



This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

Allison, Jordan ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8513-4646> (2026) Can we trust AI research in education? Introducing the Reporting AI Studies in Education (RAISE) framework. British Educational Research Association blog.

Official URL: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/blog/can-we-trust-ai-research-in-education-introducing-the-reporting-ai-studies-in-education-raise-framework>

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/16578>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

Can We Trust AI Research in Education? Introducing the Reporting AI Studies in Education (RAISE) Framework

Dr Jordan Allison

Senior Lecturer in Computer Science

University of Gloucestershire

Artificial intelligence is becoming increasingly visible in education. Teachers are using generative AI for lesson planning and [feedback](#), whilst educational institutions are trialling adaptive learning platforms, exploring AI-supported tutoring systems (Létourneau et al., 2025) and [adapting assessments](#). Alongside this growth, educators are also encountering an increasing number of claims about what AI can supposedly achieve for learning, attainment and efficiency.

This blog is about the Reporting AI Studies in Education (RAISE) framework (Allison, 2026), which aims to improve how AI research is reported in educational settings so that evidence is transparent, interpretable and relevant to practice.

The problem is that these claims can be difficult to evaluate. Useful AI research needs to provide [more than technical descriptions or headline outcomes](#). Educational technology research does not always provide enough information about how a tool was implemented, what role teachers played, or whether positive outcomes can realistically be transferred into different educational settings. As a result, schools and universities can find themselves making important decisions based on incomplete evidence. Without clear reporting, educators are left with important unanswered questions. Who were the learners involved? What educational problem was the AI intended to address? How much teacher support was required? Was the technology used for feedback, revision, tutoring or assessment? Were there safeguards to address inaccurate outputs, bias or accessibility concerns?

Why reporting standards matter in educational AI

Reporting standards in AI research help readers judge the quality, credibility and applicability of findings. In education, this is particularly important because teaching and learning are highly contextual. An AI system that appears effective in one setting may not produce similar outcomes elsewhere.

In systematic literature reviews, [PRISMA has often been used for accurate reporting](#). In medicine, frameworks such as [CONSORT](#) have long been used to improve transparency in clinical trials. In education, however, reporting practices around AI remain inconsistent despite the rapid expansion of AI-related research. RAISE was developed in response to this gap, recognising that educational AI research requires reporting that captures both technical and pedagogical dimensions of implementation.

What the RAISE framework does

The [Reporting AI Studies in Education \(RAISE\)](#) framework (Allison, 2026) contains 30 checklist items within 10 domain areas. Rather than focusing only on technical performance, the

framework encourages researchers to explain how AI tools are situated within teaching and learning processes. This includes reporting information about educational context, pedagogical rationale, ethical considerations, implementation decisions and the role of educators within AI-supported activities.

For example, educational context reporting requires researchers to explain who the learners were, where the intervention took place and what educational challenge was being addressed. Pedagogical rationale requires explanation of why AI was selected and how it aligns with learning objectives. Reporting educator involvement encourages researchers to describe how teachers supported, monitored or mediated learner interactions with AI systems. This is important because AI tools do not operate independently from educational practice; effectiveness depends on context and human judgement.

RAISE is also notable because it encourages more explicit discussion of risks and ethics through a [fillable template matrix](#) (Figure 1), whilst also [providing good and bad reporting examples](#). Current debates about AI in education often focus on efficiency and innovation, but practitioners are increasingly concerned about issues such as privacy, bias, accessibility and [learner dependency](#). These are not abstract questions. Teachers are already navigating concerns about [responsible assessment design](#) and [student overreliance on generative AI tools](#). [Transparent reporting helps practitioners assess these risks more critically](#).

Risk Theme	Risk Category	Description	Observed or Anticipated Impact (Author to specify)	Mitigation/Safeguards (Author to specify)
Pedagogical Integrity and Learning Impact	Loss of Learner Agency	Potential over-reliance on AI that may reduce learner autonomy and critical thinking.		
	Misuse or Overuse of AI	Risk of AI being used beyond intended scope or without adequate oversight.		
	Emotional Impact and Wellbeing	Potential negative emotional effects from AI feedback (e.g., anxiety, discouragement).		
	Data Misinterpretation	Risk that educators or learners may misinterpret AI-generated analytics or feedback.		
	Hallucination / Misinformation	Risk that AI may generate incorrect or misleading information.		
	Transparency and Explainability	Lack of clarity about how AI feedback or decisions are generated.		
Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility	Bias and Fairness	Risk that AI may perpetuate or amplify biases (e.g., socio-economic, gender, race).		
	Cultural Insensitivity	AI outputs or prompts that may be culturally inappropriate or irrelevant.		
	Accessibility Barriers	Risks of excluding learners with disabilities or diverse needs.		
	Equity in Access to Technology	Unequal access to devices or connectivity impacting participation.		
Data Governance and Learner Rights	Privacy and Data Security	Risks related to unauthorized access, data leakage, or privacy breaches.		
	Informed Consent and Autonomy	Concerns over learner awareness of AI involvement and data use.		
	Data Ownership and Usage Rights	Uncertainties about who owns student-generated data and AI outputs.		
Technical Dependability and System Reliability	Technical Failures / Downtime	Possible interruptions due to AI system malfunctions or outages.		
	Dependence on Proprietary Systems	Concerns about transparency, replicability, and vendor lock-in with closed-source AI.		
	Algorithmic Accountability	Unclear assignment of responsibility for AI-generated outcomes or errors.		

Figure 1 - RAISE Ethics and Risk Matrix (Allison, 2026)

For practitioners, RAISE can help shift attention away from simple claims that an AI tool “works” towards more meaningful questions about under what conditions it works, for whom, and with what trade-offs, therefore aiding practitioners in trying to make evidence-informed decisions.

AI is likely to remain an important part of educational innovation. However, innovation requires evidence that is transparent, interpretable and relevant to practice. RAISE is a step forward to help make AI evidence more meaningful for those responsible for educational decision-making.

References

Allison, J. (2026). RAISE the Standard: A Framework for Transparent Reporting of Artificial Intelligence Studies in Education. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 64(1), 3-15.

Létourneau, A., Deslandes Martineau, M., Charland, P., Karran, J. A., Boasen, J., & Léger, P. M. (2025). A systematic review of AI-driven intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) in K-12 education. *npj Science of Learning*, 10(1), 29.