ann Kristin Glenster and Megan Ennion. The evidence also incorporates findings from two years of the international academic Cambridge Generative AI and Education conference and ongoing work on education policy. It represents evidence either gathered directly by us as leading experts in law and education or presented to us by other experts in fields such as education, philosophy, policy, and computer science.
2. The evidence is also based on qualitative and empirical findings from Accessible Digital Futures (ADF), a two-year project on AI and accessibility in higher education, convened by the Glenlead Centre and Jisc¹; and on convenings of the AI Thought Exchange (AITE), an international network of AI and higher education experts.²

AI's Impact on Learning and Assessments

3. There is great potential for the use of AI in learning and assessments.
4. Nevertheless, we have found concerns that lack of policy, or risk-averse policies means that students are often not provided with access to AI tools or that the use of AI is disjointed, leaving significant knowledge gaps which can make it difficult and disorienting for students to move from one stage of education to another. We see different attitudes and rules governing AI use in secondary and tertiary education, and between institutions.
5. Students are sometimes allowed to use AI in coursework but not in exams, which breaks the narrative cohesion of educational progression. Students are not equally prepared to use AI critically or effectively, and many receive little guidance or training on how to evaluate outputs, use tools appropriately, or recognise limitations. This risks deepening existing inequalities, as some students are supported to use AI in informed and critical ways while others are left to navigate it unsupervised.

¹ <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/innovation/projects/accessible-digital-futures>.

² <https://aithoughtexchange.org/>.

6. Students are sometimes allowed to use AI in coursework but not in exams, which breaks the narrative cohesion of educational progression. Students are not equally prepared to use AI critically or effectively, and many receive little guidance or training on how to evaluate outputs, use tools appropriately, or recognise limitations. This risks deepening existing inequalities, as some students are supported to use AI in informed and critical ways while others are left to navigate it unsupervised.
7. Students are sometimes allowed to use AI in coursework but not in exams, which breaks the narrative cohesion of educational progression. Students are not equally prepared to use AI critically or effectively, and many receive little guidance or training on how to evaluate outputs, use tools appropriately, or recognise limitations. This risks deepening existing inequalities, as some students are supported to use AI in informed and critical ways while others are left to navigate it unsupervised.
8. Repeatedly, we have uncovered evidence that students are using AI tools unsupervised which leads to concerns about potential academic misconduct, unfair advantages, loss of learning, and exposure to harm. There is growing awareness that learning is not only facilitated and supported through edtech software, but also surrounding software, services, and products, such as emotional chatbots and AI companions.³ We know very little about the interaction of these AI tools and systems on learning and how they affect and blur the lines between formal education and informal learning.
9. There is a recognition that the role of educators is changing from being the conveyors of knowledge to facilitators and navigators of knowledge acquisition and production.⁴ Students increasingly report experiencing generative AI not only as a tool, but as a study partner-like source of support, with some describing it in teacher-like terms while also valuing its immediacy and accessibility. Emerging research suggests that students are integrating these systems into everyday learning through increasingly complex, and at times sophisticated, forms of use.⁵ As educators, we are no longer in charge of the pedagogical information environment.

Future Competencies

10. There is a lively public debate on how education must adapt to provide the skills needed for the workforce of tomorrow.⁶ While there is no consensus on what that workforce will look like, we are increasingly seeing demands for a radical re-examination of the purpose of education.⁷ For example, there are mounting calls for education to move away from or expand beyond, rote, fact-based learning and skills, to include objectives such as fostering civic participation and strengthening capacities for social relationships and democratic resilience, echoing longstanding educational arguments that education should serve purposes beyond qualification alone.⁸

³ Common Sense Media (2025). Talk, Trust, and Trade-Offs: How and Why Teens Use AI Companions³(2025); Cybersafe Kids (2025). A Life Behind The Screens: Uncovering the Realities of Digital Childhood (Trends and Usage Report Academic Year 2024-2025).

