

Beyond Adoption™

An Institutional Evidence and Decision Alignment Workbook

Do your institution's decisions about generative AI reflect how students actually engage with it—and whether that engagement supports learning?

A research-informed process for higher education teams to examine student engagement, educational purpose, and institutional response.

Designed for advance review of institutional evidence and two 60-minute cross-functional working sessions.

Evidence map What the institution knows	Learning alignment What use means for learning	Response test Whether decisions fit evidence	Action plan What happens in 90 days
---	--	--	---

International Institute of Technology Education and Leadership

Where innovation serves people™

Purpose and Research Foundation

This workbook helps institutional teams test whether decisions about generative AI rest on evidence about student engagement and educational purpose. It is not a maturity assessment or a substitute for local research. Completing the workbook should leave the team with a defensible account of what it knows, what it is assuming, what it still needs to learn, and which institutional decision it is prepared to advance.

What the Study Contributes

Article finding	Institutional implication for inquiry
In the study sample, habit had the largest statistically significant association with behavioral intention among the predictors examined.	Ask how routine practices may shape intention locally; do not assume the same relationship on every campus.
In the study sample, hedonic motivation, performance expectancy, and social influence were also statistically significant predictors of behavioral intention.	Use these factors to inform local questions, not conclusions about students.
Behavioral intention and facilitating conditions were statistically significant predictors of self-reported actual use in the study model.	Examine both student intentions and the local conditions surrounding use.
The model accounted for 75.0% of the variance in behavioral intention and 16.7% of the variance in self-reported actual use within the study sample.	Do not treat interest, acceptance, or intention as sufficient evidence of behavior. Gather local evidence about use.

Evidence Boundaries

The cross-sectional study identified associations, not causal effects. It did not determine whether generative AI improved learning, supported ethical use, advanced equity, protected scholarly integrity, or improved institutional performance. Because the study was cross-sectional and based on a defined student sample and self-reported measures, its findings should not be assumed to represent every institution, program, or student population.

Working rule: If no evidence is available, record “no evidence identified.” Do not convert experience, expectations, or assumptions into findings.

Criteria for Evidence Informed Decision Making

Use these six criteria to structure discussion and document the basis for a decision. They are practice-informed prompts, not a validated assessment scale. For each criterion, record the available evidence, limitations, unresolved risks, and the rationale for proceeding, pausing, revising, or stopping.

Criterion	Question the team must answer	Acceptable evidence or documentation
Educational purpose	What learning objective, learner need, or institutional responsibility is the decision intended to serve?	A defined objective and a plausible explanation of how the response supports it.
Evidence fit	Does the evidence directly address the student practice, population, context, and decision under review?	Relevant local evidence, interpreted alongside applicable external research or guidance, with source, date, population, method, and limitations recorded.
Student participation	Have students and other affected groups informed the interpretation of the issue and proposed response?	Documented input from people affected, including perspectives that may differ across programs or student groups.
Equity and access	Could the response create different benefits, burdens, or access conditions across student groups?	Review of accessibility, cost, tool access, language, program, modality, and other relevant contexts.
Integrity, Privacy, and Safety	Have academic integrity, privacy, data security, transparency, and human oversight been considered?	Named safeguards, responsible offices, escalation routes, and unresolved risks.
Accountability and review	Who owns the decision, how will implementation be monitored, and when will it be reconsidered?	An owner, indicators, a review date, and conditions for revising or stopping the response.

Best practice basis: These criteria draw on UNESCO's human-centered guidance for generative AI in education and NIST AI RMF functions for governing, mapping, measuring, and managing AI risks. The NIST framework is voluntary and cross-sectoral; this workbook applies selected concepts to higher education rather than treating the framework as an education-specific standard.

Preparation and Session Design

The workbook is most useful when participants review available evidence before the meeting. Assign one coordinator to assemble materials and distribute them in advance.

Bring Available Evidence

Evidence source	Available	Date and population	Owner or location
Student surveys or focus groups	☐ Yes ☐ No		
Course or syllabus guidance	☐ Yes ☐ No		
Faculty feedback or observations	☐ Yes ☐ No		
Academic integrity or conduct information	☐ Yes ☐ No		
Assessment results or other learning evidence	☐ Yes ☐ No		
Student support, accessibility, or access data	☐ Yes ☐ No		
Approved tool and access information	☐ Yes ☐ No		
Teaching and help desk support requests	☐ Yes ☐ No		
Administrative or system-use data the institution is authorized to review	☐ Yes ☐ No		
Existing AI policy, guidance, or committee decisions	☐ Yes ☐ No		

Recommended Participants

Academic affairs • institutional research • teaching and learning • faculty governance • student affairs • information technology • library or academic support • accessibility • students and student representatives, as appropriate

Session outcome: Complete the four exercises, select one priority decision, and assign a 90-day evidence and action plan.

