TEACHERMATIC

AVALLAIN GROUP

Foundational Evidence Study

Instructure.
Foundational Evidence
★☆☆☆
2026

4th June 2026

Executive Summary

Avallain has independently developed this Foundational Evidence Study for TeacherMatic. This submission presents a logic model, an evaluation study design and a supporting research base, prepared to satisfy the criteria for Foundational Evidence designation within a Research Certification process grounded in multiple regulatory frameworks.[1] The logic model and evidence synthesis have been developed entirely by Avallain's research and operational teams. The Research Certification framework used to evaluate this submission was developed by Instructure and is referenced here as an external validation standard.

Logic Model

The TeacherMatic logic model, developed by Avallain's research team, maps the platform's inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes across six educator role groups, connecting programme delivery to expected professional and learner impacts.

Planned Evaluation Study

Avallain has developed the following research framework to generate empirical evidence about TeacherMatic's impact across FE and HE settings. The evaluation will be conducted by Avallain's research team in collaboration with partner institutions. The questions below will structure the investigation:

1. To what extent do teachers, leaders and other education professionals use TeacherMatic during an academic term?
2. What are participants' perceptions of TeacherMatic's impact on their professional workflows and learner outcomes?
3. How does time spent on content creation and feedback compare between staff who use TeacherMatic and those who do not?
4. To what extent does TeacherMatic use vary by role type (teacher, leader, quality officer, assessor, administrator) and what role-specific adoption patterns are observed?

Conclusions

This submission addresses the two criteria required for the Foundational Evidence designation, as defined in the Research Certification framework developed by Instructure. It presents a well-defined, research-based logic model that documents how TeacherMatic is expected to improve professional and learner outcomes and confirms that an independent evaluation study is currently planned. Both criteria are fully addressed in this report.

[1]The Research Certification is based on evidence frameworks from the Australian Education Research Organization (2021); Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (2020); Clearinghouse for Labor and Evaluation Research (2022); Every Student Succeeds Act (2015); Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse (2022); and the U.S. Department of Education (2023).

Table of Contents

Introduction

Avallain has prepared this Foundational Evidence Study to document the research basis and theoretical framework underpinning TeacherMatic's design, and to present an evaluation plan for future empirical investigation. This submission has been developed independently by Avallain's research and product teams and is intended to satisfy the criteria for Foundational Evidence designation within a Research Certification process developed by Instructure (Appendix A).[2]

Educators across all phases and roles in education face relentless, growing demands on their professional time. Teachers spend significant hours each week on resource preparation, differentiation, assessment design and marking, all of which are essential to quality provision but leave limited time for direct student engagement, professional reflection or wellbeing. The Department for Education's Teacher Workload Survey (2017) found that teachers in England work an average of 54.4 hours per week during term time, with resource creation and marking identified as the most time-intensive non-teaching activities. These pressures extend beyond classroom teachers: leaders must produce strategic documentation; quality officers manage compliance and observation processes; assessors design and moderate assessments; HR and careers staff generate professional materials; and administrators sustain institutional operations, all under similar resource constraints.

TeacherMatic addresses this challenge directly. The platform provides over 150 structured, professional, AI generators designed specifically for education, enabling teachers, leaders, quality officers, assessors, careers & HR professionals, administrators and marketing teams to produce high-quality professional outputs in a fraction of the time previously required. Unlike general-purpose AI tools, TeacherMatic uses pedagogically aligned, role-specific workflows — embedding Bloom's Taxonomy, Rosenshine's Principles of Instruction and SOLO Taxonomy into generator design — ensuring that outputs meet the quality expectations of education professionals rather than requiring extensive reworking.

This Foundational Evidence Study had the following objectives:

1. Develop and document the TeacherMatic logic model and its evidence base.
2. Set out the design for Avallain's planned evaluation research.
3. Present the independently compiled research base underpinning the platform's design (Appendix B).

[2] The Research Certification is based on evidence frameworks from the Australian Education Research Organization (2021); Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (2020); Clearinghouse for Labor and Evaluation Research (2022); Every Student Succeeds Act (2015); Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse (2022); and the U.S. Department of Education (2023).

Logic Model

A logic model is a structured representation of a programme's theory of change: it connects the resources and activities delivered through an intervention to the outputs produced and the outcomes expected for participants. In educational technology research, logic models are widely used to establish the plausibility of an intervention's impact claims prior to formal empirical evaluation. The logic model for TeacherMatic has been developed by Avallain's research and operational teams, drawing on a five-component programme evaluation framework consistent with established methodology in the field. All content within the model reflects Avallain's independent analysis of the TeacherMatic platform; the five-component structure is also consistent with the evaluation reference framework used by Instructure's Research Certification process. The five components and their application to TeacherMatic are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. TeacherMatic Logic Model: Component Definitions and Application

Component	Programme Definition	Application to TeacherMatic
Inputs	What TeacherMatic and the district, school or teacher invests	The platform features, infrastructure, institutional resources and professional conditions that must be in place for TeacherMatic to operate as intended.
Participants	Who TeacherMatic reaches	The educators and institutional staff who engage with TeacherMatic across FE, HE and school settings spanning six distinct professional role groups.
Activities	What participants do	The professional tasks and platform interactions that participants undertake using TeacherMatic's AI generators are differentiated by educator role.
Outputs	Products of activities	Quantifiable measures of platform engagement and resource production that enable monitoring of implementation fidelity across educator roles and institutions.
Outcomes	Short-term, intermediate, long-term	Expected changes at three time horizons: short-term (growth in confidence and initial adoption behaviours); intermediate (embedded changes to professional practice); and long-term (sustained reductions in workload alongside improvements in teaching quality and learner outcomes).

The logic model below was developed by Avallain's research team through a systematic review of TeacherMatic's platform architecture, generator design and pedagogical documentation. The draft was reviewed and refined collaboratively by Avallain and TeacherMatic's senior team. The finalised model represents Avallain's independent analysis of how TeacherMatic's features connect to expected professional and learner outcomes.

