

Regulatory Models for Artificial Intelligence in Education in European Union Countries

PhD Student **Ioana CREȚU**¹

Abstract

In the context in which artificial intelligence (AI) is permeating education services, it becomes necessary to establish regulatory frameworks for the ethical use of AI, limiting negative effects and maximizing benefits of using AI for students and teachers. The purpose of this comparative study is to investigate how the EU countries regulate the use of AI in education. The objectives of the study are: evaluating the normative and methodological framework applicable to the use of AI in education, identifying and analyzing the rights and obligations of students and teachers related to the use of AI, identifying and analyzing elements of convergence and divergence of regulatory frameworks of EU states. The study sample consist of five EU countries (Greece, Estonia, Czech, Denmark and Romania). The research methodology includes a qualitative content analysis of the laws, strategies, methodological guides developed by member states and the European regulatory framework. This is complemented by a comparative evaluation grid. The results highlight different concerns of the member states regarding the regulation of AI in education, but also convergence elements relating to the importance of GDPR. The conclusions contribute to substantiating the regulatory framework in Romania based on good practices taken from the member states.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, education, normative framework, methodological framework.

JEL Classification: K24, K38

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62768/ADJURIS/2026/7/14>

Please cite this article as:

Crețu, Ioana. "Regulatory Models for Artificial Intelligence in Education in European Union Countries." In *Comparative and International Law in an Era of Global Transformation: Sovereignty, Justice, Cooperation, and Emerging Technologies*, edited by Liliana Tymchenko and Paulina Guli Hoti, 241–257. ADJURIS – International Academic Publisher, 2026.
<https://doi.org/10.62768/ADJURIS/2026/7/14>

¹ Ioana Crețu - Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-8322-6595>. E-mail: ioana.cretu@amp.ase.ro.

1. Introduction

Although artificial intelligence (AI) has been around since 1950², it became known to people all over the world only in 2022 when ChatGPT has been released³. Just a few years after the emergence of this natural language processing system, AI became present in everyday activities and more and more attractive⁴ thanks to the help it can bring, as making decision or solving problems in different areas, like mathematics⁵.

The growing presence of AI in essential areas of society as education, has raised concerns among researchers regarding the need to establish a legal framework governing the use of AI in education services⁶. The academic environment in particular, but also other public and private institutions, support the existence of a globally approved and applied regulatory framework in AI⁷.

Also, studies highlight a number of factors that should be considered in developing regulatory frameworks for the use of AI in education. Thus, institutional policies, along with ensuring equitable access to AI tools are considered important for the integration of this new technology in education⁸. Other researchers support that AI should be used in education in the most responsible way possible and by respecting academic integrity⁹. The protecting of personal information is considered equally important because the more AI is used in education, the lower the privacy of students. Through a chain reaction, the more information about students is known, the more vulnerable they become in online¹⁰.

² Michael Haenlein and Andreas Kaplan, "A Brief History of Artificial Intelligence: On the Past, Present, and Future of Artificial Intelligence," *California Management Review* 61, no. 4 (2019): 5–14, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619864925>.

³ Nikita Malik and Menal Dahiya, "Interacting with ChatGPT: Impact on Students and Teaching-Learning," *Sigma Journal of Engineering and Natural Sciences* 42, no. 6 (2024): 1736–48, <https://doi.org/10.14744/sigma.2023.00147>.

⁴ Francisco J. García-Peñalvo, Faraón Llorens-Largo, and Javier Vidal, "The New Reality of Education in the Face of Advances in Generative Artificial Intelligence," *RIED—Revista Iberoamericana de Educación a Distancia* 27, no. 1 (2024): 9–39, <https://doi.org/10.5944/ried.27.1.37716>.

⁵ Jonas Souza Barreira, Marcos Guilherme Moura Silva, and Tadeu Oliver Gonçalves, "Desafios e oportunidades para o uso do Chat GPT na pesquisa em educação matemática," *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação* 19, special no. 2 (2024): e024084, <https://doi.org/10.21723/ri-aeec.v19iesp.2.18594>.

⁶ Mehul Mahrishi, Asad Abbas, and Mohammad Khubeb Siddiqui, "Global Initiatives Towards Regulatory Frameworks for Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Higher Education," *Digital Government: Research and Practice* 6, no. 2 (2025): article 20, 1–9, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3672462>.

⁷ Mahrishi, Abbas, and Siddiqui, "Global Initiatives Towards Regulatory Frameworks."

⁸ Gary Reyes, Roberto Tolozabo-Benites, Carlos George-Reyes, Dayron Rumbaut, and Julio Barzola-Monteses, "Adoption of Artificial Intelligence Applications in Higher Education," *Frontiers in Education* 10 (2025): 1680401, <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1680401>.

⁹ Zizhuo Zhang, Lian Wen, Yanfei Jiang, and Yongli Liu, "Evaluate Chat-GPT's Programming Capability in Swift Through Real University Exam Questions," *Software: Practice and Experience* 54, no. 11 (2024): 2129–43, <https://doi.org/10.1002/spe.3330>.

