



AAB

AAB-STD-001

AI Education Evidence & Registry Standard

Version: Draft v0.1

Status: Public Draft for External Review

Classification: AAB Standards Series

Approval Authority: AAB Standards Council

Effective Date: 8/20/2025

Next Systematic Review: 12 months, or earlier when database schema or publication rules change



Foreword

This document has been prepared as a draft AAB standard for structured, comparable, source-traced AI education evidence. It remains subject to AAB evidence review and Standards Council approval.

This document is not a final AAB standard, certification basis, endorsement, or public AAB position until approved through the applicable human review process.

1. Scope

This draft standard defines how AAB should record, structure, review, and publish AI education evidence across cases, pilots, frameworks, resources, assessments, policies, and community signals.

It is intended to make AI education activity comparable across age groups, settings, tools, jurisdictions, and evidence maturity levels. It does not endorse any product, curriculum, institution, or policy.

2. Purpose

AAB's authority depends on structured evidence rather than simple collection. This standard defines the minimum registry structure needed to support:

- Public registry pages
- Consensus reports
- Draft standards
- Research briefs
- Framework crosswalks
- Policy briefs
- Evidence summaries
- Website search and filtering
- MongoDB-backed evidence workflows

3. Terms and Definitions

AI education evidence record: A structured AAB record describing an AI education activity, pilot, framework, resource, assessment, policy, or community signal.

Case: A documented real-world AI education activity or implementation, often descriptive and context-rich.

Pilot: A structured implementation reviewed through the AAB Pilot Framework or equivalent controlled process.



AAB AAB Standards Series

Framework: A structured set of principles, competencies, standards, or guidance from AAB or an external organization.

Resource: A course, tool, grant, event, curriculum, training material, or public support item relevant to AI literacy or AI education.

Assessment: A test, rubric, portfolio process, performance task, survey, learning analytics signal, or other measure used to interpret learner understanding, practice, or readiness.

Policy: Official or institutional guidance, strategy, rule, law, consultation, or implementation note related to AI literacy, AI education, data governance, or responsible AI use.

Evidence maturity: A structured indication of how strong, complete, comparable, and reviewable the available evidence is.

Source trace: A record-level or claim-level link between a statement and its supporting source, locator, review status, and interpretation note.

4. Required Registry Principles

4.1 Evidence before endorsement

Registry inclusion shall not imply endorsement, certification, or recommendation.

4.2 Structured comparability

Records shall use shared fields so that activities can be compared across age, setting, tool type, AI role, human role, safeguards, and evidence type.

4.3 Source trace

Every material public claim shall be traceable to a source, record, reviewer decision, or documented AAB standard.

4.4 Human review

AI agents may draft, extract, classify, summarize, and suggest mappings. They shall not approve public records, publish AAB positions, or approve standards.

4.5 Public-safe release

Public records shall expose approved metadata and summary fields only. Raw student data, private partner notes, reviewer comments, and unpublished source files shall remain internal unless explicitly approved for release.

5. Minimum Shared Data Fields

Each record shall include:

- Record ID



AAB AAB Standards Series

- Record type
- Title
- Short summary
- Status
- Visibility
- Audience or learner group
- Grade band or age range, when applicable
- Learning context
- Geography or jurisdiction, when applicable
- AI role
- Human role
- Learning outcomes
- Activity or implementation design
- Safeguard tags
- Risk tags
- Evidence type
- Evidence maturity note
- Limitations
- Source trace
- Review history
- Publication boundary
- Related AAB standards
- Related publications
- Created and updated timestamps

6. Collection-Specific Requirements

6.1 Case records

Case records shall document:

- Context and setting
- Learner profile in non-identifiable form
- Learning intent
- AI tool or system role
- Human facilitation role
- Activity structure
- Observed challenges
- Design adaptations



AAB AAB Standards Series

- Reported outcomes
- Evidence type
- Ethical and privacy considerations
- Limitations

6.2 Pilot records

Pilot records shall follow the AAB Pilot Framework unless an approved equivalent is documented. Pilot records shall preserve:

- Pilot type
- Phase status
- Phase artifacts
- Readiness disposition
- Training and role assignments
- Implementation notes
- Monitoring notes
- Issue logs
- Safeguard events
- Final summary
- Registry decision
- EMI note
- Follow-up or sustainment record, if applicable

6.3 Framework records

Framework records shall include:

- Organization
- Jurisdiction
- Year
- Source URL or controlled source file
- Target audience
- Domains or competencies
- Grade bands or levels
- Principles
- AAB category mapping
- Mapping strength
- Limitations and reviewer questions

6.4 Resource records

Resource records shall include:



AAB AAB Standards Series

- Provider
- Resource type
- Audience
- Cost or access condition
- Eligibility
- Geography
- Expiration or last-checked date
- AI literacy relevance
- Restrictions
- Review status
- Alignment notes

6.5 Assessment records

Assessment records shall include:

- Assessment purpose
- Construct or competency measured
- Target audience
- Delivery context
- Evidence format
- Scoring method or rubric
- Validity, reliability, or review signals when available
- Privacy and accessibility notes
- Alignment to AAB learning outcomes
- Limitations

6.6 Policy records

Policy records shall include:

- Jurisdiction
- Issuing authority
- Policy type
- Legal or adoption status
- Education level
- AI literacy scope
- Teacher training relevance
- Student competency relevance
- Governance or data requirements
- Source URL



- Last-checked date

7. Evidence Maturity

AAB records should not be reduced to a single quality score. Each record shall include a short evidence maturity note explaining what is known, what is documented, and what remains limited.

Recommended maturity labels:

- Exploratory record
- Structured descriptive record
- Reviewed implementation record
- Pilot-supported record
- Cross-context pattern
- Provisional consensus
- Mature standard-supporting evidence

8. Source Trace Requirements

Source trace shall include:

- Source ID or citation
- Source type
- Locator, such as page, section, URL, or file path
- Supported claim or field
- Support type: direct, inferential, contextual, conflicting, or insufficient
- Reviewer note
- Review status

9. Review Workflow

Records should move through the following states:

Draft extracted

Source verified

Evidence mapped

Review pending

Approved internal

Approved public

Published

Retired or superseded



No record shall be treated as public evidence until it reaches approved public status.

10. Website Display Requirements

Public website pages shall display:

- Public summary
- Record type
- AAB classification tags
- Audience and grade band
- AI role and human role
- Evidence type
- Evidence maturity note
- Safeguards and limitations
- Source or citation metadata
- Related standards or reports
- Non-endorsement notice

The website shall not expose private reviewer notes, raw student data, private partner files, or unapproved source materials.

11. Clause Rationale

This draft standard is based on AAB's visible case registry structure, the finalized AAB Pilot Framework, the AAB AI evidence infrastructure workflow, and the AAB roadmap principle of evidence before standardization.

12. Open Review Questions

- Which fields should be mandatory for all public records versus optional by collection type?
- Should EMI be stored as a controlled label, a narrative note, or both?
- Should draft records be queryable internally by future report agents?
- What public wording should distinguish documentation from endorsement?
- Which source trace fields should be displayed publicly?

Revision History

Version	Date	Summary of Changes	Approved By
Draft v0.1	Draft	Initial working document generated from AAB evidence-layer drafts and ISO-style template.	AAB Standards Council