INTEGRATING AI IN DECISION MAKING IN EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT: CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS

[1]PROF. OSAWARU-OGBEGIE R. I.; & [2]OBOZUWA, J.
Department of Educational Foundations and Management, Faculty of Education
Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria
[1]Prof.iyalekhuosa@gmail.com; & [2]jossy.zuwa@aauekpoma.edu.ng

Abstract
Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly transforming educational management by strengthening institutional planning, administrative efficiency, monitoring, forecasting and evidence-based decision-making. Contemporary educational institutions can employ AI tools such as machine-learning and predictive-analytics systems, natural-language processing applications, learning and institutional analytics platforms, AI-powered dashboards and generative AI assistants to analyse institutional information and support managerial decisions. However, the use of AI in educational decision-making also creates challenges relating to transparency, accountability, algorithmic bias, data privacy, explainability, infrastructure, technical capacity and stakeholder trust. These concerns are particularly important where AI informs high-stakes decisions involving admissions, staff recruitment and promotion, resource allocation, student support, quality assurance, accreditation and institutional planning. This paper examined the integration of AI in decision-making in educational management, with particular attention to its applications, benefits, challenges and prospects. The paper adopted a conceptual and narrative review approach, synthesising literature on AI in education, educational management, AI-supported decision-making, explainable AI, ethical governance and responsible AI. The discussion was guided by the Trust-Centred Explainable Governance Framework (TCEGF), which was proposed in the original version of the paper and is explicitly operationalised in the revised article. The framework links AI-enabled data and analytical tools to AI-generated recommendations, explainability and transparency, human oversight, ethical and algorithmic accountability, stakeholder participation, institutional learning and improved educational-management outcomes. The paper argued that AI should function as a decision-support capability rather than an autonomous substitute for educational managers. It concludes that responsible integration of AI can improve the timeliness, consistency, predictive capacity and evidence base of educational decisions when supported by appropriate governance, explainability, data protection, capacity building and human judgement.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Accountability, AI Decision-Making, Decision Support Systems, Educational Management, Explainable Artificial Intelligence, Educational Governance, Trust.*

Introduction
Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become one of the most influential technologies shaping contemporary organisational decision-making and public-service delivery. In education, its influence extends beyond teaching and learning to educational planning, administration, institutional governance, quality assurance, human-resource management, student services and strategic decision-making. Advances in machine learning, predictive analytics, natural-language processing and other computational techniques enable institutions to process large volumes of

Studies in Education All Rights Reserved. © 2026 | https://www.sie.com.ng

information, identify patterns, forecast outcomes and generate recommendations for managerial action (Bozkurt et al., 2021; Crompton & Burke, 2023; UNESCO, 2023).

Educational management involves the planning, organisation, coordination, supervision and evaluation of educational resources and activities in order to achieve institutional goals effectively (Bush, 2020). The increasing complexity of universities and other educational institutions makes timely and evidence-based decision-making essential. Managers must make decisions concerning student admissions and retention, staffing, workload allocation, budgeting, curriculum development, infrastructure, quality assurance, accreditation and institutional performance. Traditional approaches based heavily on manual records and retrospective reporting may not adequately exploit the volume and variety of data generated by modern institutions. AI therefore offers a pathway towards more predictive and responsive educational management.

The practical use of AI in decision-making is already reflected in a range of tools. Machine-learning and predictive-analytics systems can forecast enrolment, identify students at risk of disengagement, estimate staffing requirements and support resource allocation. Natural-language processing tools can analyse institutional documents, surveys and feedback. AI-enabled dashboards can detect performance patterns and generate alerts, while generative AI assistants can support information synthesis, scenario analysis, report preparation and administrative communication. These tools do not make all institutional decisions automatically; rather, they can provide decision-makers with additional evidence, predictions and recommendations that inform professional judgement (Holmes et al., 2023; Ifenthaler & Schumacher, 2023).