¹⁰ Lan Huang, "Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Education: Student Privacy and Data Protection,"

At the level of European Union (EU), most member states have aligned themselves with these needs of the educational community, some of these establishing strict regulatory frameworks to regulate the use of AI in education, and most of them adopting methodological guidelines to support educational institutions in the face of inadequate use of AI by students.

The purpose of this comparative pilot study is to investigate how the EU countries regulate the use of AI in education. The objectives of the study are: evaluating the normative and methodological framework applicable to the use of AI in education, identifying and analyzing the rights and obligations of students and teachers related to the use of AI, identifying and analyzing elements of convergence and divergence of regulatory frameworks of EU states.

In this pilot study, the analysis focuses on four EU member states: Greece, Estonia, the Czech Republic, Denmark. To these is added Romania, the fifth country selected in particular to identify best practices in the other countries. The selection of the four states was determined on the one hand, the rate of use of AI according to European statistical databases, and on the other hand, the interest given to both education and AI. According to Eurostat, in 16 of the 27 EU member states over 70% of young people aged 16 to 24 used AI in 2025. Of these countries, the top four member states that have the highest percentages of AI use are: Greece (83,54%), Estonia (82,81%), Czech (78,47%), Denmark (77,64%). Romania presents the lowest rate of individual AI use by young people (44,05%)¹¹.

Regarding concerns for education and the evolution of AI, Greece is among the 7 European countries where one of the AI Factory will be developed with the aim of providing innovative public services with the help of AI¹². Estonia excelled in the last PISA test with the best results in mathematics towards the other EU member states, including above the average of the countries included in the analysis¹³. Also, this country carries out ambitious programs for the introduction of AI in education¹⁴. The Czech Republic aims to stand out internationally in the AI sector by a center that brings together specialist from academic and private sector, contributing to the development and integration of innovative AI systems

Science Insights Education Frontiers 16, no. 2 (2023): 2577–87, <https://doi.org/10.15354/sief.23.re202>.

¹¹ Eurostat, “Individuals – Use of Generative AI Tools,” Data Browser, accessed June 8, 2026, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/isoc_ai_iaiu/bookmark/table?lang=en&bookmarkId=45e9481a-e577-4b03-80c1-ab654032ff65&c=1769165540000.

¹² OECD, “Greece,” in *Progress in Implementing the European Union Coordinated Plan on Artificial Intelligence (Volume 1): Member States’ Actions* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025), https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/progress-in-implementing-the-european-union-coordinated-plan-on-artificial-intelligence-volume-1_6d530a88-en/greece_e5215c30-en.html.

¹³ OECD, *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The State of Learning and Equity in Education* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2023), <https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en>.

¹⁴ Eurydice, “Estonia: AI Leap Initiative to Enhance Learning and Teaching,” March 2025, accessed June 11, 2026, <https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/news/estonia-ai-leap-initiative-enhance-learning-and-teaching>.

in several key areas, such as education¹⁵. Also, according to an analysis, in Czech Republic AI is accessed to a significant extent by children and young people for school tasks. Thus, 42% of students use AI to create texts, and 39% use AI for understanding certain concepts¹⁶. From 2024, at the initiative of the Danish ministry of Education, a Center with the purpose of developing innovative anthropocentric AI tools, operates in Denmark¹⁷. There is also a Consortium of universities dedicated to developing AI infrastructure for research and education¹⁸.

Romania is only at the beginning of the steps regarding the introduction AI in education and it was included in this pilot study, as previously mentioned, in order to identify examples of good practices that could be taken from the other four analyzed states, on the basis of the similarities and, in particular, the differences identified during the analysis.

2. Research Methodology

In this pilot study, research methodology includes a qualitative content analysis on EU regulations in the field of AI, as well as on the AI strategies of the five analyzed states and on normative and methodological acts with national applicability regarding the use of AI in education. The analysis focuses on how the use of AI in pre-university education is regulated.

The qualitative content analysis is complemented by a comparative evaluation grid. This is carried out on the strategies of the analyzed states following criteria such as the existence of strategic measures related to the use of AI in preschool, primary, secondary and high school education, training of managers and teachers. Also, a comparative evaluation grid is carried out on the analyzed normative and methodological frameworks, following criteria such as: prohibition or permission to use AI during exams, homework achievement and student evaluation, respect for equal opportunities in the use of AI, respect for ethical principles, autonomy in decision making on the use of AI.

¹⁵ OECD, "Czechia," in *Progress in Implementing the European Union Coordinated Plan on Artificial Intelligence (Volume 1): Member States' Actions* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025), https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/progress-in-implementing-the-european-union-coordinated-plan-on-artificial-intelligence-volume-1_6d530a88-en/czechia_0482b6c9-en.html.

¹⁶ Marie Jaron Bedrosova, Vojtech Dvorak, Hana Machackova, Iveta Jansova, Karolina Bielikova, Maria Jurikova, and Karolina Kozumplikova, *Generative Artificial Intelligence through the Eyes of Czech Children and Adolescents: Findings from the EU Kids Online V Project* (Brno: Masaryk University, 2026), https://is.muni.cz/publication/2553899/euko_ai_report_en.pdf.

