

Governing AI in school trusts

Stewardship, assurance, and responsible innovation

Samira Sadeghi and Jonny Wathen

in association with



October
2026



Confederation
of School Trusts

The voice of school trusts



The Confederation of School Trusts is the national organisation and sector body for academy trusts. Our members educate more than four million children through the dedicated work of their 600,000 staff.

We believe school trusts offer the best model for improving education because they uniquely unite schools in organisations with a strong, single purpose: education. This encourages the sharing of expertise, ideas, and resources to give pupils a better start in life.

We advocate for trusts by helping politicians, policy makers, and the wider public better understand their power to help children. We support trusts through practical advice, strategic guidance, and consultancy. We connect them with each other, and with expert thinking and research.

Published in October 2026 by the Confederation of School Trusts. Registered offices c/o Stone King LLP, Boundary House, 91 Charterhouse Street, London, EC1M 6HR. Registered charity number 1107640. © 2026 Confederation of School Trusts. All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without prior written permission of CST.

How to cite this publication: Sadeghi, S and Wathen, J (2026). *Governing AI in school trusts* London: Confederation of School Trusts

Introduction: why AI governance matters now

“A technology isn’t merely a neutral tool; each intrinsically embodies and supports certain values over others. And different technologies support different values. We do not simply use our tools. Our tools also shape and transform us.”

- Professor C. Thi Nguyen¹

Artificial intelligence (AI) is already changing how school trusts work. Staff are using it to create resources, draft communications, analyse information, support administrative tasks, and reduce workload. Pupils are encountering it both within education and beyond it. Suppliers are embedding AI into products that trusts already use, often without organisations actively seeking it out. The question for boards is no longer whether AI will affect their organisation, but whether its use is being governed effectively.

AI is not simply a technology issue. It is a governance issue because it affects how decisions are made, how information is produced, how risks are managed, how staff work, how pupils learn, how public money is spent, and how trust is maintained with stakeholders.

Its impact is shaped through thousands of decisions about how work is organised, how technology is deployed, how people are supported, and how benefits are shared. Those decisions are all governance decisions. They are ultimately matters of leadership, stewardship, and accountability.

The Department for Education recognises that AI has significant potential to reduce administrative burdens, support teaching and learning, and improve efficiency.²

At the same time, it highlights important risks relating to safeguarding, data protection, intellectual property, misinformation, bias, and inappropriate use. Its current generative AI product safety standards also address security, cognitive development, emotional and social development, mental health, and manipulation.

The challenge for boards is not choosing between innovation and caution. It is ensuring that innovation is pursued in a way that is safe, ethical, evidence-informed, and aligned with the trust’s charitable objects.

¹ Nguyen, C (2026). *The Score: How to Stop Playing Someone Else’s Game*. Penguin Random House UK.

² DfE (2025), [Generative artificial intelligence in education](#).



The board's role: stewardship, assurance, and public value

AI poses new questions, but the answer is not new governance. The answer is applying the enduring principles of good trust governance, stewardship, public benefit, professional judgement, stakeholder voice, accountability, and long-term thinking, to a rapidly changing technological environment.

Different trusts will reach different conclusions about the appropriate use of AI depending on their context, values, strategic priorities, and appetite for risk. The board's role is not to eliminate uncertainty, but to make deliberate and informed decisions about it.

Boards are not expected to become technical experts and they do not need to understand the architecture of large language models or the mechanics of machine learning. Their role is to provide stewardship, strategic oversight, and assurance. They should, therefore, possess sufficient AI and digital literacy to understand the nature of significant risks, dependencies, data implications, and controls so that they can provide effective challenge. This means ensuring that:

- AI use supports the trust's mission, educational aims, and strategic priorities
- Risks are properly identified, understood, and managed
- Legal and regulatory requirements are met
- Pupils, staff, and stakeholders are protected
- Resources are used wisely and deliver value for money
- Technology strengthens, rather than weakens, professional judgement
- Decisions remain transparent, accountable, and capable of challenge

Boards should be particularly mindful of the impact that AI may have on the workforce. Throughout history, technological change has altered how people work. The key governance question is not simply whether tasks can be automated, but what happens to professional judgement, expertise, development, and organisational culture when they are.