Despite these prospects, AI-supported decision-making is not inherently neutral or risk-free. The quality of an AI recommendation depends on the quality and representativeness of the data, the design of the model, the objectives specified by its developers and the context in which its output is interpreted. Complex models may also be difficult for administrators and affected stakeholders to understand. Where AI contributes to decisions with substantial consequences for students or staff, a lack of explainability can weaken accountability and trust (Adadi & Berrada, 2018; Arrieta et al., 2020). Ethical concerns also arise in relation to privacy, discrimination, data security, human autonomy and responsibility for errors (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021).

In Nigerian universities, these issues are particularly relevant because digital transformation is occurring alongside constraints involving infrastructure, data integration, technical expertise and financial resources. The potential value of AI is therefore inseparable from the institutional conditions under which it is introduced. A university may possess an AI application but still obtain poor managerial outcomes if its databases are fragmented, its data are unreliable, its users lack AI literacy or there are no clear procedures for reviewing algorithmic recommendations.

This paper consequently examines the integration of AI in decision-making in educational management, focusing on both challenges and prospects. The paper also retains and explicitly develops the Trust-Centred Explainable Governance Framework (TCEGF) identified in the earlier version. The framework provides the conceptual linkage through which AI tools, decision processes, explainability, ethical governance, human oversight and stakeholder trust are connected to educational-management outcomes. This linkage is central to the paper because the value of AI in educational management should be judged not merely by technological sophistication but by whether AI-supported decisions are useful, explainable, fair, accountable and aligned with educational goals.

Studies in Education All Rights Reserved. © 2026 | https://www.sie.com.ng

Purpose of the Paper

The purpose of this paper is to examine the integration of Artificial Intelligence in decision-making in educational management, with particular emphasis on the challenges and prospects of responsible adoption in educational institutions. Specifically, the paper:

1. examines the concept and applications of AI in educational-management decision-making;
2. identifies major AI tools that can support educational managers in decision-making;
3. examines the benefits of AI-supported decision-making in educational management;
4. analyses the major technical, organisational, ethical and governance challenges associated with AI integration; and
5. explains how the Trust-Centred Explainable Governance Framework can guide responsible AI-enabled decision-making in educational management.

Conceptual Review

AI refers broadly to computational systems capable of performing tasks that ordinarily require aspects of human intelligence, including learning from data, recognising patterns, making predictions, processing language and supporting problem-solving. Within educational management, AI can be understood as a set of computational capabilities used to analyse institutional information and support planning, administration, monitoring and decision-making.

Educational institutions generate substantial quantities of data through student-information systems, finance and accounting records, human-resource databases, learning-management systems, research repositories, admission records, quality-assurance activities and institutional surveys. AI can integrate or analyse relevant datasets to identify trends, predict likely outcomes and present recommendations to managers. Consequently, AI changes the managerial process from primarily retrospective reporting towards more proactive and predictive decision support (Crompton & Burke, 2023; UNESCO, 2023).

AI should nevertheless be conceptualised as part of a socio-technical decision system rather than as a replacement for educational leadership. Educational decisions involve institutional values, professional judgement, contextual knowledge and responsibilities that cannot always be reduced to numerical optimisation. Human decision-makers therefore remain essential for interpreting AI outputs, considering contextual factors and accepting responsibility for final decisions.

AI Tools Used for Decision-Making in Educational Management

The integration of AI into educational management can involve several complementary tools and techniques.

First, machine-learning algorithms can identify patterns in historical institutional data and generate predictions. For example, they can support enrolment forecasting, student-risk prediction, staffing analysis and institutional-performance monitoring.

Second, predictive-analytics tools can estimate future outcomes from existing data. Educational managers may use predictive analytics to anticipate enrolment changes, identify potential student attrition, forecast budgetary requirements and assess infrastructure needs. Predictive analytics therefore supports proactive planning rather than waiting for problems to become visible.

Third, natural-language processing (NLP) tools can analyse large quantities of textual information such as student feedback, staff surveys, policy documents, complaints and institutional

Studies in Education All Rights Reserved. © 2026 | https://www.sie.com.ng

reports. NLP can assist managers in identifying recurring issues, classifying feedback and summarising information for decision support.

