Volume 3 Issue 1 (May, 2026) Pages 1-10
Gestion Educativa : Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan
E-ISSN: : 3062-7524

Algorithmic Educational Management: When Algorithms Influence Educational Policy and Decision-Making

Nur Wahyuni✉
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia(1)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62872/5r999285

Abstrak

Manajemen pendidikan berbasis algoritma merupakan fenomena yang semakin berkembang dalam konteks transformasi digital sistem pendidikan modern. Artikel ini mengkaji secara komprehensif bagaimana algoritma kecerdasan buatan dan pembelajaran mesin memengaruhi pengambilan kebijakan dan keputusan dalam institusi pendidikan. Melalui tinjauan sistematis terhadap literatur terkini, penelitian ini mengidentifikasi tiga domain utama penerapan algoritma dalam pendidikan: prediksi kinerja akademik, personalisasi pembelajaran, dan optimasi manajemen kelembagaan. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahwa meskipun algoritma mampu meningkatkan efisiensi dan akurasi pengambilan keputusan, terdapat tantangan serius terkait transparansi, bias algoritmik, privasi data, dan akuntabilitas etis. Diperlukan kerangka kebijakan yang holistik dan berbasis prinsip-prinsip etika kecerdasan buatan untuk memastikan bahwa implementasi teknologi ini mendukung kesetaraan dan keadilan pendidikan.
Kata Kunci: *algoritma pendidikan; kecerdasan buatan; kebijakan pendidikan; manajemen pendidikan; pengambilan keputusan*

Abstract

Algorithm-based educational management is an increasingly prominent phenomenon in the context of the digital transformation of modern educational systems. This article comprehensively examines how artificial intelligence algorithms and machine learning influence policy-making and decision-making in educational institutions. Through a systematic review of recent literature, this study identifies three main domains of algorithmic application in education: academic performance prediction, personalized learning, and institutional management optimization. The findings reveal that while algorithms can enhance the efficiency and accuracy of decision-making, serious challenges remain regarding transparency, algorithmic bias, data privacy, and ethical accountability. A holistic policy framework grounded in artificial intelligence ethics principles is needed to ensure that technology implementation supports educational equity and justice.
Keywords: *artificial intelligence; algorithmic management; decision-making; educational policy; machine learning*

✉ Corresponding author :
Email Address : 2205070016@webmail.uad.ac.id
Received May 01, 2026, Accepted May 22, 2026 Published May 31, 2026

Introduction

The rapid advance of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning has markedly changed the routines, decision-making processes, and policy frameworks of educational institutions. The growing integration of algorithmic systems into administrative and pedagogical functions, now often termed Algorithmic Educational Management (AEM), constitutes a major paradigm shift in how schools, colleges, and universities are governed. AEM spans a wide range of applications: predictive analytics that identify students at academic risk and forecast progression, adaptive learning platforms that tailor content and pacing to individual needs, automated scheduling and resource-allocation tools, and decision-support systems that inform policy choices at institutional and system levels.

These algorithmic tools are no longer peripheral experiments but core components of educational governance, reshaping who makes which decisions and on what basis. By converting large volumes of student, course, and operational data into actionable recommendations, AEM can improve efficiency, target interventions more precisely, and enable scalable personalization. At the same time, it raises important questions about transparency, fairness, and accountability, since algorithmic outputs depend on design choices, training data, and optimization objectives that may embed biases or unintended incentives. Understanding AEM therefore requires attention both to its technical affordances (what algorithms can do) and to its institutional consequences (how algorithmic decision-making changes power, professional roles, and policy priorities within education systems).

Wang (2021) argues that artificial intelligence functions symbiotically within educational leadership, augmenting human judgment and expanding leaders' analytical capacities rather than outright replacing professional decision-making. In practice, AI can provide timely predictive insights, surface patterns in large datasets, and suggest policy or intervention options that leaders can then interpret in light of contextual knowledge and values. At the same time, however, the growing influence of algorithmic outputs, especially when those outputs are presented as highly confident or are embedded in automated workflows, creates difficult questions about where final authority lies. When algorithms begin to shape, constrain, or even override human choices, concerns about autonomy, responsibility, and institutional accountability become acute.