¹⁷ OECD, "Denmark," in *Progress in Implementing the European Union Coordinated Plan on Artificial Intelligence (Volume 1): Member States' Actions* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025), 4, https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/progress-in-implementing-the-european-union-coordinated-plan-on-artificial-intelligence-volume-1_6d530a88-en/denmark_89c393fa-en.html.

¹⁸ OECD, "Denmark," 3.

3. Analysis of Strategic Concerns Regarding AI in Education

Aiming to become a global leader in AI, as stated in its policy documents, EU was concerned with the development of strategic documents and normative acts to ensure the explanation and use of AI in education in an ethical and appropriate manner¹⁹.

At EU level, the strategic framework is represented in particular by the Action Plan for the European continent, which defines five main pillars. These include: expansion and development of a very strong computing infrastructure, access to high quality data for the purpose of AI development, developing AI skills along with creating a talent base and simplification of the regulations²⁰. To fulfill the fourth pillar, related to AI skills, in 2024 a strategic plan was developed targeting the education services sector. This establishes, among others, creating new curricula that include the study of AI, expanding access to training, promoting inclusion and the ethical use of AI, promoting the opportunities and challenges that AI can bring in the process of developing AI skills²¹.

In the process of alignment with the common European strategic framework, all member states have developed their own strategies in the field of AI development and each of them includes in the strategic documents a section dedicated to developing the AI skills. This section covers the education services sector by default. Differences arise in how this technology is intended to be included in education at the level of each state, as shown in **Table 1**.

All AI strategies of the five analyzed countries include strategic objectives and measures related to the introduction on AI in high school education. The differences are noted in the case of other levels of education. Greece aims to introduce AI from pre-school education and defines its strategic objectives according to three levels: in the first level, students learn fundamental AI concepts and develop critical thinking through exploratory learning, the second level allows passionate students to become AI developers, and the last level includes higher education²².

Similarly, the Estonian AI strategy, published in 2019, aims to include AI

¹⁹ Andreea-Nicoleta Dragomir, "The Role of the European Union in Shaping an Ethical and Legal Framework for Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education," *Review of Artificial Intelligence in Education* 6 (2025): 1–17, <https://doi.org/10.37497/rev.artif.intell.educ.v6ii.48>.

²⁰ European Commission, *AI Continent Action Plan*, COM(2025) 165 final (Brussels, April 9, 2025), <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ai-continent-action-plan>, accessed May 8, 2026.

²¹ Artificial Intelligence Skills Alliance (ARISA), *AI Skills Strategy for Europe* (2024), https://aiskills.eu/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/ARISA_AI-Skills-Strategy-for-Europe_2024.pdf, accessed June 18, 2026.

²² Hellenic Republic, Presidency of the Government, Special Secretariat of Foresight, High-Level Advisory Committee on Artificial Intelligence, *A Blueprint for Greece's AI Transformation* (2024), https://foresight.gov.gr/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/Blueprint_GREECES_AI_TRANSFORMATION.pdf, accessed May 2, 2026.

from preschool to high school level. Along with including AI in school curricula, the aims are also to train public sector managers, including those in the education services sector, in the field on AI²³.

Table 1. Comparative grid on strategic objectives related to the introduction of AI in education

Country	Strategic measures regarding the introduction of AI in					
	High school	Lower secondary education	Primary education	Preschool education	AI skills for teachers	AI skills for managers
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-
Estonia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Czech	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-
Romania	Yes	-	-	-	Yes	Yes

Source: data collected and processed by the author from the national strategies in the field of AI

On the other hand, the Czech Republic and Denmark do not mention strategic measures dedicate to the inclusion of AI in preschool education, according to the analysed strategies. Denmark proposed in 2019, when the still current strategy was published, to introduce AI into education by developing pilot programs that, on the one hand, help students learn to use AI tools, and on the other hand, develop critical thinking about any AI generated product²⁴. Also, the Czech Republic aims to modify its curricula by including AI subjects, as well as a special focus on developing creative thinking among students²⁵.

In Romania, the AI strategy was approved by the Government in 2024. In this strategy, unlike the previously analyzed states, it is mentioned the introduction of the AI study in high school, by adapting the content of existing disciplines or introducing optional subjects²⁶.

²³ Government of the Republic of Estonia, *Estonia's National Artificial Intelligence Strategy 2019–2021* (July 2019), https://f98cc689-5814-47ec-86b3-db505a7c3978.filesusr.com/ugd/7df26f_27a618cb80a648c38be427194affa2f3.pdf, accessed May 4, 2026.

²⁴ European Commission, “Denmark AI Strategy Report,” AI Watch, last updated September 1, 2021, https://ai-watch.ec.europa.eu/countries/denmark/denmark-ai-strategy-report_en#human-capital, accessed May 1, 2026.

²⁵ Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic, *National Artificial Intelligence Strategy of the Czech Republic* (2019), https://mpo.gov.cz/assets/cz/rozcestnik/pro-media/tiskove-zpravy/2019/6/NAIS_eng_korektura_06-19_web.pdf, accessed May 3, 2025.