⁴ Ennion, M. (2025). Generative AI in English Sixth Form Education: Student Use, Perceptions, and Literacy Gaps. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-7122270/v1>; Durgungoz, A., & Kharrufa, A. (2025). "ChatGPT is like a study buddy, a teacher and sometimes just a friend": a longitudinal exploration of students' interactions, perception and acceptance. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2025.2509276>; Yeung, L.K.C., Chow, D.P.L., Wong, P.H. et al. (2026). In ChatGPT they trust: a study of students' perceptions and misuse of ChatGPT in higher education. *AI Ethics* 6, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-025-00855-w>; Lodge, J. M., De Barba, P., & Broadbent, J. (2024). Learning with Generative Artificial Intelligence Within a Network of Co-Regulation. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 20(7). <https://doi.org/10.53761/m2v9an32>.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Tuomi, I. et al. (2018). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Learning, Teaching, and Education (JRC Science for Policy Report, European Commission, 2018); Burns, M. et al. (2026). A New Direction for Students In an AI World: Prosper, Prepare, Protect (Centre for Universal Education, January 2026); HP Futures (2025). AI and the Future of

11. Some researchers advocate for a shift towards education focusing on cognitive abilities, such as problem solving and concentration, as well as epistemic skills such as evaluating information, exercising judgement, independent thinking, and critical engagement with AI. Others extend this argument further, calling for education to develop students' capacities for co-creation and co-intelligence with AI.⁹
12. Some commentators predict a greater need for the humanities as AI will take over many STEM functions, while others see STEM competencies as more important than ever. Alongside these debates about which skills matter most, there is also a need to consider that AI may shape the learning environments and interactions through which those skills are developed.¹⁰
13. Furthermore, employers report that students who have not used AI in their education are not prepared for the AI-driven workplace, which leads to profound questions regarding the purpose of education, and which risks undermining motivation for students to pursue academic degrees.

Children's Digital Rights

14. There is no doubt that AI in education impacts children's digital rights. However, the answer cannot be to ban AI in education. Such a ban would both be counterproductive and potentially infringe on several fundamental rights, such as the right to access information, the right to education, and the right to develop one's personality.¹¹ Children also have specific digital access rights which must be safeguarded in educational contexts.¹²
15. Nevertheless, while the right of children to use AI in education must be protected, use must not infringe on other fundamental rights, such as the right to privacy. The UK GDPR is clearly not sufficient, in our view, largely due to the lack of adequate enforcement.¹³

Learning: A strategic blueprint from global education experts (HP Futures, 2025). UNESCO (2021). Understanding the impact of artificial intelligence on skills development (Paris, France: UNESCO, 2021). Brown, R. (2023). The AI Generation: How universities can prepare students for the changing world (DEMOS, 2023).

7 Ditchley Foundation (January 2026); Noesis Collaborative (March 2026).

8 Biesta, G. Good Education in an Age of Measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy (Boulder, CO: Paradigm, 2010); Biesta, G. (2020), Risking Ourselves in Education: Qualification, Socialization, and Subjectification Revisited. *Educ Theory*, 70: 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12411>.

9 Mollick, E. (2024). Co-Intelligence: Living and Working with AI. New York: Portfolio. Published 2 April 2024; Pratschke, B. M. (2024). Generative AI and Education: Digital Pedagogies, Teaching Innovation and Learning Design. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland: Le Serre, D., L'Avenir de l'Intelligence Humaine (Alkaia, 2025).

10 Ennion, M., & McLellan, R. (2025). Large Language Model Chatbots in education: Exploring literature insights on their impact and influence on learning behaviours. *Studies in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 4(1).

<https://doi.org/10.21428/8c225f6e.540b41b5>; Watson, S., & Ennion, M. (2026). Programmable support: generative AI, behavioural influence, and the mediation of meaning in education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2026.2642199>

11 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR); International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR); International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).

12 The UN Convention on the Right of the Child (UNCRC).

13 Erdos, D. (2025). "The UK Information Commissioner's Annual report 2024/25: Surveying a Systematic Trend Away from Adequate Enforcement", ¹UK Constitutional Law Association, 22 July 2025.

