



\*

## AI and Technology Wearables Task and Finish Group Report and Recommendations

Produced for the IOE Research Ethics Committee, UCL Institute of Education

July 2025

To Cite this report:

Svennevig, H. (Ed.) (2025). AI and Technology Wearables Task and Finish Group Report and Recommendations. Ahern, S., Bomford, K., Brown, N., Clark, T., Clarke, S., Cukurova, M., Holmes, W., Knight, S., Lamont, A., Neumann, T., Pollock, L., Pradhan, U., Price, S., Ronca, F., Ceja, O. and Svennevig, H. IOE Research Ethics Committee. UCL Institute of Education.

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Rationale.....	5
Context .....	8
History .....	8
Group Membership .....	8
Group Methods .....	9
Discussions .....	10
Recommendations.....	13
References .....	15
Appendices .....	18
I Generative AI Viewpoint on Research Ethics using GenAI .....	18
II Generative AI Cover for Report Discussions.....	21
III Potential AI Ethics Guidelines.....	22
IV Potential Staff Research Ethics Form .....	23
V Potential Student Research Ethics Form .....	33
VI Funneling process for Task and Finish Group around Research Ethical Considerations .....	48
VII Recommended new Standing Group items to consider .....	50

# Executive Summary

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and technology wearables (Tech Wearables) are increasingly present across personal and professional contexts. News reports on their use and the opportunities and threats they pose are a daily occurrence. We often hear about the rationales for these methods as being either helpful in basic terms (like a calculator) or far reaching and complex (like the use of the Internet). Dystopic scenarios are frequently prophesied, with connections to popular fictitious and imaginary tales intended as warnings to humanity.

AI and Tech Wearables are being used in many areas, including in education and research. Academic institutions need to respond, developing policies and tools to address these technologies. To do this, we all need to come together to consider how we can apply current policies and develop new ones appropriate for these current and developing circumstances.

It is important to note that AI and Tech wearables are not just emerging at this point in time: there are different forms of AI and Tech Wearables, with roots in the 1950s-1960s. So, while we all engage in considering the developments of the latest trends in the field, we need to remember that we are already using aspects of these technologies in many of the everyday devices we use and wear today. Public access to Large Language Models (LLMs) adds further complex considerations around the subject area. Questions need to be raised by researchers relating to the use of this collection of technologies: Do they need to be used? Can other methods be used? How can we avoid their use? Are we aware of the human rights implications? Are we aware of the problems around representation with these tools and how they can increase negative stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination? How can we draw in criticality when considering diversity and inclusion when using AI? Are we aware of the significant energy use associated with supporting these technologies, and the impact this has on the climate? Are we aware how these technologies data mine, data extract and engage in IP theft? How can we ensure equity and inclusion are promoted by researchers, to ensure that research is fair and valid? How do we ensure that we are not engaging in exclusionary methods in research?

While this list of questions gives some criticality to the debate, they are not designed to exclude the use of AI and Tech Wearables but to ensure that we make informed decisions about if and how we use them – in a considered manner. Our use of the Internet and its possibilities, and our use of social media and its possibilities, are still in their infancies. Now, with the increasing presence of AI and Tech Wearables, we should take the time to better prepare for addressing the new challenges. Utilising AI has a range of purported benefits including enabling users to reduce workload, be more creative, or to speed up engagement with handling complex and large amounts of information but it is important to remember that up to this point, LLMs do not demonstrate criticality. This skill is required by the user, and when engaging with ethics – the researcher.

The Institute of Education (IOE) has a range of ethics frameworks to consider when developing research. However, due to the exponential rise of AI and Tech wearables the [IOE Ethics Committee](#) deemed it appropriate to set up a Task and Finish Group to consider actionable recommendations to improve researchers navigation of this area. This report is the culmination of the work of that group.

It is exceptionally important to note the limitations of this group. We are a group of 16 academics from across the IOE who have given up our time voluntarily. We are very mindful of our limitations and were uncomfortable at the start and often during this process about the enormity of the scope of the challenge faced. It is impossible to cover every aspect of the debate. Even within our own four hours of meetings across the year, we found it difficult to reduce the scope and complexity of the task at hand and, we did not use AI to help us, unless as noted. So, when reading this report and its subsequent recommendations, we thank you for your patience – especially if you notice areas that are missing or conflicted and we apologise for any errors or omissions as they are not intended. For example, we do not give full definitions for either AI or Tech Wearables, as there are a range of definitions that can be drawn upon. In any case, it was not the remit of this report to

determine which definition is most appropriate, or for which group. Instead, this report is intended as a starting point for wider engagement in this area.

The one thing that we are all clear on is that this work is essential – to ensure robust ethical principles are maintained whatever the challenge.

Our recommendations can be summarised as:

1. Standing IOE ethics groups should be established for the fields of AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies.
2. IOE research ethics forms (used by staff and students when applying for ethical approval for their research) should explicitly engage with AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies.
3. UCL Institute of Education should invest in this area: researching the impact of AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies on ethical research; to respond to these recommendations; and to include these recommendations in professional development for staff and training for students at the IOE.
4. The IOE should set a precedent in the language it uses around AI, avoiding anthropomorphic, hyperbolic and inaccurate or misleading terminologies.
5. Appropriate training should be given to researchers on AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies, and their implications for ethical research.
6. Researchers should critically engage with and think deeply about the ethics of AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies, and their implications for academic research.
7. These recommendations should be adopted by all researchers, whether in formal employment, or other, and by all students engaging in research.

Hans Svennevig

Chair, IOE Research Ethics Committee AI and Tech Wearables Task and Finish Group

July 2025.



# Rationale

Despite AI's growing influence in the field of education, there is no single, universally accepted definition of AI. However, a useful definition is provided by UNICEF:

AI refers to machine-based systems that can, given a set of human-defined objectives, make predictions, recommendations, or decisions that influence real or virtual environments. AI systems interact with us and act on our environment, either directly or indirectly. Often, they appear to operate autonomously, and can adapt their behaviour by learning about the context. (UNICEF, 2021, p. 16)

AI is not particularly new but, following the public launch of OpenAI's ChatGPT in 2022, there has been a noticeable step change – as LLMs and generative AI (GenAI), and their increasing range of applications have created novel challenges and possibly some opportunities for researchers. 'Machine Learning' - based algorithmic decision making has become part and parcel of our daily lives, across almost all domains of human endeavour, whether via social media, mobile devices or wearables. While most of these algorithmic interventions have gone largely unnoticed, with perhaps the exception of voice assistants and chatbots, the quantified self has become the norm. The 2020s have seen the development and rapid rollout of an increasing range of sophisticated AI models which go beyond assistive technologies and are either standalone or embedded into sometimes unexpected everyday tools and platforms. Alongside this, other 'emerging technologies' (including Tech Wearables, haptics, blockchain, the Internet of things, and digital touch tech, watches, and virtual reality devices) are becoming ubiquitous. While these emerging technologies may not always be as impactful or well-known as AI, we envisage that all new implementations of these technologies will increasingly include AI capabilities. However, the key point is that all of these technologies – from AI to Tech Wearables – raise a new and complex set of ethical concerns (centred on issues such as automation, data harvesting, privacy, and so on).

While there is a history of digital technologies in education (EdTech) spanning over 40 years, and across all levels of education, today's emerging technologies (including AI and Tech Wearables) appear to have landed unexpectedly in education and workplace settings, challenging concepts of idea generation, creativity, and authorship and authenticity. In fact, UK governments since the 1980s have promoted the introduction of computer hardware, software and Internet connectivity into our classrooms, seeding a growing EdTech market; which in recent years has been extended to include AI EdTech (known as AIED). AIED, for analytical purposes (any particular tool may fit in more than one category), may be categorised as:

- Student-focused (which has seen the most research and the most funding, covering everything from adaptive tutoring to assistive technologies for children with special educational needs and disability (SEND));
- Teacher-focused (covering classroom monitoring and summative assessment); and
- Institution-focused (covering admissions, timetabling, and security) (Holmes et al., 2019; Holmes & Tuomi, 2022).

In addition to ongoing UK government promotion and investment in educational technologies, EdTech has become a large global market. In a 2024 report, Research and Markets estimated the value of the global EdTech market in 2023 as \$ 334.29 Billion (USD), rising to \$ 736.9 Billion (USD) by 2029 (ResearchAndMarkets.com, 2024).

However, the deployment of these technologies has resulted in mixed and inconsistent outcomes. In a 2021 report for UNESCO, Facer and Selwyn (2021) identified six recurring themes from the deployment of digital technologies in education:

- Digital technology alone does not transform education.
- Digital technology does not improve learning.

- Digital technology does not fix inequalities.
- Digital technology does not alleviate teachers' work.
- Digital technology use often results in broad consequences that stretch beyond matters of 'learning'.
- Any 'impacts' are context specific and tied to socio-technical factors.

Moreover, the alignment of EdTech applications with research and research informed pedagogy is inconsistent (Finnigan, 2021; Hollands and Escueta, 2020; Meyer, et al., 2021; Price and Kirkwood, 2014; Kirkwood and Price, 2013, Knight, 2025). At best, this lack of evidence leads to opportunity costs related to potential inappropriate use of tools, and poor procurement, at worst it raises significant ethical concerns. Nonetheless, educational practices in the 21st century have been rapidly impacted by emerging technologies, which aim to amplify learning by offering new tools and methods (Toyama, 2015; Peterson, 2021). Among these, AI systems are particularly impactful (Holmes, 2023a & 2023b).

While most AIED research, which has been happening for more than forty years, focuses on primary and secondary education developments are increasingly of relevance across sectors. In Higher Education, AIED technologies are increasingly being embedded in productivity tools and specialist software used for research purposes (such as computer-aided qualitative data analysis software: CAQDAS). While researchers are increasingly engaging with the ethics of AIED (Holmes et al., 2021; Holmes & Porayska-Pomsta, 2023), navigating this rapidly developing and changing context is challenging – due to gaps in available ethics guidelines and research ethics structures. The impact of these gaps remain unknown.

Whilst the integration of AI and tech wearables into education and research may offer transformative opportunities, it also raises complex ethical challenges concerning personalized learning (Merino-Campos, 2025), data collection (Sui et al., 2023), and improved accessibility (Chemnad & Othman, 2024), not to mention environmental dimensions (Valdivia, 2024), issues of privacy, regulation, surveillance and monitoring (Bouderhem, 2023; Snoek et al., 2025), and social inequalities (Arora et al., 2023), among others.

