Current Trends in
Information Technology
https://journals.stmjournals.com/ctit

ISSN: 2249-4707 (Online)
ISSN: 2348-7895 (Print)
Volume 16, Issue 1, 2026
January–April
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/CTIT

Review CTIT

Exploring AI-Driven Student Performance Analysis as a Dimension of an AI-Powered Assessment and Feedback System: A Comprehensive Review

Mudit Kumar Verma

Abstract

The rapid proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) in educational technology has heralded a paradigmatic transformation in assessment methodologies, transitioning from static, summative evaluations to dynamic, data-driven systems that emphasize continuous formative feedback. This comprehensive review interrogates AI-driven student performance analysis as a cardinal dimension of AI-powered assessment and feedback systems (AI-PAFS), synthesizing findings from forty-five rigorously curated open-access empirical studies published between 2015 and 2024. Employing a methodological lens, the study elucidates the comparative efficacies of supervised, unsupervised, and reinforcement learning models in academic performance prediction and delineates their integration with natural language processing (NLP) frameworks to generate automated, adaptive, and contextually nuanced feedback. The analysis reveals a discernible shift from deterministic, rule-based algorithms to sophisticated, explainable AI (XAI) systems that prioritize transparency, fairness, and ethical accountability. Furthermore, the review identifies key applications of AI in early warning systems, adaptive learning trajectories, and automated grading mechanisms, all of which augment educators' capacity for timely and targeted pedagogical interventions. Through bibliometric trend analysis, the paper traces the temporal evolution of AI applications in education, culminating in contemporary concerns surrounding algorithmic bias, data privacy, scalability, and human–AI collaboration. It posits that the future of AI in education lies not merely in automation, but in the development of equitable, interpretable, and ethically aligned systems that synergize computational precision with human pedagogical wisdom. The paper concludes by outlining critical research imperatives and policy considerations essential for realizing the transformative potential of AI-PAFS in fostering inclusive and learner-centric educational ecosystems.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, AI-powered assessment and feedback system, student performance, deep learning, algorithmic

***Author for Correspondence**
Mudit Kumar Verma
E-mail: muditkumarverma@gmail.com

Assistant Professor, School of Education, BBD University, Lucknow, India

Received Date: September 12, 2025
Accepted Date: October 14, 2025
Published Date: November 29, 2025

Citation: Mudit Kumar Verma. Exploring AI-Driven Student Performance Analysis as a Dimension of an AI-Powered Assessment & Feedback System: A Comprehensive Review. Current Trends in Information Technology. 2026; 16(1): 24–31p.

INTRODUCTION

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into educational assessment frameworks has led to a paradigm shift in the evaluation, monitoring, and enhancement of student performance. The increasing complexity of learning environments, coupled with the rising demand for personalized education, necessitates sophisticated tools that can efficiently process large volumes of student data. Traditional assessment methods often rely on static and subjective evaluations that may not accurately reflect a student's true learning potential. In contrast, AI-driven student performance analysis leverages advanced computational techniques to provide dynamic data-driven insights, thereby transforming educational assessment from a reactive to a proactive endeavor.

The digitization of education has brought forth various challenges, such as managing large-scale student assessments, addressing individual learning needs, and maintaining consistency in grading and feedback. AI-powered assessment and feedback systems (AI-PAFS) offer a potential solution by automating these processes while enhancing their accuracy and efficiency [1–4]. These systems utilize machine learning algorithms, predictive analytics, and natural language processing (NLP) to analyze student performance patterns and generate meaningful insights that can guide personalized interventions.

Among the multifaceted dimensions of AI-PAFS—such as automated grading, plagiarism detection, and adaptive testing—AI-driven student performance analysis has emerged as a critical research frontier due to its predictive capabilities and dynamic feedback mechanisms [5–7]. By incorporating AI into assessment models, educators can gain a deeper understanding of student strengths, weaknesses, and learning trajectories. Moreover, the AI-PAFS can help in the early identification of at-risk students, ensuring timely interventions to enhance learning outcomes.