<https://ukconstitutionallaw.org/2025/07/22/david-erdos-the-uk-information-commissioners-annual-report-2024-25-surveying-a-systematic-trend-away-from-adequate-enforcement/>.

16. AI in education engages the right to privacy in several ways. There are concerns that children's personal data is being used to train LLMs and other AI models, or that children will surrender or confide private information to AI tools and chatbots about themselves or others. Another primary concern is that AI will be used for covert profiling and assessment of abilities and capabilities, especially as education shifts towards focusing on the development of cognitive skills.
17. These concerns relate to worries about assessments increasingly relying on the gathering and interpretation of biological signals, as foreshadowed with the emergence of neurotechnologies and wearable technologies in education.¹⁴ Assessing learners based on their biology is likely to entrench new inequalities. Suggestions that neurotechnologies and other data-gathering techniques will be used to personalise learning and assessments are particularly worrying.¹⁵
18. There are also concerns that AI-generated profiles will follow students for life and thereby limit opportunities to learn from mistakes or to flourish. This is also important for the development of a sense of dignity and autonomy as the impression of being constantly under surveillance may have a detrimental chilling effect on children and young people's capacity to develop identities, social relationships, and trust.
19. There is also a need to consider how education should prepare students to navigate an increasingly complex information environment in which AI systems can be highly fluent and persuasive, while also generating inaccurate or misleading content.¹⁶ Several commentators and scholars have noted the pressure on children and young people to partake in coercive and sometimes illegal behaviour, or their exposure to victimisation in ways that are facilitated through edtech used in schools (such as grooming), or in ways that are facilitated by digital technologies in social settings, such as being subjected to deepfake nudification or pressure to engage in sexting or oversharing.¹⁷ Often these violations are directed at girls and young women, which makes it reasonable to assume that their education may be disproportionately jeopardised because schools, institutions, and parents do not have the tools (including effective and enforceable legal means) by which to protect young people. There is also considerable concern over the impact of addictive tech and social media on children and young people's ability to learn,¹⁸ with, for example, calls for a ban on smartphones in schools.¹⁹

14 Digital Education Futures Initiative (DEF), Innovation Lab.

15 Glenster, A.K. & Shiner, B. (2025). AI and Human Rights: Written Evidence to the Joint Committee on Human Rights (Glenlead Centre, 14 September 2025); Unicef, Neurotechnology and Children (Working Paper, June 2024); Andrejevic M. and Selwyn, N. (2020). Facial recognition technology in schools: critical questions and concerns, *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45:2, 115-128. DOI:10.1080/17439884.2020.1686014.

16 Park, P. S., Goldstein, S., O'Gara, A., Chen, M., & Hendrycks, D. (2024). AI deception: A survey of examples, risks, and potential solutions. *Patterns*, 5(5), 100988. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2024.100988>; Hackenburg, K., Tappin, B. M., Hewitt, L., Saunders, E., Black, S., Lin, H., Fist, C., Margetts, H., Rand, D. G., & Summerfield, C. (2025). The levers of political persuasion with conversational artificial intelligence. *Science*, 390(6777). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aea3884>; Höbling, L., Maier, S. & Feuerriegel, S. A meta-analysis of the persuasive power of large language models. *Sci Rep* 15, 43818 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-30783-y>

17 Bates, L. (2025), *The New Age of Sexism: How the AI revolution is reinventing misogyny* (London: Simon & Schuster, 2025).

18 Anderson, J. and Winthrop, R (2025). *The Disengaged Teen: Helping Kids Learn Better, Feel Better, and Live Better* (London: Vermilion 2025).