Culturally, AI systems and tech wearables have the potential to reinforce dominant norms and marginalize diverse epistemologies. For instance, algorithms trained on Western-centric datasets risk perpetuating biases that exclude non-Western perspectives in educational content and research methodologies (Abbas, 2025). Wearables used to monitor student engagement or emotional states may also conflict with cultural norms around privacy and bodily autonomy (Snoek et al., 2025) and risk reducing students to data points to be monitored for compliance (Sui et al., 2023). Socially, the deployment of AI and wearables could exacerbate inequalities. Students and researchers from under-resourced communities may lack access to these tools, deepening the digital divide and limiting participation in data-driven learning environments (Reiss, 2021). Finally, environmentally, the production and disposal of wearable devices contribute to electronic waste and resource depletion. Ethical research must consider the lifecycle of these technologies and promote sustainable design and procurement practices (Lannelongue, 2024; Valdivia, 2024).

The IOE Research Ethics Artificial Intelligence and Technology Wearables Task and Finish Group was set up to provide research ethics recommendations and considerations around this theme. In particular, the group was established to provide guidance regarding issues researchers should consider before, during and after research that may engage with (directly or indirectly) AI and Tech wearables, and related emerging developments.

The group was established to help consider the many ethical issues facing researchers, and to address the related gap in IOE guidance and policy. Pertinent questions include the following:

- Is research engaging with AI or Tech Wearables? If so, why and how, and what are the implications?
- For what reasons are researchers using AI?
- Do researchers know or realise that their research may be engaging with AI or Tech Wearables?
- What about issues related to data theft, data storage, retention, security, and access?



- What about issues related to analysis and reliability?
- What about the recognition of the environmental impact that infrastructure supporting AI systems demand, as is the case with electricity and water consumption of data centres and the disposal of e-waste?
- What about the socioeconomic dimensions associated with the geographical spaces where data centres are built?
- Are researchers considering problems of bias when using LLMs?

This guidance should be considered in accordance with The Concordat to Support Research Integrity and the UKCORI publication [The Concordat to Support Research Integrity and Generative AI](#).

There is a significant wide-ranging debate around ethical research and guideline principles for AI and tech wearables. It was not in the scope of this report to solve this debate, but to enable the IOE Ethics Research Committee to consider next steps in moving further.

# Context

## History

Towards the end of 2022 [Simon Knight](#), while on sabbatical at the IOE, was invited to begin working towards the first IOE Ethics AI and Tech Wearables Task and Finish group – to establish much needed recommendations for this area of research ethics. Simon’s initial work was to frame possible outputs for a group, and to produce analyses of the significant problems and gaps in this area of research practice. Simon has since published in this area – and much of this work has helped in the continued development of this task and finish group.

In 2023 [Hans Svennevig](#) took over chairing the group, as Simon finished his sabbatical at the IOE. Hans invited a range of participants to the group, chaired meetings to develop together the recommendations given in this report and led the writing and compiling of the final report, editing it accordingly.

## Group Membership

Membership of this group was drawn from across the IOE, across departments and particularly across disciplines and backgrounds. The call was distributed via IOE Research Ethics Leads, and then via department heads and word of mouth via teams who were interested and could support the initiative over time, attending the meetings and contributing to report writing or reviewing.

It was important to draw on a range of expertise, those with high level academic and practice knowledge on Artificial Intelligence and Tech Wearables, but additionally those with relatively new or little experience in those specific domains but with a wealth of experience in ethics, research, teaching, teacher education and social work. Contributors to this work also include those who have some or more connection with the IOE, but not limited to the IOE, so that we could consider the wider implications of the report to other faculties within our own university and other universities. Combined, we were able to work together to draw on each other’s expertise while responding to differing perspectives around the field, posing and questioning practices and ways of responding to the complexity of the task.

We are grateful for the time given to the development of this report, the writing and the reviewing and the recommendations presented. The work has been done outside of normal activities, and in a voluntary capacity.

Thank you to group members (alphabetical order, not order of contribution\*\*):

[Samantha Ahern](#)  
[Kate Bomford](#)  
[Nicole Brown](#)  
[Omar Ceja Salgado](#)  
[Timothy Clark](#)  
[Sam Clarke](#)  
[Mutlu Cukurova](#)  
[Wayne Holmes](#)

[Simon Knight](#)  
[Alison Lamont](#)  
[Tim Neumann](#)  
[Louise Pollock](#)  
[Uma Pradhan](#)  
[Sara Price](#)  
[Flaminia Ronca](#)  
[Hans Svennevig](#)

Thank you to report writers:\*\* Samantha Ahern, Samuel Clarke, Wayne Holmes, Simon Knight, Tim Neumann, Uma Pradhan, Sara Price, Omar Ceja Salgado and Hans Svennevig.

Thank you to report reviewers:\*\* Nicole Brown, Timothy Clark, Wayne Holmes, Louise Pollock, Sara Price, Omar Ceja Salgado and Hans Svennevig.

A significant range of participants took part in a range of ways to develop the report, and as such when citing the report, full citations should be given to recognise the range of expertise and time given to it.



## Group Methods

Being aware that schedules were complicated, those who were interested were approached and polled for timings to meet. We not only had to balance meeting across departments in the faculty, but across time zones with some contributors living on the other side of the planet. We also were keen to include all those who responded to the call, with different tasks for different people – some making notes, some meeting more formally to discuss elements of the work, some writing the report, and some reviewing the report. It was important to include the range of expertise given and to ensure a level of criticality was given to the task at hand.

This report, while engaging in academic considerations – and a range of these elements are listed to the rationale and the context of the work, is written in a reflective method – from the reflective engagements that occurred. It forms the findings of a working group and not an academic research project, and this is why the tone of the report is through consideration, debate and dialogue. We hope that the report not only demonstrates a meeting of a collegiate group to problematise this area and come up with recommendations – but demonstrates a reflective account of how such a group has worked through a project that was immediately very daunting. The report includes writing and reviewing from practitioners and academic authors.

## Discussions

During our early meetings when taking stock from the materials that had previously been analysed in the first iteration of the group, and during discussions about what we meant by Artificial Intelligence or Tech Wearables, the magnitude of the task we had been given became increasingly evident in each meeting and engagement. Many of the group members became uncomfortable with the wide-ranging scope of the work at hand, that we as a group simply did not have the time or capacity in our roles to address the litany of ethical research questions. We realised that combining the areas of Artificial Intelligence and Tech Wearables, while seemingly logical, posed a range of problems, as the two domains are not always connected.

The Chair held frequent one-to-one meetings with contributors to the group, not only to reassert the principles and objectives of the group, but to encourage group membership to continue. The rationale for having a range of experts in the field is important to note here and to reflect on when continuing this work – which is one of the recommendations.

We had four 1-hour meetings and were able to get to the heart of a range of discussions in that period. Meetings were recorded to enable other participants of the group to watch back and engage in the tasks after, clear minutes with actions presented were provided swiftly after each meeting. An overview of the meetings, and the process of this report is included here:

### Meeting One

After determining the composition of the group, this first meeting aimed to make connections, learn about each other's expertise and build a brave community of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991) to problematise and consider the range of experience of the group and to consider objectives. A range of meeting materials were shared, and the group immediately started to consider the scale of the problem at hand. Specifically, the time commitment that we could all give would be limited, and we would wish to have a clear, straightforward and flowing debate to determine the recommendations of the report. We acknowledged that we would only be able to meet a handful of times over the year, and to make sure that these meetings were fruitful in their outcomes. We additionally realised that, while there was an overlap between the areas of AI and Tech Wearables, there were significant differences. Additionally, we noted that problems existed in only one or other area, while there was knowledge and expertise in one or other area, but not both. This emphasised that we would need to read and learn from each other, especially given the limited time that we had, but it also demonstrated the ongoing need for this work. We wished at this time to write a short report with recommendations, the scale of the final report indicates the challenge of the task.

### Meeting Two

In this meeting, after reviewing documents, we came to the stark understanding that this was a much wider project, and we were in the early stages. Simon Knight had investigated the background literature in 2024-25, and we were now working with a range of participants to funnel down some recommendations for response to a range of the ethical dilemmas, many of which were not yet fully established. In this meeting, we realised that IOE Ethics forms do not have any prompt about AI and Tech Wearables, or any guidance on this issue. So, this was an immediate area that we could consider. We noted a range of external guidelines existed on this issue.

To aid discussion further, we took part in a funnelling exercise (thanks to [Nicolas Gold](#) for the suggestion) to consider the important areas of ethics research related to AI and Tech Wearables that needed to be considered. The list of considerations raised in just one short section of one meeting was enormous, and demonstrated that more time on this issue was needed (perhaps a standing group). See Appendix VI for the funnelling exercise discussions that we believe would be useful for a relevant standing group to consider, in order to further develop this work. We also realised during this discussion the limitation of researchers. What do they know about the involvement of AI/tech in their research, the types of AI/tech, and the limitations they undermine mitigating the associated risks.

Following a meeting to update the Head of Research Ethics and Integrity, the Chair presented to the group how we had composed a prompt to Microsoft Co-Pilot for the development of a set of ethical principles. This can be seen in Appendix I. This helped our thinking around what is possible from GenAI itself and led to a suggested framework that could also be used as a prompt to researchers (as seen in external ethical guidelines: Appendix III). On reflection, we also recognised that deciding to use GenAI in this way raised important ethical issues (if only due to the fact that GenAI only functions thanks to on data scraped from the Internet without any recompense to the original creators). In any case, the GenAI output lacked evidence for its sources, links to other materials to review or deep critical thinking around the issues.

During this meeting, a range of group members continued to use casual terms to describe AI (e.g., learning, smart, solutions), but we realised this was not helpful in this research setting as this language was not linked to evidence, and in actuality related to media mis/mal/dis-information. We were aware of the anthropomorphisms that were being used (e.g., hallucinations, rather than errors), and the danger of this language. We decided to avoid this in the future and in turn provide recommendations about this.

### Meeting Three

In this meeting we reiterated the purposes of this group, and what the group could achieve with the short amount of available time to meet, and challenging schedules. Since we needed to provide actionable recommendations that the IOE Research Committee Ethics panels could put in place quickly, with some other far-reaching ones to develop the work, the recommendations listed in this report started to emerge.