Evidence cautions: Academic integrity cases cannot establish prevalence. System and vendor logs may be incomplete and must be lawfully and ethically available, minimized or de-identified where appropriate, and interpreted cautiously: system activity does not reveal purpose, learning, or off-platform use. Document how student participants were selected and whose perspectives remain missing; consultation is not representative unless the method supports that conclusion.

Step 1A Student Engagement Evidence Inventory

Document claims the institution currently makes or relies upon about student use. Classify the evidence before judging its meaning.

Why this matters: The study treated behavioral intention and self-reported actual use as distinct outcomes. Institutions should distinguish evidence of intention from evidence of reported or observed use.

What we believe students are doing	Evidence source and date	Population and context represented	Evidence type	What the evidence establishes	What the evidence cannot establish	Evidence fit
			☐ Intention ☐ Self-report ☐ Observation ☐ Administrative or system-use data			☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Insufficient
			☐ Intention ☐ Self-report ☐ Observation ☐ Administrative or system-use data			☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Insufficient
			☐ Intention ☐ Self-report ☐ Observation ☐ Administrative or system-use data			☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Insufficient
			☐ Intention ☐ Self-report ☐ Observation ☐ Administrative or system-use data			☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Insufficient
			☐ Intention ☐ Self-report ☐ Observation ☐ Administrative or system-use data			☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Insufficient

Evidence note: A source may be useful without answering every question. Record limits so later decisions do not overreach the evidence.

Step 1B Evidence Synthesis

Use the inventory to agree on statements the institution can defend now and questions it cannot yet answer.

Synthesis category	Team statement	Evidence supporting the statement	Population or context missing	Office that can address the gap
What we know				
What we partially know				
What we have assumed				
What remains unknown				

Priority Evidence Gaps

Gap	Decision affected	Why the gap matters	Evidence needed	Owner

Output 1: A student engagement evidence map that distinguishes documented knowledge, partial evidence, assumptions, and unknowns.

Step 2 Learning Purpose Alignment Map

Select common or consequential student uses of generative AI. Examine each use in relation to an intended learning objective and the evidence currently available.

Evidence rule: Adoption data do not establish learning benefit or harm. Select demonstrated learning only when the intended outcome was directly measured against a baseline, comparison, or other credible reference.

Student use and context	Intended learning objective	Conditions of AI assistance	Proposed relationship to the learning objective	Evidence source or method	Evidence status	Potential effect on reasoning, feedback, interaction, or skill development	Alignment determination
					☐ Demonstrated learning ☐ Task performance ☐ Perception ☐ Mixed or no detected effect ☐ Not evaluated		☐ Supported ☐ Plausible not evaluated ☐ Evidence of misalignment ☐ Not enough evidence
					☐ Demonstrated learning ☐ Task performance ☐ Perception ☐ Mixed or no detected effect ☐ Not evaluated		☐ Supported ☐ Plausible not evaluated ☐ Evidence of misalignment ☐ Not enough evidence
					☐ Demonstrated learning ☐ Task performance ☐ Perception ☐ Mixed or no detected effect ☐ Not evaluated		☐ Supported ☐ Plausible not evaluated ☐ Evidence of misalignment ☐ Not enough evidence
					☐ Demonstrated learning ☐ Task performance ☐ Perception ☐ Mixed or no detected effect ☐ Not evaluated		☐ Supported ☐ Plausible not evaluated ☐ Evidence of misalignment ☐ Not enough evidence

Examples of use may include brainstorming, drafting, summarizing, tutoring, feedback, research, coding, problem solving, translation, or studying. Define the actual context rather than evaluating a tool in the abstract.

Output 2: A learning alignment map showing where alignment with educational purpose is supported, uncertain, potentially misaligned, or not evaluated.

Step 3 Institutional Response Review

Test current policies, guidance, support activities, and governance decisions against the evidence mapped in the first two exercises.

Current response	Evidence informing it	How it supports or protects learning	Affected groups	Implications reviewed	Unresolved risk or safeguard	Disposition	Authority and review date
				☐ Equity ☐ Integrity ☐ Privacy ☐ Safety		☐ Retain ☐ Revise ☐ Pilot with safeguards ☐ Gather evidence ☐ Retire	
				☐ Equity ☐ Integrity ☐ Privacy ☐ Safety		☐ Retain ☐ Revise ☐ Pilot with safeguards ☐ Gather evidence ☐ Retire	
				☐ Equity ☐ Integrity ☐ Privacy ☐ Safety		☐ Retain ☐ Revise ☐ Pilot with safeguards ☐ Gather evidence ☐ Retire	
				☐ Equity ☐ Integrity ☐ Privacy ☐ Safety		☐ Retain ☐ Revise ☐ Pilot with safeguards ☐ Gather evidence ☐ Retire	

Decision Test

Retain a response when evidence and educational purpose are sufficiently aligned. Revise it when the purpose is sound but the response is unclear or incomplete. Pilot with safeguards when a bounded, reversible test is proportionate to the uncertainty. Gather evidence before acting when a consequential gap remains. Retire a response that does not fit documented practice, educational purpose, or represented contexts.