²⁶ Government of Romania, Government Decision No. 832 of July 11, 2024, approving the *National Strategy in the Field of Artificial Intelligence 2024–2027*, *Monitorul Oficial al României*, Part I,

Another similarity of the strategic objectives of the states included in this study is that they all attach importance to the training of teachers so that they have competences to use AI in teaching and administrative activities.

Estonia, the Czech Republic and Romania mention concerns regarding AI training for managers in educational institutions in their national strategic frameworks. Among these, the Czech Republic aims to develop pilot programs through which school managers will use specialized AI tools to streamline management activities²⁷.

Thus, the pillar established by the EU regarding skills development is reflected in the strategic documents of the analyzed states, some of these including a broader future perspective and setting more ambitious targets, such as Greece.

4. Analysis of AI Regulation in Education

In order to establish harmonised rules at EU level in the context of the introduction of AI in more and more areas of activity, the European Parliament has adopted Regulation (EU) 2024/1689. This is the first international regulatory act that includes rules to limit the risks associated with the use of AI. Article 5 prohibits the use of AI tools that detect the emotional state of individual, particularly in the field of employment and education services, as a result of the fact that they can provide erroneous results that ultimately lead to treat those individuals in an unfavorable or even harmful way²⁸. Annex 3 of the Regulation indicated that the AI tools used in the study admission processes, distribution of candidates, assessment of skills, detecting students who cheat during exams, are considered high-risk AI systems, as a result of the fact that they can have a major influence on fundamental rights and on the educational path of an individual²⁹. Thus, before implementing such an AI tool, the institutions responsible for providing these services have the obligation to analyze the impact it may have on the rights of the beneficiary of the education services. In 2026, the European Commission also launched a set of guidelines dedicated to teachers and students for the ethical use of AI in education. It emphasized the importance of equality in access to AI tools, along with their ethical and transparent use.³⁰

no. 730 (July 25, 2024).

²⁷ Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic, *National Artificial Intelligence Strategy of the Czech Republic*.

²⁸ European Union, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of June 13, 2024, laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act), OJ L 2024/1689 (July 12, 2024), <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng>.

²⁹ Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, annex III.

³⁰ European Commission, Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture, *Guidelines on the Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence and Data in Teaching and Learning for Educators* (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2026), <https://doi.org/10.2766/7967834>.

Given that each member state has its own regulations regarding the organization and functioning of education services, its own level of digitalization and the different quality of infrastructure, it is becoming a challenge to apply the common legislative rules established at EU level.³¹

In Greece, education sector is supervised by the Ministry, through its subordinate departments, and the decision-making autonomy of managers in schools is limited, with official recommendations on giving greater confidence to their experience.³²

In Estonia, education is decentralised and educational institutions have a high degree of decision-making autonomy, with requires a greater need for monitoring teaching activities³³. The Czech Republic also offers schools a significant level of autonomy and the education system is, also, decentralised, with fragmented governance³⁴. Similar to Estonia and the Czech Republic, managers in preuniversity education have an increased degree of freedom in decision making in Denmark³⁵. In Romania, directors in preuniversity education have quite limited autonomy, as an important role is given to the Country School Inspectorates³⁶.

Regarding establishing rules for the use of AI in the education sector, Greece is noted at EU level as the first state to issue a binding normative act with national applicability that regulates the use of AI in education and the protection personal data of the students in the context of using AI. Decision no. 55909 of May 2026 of the Government of Greece lays down a series of mandatory provisions for teachers, students, parents, managers and providers of AI tools used in educational institutions³⁷.

In Estonia, The Ministry of Education and Research published in 2024 a Guide with recommendations for the educational community on the integration of AI in education³⁸. Similarly, the Czech Republic released in 2024 a guide to

³¹ Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, art. 165(1), OJ C 202 (June 7, 2016): 120, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12016E165>.

³² OECD, *Improving Learning Outcomes in Greece: Strengthening School Governance, Teacher Professionalism and Digital Education* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2026), <https://doi.org/10.1787/6323bd8e-en>.

³³ OECD, "Enhancing Data-Informed Strategic Governance in Education in Estonia," *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, no. 47 (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.1787/11495e02-en>.

³⁴ OECD, "Education Policy Outlook in the Czech Republic," *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, no. 11 (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2020), <https://doi.org/10.1787/6363ab1d-en>.

³⁵ OECD, "Education Policy Outlook in Denmark," *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, no. 12 (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2020), <https://doi.org/10.1787/3288629c-en>.

³⁶ OECD, *Education and Skills in Romania* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025), <https://doi.org/10.1787/594cbb5d-en>.

³⁷ Hellenic Republic, Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, "Determining Issues Related to the Use of Artificial Intelligence Systems in the Educational Process and the Protection of Personal Data," Government Gazette B 2639 (May 12, 2026), <https://www.e-nomothesia.gr/kat-ekpaideuse/kya-55909-d6-2026.html>.

³⁸ Haridus- ja Teadusministeerium [Estonian Ministry of Education and Research], *Tehisaru juhend*

using AI in primary and secondary schools, developed by the National Pedagogical Institute³⁹.