Trustees should seek assurance that leaders understand how AI and automation may affect roles, workload, professional expertise, staff development, consultation, and educational quality. Workload reduction and efficiency can be legitimate objectives, but changes should be introduced deliberately, with appropriate regard for professional identity, capability, and the quality of relationships that underpin education.

Stewardship also requires boards to balance any immediate benefits of AI with long-term implications of technological choices. Whilst AI may have environmental costs associated with energy consumption, data storage, and computing infrastructure, it can also support sustainability by helping organisations monitor energy usage, optimise building management systems, reduce waste, and identify opportunities for greater efficiency. Trustees should therefore consider not only what AI enables today, but its wider implications for future generations.

As with any significant organisational change, boards should ask not only: 'Can we do this?' but also: '*Should* we do this?', 'Why are we doing this?' and 'How will we know it is making things better?'



Key risk areas for trustees to understand

Good governance begins with understanding risk. AI introduces some new risks, but perhaps more importantly, it changes the nature and scale of existing risks. Key areas of board attention include:

- **Safeguarding and online safety:** AI tools can generate harmful, misleading, or inappropriate content. Trusts must ensure that any staff and pupil-facing use of AI is appropriate, proportionate, consistent with professional conduct and acceptable use policies, and aligned with safeguarding responsibilities, filtering and monitoring arrangements, and statutory guidance. This should include regard to *Keeping Children Safe in Education*, current DfE filtering and monitoring standards, and the DfE's generative AI product safety standards where relevant.
- **Data protection, information governance, and privacy:** Many AI systems process large quantities of information. Trusts should understand what personal data is being shared, how suppliers use that data, where it is stored, and what controls are in place. Data protection obligations apply regardless of whether the technology is new or familiar. And 'shadow' AI (unsanctioned use of AI) exacerbates this risk, as the organisation loses visibility of what data it touches.³ Trusts should also understand retention and deletion arrangements, international transfers, sub-processors, whether prompts or uploaded content are used for model training, and whether a data protection impact assessment is required.
- **Accuracy and hallucinations:** AI systems can present inaccurate information with great confidence. Human review and professional judgement therefore remain essential. Responsibility for decisions continues to sit with the individual and organisation using the technology. Accountability for decisions remains with the trust and, where appropriate, the authorised human decision-maker. The use of AI does not remove the need for appropriate scrutiny, challenge, and accountability.
- **Bias and fairness:** AI outputs may reflect biases present in training data or system design. Trusts should consider equality, inclusion, and fairness when evaluating both the risks and benefits of AI-enabled processes and decisions.
- **Cyber security:** AI can create new routes for data leakage, account compromise, malicious content, prompt injection, excessive permissions, and AI-enabled phishing or social engineering. Trusts should consider how AI tools connect to existing systems and data, what permissions they receive, and how security controls, incident response, and supplier assurance are maintained.
- **Intellectual property and confidentiality:** Trusts should understand the implications of entering copyright material, confidential information, pupil work, or staff-created content into AI systems. They should consider ownership, licensing, model-training terms, and the risk of infringing third-party intellectual property when AI-generated content is used or published.
- **Assessment and academic integrity:** AI can support learning, but its use in assessed work creates risks around authenticity, malpractice, and the validity of qualifications. Trusts should ensure that staff and pupils understand current awarding organisation and Ofqual expectations, including when AI use must be acknowledged and where its use is prohibited.⁴
- **Cognitive, emotional, and social development:** Pupil-facing AI may affect how children think, learn, relate to others, and seek support. Boards should

³ In its *Future of Professionals Report 2026*, Thomson Reuters surveyed 400 corporate professionals across 36 countries and found that 36% use AI tools their employer has not authorised.