Fourth, AI-powered dashboards and business-intelligence systems can combine institutional indicators and predictive outputs into accessible management interfaces. These systems can support continuous monitoring of key performance indicators and provide alerts when performance deviates from expected levels.

Fifth, generative AI tools can support administrative and managerial tasks such as synthesising documents, comparing policy options, drafting reports, generating scenarios and assisting with information retrieval. Their outputs, however, require verification because generative systems can produce inaccurate or unsupported information.

Sixth, Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) tools can provide information about why an AI model produced a particular prediction or recommendation. Techniques such as feature-importance analysis, local explanations and model-agnostic explanation methods can help managers interrogate AI outputs. Explainability is particularly important where AI contributes to high-stakes educational decisions (Adadi & Berrada, 2018; Arrieta et al., 2020).

These tools are most useful when connected rather than deployed as isolated technologies. Institutional data provide the inputs; AI models analyse those data; decision-support systems generate predictions or recommendations; XAI provides explanations; managers exercise human judgement; governance mechanisms assess fairness, accountability and compliance; and the resulting decisions contribute to institutional learning and improved management.

AI-Supported Decision-Making Process in Educational Management

AI-supported educational-management decision-making can be represented as a connected process. The process begins with the identification of a managerial problem or decision requirement. Relevant institutional data are then collected, integrated and prepared. Appropriate AI tools are applied to analyse the data and generate predictions, classifications, risk indicators or recommendations. Where the decision is consequential, the output should be accompanied by an explanation of relevant factors, limitations and confidence.

The educational manager then reviews the AI output against institutional policy, professional knowledge, contextual information and ethical requirements. Where necessary, the manager requests further analysis, rejects the recommendation or modifies the proposed action. The final decision remains a human institutional decision, even where AI has made a substantial analytical contribution. The decision and its outcome are subsequently monitored and evaluated, creating feedback that can improve data quality, model performance and institutional practice.

Thus, the linkage can be expressed as:

Institutional Problem/Decision Need → Data Collection and Integration → AI Tool/Analytical Model → Prediction or Recommendation → Explainability and Transparency → Human Review and Ethical Validation → Final Management Decision → Implementation → Monitoring and Feedback → Institutional Learning. This sequence is important because it prevents AI from being treated as an autonomous decision-maker. It establishes a chain of responsibility from the original management problem through technological analysis to human judgement and institutional accountability.

Evidence-Based Decision-Making

AI can strengthen evidence-based management by processing large and complex datasets more rapidly than conventional manual approaches. Managers can use patterns and predictions to

Studies in Education All Rights Reserved. © 2026 | https://www.sie.com.ng

supplement institutional reports and professional judgement. This can improve the timeliness and informational basis of decisions (UNESCO, 2023).

1. ***Predictive Planning:*** Predictive analytics can support forecasting of enrolment, staffing, finance, infrastructure and student outcomes. The ability to identify emerging trends allows managers to act proactively and allocate resources before problems intensify.
2. ***Improved Resource Allocation:*** AI can help institutions compare demand, utilisation and performance indicators to support resource allocation. When combined with transparent criteria and managerial oversight, such systems may improve the efficiency and consistency of institutional resource decisions.

Quality Assurance and Institutional Performance

AI can support continuous monitoring of institutional performance indicators and identify areas requiring managerial attention. This can strengthen quality assurance by providing more frequent evidence for evaluation, planning and corrective action.

1. ***Administrative Efficiency:*** Routine analytical and information-processing tasks can be automated or accelerated, reducing administrative workload. Generative AI and NLP can also assist in processing documents, feedback and reports, allowing managers to devote more time to complex professional decisions.
2. ***Improved Student and Staff Support:*** AI can help identify students who may require additional support and can inform workload, professional-development and human-resource planning. However, such applications must be carefully governed to avoid labelling individuals unfairly or allowing automated predictions to determine outcomes without human review.
3. ***Scenario Analysis and Strategic Management:*** AI can assist managers in exploring alternative scenarios, such as changes in enrolment, staffing or funding. This can strengthen strategic planning by allowing decision-makers to examine potential consequences before implementing a policy.

