

A Cross-Sectional Study:

Student Outcomes and SchoolAI Usage



Abstract

This study examines whether more frequent use of the SchoolAI platform is associated with improvements in student outcomes. Using cross-sectional survey data from 1,070 students across 36 schools, we compared outcomes between students who used SchoolAI rarely or had never used it (n=524) and those who used it monthly or more often (n=546) across five domains: Student Experience, Whole Learner, Cognitive Skills, Academics, and Future-ready Skills. Regression models controlling for grade band showed that more frequent SchoolAI use significantly predicted higher scores across all five outcomes ($p < .001$), with medium-to-large effect sizes ($d = 0.58$ to 0.65). Students using SchoolAI monthly or more often reported double-digit gains in agreement on every individual item, with the largest gaps appearing on excitement about learning, willingness to ask questions, and engagement with school. Findings provide promising evidence that the benefits of SchoolAI deepen with regular student use across multiple dimensions of academic, cognitive, and socio-emotional outcomes.

Introduction

The promise of AI in K-12 education is not simply that it can deliver content. It is that it can help realize the kind of classroom long held up as the ideal but rarely achieved at scale. Every student gets individualized support. Teachers facilitate learning rather than serve as the sole source of information. Instruction adapts to real-time data on what students need. Every learner has an equitable, creative, and brave space to ask questions, take risks, and follow their own curiosities. Early adoption often centers on visible products. The deeper question is whether sustained student use changes how students experience school, think about their own learning, and see themselves as capable of shaping their academic and future paths.

SchoolAI is an AI-powered educational platform designed specifically for K-12 classrooms. Unlike general-purpose AI tools, SchoolAI provides students with structured, teacher-designed learning experiences (“Spaces”) and an embedded AI assistant that supports inquiry, drafting, problem-solving, and reflection within a safe, age-appropriate environment. These design choices are grounded in SchoolAI’s **theory of change**, which posits that when students have consistent access to individualized, student-centered, and data-informed learning experiences, they develop the academic, cognitive, and socio-emotional capacities that prepare them to thrive in school and beyond.



This study investigates whether more frequent engagement with SchoolAI is associated with improved student outcomes by comparing students who use SchoolAI rarely to those who use it monthly or more often. Using cross-sectional survey data, we examine five outcome domains:

- ↘ **Student Experience:** To what extent is more frequent SchoolAI use associated with stronger engagement, belonging, and a sense that students' ideas and voices matter at school?
- ↘ **Whole Learner:** To what extent is more frequent SchoolAI use associated with stronger confidence, agency, self-management, reflection, and creative expression?
- ↘ **Cognitive Skills:** To what extent is more frequent SchoolAI use associated with stronger critical thinking, problem-solving, and reasoned judgment?
- ↘ **Academics:** To what extent is more frequent SchoolAI use associated with greater understanding of classwork and confidence that grades reflect true understanding?
- ↘ **Future-ready Skills:** To what extent is more frequent SchoolAI use associated with stronger growth mindset, goal-setting, digital literacy, and confidence in future success?

Methods

Survey Design and Recruitment

A cross-sectional survey was administered in April 2026 to students in classrooms whose teachers were active SchoolAI users. Recruitment was conducted through a follow-up outreach to the 180 teachers who had completed the earlier SchoolAI teacher survey and had indicated interest in administering a companion student survey. Of those teachers, 36 administered the survey to their students, yielding the schools represented in this analysis. The survey assessed student demographics, SchoolAI usage patterns, and student outcomes across academic, cognitive, and socio-emotional domains. The analytic sample consists of 1,070 students drawn from 36 schools across the United States. Students were classified into two groups based on SchoolAI use: rarely or never used (n=524) and monthly or more often (n=546).