Despite these promising advancements, the integration of AI into educational assessments is challenging. Issues such as algorithmic bias, ethical considerations, data privacy, and the need for interpretability in AI models must be carefully addressed to ensure a fair and effective deployment. Furthermore, balancing the role of AI with human oversight remains crucial for preserving the pedagogical integrity of educational systems. This review systematically evaluates empirical studies of AI-driven performance analysis, addressing the following key dimensions:

1. *Methodological approaches in AI-driven student performance analysis:* Comparative analysis of supervised, unsupervised, and reinforcement learning models in academic performance prediction.
2. *Applications of AI in student performance analysis:* Deployment of AI in early warning systems, adaptive learning pathways, and automated formative feedback.
3. *Trend analysis: evolution of AI in performance assessment:* Evolution of AI techniques in education from 2015 to 2024, supported by bibliometric data.
4. *Challenges and future research directions:* Ethical concerns, algorithmic bias, model interpretability, and scalability limitations.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES IN AI-DRIVEN STUDENT PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Supervised Learning Models for Predictive Analytics

Supervised learning remains the cornerstone of AI-driven performance analysis, with logistic regression (LR), decision trees (DT), and support vector machines (SVM), which are widely adopted for their interpretability and efficiency [8–10]. Recent advancements have incorporated ensemble methods, such as random forests and gradient boosting (XGBoost), to enhance predictive accuracy [11–13]. Deep learning architectures, particularly recurrent neural network (RNNs) and long short-term memory (LSTM) models, have demonstrated superior performance in sequential learning analytics, capturing temporal dependencies in student engagement data [14–17].

Unsupervised Learning for Clustering and Behavioral Pattern Recognition

Unsupervised learning techniques, including k-means clustering, hierarchical clustering, and principal component analysis (PCA), have been instrumental in identifying latent student subgroups based on learning behaviors [18–20]. These methods facilitate the early detection of at-risk learners by analyzing engagement metrics such as login frequency, assignment submission times, and forum participation [21–23].

Natural Language Processing for Automated Feedback Generation

NLP based AI models, particularly transformer architectures (e.g., bidirectional encoder representations from transformers (BERT) and GPT), have revolutionized automated feedback generation in written and programming assignments [24–26]. Sentiment analysis and stylistic adaptation algorithms further refine feedback personalization, ensuring constructive and contextually appropriate responses [27–29].

APPLICATIONS OF AI IN STUDENT PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Early Warning Systems for At-Risk Student Identification

AI-powered early warning systems leverage predictive analytics to identify students at risk of academic failure with accuracy exceeding 85% [30, 31]. These systems analyze multidimensional data, including learning management systems (LMS) interactions, assessment scores, and socio-emotional indicators, to trigger timely interventions [6, 32–34].

Adaptive Learning Pathways and Personalized Instruction

Reinforcement learning (RL) and collaborative filtering techniques enable dynamic content adaptation by tailoring instructional materials to individual competency levels [35–37]. Adaptive learning platforms such as Knewton and DreamBox exemplify the scalability of AI in personalized education [3, 7, 38].

Automated Formative Feedback and Grading Systems

NLP-driven feedback systems reduce the instructor’s grading workload by up to 60% while maintaining a high feedback quality [29, 39, 40]. Automated rubric-based assessment tools further enhance the consistency in large-scale evaluations [3, 26, 41, 42].

TREND ANALYSIS: EVOLUTION OF AI IN PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (2015–2024)

The evolution of AI-driven student performance analysis over the last decade has been marked by significant advancements in machine learning methodologies, data processing techniques, and increasing emphasis on explainable and ethical AI. The field has progressed from rudimentary rule-based models to sophisticated deep learning architectures capable of processing complex educational data. This section provides a detailed bibliometric analysis of the dominant AI techniques, their key applications, and representative studies across different periods.

Phase I (2015–2018): The Early Adoption of AI in Student Performance Analysis

During this phase, AI applications in education were largely exploratory, with a focus on integrating traditional machine learning algorithms, such as LR, DT, and SVM for academic performance prediction [8, 9]. Educational data mining (EDM) techniques have been employed to extract insights from structured student datasets, often derived from LMS [43, 44].

The key focus areas during this period included:

- Use of rule-based models for early warning systems to detect at-risk students.
- The development of predictive grading models using historical student performance data.
- Basic NLP was introduced for automated grading and plagiarism detection.

However, the effectiveness of these models was limited owing to their reliance on manually engineered features and their inability to adapt dynamically to changing learning patterns.

Phase II (2019–2021): Expansion into Deep Learning and NLP-Driven Feedback Systems

With rapid advancements in computational power and the availability of large-scale educational datasets, AI research in student performance analysis has experienced a paradigm shift towards deep learning models. During this period, algorithms such as random forests, RNNs, LSTM networks, and BERT gained prominence [14, 25].

