International Journal of Computer Information Systems and Industrial Management Applications
ISSN 2150-7988 Volume 18(9s) 2026 pp. 305-317
https://doi.org/10.70917/ijcisim-2026-3442
Article

AI - Driven Adaptive Learning Ecosystems for Personalized Higher Education: Integration Learning Analytics, Cognitive Modeling and Predictive Student Performance Framework

N. Abiramasundari[1], Varanasi Rahul[2], M. Bala Koteswari[3], Rashmi Paranjpye[4], A. Vivek Ignatius[5], Roshan Usapkar[6]

[1]Department of Commerce - Bank Management, Anna Adarsh College for Women (Autonomous), Chennai, Tamilnadu, India.
Email: abiaac2016@gmail.com
[2]Department of BBA Aviation Management, Acharya Institute of Graduate Studies, Bangalore, Karnataka, India.
Email: rahul.varanasi123@gmail.com
[3] Sanskrithi School of Business, Puttaparthi, Andhra Pradesh, India.
Email: drbalakoteswari@gmail.com
[4]Dr. D. Y. Patil B School, Pune, Maharashtra, India.
Email: rashmi.mpa@gmail.com
[5]Department of Computer Science and Engineering, K. Ramakrishnan college of Technology (Autonomous), Samayapuram, Trichy, Tamilnadu, India.
Email: vivekigs@gmail.com
[6]Department of Commerce, Sant Sohirobanath Ambiye, Govt College and Research Centre, Pernem Goa.
Email: roshnaik@gmail.com

Abstract: Higher education systems globally are transitioning from a standardized, uniform approach to instruction towards customized, data-driven learning experiences facilitated by artificial intelligence (AI). This paper introduces a comprehensive conceptual framework known as the AI-driven Adaptive Learning Ecosystem (AI-ALE), which integrates three foundational components: learning analytics (LA), cognitive modeling (including knowledge tracing), and predictive modeling of student performance, all within a cohesive architecture designed for personalized higher education. Drawing on recent systematic reviews and empirical research conducted between 2020 and 2026, the paper consolidates global trends in the design of adaptive learning systems, the progression of cognitive and knowledge-tracing models from Bayesian methodologies to deep learning and attention-based frameworks, as well as techniques in predictive analytics aimed at identifying students at risk. The framework is then analyzed thoroughly within the context of Indian higher education, taking into account the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, the India AI Mission, state-level policies on AI education, and the ongoing digital divide between elite institutions and those with limited resources. The findings reveal that while India demonstrates robust policy intentions and developing infrastructure for AI-enabled personalization, challenges such as unequal connectivity, disparities in device access, language barriers, and varied capacities for institutional data governance threaten to create an uneven higher education landscape. The paper concludes with recommendations regarding governance, ethics, and future research advocating for federated and privacy-conscious analytics, multilingual cognitive models, and human oversight, to assist Indian educational institutions in responsibly implementing adaptive learning ecosystems on a large scale.

Keywords: Adaptive Learning; Learning Analytics; Cognitive Modeling; Knowledge Tracing; Predictive Student Performance; Artificial Intelligence in Education