Sample Characteristics

The analytic sample of 1,070 students was drawn from 36 schools and spanned grades 3 through 12, with 35.6% in elementary (grades 3–5), 25.0% in middle (grades 6–8), and 39.4% in high school (grades 9–12). Respondents represented all four U.S. regions (Midwest 42.1%, West 29.7%, South 17.4%, Northeast 10.7%) and a range of community types (Urban 30.5%, Suburban 29.5%, Town 28.9%, Rural 9.9%). The vast majority attended public schools (94.3%). At the school level, 16 of the 36 schools (44%) enrolled a majority of students of color, and 16 of the 36 (44%) enrolled a majority of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch; school-level averages were 50% students of color and 46% free or reduced-price lunch eligibility. The sample therefore includes meaningful representation of higher-need school contexts.

The 36 administering teachers were predominantly experienced classroom teachers, with 80% reporting more than 10 years of teaching experience. Their tenure on the SchoolAI platform, drawn from product telemetry and measured at the time of student survey administration, ranged from 4 to 31 months (median 16, mean 16.5). Twenty-three of the 36 teachers (64%) had used SchoolAI for at least one year at the time their students completed the survey, accounting for 72% of the analytic student sample.

Implementation Context

SchoolAI provides partnering districts with a structured first-year implementation program that includes a dedicated Customer Success Manager, full technical onboarding (platform launch, LMS integration, and rostering), and ongoing professional development through weekly live sessions, self-paced courses, and monthly training toolkits. Implementation unfolds in phases across the first year, beginning with launch and rostering, progressing through guided adoption with weekly support, and culminating in deeper classroom integration.

Within this model, adoption typically operates by choice rather than mandate. Many partnering districts and schools give individual teachers discretion over whether and how to integrate SchoolAI into their instruction, and teachers in turn often give students choice in when to use the AI assistant for a given task. As a result, student exposure to SchoolAI varies meaningfully both across classrooms and within them.

This variation is reflected in the current sample. As shown in Table 1, just over half of students reported using SchoolAI at least monthly, while 44% reported only rare use and an additional 5% indicated in open-ended responses that they had never used SchoolAI (despite being in a SchoolAI-using classroom). Sustained, classroom-embedded use is therefore the exception rather than the norm, making the comparison between rare/never users and monthly+ users a meaningful proxy for dose of exposure.

Student usage frequency also varied with teacher experience on the platform. Students of teachers with at least one year of SchoolAI tenure were eight percentage points more likely to use SchoolAI monthly or more often (53% vs. 45%) and roughly one-third more likely to use it weekly or daily (31% vs. 22%). This pattern is consistent with the implementation model: teachers who have used the platform longer tend to integrate it more deeply into their classrooms, and their students follow.

Table 1. SchoolAI Usage Frequency by Teacher SAI Tenure

Usage	Full Sample (N=1,070)	%	Teacher <1 yr (n=304)	Teacher 1+ yr (n=766)
Everyday	37	3.5%	3.3%	3.5%
A few times a week	146	13.6%	10.2%	15.0%
About once a week	120	11.2%	8.9%	12.1%
A few times a month	243	22.7%	23.0%	22.6%
Rarely	471	44.0%	51.0%	41.3%
Never used	53	5.0%	3.6%	5.5%

Measures

All outcome items were rated on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 4 = Strongly Agree). For each domain, items were averaged to create a composite score. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach’s α .

Student Experience (8 items, $\alpha = .880$). Students rated their agreement with statements about engagement, belonging, and voice:

- I am excited to use SchoolAI
- I feel safe to try new things and make mistakes without being judged
- I feel comfortable sharing my ideas
- I feel like my thoughts and ideas matter when I’m talking with AI tools
- I can pursue my own interests and curiosities as part of my schoolwork
- I feel like I belong at this school
- I like going to school
- My teachers know me as a person, like things I’m interested in

Whole Learner (8 items, $\alpha = .921$). Students rated their agreement with statements about confidence, agency, self-management, reflection, and creative expression:

- I feel confident I can learn new things
- I'm proud of the work I do in school
- I ask for help when I need it
- I think about how I'm doing in school and what I can do to improve
- Keep trying, even when things are hard
- Express my ideas in creative ways (art, writing, speaking, etc.)
- Organizing my time and materials for school
- Speak up for what I need to learn better

Cognitive Skills (5 items, $\alpha = .919$). Students rated their agreement with statements about critical thinking, problem-solving, and reasoned judgment:

- Ask questions about things I'm learning
- Look for connections between different things I'm learning
- Solve problems in different ways
- Explain why I think something is true or not true
- Consider different perspectives and/or multiple sources of information before I make a decision

Academics (3 items, $\alpha = .781$). Students rated their agreement with statements about understanding their classwork, the accuracy of academic performance, and preparation for next steps. (Note: "Prepare for school/college and/or a future career" is also included in the Future-ready Skills composite; items may overlap across broad outcomes.)

- Understand the work I'm doing in my classes
- My current grades are accurate and reflect my true understanding of the material
- Prepare for school/college and/or a future career



Future-ready Skills (7 items, $\alpha = .913$). Students rated their agreement with statements about growth mindset, goal-setting, digital literacy, and future readiness:

- I believe my abilities can improve with practice
- Feel confident I can succeed in what I want to do
- Have goals for my future and know steps to reach them
- Prepare for school/college and/or a future career
- My teachers show me how I'm doing and give me feedback for how to improve my work
- I'm comfortable using technology to learn and create
- I like to learn new digital tools or apps

Analytic Approach

Linear regression models were conducted for each outcome with SchoolAI usage (0 = Rarely or Never used, 1 = Monthly+) and grade band as predictors. Grade band was included to account for developmental differences across elementary, middle, and high school students. Initial models also explored locale and region as covariates; neither was a significant predictor and their inclusion did not change the usage effect, so they were removed in favor of a more parsimonious model. As a robustness check, teacher SchoolAI tenure (<1 year vs. 1+ year) was added as an additional covariate; the student-usage effect was substantively unchanged across all five outcomes, and teacher tenure was not an independent predictor of student outcomes ($p > .25$ for four of five domains; $p = .053$ for Cognitive Skills). This indicates that student-level dose of exposure, rather than teacher-level platform experience, is what is most directly associated with student outcomes in this sample.

Data Privacy and Ethics

Participation in the survey was voluntary and administered through classroom teachers. No personally identifiable student information was collected. All analyses were conducted on de-identified records, with demographic descriptors provided at the school level rather than the individual level. All tools were used to assist with statistical analyses and drafting of this report.

Results

Student Experience

Students using SchoolAI monthly or more often reported significantly higher Student Experience scores than students who used it rarely or had never used it ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.52$ vs. $M = 2.58$, $SD = 0.74$; $d = 0.65$). In the regression model, usage was a significant predictor after controlling for grade band ($B = 0.42$, $t = 10.69$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.34, 0.49]). The overall model was significant, $F(3, 1066) = 39.89$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .10$. As shown in Table 2a, agreement rates were higher among Monthly+ users on every item, with the largest gaps on “I am excited to use SchoolAI” (49% vs. 74%), “I feel safe to try new things and make mistakes” (70% vs. 89%), and “I feel like I belong at this school” (68% vs. 87%).

Table 2a. Student Experience: Percent Agreement by Usage

Item	Rarely/Never	Monthly+
I am excited to use SchoolAI	48.5%	74.4%
I feel safe to try new things and make mistakes without being judged	70.0%	89.0%
I feel comfortable sharing my ideas	63.5%	82.1%
I feel like my thoughts and ideas matter when I'm talking with AI tools	54.8%	76.0%
I can pursue my own interests and curiosities as part of my schoolwork	64.9%	82.8%
I feel like I belong at this school	68.3%	87.2%
I like going to school	46.4%	65.0%
My teachers know me as a person, like things I'm interested in	59.2%	79.9%