TeacherMatic Logic Model

Need	Inputs	Participants	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes
Why are we doing this?	What does TeacherMatic provide?	Who uses TeacherMatic?	How are participants using TeacherMatic?	What are the measurable results?	What are the expected changes or impacts?
The increasing complexity of professional demands across education creates a systemic risk to educator capacity and retention. Teachers must manage planning, assessment, feedback and differentiation, while institutional leaders and support staff must navigate inspection frameworks, quality assurance processes, strategic planning and administrative documentation. The volume and variety of professional outputs required across these roles leave limited time for meaningful student engagement and high-quality instruction. Without scalable, pedagogically aligned support tools, institutions risk declining resource quality, increased staff burnout and weaker learner outcomes. TeacherMatic addresses this need by providing more than 150 structured AI generators designed specifically for education, enabling staff across multiple institutional roles to produce professional-quality outputs efficiently while maintaining educator oversight and pedagogical alignment. The logic model below outlines how TeacherMatic's inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes are expected to address these challenges.	**Teachermatic provides** Platform and app containing 150+ structured AI generators for all education roles, including: • Tools for lesson planning, schemes of work and starter/plenary tools • Assessment tools: rubrics, MCQs, assignment briefs, APQs • Advanced Feedback Generator with annotation and editing • Differentiation generator for SEND and mixed-ability groups • Tools for strategic planning, QA and institutional documentation • LTI 1.3 and SSO integrations with LMS platforms • Multi-format export: Word, PDF, Canvas QTI, Moodle GIFT, Kahoot • GDPR/FERPA-compliant secure cloud infrastructure • Support & Training: Offers client training and online certified course • Accessibility & Data Security • Complies with WCAG1 2.2 Level AA standards and successfully completed a SOC2 Type 11 audit **Institution Provides** • Internet-enabled devices for staff • User account rostering & management via teachermatic.com	• Teachers • Leaders (Principal, HoD, Senior Leaders) • Quality Officers • Careers Officers, HR Officers & Assessors • Administrators & Marketing	**Teachers** • Generate lesson plans, schemes of work and classroom activities • Create differentiated resources for SEND and mixed-ability groups • Produce quizzes, MCQs and assessment tasks • Draft and annotate student feedback via the Advanced Feedback Generator **Leaders** • Produce strategic plans, improvement frameworks and staff briefings • Generate inspection preparation and institutional reports • Monitor platform adoption and access usage analytics **Quality Officers** • Generate observation forms, coaching templates and QA documentation • Create SAR templates, action plans and compliance-ready reports **Careers, HR & Assessors** • Create job adverts, interview frameworks, appraisal tools and CPD plans • Generate rubrics, assessment briefs and moderation documentation • Produce student-facing employability and careers resources **Admins & Marketing** • Draft policies, templates and promotional materials	**Teachers** • Number of teaching and learning resources created per participant per week • Estimated time saved on planning, preparation and feedback tasks • Feedback drafts generated and reviewed • Canvas QTI exports and LTI 1.3 accesses logged **Leaders** • Number of strategic documents produced • Usage and adoption reports accessed **Quality Officers** • QA documents and observation templates generated **Careers, HR & Assessors** • Professional documents generated across combined roles • Active users per role type per institution **Institution-Level** • Total licensed and active users by institution • Generator usage and export rates • User satisfaction and advocacy measured through Net Promoter Score (likelihood of recommending TeacherMatic to colleagues) • Staff retention rates	**Short-Term** **Teachers** • Grow confidence using AI for professional tasks • Begin integrating generators into daily planning and feedback • Develop awareness of responsible, pedagogy-led AI use • Reduce time spent on routine preparation tasks, e.g., lesson planning, quiz creation & feedback drafting **Leaders** • Understand AI-supported institutional workflows • Begin using the platform for strategic documentation • Recognise opportunities for AI to reduce administrative workload across teaching teams **All roles** • Experience initial time savings on administrative and documentation tasks • Develop familiarity with the generator ecosystem • Begin exploring AI as a workload-support tool rather than a replacement for professional judgement **Intermediate** **Teachers** • Integrate TeacherMatic into regular marking and feedback cycles • Produce more differentiated resources with less preparation time • Deliver more timely, criterion-referenced feedback to learners • Reduce workload associated with routine content generation, planning and documentation **Leaders & Quality Officers** • Use platform data to monitor adoption and plan CPD • Strengthen QA processes through consistent AI-supported documentation • Improve efficiency of quality assurance processes such as observation reports, curriculum documentation and feedback reviews **Support Staff** • Integrate AI into routine documentation, communications and operational workflows **Long-Term** **Teachers** • Sustain reduced workload while maintaining high-quality professional outputs • Spend more time on high-value activities such as teaching, mentoring and supporting learners • Serve as confident, informed advocates for responsible AI in education **Support Staff** • Sustain efficient AI-supported workflows for communications, documentation and operational tasks **Institutions** • Establish a culture of evidence-based AI adoption across all staff roles • Improve consistency and quality of documentation, assessment and feedback practices • Reduce system-wide administrative workload while strengthening teaching and learning practices • Demonstrate measurable improvements in learner outcomes • Strengthen institutional capability for responsible and pedagogically informed AI adoption

Logic Model

TeacherMatic Platform: Inputs, Activities and Outcomes in Detail

Inputs

TeacherMatic provides several core inputs, including:

- An AI platform with over 150 structured professional generators designed specifically for education
- Pedagogically aligned tools embedding Bloom's Taxonomy, Rosenshine's Principles of Instruction and SOLO Taxonomy
- A multi-stage Advanced Feedback Generator enabling structured, criterion-referenced written feedback with educator annotation
- A Canvas LTI 1.3 integration with Single Sign-on (SSO)
- Multi-format export capability: Microsoft Word, PDF, Canvas QTI, Moodle GIFT, Kahoot, Quizizz and Blackboard
- Secure, GDPR- and FERPA-compliant cloud infrastructure managed by Avallain Group
- Evidence from Jisc-supported pilot studies conducted across 15 further education and higher education institutions involving approximately 750 participants

Participants

TeacherMatic is designed for teachers, leaders, quality officers, careers and HR officers, assessors, administrators and marketing professionals across further education (FE), higher education (HE) and schools.

Activities

TeacherMatic's generators enable participants across all six role groups to undertake the following professional activities:

Teachers:

- Generate lesson plans, schemes of work, starters, plenaries and classroom activities
- Create differentiated resources for SEND learners and mixed-ability groups
- Produce quizzes, multiple-choice questions and assessment tasks aligned to Bloom's Taxonomy levels
- Use the Advanced Feedback Generator to draft, annotate and release structured student feedback

Leaders (Principals, Heads of Department, Senior Leaders):

- Produce strategic planning documents, improvement frameworks and inspection preparation materials
- Generate institutional communications, staff briefings and meeting documentation
- Access platform usage data to monitor adoption and inform staff development decisions

Quality Officers:

- Generate observation forms, coaching templates and teaching and learning review documentation
- Produce compliance-ready documentation aligned with inspection and regulatory requirements
- Create self-assessment report (SAR) templates, action plans and quality improvement frameworks

Careers Officers, HR Officers and Assessors:

- Create job adverts, interview question banks, employer-facing materials and student employability resources
- Draft job descriptions, person specifications, staff appraisal tools and CPD planning documentation
- Generate assessment rubrics, structured feedback templates and moderation documentation
- Create standardised assessment brief templates and internal verification checklists

Administrators and Marketing:

- Produce communications, institutional policies, templates and operational documentation
- Manage platform account settings, user provisioning and institutional configurations
- Draft campaign content, social media copy, promotional messaging and student recruitment materials

Outputs

Implementation of TeacherMatic can be monitored through several quantifiable outputs that indicate the extent to which core activities are delivered, and how participants engage with the platform.