This meeting also enabled us to hear about work in the group's various areas of expertise, both in teaching and academic research, including meta-analyses of a range of AI and education literature and teaching staff to develop their experience of AI. For example, one focus was on explainability or transparency. The meta-analysis of literature on AI, involved an exploration of the historical development of explanation-focused approaches in AI research, which have aimed to make AI more transparent (Clancey, 1981; Buchanan and Shortliffe, 1984) and how the field has evolved to emphasise different types of explanations (Doshi-Velez and Kim, 2017; Alonso et al., 2018). Particularly in education, explanations are seen as vital for improving understanding, usability, and decision-making (Lipton, 2016; Hoffman, et. al., 2018) which was found to often involve analogies and mental models—representations that individuals form to understand complex systems (Johnson-Laird, 1980; Kass and Leake, 1987; Gentner, et. al., 2001)—with efforts to evaluate and enhance their utility in AI contexts (Cañas, et. al., 2003; Felten, 2017).

The advent of AI models trained on vast datasets opened up further areas of consideration for ethical use of emerging AI technologies, particularly GenAI. The legality of data and retention of data for example around GDPR and the data used by GenAI companies for training their models will remain under investigation for a while, although recent developments point to a strengthening of intellectual property rights, which may well lead to more litigation (Buick, 2025; Lemley, 2024), but makes the development of recommendations and guidelines for researchers, beyond attempting transparency, difficult.

The Higher Education sector was quick to identify challenges raised by GenAI beyond copyright and intellectual property concerns: Bobula (2024) highlights academic integrity, assessment design, bias in generative models, misinformation, and privacy as key concerns that need a response, and while focused on teaching, most concerns are equally applicable to research. On a psychological level, the impact of GenAI on human cognition “remains ambiguous” (León-Dominguez, 2024) with potential dangers due to cognitive offloading.

UCL and IOE have recognised the need to build AI literacy skills in staff and students (although how AI literacy is defined has yet to be agreed – should it focus on the technological and practical dimensions, as most examples do, or should it focus on the human dimension, the impact of AI technologies on humans, human rights, the environment and so on). Nonetheless, the aim is to help manage the challenges and capture the potential (another way of saying that it is not clear what these technologies can and will do to students, academics, and research). The [UCL Generative AI Hub](#) provides a launchpad to access a wide range of resources and activities, while a student-facing [Generative AI and Academic Skills self-paced course](#) is regularly updated.

IOE initially developed risk-assessment-based [quick sheets](#) to support dissertation writing and PGR student-supervisor discussions, and works proactively with students and alumni in AI literacy events such as challenges and ChangeMaker projects. At the staff level, departments organise their own AI literacy initiatives, while UCL Institute of Education at a faculty level is conducting a review including around AI in Education and trials [events](#), such as documented learning lunches and podcasts to help build an understanding on how to navigate the field. We also learned that most of these interventions rarely invite academics whose work focuses on AI, AI and education, or AI literacy to contribute.

We decided a strategy for writing the report, with some members selected for reviewing the report and injecting academic expertise. At this point the report started to be written, and recommendations solidified.

#### Meeting Four

In this final meeting we discussed contentious issues that we would need to resolve before the final report, and what the report was missing. There were a range of aspects noted, for example the significantly complicated task, and our worry as a group, that we were not even able to scrape the surface sufficiently.

We discussed that the report needed to include statements around the limitations of the work, the time challenges and that our volunteer role was faced with a gargantuan task. We were aware of the debate around definitions and the language used to describe the nature of the task. We were aware that much of the debate around human rights data extraction, energy use, IP theft, GDPR and other critical considerations of Ethics in this area are important to note.

We were aware that the report should not be used as a method of arguing for more engagement with AI or Tech Wearables, but as a tool to consider critical thought around its use – for we wonder if researchers should avoid engaging with AI or Tech Wearables (due to the ethical issues or unknown consequences) to complete their research, or as the case may be, not to avoid it.

These discussions also emerged when considering the cover art used for this report. It was concluded that it would be hypocritical for an Ethics Task and Finish group to use an AI image due to potential IP theft – even if the idea would be marketable. As such we asked a human designer to create an image.

In this meeting it was decided that we would write these aspects into the report directly to highlight the complexity around the decision making process for this report, and to help other groups in the future consider how to engage with complicated processes with groups drawing on voluntary engagements.

#### Recommendations

As can be seen from the developmental discussions, we realised that recommendations were emerging from a range of the problems presented in meetings and so we have drawn these together over the life of the Task and Finish group. The recommendations emerge from the considerations throughout this report. The complexity of the task at hand requires significant further investment and engagement, as of writing some of this is taking place at UCL and UCL Institute of Education more broadly, and while some aspects of the recommendations may be seen to be out of date – they did take place in this group year, but their timeliness also reflects the fast paced nature of the subject matter. As a group we felt that the recommendations should be engaged with by all staff and students who are taking part in research as this is ethical aspirational practice for those at UCL Institute of Education. Further training is needed by all, and considerations around criticality with AI and tech wearables are needed, which includes appropriate engagement with the language of the subject area.

The group has frequently mentioned the complexity of the task at hand, and we are aware of the complexity in establishing the recommendations – however we all felt that there is no time to waste, as many individuals and groups are already using AI and tech wearables without fully thinking through the impacts.

# Recommendations

1. Standing IOE ethics groups should be established for the fields of AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies (because they and their impacts are exponentially growing).
  - a. Separate standing IOE ethics groups should be established for AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies.
  - b. The chairs of each group should meet to collaborate and discuss cross-over themes.
  - c. The standing groups should be given the support, time and capacity given to enable them to respond appropriately to these ongoing areas.
  - d. The standing groups should review specific areas in the IOE staff and students' ethics forms that other ethical reviewers may not have sufficient expertise to consider.
  - e. The composition of the standing groups should include experts in the field along with experts in other fields to provide critical analysis.
  - f. Groups related to AI should be established for IOE programmes.
2. IOE research ethics forms (used by staff and students when applying for ethical approval for their research) should explicitly engage with AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies. It must also be noted that as AI systems become more integrated into wearables, computing software, and online platforms, researchers may indirectly find themselves using AI by making use of such technologies and services.
  - a. New sections on AI and Tech Wearables should be added to the forms, prompting researchers to consider if/why/how they use these technologies in their research. This should establish definitions for how researchers engage with AI and Tech Wearables.
  - b. There should be guidance on the ethical principles around AI and Tech Wearables that researchers need to consider on the staff Ethics webpage.
  - c. A prompt on ethics forms to highlight thinking around AI and Tech wearables should be considered and consideration given if AI/tech wearables are needed to be used at all in research.
  - d. Other areas of the form should be modified accordingly, including around data retention, storage and data sharing, data governance, self-developed data, impacts around GDPR and consent of data use to be used to train large language models.

See Appendix IV and V for Potential Staff and Student Ethics form with yellow highlights for potential changes to be made.

3. The IOE should invest in this area, researching the impact of AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies on ethical research. It should respond to these recommendations, and they should be included in professional development for staff and training for students.
  - a. The implications and impact are far reaching, the scale of the transition is exponential and complex. Accordingly, more funding is required to upskill staff and students in this rapidly evolving area.
  - b. This is also required in order to ensure that the IOE remains the leading educational institution, but also to respond to threats from misinformation and misuse of AI and Tech Wearables, including around ethical errors and malpractice.

4. The IOE should set a precedent in the language it uses around AI, avoiding anthropomorphic, hyperbolic and inaccurate or misleading terminologies.
  - a. Language in modules, teaching files, lectures by educational experts, and non-experts should avoid anthropomorphism when talking about or using AI systems and Tech Wearables.
  - b. Language at an academic institution should avoid mis/mal/dis-information when talking about or using AI systems and Tech Wearables.
5. Appropriate training should be given to researchers on AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies, and their implications for ethical research.
  - a. Training is essential to ensure that staff are aware of the various types of AI and Tech Wearables that exist currently (for example, the difference between AI and GenAI, or interactive Tech Wearables or those that record data from the user).
  - b. This training needs to support researchers to make informed decisions about whether and when to use AI and Tech Wearables, why and why not.
  - c. This training needs to support researchers to understand and how to limit and mitigate associated research risks.
  - d. This training needs to consider how to make it inclusive, so not to exclude researchers who are less engaged with AI and Tech Wearables.
  - e. Training should engage with themes related to social justice, diversity, equality and inclusion and AI related challenges
6. Researchers should critically engage with and think deeply about the ethics of AI, Tech Wearables, and other emerging technologies, and their implications for academic research.
  - a. While using AI to suggest ideas, research and even guidelines can be fun and apparently easy – the systems need to be deeply scrutinised before use.
  - b. A set of principles for ethics should be developed, relevant for different types of AI used in educational contexts.
7. These recommendations should be adopted by all researchers, whether in formal employment, or other, and by all students engaging in research.
  - a. Principles from these recommendations need to be adopted on academic programmes that engage students in research an exemplar is demonstrated in Appendix V
  - b. The standing group as noted in 1. needs to develop training packages that can support researchers and adapt and respond to the changing complexity of the field.

# References

- Abbas, A. (2025). Western Bias in AI: Why Global Perspectives Are Missing, Unite.AI. Available at: <https://www.unite.ai/western-bias-in-ai-why-global-perspectives-are-missing/>
- Alonso, E., Castiello, C. & Mencar, C. (2018). Integrating knowledge representation and reasoning in educational systems. *Computational Intelligence*, 34(2), pp 415-438
- Arora, A., Barret, M., Lee, E., Oborn, E. & Prince, K. (2023). Risk and the future of AI: Algorithmic bias, data colonialism, and marginalization. *Information and Organization*, 33(3), p. 100478. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2023.100478>
- Bobula, M. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education: a comprehensive review of challenges, opportunities, and implications. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, (30). <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi30.1137>
- Bouderhem, R. (2023). Privacy and Regulatory Issues in Wearable Health Technology. *Engineering Proceedings*. 58(1), 87. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ecsa-10-16206>
- Buchanan, B. & Shortliffe, E. (1984). Explanation as a topic of AI research. In *Rule-based expert systems: The MYCIN experiments of the Stanford Heuristic programming project*, pp 331–337
- Buick, A. (2025). Copyright and AI training data—transparency to the rescue? *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 20 (3), pp 182–192. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpae102>
- Cañas, A., Coffey, J.W., Carnot, M., Feltovich, P., Hoffman, R., Feltovich, J. & Novak, J. (2003). A summary of literature pertaining to the use of concept mapping techniques and technologies for education and performance support. Report to The Chief of Naval Education and Training, prepared by the Institute for Human and Machine Cognition, Pensacola FL
- Chemnad, K. and Othman, A. (2024). Digital accessibility in the era of artificial intelligence—Bibliometric analysis and systematic review. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*. 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1349668>
- Cukurova, M. (2025). The interplay of learning, analytics and artificial intelligence in education: A vision for hybrid intelligence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56 (2), pp 469-488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13514>
- Doshi-Velez, F. & Kim, B. (2017). Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. arXiv, New York: Cornell University, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1702.08608>
- Facer, K., & Selwyn, N. (2021). Digital Technology and the Futures of Education: Towards ‘Non-Stupid’ Optimism. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000377071>
- Felten, E. (2017). What does it mean to ask for an “explainable” algorithm? <https://freedom-to-tinker.com/2017/05/31/what-does-it-mean-to-ask-for-an-explainable-algorithm/>
- Finnigan, K. S. (2021). The current knowledge base on the Use of research evidence in education policy and practice: A synthesis and recommendations for future directions. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine’s Committee on the Future of Education Research at the Institute of Education Sciences in the U.S. Department of Education. [https://nap.nationalacademies.org/resource/26428/Finnigan\\_Knowledge\\_Base\\_URE\\_National\\_Academies.pdf](https://nap.nationalacademies.org/resource/26428/Finnigan_Knowledge_Base_URE_National_Academies.pdf)
- Gentner, D., Holyoak, K. & Kokinov, B. (eds.) (2001). The analogical mind: Perspectives from cognitive science. The MIT press, <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/1251.001.0001>
- Havinga, B., Holmes, W., & Persson, J. (2024). Preparatory Study for the Development of a Legal Instrument on Regulating the Use of Artificial Intelligence Systems in Education. Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/preparatory-study-for-the-development-of-a-legal-instrument-on-regulat/1680af118c>