Whole Learner

Students using SchoolAI monthly or more often reported significantly higher Whole Learner scores ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.54$ vs. $M = 2.69$, $SD = 0.79$; $d = 0.60$). Usage was a significant predictor after controlling for grade band ($B = 0.41$, $t = 9.80$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.32, 0.49]). The overall model was significant, $F(3, 1066) = 32.15$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .08$. As shown in Table 2b, agreement rates were higher among Monthly+ users on every item, with the largest gaps on “Keep trying, even when things are hard” (64% vs. 86%) and “Organizing my time and materials for school” (55% vs. 76%). Even items with already-high baseline agreement showed meaningful gains: 87% of Monthly+ users reported being confident they can learn new things, compared to 72% of rare/never users.

Table 2b. Whole Learner: Percent Agreement by Usage

Item	Rarely/Never	Monthly+
I feel confident I can learn new things	71.8%	86.8%
I'm proud of the work I do in school	69.3%	86.4%
I ask for help when I need it	68.3%	85.5%
I think about how I'm doing in school and what I can do to improve	71.0%	86.3%
Keep trying, even when things are hard	63.7%	85.7%
Express my ideas in creative ways (art, writing, speaking, etc.)	59.0%	79.5%
Organizing my time and materials for school	55.3%	76.4%
Speak up for what I need to learn better	60.1%	79.7%

Cognitive Skills

Students using SchoolAI monthly or more often reported significantly higher Cognitive Skills scores ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.58$ vs. $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.84$; $d = 0.60$). Usage was a significant predictor after controlling for grade band ($B = 0.44$, $t = 9.83$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.35, 0.52]). The overall model was significant, $F(3, 1066) = 32.30$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .08$. Notably, Cognitive Skills was the only domain in which teacher SchoolAI tenure showed a marginal independent association with student outcomes after controlling for student-level usage ($B = 0.10$, $p = .053$); while not reaching conventional significance, this pattern is consistent with the possibility that more-experienced SchoolAI teachers may scaffold inquiry, reasoning, and perspective-taking in ways that shape student cognitive development beyond what is captured by student-reported usage frequency. As shown in Table 2c, agreement rates were higher among Monthly+ users on every item. The largest gap was on “Ask questions about things I’m learning” (65% vs. 88%), suggesting that regular SchoolAI use is associated with greater intellectual initiative.

Table 2c. Cognitive Skills: Percent Agreement by Usage

Item	Rarely/Never	Monthly+
Ask questions about things I'm learning	65.3%	87.9%
Look for connections between different things I'm learning	62.6%	82.6%
Solve problems in different ways	67.7%	84.2%
Explain why I think something is true or not true	65.5%	81.5%
Consider different perspectives and/or multiple sources of information before I make a decision	65.8%	84.6%

Academics

Students using SchoolAI monthly or more often reported significantly higher Academics scores ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 0.59$ vs. $M = 2.69$, $SD = 0.81$; $d = 0.58$). Usage was a significant predictor after controlling for grade band ($B = 0.41$, $t = 9.40$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.32, 0.49]). The overall model was significant, $F(3, 1066) = 29.62$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .08$. As shown in Table 2d, Monthly+ users were 18 percentage points more likely to report understanding their classwork (87% vs. 68%), 17 percentage points more likely to report that their grades accurately reflect their understanding (82% vs. 65%), and 19 percentage points more likely to feel prepared for school/college or a future career (81% vs. 63%).

Table 2d. Academics: Percent Agreement by Usage

Item	Rarely/Never	Monthly+
Understand the work I'm doing in my classes	68.3%	86.6%
My current grades are accurate and reflect my true understanding of the material	65.3%	82.1%
Prepare for school/college and/or a future career	62.6%	81.3%

Future-ready Skills

Students using SchoolAI monthly or more often reported significantly higher Future-ready Skills scores ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.56$ vs. $M = 2.74$, $SD = 0.81$; $d = 0.64$). Usage was a significant predictor after controlling for grade band ($B = 0.44$, $t = 10.42$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.36, 0.52]). The overall model was significant, $F(3, 1066) = 37.26$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .10$. As shown in Table 2e, agreement rates were higher among Monthly+ users on every item, with particularly strong gaps on teacher-provided feedback (68% vs. 89%) and confidence in future success (67% vs. 86%). The highest item-level agreement in the entire study appeared here: 93% of Monthly+ users agreed that their abilities can improve with practice.