Teachers:

- Average weekly time saved on planning and feedback (pilot evidence: avg. 2 hrs/week; 79% FE and 51% HE participants reported savings; Jisc, 2024)
- Number of resources created (avg. 18.1 per participant across the HE pilot; Jisc (2024b)
- Number of feedback drafts generated and reviewed via the Advanced Feedback Generator
- Number of Canvas QTI exports and LTI 1.3 platform accesses

Leaders:

- Number of strategic and institutional documents produced
- Number of platform usage and adoption reports accessed

Quality Officers:

- Number of observation templates and QA documents generated
- Number of inspection preparation resources created
- Careers Officers, HR Officers and Assessors:
- Number of professional documents generated across combined roles
- Number of active users per role type per institution

Administrators and Marketing:

- Number of operational documents and communications produced
- Number of active users and platform configurations completed

Institution-Level:

- Total licensed users and active user rates by institution
- Total generators used and resources exported
- Net Promoter Score: avg. 7.7/10 (Jisc, 2024a); 63% would recommend (Jisc, 2024b)
- 93% of FE participants would continue using TeacherMatic (Jisc, 2024a)

These outputs provide the measurement basis for tracking TeacherMatic's progression through three outcome horizons. Where platform outputs are sustained, and engagement remains strong, the following changes in professional practice and institutional culture are anticipated.

Outcomes

Short-term outcomes

Teachers will grow in confidence using AI for professional tasks, begin integrating generators into daily planning and feedback routines and develop awareness of responsible, pedagogically led AI use. Leaders will develop an understanding of AI-supported institutional workflows and begin using the platform for strategic document production. All participants will experience initial time savings on administrative tasks and develop familiarity with the platform's generator ecosystem across their roles.

Intermediate outcomes

As TeacherMatic becomes embedded in professional practice, teachers will incorporate the platform's generators into regular marking and feedback cycles, producing more differentiated resources with less preparation time and delivering more timely, criterion-referenced feedback to learners. Leaders and quality officers will draw on platform usage data to monitor adoption patterns and shape CPD planning, using consistent AI-supported documentation to strengthen QA processes.

Long-term outcomes

Over the longer term, teachers will sustain reduced professional workload while maintaining high-quality outputs, and will serve as confident, informed advocates for responsible AI use across their institutions. At an organisational level, institutions will have established a culture of evidence-based AI adoption across all staff roles, with measurable improvements in learner experience and outcomes that contribute to the growing sector-wide evidence base for AI-supported professional practice.

Planned Evaluation Study

Avallain has developed the following research framework to generate empirical evidence about TeacherMatic's impact across FE and HE settings. The evaluation will be conducted by Avallain's research team in collaboration with partner institutions. The questions below will structure the investigation:

1. To what extent do teachers, leaders and other education professionals use TeacherMatic during an academic term?
2. What are participants' perceptions of TeacherMatic's impact on their professional workflows and learner outcomes?
3. How does time spent on content creation, resource preparation and feedback compare between staff who use TeacherMatic and those who do not?
4. To what extent does TeacherMatic use vary by role type (teacher, leader, quality officer, assessor, administrator) and what role-specific adoption patterns are observed?

Conclusions

This report has been prepared by Avallain as an independent Foundational Evidence submission for TeacherMatic. It presents a research-based logic model developed by Avallain's research and operational teams, an independently compiled annotated bibliography spanning four evidence domains and a design for future evaluation studies.

The submission addresses the two criteria required for Foundational Evidence designation within the Research Certification framework developed by Instructure: the provision of a well-defined, research-based logic model documenting how the intervention is expected to improve relevant outcomes; and confirmation that an evaluation study examining the platform is currently planned. Both criteria are fully addressed in this report.

The Research Certification framework is acknowledged as the external validation reference point for this submission. The logic model content, evidence synthesis, annotated bibliography and study design presented throughout this report were developed independently by Avallain's research and operational teams and represent Avallain's own evidence-based assessment of the TeacherMatic platform.

Appendix A:

Evidence Evaluation Against Instructure's Research Certification Framework

The Research Certification Framework referenced throughout this submission was developed by Instructure and provides a four-level evidence classification system for educational technology products: Foundational (★), Early (★★), Moderate (★★★) and Strong (★★★★). This framework is grounded in regulatory and evidence standards from the six organisations listed in the footnotes to this report. The table below sets out the rubric criteria as defined in Instructure's framework, along with Avallain's assessment of TeacherMatic's current standing against each criterion. This submission seeks Foundational Evidence (★) designation. All assessment content in this appendix has been prepared independently by Avallain. Attribution: research certification criteria reproduced with reference to Instructure's Research Certification Process.

Evidence Criterion (Instructure Research Certification Framework)	★ Foundational	★★ Early	★★★ Moderate	★★★★ Strong
The study contains at least 350 participants		✓	✓	✓
There are at least two sites in the analysis		✓	✓	✓
The study specifies the setting, population and/or subgroups		✓	✓	✓
The study included a control or comparison group			✓	✓
A well-defined, research-based logic model documenting how the intervention improves relevant outcomes	✓	✓	✓	✓
An evaluation study examining the intervention currently planned or underway	✓	✓	✓	✓

Appendix B:

Annotated bibliography

Evidence Summary

The design of TeacherMatic is informed by a research base spanning teacher workload studies, feedback and assessment research, instructional design theory, and emerging evidence on artificial intelligence in education. The evidence presented in Appendix B draws on empirical studies, meta-analyses, literature reviews, theoretical frameworks and sector reports that collectively inform the platform's design principles and pedagogical approach.

