Applied Artificial Intelligence Research

INNOVIAIR

AI and Big Data in Private School Decision-Making: A Human-Centered Governance Framework

Yundong Wu[a], Weijian Kong[b,*]

[a]Graduate School, Dongshin University, 67 Dongshindae-gil, Naju 58245, South Korea

[b]College of Humanities and International Studies, Keimyung University, 1095 Dalgubeol-daero, Daegu 42601, South Korea

ARTICLEINFO

Keywords:
Artificial Intelligence
Big Data
Private School Management
Educational Governance
Data-Driven Decision-Making

ABSTRACT

This article examines how artificial intelligence and big data can support decision-making in private school management while preserving educational judgment, stakeholder trust, and institutional responsibility. Private schools operate under distinctive pressures, including enrolment competition, parental choice, financial sustainability, reputational risk, and regulatory compliance. These conditions make data-driven tools attractive for admissions forecasting, learning quality monitoring, student support, teacher development, financial planning, family communication, reputation analysis, and risk management. However, the use of AI in private schools also raises significant concerns, including data privacy, algorithmic bias, excessive surveillance, metric drift, vendor dependence, and the possible substitution of professional judgment with automated recommendations. Drawing on literature from AI in education, learning analytics, privatization, and data ethics, this article argues that AI should be understood as a socio-technical system rather than a neutral technical upgrade. It proposes a human-centered governance framework based on educational purpose, proportionality, contestability, transparency, stakeholder participation, vendor accountability, professional development, and continuous audit. The article concludes that AI and big data can improve private school decision-making only when they are embedded in responsible governance practices that strengthen, rather than weaken, educational values and institutional legitimacy.

1.Introduction

Private school administrators face a complex set of decisions. They must plan enrolment, hire and retain teachers, design curriculum, communicate with families, manage finances, respond to public opinion, and satisfy legal requirements. These tasks are not separate. A change in tuition may affect enrolment, staffing, programme quality, and family trust. A new technology platform may improve communication but also raise privacy concerns. A decision about class size may influence learning quality, teacher workload, and long-term reputation. For this reason, private school management is best understood as a form of organizational judgement under uncertainty.

Digital transformation has changed the conditions of that judgement. School leaders now have access to data that was hard to collect in the past: inquiry records, website visits, student information system data, learning platform traces, assessment results, attendance patterns, teacher development records, payment histories, survey responses, and comments on social media. AI systems can classify, predict, summarize, recommend, and detect patterns across these data sources. In principle, such systems can help leaders see weak signals earlier and compare options more carefully. They can support admissions planning, identify students who need support, detect workload risks for teachers, and improve the timing of financial decisions.

The appeal of AI is especially strong for private schools. Unlike many public schools, private schools often work in a more competitive environment. Families can compare schools and move between them. Enrolment directly affects revenue. Reputation can change quickly. Many private schools also use distinctive curriculum models, international programmes, or premium services to justify their position in the market. These features create a demand for timely information and visible responsiveness. Data-driven tools seem to offer an answer to that demand.

Yet the same features also create risks. Private schools may collect more detailed information about families than they

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: ethan@dsu.ac.kr.
https://doi.org/10.65455/e99jvv58
Received 13 July 2026; Received in revised form 20 July 2026; Accepted 30 July 2026; Available 5 August 2026

actually need. They may use predictive systems to prioritize applicants who appear more likely to pay, stay, or improve performance indicators. They may rate teachers through narrow metrics that do not capture care, professional judgement, or moral responsibility. They may outsource data processing to commercial vendors without enough control over storage, access, model design, or secondary use. In such cases, AI does not simply make decisions more efficient. It changes the relationship between schools, students, families, teachers, and the market.

Existing research provides important ethical principles and identifies risks associated with learning analytics, but its findings are dispersed across general AI-in-education guidance, data ethics, and privatization studies. It does not systematically specify how governance should operate when a school is simultaneously exposed to enrolment competition, direct parental payment, reputational volatility, high operational autonomy, and reliance on commercial technology providers. Consequently, existing work does not offer a dedicated framework that connects private-school application scenarios with risk ownership, decision rights, vendor obligations, appeal mechanisms, and continuous review. This unresolved gap provides the central justification for the present study.

This article addresses the following question: how can AI and big data assist private school administrators without replacing educational judgement or weakening trust? The paper does not treat AI as a neutral technical upgrade. It treats AI as a socio-technical system that is shaped by institutional goals, data practices, stakeholder expectations, and governance rules. This view is consistent with learning analytics research, which stresses that analytics must be connected to learning theory, human interpretation, and ethical safeguards rather than treated as a purely computational field[1,2].