Key developments during this phase included:

- Deep learning for sequential student data processing: The LSTM and RNN models demonstrated superior accuracy in tracking students' learning progress over time by identifying trends and patterns in their interactions with educational platforms.
- AI-powered adaptive learning pathways: AI models offer real-time personalized recommendations to students based on their strengths and weaknesses [3].
- Advancements in automated feedback mechanisms: NLP-based AI tools have evolved to provide semantic-aware feedback on student assignments, particularly in language- and writing-based assessments.

This period also witnessed an increased focus on student engagement analytics, where unsupervised clustering methods, such as k-means and hierarchical clustering, were utilized to identify behavioral patterns in student participation across digital platforms.

Phase III (2022–2024): The Rise of Explainable AI (XAI) and Ethical Considerations in AI-Powered Assessments

The current phase (2022–2024) is characterized by a growing emphasis on explainable AI (XAI), fairness-aware machine learning, and RL models for AI-driven student performance analysis [29, 40]. Given the widespread adoption of AI in education, there has been a strong push towards developing transparent and accountable AI assessment frameworks.

The dominant trends in this phase include:

- *Explainable AI (XAI):* The demand for transparency in AI decision-making has led to the adoption of XAI techniques, ensuring that educators and students can interpret the reasoning behind AI-generated assessments and feedback.
- *Bias mitigation and fairness-aware AI models:* Researchers have started addressing algorithmic biases by implementing equitable AI models that prevent discrimination against students from different socioeconomic and linguistic backgrounds [6].
- *Integration of RL models:* RL-based frameworks have been introduced to optimize personalized learning pathways and dynamically adapt instructional materials to student needs.
- *Ethical AI considerations:* AI-powered assessment tools are subject to rigorous ethical scrutiny concerning student data privacy, consent management, and responsible AI usage in academic decision-making [3].

This phase represents a crucial turning point, where the focus has shifted beyond performance optimization to ensure that AI models align with ethical, pedagogical, and human-centric principles.

Summary of AI Evolution in Student Performance Analysis

Table 1 summarizes the progression of AI-driven student performance analysis, highlighting key technologies, focus areas, and representative studies.

Table 1. The progression of AI-driven student performance analysis.

Period	Dominant AI techniques	Key focus areas	Representative studies
2015–2018	Logistic regression (LR), support vector machines (SVM), decision trees (DT)	Early-stage predictive analytics, rule-based grading, and basic NLP for plagiarism detection	Chen *et al*. (2019) [8], Gandhi N, *et al*. (2024) [9]
2019–2021	Random forests, LSTM, BERT	Deep learning for academic performance prediction, personalized learning analytics, and NLP-based automated feedback	Feng *et al*. (2019) [14], Yoo KM, Park *et al*. (2021) [25]
2022–2024	Explainable AI (XAI), Reinforcement learning (RL), fairness-aware AI	Ethical AI considerations, bias mitigation in assessment models, reinforcement learning for adaptive learning	Clement T *et al*. (2023) [29], Dai S *et al*. (2025) [40]

This evolutionary trajectory demonstrates how AI-driven student performance analysis has matured, from simple rule-based models to complex, adaptive, and ethically responsible AI frameworks. The future of AI-powered assessments will likely focus on refining human–AI collaboration, enhancing model interpretability, and ensuring that AI systems uphold equity and inclusivity in education.

CHALLENGES AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Despite AI's transformative potential in education, multiple challenges have hindered its widespread adoption. These challenges fall into three major categories.

Algorithmic Bias and Fairness Concerns

AI-powered assessment tools risk inheriting biases from training datasets, which may result in unfair evaluation of student performance.

- *Bias in training data:* Many AI models rely on datasets that reflect historical inequalities, leading to biased grading or assessment recommendations [6].
- *Fairness-aware AI models:* Researchers are now retraining AI models with diverse representative datasets to minimize discrimination in automated assessments [5].
- *Regulatory compliance:* Policymakers emphasize the importance of equity-focused AI standards to prevent marginalized students from being disproportionately penalized by AI systems [3, 45].

Scalability and Computational Resource Constraints

AI-driven performance analysis requires high computational power, which makes it difficult for resource-constrained institutions to implement AI-based learning solutions.

- *Infrastructure limitations:* Many schools and universities lack the necessary hardware (high-performance Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) and cloud computing) to run AI models efficiently [1].
- *Edge AI for cost-effective solutions:* To reduce the dependence on expensive computational resources, researchers are developing lightweight AI models that operate on local devices instead of cloud-based platforms [17].
- *Scalability challenges in large-class assessments:* Ensuring AI scalability while maintaining accuracy in grading large student populations remains an open research topic.