- Hoffman, R., Mueller, S. & Klein, G. (2018). Metrics for explainable AI: Challenges and prospects. arXiv, New York: Cornell University, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1812.04608>
- Hollands, F., & Escueta, M. (2020). How research informs educational technology decision-making in higher education: The role of external research versus internal research. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 68(1), 163–180. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-019-09678-z>
- Holmes, W. (2023a). AIED—Coming of Age? *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-023-00352-3>
- Holmes, W. (2023b). The Unintended Consequences of Artificial Intelligence and Education. *Education International Research*. <https://www.ei-ie.org/en/item/28115:the-unintended-consequences-of-artificial-intelligence-and-education>
- Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence in Education. Promises and Implications for Teaching and Learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign
- Holmes, W., & Littlejohn, A. (2024). Artificial Intelligence for Professional Learning. In A. Renda, I. MacInnes, & M. Garcia-Murillo (Eds.), *Artificial Intelligence at Work: Interconnections and Policy Implications*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Incorporated
- Holmes, W., Persson, J., Chounta, I.-A., Wasson, B., & Dimitrova, V. (2022). Artificial Intelligence and Education a Critical View Through the Lens of Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law. Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/artificial-intelligence-and-education-a-critical-view-through-the-lens/1680a886bd>
- Holmes, W., & Porayska-Pomsta, K. (Eds.). (2023). *The Ethics of AI in Education. Practices, Challenges, and Debates*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Ethics-of-Artificial-Intelligence-in-Education-Practices-Challenges/Holmes-Porayska-Pomsta/p/book/9780367349721>
- Holmes, W., & Tuomi, I. (2022). State of the art and practice in AI in education. *European Journal of Education: Research, Development and Policies*, 57(4), 542–570. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12533>
- Johnson-Laird, P. (1980). Mental models in cognitive science. *Cognitive Science*, 4(1), pp 71-115
- Kass, A. & Leake, D. (1987). Types of explanations. Report. Yale Artificial Intelligence Project., Connecticut: Yale University, <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA183253.pdf>
- Kirkwood, A., & Price, L. (2013). Missing: Evidence of a scholarly approach to teaching and learning with technology in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(3), 327–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.773419>
- Knight, S. (2025). Identifying and Designing Evidence-Informed Practice, in Practice: The Case for Pragmatic Evidence Synthesis Matrices (PESM). *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069251318590>
- Knight, S., Viberg, O., Mavrikis, M., Kovanović, V., Khosravi, H., Ferguson, R., Corrin, L., Thompson, K., Major, L., Lodge, J., Hennessy, S. and Cukurova, M. (2024). Emerging technologies and research ethics: Developing editorial policy using a scoping review and reference panel. *PLoS ONE* 19(10): e0309715. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0309715>
- Lannelongue, L. (2024). Modelling the increase of electronic waste due to generative AI. *Nature Computational Science* 4, 805–806. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-024-00726-0>
- Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive and Computational Perspectives)
- Lemley, M. (2024). How Generative AI Turns Copyright Law Upside Down. *Science and Technology Law Review*, 25(2). <https://doi.org/10.52214/stlr.v25i2.12761>
- Lipton, Z. (2016). The mythos of model interpretability. arXiv, New York: Cornell University, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1606.03490>
- Merino-Campos, C. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Personalized Learning in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. *Trends in Higher Education*, 4(2), 17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu4020017>

- Meyer, M., Zosh, J. M., McLaren, C., Robb, M., McCafferty, H., Golinkoff, R. M., Hirsh-Pasek, K., & Radesky, J. (2021). How educational are “educational” apps for young children? App store content analysis using the four pillars of learning frame- work. *Journal of Children and Media*, 15(4), 526–548. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2021.1882516>
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>
- Miao, F., Holmes, W., Huang, R., & Zhang, H. (2021). AI and Education: Guidance for Policy-Makers. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000376709>
- Peterson, J. (2021). Innovative assessment practices. Higher Ground Education Inc: Fresh Grade, <https://learn.sd61.bc.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/96/2017/09/FG-Innovative-Assessment-Whitepaper.pdf>
- Price, L., & Kirkwood, A. (2014). Using technology for teaching and learning in higher education: A critical review of the role of evidence in informing practice. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 33(3), 549–564. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.841643>
- Reiss, M. J. (2021). The use of AI in education: Practicalities and ethical considerations. *London Review of Education*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.14324/lre.19.1.05>
- ResearchandMarkets.com (2024). EdTech Market - Global Outlook & Forecast 2024-2029. Found online: <https://www.researchandmarkets.com/report/education-software>
- Snoek, A., Brouwer, A. M., Stuldreher, I. V., Haselager, P., & Horstkötter, D. (2025). Wearables for tracking mental state in the classroom: ethical considerations from the literature and high school students. *Frontiers in Neuroergonomics*, 6, 1536781. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnrgo.2025.1536781>
- Sui, A., Sui, W., Liu, S., & Rhodes, R. (2023). Ethical considerations for the use of consumer wearables in health research. *Digital Health*. 9. <https://doi:10.1177/20552076231153740>
- Toyama, K. (2015). Geek heresy: Rescuing social change from the cult of technology. *PublicAffairs*, <https://doi.org/10.13021/G8itlcp.9.2017.1853>
- Valdivia, A. (2024). ‘The supply chain capitalism of AI: a call to (re)think algorithmic harms and resistance through environmental lens’, *Information, Communication & Society*, pp. 1–17. <https://doi:10.1080/1369118X.2024.2420021>.
- UNICEF. (2021). Policy Guidance on AI for Children. <https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/media/1341/file/UNICEF-Global-Insight-policy-guidance-AI-children-2.0-2021.pdf>

# Appendices

## Appendix I

Microsoft Co-Pilot Response to prompt on AI Ethics

Prompt Question written 10:12am October 15<sup>th</sup> 2025: 'Create an ethical guidelines list for how I can mitigate ethical risks in research when I work with vulnerable participants and sensitive topics'

Co-Pilot Response. Generated in 5 seconds:

Certainly! Here's an ethics statement tailored for research involving vulnerable participants and sensitive topics using AI:

---

### Ethics Statement

#### Introduction

This ethics statement outlines our commitment to ethical research practices when working with vulnerable participants and sensitive topics using artificial intelligence (AI). Our goal is to ensure the dignity, rights, and well-being of all participants are respected and protected throughout the research process.

#### Principles

##### 1. Respect for Persons

- **Informed Consent:** We will obtain informed consent from all participants, ensuring they understand the purpose, procedures, risks, and benefits of the research. Special care will be taken to communicate effectively with vulnerable populations.
- **Autonomy:** Participants will be treated as autonomous agents, and their decisions to participate or withdraw from the study will be respected without any coercion or undue influence.

##### 2. Beneficence

- **Risk Minimization:** We will identify and minimize potential risks to participants, particularly those who are vulnerable. This includes psychological, social, and emotional risks.
- **Maximizing Benefits:** The research will be designed to maximize potential benefits to participants and society, ensuring that the outcomes contribute positively to the field of study and the well-being of the participants.

##### 3. Justice

- **Fair Selection of Participants:** Participants will be selected fairly, ensuring that vulnerable populations are not exploited. The selection process will be based on the research objectives and not on convenience or vulnerability.
- **Equitable Distribution of Benefits and Burdens:** The benefits and burdens of the research will be distributed equitably among all participants, ensuring that no group is disproportionately affected.

#### 4. Confidentiality and Privacy

- **Data Protection:** We will implement robust data protection measures to ensure the confidentiality and privacy of participants' information. This includes secure data storage, anonymization, and restricted access to sensitive data.
- **Transparency:** Participants will be informed about how their data will be used, stored, and shared. They will have the right to access their data and request corrections or deletions.

#### 5. Accountability and Oversight

- **Ethical Review:** The research will undergo rigorous ethical review by an independent ethics committee to ensure compliance with ethical standards and guidelines.
- **Ongoing Monitoring:** We will continuously monitor the research process to identify and address any ethical issues that arise. This includes regular audits and feedback mechanisms for participants.

#### 6. Cultural Sensitivity

- **Respect for Cultural Differences:** We will respect and accommodate cultural differences among participants, ensuring that the research is culturally sensitive and appropriate.
- **Community Engagement:** Engaging with community leaders and representatives to gain insights and support for the research, ensuring that it aligns with the values and needs of the community.

### Conclusion

By adhering to these ethical principles, we aim to conduct research that is respectful, fair, and beneficial to all participants, particularly those who are vulnerable. Our commitment to ethical research practices ensures that the dignity and rights of participants are upheld, and the integrity of the research is maintained.

---

Feel free to adjust this statement to better fit your specific research context and requirements. If you have any other questions or need further assistance, just let me know!

Expanded Prompt:

'Create a research ethics guideline of principals when using AI and Tech Wearables' requested 8<sup>th</sup> April 2025 at 2.40pm. Response:

### Research Ethics Principles for AI and Tech Wearables

#### 1. Transparency

- Clearly disclose the purpose, methodology, and intent behind using AI and wearable technology in research.
- Inform participants about how their data will be collected, processed, stored, and used.