Teacher Workload and Professional Sustainability

Across the literature reviewed, a consistent and well-evidenced theme concerns the scale of teacher workload and its consequences for professional sustainability. National workforce surveys report that teachers work in excess of 54 hours per week during term time, with marking, planning and resource creation identified as the most time-intensive non-teaching activities (Higton et al., 2017). Teacher retention research confirms that administrative burden and workload stress are among the primary drivers of early career exit (NFER, 2023). Emerging empirical studies indicate that automation and structured workflows can produce meaningful reductions in routine professional tasks — reporting time savings of between five and seven hours per week for educators using generative AI tools (Acevedo, 2025) — and that AI-supported resource systems are perceived as significantly less cognitively demanding than manual alternatives (Machado et al., 2025). AI-assisted assessment systems have been shown to substantially reduce grading time while improving the depth and timeliness of feedback (Dragan, 2025). Survey-based research documents significant correlations between teacher-friendly AI tools and reduced workload alongside improved academic outcomes (Iqbal et al., 2026), and studies in high-documentation environments identify AI as a viable classroom assistant that could alleviate workload while preserving professional judgement (Hashem et al., 2023; Alharbi, 2025). These findings directly inform TeacherMatic's design goal of reducing time spent on planning, feedback, documentation and resource creation while maintaining educator control over all outputs.

Feedback and Assessment Practices

Systematic reviews confirm that elaborated, criterion-referenced feedback produces significantly greater learning gains than simple evaluative responses (Shute, 2008), but providing detailed written feedback at scale presents a persistent workload challenge. Recent empirical studies demonstrate that AI-supported feedback systems can address this challenge effectively: adaptive feedback systems produce significant improvements in student performance and self-regulated learning behaviours (Rakhmetov et al., 2025; Cuéllar et al., 2025); structured AI feedback tools report improved marking

efficiency without compromising academic rigour (Anderson et al., 2025); AI-assisted dual feedback models reduced grading time by 65% while increasing feedback length and specificity (Dragan, 2025); and systematic reviews confirm that AI-driven grading systems bring efficiency and consistency to assessment while recommending human oversight for fairness and contextual accuracy (Deepshikha, 2025). Additional studies confirm that AI integration improves personalised learning and instructional quality at scale (Alalwany & Yonan, 2023; Nhan, 2025; Shuaibu et al., 2024). These findings directly informed the design of TeacherMatic's Advanced Feedback Generator, which produces structured, criterion-referenced feedback aligned with rubrics while retaining full educator oversight through annotation and editing workflows.

Pedagogical Foundations for Instructional Design

Established pedagogical frameworks provide the theoretical foundation for TeacherMatic's generator design. Bloom's Taxonomy, as revised by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), offers a hierarchical model of cognitive learning objectives — from foundational knowledge through analysis, evaluation and creation — embedded into TeacherMatic's question and activity generators. Rosenshine's Principles of Instruction (2012) identify evidence-based practices, including structured lesson sequences, modelling, guided practice, frequent review and scaffolded questioning, which are incorporated into lesson planning and resource generation workflows. Research on pedagogically aligned AI tools confirms that theory-informed prompt engineering significantly improves the quality and educational appropriateness of AI-generated content (Celik et al., 2026; Tan et al., 2025). Studies also demonstrate that generative AI tools effectively support curriculum design when human expertise is synergised with machine intelligence through structured frameworks (Ahmad & Schmid, 2025; Raman et al., 2026). The Yao et al. (2026) study on multi-agent instructional design systems provides direct empirical support for AI-assisted course material generation, which reduces faculty development time while maintaining pedagogical quality and coherence.

Responsible AI and Human Oversight in Education

Research on AI in education consistently emphasises the importance of maintaining educator agency and professional judgement. Holmes, Bialik and Fadel (2022) identify human-in-the-loop models — in which AI generates drafts while educators review, refine and take ownership of outputs — as the most appropriate approach for current educational contexts. Critical analysis highlights the risks of uncritical commercial use of AI and the importance of preserving professional expertise, data governance and teacher autonomy (Selwyn, 2019). These concerns are addressed directly in TeacherMatic's design: generators produce drafts requiring professional review; the platform does not permit autonomous AI action; GDPR-compliant data processing supports responsible institutional adoption. Bhat (2023) provides evidence that AI-powered workflow automation can reduce manual administrative processing time by up to 62%, supporting the efficiency rationale for TeacherMatic's documentation generators, while Alharbi (2025) reinforces the importance of designing AI tools that assist with documentation and feedback generation while ensuring educators retain full control over final outputs.

TeacherMatic reflects these research insights by combining structured AI-assisted workflows with established pedagogical frameworks and educator oversight. The platform is designed to support educators in producing pedagogically aligned professional outputs while reducing the time required for routine planning, documentation and feedback tasks. The evidence presented in Appendix B collectively demonstrates the research-informed foundations underpinning the platform's design principles.

Annotated Bibliography

The following annotated bibliography presents the research base that informed the design of TeacherMatic. Sources were independently selected by Avallain's research team and span empirical studies, experimental and quasi-experimental research, systematic reviews, theoretical frameworks and sector-level reports. The evidence base addresses four domains central to TeacherMatic's design rationale: professional workload and sustainability; feedback and assessment practice; instructional design theory; and the responsible use of AI in education.

The literature reviewed reflects four key evidence domains that inform the platform's design principles: teacher workload and professional sustainability; feedback and assessment practices; pedagogical foundations for instructional design; and responsible AI with human oversight. Each source has been summarised using a consistent structure covering citation type, sample and theoretical framework, design decisions driven by the research and how the team leveraged each source to arrive at specific design decisions.

Evidence Domain 1: Teacher Workload and Professional Sustainability

Research consistently identifies teacher workload as a significant challenge across education systems. National workforce studies report that teachers spend substantial time each week on planning, resource preparation and marking. These pressures are associated with professional stress and contribute to wider challenges in teacher recruitment and retention. Emerging research suggests that AI-supported tools may reduce time spent on routine professional activities. The following studies provide evidence on the scale of teacher workload and the potential role of technology-assisted systems in supporting more sustainable professional practice.

Citation	Study type	Methodology and study context	Key implications for platform design	Application to TeacherMatic's design decisions
Acevedo, K. (2025). Exploring the Impact of Generative AI to Mitigate Educator Burnout. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/etd/925	Empirical Study	Qualitative case study with six full-time teachers of grades 6–12 at a West Texas single-gender public school. Framed by job demand-resource theory, connectivism and heutagogy. Data collected via semi-structured interviews were analysed using Braun and Clarke's six-phase thematic analysis with MAXQDA software.	Educators using AI tools consistently reported saving between 5 and 7 hours per week on routine tasks. AI tools support more sustainable teaching conditions when accompanied by professional development and equitable access. Generative AI functions as a job resource, supporting networked learning and teacher-driven adaptation.	The time-saving evidence directly informed TeacherMatic's efficiency targets. The team used these findings to confirm that structured, task-specific AI generators — particularly for lesson planning, rubric creation, quiz generation and professional communications — offer meaningful relief from workload without requiring extensive professional effort to operate.