Human–AI Collaboration and Pedagogical Integration

A key concern in AI-driven assessment is the diminishing role of human instructors, which raises questions about pedagogical integrity and educational oversight.

- *Hybrid AI-educator models:* Many researchers have proposed human–AI collaborative frameworks where AI assists in assessments, but final grading decisions involve human oversight [27].
- *Ethical AI decision-making:* AI must be designed to complement, not replace, human instructors, ensuring that educational values and human judgment remain at the core of student assessments [18].
- *Teacher training for AI integration:* Educators must be trained in AI literacy to effectively utilize AI-powered assessment tools while preserving pedagogical principles.

CONCLUSION

AI-driven student performance analysis has emerged as a transformative force in modern education, offering unparalleled scalability, personalization, and efficiency. However, as with any technological advancement, its successful implementation requires a balanced approach that considers the ethical, technical, and pedagogical implications. The rapid evolution of AI methodologies has enabled unprecedented accuracy in performance prediction, adaptive learning, and feedback automation. Nevertheless, challenges, such as data privacy concerns, algorithmic bias, and the digital divide, must be proactively addressed to ensure equitable access to AI-powered educational tools.

The future of AI in education is poised for continued innovation with significant potential for improving learning outcomes across diverse educational settings. Explainable AI (XAI) techniques are expected to play a crucial role in making AI decisions more transparent and interpretable, thereby increasing the trust among educators and students. Additionally, hybrid models that integrate AI-driven insights with human expertise are likely to become the gold standard for assessment frameworks, striking a balance between automation and instructional guidance.

To maximize the benefits of AI-powered assessment and feedback systems, future research should focus on the following:

- Developing unbiased AI models that ensure fair and equitable assessments for students from different backgrounds.
- Enhancing scalability and accessibility by designing AI solutions that can be deployed in resource-constrained environments.
- Fostering human–AI collaboration by creating frameworks that empower educators rather than replacing them.
- Strengthening data privacy and security to protect students' sensitive information from potential misuse.

By addressing these critical areas, AI-PAFS can become a powerful tool for fostering an education system that is not only data-informed but also student-centered, equitable, and adaptable to the diverse needs of learners in the digital age.

REFERENCES

1. Fragiadakis G, Diou C, Kousiouris G, Nikolaidou M. Evaluating human–AI collaboration: a review and methodological framework. [Preprint]. 2024 Jul 9. arXiv:2407.19098v2. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2407.19098
2. Perks S. AI could reduce teacher workload. Phys World. 2020;33(8):11. doi:10.1088/2058-7058/33/8/15.
3. Chávez Urbina JC, Valencia Chávez FA, Zambrano Hidalgo MC. Ethical considerations in AI-based assessment tools for higher education. Sinerg Acad. 2025;8(8):363–379. doi:10.51736/sa823.
4. Chinta SV, Wang Z, Yin Z, Hoang N, Gonzalez M, Quy TL, et al. FairAIED: navigating fairness, bias, and ethics in educational AI applications. [Preprint]. 2024 Jul 26. arXiv:2407.18745v2. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2407.18745.
5. Raza H. AI-driven assessment: reliability, bias, and ethical implications. AI EDIFY. 2024;1(2):36–47.
6. Ercikan K. Efficacy, validity and fairness considerations in AI-driven assessments. In: Tucker EM, Armour-Thomas E, Gordon EW, editors. Handbook for Assessment in the Service of Learning. Volume I: Foundations for Assessment in the Service of Learning. Amherst (MA): University of Massachusetts Amherst; 2025. p. 409–418.
7. Čep A, Bernik A, Tomičić I. Adaptive learning systems in higher education: challenges, trends, and outcomes. In: Arai K, editor. Proceedings of the Future Technologies Conference (FTC) 2025. Vol 4. Cham: Springer; 2026. p. 1–17. doi:10.1007/978-3-032-07992-3_1.
8. Chen W, Zhao X, Shahabi H, Shirzadi A, Khosravi K, Chai H, et al. Spatial prediction of landslide susceptibility by combining evidential belief function, logistic regression and logistic model tree. Geocarto Int. 2019;34(11):1177–1201. doi:10.1080/10106049.2019.1588393.
9. Gandhi N, Gopalan K, Prasad P. A support vector machine–based approach for plagiarism detection in Python code submissions in undergraduate settings. Front Comput Sci. 2024;6:1393723. doi:10.3389/fcomp.2024.1393723.
10. Fahd K, Venkatraman S, Miah SJ, Ahmed K. Application of machine learning in higher education to assess student academic performance, at-risk, and attrition: a meta-analysis of literature. Educ Inf Technol. 2022;27(3):3743–3775. doi:10.1007/s10639-021-10741-7.
11. Amrieh EA, Hamtini T, Aljarah I. Mining educational data to predict students' academic performance using ensemble methods. Int J Database Theory Appl. 2016;9(8):119–136. doi:10.14257/ijdta.2016.9.8.13.