#### 2. Privacy and Confidentiality

- Implement robust measures to safeguard participants' personal data and ensure their privacy.
- Use encryption and secure systems to prevent unauthorized access to sensitive information.

- Ensure anonymity in reports and publications unless participants provide explicit consent.

### **3. Informed Consent**

- Provide participants with all necessary information to make an informed decision about their involvement in the study.
- Explain potential risks, benefits, and implications of the use of AI and wearables.
- Ensure consent is ongoing and can be withdrawn at any time without consequences.

### **4. Fairness and Inclusivity**

- Avoid bias and discrimination by ensuring the AI systems and wearable technologies are designed and tested for diverse groups.
- Make participation accessible and inclusive to individuals from varying demographics and abilities.

### **5. Safety and Risk Management**

- Conduct thorough risk assessments to ensure that the wearable technology does not pose physical or psychological harm to participants.
- Provide appropriate support mechanisms in case of adverse events or unintended consequences.

### **6. Accountability**

- Researchers and institutions must take responsibility for the ethical use of AI and Tech Wearables.
- Establish oversight committees to monitor compliance with ethical standards.

### **7. Purpose and Societal Benefit**

- Ensure that the research contributes positively to society and avoids harmful applications.
- Avoid research goals that exploit vulnerable populations or prioritize profit over wellbeing.

### **8. Accuracy and Integrity**

- Use reliable algorithms and hardware to minimize errors and ensure data accuracy.
- Report findings honestly and avoid manipulating results to fit desired outcomes.

### **9. Continuous Monitoring and Improvement**

- Regularly review and adapt ethical protocols in response to advancements in AI and wearable technology.
- Engage participants, stakeholders, and experts to refine ethical standards over time.

### **10. Compliance with Legal and Regulatory Frameworks**

- Adhere to local, national, and international laws governing data protection, technology usage, and research practices.
- Stay informed about evolving regulations and incorporate them into research ethics guidelines.

This guideline can serve as a foundation for ethical research practices involving AI and wearable technology.

## Appendix II

The cover of this report was originally selected by Magic Hour AI on 01/04/25 at 11:35am. With the following prompt:

‘Create a cover photo of an academic report on AI and Tech Wearables with no robots but a human interacting with these devices.’

However, as an ethics Task and Finish group we discussed in the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting about the problem of IP theft, the ethics around AI generated images and that our group would be hypocritical if we were to use such an image.

AI image generation, in the absence of specific instructions, may make decisions that humans would be uncomfortable with such as reinforcing stereotypes, including bias, or contributing to anthropomorphisation of the technology.

As such we chose to use the skills of: [Ellis Brooks](#) a Peace and human rights education worker to draw an image to represent the themes of this report using free sketch and then the use of computer drawing methods to represent the interaction between a human and computers. Ellis was given a vague prompt, and created the images without association to the previous images. Ellis did this for free, and quickly within the time constraints of this report – and tried to draw in considerations around justice and ethics as can be seen by the images included in this report. We are grateful for this work.

## Appendix III

When researchers choose the ethical guidelines that they follow it would be pertinent to have a range of options. Different Generative AI models could be used with prompts to find guidelines, an example can be seen in Appendix III. However, these need to be used in conjunction with recommendation 6. The options that could be used to develop this include the following: (This list is by no means exhaustive and should be developed further by a future standing group).

European Commission (2019) High Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence. Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI.

[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/196377/AI%20HLEG\\_Ethics%20Guidelines%20for%20Trustworthy%20AI.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/196377/AI%20HLEG_Ethics%20Guidelines%20for%20Trustworthy%20AI.pdf)

European Commission (2024) Living Guidelines on the Responsible Use of Generative AI in Research [https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/document/download/2b6cf7e5-36ac-41cb-aab5-0d32050143dc\\_en?filename=ec\\_rtd\\_ai-guidelines.pdf](https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/document/download/2b6cf7e5-36ac-41cb-aab5-0d32050143dc_en?filename=ec_rtd_ai-guidelines.pdf)

Leslie, D. (2019). Understanding artificial intelligence ethics and safety: A guide for the responsible design and implementation of AI systems in the public sector. The Alan Turing Institute.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3240529>

This includes the FAST Track Principles.

UKRI (2024) Use of generative artificial intelligence in application preparation and assessment <https://www.ukri.org/publications/generative-artificial-intelligence-in-application-and-assessment-policy/use-of-generative-artificial-intelligence-in-application-preparation-and-assessment/>

UNESCO (2021) Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. The Recommendations.

<https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics>

For more information and reading:

Crown (2019) Understanding artificial intelligence ethics and safety.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/understanding-artificial-intelligence-ethics-and-safety>

Links to the Alan Turing Institute report.

UN Systems (2022) Principles for the Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence in the United Nations Systems

[https://unsceb.org/sites/default/files/2022-09/Principles%20for%20the%20Ethical%20Use%20of%20AI%20in%20the%20UN%20System\\_1.pdf](https://unsceb.org/sites/default/files/2022-09/Principles%20for%20the%20Ethical%20Use%20of%20AI%20in%20the%20UN%20System_1.pdf)

University of Technology Sydney Use of AI in Research Guidelines <https://www.uts.edu.au/about/leadership-governance/policies/a-z/use-of-ai-in-research-guidelines>

Samson, R. and Pothong, K. (2025) A learning curve? A landscape review of AI and education in the UK (Ada Lovelace Institute and Nuffield Foundation 2025). <https://www.adalovelaceinstitute.org/report/a-learning-curve>

Zhgenti, S., & Holmes, W. (2023). Generative AI and Education: Adopting a Critical Approach. Bot Populi. [https://botpopuli.net/?post\\_type=post&p=7232](https://botpopuli.net/?post_type=post&p=7232)

While many of these guidelines can be extrapolated for Tech Wearables, they do not address these points only. For further guidance here a good article with a pictogram is:

Sui, A., Sui, W., Liu, S., & Rhodes, R. (2023). Ethical considerations for the use of consumer wearables in health research. *Digital health*, 9, 20552076231153740. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/20552076231153740>



## Appendix IV

Potential Staff Research Ethics Form to respond to recommendations.

The potential changes to the current form are noted in yellow highlight. The blue highlight indicates comments that a future standing group, or other IOE Research Ethics Committee members may need to consider.

The guidelines for ethics applications could also include between section 7 & 8. If this was to occur new guidelines around AI and Tech wearables would be needed to accompany this form on the ethics website. Section 8 ethical issues – should also raises questions around how AI or other technology including wearables are involved? And, if so, have researchers considered how this will impact their research, the collection and storage of data and therefore participants informed consent?

## Staff Ethics Application Form

Anyone conducting research under the auspices of the Institute (staff, students or visitors) where the research involves human participants or the use of data collected from human participants, is required to gain ethical approval before starting. This includes preliminary and pilot studies. Please answer all relevant questions in terms that can be understood by a lay person and note that your form may be returned if incomplete.

The guidelines on the IOE Research Ethics webpage provide support and advice. If you require further guidance or require an alternative format of this form, please contact the IOE Research Ethics team at [ioe.researchethics@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:ioe.researchethics@ucl.ac.uk).

## Section 1 – Project Details

- a. Project Title: Enter text
- b. Principal Investigator (PI): Enter text
- c. Department: Enter text
- d. Research Centre (if applicable): Enter text
- e. Co-Investigators (Co-I):
  - a. UCL-based Co-Is/Collaborators: Enter text
  - b. Non-UCL Co-Is/Partners/Collaborators: Enter text  
(Please enter Co-Is/Collaborators separated by a semi-colon. I.e. John Smith – Oxford University; Jane Smith – LSE; etc)
- f. Start Date for data collection/systematic review/secondary analysis : Enter text
- g. End Date: Enter text
- h. Funder : Enter text
- i. Funding confirmed? Yes ☐ No ☐  
**If yes**, please could you provide your Worktribe ID: Enter text
- j. Expedited review requested? Yes ☐ No ☐  
**If yes**, please give your reason for expedited review. **Note:** Expedited reviews are for exceptional circumstances only. Enter text  
Please see our [guidance](#) on how to request expedited reviews
- k. Specify which professional code of ethics will be adhered to for this research:

Enter text

- l. Is this application a continuation of a research project that has already received ethical approval? Yes ☐ No ☐

**If yes**, provide details below (see guidelines) including the ethics reference number. Enter text

- m. Country fieldwork will be conducted in Click or tap here to enter text.

*If research to be conducted abroad, please ensure travel insurance is obtained through UCL. Details can be found on the [UCL travel advice webpage](#)*

- n. Has this project been considered by another (external) Research Ethics Committee?

Yes ☐ External Committee Name: Enter text

Date of Approval: Enter text

No ☐ **If no, continue to Section 2**

**If yes:** Submit a copy of the approval letter with this application.  
Proceed to Section 10 - Attachments

## Section 2 – Research methods summary (tick all that apply)

☐ Interviews

☐ Focus groups

☐ Questionnaires

☐ Action Research

☐ Observation

☐ Literature Review

☐ Controlled trial/other intervention study

☐ Use of personal records

☐ Use of artificial intelligence and emerging technologies for data collection and or analysis, such as the Internet of Things (IoT) and or other examples can be used. – **must complete all sections on AI and Tech Wearables and ethics**

☐ Systematic review - **if only method used complete the below then go to Section 5.**

☐ Secondary data analysis - **if only method used complete the below then go to Section 6.**

☐ Advisory/consultation/collaborative groups

☐ Other, give details: Enter text

**Please provide an overview of the project, focusing on your methodology.** This should include some or all of the following: purpose of the research, aims, main research questions, research design, participants, sampling, data collection (including

justifications for methods chosen and description of topics/questions to be asked), reporting and dissemination. Please focus on your methodology; the theory, policy, or literary background of your work can be provided in an attached document (i.e. a full research proposal or case for support document). *Minimum 150 words required.*

Click or tap here to enter text.

## Section 3 – Research Participants (tick all that apply)

Approximate maximum number of participants required: Enter text

Approximate lower age limit: Enter text

Approximate upper age limit: Enter text

- ☐ Early years/ pre-school
- ☐ Ages 5-11
- ☐ Ages 12-15
- ☐ Young people aged 16-18
- ☐ Adults - *please specify*:
- ☐ Unknown – *please specify*
- ☐ No participants

Click or tap here to enter text.

**NB:** Ensure that you check the guidelines carefully as research with some participants will require ethical approval from a different ethics committee such as the [National Research Ethics Service](#) (NRES) or [Social Care Research Ethics Committee](#) (SCREC).