Table 2e. Future-ready Skills: Percent Agreement by Usage

Item	Rarely/Never	Monthly+
I believe my abilities can improve with practice	75.6%	92.7%
Feel confident I can succeed in what I want to do	66.6%	86.4%
Have goals for my future and know steps to reach them	62.8%	83.0%
Prepare for school/college and/or a future career	62.6%	81.3%
My teachers show me how I'm doing and give me feedback for how to improve my work	68.1%	88.8%
I'm comfortable using technology to learn and create	73.1%	91.8%
I like to learn new digital tools or apps	61.8%	83.0%

Limitations

The sample was drawn from classrooms whose teachers were active SchoolAI users, so the findings reflect variation within implementing schools and do not generalize to non-implementing contexts. Because the design is cross-sectional, the observed associations cannot be interpreted as causal; students who engage more with SchoolAI may differ from those who use it rarely on unmeasured characteristics such as baseline motivation, teacher quality, and classroom climate. Usage was also self-reported and does not directly measure depth or quality of engagement. Future research should incorporate behavioral log data and longitudinal designs to more precisely characterize the relationship between exposure and student outcomes.

The effect sizes, while consistently in the medium-to-large range ($d = 0.58$ to 0.65), correspond to absolute differences on a 4-point scale of approximately 0.4 to 0.5 points. The practical significance of these differences for day-to-day student experience warrants further investigation, particularly through longitudinal designs and through comparisons across schools at different stages of SchoolAI implementation.

Finally, although the sample includes meaningful representation of higher-need school contexts (mean school-level FRL of 46%), within-sample sub-analyses by demographic subgroup were not the focus of this report. Future analyses should examine whether the observed associations differ across student demographic groups and school contexts.



Conclusion

This study examined whether more frequent student use of SchoolAI is associated with stronger outcomes across five domains: Student Experience, Whole Learner, Cognitive Skills, Academics, and Future-ready Skills. Across all five, students using SchoolAI monthly or more often reported significantly higher scores than students who used it rarely or had never used it, and these differences held after controlling for grade band.

The Student Experience findings illustrate the foundational conditions on which the rest depend. Students who use SchoolAI regularly are markedly more excited about learning, more willing to take risks, and more likely to feel that they belong at school and that their ideas matter. These affective and relational conditions appear meaningfully strengthened in classrooms where SchoolAI is a regular part of student experience.

The Whole Learner and Cognitive Skills findings show how those conditions translate into the dispositions and thinking moves that drive deeper learning. Regular users are more likely to persist through difficulty, organize their work, ask for help, and reflect on how they are doing, and dramatically more likely to ask questions, look for connections, and consider multiple perspectives. The largest single-item gap in the entire study, a 23-point jump in students asking questions about what they are learning, points to SchoolAI functioning not as an answer machine but as a thinking partner that lowers the cost of curiosity.

The Academics and Future-ready Skills findings round out the picture as the outcomes that flow from those dispositions and skills. Regular users are far more likely to report understanding their classwork, to feel their grades reflect their true understanding, and to feel prepared for school, college, or career. Looking further ahead, they are also more likely to believe their abilities can grow with practice, set goals for their future, and feel comfortable with the digital tools they will need beyond school.

Taken together, these results provide preliminary evidence that regular student use of SchoolAI is associated with broad-based improvements in how students experience school, how they engage with their learning, and how they see themselves as learners. SchoolAI is not simply giving students another tool. It is helping create the conditions in which students can do their best work and feel it.