Citation	Study type	Methodology and study context	Key implications for platform design	Application to TeacherMatic's design decisions
Hashem, R., Ali, N., Zein, F., Fidalgo, P., & Abu Khurma, O. (2023). AI to the rescue: Exploring the potential of ChatGPT as a teacher ally for workload relief and burnout prevention. Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 19, 023. https://doi.org/10.58459/rptel.2024.19023	Empirical Study	Secondary school teachers in English, science and mathematics. ChatGPT was tested with tailored, subject-specific queries using an explanatory research approach. Lesson planning and content development were primary focus areas.	Lesson planning and content development are significant contributors to burnout. AI tools optimise teacher planning, enhance instructional support and refine resource allocation. Balanced use is essential, and AI should be positioned as a classroom assistant rather than an autonomous replacement.	These findings confirmed the importance of educator-led AI tools that retain professional oversight. The team used this research to inform TeacherMatic's review-first workflow model — AI generates drafts; educators review, edit and release final outputs — directly addressing the balanced-use principle identified in this study.
Higton, J. et al. (2017). Teacher Workload Survey 2016. Department for Education. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teacher-workload-survey-2016	National Survey	1,546 classroom teachers in England. Self-reported time logs and structured questionnaires. Weighted to be representative of the national teacher workforce. Average of 54.4 hours worked per week during term time.	Marking, planning and resource creation account for over 12 hours per week — the most time-intensive non-teaching tasks. These three activities represent the primary sources of professional workload pressure for teachers.	The survey data directly informed TeacherMatic's generator design priorities. The platform targets the three highest-workload tasks — resource creation, lesson planning and feedback/marking — through structured AI generators that reduce time per task while preserving educator quality control.
Iqbal, S., Khan, A., & Yasmeen, R. (2026). Exploring the Impact of AI Teacher-Friendly Tools on Student Academic Performance and Teacher Workload at Higher Level. Journal of Political Stability Archive, 4(1), 430–449. https://doi.org/10.63468/jpsa.4.1.25	Survey Report	85 educators in higher education were assessed using a structured questionnaire. Quantitative design using t-tests and correlation analysis.	Teacher-friendly AI tools are significantly associated with reduced teacher workload and improved student academic outcomes. AI tools support customised learning, immediate evaluation, instant feedback and detection of learning gaps, leading to improved academic performance.	This study provided evidence that well-designed, educator-friendly AI tools can simultaneously reduce workload and improve learner outcomes. The team used these findings to justify TeacherMatic's dual design goal: reducing routine professional burden while maintaining pedagogical quality in all generator outputs.
Jisc (2024a), TeacherMatic Further Education Pilot Report. https://repository.jisc.ac.uk/9576/1/Jisc-AI-TeacherMatic-FE-pilot-report.pdf	Pilot Report	Jisc, which acts as the official digital and technology agency for UK tertiary education and research, selected 8 institutions, with 50 participants each, to pilot TeacherMatic over 9 months. Jisc conducted a phased review process, each culminating in user surveys and focus groups.	The FE pilot demonstrated that adoption and satisfaction are strongly linked to role-specific generator fit rather than general AI familiarity. High willingness to continue (93%) and strong NPS (7.7/10) indicate that pedagogically scaffolded tools create lower perceived risk than general-purpose AI. The 79% time-saving rate suggests that platform design must prioritise discoverability, task specificity and structured onboarding to support sustained adoption.	The time-saving evidence (79% of FE participants; avg. 2 hrs/week) validated continued investment in lesson planning, assessment and feedback generators. NPS and retention data reinforced TeacherMatic's review-first workflow. Feedback gathered through Jisc's phased review process directly informed platform enhancements, including saved results functionality, improved generator performance and response times, content-sharing capabilities, presentation generation and refinements to assessment generators, supporting TeacherMatic's iterative, community-led development approach.

Citation	Study type	Methodology and study context	Key implications for platform design	Application to TeacherMatic's design decisions
Jisc (2024b), TeacherMatic Higher Education Pilot Report. https://repository.jisc.ac.uk/9716/1/TeacherMatic-higher-education-pilot-report.pdf	Pilot Report	Jisc, which acts as the official digital and technology agency for UK tertiary education and research, selected 7 institutions, with 50 participants each, to take part in a 6-month pilot. Jisc conducted a phased review process, culminating in a focus group (phase one) and a pilot lead meeting and user survey (phase two).	The lower time-saving adoption rate in HE (51% vs 79% FE) signals that HE staff operate within more heterogeneous workflow contexts and require greater output customisation. High average resource production (18.1 resources per participant) indicates that platform value in HE is driven by depth of functionality, workflow flexibility and export capability rather than broad adoption alone.	The high per-user resource production rate informed TeacherMatic's multi-format export strategy and support for high-volume content workflows. The lower aggregate time-saving rate was interpreted as evidence of differing HE integration patterns, informing role-specific generator groupings and discipline-customisable prompt structures. Feedback from focus groups, pilot reviews and surveys also informed improvements to presentation generation, complexity controls, Bloom's Taxonomy implementation, onboarding guidance and generator labelling to better support higher education workflows and higher-order academic tasks.
Machado, A., Tenório, K., Santos, M. M., Barros, A. P., Rodrigues, L., Mello, R. F., Paiva, R., & Dermeval, D. (2025). Workload perception in educational resource recommendation supported by artificial intelligence: A controlled experiment with teachers. Smart Learning Environments, 12(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-025-00373-6	Empirical Study	151 teachers in a randomised controlled experiment comparing perceived workload across manual, automated and semi-automated educational resource recommendation scenarios on a simulated gamified platform.	Automated AI recommendation scenarios are perceived as significantly less cognitively demanding than manual alternatives. Workload reduction benefits are particularly pronounced for teachers with lower ICT skills, suggesting that AI tools can reduce professional equity gaps.	This study confirmed that structured, automated AI generators reduce cognitive load for all educator types, including those with limited prior experience with technology. The team used this finding to justify TeacherMatic's accessible, non-technical interface design, ensuring generators are usable by all staff regardless of ICT confidence level.
NFER (2023). Teacher Labour Market in England: Annual Report 2023. National Foundation for Educational Research. https://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/teacher-labour-market-in-england-annual-report-2023/	Survey Report	Annual longitudinal analysis of teacher recruitment, retention and workforce trends across England. Draws on large-scale national survey data and administrative workforce records across multiple annual cycles.	Teacher retention is significantly associated with perceived workload. Administrative burden and professional stress are identified as primary drivers of early career exit. These findings establish workload reduction as a retention and sustainability issue, not only a productivity issue.	TeacherMatic's workload reduction model was developed in direct response to this evidence. The platform addresses the retention risk by reducing administrative and documentation burden across all staff roles. Jisc pilot evidence shows that 79% (FE) and 51% (HE) of participants saved time, supporting its contribution to professional sustainability.