Challenges of Integrating AI into Educational Management

1. ***Data Quality and Fragmentation:*** AI systems depend on reliable, relevant and sufficiently representative data. Fragmented institutional databases, incomplete records and inconsistent data definitions can produce unreliable outputs. Nigerian institutions may therefore need to strengthen data integration and governance before sophisticated AI systems can deliver sustainable value.
2. ***Algorithmic Bias and Fairness:*** AI models can reproduce or amplify patterns contained in historical data. If past institutional decisions contain systematic inequalities, an AI system trained on those data may generate recommendations that perpetuate them. Continuous auditing, bias assessment and human review are therefore necessary (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021).
3. ***Lack of Explainability:*** Complex models can produce useful predictions while offering limited insight into their reasoning. This creates difficulties when managers must justify decisions to students, staff, governing councils or regulators. XAI is therefore an important component of responsible AI-enabled management (Adadi & Berrada, 2018; Arrieta et al., 2020).
4. ***Privacy and Data Protection:*** Educational AI frequently relies on personal and institutional data. Poor data governance can expose individuals to unauthorised access,

Studies in Education All Rights Reserved. © 2026 | https://www.sie.com.ng

profiling or misuse. Institutions need clear rules for data collection, access, storage, security, retention and responsible use.

5. ***Infrastructure and Financial Constraints:*** AI integration requires computing resources, reliable connectivity, interoperable databases, cybersecurity and appropriate software. Institutions operating under financial constraints may struggle to sustain these requirements.
6. ***Limited Technical and AI Literacy:*** Educational managers and staff may not possess sufficient knowledge to evaluate AI-generated outputs. Capacity building should therefore extend beyond technical personnel to include administrators and other decision-makers who interpret and act upon AI recommendations.
7. ***Resistance to Organizational Change:*** AI may create concerns about job displacement, surveillance, loss of professional autonomy or unfamiliar decision processes. Transparent communication, participation and gradual implementation are necessary to build acceptance.
8. ***Accountability for AI-Assisted Decisions:*** A central governance question is who is responsible when an AI-assisted decision causes harm. The answer cannot simply be attributed to the algorithm. Institutions and authorised human decision-makers must retain responsibility for decisions made using AI systems.
9. ***Overdependence on AI:*** AI can create a false impression of objectivity or certainty. Managers may accept automated recommendations without adequately considering context, data limitations or alternative explanations. Human oversight is therefore essential.

Trust-Centred Explainable Governance Framework (TCEGF)

Rationale for the Framework

The original version of this paper proposed the Trust-Centred Explainable Governance Framework (TCEGF) as a guide for transparent and accountable AI-enabled educational management. In the revised paper, the framework is explicitly positioned as the organising framework linking the AI decision-making process to the challenges and prospects discussed above.

The framework rests on the premise that the effectiveness of AI in educational management is not determined solely by predictive performance. An AI system may be technically accurate but still be inappropriate for institutional decision-making if its data are poor, its recommendations are discriminatory, its reasoning cannot be examined, or stakeholders have no avenue to question decisions. TCEGF therefore integrates technological capability with governance, ethics, human judgement and institutional learning.

Components of TCEGF

The framework comprises interconnected components:

1. *Institutional Data and AI Capability:* Universities establish appropriate digital infrastructure, integrated datasets, AI tools and technical capacity.
2. *AI Analysis and Decision Support:* Machine learning, predictive analytics, NLP, AI dashboards and related tools process institutional data to produce predictions, classifications, alerts and recommendations.
3. *Explainability and Transparency:* XAI mechanisms help users understand the factors, assumptions and limitations associated with AI outputs.