## Section 4 – Security-sensitive material

Security sensitive research includes: commissioned by the military; commissioned under an EU security call; involves the acquisition of security clearances; concerns terrorist or extreme groups.

- a. Will your project consider or encounter security-sensitive material?  
Yes\* ☐ No ☐
- b. Will you be visiting websites associated with extreme or terrorist organisations?  
Yes\* ☐ No ☐
- c. Will you be storing or transmitting any materials that could be interpreted as promoting or endorsing terrorist acts?  
Yes\* ☐ No ☐
- d. Will your research involve personal data involving criminal convictions and offences?

Yes\* ☐ No ☐

\* Give further details in **Section 9 Ethical Issues**

## Section 5 – Systematic reviews of research

a. Will you be collecting any new data from participants

Yes\* ☐ No ☐

b. Will you be analysing any secondary data

Yes\* ☐ No ☐

\* Give further details in **Section 9 Ethical Issues**

*If your methods do not involve engagement with participants (e.g., systematic review, literature review) **and** if you have answered **No** to both questions, please go to **Section 9 Attachments**.*

## Section 6 - Secondary data analysis (Complete for all secondary analysis)

a. Name of dataset/s

Enter text

b. Owner of dataset/s

Enter text

c. Are the data in the public domain?

Yes ☐ No ☐

**If no**, do you have the owner's permission/license?

Yes\* ☐ No ☐

d. Are the data special category personal data (*i.e. personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person's sex life or sexual orientation*)?

Yes\* ☐ No ☐

e. Will you be conducting analysis within the remit it was originally collected for?

Yes ☐ No\* ☐

f. **If no to above**, was consent gained from participants for subsequent/future analysis

Yes ☐ No\* ☐

g. **If no to above**, was data collected prior to ethics approval process?

Yes ☐ No\* ☐

\* Give further details in **Section 8 Ethical Issues**

*If secondary analysis is only method used **and** no answers with asterisks are ticked, go to **Section 9 Attachments**.*

## Section 7 – Data Storage and Security

**Please ensure that you include all hard and electronic data when completing this section.** Guidance about data storage and security can be found on the [UCL Research Data Management webpage](#)

a. **Data subjects** - Who will the data be collected from?

b. **What data will be collected?** Please provide details of the type of personal or special category data to be collected

c. **Is the data anonymised?** Yes ☐ No\* ☐

Do you plan to anonymise the data? Yes\* ☐ No ☐

Do you plan to use individual level data? Yes\* ☐ No ☐

Do you plan to pseudonymise the data? Yes\* ☐ No ☐

*Guidance on anonymisation vs pseudonymisation can be found on [Practical Data Protection Guidance Notices](#)*

d. **Disclosure** - Who will the results of your project be disclosed to?

Disclosure - Will personal data be disclosed as part of your project?

e. **Data storage** – Please provide details on how and where the data will be stored  
Guidance can be found on [Best Practice to Store and Preserve Data](#)

- f. **Data Safe Haven (Identifiable Data Handling Solution)** – Will the personal identifiable data collected and processed as part of this research be stored in the [UCL Data Safe Haven](#) (mainly used by SLMS divisions, institutes and departments)?

Yes ☐ No ☐

- g. **How long will the data and records be kept for and in what format?**

Please note that the [UCL Records Retention Schedule](#) recommends research data is retained for 10 years after completion of the research.

- h. **Will data be used by/or engaged with Artificial Intelligence or Tech Wearables?**

If so how will you communicate risks of these, and ensure data security, GDPR consent and research integrity?

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Will personal data be processed or be sent outside the European Economic Area?**

*(If yes, please confirm that there are adequate levels of protections in compliance with GDPR and state what these arrangements are)*

Yes ☐ No\* ☐

**j. Will data be archived for use by other researchers?**

*(If yes, please provide details.)*

Click or tap here to enter text.

k. If personal data is used as part of your project, describe what measures you have in place to ensure that the data is only used for the research purpose (e.g. pseudonymisation and short retention period of data)

Click or tap here to enter text.

**I. Data sharing.** Will data be shared with other organisations, e.g. research partners or collaborators, funders, contractors or government departments?

Yes\* ☐ No ☐

***If yes to the above:***

i. What is the name of the organisation (or type, if name not known) that data will be shared with:

ii. Please provide a brief purpose for the data sharing:

Click or tap here to enter text.

iii. Please clarify whether you will be the [data controller or data processor](#):

Click or tap here to enter text.

iv. Will a [data sharing agreement](#) be put in place?



Yes ☐ No ☐

\* Give further details in **Section 9 Ethical Issues**

## Section 8 – Artificial Intelligence and Tech Wearables

Please state clearly if you will be using Artificial Intelligence (AI) and/or Tech Wearables in your research.

a. Will your project use any Artificial Intelligence systems? A list of examples may wish to be given that cover GenAI and AI.

Yes\* ☐ No ☐

b. Will your project use Technology Wearables? A list of examples may wish to be given.

Yes\* ☐ No ☐

If you answered \*yes to any of these questions. You need to continue with the questions on this section AND answer the questions related to this area in Section 9.

Please write a statement to indicate how you will be using Artificial Intelligence and/or Tech wearables in your research project. *Minimum 150 words required* A list of examples could be included; this could include Inception and project design, applying for funding, reviewing literature, data collection, data analysis, writing up and editing research and would need detail on the Ethics website.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Specify which professional code of research AI and/or Tech wearables ethics will be adhered to for this research: (See Appendix III for a potential list from this report)

Enter text

A list of suggestions can be found on the IOE Ethics Guidelines website. This may come from Appendix III and beyond.

## Section 9 – Ethical issues

Please state clearly the ethical issues and any risks which may arise in the course of this research and how will they be addressed.

**All** issues that may apply should be addressed. Some examples are given below, further information can be found in the guidelines. *Minimum 150 words required.*

- Methods
- Sampling
- Recruitment

- Gatekeepers
- Informed consent
- Potentially vulnerable participants
- Safeguarding/child protection
- Sensitive topics
- Consideration of positionality and reflexivity
- International research
- Risks to participants and/or researchers
- Confidentiality/Anonymity
- Disclosures/limits to confidentiality
- Data storage and security both during and after the research (including transfer, sharing, encryption, protection)
- Reporting
- Dissemination and use of findings
- Impact, public engagement, and knowledge exchange activities
- Use of artificial intelligence and/or Tech Wearables for data collection, analysis, or other involvement. Why do you need to use these methods?

Click or tap here to enter text.

Please confirm that the processing of the data is not likely to cause substantial damage or distress to an individual Yes ☐

## Section 10 – Attachments

Please attach the following items to this form or explain if not attached. Please see our guidance and templates on [informed consent](#) and [General Data Protection Regulation \(GDPR\)](#)

- Information sheets, consent forms and other materials to be used to inform potential participants about the research (*List attachments below*) Yes ☐ No ☐

Click or tap here to enter text.

***If applicable/appropriate:***

- Approval letter from external Research Ethics Committee Yes ☐
- The proposal ('case for support') for the project Yes ☐

## Section 11 – Declaration

I confirm that to the best of my knowledge the information in this form is correct, that this is a full description of the ethical issues that may arise in the course of this project and that I will have completed risk assessment on RiskNET before commencing my study.

Name:

Date:

## Timescales

For receiving the Committee's decision following submission are as follows:

Standard –30 working days

Expedited – 15 working days

**Please note** that the above are guidelines for response times which will vary depending on the quality of the application and the number of applications being processed. All applications are assessed prior to forwarding to the Research Ethics Committee and **incomplete** applications will be returned for further detail.

## Decisions

**Approved:** The research is fully approved and can commence immediately.

**Revision required:** The application is incomplete and/or raises concerns so further information and/or changes need to be made and submitted before full approval can be granted.

**Rejected:** The application is considered to raise fundamental concerns that means it cannot be approved by the committee.

## Appendix V

### Potential Student Research Ethics Form

Thank you to MA Digital Media Education colleagues for this exemplar that has been developed and adapted for students. If this is to be adopted – do request the MA team for the form, as it has specific formatting that can help applicants.

Note – this is the form as used, not adapted by this T&F – as such no highlights as noted in Appendix IV given.

Anyone conducting research under the auspices of the Institute (staff, students, or visitors) where the research involves human participants or the use of data collected from human participants, is required to gain ethical approval before starting. This includes preliminary and pilot studies. Please answer all relevant questions in terms that can be understood by a lay person and note that your form may be returned if incomplete.

- For further support and guidance please see accompanying guidelines and the Ethics Review Procedures for Student Research or contact your supervisor.
- Before completing this form, you will need to discuss your proposal fully with your supervisor(s).
- Please attach all supporting documents and letters.
- For all Psychology students, this form should be completed with reference to the British Psychological Society (BPS) Code of Human Research Ethics and Code of Ethics and Conduct.

### Section 1: Project details

a)	Student name:	Click or tap here to enter text.
b)	Supervisor(s):	Click or tap here to enter text.
c)	Faculty:	
d)	Department:	
e)	Course category ( <b><i>Tick one</i></b> ):	<input type="checkbox"/> PhD/MPhil <input type="checkbox"/> EdD <input type="checkbox"/> MRes <input type="checkbox"/> DEdPsy <input type="checkbox"/> MTeach <input type="checkbox"/> MA/MSc <input type="checkbox"/> ITE <input type="checkbox"/> BA, Diploma or other.
f)	Course / Programme:	
g)	Module title:	
h)	Project title:	Click or tap here to enter text.
i)	If applicable, state who the funder is and if funding has been confirmed:	Click or tap here to enter text.
j)	Research start date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
k)	Research end date:	Click or tap to enter a date.
l)	Country where fieldwork will be conducted:	Click or tap here to enter text.

If research is to be conducted abroad, please check the [Foreign and Commonwealth Office \(FCO\)](#) and submit a completed travel risk assessment form (see guidelines). If the FCO advice is against travel this will be required before ethical approval can be granted: [UCL travel advice webpage](#).

m )	Has this project been considered by another (external) Research Ethics Committee?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes External Committee Name: Click or tap here to enter text. Date of Approval: Click or tap to enter a date. <input type="checkbox"/> No
--------	---	---

## Section 2: Research methods summary

Indicate the data collection methods that you will employ in your research (***Tick all that apply***):

- ☐ Interviews.
- ☐ Focus groups.
- ☐ Case study.
- ☐ Questionnaires / Surveys.
- ☐ Action research.
- ☐ Participant observation.
- ☐ Literature review / Systematic review / Meta analysis – ***If only method used, go to Section 5.***
- ☐ Controlled trial / other intervention study.
- ☐ Use of personal records.
- ☐ Archival research / Secondary data analysis – ***If only method used, go to Section 6.***
- ☐ Advisory / Consultation / Collaborative groups.
- ☐ Digital artefact production (practice-based research).
- ☐ Other (***Please, give details***): Click or tap here to enter text.