The article has three aims. First, it explains why private schools have distinctive needs for data-assisted decision-making. Second, it maps the main areas in which AI and big data can support school management. Third, it proposes a governance pathway that can help private schools use these tools in a responsible manner. The article's distinctive contribution is a private-school-specific governance framework that links concrete application scenarios to eight interrelated risk domains and eleven governance procedures, while incorporating safeguards for enrolment competition, fee-paying parent relationships, institutional autonomy, and dependence on commercial vendors.

The paper is organized as follows. The next section reviews the literature and develops the conceptual basis of the argument. The third section explains the private school context and its stakeholder pressures. The fourth section discusses application areas. The fifth section analyzes major risks. The sixth section proposes a governance framework. The final sections discuss implications and conclude.

2.Literature review and conceptual basis

Research on AI in education has moved from early interest in intelligent tutoring systems toward wider questions about analytics, automation, governance, and ethics. AI is now used for adaptive learning, automated feedback, early warning systems, recommendation tools, content generation, administrative prediction, and natural language processing. The promise is not only that AI can process more data than human administrators, but also that it can reveal patterns that are difficult to notice through ordinary observation[3,4].

Learning analytics provides one of the most relevant bodies of work for school management. Siemens describes learning analytics as an emerging discipline concerned with the measurement, collection, analysis, and reporting of data about learners and their contexts[1]. Baker and Inventado connect learning analytics with educational data mining, showing how data can be used to model learning processes and support intervention[5]. Joksimovic et al. emphasize that the field has developed from technical experimentation toward a more mature concern with theory, design, and institutional use[6]. These studies suggest that analytics should not be reduced to dashboards. It should be tied to educational purpose and interpreted by people who understand the local context. Recent research has also emphasized that AI integration in education brings not only efficiency gains and personalized learning opportunities, but also ethical risks, weaker teacher-student interaction, technology dependence, data privacy concerns, and unequal access to educational resources[7].

The ethical literature is equally important. Slade and Prinsloo argue that learning analytics raises questions about consent, privacy, transparency, and the obligation to act on information[2]. Prinsloo and Slade further show that analytics can redraw boundaries of power in education[8]. Once a school can track students more closely, it must decide who may see the data, how risk labels are used, and how students can contest interpretations. Regan and Jesse warn that edtech, big data, and personalized learning can create new forms of sorting and tracking[9]. Their argument is highly relevant to private schools, where market incentives may strengthen the temptation to rank families, students, or teachers according to institutional benefit.

Policy documents have also become more explicit. UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence frames responsible AI governance around human rights, inclusion, equity, transparency, privacy, accountability, non-discrimination, capacity building, and public oversight[10]. The European Commission offers guidance for educators on the ethical use of AI and data, with emphasis on human agency, fairness, explainability, and safe data practices[11]. The U.S. Department of Education similarly argues for human-centered AI and warns against systems that make high-stakes decisions without adequate human review[12]. The EU AI Act adds a broader regulatory signal by treating many education-related AI applications as high-risk when they affect access, assessment, or life opportunities[13].

Research on private education adds another layer. Ball and Youdell argue that privatization in education can be visible or hidden, and that market logics may enter schools through funding, performance, choice, and management practices[14]. Verger et al. show that private provision cannot be understood only through efficiency[15]. It is connected to public regulation, family choice, equity, and political economy. In a private school, data tools are therefore not only educational tools.

They can also become market tools, branding tools, and risk management tools. This makes governance especially important.

The concept of bounded rationality helps explain why administrators seek AI support. School leaders rarely have complete information or unlimited time. Their goals may conflict. They must make decisions under pressure and with incomplete evidence. AI and big data can reduce some information gaps by organizing data, producing forecasts, and showing possible effects of different choices. However, they cannot decide what the school should value. They cannot determine whether a strategy is educationally just, whether a family has been treated with dignity, or whether a teacher's contribution is best captured by a number.

This article therefore uses the idea of human-machine collaboration. In this view, AI systems provide evidence, warnings, comparisons, and possible explanations. Administrators, teachers, and other stakeholders interpret these outputs in light of educational aims, ethical duties, and local knowledge. Human-machine collaboration differs from automation. Automation seeks to remove human judgement. Collaboration seeks to make judgement better informed and more accountable.

Three principles guide the analysis. The first is educational purpose. Data should be collected and analyzed only when the purpose is connected to student development, teaching quality, organizational sustainability, or legitimate compliance. The second is proportionality. The intensity of data collection and prediction should be proportionate to the problem being addressed. A minor communication issue does not justify deep profiling of families. The third is contestability. People affected by algorithmic outputs should have ways to ask questions, correct errors, and request human review. These principles are not technical extras. They are conditions for trust.