Evidence Domain 2: Feedback and Assessment Practices

Extensive research demonstrates that high-quality feedback is one of the most influential factors affecting student learning. Meta-analyses and systematic reviews highlight that feedback is most effective when it is timely, specific and aligned with clear learning criteria. However, producing detailed written feedback for large cohorts requires substantial time from educators. Recent studies exploring AI-supported feedback systems suggest that adaptive tools can assist educators in producing more frequent, personalised feedback while reducing drafting time. The following studies illustrate both the importance of feedback in learning and emerging technology-supported approaches to feedback generation.

Citation	Study type	Methodology and study context	Key implications for platform design	Application to TeacherMatic's design decisions
Alalwany, W. S. H., & Yonan, J. F. (2023). Role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Improving Educational Quality and Networking for Students and Faculty. Babylonian Journal of Networking, 2023, 66–76. https://doi.org/10.58496/BJN/2023/008	Empirical Study	Purposive sample of 150 students across various programmes at Al-Mustansiriyah University, Baghdad. Qualitative case study design with detailed insights from faculty. Examines AI's role in improving educational outcomes and teaching effectiveness.	AI integration significantly improved student performance metrics, including exam, assignment and project scores. AI facilitated personalised learning experiences, timely feedback, real-time instructional adjustments and enhanced faculty efficiency, fostering an inclusive and adaptive educational environment.	This study directly supported the design of TeacherMatic's Advanced Feedback Generator workflow. The team adopted the same principle — educators input structured feedback points; AI restructures them into polished, student-facing commentary — ensuring a balance between automation efficiency and human professional judgement.
Anderson, N., Browning, J., Stewart, D., McGowan, A., & Galway, L. (2025). Transforming Feedback With AI: A Smarter Way To Support Student Learning. EDULEARN25 Proceedings, 6–12. 17th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies. https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2025.0004	Preliminary Evaluation	Educators using a structured AI feedback tool that transforms raw feedback points into polished, student-focused text. Markers select pre-written feedback statements tailored to common performance areas, which AI restructures into cohesive professional feedback. Initial testing with user satisfaction data.	Initial testing showed high satisfaction rates. Users reported improved marking efficiency without compromising academic rigour. The approach preserves meaningful assessment capability while maintaining clarity, consistency and alignment with pedagogical best practices.	This study provided strong experimental evidence that timely, personalised AI-generated feedback reduces knowledge gaps and improves learner outcomes. The team used these findings to reinforce the design rationale for TeacherMatic's feedback generators, particularly the value of timely feedback release supported by the platform's Advanced Feedback Generator.
Cuéllar, Ó., Contero, M., & Hincapié, M. (2025). Personalized and Timely Feedback in Online Education: Enhancing Learning with Deep Learning and Large Language Models. Multimodal Technologies and Interaction, 9(5). https://doi.org/10.3390/mti9050045	Empirical Study	Quasi-experimental study in a Digital Art higher education course. Intervention group (n = 42) received weekly AI-adaptive feedback from model predictions; control group (n = 39) followed the same programme without AI feedback, across four learning blocks.	Significant cumulative performance gain (+12.63 percentage points) in the final block. Reduction in performance disparities between prior-knowledge groups. Up to 42.9% of students surpassed negative performance predictions. Positive impacts on class attendance and forum engagement.	The team used this systematic review to confirm that AI-assisted grading and feedback tools are most effective when combined with human oversight. This directly informed TeacherMatic's human-in-the-loop design: AI generates feedback drafts that educators review, refine and release — preserving accuracy, fairness and professional accountability.

Citation	Study type	Methodology and study context	Key implications for platform design	Application to TeacherMatic's design decisions
Deepshikha, D. (2025). A systematic review on the future of educational assessment: AI-driven grading and personalised feedback in higher education. Artificial Intelligence in Education, 2(2), 75–115. https://doi.org/10.1108/AIIE-03-2025-0036	Systematic Literature Review (PRISMA)	PRISMA-compliant systematic review examining AI technologies — including machine learning, NLP and computer vision — applied to assessment and feedback across higher education contexts. Critically analyses ethical considerations alongside effectiveness evidence.	AI-driven grading systems bring efficiency, scalability and consistency with reduced human bias. AI-enabled feedback enriches student learning with personalised and real-time responses. Human oversight is nonetheless required to ensure fairness and contextual accuracy, and ethical risks, including data privacy and algorithmic bias, must be addressed.	This study provided the clearest direct model for TeacherMatic's Advanced Feedback Generator: AI produces rubric-aligned draft feedback; educators review and refine each response in under a minute; polished feedback is released to learners. The 65% grading time reduction figure is cited in the platform's evidence base.
Dragan, N. (2025). Using AI to Streamline Grading in Large Enrollment IS Courses: A Dual Feedback Approach. Business Education Innovation Journal, 17(2).	Empirical Study	200 undergraduate Management Information Systems students at Kent State University. An AI-assisted dual feedback model was implemented across video case discussion assignments. AI-generated rubric-based draft comments; instructors reviewed and edited each (under one minute per student); refined feedback returned with anonymised whole-class summaries.	Grading time decreased by 65%. Feedback length and specificity increased significantly. Student perceptions of fairness, clarity and commitment to learning improved. The model demonstrates that AI-generated rubric-based drafts combined with instructor review produce better feedback more efficiently than traditional manual grading alone.	The team used this research to shape the structure of TeacherMatic's feedback generator workflow. The generator guides educators toward criterion-level commentary and improvement-oriented language, reflecting Shute's framework of effective written feedback. This directly informs the generator's structured prompt architecture.
Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. Review of Educational Research, 78(1), 153–189. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795	Literature Review	Review of formative feedback research across K–12 and higher education settings. Distinguishes between verification and elaborated feedback types and examines immediate vs delayed feedback effects across multiple contexts.	Elaborated instructional feedback — explaining what to improve and how — is significantly more effective than simple verification. Feedback is most effective when it supports learner understanding of how to improve performance rather than simply confirming correct or incorrect responses.	