⁴ See JCQ (2025) [AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications](#).

seek assurance that age, developmental stage, dependency, manipulation, mental health, and the quality of human interaction are considered when AI is introduced into learning or pastoral contexts.

- **High-impact and automated decision-making:** The level of governance should reflect the consequence of the use case. Drafting a communication is materially different from using AI to influence recruitment, safeguarding, SEND provision, pupil intervention, staff performance, or other significant decisions about individuals. Where AI informs higher-impact decisions, trusts should ensure meaningful human oversight, transparency, appropriate safeguards, and routes for challenge or redress.
- **Procurement and value for money:** The education technology market can be characterised by ambitious claims and varying levels of evidence. Trusts should undertake due diligence and remain focused on educational benefit, rather than adopting technology simply because it appears innovative.
- **Environmental sustainability:** The computing power required to develop and operate AI systems can involve significant energy and water consumption. However, AI may also help organisations reduce their environmental impact through better monitoring, forecasting, and optimisation of energy and resource use. Boards should consider environmental sustainability when making procurement and implementation decisions, including whether anticipated benefits justify resource use, avoiding unnecessary duplication of tools, and seeking evidence of responsible environmental practices from suppliers.
- **Workforce and organisational culture:** Introducing AI may alter workloads, responsibilities, professional roles, and ways of working. Boards should understand how staff are being consulted, supported, trained, and equipped to adapt successfully, while also considering the longer-term workforce implications of more autonomous forms of AI. This should include appropriate governance for the use of AI agents and agentic AI, clarity over which activities may be delegated or automated, where human oversight and accountability must be retained, and how roles and skills may need to evolve as these technologies mature.

Governance principles

The principles set out in the voluntary sector-led [Academy Trust Governance Code](#) (ATGC) remain applicable, supplemented by CST's [guiding principles for digital transformation](#). AI should be governed through the same commitments to purpose, leadership, integrity, decision-making, risk, effectiveness, equality, diversity and inclusion, openness, and accountability that underpin all aspects of effective trust governance:

- **Educational purpose first:** AI should support the trust's mission and educational objectives. Technology is an enabler, not an end in itself. Decisions about AI should always begin with educational purpose and public benefit. Trusts should begin with the problem they are trying to solve, not the technology they wish to implement. Successful AI adoption is generally characterised by clarity of purpose, rather than enthusiasm for particular tools. (ATGC Principle 1 of delivering the charitable objects and guiding principle of being pedagogically led)
- **Human judgement remains central:** AI can support decision-making, but accountability cannot be delegated to an algorithm. The aim should be to augment and enhance the effectiveness of staff, leaders, trustees, and governance professionals, not to remove necessary expertise, challenge, or

oversight. Professional judgement, ethical reasoning, and human relationships remain fundamental. (ATGC principles of integrity and accountability and guiding principle of recognising and preserving what we value)

- **Curious but cautious:** Trusts should remain open to innovation whilst maintaining a disciplined approach to risk assessment, evaluation, and evidence. Neither uncritical enthusiasm nor excessive risk aversion serves children and young people well. Boards should be wary of adopting AI simply because it is fashionable or widely discussed. The starting point should always be a clearly defined educational or organisational need, with evidence that AI is likely to deliver meaningful benefit. (ATGC Principle 4.3 of decision-making, risk, and control and guiding principle of being curious but cautious)
- **Transparency and stakeholder voice:** Trusts should be open about how AI is being used and involve those affected by significant changes. Staff, pupils, parents, and communities are more likely to support innovation when they understand its purpose and have opportunities to contribute to its development. (ATGC Principle 7 of openness and guiding principle of capacity building)
- **Continuous assurance:** AI governance is not a one-off approval process. Technology, regulation, and practice are changing rapidly. Boards should expect ongoing monitoring, review, and adaptation (ATGC Principle 4 of decision-making, risk, and control and guiding principle of being curious but cautious)
- **Stewardship for future generations:** Trusts exist to create long-term public benefit. Decisions on AI adoption should therefore be considered through both a present and future lens. Boards should seek to maximise educational and organisational benefit whilst remaining mindful of environmental sustainability, social impact, and the longer-term consequences of technological dependence. (ATGC Principle 1.5 and guiding principle of preserving what we value)