Please provide an overview of the project, focusing on your methodology (***Use references. Minimum 150 words required***). This should include some or all the following: purpose of the research, aims, main research questions, research design,

participants, sampling, data collection (including justifications for methods chosen and description of topics / questions to be asked), reporting and dissemination. Please focus on your methodology; the theory, policy, or literary background of your work can be provided in an attached document (i.e., a full research proposal or case for support document where necessary).

Click or tap here to enter text.

### Section 3: Research involving emerging technologies including wearables and artificial intelligence (AI)

a) Does your research involve the use of AI?

☐ Yes (**Please, specify which AI system**): Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ No

Before using Generative AI, you should ensure that:

- You know whether or not it is permitted for your assignment / research.
- You understand the limitations and risks of using Generative AI.
- Your assignment / research remains your own work.

The use of Generative AI must be acknowledged in an 'Acknowledgements' section of any piece of academic work where it has been used as a functional tool to assist in the process of creating academic work.

a) I confirm that I have read and understood the information about [engaging with AI in education and assessment](#) and the [acknowledgement of the use of AI](#). I also confirm that I will abide by the [Living Guidelines on the Responsible use of Generative AI in Research](#).

☐ Yes

a) After consulting which of the [categories](#) of AI use are allowed in your programme/module and having discussed it with your supervisor, please tick the option that is applicable to your research/assignment:

*Category 2 – AI tools can be used in an assistive role:*

☐ I will use AI as part of the research process (e.g., literature searching, summarising, note taking, data analysis, pattern recognition, generating insights, data management, testing code, transcribing).

☐ I will use AI in the writing process (e.g., proofreading, getting feedback in content you wrote, translating, referencing, drafting and structuring content).

*Category 3 – AI has an integral role (AI is the subject of research itself).*

☐ I will conduct research with AI as a central tool (e.g., AI development or AI use such as content generation).

☐ I will conduct research about AI (e.g., explore people's use of AI in different settings).

Provide below a detailed description of the name of the AI technology being used, the type (i.e., *Narrow AI* such as face and eye tracking or voice assistants; *General AI* such as machine learning, computer vision, natural language processing - NLP, robotics, deep learning and neural networks as used for voice control and image recognition), and the extent to which your research uses AI. Elaborate on the options you selected in question 'c' above. Consider that online platforms may have embedded some form of AI use, which means that by using them, you are also using AI indirectly:

Click or tap here to enter text.

a) Does your research involve the use of wearables?

☐ Yes (***Please, specify which type of wearables***): Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ No

Provide below a detailed description of your intended use of wearables in your research and the kind of data that you will collect from the participants using them:

Click or tap here to enter text.

a) Does your research involve the use of any other type of emerging technology (i.e., blockchain)?

☐ Yes (***Please, specify which type of technology***): Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ No

Provide below a detailed description of your intended use of the technology in your research and the kind of data that you will collect from the participants using it:

Click or tap here to enter text.

## Section 4: Research participants

l) Will your research involve human participants?

☐ Yes

☐ No – ***If 'No', go to Section 5.***

l) Who are the participants for this project (i.e., what sorts of people will be involved)? (***Tick all that apply***).

☐ Early years/pre-school.

☐ Ages 5-11.

☐ Ages 12-16



***(Please, note that working with children will need a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check and the approval of supervisor and the module leader).***

- ☐ Young people aged 17-18.
- ☐ Adults (***Please, give details***): Click or tap here to enter text.
- ☐ Unknown (***Please, give details***): Click or tap here to enter text.

**Note:** Ensure that you check the guidelines carefully as research with some participants will require ethical approval from a different ethics committee such as the [National Research Ethics Service](#) (NRES) or [Social Care Research Ethics Committee](#) (SCREC).

- I) If participants are under the responsibility of others (such as parents, teachers, or medical staff) how do you intend to obtain permission to approach the participants to take part in the study? (***Please, attach approach letters or details of permission procedures - see Section 9***):

Click or tap here to enter text.

- I) How will participants be recruited (identified and approached)?

Click or tap here to enter text.

- I) Describe the process you will use to inform participants about what you are doing.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- I) How will you obtain the consent of participants? Will this be written? How will it be made clear to participants that they may withdraw consent to participate at any time?

Click or tap here to enter text.

- I) **Studies involving questionnaires:** Will participants be given the option of omitting questions they do not wish to answer?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No (***Please, read the guidelines, Ethical Issues section, and explain why below. Also, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***):

Click or tap here to enter text.

- ☐ N/A

- I) **Studies involving observation:** Please, confirm whether participants will be asked for their informed consent to be observed.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No (***Please, read the guidelines, Ethical Issues section, and explain why below. Also, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***):

Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ N/A

- l) Might participants experience anxiety, discomfort, or embarrassment as a result of your study?

☐ Yes (***Please, give details below of what steps will you take to explain and minimise this:***

Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ No (***Please, give details below explaining how you can be sure that no discomfort or embarrassment will arise:***

Click or tap here to enter text.

- l) Will your project involve deliberately misleading participants (deception) in any way?

☐ Yes (***Please, give details below and ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8:***

Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ No

- l) Will you debrief participants at the end of their participation (i.e., give them a brief explanation of the study)?

☐ Yes

☐ No (***Please, give details below and ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8:***

Click or tap here to enter text.

- l) Will participants be given information about the findings of your study? (This could be a brief summary of your findings in general; it is not the same as an individual debriefing).

☐ Yes

☐ No (***Please, explain why not:***

Click or tap here to enter text.

## Section 5: Security-sensitive material

Security sensitive research includes: research commissioned by the military; commissioned under an EU security call; involves the acquisition of security clearances; concerns terrorist or extreme groups.

- c) Will your project consider or encounter security-sensitive material?

☐ Yes (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8)***

☐ No – ***If ‘No’, go to Section 6.***

- c) Will you be visiting websites associated with extreme or terrorist organisations?
- ☐ Yes (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)
- ☐ No
- c) Will you be storing or transmitting any materials that could be interpreted as promoting or endorsing terrorist acts?
- ☐ Yes (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)
- ☐ No

## Section 6: Systematic reviews of research and secondary data analysis

- a) Does your study involve a literature review or a systematic review of research?
- ☐ Yes (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)
- ☐ No
- b) Will you be analysing any secondary data?
- ☐ Yes (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)
- ☐ No
- k) Will you be collecting any new data from participants?
- ☐ Yes (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)
- ☐ No ***If your methods do not involve engagement with participants (e.g. systematic review, literature review) and if you have answered 'No' to questions 'a', 'b' and 'c' in this section, please go to Section 7.***
- k) Name of dataset(s): Click or tap here to enter text.
- k) Owner of dataset(s): Click or tap here to enter text.
- k) Are the data in the public domain?
- ☐ **Yes *If 'Yes', go to question 'e'.***
- ☐ No
- k) Do you have the owner's permission/license?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)

- k) Are the data special category personal data (i.e., personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person's sex life or sexual orientation)?
- ☐ Yes (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)
- ☐ No
- k) Will you be conducting analysis within the remit the data were originally collected for?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)
- k) Was consent gained from participants for subsequent / future analysis?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)
- k) Was data collected prior to the ethics approval process?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)

## Section 7: Data storage and security

- h) Confirm that all personal data will be stored and processed in compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (See the [Guidelines](#) and the Institute's Data Protection & Records Management Policy for more detail).
- ☐ Yes (***Please, ensure that you cover any ethical issues arising from this in Section 8***)
- h) Who will have access to the data and personal information, including advisory / consultation groups, and during transcription?
- Click or tap here to enter text.
- h) Where will the data be stored during the research?
- Click or tap here to enter text.
- h) Indicate which mobile devices / storage medium will be used during the research (***Tick all that apply***):
- ☐ Laptop / Netbook / Chromebook
- ☐ Tablet / e-reader

- ☐ Smartphone
- ☐ SD memory card
- ☐ USB thumb drive
- ☐ Portable hard drive / solid state drive
- ☐ CD / DVD / Blu-ray / Cassette
- ☐ Cloud storage (i.e., OneDrive, Google Drive, Dropbox, iCloud)
- ☐ Other (**Please, specify**): Click or tap here to enter text.

h) How will you safeguard the integrity of the data and ensure it does not get lost, stolen, or is accessed by unauthorised persons (i.e., password, encryption)?

Click or tap here to enter text.

h) Where will the data be stored after the research has concluded?

Click or tap here to enter text.

h) How long will the data and records be kept for, and in what format, after the research has concluded?

Click or tap here to enter text.

h) Will the data be archived for use by other researchers?

☐ Yes (**Please, give details**): Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ No

## Section 8: Ethical issues

Are there particular features of the proposed work which may raise ethical concerns or add to the complexity of ethical decision making? If so, please outline how you will deal with these below.

It is important that you demonstrate your awareness of potential risks or harm that may arise as a result of your research. You should then demonstrate that you have considered ways to minimise the likelihood and impact of each potential harm that you have identified. Please, be as specific as possible in describing the ethical issues you will have to address. Please, consider / address all issues that may apply from the table below and leave the rest blank:

q) Methods	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Sampling	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Recruitment	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.

	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Gatekeepers / use of material subjected to copyright laws	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Informed consent	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Potentially vulnerable participants	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Safeguarding / Child protection	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Sensitive topics	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) International research	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Risks to participants and/or researchers	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Confidentiality / Anonymity (disclosure and limits)	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Data storage and security (during and after research, including transfer, sharing, encryption, and protection)	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Reporting, dissemination, and use of findings	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.

q) Researcher's subjectivity and positionality	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Online (social media) research	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Use of AI in research (social / environmental impact)	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
q) Use of wearables or other emerging technologies in research	<i>Ethical issue:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.
	<i>Minimisation strategy:</i>	Click or tap here to enter text.

## Section 9: Further information

List and outline any other information you feel is relevant to this submission, using a separate sheet or attachments if necessary:

Click or tap here to enter text.

## Section 10: Face-to-face data collection

- b) Will you be collecting face-to-face / personal data in the United Kingdom later to be processed or be sent abroad?