Denmark also has a methodological framework for the use of AI in education. The ministry, through the Danish Agency for Education, has formulated three guidelines with recommendations for lower primary and secondary education, higher secondary education and vocational training. In Denmark, the development of the guide for higher secondary education had as a starting point the uncertainty of students on how much they are allowed to use AI for school activities, and on the other hand the growing mistrust of teachers in student work⁴⁰.

In Romania, there is no official national normative or methodological framework to establish rules or recommendations related to the use of AI tools in education. In May 2026, ECDL Romania launched a guide to support Romanian schools in using AI⁴¹, but this does not represent a set of methodological guidelines belonging to the central authorities that manage education in Romania, which is why it was not included in this analysis. Some of the higher education institutions have developed their own internal regulations by which they have established rules for the use of AI. Also, the Country School Inspectorate of Dâmbovița published in 2025 a set of guidelines dedicated to the use of AI by English language teachers⁴². It is considered that, in the absence of any unitary legislative norms, Romania will not be able to align with member states and EU norms in this integration of AI in education⁴³.

A summary of the comparison regarding the normative and methodological framework of the analyzed states regarding AI in education is given in **Table 2**.

In accordance with art. 2, part. 3 of the aforementioned Government Decision, Greece does not oblige the educational community to use AI systems in

[*Artificial Intelligence Guide*] (2024), <https://www.hm.ce/sites/default/files/documents/2024-03/Tehisaru%20juhend%202024.pdf>, accessed May 12, 2026.

³⁹ Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic, “NPI ČR Issued Guides for Teachers on How to Use Artificial Intelligence in Schools,” 2024, <https://msmt.gov.cz/npi-vydalo-navody-pro-pedagogy-jak-na-umelou-inteligenci-ve?lang=1>, accessed May 13, 2026.

⁴⁰ Danish Agency for Education and Quality, *Recommendations on the Use of Generative AI in Primary School Teaching* (June 26, 2025), <https://uvm.dk/media/dylly3ye/250626-tilgaengeliggjort-anbefalinger-om-brug-af-generativ-ai-i-undervisningen-i-folkeskolen.pdf>, accessed May 14, 2026.

⁴¹ ICDL Romania, *Ghid AI pentru educație: Ghid practic pentru școlile din România* (2026), https://icdl.ro/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/GHID_AI_PT_EDUCATIE_final.pdf, accessed June 16, 2026.

⁴² Inspectoratul Școlar Județean Dâmbovița, *Ghid de utilizare IA în educație* (2025), <https://www.isj-db.ro/public/public/upload/manager/files/Limbi%20moderne/2024-2025/Ghid%20de%20utilizare%20IA%20%C3%AEn%20educa%C8%9Bie.pdf>, accessed June 16, 2026.

⁴³ Compare Government of Romania, *National Strategy in the Field of Artificial Intelligence 2024–2027*, approved by Government Decision No. 832/2024; ICDL Romania, *Ghid AI pentru educație: Ghid practic pentru școlile din România* (2026); and Inspectoratul Școlar Județean Dâmbovița, *Ghid de utilizare IA în educație* (2025).

education, but mentions that their use is strictly voluntary⁴⁴. Estonia, the Czech Republic and Denmark also do not mandate the use of AI, but recommend that both teachers and students experiment with AI tools. Estonia, for example, urges the educational community to view AI as an opportunity and to be willing to explore the benefits it offers⁴⁵.

Table 2. Comparative grid on the normative and methodological frameworks of the states regarding AI in education

Country	Normative framework	Methodological framework	AI in exams	AI in homework	AI in assessment	Ethics and transparency	Equality / non-discrimination	GDPR	Consultation	Autonomy
Greece	Yes		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Partial
Estonia	No	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Partial	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Czech	No	Yes	-	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Denmark	No	Yes	No	No	-	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Romania	No	No	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-

Source: data collected and processed by the author

Regarding the use of AI in teaching, learning and assessment, some countries have concrete rules or recommendations. Greece prohibits the full or majority solving of homework with the help of AI, as well as the use of AI during exams and competitions. In addition, teachers have the obligation to check whether or not the homework presented by students have been developed using intelligent tools, as stated in art. 5⁴⁶.

The approach of Estonia is much more permissive. This leaves the decision on the degree and use of AI for certain tasks to the autonomy of educational managers, as well as the prohibition of using AI in certain activities. It also recommends that students use AI on homework only when they consider it would not prevent them from developing a certain competence. In the event that students have used AI for an activity that they were prohibited from doing at school, it is recommended that teachers explain to students the negative effects that AI could

⁴⁴ Hellenic Republic, Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, art. 2(3).

⁴⁵ Haridus- ja Teadusministeerium, *Tehisarju juhend*.

⁴⁶ Hellenic Republic, Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, art. 5.

have on their skills⁴⁷. In contrast, according to art. 5, in Greece teachers have the obligation to consider such a situation at the final score of the student⁴⁸.

Czech Republic recommends avoiding the use of AI by students for homework, but does not include mentions regarding exams⁴⁹. In contrast, Denmark specifies in its methodological guidelines the prohibition of using AI during exams. At the same time, it is recommended that intelligence tools be used in teaching activities only if they add value to teaching or learning⁵⁰.