A practical assurance framework for boards

Boards do not need a separate governance system for AI. Existing assurance arrangements can usually be extended to incorporate AI-related considerations. The assurance framework below does not create additional governance expectations. Rather, it demonstrates how existing governance responsibilities and principles, including those set out in the [Academy Trust Governance Code](#) and the [guiding principles for digital transformation](#), can be applied to the opportunities and risks presented by AI.

Trusts will be at different stages of AI maturity. The objective is not maximum adoption. It is deliberate, safe, and evidence-informed use, underpinned by strong digital foundations and proportionate assurance. The maturity of a trust's AI governance should therefore be judged not by how much AI it uses, but by how deliberately it decides where AI should, and should not, be used and by the evidence it has that those decisions are delivering benefit safely.

1. Get the lay of the land

Boards should begin by seeking assurance that the trust understands how AI is currently being used across the organisation:

- Define the scope of what you mean by AI within the trust, including generative AI, AI agents, agentic AI and AI-enabled automated workflows, machine-learning systems, AI-supported decision tools, and AI capabilities embedded within existing platforms. Not all automation is AI, although automated processes may raise similar governance questions.
- Understand usage and identify 'shadow AI' (use of unsanctioned tools) by conducting a low stakes no-judgement survey of tools in use, who is using them, and for what purpose, ensuring psychological safety so staff can be honest about their practice
- Maintain a proportionate AI use-case and systems register for material uses, recording purpose, owner, users affected, data involved, supplier, human oversight, key risks, relevant assessments, approval status, and review date, crossing referencing this with the existing information asset register and Record of Processing Activity (ROPA)
- Classify use cases according to their potential impact on pupils, staff, decisions, and organisational risk so that controls and oversight are proportionate and correlate with the sensitivity of the data involved. Office suites and workspaces already have 'sensitivity labels', which can be utilised to inform AI use.
- Assess whether usage aligns with legal requirements, safeguarding expectations, data protection obligations, cyber security standards, your pedagogical approach, and your organisational values
- Connect this with the wider principle of laying strong foundations: secure infrastructure, interoperability, and ethical data stewardship

Suggested questions:

How is AI currently being used across the trust?

Do we have sufficient visibility of actual practice?

Where are the greatest opportunities and risks?

Which uses are sufficiently significant to require formal approval, additional assurance, or ongoing monitoring?

2. Consider your approach to strategy, policies, and procedures

AI governance should be embedded within existing strategic and policy frameworks rather than treated as a standalone initiative:

- Agree the principles that govern safe, effective, ethical, and equitable AI usage within your organisation. Rather than assuming that technological capability alone justifies adoption, there should be explicit consideration of ethical questions such as: Is this the right thing to do? Who benefits? Who may be disadvantaged? What are the unintended consequences? And does the use of AI support, rather than undermine, the trust's educational and moral purposes?
- Integrate AI into relevant strategies and policies covering data protection, safeguarding, teaching and learning, school improvement, HR, procurement, assessment, and staff handbooks. Trusts may choose to have a standalone AI policy, integrated policy provisions, or a combination of both. The important point is that responsibilities, controls, and expectations are coherent, accessible, and connected to the wider governance framework.
- Ensure AI use is linked to your mission, pedagogy, and long-term digital transformation aims, building on what you already value.
- Exercise due diligence and avoid AI becoming an expensive distraction. Supplier claims must be tested against research evidence, data security and pedagogical priorities.

Suggested questions:

How can AI support our strategic priorities?

Are existing policies sufficient? Have we identified any policy gaps?