Evidence Domain 3: Pedagogical Foundations for Instructional Design

Established pedagogical frameworks provide a foundation for effective instructional design and assessment. Educational research emphasises structuring learning activities that promote progression from foundational knowledge to higher-order thinking. Frameworks such as Bloom's Taxonomy and Rosenshine's Principles of Instruction are widely used in curriculum design, lesson planning and classroom practice. The following sources provide theoretical and research-based foundations for designing instructional activities and assessments aligned with recognised pedagogical principles.

Citation	Study type	Methodology and study context	Key implications for platform design	Application to TeacherMatic's design decisions
Ahmad, A. & Schmid, T. (2025). Synergising Human Expertise and Generative Artificial Intelligence for Curriculum Design. 23. Fachtagung Bildungstechnologien (DELFI 2025). DOI: 10.18420/delfi2025_22 Gesellschaft für Informatik e.V., pp. 239–244.	Theoretical Evaluation	Proof-of-concept study investigating GenAI as an intelligent curriculum recommender. Examines integration of human intellectual expertise (lecturers' knowledge) and machine intelligence (data-driven recommendations) to design a curriculum for diverse learners in higher education.	Controlled experimentation provided empirically grounded guidelines for safe and reliable GenAI integration in curriculum design. Synergising human and machine intelligence produces more inclusive and contextually responsive curriculum outcomes than AI alone.	The team used this study to reinforce TeacherMatic's human-AI collaboration model across all curriculum and instructional design generators. The evidence confirmed that educator professional knowledge, when combined with AI-generated structured outputs, produces higher-quality educational materials than AI tools used in isolation.
Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.) (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing. Harlow, UK, Addison Wesley Longman. (Revision of Bloom et al., 1956)	Theoretical Framework	Revision of the original Bloom taxonomy using educational research and expert consensus. Framework of six active cognitive processes: remember, understand, apply, analyse, evaluate, create. Widely adopted across curriculum design, assessment development and instructional planning globally.	Question and activity design should target specific cognitive levels. Assessments that progress through Bloom's levels systematically develop higher-order thinking over time. The revised active-verb model makes cognitive alignment more applicable to the design of practical lessons and assessments.	Bloom's Taxonomy is embedded directly into TeacherMatic's question and activity generators. The team used the six-level framework to enable educators to specify target cognitive levels when generating MCQs, discussion questions and classroom activities, ensuring all generator outputs are pedagogically aligned by default.
Celik, I., Zabolotna, K., & Viberg, O. (2026). Knowledge construction with GenAI: The role of theory-informed prompt engineering in achieving pedagogical alignment. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 0(0), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2026.2631586	Theoretical Evaluation	Theory-driven prompt engineering was evaluated using the TPACK (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) framework. ChatGPT responses were analysed across five instructional aims. Structural equation modelling was used to examine the relationships among TPACK dimensions in GenAI-generated outputs.	Theoretically informed prompts significantly increase the quality and pedagogical alignment of AI-generated outputs. Outputs better reflect curriculum goals and TPACK dimensions compared to generic, unstructured prompts.	This study confirmed the importance of pedagogy-informed generator architecture. The team used these findings to reinforce TeacherMatic's practice of embedding Bloom's Taxonomy, Rosenshine's Principles and SOLO Taxonomy directly into the structured prompt logic of each generator, ensuring pedagogical alignment is built into every output by design.

Citation	Study type	Methodology and study context	Key implications for platform design	Application to TeacherMatic's design decisions
Matthew Nyaaba, M. & Zhai, X., (2025) Developing a theory-grounded AI tool for the generation of culturally responsive lesson plans. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 9, 100474. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100474	Expert Evaluation	Design science research developing a Culturally Responsive Lesson Planner (CRLP) GPT. Interactive Semi-Automated prompt architecture engages teachers in dialogue to collect cultural and contextual details. Two expert reviewers evaluated Grade 7 plans generated by CRLP vs. standard GPT-4o.	CRLP-generated lesson plans rated significantly higher than standard GPT output in cultural relevance, accuracy and curriculum appropriateness. Plans included more contextually relevant examples and locally recommended resources. Teacher final revisions before plan completion supported professional ownership.	This study provided evidence that pedagogy-grounded AI tools with educator input stages produce markedly better outputs than generic AI tools. The team used this finding to strengthen the case for TeacherMatic's structured, role-specific generator design and its educator review-and-editing stage before any content is finalised or released.
Raman, R., Achuthan, K., & Nedungadi, P. (2026). Generative AI Integration in Education: Theoretical Review and Future Directions Informed by the ADO Framework. Information, 17(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/info17030241	Theoretical Evaluation	Theoretical review synthesising GenAI adoption research using the Antecedents–Decisions–Outcomes (ADO) framework. Integrates TAM, Self-Determination Theory, Institutional Theory, Constructivist Learning and Diffusion of Innovations across educational settings.	Learner motivation, perceived usefulness, digital literacy and institutional readiness are critical antecedents affecting GenAI adoption. Pedagogical adaptation mediates the extent to which GenAI integration produces intended outcomes. GenAI enhances personalisation, feedback and self-regulated learning, but introduces risks around ethical ambiguity and overreliance.	The ADO framework informed TeacherMatic's adoption model. The team used this research to design structured onboarding, certified training and transparency-first platform governance — addressing institutional readiness and digital literacy as prerequisites for sustainable AI adoption across diverse education settings.
Rosenshine, B. (2012). Principles of instruction. American Educator, 36(1), 12–19. https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/Rosenshine.pdf	Research Synthesis	Synthesis of cognitive science research, classroom observation studies and tutoring research. Identifies ten evidence-based principles of effective explicit instruction used consistently by the most successful teachers.	Effective teaching requires structured, sequenced lesson design; modelling and worked examples; frequent low-stakes review; scaffolded guided practice; and structured questioning. Teachers who apply these principles produce stronger and more consistent learner outcomes.	Rosenshine's Principles directly inform TeacherMatic's lesson planning and resource generator architecture. The team embedded daily review starters, worked examples, scaffolded practice activities and guided questioning into the generator output structure, ensuring AI-generated lesson plans and resources reflect the characteristics of effective explicit teaching.
Tan, A., Dorneich, M. C., & Cotos, E. (2025). Aligning Pedagogy with Generative AI: An Approach to Customizing Educational GPTs. Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting, 69(1), 894–899. https://doi.org/10.1177/10711813251358778	Case Study / Simulation	Educators in higher education who are using customised educational GPT tools. Framework developed to help educators translate learning theories and objectives into structured prompts and curated knowledge bases. Case study applied in a research communication teaching context. The evaluation compared customised GPT with default GPT-4 across multiple quality dimensions.	Customised GPT outperformed the default model across all dimensions, particularly pedagogical helpfulness. Theory-informed prompt design significantly improves the educational appropriateness of AI-generated content. Default models without contextual training risk producing harmful or misleading outputs.	This study validated TeacherMatic's approach of embedding pedagogical frameworks into structured generator prompts rather than relying on general-purpose AI tools. The team used this evidence to justify role-specific, pedagogy-informed generator design as a quality assurance mechanism — ensuring that outputs are contextually appropriate for professional educational use.