For the activity of assessing or correcting student work, in accordance with art. 4, part. 3, Greece does not allow teachers to fully use AI tools for such tasks⁵¹. The Czech Republic also emphasizes avoiding the use of AI to correct student work. Estonia does not mention this prohibition, but encourages teachers to use AI to develop tests or teaching materials⁵².

The ethics and transparency criterion highlights whether or not the analyzed states legislate or recommend compliance with the ethical principles of drafting a work, together with the assumption and mention of the AI systems used. In the case of Greece, in art. 6, part. 2, it is stated that the generation by AI of false or nonexistent bibliographic data, information or sources, is prohibited⁵³. In addition, AI can be used in teaching or learning if users are transparent about the AI tools used, if copyrights is respected and if students and teachers, as appropriate, take responsibility for any content created with the support of AI, according to art. 4, part. 5⁵⁴.

Estonia, the Czech Republic and Denmark recommend in their methodological documents that students and teachers take responsibility for any activity or work done using AI. A difference in the case of Estonia is given by the fact that it recommends mentioning the use of AI if it is used to generate an image or text, but it does not appreciate that citation is necessary when AI helped generate teaching materials.

The principles of equality and nondiscrimination in terms of access to AI tools are provided for by Greece, but also by the Czech Republic in the recommendations formulated.

All four states indicate in their normative or methodological frameworks the importance of respecting and protecting personal information. It is worth noting that this common approach is also influenced by Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the processing of data of European citizens. Greece specifically mentions the

⁴⁷ Haridus- ja Teadusministeerium, *Tehisaru juhend*.

⁴⁸ Hellenic Republic, Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, art. 5.

⁴⁹ Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic, “NPI ČR Issued Guides for Teachers on How to Use Artificial Intelligence in Schools.”

⁵⁰ Danish Agency for Education and Quality, *Recommendations on the Use of Generative AI in Primary School Teaching*.

⁵¹ Hellenic Republic, Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, art. 4(3).

⁵² Haridus- ja Teadusministeerium, *Tehisaru juhend*.

⁵³ Hellenic Republic, Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, art. 6(2)(b).

⁵⁴ Hellenic Republic, Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, art. 4(5).

data that students and teachers are allowed to enter into AI platforms, which must the information that is not allowed to be uploaded such as photos, videos, audio recording of voice, contact details, medical history, along with other data specified in art. 16, part. 3⁵⁵. In turn, the Czech Republic mentions avoiding uploading personal information. Both the Czech Republic and Denmark and Greece also support the use of secure AI systems in schools.

The needs to consult teachers and pupils before making decision on the AI tools introduced in school, establishing the rules, rights and obligations that will follow from the regulations developed at the level of the institution, is stated in the methodological documents developed by Estonia and the Czech Republic. Denmark indicates the importance of consulting students in higher secondary education. In contrast, Greece does not specify the need for prior consultation, but establishes through art. 10, part. 1 the importance of informing the entire education community about the tools and how to use AI in schools⁵⁶.

Similarly, the autonomy of educational managers in making decisions regarding the use of AI in schools is also reflected, an aspect influenced, moreover, by the way educational services are governed in each country.

Thus, Estonia allows school managers to establish a series of regulation on activities and disciplines where AI can be used, as well as sanctions. The Czech Republic and Denmark also allow freedom in decision making, but draw more restrictive recommendation than Estonia. In the case of Greece, managers can decide whether or not to use an AI system in schools, but any such tool to be introduced must be assessed in advance by the Ministry of Education, according to art. 13, part. 1⁵⁷.

5. Conclusions

EU member states align themselves with the common European objective of making the continent a leader in AI. In this respect, all member states have set promising strategic objectives, different from country to country, depending on the current level of digital development, available resources and administrative capacity.

Although all five countries analyzed in this pilot study have set goals regarding the integration and development of AI in education services, strategic concerns are different. For example, Greece and Estonia mention in their national strategies measures to introduce AI since preschool education, so that children adapt to such technologies and learn to critically look at AI generated content. Greece and Estonia differ, however, in establishing regulations for the use of AI in education, due to the different level to autonomy that educational managers have. Greece is distinguished by a regulatory framework that sets out prohibitions

⁵⁵ Hellenic Republic, Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, art. 16(3).

⁵⁶ Hellenic Republic, Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, art. 10.

⁵⁷ Hellenic Republic, Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, art. 13(1).

and conditions to be respected by the entire educational community when AI is used in schools or beyond for teaching and learning activities.

Estonia has not formulated rules with mandatory applicability, but methodological guidelines that guide school managers and other stakeholders towards the appropriate and beneficial use of AI. Compared to the other countries covered in this study, Estonia focuses on encouraging teachers, especially those who are reluctant and less experienced in the field of AI, emphasizing the importance of experimenting with AI and using it for teaching activities. To reinforce this encouragement, Estonia specifies in its methodological framework that it is not necessary to cite the use of AI in the development of teaching materials and allows for the assessment of students with the support of an AI system.

A common aspect reflected by the regulations of the analyzed states is the protection of the personal rights of students. Students are also encouraged to use AI in a responsible way and to be aware that these tools can provide false information and also affect the development of their own skills. Greece and Denmark do not support the use of AI in solving exams or homework, while Estonia encourages students to experiment with tools that can help them.