Does our procurement practice sufficiently control for risks and align with our values? (See Appendix 1)

Are we clear which AI uses are prohibited, permitted, encouraged, or subject to additional approval?

3. Raise awareness and increase capability

Technology is only as effective as the people using it. Building capability is not simply a matter of teaching people how to use AI tools. Trusts should seek to develop AI literacy across the organisation, ensuring staff and pupils are equipped to use AI safely, responsibly, and effectively, whilst understanding both opportunities and limitations. This includes understanding where AI can enhance learning, teaching, governance, and operational effectiveness; recognising its limitations; identifying bias and inaccuracies; understanding data and privacy implications; and exercising informed human judgement about when and how AI should be used.

Capability-building should also address the risks of automation bias and cognitive outsourcing. AI can make some tasks quicker and easier, but over-reliance on AI-generated outputs may weaken critical thinking, professional judgement, and subject expertise. Trusts should encourage staff and pupils to use AI as a tool for support and challenge, rather than as a substitute for thinking.

An AI-enabled organisation requires critical AI literacy and metacognitive awareness: an understanding of how we learn, how we make decisions, how bias influences judgement, and how technology shapes our thinking. This applies as much to trustees and leaders as it does to pupils. And while boards are not expected

to become technical experts, they should possess sufficient technological literacy to understand the opportunities, limitations, risks, and data implications of significant AI initiatives.

Trusts should consider how they:

- Provide staff, pupils, and governance volunteers with appropriate practical training so they can identify hallucinations, biases, and inaccuracies, and use AI responsibly. Training should also address the tendency to place undue trust in computer-generated outputs by ensuring meaningful human oversight, appropriate challenge of AI-generated information, and the application of professional judgement.
- Embed AI training within existing professional development, safeguarding updates, data protection training, and curriculum design, rather than creating standalone modules.
- Consider identifying AI leads or a network of champions, where proportionate to the trust's operating model, to model responsible use, share good practice, and connect learning across schools. Trusts should also seek opportunities to collaborate with other schools, trusts, local authorities, and external partners.
- Connect this with broader digital literacy ambitions and the principle of building capacity and capability across the trust.

Suggested questions:

How are we building digital literacy?

How are we building confidence and capability?

How do we know that our stakeholders understand both risks and opportunities?

Do trustees and leaders have sufficient AI literacy to provide informed challenge without becoming operationally involved?

4. Monitor usage and adapt quickly

Given the pace of change, trusts should establish mechanisms for monitoring emerging developments, identifying issues, and sharing learning. Many organisations may benefit from creating an AI working group or similar forum to oversee implementation and report through existing assurance structures:

- Consider establishing an AI working group or using an existing digital, data, curriculum, or risk forum, with representation appropriate to the trust's context, including leaders, teachers, support staff, and pupils where relevant, and with space for sceptics as well as early adopters.
- Foster a culture of responsible experimentation, where innovation is encouraged, lessons are shared openly, and appropriate safeguards remain in place.
- Track patterns of use, risks, and opportunities, and report insights into existing assurance cycles.
- Use data to understand where AI delivers value, where it causes inefficiencies, and where controls are needed.
- Maintain continuous assessment because the landscape changes rapidly.
- Keep material entries in the AI use-case and systems register under review, particularly when suppliers change functionality, model providers, data

processing terms, or integrations.

Suggested questions:

How are we tracking AI use over time?

What are we learning?

How are emerging risks escalated?

How do we know when a change to an existing product materially alters its risk profile?

5. Seek independent challenge and validation

Independent challenge can strengthen assurance and reduce the risk of blind spots. Depending on the trust's context and risk profile, this might include internal audit, peer review, specialist advice, external assurance, sector benchmarking, or an appropriately evidenced quality framework.