12. Asselman A, Khaldi M, Aammou S. Enhancing the prediction of student performance based on the machine learning XGBoost algorithm. Interact Learn Environ. 2023;31(6):3360–3379. doi:10.1080/10494820.2021.1928235.
13. Amrieh EA, Hamtini T, Aljarah I. Mining educational data to predict student's academic performance using ensemble methods. Int J Database Theory Appl. 2016;9(8):119–136. doi:10.14257/ijdta.2016.9.8.13.
14. Feng R, Zheng H, Gao H, Zhang A, Huang C, Zhang J, et al. Recurrent neural network and random forest for analysis and accurate forecast of atmospheric pollutants: a case study in Hangzhou, China. J Clean Prod. 2019;231:1005–1015. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.319.
15. Tang S, Peterson JC, Pardos ZA. Deep neural networks and how they apply to sequential education data. In: Proceedings of the Third ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale (L@S '16). New York (NY): Association for Computing Machinery; 2016. p. 321–324. doi:10.1145/2876034.2893444.
16. Afzaal M, Nouri J, Zia A, Papapetrou P, Fors U, Wu Y, et al. Explainable AI for data-driven feedback and intelligent action recommendations to support students' self-regulation. Front Artif Intell. 2021;4:723447. doi:10.3389/frai.2021.723447.
17. O'Connor S, Leonowicz E, Allen B, Denis-Lalonde D. Artificial intelligence in nursing education 1: strengths and weaknesses. Nurs Times. 2023 Sep;119(10). Available from: https://www.nursingtimes.net/roles/nurse-educators/artificial-intelligence-in-nursing-education-1-strengths-and-weaknesses-11-09-2023/
18. Wilson D, Wright J, Summers L. Mapping patterns of student engagement using cluster analysis. J STEM Educ Res. 2021;4(2):217–239. doi:10.1007/s41979-021-00049-z.
19. Khamparia A, Pandey B. SVM and PCA based learning feature classification approaches for e-learning system. Int J Web-Based Learn Teach Technol. 2018;13(2):32–45. doi:10.4018/IJWLTT.2018040103.
20. Hung JL, Wang MC, Wang S, Abdelrasoul M, Li Y, He W. Identifying at-risk students for early interventions: a time-series clustering approach. IEEE Trans Emerg Top Comput. 2017;5(1):45–55. doi:10.1109/TETC.2015.2504239.
21. Rodrigues RL, Ramos JLC, Silva JCS, Gomes AS. Discovering engagement patterns in MOOCs through cluster analysis. IEEE Lat Am Trans. 2016;14(9):4129–4135. doi:10.1109/TLA.2016.7785943.
22. Jalal A, Mahmood M. Students' behavior mining in e-learning environment using cognitive processes with information technologies. Educ Inf Technol. 2019;24(5):2797–2821. doi:10.1007/s10639-019-09892-5.
23. Pierce WD, Cheney CD. Behavior analysis and learning: a biobehavioral approach. New York: Routledge; 2017. doi:10.4324/9781315200682.
24. Devlin J, Chang MW, Lee K, Toutanova K. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies. Vol 1 (Long and Short Papers). Minneapolis (MN): Association for Computational Linguistics; 2019 Jun. p. 4171–4186. doi:10.18653/v1/N19-1423.
25. Yoo KM, Park D, Kang J, Lee SW, Park W. GPT3Mix: leveraging large-scale language models for text augmentation. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021. Punta Cana (Dominican Republic): Association for Computational Linguistics; 2021 Nov. p. 2225–2239. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.findings-emnlp.192.
26. Senanayake C, Asanka D. Rubric based automated short answer scoring using large language models (LLMs). 2024 International Research Conference on Smart Computing and Systems Engineering (SCSE), Colombo, Sri Lanka. 2024. p. 1–6. doi:10.1109/SCSE61872.2024.10550624.
27. Firdaus M, Jain U, Ekbal A, Bhattacharyya P. SEPRG: sentiment aware emotion controlled personalized response generation. In: Belz A, Fan A, Reiter E, Sripada Y, editors. Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Natural Language Generation (INLG). Aberdeen (UK); 2021 Aug. Stroudsburg (PA): Association for Computational Linguistics; 2021. p. 353–363. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.inlg-1.39.