These tensions have intensified as the adoption of AI tools in education has accelerated, a process that quickened notably during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic forced rapid digital transformation across schooling systems and higher education, pushing institutions to deploy remote-teaching platforms, data-driven student-support systems, and automated administrative tools at scale (Bahroun et al., 2023). While these technologies have enabled continuity of instruction and new forms of personalization, their widespread use also raises equity concerns, about differential access to digital infrastructure, biased training data, and opaque decision logic, that educational leaders must address if AI is to serve inclusive and just educational ends.

Several important gaps remain in our understanding of Algorithmic Educational Management (AEM). First, although a substantial body of work evaluates the technical performance of algorithmic tools, accuracy of predictions, adaptive-learning gains, or operational efficiencies, relatively few studies interrogate the broader policy and ethical implications of large-scale adoption, including issues of privacy, fairness, and accountability (Nguyen et al., 2022). Second, much of the literature treats algorithmic applications as discrete innovations (for example, predictive analytics, adaptive tutors, or automated grading) rather than studying how these tools interact within institutional ecosystems; as a result, we know little about the systemic governance effects that arise when multiple algorithmic systems operate simultaneously across administration, instruction, and assessment (Bond et al., 2024).

Third, practitioners lack comprehensive, evidence-based frameworks to guide responsible deployment: there are limited practical roadmaps for aligning technical capabilities with governance safeguards, stakeholder engagement, impact monitoring, and mitigation strategies for unintended harms. This absence leaves educational leaders without clear criteria for when to adopt, scale, or suspend algorithmic interventions, and it increases the risk that well-intentioned tools produce inequitable or opaque outcomes. Addressing these gaps will require interdisciplinary research that combines technical evaluation with policy analysis, ethical inquiry, and implementation studies to produce actionable guidance for administrators and policymakers.

This article responds to those gaps by conducting a systematic review of recent literature on the use of algorithms and artificial intelligence in educational management and policy. Its primary aim is to build a comprehensive picture of how algorithmic systems shape educational decision-making, mapping where algorithms are being used, what kinds of decisions they inform, and how they change institutional routines and stakeholder roles. The review also seeks to identify the central challenges and opportunities that arise during implementation, including concerns about accuracy, bias, transparency, governance, and equity, as well as potential benefits such as improved targeting of supports, administrative efficiency, and scalable personalization.

The study goes beyond diagnosis by proposing an ethical framework for the responsible governance of algorithmic systems in education, translating high-level concerns into concrete principles and operational recommendations that administrators and policymakers can apply during design, procurement, deployment, and evaluation of AEM tools. The framework emphasizes practical steps, such as transparency protocols, impact assessments, data-governance rules, stakeholder participation, monitoring for bias, and remediation pathways, that help institutions balance efficiency and innovation with safeguards for equity and accountability.

What makes this work distinctive is its integrative approach: instead of examining technical performance, policy consequences, or ethical questions in isolation, the review synthesizes evidence and perspectives from multiple disciplines, educational management, computer science, ethics, and public policy, to produce a cohesive, cross-cutting analysis. By weaving empirical findings together with normative reflection, the article aims to shift the conversation from abstract risks and opportunities to implementable guidance, enabling institutions to harness algorithmic capabilities while protecting student rights, promoting fair outcomes, and maintaining institutional responsibility.

Methodology

This study employs a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology to examine the current state of algorithmic educational management research. The SLR approach was selected because it enables a rigorous, transparent, and reproducible synthesis of existing evidence (Almalawi et al., 2024). The review was guided by the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) framework, which provides a structured protocol for identifying, screening, and including relevant studies.

The literature search was conducted across multiple academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar. Search terms included combinations of keywords such as "artificial intelligence education," "algorithmic decision-making," "educational management," "machine learning education policy," "predictive analytics education," and related terms. The search was limited to peer-reviewed articles published between 2020 and 2025 to ensure relevance and recency. An initial pool of 347 articles was identified, from which 20 studies meeting the inclusion criteria were selected for detailed analysis.