Because we live in an era of digitalization, in which children use digital technologies from a young age that can influence their cognitive and language development⁵⁸, the risk of using AI to replace human effort increases. Setting limits on the use of AI in schools and formulating guidelines so that it is used in an assumed correct and trust-inspiring manner in the student-teacher relationship remains essential both for respecting ethical and moral principles and for achieving the purpose of the education services system as a whole.

The Greek model can be an example of good practice for both Romania and other countries where school autonomy is limited. The Hellenic Republic is concerned with innovation, the development of AI in education, the attraction of talent, but also is interested in the ethical and efficient use of this new technology. In Romania it remains important to develop normative or, at least, methodological frameworks to regulate the use of AI in education. The guidelines published by ECDL or the Dambovită Inspectorate, together with the fact that some Romanian universities have already developed their own regulations for the use of AI by the academic community, highlight the requirement of stakeholders to have clearly established rules, guidelines, limits and permissive. In addition, the development of such regulations allows Romania to align with other EU Countries and implement its strategic objectives of training AI skills in an efficient and appropriate manner.

⁵⁸ OECD, *How's Life for Children in the Digital Age?* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025), <https://doi.org/10.1787/0854b900-en>.

Bibliography

I. Books and Articles

1. Barreira, Jonas Souza, Marcos Guilherme Moura Silva, and Tadeu Oliver Gonçalves. “Desafios e oportunidades para o uso do Chat GPT na pesquisa em educação matemática.” *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação* 19, special no. 2 (2024): e024084. <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v19iesp.2.18594>.
2. Bedrosova, Marie Jaron, Vojtech Dvorak, Hana Machackova, Iveta Jansova, Karolina Bielikova, Maria Jurikova, and Karolina Kozumplikova. *Generative Artificial Intelligence through the Eyes of Czech Children and Adolescents: Findings from the EU Kids Online V Project*. Brno: Masaryk University, 2026. https://is.muni.cz/publication/2553899/euko_ai_report_en.pdf.
3. Dragomir, Andreea-Nicoleta. “The Role of the European Union in Shaping an Ethical and Legal Framework for Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education.” *Review of Artificial Intelligence in Education* 6 (2025): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.37497/rev.artif.intell.educ.v6ii.48>.
4. García-Peñalvo, Francisco J., Faraón Llorens-Largo, and Javier Vidal. “The New Reality of Education in the Face of Advances in Generative Artificial Intelligence.” *RIED—Revista Iberoamericana de Educación a Distancia* 27, no. 1 (2024): 9–39. <https://doi.org/10.5944/ried.27.1.37716>.
5. Haenlein, Michael, and Andreas Kaplan. “A Brief History of Artificial Intelligence: On the Past, Present, and Future of Artificial Intelligence.” *California Management Review* 61, no. 4 (2019): 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619864925>.
6. Huang, Lan. “Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Education: Student Privacy and Data Protection.” *Science Insights Education Frontiers* 16, no. 2 (2023): 2577–87. <https://doi.org/10.15354/sief.23.re202>.
7. Mahrishi, Mehul, Asad Abbas, and Mohammad Khubeb Siddiqui. “Global Initiatives Towards Regulatory Frameworks for Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Higher Education.” *Digital Government: Research and Practice* 6, no. 2 (2025): article 20, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3672462>.
8. Malik, Nikita, and Menal Dahiya. “Interacting with ChatGPT: Impact on Students and Teaching-Learning.” *Sigma Journal of Engineering and Natural Sciences* 42, no. 6 (2024): 1736–48. <https://doi.org/10.14744/sigma.2023.00147>.
9. Reyes, Gary, Roberto Tolozabo-Benites, Carlos George-Reyes, Dayron Rumbaut, and Julio Barzola-Monteses. “Adoption of Artificial Intelligence Applications in Higher Education.” *Frontiers in Education* 10 (2025): 1680401. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1680401>.
10. Zhang, Zizhuo, Lian Wen, Yanfei Jiang, and Yongli Liu. “Evaluate Chat-GPT’s Programming Capability in Swift Through Real University Exam Questions.” *Software: Practice and Experience* 54, no. 11 (2024): 2129–43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/spe.3330>.