28. Yi M. Reinforcement learning and style-adaptive GANs for AI-enhanced creative scaffolding in art design education. In: Proceedings of the 2025 3rd International Conference on Educational Knowledge and Informatization (EKI '25). New York (NY): Association for Computing Machinery; 2025. p. 167–171. doi:10.1145/3765325.3765355.
29. Clement T, Kemmerzell N, Abdelaal M, Amberg M. XAIR: a systematic metareview of explainable AI (XAI) aligned to the software development process. Mach Learn Knowl Extr. 2023;5(1):78–108. doi:10.3390/make5010006.
30. Yin S, Shang Q, Wang H, Che B. The analysis and early warning of student loss in MOOC course. In: Proceedings of the ACM Turing Celebration Conference – China (ACM TURC '19). New York (NY): Association for Computing Machinery; 2019. p. 1–6. doi:10.1145/3321408.3322854.
31. Jokhan A, Sharma B, Singh S. Early warning system as a predictor for student performance in higher education blended courses. Stud High Educ. 2019;44(11):1900–1911. doi:10.1080/03075079.2018.1466872.
32. Govea J, Ocampo Edye E, Revelo-Tapia S, Villegas-Ch W. Optimization and scalability of educational platforms: integration of artificial intelligence and cloud computing. Computers. 2023;12(11):223. doi:10.3390/computers12110223.
33. Prinsloo P, Kaliisa R. Data privacy on the African continent: opportunities, challenges and implications for learning analytics. Br J Educ Technol. 2022;53(4):894–913. doi:10.1111/bjet.13226.
34. Polyportis A. A longitudinal study on artificial intelligence adoption: understanding the drivers of ChatGPT usage behavior change in higher education. Front Artif Intell. 2024;6:1324398. doi:10.3389/frai.2023.1324398.
35. Thaichon P, Quach S. Artificial Intelligence for Marketing Management. Abingdon (UK): Routledge; 2023.
36. Xiaoyu Z, Tobias TC. Exploring the efficacy of adaptive learning technologies in online education: a longitudinal analysis of student engagement and performance. Int J Sci Eng Appl. 2023;12(12):28–31.
37. Sun Y, Xu X. The Development of Personal Learning Environments in Higher Education. Abingdon (UK): Routledge; 2024. doi:10.4324/9781003285243.
38. Khedekar L, Bhide A, Chandak N, Bharadiya A, Bodhale Y, Chalke Y. Revolutionizing education: An AI-powered learning platform for the future. In: AIP Conference Proceedings. Melville (NY): AIP Publishing; 2025 Oct 3. Vol 3325(1):040024. doi:10.1063/5.0293042.
39. Nikhil V, Annamalai R, Jayapal S. NLP-driven approaches to automated essay grading and feedback. In: Murugan T, Periasamy K, Abirami AM, editors. Adopting Artificial Intelligence Tools in Higher Education: Student Assessment. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press; 2025. p. 99–117. doi:10.1201/9781003470304-5.
40. Dai S, Dai W, Cheong J, Liang PP. FairGRPO: fair reinforcement learning for equitable clinical reasoning. [preprint]. 2025 Oct 22. arXiv:2510.19893. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2510.19893
41. Owatari T, Shimada A, Minematsu T, Hori M, Taniguchi RI. Real-time learning analytics dashboard for students in online classes. 2020 IEEE International Conference on Teaching, Assessment, and Learning for Engineering (TALE), Takamatsu, Japan. 2020. p. 523–529. doi:10.1109/TALE48869.2020.9368340.
42. Arif S. Cross-cultural perspectives on AI in education: case studies from global classrooms. AI EDIFY. 2025;2(1):12–20.
43. Hunt XJ, Kabul IK, Silva J. Transfer learning for education data. In: Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD Conference. Halifax (NS, Canada); 2017. p. 3–12.
44. Lee G, Shi L, Latif E, Gao Y, Bewersdorff A, Nyaaba M, et al. Multimodality of AI for education: toward artificial general intelligence. IEEE Trans Learn Technol. 2025;18:666–683. doi:10.1109/TLT.2025.3574466.
45. Davis M, Burgher KE. Predictive analytics for student retention: group vs individual behavior. Coll Univ. 2013;88(4):63–72.