Studies in Education All Rights Reserved. © 2026 | https://www.sie.com.ng

4. *Human Oversight and Professional Judgement:* Educational managers review AI recommendations, consider contextual and ethical factors and retain responsibility for final decisions.
5. *Ethical and Algorithmic Accountability:* Institutions monitor fairness, privacy, security, bias, compliance and the consequences of AI-assisted decisions.
6. *Stakeholder Participation and Trust:* Administrators, academic staff, students, governing bodies and relevant regulators are involved in appropriate stages of AI governance and evaluation.
7. *Monitoring, Feedback and Institutional Learning:* Outcomes are monitored and used to improve data, models, policies and managerial practice.
8. *Educational Management Outcomes:* The combined process is expected to strengthen evidence-based planning, administrative efficiency, quality assurance, resource optimisation, transparency, accountability and stakeholder confidence.

Linkage among the Framework Components

The framework is not a collection of independent principles. Its strength lies in the linkage among its components. Institutional data and AI capability enable analytical processing; AI tools generate recommendations; XAI makes those recommendations interpretable; human managers validate the outputs; ethical governance tests whether the decision is fair, lawful and responsible; stakeholder participation strengthens legitimacy and trust; and monitoring provides feedback for institutional learning.

Accordingly: AI Capability + Quality Data → AI Analysis → Decision Recommendation → XAI/Transparency → Human Oversight + Ethical Accountability → Stakeholder Trust → Management Action → Monitoring/Feedback → Institutional Learning and Improved Outcomes. This linkage responds directly to the central challenge of AI integration: ensuring that technological intelligence is converted into responsible managerial intelligence.

Theoretical and Governance Basis of TCEGF

The framework is consistent with established responsible-AI principles. UNESCO (2021) emphasises human oversight, fairness, transparency, privacy and accountability in AI governance. The OECD (2019) principles similarly emphasise inclusive growth, human-centred values, transparency, robustness, security and accountability. The explainability literature further establishes the importance of making AI systems understandable where users need to interpret and evaluate algorithmic outputs (Adadi & Berrada, 2018; Arrieta et al., 2020).

Within educational management, TCEGF therefore translates these broad responsible-AI principles into a decision-governance sequence. It recognises that educational institutions are not merely technology users; they are governance environments in which AI-supported decisions affect people, resources, opportunities and institutional legitimacy.

Implications for Educational Planning, Administration and Management

The integration of AI has implications for the three closely related functions of educational planning, administration and management. In planning, AI can improve forecasting and scenario analysis. In administration, it can streamline routine processes and support timely information retrieval and reporting. In management, it can strengthen performance monitoring, resource allocation, risk identification and strategic decision-making.

Studies in Education All Rights Reserved. © 2026 | https://www.sie.com.ng

The implications, however, are conditional. AI should not be introduced merely because it is technologically fashionable. Institutions should first identify decision problems for which AI can add measurable value, determine the quality and availability of required data, assess risks, select appropriate tools and establish governance procedures. The TCEGF provides a practical logic for this process by connecting technological capability to explainability, human judgement, accountability, stakeholder trust and continuous learning.

For universities in Edo State and comparable Nigerian settings, implementation should therefore be incremental. Institutions can begin with lower-risk applications such as institutional analytics, enrolment forecasting, document analysis and performance dashboards, while building capacity for more sensitive applications. High-stakes decisions should receive stronger human oversight, explanation requirements, audit procedures and stakeholder safeguards.

Prospects for AI-Enabled Educational Management

The prospects for AI integration are considerable. Continued development in predictive analytics, explainable AI, natural-language processing, generative AI and institutional data platforms may enable universities to develop more responsive management systems. AI could increasingly support integrated institutional dashboards, early-warning systems, resource forecasting, quality-assurance monitoring and scenario-based strategic planning. The most promising future is not one in which AI replaces educational managers. Rather, it is one in which AI augments managerial capacity. Managers can use AI to analyse evidence at greater scale and speed while retaining responsibility for contextual interpretation, ethical judgement and institutional accountability. This human-AI complementarity is particularly important in education because decisions are fundamentally connected to human development, equity and institutional values.