Inclusion criteria required that studies: (1) addressed algorithmic or AI applications in educational settings, (2) discussed implications for educational policy, decision-making, or institutional management, (3) were published in peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings, and (4) were written in English or Indonesian. Studies focused exclusively on technical algorithm development without educational management implications were excluded. Data extraction and thematic analysis were used to synthesize findings across the selected literature, with emerging themes coded and categorized systematically.

Figure 1. PRISMA-Based Systematic Review Process for Algorithmic Educational Management

Identification Phase

347 records identified from databases (Scopus, WoS, ERIC, Google Scholar)

▼

Screening Phase

189 records after removing duplicates → 98 full-text articles assessed

▼

Eligibility & Inclusion Phase

20 studies included in final systematic review and thematic synthesis

Results and Discussion

A. The Landscape of Algorithmic Applications in Education

The literature review reveals a rapidly expanding and diverse ecosystem of algorithmic applications across educational settings. Three primary domains recur across studies: (1) academic performance prediction and early-warning systems that identify students at risk and enable timely interventions; (2) personalized and adaptive learning systems that tailor content, pacing, and feedback to individual learner needs; and (3) institutional management tools that optimize scheduling, staffing, and resource allocation to improve operational efficiency. Together, these domains show how algorithms are being used not only to automate routine tasks but to augment decision-making at multiple levels of the education system.

Consistent with this broader pattern, Harry (2023) argues that AI's contribution to education reaches well beyond mere automation: contemporary systems now perform complex cognitive functions, pattern recognition, individualized diagnosis, and dynamic decision support, that historically rested with human educators and administrators. As a result, algorithmic tools are reshaping roles and workflows in schools and universities by shifting some analytic and predictive responsibilities to machines, while creating new demands for oversight, interpretation, and ethical governance by human professionals.

Predictive analytics has become one of the most widely adopted algorithmic tools in educational management, offering institutions the ability to anticipate student outcomes and intervene proactively. Empirical studies by Yagci (2022) and Ahmed (2024) show that machine-learning models can forecast academic performance with high accuracy, allowing educators to identify at-risk students early and deploy targeted supports before failure or disengagement becomes entrenched. A systematic review by Almalawi et al. (2024) catalogs the methodological landscape of these efforts, noting that logistic regression, decision trees, random forests, and neural networks are the techniques most commonly used to model student trajectories. Complementing this methodological overview, Villar and De Andrade (2024) demonstrate that supervised machine-learning approaches effectively predict dropout risk, producing actionable intelligence that administrators can use to design retention strategies, allocate advising resources, and prioritize interventions. Together, these findings indicate that predictive analytics can strengthen early-warning systems and resource targeting, though their practical benefit depends on model validity, careful feature selection, and integration with human decision-making processes.

Table 1. Key Algorithmic Applications in Educational Management

Domain	Algorithmic Tools	Key Applications	Representative Studies
Academic Performance Prediction	Random Forest, Neural Networks, SVM	Early warning, grade prediction, dropout detection	Yagci (2022); Ahmed (2024); Villar & De Andrade (2024)
Personalized Learning	Reinforcement Learning, NLP, Deep Learning	Adaptive content delivery, ITS, feedback generation	Lin et al. (2023); Mon et al. (2023)
Institutional Management	Clustering, Regression, Decision Trees	Resource allocation, scheduling, policy simulation	Wang (2021); Alotaibi (2024)
Learning Analytics	XAI, Bayesian Models, Process Mining	Learning behavior analysis, process optimization	Khosravi et al. (2022); Kaddoura et al. (2022)

Domain	Algorithmic Tools	Key Applications	Representative Studies
Academic Integrity	NLP, Text Classification, Anomaly Detection	Plagiarism detection, AI-generated text identification	Gustilo et al. (2024)