Output 3: An institutional response review identifying policies, guidance, and support that are aligned, unclear, insufficiently supported, or ready for reconsideration.

Step 4 Priority Decision Brief

Select one institutional decision that is consequential, actionable, and appropriately bounded by the available evidence.

Decision brief element	Team response
Decision or question that must be addressed	
Why this matters for learners or educational purpose	
Options considered	
What is known and the supporting evidence	
What is assumed or remains unknown	
Legal, regulatory, accreditation, or policy constraints	
Risk of action and risk if deferred	
Reversibility and decision trigger	
Interim action, safeguards, and monitoring	
Decision authority and required approvals	
Operational owner and review date	

Action category: ☐ Gather evidence before acting ☐ Revise guidance or expectations ☐ Support students or faculty ☐ Strengthen governance, policy, accountability, or oversight ☐ Pilot with safeguards

Evidence and Action Plan for the Next Ninety Days

Translate the priority decision into a bounded sequence of work. Name a deliverable, an owner, and a review point for each action.

Time	Action	Evidence or deliverable	Owner	Stakeholders	Dependency or resource	Status	Review or decision point
First 30 days							
First 30 days							
Days 31 to 60							
Days 31 to 60							
Days 61 to 90							
Days 61 to 90							

Measures of Completion

Indicator type	Indicator	Baseline	Target or decision rule	Population or disaggregation	Data source and cadence	Person reviewing
☐ Process ☐ Learner outcome ☐ Guardrail						
☐ Process ☐ Learner outcome ☐ Guardrail						

Output 4: A 90-day institutional action plan with accountable owners, specified evidence needs, defined deliverables, and a scheduled decision point.

Institutional Evidence and Decision Alignment Plan

Use this page as the leadership readout from the completed workbook.

Leadership conclusion	Final statement
Central question determination	☐ Supported by current evidence ☐ Partially supported ☐ Not established ☐ Evidence indicates misalignment
Basis for the determination	
Confidence, limitations, and missing perspectives	
What we can responsibly say about student engagement	
What we can responsibly say about alignment with learning	
Institutional response that is currently aligned	
Most consequential gap or misalignment	
Priority decision	
Ninety-day commitment	
Executive owner and review date	

Using the Workbook Independently

Institutional teams may use and adapt this workbook for internal planning. Conclusions should remain tied to the evidence reviewed and should identify populations or contexts not represented.

Additional Institutional Support

Institutions seeking support to gather local evidence, facilitate the alignment process, or translate findings into policy and practice may contact IITEL at info@iitelsolutions.com.

Worked Example for Institutional Use

This hypothetical example illustrates how a team can move from a local claim to a proportionate institutional response. It is not a finding from the Bailey and Bista study.

Workbook step	Illustrative entry
Define the decision	Should the institution revise course-level generative AI guidance for first-year general education writing assignments?
Student engagement evidence	A recent voluntary survey of 220 students and a faculty focus group suggest that some students use generative AI for first drafts. The evidence is limited to first-year general education and does not establish institution-wide prevalence.
Learning alignment	The intended objective is independent argument development. No direct learning measure compares performance under defined conditions of AI assistance. Determination: plausible relationship, but not evaluated.
Institutional response review	Syllabus guidance varies across sections. The team identifies clarity, equity of access, privacy, academic integrity, and preservation of independent reasoning as implications requiring review.
Evidence sufficiency decision	Gather evidence before institution-wide action; run a time-limited pilot with safeguards in selected sections. The action is bounded and reversible.
Ninety-day plan	Consult faculty governance and students; define permitted assistance; conduct accessibility and privacy review; use a common rubric and baseline or comparison; monitor support requests and unintended effects.
Decision point	At day 90, the authorized body reviews process, learner-outcome, and guardrail indicators and decides whether to revise, extend, stop, or scale the guidance.

What this example demonstrates. Evidence of use can justify inquiry, but it cannot by itself establish learning benefit or support a system-wide policy. The response matches the strength of the evidence, names safeguards and decision rights, and creates a path to a better-supported decision.

Sources and Practice Foundations

The workbook integrates the peer-reviewed IITEL-affiliated study with public-sector guidance and a higher education practice source. These materials serve different purposes and do not replace local evidence or professional legal, privacy, accessibility, or security review.

Bailey, K., & Bista, K. (2026). Habit before utility: Understanding student acceptance and use of generative AI in higher education. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, 15(7). <https://doi.org/10.32674/9dyk2n48>

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). *Artificial intelligence risk management framework (AI RMF 1.0)* (NIST AI 100-1). U.S. Department of Commerce. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1>

OECD. (2026). *OECD digital education outlook 2026: Exploring effective uses of generative AI in education*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/062a7394-en>

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>