Suggestions

1. Universities should develop institutional AI governance policies covering transparency, accountability, fairness, privacy, security, human oversight and responsible use.
2. Educational institutions should identify appropriate AI tools, including predictive analytics, machine learning, NLP, AI dashboards, generative AI assistants and XAI techniques, according to clearly defined management needs.
3. AI-generated recommendations should be treated as decision support and should not automatically replace the judgement of educational managers.
4. Universities should strengthen data governance by improving data quality, interoperability, security and responsible access across institutional units.
5. Institutions should adopt explainability requirements for high-impact AI applications so that managers and affected stakeholders can understand the basis of consequential recommendations.
6. Regular algorithmic audits should be conducted to identify bias, performance deterioration and unintended consequences.
7. Universities should invest in AI literacy and continuous professional development for educational managers, academic staff, ICT personnel and other relevant stakeholders.
8. Stakeholders should be involved in the development, deployment and evaluation of AI systems where their interests are materially affected.
9. Institutions should implement AI gradually, prioritising applications with clear institutional value and manageable risk.

Studies in Education All Rights Reserved. © 2026 | https://www.sie.com.ng

10. Monitoring and feedback mechanisms should be established so that AI-supported decisions generate evidence for continuous institutional learning and improvement.

Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence offers substantial opportunities to transform decision-making in educational management by improving access to evidence, forecasting, administrative efficiency, monitoring and strategic planning. AI tools such as machine learning, predictive analytics, natural-language processing, AI dashboards, generative AI and explainable AI can provide educational managers with capabilities that complement conventional administrative processes. However, the benefits of AI cannot be separated from challenges involving data quality, algorithmic bias, privacy, explainability, infrastructure, technical capacity, organizational resistance and accountability.

This paper has argued that responsible AI integration requires a connected decision process in which institutional data feed appropriate AI tools, AI generates recommendations, explainability makes outputs understandable, human managers validate the recommendations, ethical governance provides accountability, stakeholders participate appropriately, and monitoring generates feedback for institutional learning. The Trust-Centred Explainable Governance Framework (TCEGF) provides the conceptual structure for this linkage.

The central implication is that successful AI adoption in educational management should be evaluated not simply by whether an AI system can make a prediction, but by whether its use contributes to better, fairer, more transparent, explainable and accountable decisions. For educational institutions in Edo State and Nigeria more broadly, the strategic task is therefore to build the infrastructure, capacity and governance conditions that allow AI to augment—not replace—responsible educational leadership.

References

Adadi, A., & Berrada, M. (2018). Peeking inside the black-box: A survey on explainable artificial intelligence (XAI). *IEEE Access, 6*, 52138–52160.

Arrieta, A. B., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., García, S., Gil-López, S., Molina, D., Benjamins, R., Chatila, R., & Herrera, F. (2020). Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. *Information Fusion, 58*, 82–115.

Bozkurt, A., Karadeniz, A., Baneres, D., Guerrero-Roldán, A. E., & Rodríguez, M. E. (2021). Artificial intelligence and reflections from educational landscape: A review of AI studies in half a century. *Sustainability, 13*(2), 800.

Bush, T. (2020). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*.

European Commission. (2024). *Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act).* Publications Office of the European Union.

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review, 1*(1).

Holmes, W., Miao, F., Akin-Nibosun, T., & Sharma, R. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research.* UNESCO.

Studies in Education All Rights Reserved. © 2026 | https://www.sie.com.ng

Ifenthaler, D., & Schumacher, C. (2016). Student perceptions of privacy principles for learning analytics. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 64*(5), 923–938.

Ifenthaler, D., & Schumacher, C. (2023). Reciprocal human-AI interaction in higher education: A framework for responsible use of artificial intelligence in learning and teaching. [Source cited in the original manuscript; bibliographic details should be verified against the final journal record before external publication.]

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence.* OECD Publishing.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *OECD artificial intelligence policy observatory.* OECD Publishing.

UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO.

Studies in Education All Rights Reserved. © 2026 | https://www.sie.com.ng