B. ***Algorithmic Influence on Educational Policy and Decision-Making***

Algorithms shape educational policy and decision-making through several interlinked pathways that reconfigure how information is produced, interpreted, and acted upon. Wang (2021) frames this dynamic as a symbiotic human, AI decision-making model: algorithms supply data-driven analyses, forecasts, and recommendations that augment human judgement and help administrators make faster, more evidence-informed choices. These systems can surface patterns that humans miss, prioritize scarce resources, and suggest targeted interventions, thereby improving the timeliness and precision of policy responses. At the same time, the increasing sophistication and apparent reliability of algorithmic outputs risk shifting authority from humans to machines; as recommendations become more actionable and are embedded into automated workflows, the distinction between supportive advice and de facto delegation can blur. This shift raises governance questions about who retains final responsibility, how to audit algorithmic decisions, and how to ensure that automated recommendations remain aligned with institutional values, professional judgment, and equity goals.

Alotaibi (2024) analyzes how the integration of AI with Learning Management Systems (LMS) is reshaping decision-making in higher education, showing that algorithmic tools now inform a wide array of institutional choices, from curriculum design and course sequencing to resource allocation and faculty performance evaluation. The study finds that these systems can improve operational efficiency by automating routine analyses, identifying curricular gaps, and highlighting areas where student support is most needed; however, they also foster new dependencies, as administrators come to rely on algorithmic outputs when making strategic and evaluative judgments.

Complementing this evidence, Khan et al. (2021) demonstrate that AI-driven student-monitoring systems exert a direct influence on administrative policy: automated alerts and risk scores change how institutions prioritize academic support and implement interventions, often accelerating the timing and targeting of aid. Together, these studies suggest a double-edged effect: algorithmic-LMS integration can enhance responsiveness and evidence-based management, but it also raises concerns about overreliance on opaque models, the potential sidelining of professional judgment, and the need for governance mechanisms to ensure that algorithmic recommendations are used appropriately, transparently, and in ways that preserve institutional values and fairness.

Algorithms shape educational policy not only within individual institutions but also at the systemic level, where they increasingly inform and optimize governance decisions. Mon et al. (2023) review the use of reinforcement-learning systems to simulate policy choices and to tune parameters, such as resource distribution rules, intervention thresholds, or curriculum sequencing, based on projected long-term effects on student outcomes. By enabling policymakers to explore many counterfactual scenarios rapidly and to identify policy mixes that maximize specified objectives, these systems shift policy design from deliberation and expert judgment toward data-driven computational optimization.

This shift brings substantial potential benefits, improved precision, evidence-based forecasting, and the ability to test policies in virtual environments before costly real-world rollout, but it also raises deep normative and governance concerns. When algorithmic models begin to recommend or automatically set policy parameters, questions about democratic accountability become acute: who is responsible for the value judgments embedded in optimization goals, how are trade-offs between equity and efficiency negotiated, and how can affected communities meaningfully participate in decision processes that are increasingly mediated by opaque algorithms? Moreover, reliance on simulated optimization risks amplifying biases present in input data or in objective functions, producing policy recommendations that reflect historical inequities rather than remedial priorities. Addressing these issues requires transparent model specification, stakeholder engagement in objective setting, robust impact assessment, and institutional safeguards that preserve human agency and democratic oversight in educational governance.

Table 2. Opportunities and Challenges of Algorithmic Educational Management

Dimension	Opportunities	Challenges
Decision-Making	Data-driven insights, increased accuracy, reduced bias in standardized assessments	Over-reliance on algorithmic outputs, reduced human agency
Equity & Access	Personalized support for diverse learners, early identification of at-risk students	Algorithmic bias, digital divide, unequal access to technology
Transparency	Documented decision trails, reproducible analysis	Black-box models, lack of explainability (XAI)
Ethics & Privacy	Standardized consent frameworks, data governance protocols	Surveillance concerns, data misuse, student profiling
Institutional Efficiency	Optimized resource allocation, predictive planning	Implementation costs, technical dependency, staff resistance

C. *Ethical Dimensions and Challenges of Algorithmic Educational Management*

The ethical implications of algorithmic educational management are among the most urgent and debated topics in current education research. Nguyen et al. (2022) synthesize the literature to propose six foundational ethical principles for AI in education, transparency, justice and non-discrimination, non-maleficence (do no harm), responsibility (clear lines of accountability), privacy and data protection, and beneficence (promoting student welfare), which together form a normative scaffold for assessing algorithmic deployments. Their systematic review, however, uncovers a troubling gap between these aspirations and everyday practice: many implemented systems fall short on transparency (models and decision logic are often opaque), and accountability mechanisms are frequently weak or ill defined, leaving institutions and stakeholders uncertain about who answers for harmful or biased outcomes.