Boards should understand the scope, independence, methodology, and evidential basis of any external quality mark rather than treating certification alone as assurance:

- Use independent review proportionately to validate higher-risk or strategically significant AI use, focusing on risk controls, data protection, cyber security, procurement, safeguarding, and adherence to the trust's strategic principles.
- Draw on external evidence and sector collaboration to benchmark your approach against emerging best practice.
- Connect with the wider principle of ensuring digital transformation is grounded in evidence, ethics, and sector-wide learning.

Suggested questions:

What independent scrutiny have we sought?

How do we know our approach reflects emerging good practice?

What evidence do we have that any external assurance or quality mark is rigorous, independent, and relevant to our use case?

6. Maintain governance oversight

Boards should integrate AI within established reporting, assurance, and risk management arrangements. The objective is not to create additional bureaucracy, but to ensure that AI receives appropriate and proportionate scrutiny:

- Integrate AI into existing KPIs, risk registers, and committee reporting.
- Ensure your relevant committees monitor controls, legal compliance, and the strategic value of AI.
- Evaluate how AI supports your strategic priorities, improves workload, strengthens decision-making, or affects pupils. Where AI is used to support significant decisions, can the trust explain where the input data came from, how the output informed the decision, what information and assumptions were relevant, how the output was validated, and where meaningful human judgement was applied?
- Maintain oversight of ethical, pedagogical, and safeguarding implications as

the regulatory environment evolves.

For material or higher-risk uses, seek assurance that transparency, meaningful human oversight, appropriate safeguards, and routes for challenge or redress are in place.

Suggested questions:

What assurance do we receive about AI?

How do we know controls are effective?

How do we know that the use of AI has helped us deliver our strategic objectives?

What evidence would cause us to pause, change, or stop an AI-enabled activity?



The role of the governance professional

Governance professionals have a critical role to play in helping boards navigate AI and translate the principles of the Academy Trust Governance Code into practical assurance arrangements.

They help ensure that discussions remain focused on purpose, integrity, accountability, effective decision-making, and stakeholder trust, rather than becoming distracted by the complexities of individual technologies.

They are uniquely positioned to:

- ensure that governance discussions focus on strategic questions rather than technical detail
- coordinate assurance from different parts of the organisation
- identify where AI considerations should be incorporated into existing governance processes
- support effective risk management and reporting
- facilitate informed trustee challenge
- maintain oversight of how significant decisions are recorded and reviewed

In governance itself, AI has great potential for supporting administrative processes, gaining data insights, and streamlining reporting, but governance is fundamentally about judgement, relationships, accountability, and stewardship. These remain deeply human responsibilities.

The future of governance is therefore not human versus machine, but human plus machine. The challenge for trusts is ensuring that technology enhances governance capacity and judgement rather than diminishing or replacing it.

Procurement and supplier due diligence

The board does not need to approve every technology purchase where authority has been properly delegated through the trust's scheme of delegation.

Management information systems (MIS) increasingly offer AI-based functionality, and trusts should ensure MIS procurement is in line with [Academy trust handbook](#) requirements.

For material or higher-risk AI-related procurement, boards should seek assurance that leaders have considered the following:

Purpose

- What problem is the tool intended to solve?
- How does it support educational or organisational priorities?
- Is AI necessary for this use case, or could the objective be achieved more simply or with lower risk?

Data

- What data is used?
- Where is data stored?
- Will user inputs be used to train future models?
- What are the retention and deletion arrangements?
- Which sub-processors or model providers are involved, and can these change during the contract?
- Are international transfers involved, and are appropriate safeguards in place?

Safety and compliance

- What safeguarding controls exist?
- How are risks monitored?
- Does the product support relevant DfE expectations and standards?
- Does the proposed use align with Keeping Children Safe in Education 2026, current filtering and monitoring standards, and relevant DfE generative AI product safety standards?
- Are equality, accessibility, age-appropriateness, and routes for challenge or redress adequately addressed?
- Cyber security and access
- What security certifications, testing, and incident response arrangements does the supplier provide?
- What systems can the product access, what permissions does it require, and are these proportionate?
- How are accounts, integrations, API access, logging, and privileged access controlled?