II. Legislation and Official Sources

11. Artificial Intelligence Skills Alliance (ARISA). *AI Skills Strategy for Europe*. 2024. https://aiskills.eu/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/ARISA_AI-Skills-Strategy-for-Europe_2024.pdf.
12. Danish Agency for Education and Quality. *Recommendations on the Use of Generative AI in Primary School Teaching*. June 26, 2025. <https://uvm.dk/media/dylly3ye/250626-tilgaengeliggjort-anbefalinger-om-brug-af-generativ-ai-i-undervisningen-i-folkeskolen.pdf>.
13. European Commission. *AI Continent Action Plan*. COM(2025) 165 final. Brussels, April 9, 2025. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ai-continent-action-plan>.
14. European Commission. “Denmark AI Strategy Report.” AI Watch. Last updated September 1, 2021. https://ai-watch.ec.europa.eu/countries/denmark/denmark-ai-strategy-report_en#human-capital.
15. European Commission, Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. *Guidelines on the Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence and Data in Teaching and Learning for Educators*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.2766/7967834>.
16. European Union. Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, art. 165. OJ C 202 (June 7, 2016): 120. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12016E165>.
17. European Union. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of June 13, 2024, laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). OJ L 2024/1689 (July 12, 2024). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng>.
18. Eurostat. “Individuals – Use of Generative AI Tools.” Data Browser. Accessed June 8, 2026. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/isoc_ai_iaiu/bookmark/table?lang=en&bookmarkId=45e9481a-e577-4b03-80c1-ab654032ff65&c=1769165540000.
19. Eurydice. “Estonia: AI Leap Initiative to Enhance Learning and Teaching.” March 2025. Accessed June 11, 2026. <https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/news/estonia-ai-leap-initiative-enhance-learning-and-teaching>.
20. Government of Romania. Government Decision No. 832 of July 11, 2024, approving the *National Strategy in the Field of Artificial Intelligence 2024–2027*. *Monitorul Oficial al României*, Part I, no. 730 (July 25, 2024).
21. Government of the Republic of Estonia. *Estonia’s National Artificial Intelligence Strategy 2019–2021*. July 2019. https://t98cc689-5814-47ec-86b3-db505a7c3978.filesusr.com/ugd/7df26f_27a618cb80a648c38be427194affa2f3.pdf.
22. Haridus- ja Teadusministeerium [Estonian Ministry of Education and Research]. *Tehisaru juhend [Artificial Intelligence Guide]*. 2024. <https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/documents/2024-03/Tehisaru%20juhend%202024.pdf>.
23. Hellenic Republic, Presidency of the Government, Special Secretariat of Foresight, High-Level Advisory Committee on Artificial Intelligence. *A Blueprint for Greece’s AI Transformation*. 2024. https://foresight.gov.gr/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/Blueprint_GREECES_AI_TRANSFORMATION.pdf

24. Hellenic Republic. Ministerial Decision No. 55909/Δ6/2026, “Determining Issues Related to the Use of Artificial Intelligence Systems in the Educational Process and the Protection of Personal Data.” Government Gazette B 2639 (May 12, 2026). <https://www.e-nomothesia.gr/kat-ekpaideuse/kya-55909-d6-2026.html>.
25. ICDL Romania. *Ghid AI pentru educație: Ghid practic pentru școlile din România*. 2026. https://icdl.ro/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/GHID_AI_PT_EDUCATIE_final.pdf.
26. Inspectoratul Școlar Județean Dâmbovița. *Ghid de utilizare IA în educație*. 2025. <https://www.isj-db.ro/public/public/upload/manager/files/Limbi%20moderne/2024-2025/Ghid%20de%20utilizare%20IA%20%C3%AEn%20educa%C8%9Bie.pdf>.
27. Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic. “NPI ČR Issued Guides for Teachers on How to Use Artificial Intelligence in Schools.” 2024. <https://msmt.gov.cz/npi-vydalo-navody-pro-pedagogy-jak-na-umelou-inteligenci-ve?lang=1>.
28. Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic. *National Artificial Intelligence Strategy of the Czech Republic*. 2019. https://mpo.gov.cz/assets/cz/rozcestnik/pro-media/tiskove-zpravy/2019/6/NAIS_eng_korektura_06-19_web.pdf.
29. OECD. “Czechia.” In *Progress in Implementing the European Union Coordinated Plan on Artificial Intelligence (Volume 1): Member States’ Actions*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/progress-in-implementing-the-european-union-coordinated-plan-on-artificial-intelligence-volume-1_6d530a88-en/czechia_0482b6c9-en.html.
30. OECD. “Denmark.” In *Progress in Implementing the European Union Coordinated Plan on Artificial Intelligence (Volume 1): Member States’ Actions*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/progress-in-implementing-the-european-union-coordinated-plan-on-artificial-intelligence-volume-1_6d530a88-en/denmark_89c393fa-en.html.
31. OECD. *Education and Skills in Romania*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1787/594cbb5d-en>.
32. OECD. “Education Policy Outlook in Denmark.” *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, no. 12. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1787/3288629c-en>.
33. OECD. “Education Policy Outlook in the Czech Republic.” *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, no. 11. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1787/6363ab1d-en>.
34. OECD. “Enhancing Data-Informed Strategic Governance in Education in Estonia.” *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, no. 47. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1787/11495e02-en>.
35. OECD. “Greece.” In *Progress in Implementing the European Union Coordinated Plan on Artificial Intelligence (Volume 1): Member States’ Actions*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/progress-in-implementing-the-european-union-coordinated-plan-on-artificial-intelligence-volume-1_6d530a88-en/greece_e5215c30-en.html.
36. OECD. *How’s Life for Children in the Digital Age?* Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1787/0854b900-en>.

37. OECD. *Improving Learning Outcomes in Greece: Strengthening School Governance, Teacher Professionalism and Digital Education*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.1787/6323bd8e-en>.
38. OECD. *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The State of Learning and Equity in Education*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en>.