Beyond transparency and accountability, Nguyen et al. highlight recurring concerns about fairness, where training data and design choices can reproduce or amplify existing inequalities, and about privacy, given the scale and sensitivity of student data collected by algorithmic tools. The review suggests that without deliberate design choices and governance structures that embed these ethical principles into procurement, deployment, monitoring, and remediation processes, algorithmic educational management risks producing unintended harms even as it promises efficiency and personalization. Addressing these shortfalls therefore requires operationalized ethics: concrete policies for explainability, robust data-protection protocols, independent audits, stakeholder participation in objective setting, and clear remediation pathways when harms are detected.

Algorithmic bias poses a serious threat in educational settings because biased outputs can entrench and magnify existing inequalities rather than ameliorate them. Bond et al. (2024), in their meta-systematic review of AI applications in higher education, emphasize the urgent need for greater ethical scrutiny, interdisciplinary collaboration, and methodological rigor, documenting that many deployed systems reflect biases tied to socioeconomic status, race, gender, and language background. Such biases often stem from unrepresentative training data, proxy variables that correlate with disadvantage, or optimization objectives that privilege efficiency over equity.

In response, researchers have highlighted technical and governance remedies. Khosravi et al. (2022) point to Explainable AI (XAI) as a promising approach for improving transparency: by making model logic, important features, and decision pathways more interpretable, XAI enables educators and administrators to inspect, contest, and correct problematic recommendations. Complementary strategies include careful data curation and bias audits, inclusion of fairness constraints during model training, stakeholder participation in objective setting, and institutional processes for monitoring, redress, and continual model improvement. Together, these measures can help ensure that algorithmic tools support equitable educational outcomes rather than replicating historical disadvantage.

Gustilo et al. (2024) examine how educators perceive and respond to AI-generated student writing, revealing wide variation in institutional practices and policies that address algorithmic challenges to academic integrity. Their study finds inconsistent enforcement, unclear guidance for instructors, and divergent views about whether and how to integrate AI tools into assessment design, which together create policy gaps that can undermine fairness and credibility. These inconsistencies underscore the urgent need for coherent, evidence-based policy frameworks that define acceptable uses of generative AI, establish detection and attribution protocols, and offer clear pedagogical alternatives to high-stakes, easily gamed assessments.

Privacy concerns compound these integrity issues. As Kocsis and Molnar (2024) note, Algorithmic Educational Management involves the collection, linkage, and analysis of student data at unprecedented scale and granularity, raising risks of surveillance, intrusive profiling, and secondary uses of data that were not consented to by learners. Such practices can chill student participation, exacerbate inequities, and expose institutions to legal and reputational harms. Together, the literature points to the need for coordinated policies that protect academic standards while also implementing robust data-protection measures, such as data minimization, purpose limitation, transparent consent processes, and independent oversight, to ensure that algorithmic tools are deployed in ways that respect student rights and institutional integrity.

D. *Domain-Specific Applications: Medical Education as a Case Study*

Medical education offers a particularly revealing arena for exploring the broader implications of Algorithmic Educational Management (AEM). Gordon et al. (2024), in their comprehensive scoping review (BEME Guide No. 84), document an exponential rise in AI applications across medical training, spanning adaptive tutors, virtual patient simulations, assessment analytics, and clinical decision-support tools. These technologies are reshaping how competencies are taught, practiced, and evaluated, enabling more individualized learning paths and fine-grained assessment of clinical skills. Building on this work, Rincón et al. (2025) map AI's influence on curriculum design and learner progression decisions, showing that algorithmic tools increasingly inform which competencies are prioritized, how remediation is targeted, and when students are deemed ready to advance, thereby altering traditional faculty judgments and progression pathways.