3.The private school context

Private schools have a dual character. They provide education, which is a public and moral activity, but they often operate through private funding, family choice, and competitive positioning. This dual character shapes the way administrators make decisions. A private school must ask whether a programme is educationally sound, but it must also ask whether families will choose it, whether teachers can deliver it, and whether the budget can sustain it.

The stakeholder structure is also dense. Students are the central beneficiaries, but parents and guardians are often the direct purchasers of services. Teachers are professionals, employees, and carriers of the school's reputation. Regulators set legal boundaries. Technology vendors provide platforms that may become embedded in daily operations. Communities and online audiences influence reputation. These actors do not always share the same priorities. Families may ask for more personalized reports, while students may need privacy and freedom from constant measurement. Administrators may want efficiency, while teachers may fear unfair evaluation. Regulators may require compliance, while vendors may promote rapid adoption.

This setting makes data attractive. Admissions records can show where demand is rising or falling. Student data can reveal patterns in learning needs. Parent feedback can identify service problems. Financial data can clarify which projects are sustainable. Teacher data can show professional development needs. External data, such as population trends or local competition, can help leaders plan for the future. For a school that depends on enrolment stability, such information may be vital.

At the same time, private schools face a stronger risk of metric drift. Metric drift occurs when measurable indicators slowly replace the original educational purpose. For example, a school may begin by using satisfaction surveys to improve communication. Over time, the same data may become a tool for pressuring teachers to please parents even when professional judgement requires difficult conversations. A school may use enrolment analytics to understand demand, but the model may later be used to exclude families who appear less profitable. A school may monitor learning risks to support students, but the data may become a ranking system that follows students across years.

Private schools therefore need a sharper distinction between decision support and decision substitution. Decision support means that data helps leaders ask better questions. Decision substitution means that a score or recommendation becomes the decision itself. The first can strengthen educational governance. The second can weaken responsibility because leaders may hide behind the model. A responsible school cannot say that a student was rejected, a teacher was penalized, or a family was ignored because the system recommended it. The institution remains accountable.

Another feature of the private school context is uneven capacity. Elite schools may have data teams, integrated platforms, and legal support. Smaller schools may depend on off-the-shelf systems and vendor advice. This gap matters because AI governance requires expertise. A small school may not be able to audit a model, but it can still ask basic questions: What data are collected? Where are they stored? Who has access? Can the school export or delete them? How are predictions produced? Are families informed? Are high-stakes decisions reviewed by people? Good governance does not require every school to build its own AI system. It requires every school to understand the consequences of the systems it uses.

4.Application areas for AI and big data

Admissions forecasting is one of the most obvious uses of AI in private school management. Schools can combine historical enrolment, inquiry channels, open-day attendance, website traffic, demographic trends, local housing changes, tuition levels, and competitor information. Predictive models can estimate demand for grade levels, programmes, or campuses. Administrators can then adjust marketing, staffing, scholarship planning, and facility use. This can reduce reactive decision-making and help schools avoid overexpansion.

The ethical boundary is clear. Admissions analytics should improve planning and fit. It should not become a hidden system for filtering families by income, social background, nationality, disability, or likely compliance with school culture. If a model is trained on past admissions success, it may reproduce past preferences. Private schools should therefore review the variables used in admissions models and avoid proxy indicators that lead to unfair exclusion. Where decisions affect access, human review is essential.

Learning quality monitoring is another important area. AI systems can integrate assessment data, attendance, homework completion, platform activity, classroom observations, and teacher notes. They can detect students who are falling behind, identify topics that many students find difficult, and show differences between classes or subjects. This is useful because private schools often promise individualized support. Data can help administrators see whether that promise is being fulfilled.

Still, learning analytics should not narrow learning to what can be counted. Scores, clicks, and completion rates do not capture curiosity, resilience, ethical growth, creativity, or emotional well-being. Teachers often know things that do not appear in a dashboard. A student who submits late work may be facing family stress. A quiet student may be thinking deeply rather than disengaging. For this reason, AI-generated risk labels should be treated as prompts for conversation, not as final diagnoses.

Student well-being and pastoral care can also benefit from data, but this area requires special caution. Attendance changes, counselling referrals, nurse visits, behaviour reports, and communication patterns may help schools identify students who need support. Natural language tools may summarize concerns from teacher notes or parent messages. Used carefully, such tools can improve coordination among staff and reduce the chance that a struggling student is missed.