Potential for Accessibility and Inclusivity

20. Our research shows that AI can help improve accessibility and inclusivity in education, and that this potential goes beyond assistive technologies. For example, AI can provide useful tools to students with neurodivergent access needs or with English as a second language.²⁰
21. However, through five ADF workshops with 153 participants representing 46 universities, we found that the UK higher education sector as a whole is unprepared, under-resourced, and reticent to adopt AI to provide accessibility to their students.²¹ While some institutions were able to be forward-leaning, workshop participants were concerned that too many institutions relied on individual champions to effectuate responsible and accessible uptake of AI. It emerged that the issues were not due to a lack of willingness on the part of the institutions, but an absence of know-how, understanding, time, and financial headroom that erects barriers to accessible AI adoption. There was a clear concern among people at the frontline that as the sector becomes more AI adaptive, new tools and services will be adopted without the necessary or optimal accessibility features, which may result in students with accessible needs being constantly left behind.

Institutional Capacities and Infrastructure

22. We have identified a need for clearer responsibility for the adoption of AI tools in educational institutions. With the accelerating pace of technological advancements, there is a real risk that institutions will be left behind because they have procured the wrong technology, or because the technology has become outdated before its time.
23. New technological advancements also place demands on educators and staff to continuously partake in training, which may detract from other core functions such as teaching. The need for constant upgrading of skillsets and digital and AI literacy may be overwhelming for educators and administrators who are already struggling with significant and growing workloads. Conversely, some educators report time savings from the use of AI in areas of lesson planning, timetabling, and marking.
24. Lack of standardisation also means that the services provided to students vary across the country. Overall, the result poses a danger of widening inequality between affluent and less affluent students, and between well-resourced, large institutions and less-resourced, smaller institutions. There is also a concern that lack of confidence in capabilities, understanding, and safety may lead to a reluctance on the part of institutions, educators, and students to use AI tools.²² Evidence indicates that academically stronger students in well-resourced institutions use AI tools to enhance their learning, while weaker students in institutions that may not have the competencies, resources, or confidence to adopt AI tools, use these tools predominantly as ‘shortcuts’ for better assessment results.²³ As a consequence, students may lose out on vital skills and learning, which may also exacerbate inequalities and the digital divide even further. National policies are needed to support institutions, educators, and parents to help close this gap.

19 Wilson, T. (2026). “Ban on phones in schools backed by House of Lords, BBC News, 4 February 2026. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c5y3npjyl70>.

20 Glenster, A. K. et al., Accessible Digital Futures: Opportunities for digital and AI transformation in Higher Education (Glenlead Centre, 30 January 2026). <https://glenlead.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/ADF-Report-Jan-2026.pdf>.

21 Ibid.

22 Atabey, A. et al. (2025). A child rights audit of GenAI in EdTech: Learning from five UK case studies (Digital Futures for Children, 2025).

25. Lack of standardisation also means that the services provided to students vary across the country. Overall, the result poses a danger of widening inequality between affluent and less affluent students, and between well-resourced, large institutions and less-resourced, smaller institutions. There is also a concern that lack of confidence in capabilities, understanding, and safety may lead to a reluctance on the part of institutions, educators, and students to use AI tools.²² Evidence indicates that academically stronger students in well-resourced institutions use AI tools to enhance their learning, while weaker students in institutions that may not have the competencies, resources, or confidence to adopt AI tools, use these tools predominantly as ‘shortcuts’ for better assessment results.²³ As a consequence, students may lose out on vital skills and learning, which may also exacerbate inequalities and the digital divide even further. National policies are needed to support institutions, educators, and parents to help close this gap.
26. Participants in policy workshops have expressed concerns that paradigms and models of teaching were being outsourced to American tech giants, the lack of institutional leverage in procurement, or that AI were posited as a cheap fix to solve the teacher retention and workload crises.²⁴ The UK education sector is under tremendous strain from a funding crisis in higher education to teacher shortages in primary and secondary education, to a crumbling infrastructure and estate. It must be recognised that AI (alone) cannot provide a solution to these structural and systemic challenges.

Need for Policy

From our work on AI and education in the UK, we distil the following policy recommendations:

Recommendation 1. Strengthen the regulatory environment to protect children and young people’s digital human rights in education.