Nursing education provides parallel evidence of transformative potential and attendant risks. Buchanan et al. (2021) synthesize projections that AI will meaningfully change clinical simulation, competency assessment, and continuing professional development in nursing, enabling more realistic scenario practice and data-driven evaluation of procedural skills. Together, the medical and nursing education literatures illustrate AEM's broad applicability across professional training contexts while underscoring domain-specific challenges: in high-stakes health professions, algorithmic errors, biased predictions, or opaque decision logic carry direct implications for patient safety and professional licensure. Consequently, these fields highlight the necessity of rigorous validation, transparent model design, integrated human oversight, and robust ethical safeguards when embedding algorithmic systems into professional education pathways.

E. Toward an Ethical Framework for Algorithmic Educational Management

Based on the systematic review findings, this study proposes an integrated ethical framework for algorithmic educational management. The framework, termed the TRACE Model (Transparency, Responsibility, Accountability, Collaboration, and Equity), provides a comprehensive set of principles for guiding the design, implementation, and governance of algorithmic systems in educational institutions. Lin et al. (2023) and Bahroun et al. (2023) provide complementary frameworks for understanding sustainable AI integration in education, emphasizing the importance of human-centered design and continuous ethical evaluation.

Transparency requires that algorithmic systems used in educational decision-making be explainable and interpretable to all relevant stakeholders, including students, educators, administrators, and families. Responsibility demands clear delineation of human and algorithmic roles in decision-making processes, ensuring that ultimate accountability rests with human agents rather than algorithmic systems. Accountability involves establishing robust governance structures and audit mechanisms to ensure algorithmic systems perform as intended and that any harms are promptly identified and remediated. Collaboration emphasizes the importance of multi-stakeholder participation in the design and governance of algorithmic systems, including students, educators, technical experts, and community representatives. Finally, Equity requires that algorithmic systems be designed and evaluated with explicit attention to their differential impacts on students from diverse backgrounds, ensuring that they do not perpetuate or amplify educational inequalities.

Table 3. The TRACE Framework for Ethical Algorithmic Educational Management

Principle	Description	Policy Recommendations
Transparency (T)	Algorithmic outputs must be interpretable and explainable to all stakeholders	Mandate XAI adoption; require plain-language explanations of algorithmic decisions
Responsibility (R)	Clear delineation of human vs. algorithmic decision-making roles	Establish algorithmic governance committees; define human override protocols
Accountability (A)	Robust governance, audit, and remediation mechanisms	Conduct regular algorithmic impact assessments; establish independent oversight bodies
Collaboration (C)	Multi-stakeholder participation in algorithmic design and governance	Include student and community representatives in AI governance structures
Equity (E)	Explicit attention to differential algorithmic impacts on diverse learners	Require equity audits; prioritize fairness metrics alongside accuracy metrics

Conclusion

This systematic review has demonstrated that algorithmic educational management is a rapidly expanding field with profound implications for educational policy and institutional governance. Three primary domains of algorithmic application have been identified, academic performance prediction, personalized learning, and institutional management, each offering significant opportunities for enhanced decision-making efficiency while simultaneously posing serious ethical challenges related to transparency, bias, privacy, and accountability. The proposed TRACE framework provides a comprehensive ethical foundation for the responsible implementation of algorithmic systems in education, emphasizing that technology must serve equity and justice rather than undermine them. Future research should focus on empirical evaluation of the TRACE framework's effectiveness, longitudinal studies of algorithmic impacts on educational equity, and the development of context-specific implementation guidelines for diverse educational systems.