The danger is surveillance. Well-being data are sensitive. Students should not feel that every action is converted into a risk profile. Schools must define what data are necessary, who can see them, and when they should be deleted. Sensitive data should never be used for marketing, ranking, or unnecessary discipline. The purpose must remain care.

Teacher recruitment and professional development form a further application area. Private schools need stable and capable teaching teams. AI can help analyze recruitment channels, qualifications, retention patterns, training participation, timetable pressure, feedback themes, and professional goals. Administrators can use these insights to improve induction, mentoring, workload balance, and leadership development. Predictive tools may also identify departments where turnover risk is rising.

However, teacher data must be interpreted with professional respect. Parent ratings and student outcomes are affected by many factors outside a teacher's control. A teacher who works with students in difficulty may not show quick gains on simple indicators. A popular teacher is not always the most educationally rigorous teacher. A responsible evaluation system should combine multiple sources: peer review, classroom observation, student learning evidence, teacher reflection, contribution to school culture, and professional standards. AI can organize evidence, but it should not replace fair process.

Financial planning and resource allocation are central to private school sustainability. Big data tools can compare tuition income, scholarship costs, staffing patterns, facilities use, procurement, transportation, technology subscriptions, and programme demand. Scenario models can show how enrolment decline or salary increases may affect future budgets. Administrators can use this information to plan responsibly instead of making sudden cuts.

Yet financial analytics can distort values if used alone. A music programme, counselling service, or scholarship fund may not look efficient in a narrow cost model. Its value may lie in inclusion, well-being, identity, or long-term reputation. Private school leaders should therefore combine financial dashboards with educational impact review. The question is not only whether an activity pays for itself. The question is whether it advances the mission and whether the school can sustain it fairly.

Family communication and satisfaction monitoring are also common uses. AI can summarize parent survey responses, classify complaints, track response time, and identify recurring issues. Natural language processing may reveal themes such as food quality, homework load, school bus safety, teacher communication, extracurricular options, or university counselling. This can help leaders respond before dissatisfaction becomes public conflict.

The risk is that reputation management becomes message control. Schools may use sentiment analysis to suppress criticism rather than learn from it. They may label difficult parents as risks instead of examining whether the school has failed to communicate clearly. Responsible use means treating feedback as evidence for improvement. Automated summaries should be checked by humans, especially when they affect how staff understand a family.

Brand and public reputation analytics can help schools understand how they are perceived. Online reviews, search trends, alumni stories, social media discussion, and media coverage may reveal strengths and concerns. Private schools rely on trust, and reputation data can help administrators see whether the public story matches the lived experience of students and families.

Reputation analytics must be separated from manipulation. The goal should be truthfulness and responsiveness, not image engineering. If data show repeated concerns about safety, communication, or academic pressure, the correct response is organizational improvement. AI can point to patterns, but leadership must address causes.

Finally, compliance and risk management are practical areas for AI support. Systems can remind administrators about licence renewal, teacher certification, contract deadlines, fee disclosure, safety checks, data access anomalies, and policy updates. They can flag unusual attendance patterns or possible financial irregularities. These functions can reduce administrative burden and help schools maintain standards.

Compliance automation, however, cannot replace institutional responsibility. A school still needs clear policies, trained staff, audit trails, and escalation procedures. In high-risk areas such as child protection, data protection, and financial integrity, AI should support human vigilance rather than create false confidence.

5.Major challenges and risks

Despite the significant opportunities that AI offers for private school management, its implementation also raises a range of practical, ethical, and governance concerns. The effectiveness of AI systems depends not only on technical performance but also on the quality of institutional data, the protection of stakeholder rights, and the ability of schools to maintain educational values while adopting new technologies. As AI becomes increasingly integrated into admissions, teaching, administration, and student services, private schools must address several interconnected challenges.

One of the most fundamental concerns relates to data quality. Many private schools operate multiple independent systems for admissions, student records, learning management, finance, human resources, and parent communication. These systems are often developed separately and may not use consistent data standards. As a result, records can be incomplete, duplicated, outdated, or entered differently by individual staff members. When AI models rely on such data, inaccuracies may be transformed into seemingly objective recommendations. The consequences extend beyond reduced technical performance, as flawed predictions can influence decisions regarding student support, access to educational opportunities, and performance evaluation. The analysis below therefore organizes the chapter into eight interrelated risk domains: data quality, privacy and informed consent, algorithmic bias, metric drift, vendor dependence and lock-in, substitution of professional judgment, excessive monitoring, and ambiguous accountability.