☐ Yes (***Please, give details below confirming that there are adequate levels of protection in compliance with the Data Protection Act (DPA) 2018, as well as the data protection regulations in the destination country and state what these arrangements are. Provide a link to such data protection regulations***):

Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ No

- b) Will personal data be collected abroad and brought into the United Kingdom?

☐ Yes (***Please, give details below confirming that you have implemented adequate levels of protection in compliance with the data protection regulations in the country where the data was collected, as well as the UK's DPA 2018 and state what these arrangements are. Provide a link to such data protection regulations***):

Click or tap here to enter text.

☐ No

## Section 11: Attachments

Please, indicate which of the following documents have been attached to this ethics form:

- g) Information sheets and other materials to be used to inform potential participants about the research, including approach letters, and talent release agreements (if the research involves participants/actors).

☐ Yes      ☐ No      ☐ N/A

- g) Consent form (if the research involves participants).

☐ Yes      ☐ No      ☐ N/A

- g) The proposal for the research project (if yours is a PhD project).

☐ Yes      ☐ No      ☐ N/A

- g) Approval Letter from external Research Ethics Committee (if applicable. See Section 1i).

☐ Yes      ☐ No      ☐ N/A

- g) Full risk assessment (e.g., field work, film production risk assessment, production property/vehicle release, production agreement).

☐ Yes      ☐ No      ☐ N/A

- g) Certificate of completion of '[UCL Data Protection - Undergraduate & Masters Level Students](#)' course (Only if your research will collect personal data from participants).

☐ Yes      ☐ No      ☐ N/A

***(Please note that personal data is any information that uniquely identifies an individual (i.e., names, ID numbers, address, email, location, IP address, cookies). Personal data that has been made anonymous in such a way that individuals can no longer be identified is NOT considered personal data as long as such anonymisation is irreversible).***

- g) [Disclosure and Barring Service](#) (DBS) checks certificate (if working with children or vulnerable people. See Section 4).

☐ Yes      ☐ No      ☐ N/A

## Section 12: Declaration

- d) I confirm that I have read, understood, and will abide by the following set of guidelines (**see Section 13 for relevant links**):

☐ Yes



d) Please, select the guidelines this project will be abiding by (**Choose as relevant to your field of research**):

- ☐ British Psychological Society (BPS).
- ☐ British Educational Research Association (BERA).
- ☐ British Sociological Association (BSA).
- ☐ Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR).
- ☐ UCL Code of Conduct for Research.
- ☐ Other (**Please, specify**): [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

d) I have discussed the ethics issues relation to my research with my supervisor.

- ☐ Yes      ☐ No

d) I have attended the appropriate ethics training provided by my course / department.

- ☐ Yes      ☐ No

**I confirm that to the best of my knowledge, the above information is correct, and this is a full description of the ethics issues that may arise in the course of this project.**

Name: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Date: [Click or tap to enter a date.](#)

**Once complete, please submit your complete ethics forms to your supervisor.**

### **Section 13: Useful links & information**

c) **Professional codes of ethics:** You should read and understand relevant ethics guidelines, for example:

- [British Psychological Society](#) (2021) *Code of Ethics and Conduct*.
- [British Educational Research Association](#) (2024) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*.
- [British Sociological Association](#) (2017) *Statement of Ethical Practice*.
- [Association of Internet Researchers](#) (2020) *Internet Research: Ethical Guidelines 3.0*.
- [University College London](#) (2023) *UCL Code of Conduct for Research*.

Please see the respective websites for these or later versions; direct links to the latest versions are available on the [Institute of Education Research Ethics webpage](#).

**c) Disclosure and Barring Service checks:**

If you are planning to carry out research in regulated Education environments such as Schools, or if your research will bring you into contact with children and young people

(under the age of 18), you will need to have a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check, before you start. The DBS was previously known as the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB). If you do not already hold a current DBS check, and have not registered with the DBS update service, you will need to obtain one [through UCL](#). Ensure that you apply for the DBS check in plenty of time as will take around 4 weeks, though can take longer depending on the circumstances.

**c) Further references:**

Robson, Colin (2011). *Real world research: a resource for social scientists and practitioner researchers* (3rd edition). Oxford: Blackwell. (***This text has a helpful section on ethical considerations***).

Alderson, P. and Morrow, V. (2011) *The Ethics of Research with Children and Young People: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage. (***This text has useful suggestions if you are conducting research with children and young people***).

Wiles, R. (2013) *What are Qualitative Research Ethics?* Bloomsbury. (***This text covers informed consent, approaches to research ethics and examples of ethical dilemmas***).

## Section 14: Departmental use

If a project raises particularly challenging ethics issues, or a more detailed review would be appropriate, the supervisor must refer the application to the Research Development Administrator via email, so that it can be submitted to the IOE Research Ethics Committee (REC) for consideration. A departmental research ethics coordinator or representative can advise you, either to support your review process, or help decide whether an application should be referred to the REC. If unsure, please refer to the guidelines explaining when to refer the ethics application to the IOE Research Ethics Committee posted on the committee's website.

Student name:	Click or tap here to enter text.
Department:	Click or tap here to enter text.
Course / Programme:	Click or tap here to enter text.
Module title:	Click or tap here to enter text.
Project title:	Click or tap here to enter text.

<b>Reviewer 1</b>	
Supervisor name: Click or tap here to enter text.	
Comments: Click or tap here to enter text.	
Date: Click or tap to enter a date.	Signature: Click or tap here to enter text.
<b>Reviewer 2</b>	
Advisory Committee / Course team member name: Click or tap here to enter text.	
Comments: Click or tap here to enter text.	
Date: Click or tap to enter a date.	Signature: Click or tap here to enter text.

**Decision on behalf of reviewers:**

- ☐ Approved.
- ☐ Referred back to applicant and supervisor.
- ☐ Referred to the REC for review.

**Recording:**

- ☐ Recorded in the student information system.

Once completed and approved, please send this form and associated documents to the relevant programme administrator to record on the student information system and to securely store.

Further guidance on ethical issues can be found on the [UCL Institute of Education Research Ethics Committee website](#).

## Appendix VI

Funnelling exercise on research ethics, before, after and during research that relate to AI and Tech wearables as developed during the meetings of the Task and Finish group. Thanks to [Nicolas Gold](#) for getting us started with thinking in this area. This helped us to consider recommendations for this report and gives insight to others about the range of AI & tech wearables ethics areas to consider.

Before:

- Define the nature/purpose of the use of AI in research (i.e., assistive, integral).
- AI as part of the research process (e.g., literature searching, summarising, note taking, data analysis, pattern recognition, generating insights, data management, testing code, transcribing).
- AI in the writing process (e.g., proofreading, getting feedback in content you wrote, translating, referencing, drafting and structuring content).
- Research with AI (e.g., AI development or AI use such as content generation).
- Research about AI.
- Define the type of data to be collected, how it will be processed and where it will be used.
- Review and evaluate terms and conditions of the AI system to be used and the ethical risks it poses in terms of data collection, storage, processing, whether data is sent to overseas servers, whether data is used to refine or train the algorithm.
- Cover AI data collection, storage, processing and use in information sheets and consent forms.
- Consider how data collected from wearables can be safeguarded in case of loss or devices being stolen.
- type of data collected, processed, inform others, where sent? GDPR?
- What type of AI/Tech wearables are being used?
- Review and evaluate the terms and conditions of the systems to be used.
- Refining algorithms.
- Info sheets/consent form that clearly indicate usage and unknowns.
- Ethics form working on; need a new form? If AI/Tech is worn perhaps suggest new form with new elements to consider?

After

- Core data
- Data use
- Data storage
- Accountability of where data is going and is used.
- Data colonialism.

- Data transparency
- What is the consent for – do the participants and researchers understand as well.
- Data sustainability
- Undercover or incidental data collection.
- GDPR – and responsibility researchers have beyond old fashioned.
- Platform using to refine inputs through data.
- Data collection through wearables.
- What is done with this to shape other participants results.
- Thinking about the information sheet and what the design is about – and then making sure the participants are aware – the awareness of participants is very complex. Language really matters.
- Adequacy and merit of using systems. Can the tools do what is suggested.
- Data breaches, or third party selling of data. Do researchers have to keep apprised of these aspects.
- Translation work, how/what.
- Potential participant interactions – pre-existing data, adopted into high risk uses.
- Manipulation of participant data use for future participants
- Unintended consequences: a model being used for a use it's not appropriate for, a basic element formative assessment, prediction model – for summative purposes, never tested. Data isn't suitable either.
- The ways we disseminate – open science – open where possible. People need to make sure they are well-documented, and where the data is developed from.
- Data deletion.
- Retention policies of data can they be retained, do they need review?
- Where is data stored – i.e. in the cloud, what if AI access?

## Appendix VII

### Further/Future Standing Group Suggested Items to Explore

Following the recommendation of the IOE Ethics Task and Finish Group on AI and Tech Wearables to have a standing group on AI/Tech Wearables this is a list of suggested items for such group(s) to tackle. No particular order of importance. We are sure that there are many more items that could be engaged with that are detailed in the report, the funnelling exercise in Appendix VI and beyond – but we felt it would be useful to have a starting list, and this includes areas we discussed but did not have the scope to cover.

- Develop research ethics in emerging technologies, not just AI and/or Tech Wearables
- Defining the debate, what do we class as AI, Technology Wearables or emerging technologies.
- Guidelines for each stage of research, with possible ways of using AI/emerging technologies and then indicating the risks/consequences of using these technologies. Knight et al., (2024) reviewed (and developed) journal editorial policies for research ethics reporting in light of emerging technologies, and may provide one model for further policy development: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0309715>.
- A set of IOE ethics guidelines for wide use and circulation that respond to AI/emerging technologies and update accordingly.
- A risk assessment tool or checklist to help researchers evaluate potential concerns of using around AI and/or wearable technologies
- Create guidance on ethical considerations related to AI and Tech Wearables on the staff ethics webpage around informed consent, data privacy, algorithmic bias, surveillance risks, and participant autonomy.
- Monitoring and giving scope to emerging technologies, including definitions of AI – it's become apparent how we define AI has significant implications for how policy is operationalised, because it can deem things in/out of scope potentially of a higher level of regulation (or tighter guidance)
- Broadening the consideration of Ethics in AI/Tech wearables/emerging technologies further – how we engage with these elements ethically in education and social practice as well as other areas of UCL Institute of Education.

As the standing groups are developed it would be useful to ask the members of this Task and Finish Group if they could be/would like to be involved as a very high range of significant expertise has now been developed, and it would be useful to draw on this expertise, experience and engagement as developed for this report.