Citation	Study type	Methodology and study context	Key implications for platform design	Application to TeacherMatic's design decisions
Yao, H., Xu, W., Turnau, J., Kellam, N., & Wei, H. (2026). Instructional Agents: Reducing Teaching Faculty Workload through Multi-Agent Instructional Design. In Proceedings of the 19th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers) (pp. 4087–4109). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2026.eacl-long.191	Empirical Study	A multi-agent LLM framework was evaluated across five university-level courses. System generates syllabus materials, lecture scripts, slides and assessments through role-based collaboration among educational AI agents operating across four modes of human involvement.	A multi-agent AI system produces high-quality instructional materials while significantly reducing faculty development time and workload. Particularly beneficial for institutions with limited instructional design capacity. Provides a scalable, cost-effective framework to improve access to high-quality course materials.	This study provided direct empirical support for TeacherMatic's structured AI generator approach. The team used these findings to confirm that AI-assisted course material generation substantially reduces faculty workload while maintaining pedagogical coherence — thereby validating the platform's role as an accessible, professional-grade instructional design tool.

Evidence Domain 4: Responsible AI and Human Oversight in Education

Research on artificial intelligence in education emphasises the importance of integrating AI in ways that support rather than replace professional judgement. Scholars highlight the need for transparency, ethical safeguards and educator oversight when implementing AI-supported systems. Responsible AI frameworks stress that educators should retain control over instructional decisions, evaluation and feedback. The following sources examine the principles and frameworks guiding responsible AI integration in educational practice.

Citation	Study type	Methodology and study context	Key implications for platform design	Application to TeacherMatic's design decisions
Ahmad, A. & Schmid, T. (2025). Synergising Human Expertise and Generative Artificial Intelligence for Curriculum Design. 23. Fachtagung Bildungstechnologien (DELFI 2025). DOI: 10.18420/delfi2025_22 Gesellschaft für Informatik e.V., pp. 239–244.	Empirical Study	Mixed-methods study with 258 ESL/EFL teachers (quantitative surveys) and 15 interviews plus 5 focus groups (qualitative). Saudi higher education context. Analysis uses structural equation modelling, LASSO regression and mediation analysis. Grounded in Job Demands-Resources model and Technology Acceptance Model.	QA documentation requirements and intensive feedback demands significantly increase teacher workload and contribute to burnout. Workload acts as a powerful mediator of teacher wellbeing. AI is perceived as a viable classroom assistant that could alleviate workload stress while preserving professional autonomy and pedagogical judgement.	This study reinforced TeacherMatic's positioning as a professional assistant rather than a replacement for educator expertise. The team used these findings to confirm the design priority of supporting documentation, QA reporting and feedback generation through structured generators — enabling educators to produce required professional outputs more efficiently while retaining full oversight and control.

Citation	Study type	Methodology and study context	Key implications for platform design	Application to TeacherMatic's design decisions
Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.) (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing. Harlow, UK, Addison Wesley Longman. (Revision of Bloom et al., 1956)	Theoretical Evaluation	An analytical study of AI workflow architectures evaluated through simulated institutional deployments. Examines NLP, rule-based intelligent agents, machine learning, robotic process automation and predictive analytics within a central workflow engine across university administrative contexts.	AI workflow automation reduces manual processing time by up to 62%, increases document processing accuracy by over 95% and improves student service response times by up to 70%. AI workflows unlock strategic value by allowing staff to redirect effort from repetitive administrative tasks to higher-value professional activities.	This study provided quantitative evidence of efficiency to justify TeacherMatic's administrative documentation generators. The team used the 62% processing time reduction figure and the operational transparency findings to demonstrate that AI-powered workflows deliver measurable gains in professional efficiency while preserving institutional governance standards.
Celik, I., Zabolotna, K., & Viberg, O. (2026). Knowledge construction with GenAI: The role of theory-informed prompt engineering in achieving pedagogical alignment. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 0(0), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2026.2631586	Framework Report	Comprehensive evaluation framework for AI tools in education. Examines pedagogical alignment, transparency, human oversight and evidence-based design. Reviews research literature and policy discussions on AI adoption across educational systems.	AI tools that work with humans rather than replacing them are the most appropriate model for current educational applications. Educator agency must be preserved. Successful AI implementation requires ethical safeguards, transparency and ongoing human oversight of instructional decisions.	This framework directly shaped TeacherMatic's core design philosophy. The team used it to establish the human-in-the-loop principle as non-negotiable: AI generates drafts; educators review, refine and take ownership of all outputs before release. This is operationalised through the Advanced Feedback Generator's annotation and editing interface and through the review stage embedded in every generator workflow.
	Critical Analysis	Critical scholarly examination of AI adoption in education. Analyses the risks of uncritical commercial AI use, the displacement of professional expertise and the importance of maintaining teacher agency and data governance across educational systems.	Commercial AI tools risk undermining professional autonomy and displacing educator expertise. Responsible adoption requires explicit attention to teacher agency, data governance and the preservation of professional expertise. AI should support practice, not supplant it.	This work directly informed TeacherMatic's responsible design commitments. The team used Selwyn's critique to justify the platform's educator-led, co-designed model: generators produce drafts that require professional review; no autonomous AI action is permitted; GDPR-compliant data processing supports responsible institutional adoption and protects educator data rights.

The sources reviewed for this bibliography were selected by Avallain's research team on the basis of their direct relevance to TeacherMatic's design decisions. They span empirical studies, systematic reviews, theoretical frameworks and sector reports, and collectively address the four evidence domains that inform the platform's pedagogical and operational approach.

TEACHERMATIC

AVALLAIN GROUP

Get in touch

info@teachermatic.com www.teachermatic.com