Closely related to data governance is the issue of privacy and informed consent. Student and family information often includes highly sensitive data, such as financial circumstances, health conditions, learning needs, behavioural records, and digital activity logs. Because private schools frequently emphasize personalized educational services, there may be pressure to collect increasingly large amounts of information. However, the pursuit of personalization should not justify excessive data collection. Schools have a responsibility to ensure that consent processes are transparent and meaningful, enabling families to understand what information is collected, for what purposes it is used, how long it is retained, and whether third-party providers have access to it.

Another important concern involves algorithmic bias. Bias may emerge from historical data, model design, variable selection, or the interpretation of analytical results. For example, enrolment models trained on past admission decisions may unintentionally reproduce existing social inequalities. Similarly, teacher evaluation systems that rely heavily on parent satisfaction metrics may disadvantage educators who maintain rigorous academic standards. Student risk prediction models may also misinterpret limited online engagement as a lack of motivation when differences in technology access are the underlying cause. Such biases are often embedded within data and institutional practices rather than arising from deliberate discrimination, making them particularly difficult to identify and address.

A fourth concern is metric drift, the gradual replacement of educational purposes by indicators that are easier to optimize. In admissions, forecasting intended for staffing may become applicant ranking based on payment capacity or predicted retention. In learning monitoring, clicks, scores, and completion rates may displace curiosity, well-being, and contextual teacher knowledge. In teacher evaluation, parent satisfaction can become a proxy for professional quality, while financial dashboards may marginalize scholarships, counselling, or arts programmes. Because private schools face competition and reputational pressure, such drift may occur even when the original use case was legitimate. Periodic educational-value review is therefore necessary to test whether a metric still serves the stated purpose.

A fifth concern is vendor dependence and lock-in. Smaller private schools often rely on off-the-shelf platforms and vendor expertise, which can make proprietary data models, dashboards, and workflows difficult to inspect or replace. Lock-in arises when data cannot be exported in usable formats, model updates are introduced without notice, integrations make switching costly, or contract terms permit secondary use of student and family data. Dependence can also weaken continuity if a provider changes price, service scope, or ownership. The risk is not merely financial: it may reduce the school's ability to explain decisions, correct errors, comply with deletion requests, or retire a system that no longer aligns with its mission.

A sixth concern is the substitution of professional judgment. AI outputs may initially be presented as recommendations but gradually become default decisions because staff lack time, confidence, or authority to challenge them. This is especially serious in admissions, discipline, student support, teacher evaluation, and staff termination, where contextual information and moral responsibility cannot be reduced to a score. Automation bias may encourage administrators to treat model confidence as institutional justification, while teachers may adapt their practice to satisfy dashboards. Human review is meaningful only when reviewers can access relevant evidence, depart from the recommendation, document reasons, and remain accountable for the final decision.

A seventh concern is excessive monitoring. Private schools may feel pressure to demonstrate personalization and rapid responsiveness to fee-paying families, leading to continuous collection of platform traces, attendance, communications, behaviour records, location data, and well-being indicators. Although each data point may appear useful, their combination can create intrusive profiles and a chilling effect on students, teachers, and parents. Monitoring may shift pastoral care toward suspicion, encourage performative behaviour, and damage trust when people cannot understand or limit observation. Proportionality therefore requires minimum necessary data, restricted access, defined retention periods, and a clear prohibition on reusing sensitive care data for marketing, ranking, or routine discipline.

An eighth concern is ambiguous accountability. AI-supported decisions often involve school leaders, teachers, data officers, vendors, subcontractors, and external platforms, making it unclear who must explain an output, correct an error, respond to an appeal, or remedy harm. Vendors may characterize models as proprietary, while schools may attribute contested outcomes to the system. In private schools, high operational autonomy increases the need for explicit internal responsibility rather than reducing it. Every high-risk use should therefore identify a named institutional owner, the authorized human decision-maker, the vendor's contractual duties, the escalation route, and the body responsible for periodic review. Institutional accountability cannot be outsourced.

These eight risks are mutually reinforcing rather than independent. Poor data quality can intensify bias; market pressure can accelerate metric drift and excessive monitoring; vendor lock-in can obscure accountability; and automation bias can convert imperfect indicators into substitutes for professional judgment. Risk assessment should therefore begin with the specific application scenario and trace the complete chain from data collection and model output to institutional decision, stakeholder impact, vendor involvement, review, and remedy.

6.Governance pathways for responsible use

Although the eleven procedures draw on widely accepted AI-governance principles, their implementation in private schools must be shaped by three contextual tests. The market-pressure test asks whether enrolment, revenue, or reputation incentives may distort the educational purpose of a system. The payer-beneficiary test asks whether the influence of fee-paying parents may override student privacy, equitable access, or teacher professional judgment. The autonomy-and-capacity test asks whether broad managerial discretion and uneven technical expertise are balanced by documented decision rights, appeal routes, governing-body review, and credible vendor exit options. These tests convert general principles into safeguards for the institutional conditions that distinguish private schools.