Evidence

- What evidence supports claims of impact?
- Are there examples from comparable educational settings?
- What evidence would demonstrate that the product is not delivering the

intended benefit or is creating unintended harm?

- Intellectual property and confidentiality
- Who owns inputs, outputs, and content created through the service?
- What restrictions apply to copyright, confidential, commercially sensitive, pupil, or staff-created material?

Sustainability

- What evidence can the supplier provide regarding the environmental impact and sustainability of their product or service?
- Commercial and procurement
- What is the total cost of ownership, including licensing, implementation, training, integration, support, and likely growth in usage?
- Does the procurement comply with the trust's scheme of delegation, procurement policy, and the Procurement Act 2023 and associated regulations where applicable?
- Is the trust avoiding unnecessary duplication where similar AI functionality already exists within licensed platforms?

Implementation

- What training and support are available?
- How will success be measured?
- What happens if the technology does not deliver the expected benefits?
- Who is accountable for implementation, monitoring, and periodic review?

Product evolution and exit

- How will the trust be notified if the supplier changes the underlying model, functionality, integrations, data-processing terms, or safety controls?
- Can the trust export its data in a usable format and terminate the service without unreasonable dependency or cost?
- What happens to trust data, user accounts, and integrations at the end of the contract?
- These questions should form part of a wider approach to procurement, risk management, and strategic decision-making. Due diligence is not about preventing innovation. It is about ensuring innovation serves pupils, staff, and the wider public interest.

Conclusion

Artificial intelligence will continue to evolve at a pace that makes precise prediction impossible. New opportunities, risks, and uses will emerge, whilst existing assumptions may quickly become outdated. Yet the core challenge for trustees remains unchanged.

Good governance is not about predicting the future with certainty. It is about exercising sound judgement in conditions of uncertainty, guided by purpose, values, evidence, and accountability. A mature approach to AI is therefore not defined by the scale or speed of adoption, but by the trust's ability to make deliberate choices, build organisational capability, evidence benefit, and know when not to use the technology.

The question for boards is therefore not whether AI will shape the future of education, but how they will shape its use in ways that strengthen trust, support professional judgement, promote public benefit, and create better outcomes for children and young people.

That is the essence of stewardship, and it remains as important in the age of AI as it has always been.



Further resources

Official guidance

Department for Education

- [Generative artificial intelligence in education](#)
- [Generative AI product safety standards](#)
- [Meeting digital and technology standards in schools and colleges](#)
- [Data protection in schools, including generative AI](#)
- [Keeping children safe in education](#)
- [How to reduce procurement risk, good practice guide for academy trusts](#)

Ofqual

- [AI in coursework resources for schools](#)
- [Ofqual's approach to regulating the use of artificial intelligence in the qualifications sector](#)

Information Commission

- [Data Use and Access Act 2025 and automated decision-making](#)
- [AI and data protection risk toolkit](#)

Training and support from CST

Data and digital transformation professional community

CST's [Data and digital transformation professional community](#) is for anyone with a role or interest in digital transformation, data, and innovation. This includes those leading on digital strategy, organisational change, IT, data management, and the intelligent use of emerging technologies in education, including artificial intelligence. Membership of our communities is included for all staff and governance volunteers in a trust, as an integral part of CST membership.

Training opportunities

Our training courses cover key topics for executive teams, including IT, shared services, safeguarding, estates, people, leading mergers, and relational practice. Visit the [training and events calendar](#) to see the full range, including our [Digital leadership in the age of AI](#) course.

Professional advice

[TransforMATive](#) works alongside school trusts to navigate digital transformation responsibly and with purpose. Its team draws on decades of experience leading change within some of England's most progressive trusts, supporting leaders to connect strategy, governance, technology, data and AI with the educational and organisational outcomes they want to achieve..

Contact info@thetransformative.com to continue the conversation.





Confederation
of School Trusts