27. The UK should develop a future-oriented comprehensive policy plan for the use of AI in education that covers the use of pedagogical AI and edtech tools, students’ interactions with AI in support functions (e.g., support chatbots), procurement, and enforceable measures to hold tech companies to account for potential harms or product defects. We recommend that the UK undertake a mapping exercise for this work drawing on international policy efforts by UNESCO, the OECD, the Council of Europe, the World Economic Forum, and others.²⁵

Recommendation 2. Work with national bodies, such as the National Education Union, to develop and deliver ringfenced digital and AI training in institutions and to build institutional capacities.

28. In all our convenings and evidence-gathering, we have encountered calls for better digital and AI literacy among educators, parents, students, regulators, and policymakers. We advocate the adoption of the policy recommendations proposed by the Royal Society to strengthen AI literacy frameworks.²⁶

²⁴ Noesis Collaborative workshop (January 2026).

²⁵ Glenster, A.K. et al., Capacity-Building for Innovative UK AI Education Policy: Policy Roundtable, (University of Cambridge, 18 November 2025). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.128443>.

²⁶ World Economic Forum (2022). Artificial Intelligence for Children (Toolkit, March 2022); UNESCO (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research (Paris, France: UNESCO, 2023); UNESCO (2022). Guidelines for ICT in education policies and masterplans (Paris, France: UNESCO 2022); UNESCO (2019). Artificial Intelligence in Education: Challenges and Opportunities for Sustainable Development (Paris, France: UNESCO, 2019); UNESCO (2021). AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers (Paris, France: UNESCO 2021). Holmes, W. et al., Artificial Intelligence in education: A critical view through the lens of human rights, democracy and the rule of law (Brussels, Belgium: Council of Europe, 2022).

²⁷ Hillman, V. et al. (2025). A Rapid Review of AI Literacy Frameworks, with Policy Recommendations (London: Royal Society 2025). <https://royalsociety.org/-/media/policy/projects/ai-in-education/hillman-et-al-a-rapid-review-of-ai-literacy-frameworks.pdf>.

Recommendation 3. Explore potential for a national mandatory procurement framework for AI tools, services and systems in education.

29. Consistently, we have encountered concerns about the outsourcing of pedagogy and teaching to big, predominantly American tech companies.
30. The UK should set up a taskforce to look at emerging initiatives for standardisation and certification of AI and edtech tools²⁷ and establish a working group including members of British edtech to advise government on policy that covers topics such as pedagogy, inequality, accessibility, fundamental digital rights, investment, and procurement.

Recommendation 4. Support research into the consequences of and opportunities for AI in education.

31. We are deeply concerned about the evidence gaps both in research and policymaking and recommend strengthening knowledge exchange between researchers and policymakers through strategic partnerships and collaborations, and the establishment of knowledge hubs and research-to-policy ecosystems.²⁸ We also recommend strategic and long-term investment in strengthening the UK's research infrastructure to ensure that research can join up and scale.

Conclusion

32. AI is having a radical impact on education. We believe that this is an opportunity for the UK to adopt policies that will support human cognition and learning, promote accessibility and inclusivity, strengthen social relationships and democratic resilience, and build sustainable capacities for the future.
33. However, we also note that there is currently a policy vacuum which means that the burden of assessing the relevance, appropriateness, and safety of AI tools often falls to individual institutions, educators, and students. The result is a risk of widening inequality, education that does not prepare students for tomorrow's labour market, or that outsources our epistemic security to foreign tech companies.
34. A national conversation on the purpose of education is urgently needed. The UK also needs robust, forward-leaning policies that embrace and promote the many benefits of AI in education. We do not advocate a ban on these tools, but that they be used responsibly in the interest of students, educators, and society as its north star.

²⁸ See for example efforts underway by the IEEE.

²⁹ We are currently exploring relevant models for such partnerships and knowledge-brokering at the University of Cambridge.



www.logoscambbridge.org