A responsible governance pathway begins with purpose definition. Before adopting an AI or analytics tool, a private school should state the educational or organizational problem it wants to address. The statement should be concrete. For example, the school may want to identify students who need early academic support, improve response time to parent concerns, or forecast enrolment for staffing plans. A vague goal such as “becoming intelligent” or “using big data” is not enough. Purpose definition prevents technology from searching for problems after it has already been purchased. For private schools, the purpose statement should separately disclose educational, operational, enrolment, revenue, and reputational objectives so that commercial pressures cannot be hidden within an educational use case.

The second step is data mapping. The school should list the data sources involved, the types of personal data included, the system owners, the access rights, the retention periods, and the third-party processors. This map should include hidden data flows, such as platform logs or exported spreadsheets. Many risks appear only when data flows are made visible. Data mapping also helps schools remove unnecessary data and reduce exposure.

The third step is data quality review. Administrators should ask whether the data are accurate, current, complete, and relevant. They should identify missing values, inconsistent categories, and historical bias. Teachers and staff who enter data should be included in this review because they understand how records are created in practice. A model built on weak data should not be used for high-stakes decisions.

The fourth step is risk classification. Not every AI use has the same risk. A tool that summarizes public website visits is different from a tool that predicts student mental health risk. A spelling feedback tool is different from a system used in admissions. Schools should classify systems according to possible harm. High-risk uses require stronger safeguards: documented purpose, consent review, human oversight, explanation, appeal, and periodic audit. Admissions, scholarship or fee decisions, student well-being profiling, teacher evaluation, discipline, and staff termination should normally be classified as high-risk uses.

The fifth step is stakeholder participation. Students, parents, teachers, and administrators should have opportunities to understand and comment on significant data practices. Participation does not mean every stakeholder votes on every tool. It means that affected people are not treated as data sources only. Consultation can reveal concerns that leaders may miss, such as how a dashboard changes classroom behaviour or how a parent communication score may stigmatize families.

The sixth step is human oversight. Schools should decide which decisions may be informed by AI and which decisions must never be automated. Admissions, discipline, special support placement, teacher evaluation, and staff termination should remain under human responsibility. Human oversight must be real, not symbolic. A person who reviews a recommendation must have authority, time, and information to question it. Reviewers should be insulated from enrolment, revenue, and reputation targets when deciding individual cases.

The seventh step is transparency and communication. Schools should explain AI use in clear language. They should avoid technical terms when communicating with families and staff. A good explanation includes the purpose of the tool, the data used, the people who can access results, the limits of the system, and the review process. Transparency also includes internal documentation, so future administrators know why a system was adopted and how it should be used.

The eighth step is vendor accountability. Contracts should specify data ownership, storage location, security standards, subcontractors, deletion rights, audit rights, model update notice, breach notification, and limits on secondary use. Schools should avoid contracts that prevent data export or give vendors broad rights to reuse student data. Where schools lack legal expertise, associations can provide templates. Contracts should also contain usable data-portability, exit-assistance, and service-continuity obligations to prevent lock-in.

The ninth step is professional development. Administrators and teachers need data literacy, not only tool training. They should understand basic ideas such as correlation, prediction error, bias, missing data, and false positives. They should also learn how to interpret dashboards without overreacting. Professional development should connect technical knowledge with educational judgement.

The tenth step is educational value review. Each major AI use should be reviewed against the school's mission. Does it support student development? Does it protect dignity? Does it respect teacher professionalism? Does it improve inclusion? Does it strengthen trust? Does it create pressure to optimize the wrong indicator? These questions should be asked regularly because systems drift over time. In private schools, this review should explicitly compare the educational mission with enrolment, revenue, parent-satisfaction, and reputation incentives.

The final step is continuous audit. AI governance is not a one-time approval. Data change, models change, staff change, and school priorities change. Schools should review system performance, user experience, bias risks, complaints, and unintended effects. They should be willing to modify or retire tools that no longer serve the educational purpose. Continuous audit turns governance into a living practice. Audit findings for high-risk systems should be reported to a governing board or equivalent body with authority to suspend or retire the system.