Acknowledgment

The authors express their gratitude to the academic institutions and research centers that provided access to databases and reference materials used in the preparation of this study. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

Ahmed, E. (2024). Student performance prediction using machine learning algorithms. Applied Computational Intelligence and Soft Computing, 2024, 4067721. https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/4067721

Almalawi, A., Soh, B., Li, A., & Samra, H. (2024). Predictive models for educational purposes: A systematic review. Big Data and Cognitive Computing, 8, 187. https://doi.org/10.3390/bdcc8120187

Alotaibi, N. (2024). The impact of AI and LMS integration on the future of higher education: Opportunities, challenges, and strategies for transformation. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su162310357

Bahroun, Z., Anane, C., Ahmed, V., & Zacca, A. (2023). Transforming education: A comprehensive review of generative artificial intelligence in educational settings through bibliometric and content analysis. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712983

Bond, M., Khosravi, H., De Laat, M., Bergdahl, N., Negrea, V., Oxley, E., Pham, P., Chong, S. W., & Siemens, G. (2024). A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21, 1-41. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-z

Buchanan, C., Howitt, L., Wilson, R., Booth, R., Risling, T., & Bamford, M. (2021). Predicted influences of artificial intelligence on nursing education: Scoping review. JMIR Nursing, 4. https://doi.org/10.2196/23933

Gordon, M., Daniel, M., Ajiboye, A., Uraiby, H., Xu, N., Bartlett, R., Hanson, J., Haas, M., Spadafore, M., Grafton-Clarke, C., Gasiea, R., Michie, C., Corral, J., Kwan, B., Dolmans, D., & Thammasitboon, S. (2024). A scoping review of artificial intelligence in medical education: BEME Guide No. 84. Medical Teacher, 46, 446-470. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159x.2024.2314198

Gustilo, L., Ong, E., & Lapinid, M. (2024). Algorithmically-driven writing and academic integrity: Exploring educators' practices, perceptions, and policies in AI era. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 20, 1-43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-024-00153-8

Harry, A. (2023). Role of AI in education. Interdisciplinary Journal and Humanity (INJURITY). https://doi.org/10.58631/injurity.v2i3.52

Kaddoura, S., Popescu, D., & Hemanth, J. (2022). A systematic review on machine learning models for online learning and examination systems. PeerJ Computer Science, 8. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.986

Khan, I., Ahmad, A., Jabeur, N., & Mahdi, M. (2021). An artificial intelligence approach to monitor student performance and devise preventive measures. Smart Learning Environments, 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-021-00161-y

Khosravi, H., Shum, S., Chen, G., Conati, C., Tsai, Y.-S., Kay, J. F. L., Knight, S., Maldonado, R. M., Sadiq, S., & Gasevic, D. (2022). Explainable artificial intelligence in education. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 3, 100074. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100074

Kocsis, A., & Molnar, G. (2024). Factors influencing academic performance and dropout rates in higher education. Oxford Review of Education, 51, 414-432. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2024.2316616

Lin, C.-C., Huang, A., & Lu, O. (2023). Artificial intelligence in intelligent tutoring systems toward sustainable education: A systematic review. Smart Learning Environments, 10, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00260-y

Mon, B., Wasfi, A., Hayajneh, M., Slim, A., & Ali, N. A. (2023). Reinforcement learning in education: A literature review. Informatics, 10, 74. https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics10030074

Nguyen, A., Ngo, H., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Nguyen, B.-P. T. (2022). Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. Education and Information Technologies, 28, 4221-4241. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11316-w=

Rincón, E. H. H., Jimenez, D., Aguilar, L. A. C., Florez, J. M. P., Tapia, A. E. R., & Penuela, C. L. J. (2025). Mapping the use of artificial intelligence in medical education: A scoping review. BMC Medical Education, 25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-025-07089-8

Villar, A., & De Andrade, C. R. V. (2024). Supervised machine learning algorithms for predicting student dropout and academic success: A comparative study. Discover Artificial Intelligence, 4. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-023-00079-z

Wang, Y. (2021). Artificial intelligence in educational leadership: A symbiotic role of human-artificial intelligence decision-making. Journal of Educational Administration. https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-10-2020-0216

Yagci, M. (2022). Educational data mining: Prediction of students' academic performance using machine learning algorithms. Smart Learning Environments, 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-022-00192-z