Table 1. Governance checklist for AI and big data use in private schools

Governance step	Core question	Expected evidence
Purpose definition	What educational or organizational problem is being addressed?	Written use case and responsible owner
Data mapping	What data are collected, shared, stored, and deleted?	Data inventory and access list
Data quality review	Are data accurate, current, complete, relevant, and free from avoidable bias?	Quality report, correction log, and bias assessment
Risk classification	What harm could occur, especially in admissions, well-being, fees, or evaluation?	Risk tier, safeguard plan, and approval record
Stakeholder participation	How are students, parents, teachers, and administrators consulted?	Consultation record and response log
Human oversight	Which decisions require meaningful human review?	Named reviewer, reason record, and appeal channel
Transparency and communication	What must affected people know about the system and its limits?	Plain-language notice, system record, and review route
Vendor accountability	What duties and exit obligations does the provider accept?	Clauses on security, deletion, audit, portability, updates, and continuity
Professional development	Can staff interpret, question, and override outputs appropriately?	Data-literacy training and competency record
Educational value review	Does the use advance the mission rather than only revenue or reputation metrics?	Mission-impact review and metric-drift check
Continuous audit	Does the system remain fair, useful, proportionate, and necessary over time?	Performance, bias, complaint, and retirement review

The pathway also includes five private-school-specific design rules. First, admissions-planning data must be separated from individual admissions and scholarship decisions so that payment capacity, predicted retention, or reputational value cannot become hidden selection criteria. Second, parent satisfaction and payment status may inform service improvement but must not directly determine teacher evaluation, student discipline, or access to support. Third, reputation analytics must be used to investigate and correct service problems, not to suppress criticism or profile 'difficult' families. Fourth, high-risk decisions require a named accountable owner, written reasons, an appeal channel, and periodic board- or committee-level review to constrain excessive autonomy. Fifth, vendor contracts must guarantee usable data export, deletion certification, transition assistance, model-update notice, audit access, and continuity arrangements to prevent lock-in.

7.Discussion

The analysis suggests that AI and big data can support private school decision-making in meaningful ways, but only if schools resist two extremes. The first extreme is technological optimism. This view assumes that more data will naturally lead to better decisions. It underestimates the moral and social nature of education. The second extreme is technological rejection. This view assumes that AI is too risky for schools and should be avoided. It underestimates the real pressures that administrators face and the potential value of well-governed evidence.

A more useful position is responsible pragmatism. Private schools should use data where data can improve care, planning, and accountability. They should avoid data use that increases control without improving education. Responsible pragmatism asks not “Can we predict this?” but “Should we predict this, for what purpose, with what safeguards, and with what consequences?”

This position has implications for leadership. School leaders need to become translators between technical systems and educational values. They do not need to become data scientists, but they must ask disciplined questions. What does this indicator mean? What does it leave out? Who benefits from this model? Who may be harmed? What decision will change because of this information? How will we know whether the system has improved the school?

The position also has implications for teachers. Teachers should not be treated as passive users of analytics. They are key interpreters of student data and should help design the questions that analytics address. When teachers are excluded, systems may become administratively efficient but educationally weak. When teachers are included, AI can support professional judgement rather than threaten it.

For families and students, the main implication is voice. Private schools often market themselves as responsive communities. AI adoption should reflect that promise. Families should know how their data are used. Students should be protected from unnecessary profiling. Both should have ways to correct errors and ask for human review.

Finally, regulators and school associations have a role. Individual schools may not have enough capacity to evaluate every tool. Shared standards, training resources, procurement guidance, and audit frameworks can reduce risk across the sector. This is especially important for smaller private schools, which may otherwise depend too heavily on vendor claims.

8.Limitations and future research

This section identifies limitations in the article's evidence base, contextual transferability, and implementation assumptions, and it links each limitation to a corresponding direction for future research.

This article is conceptual. It builds an argument from existing literature and from the practical features of private school governance, but it does not test the framework through field data. Future research should examine how private schools actually adopt AI systems in different national and regulatory contexts. Case studies could compare schools with different sizes, ownership models, tuition levels, curriculum types, and technological capacity. Such work would show whether governance principles are applied in daily routines or remain policy language.

Empirical research is also needed on stakeholder experience. Students may experience analytics differently from administrators. Parents may welcome personalized communication but worry about profiling. Teachers may appreciate early warning tools while resisting narrow performance dashboards. Interviews, surveys, and ethnographic observation could help explain how trust is built or lost during implementation. These methods are especially useful because many effects of AI are relational. They appear in conversations, expectations, and small changes in behaviour rather than only in measurable outcomes[16].

Another research direction concerns vendor-school relationships. Many private schools depend on commercial platforms, but the details of contracts, data flows, model updates, and vendor accountability are often hidden from public view. Future studies could analyze procurement documents and platform policies to identify common risks. Comparative work could also examine whether school associations or regulators can reduce these risks by offering shared standards.

Finally, more work is needed on educational value measurement. Private schools need financial and operational indicators, but they also need ways to examine inclusion, well-being, teacher professionalism, and family trust[17-19]. Future research could develop mixed evaluation models that combine quantitative indicators with qualitative judgement. This would help schools avoid the narrow view that only easily counted outcomes matter. The long-term question is not whether AI can make private schools more efficient. The deeper question is whether AI can help them become more responsible educational institutions.

9.Conclusion

AI and big data offer private school administrators new ways to understand complex decisions. They can improve enrolment planning, learning support, teacher development, budgeting, communication, reputation analysis, and compliance[20]. They can help leaders move from scattered impressions to more systematic evidence. In a competitive and uncertain environment, this support can be valuable.

The value is not automatic. Private schools handle sensitive data and operate under market pressure. Without strong governance, AI tools may intensify surveillance, reproduce bias, narrow educational values, and weaken trust[21]. The central task is therefore not simply to adopt technology. It is to build a decision culture in which technology serves educational purpose.

This article has argued for a human-centered and governance-based approach. AI should assist, not replace, professional judgement. Big data should inform, not define, school values. Predictive systems should prompt care, not create hidden sorting[22-24]. Private schools that follow this path can use AI and big data to strengthen transparency, responsibility, and long-term sustainability. Schools that ignore governance may gain speed but lose legitimacy. In education, legitimacy is not a secondary matter. It is part of the work itself. More broadly, responsible governance should enable artificial intelligence to support educational innovation across diverse contexts, including international Chinese language education[24].

References

[1] SIEMENS G. Learning analytics: The emergence of a discipline. American Behavioral Scientist, 2013, 57(10): 1380-1400.
[2] SLADE S, PRINSLOO P. Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. American Behavioral Scientist, 2013, 57(10): 1510-1529.
[3] HOLMES W, BIALIK M, FADEL C. Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Boston: Center for Curriculum Redesign, 2019.
[4] LUCKIN R, HOLMES W, GRIFFITHS M, et al. Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education. London: Pearson, 2016.
[5] BAKER R S, INVENTADO P S. Educational data mining and learning analytics//LARUSSON J A, WHITE B (Eds.). Learning analytics: From research to practice. Berlin: Springer, 2014: 61-75.
[6] JOKSIMOVIC S, KOVANOVIC V, DAWSON S. The journey of learning analytics. HERDSA Review of Higher Education, 2019, 6: 37-63.
[7] WU Y D. Integrating Artificial Intelligence into Education: Opportunities, Challenges, and Response Strategies. AI Lnnovations and Applications, 2025, 1(1): 115-124.
[8] PRINSLOO P, SLADE S. Ethics and learning analytics: Charting the unmapped. American Behavioral Scientist, 2017, 61(1): 49-60.
[9] REGAN P M, JESSE J. Ethical challenges of edtech, big data and personalized learning: Twenty-first century student sorting and tracking. Ethics and Information Technology, 2019, 21(3): 167-179.
[10] UNESCO. Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence. Paris: UNESCO, 2021.
[11] European Commission. Ethical guidelines on the use of artificial intelligence and data in teaching and learning for educators. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2022.

[12] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. Artificial intelligence and the future of teaching and learning: Insights and recommendations. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 2023.
[13] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence. Luxembourg: Official Journal of the European Union, 2024.
[14] BALL S J, YOUDELL D. Hidden privatisation in public education. Brussels: Education International, 2008.
[15] VERGER A, FONTDEVILA C, ZANCAJO A. The privatization of education: A political economy of global education reform. New York: Teachers College Press, 2016.
[16] AKGUN S, GREENHOW C. Artificial intelligence in education: Addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings. AI and Ethics, 2022, 2(3): 431-440.
[17] DRACHSLER H, GRELLER W. Privacy and analytics: It is a DELICATE issue//Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge. New York: ACM, 2016: 89-98.
[18] IFENTHALER D, YAU J Y K. Utilising learning analytics to support study success in higher education: A systematic review. Educational Technology Research and Development, 2020, 68: 1961-1990.
[19] OECD. Artificial intelligence in society. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2019.
[20] SELWYN N. Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019.
[21] WILLIAMSON B. Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice. London: SAGE, 2017.
[22] ZEIDE E. Artificial intelligence in higher education: Applications, promise and perils, and ethical questions. EDUCAUSE Review, 2019, 54(3): 31-39.
[23] ZAWACKI-RICHTER O, MARIN V I, BOND M, et al. Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education: Where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 2019, 16: 39.
[24] MENG F Q. On How Artificial Intelligence Drives Innovation in International Chinese Language Education. Applied Artificial Intelligence Research, 2025, 1(3).