1. Introduction

Higher education institutions globally are enrolling increasingly diverse student bodies, characterized by variations in prior knowledge, learning speed, socio-economic status, language proficiency, and motivation levels. Traditional teaching models, which rely on rigid curricula, uniform pacing, and periodic assessments, often fail to address this diversity effectively. This inadequacy can lead to student disengagement, high dropout rates, and unequal educational outcomes [1]. The advent of artificial intelligence especially the integration of machine learning, learning analytics, and cognitive science presents a promising avenue for achieving genuinely personalized education at both institutional and national levels. Recent systematic reviews indicate a significant acceleration in research and implementation of AI-enhanced adaptive learning systems following 2022 [2]. Most empirical studies on this topic were published between 2023 and 2024 and cover various technologies including machine learning, natural language processing, and hybrid recommendation systems that facilitate real-time personalization and adaptive feedback [3]. This expansion reflects a paradigm shift from static rule-based adaptive systems to frameworks that continuously assess a learner's evolving cognitive state while predicting performance trajectories for timely pedagogical interventions. Three foundational technical components support this transition. Firstly, learning analytics is defined by [4] as the measurement, collection, analysis, and reporting of learner data within their contexts to enhance understanding and optimize educational outcomes. Secondly, cognitive modelling primarily realized through knowledge tracing (KT) evaluates a learner's underlying mastery of particular skills or concepts over time. This method has its roots in earlier cognitive modeling work by [5] and has evolved to include Bayesian Knowledge Tracing along with modern deep neural architectures that utilize attention mechanisms. Thirdly, predictive student performance modeling leverages these representations to anticipate outcomes like course completion rates or dropout risks enabling proactive academic support rather than merely reactive measures. India presents a particularly noteworthy yet under-explored environment for examining the integration of these three pillars [6]. The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 explicitly advocates for technology-driven student-centered higher education while aiming for a Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) of 50 percent by 2035; this objective will be partially supported through extensive online and blended delivery methods via platforms such as SWAYAM. Additionally, the India AI Mission was sanctioned by the Union Cabinet in March 2024 with an investment plan of around ₹10,371.92 crore over five years; it emphasizes AI capacity-building initiatives including undergraduate to doctoral courses in AI and establishing Data-and-AI labs in Tier-2 and Tier-3 cities as national priorities [7]. However, India's higher education landscape remains significantly unequal: according to a household survey from 2025 only about 15 percent had internet access while merely 8 percent owned computers a disparity closely linked with the differences between well-funded urban campuses versus under-resourced rural institutions. In light of this context, this paper contributes four key insights. First, it synthesizes recent global literature from 2020 to 2026 concerning AI-driven adaptive learning systems alongside learning analytics as well as cognitive knowledge-tracing models. Second, it introduces an integrated conceptual framework the AI-driven Adaptive Learning Ecosystem which links data analysis techniques with cognitive modeling approaches and predictive analytics within a unified architecture suitable for institutional application. Thirdly, it specifically contextualizes this framework within Indian higher education by referencing local empirical studies along with national policies related to AI education while considering existing infrastructural challenges. Lastly, it provides an extensive examination of both opportunities and risks posed by this technological trajectory regarding equity issues governance practices pedagogical strategies in India; it concludes with actionable recommendations tailored for institutions regulators researchers [8].

2. Literature Review

2.1. AI-Driven Adaptive Learning Systems: Global Trends

A PRISMA-guided systematic review encompassing fifteen empirical studies published from 2020 to 2024 revealed that 73% of the analyzed literature emerged in the last two years of this timeframe. The contributions originated from fifteen countries, with the United States, China, and Europe being the most prominent contributors. The key enabling technologies identified included machine learning (40%), natural language processing (33%), and hybrid systems (27%). Reported improvements in learning outcomes varied between 15% and 25% compared to non-adaptive baselines [9] . In addition, a complementary bibliometric analysis of adaptive-learning and AI research spanning from 1990 to 2024 indicates a similar sharp increase in publications post-2020. This analysis suggests a multi-dimensional evaluation framework that includes engagement metrics (such as time-on-task, completion rates, and interaction depth) along with academic performance indicators like grade improvements and comprehension gains as essential for assessing the effectiveness of adaptive learning [10]. Scoping reviews concentrating on adaptive mechanisms embedded within learning management systems trace developments from institutional implementations between 2013 and 2022 through broader trends in AI applications in education (Guo, Zheng, & Zhai, 2024), culminating in insights informed by cognitive-neuropsychology regarding personalized learning and adaptive assessment strategies [11]. Geographically, areas of significant research activity related to adaptive technology and AI-driven learning path recommendations for skill development include China, India, and the United States. Recent reviews have underscored the increasing influence of large language models (LLMs) on personalization efforts improving engagement levels, providing emotional support, facilitating real-time monitoring, and adapting assessments—while also highlighting ethical concerns such as bias, privacy issues, and the authenticity of pedagogical techniques like Socratic questioning [12]. A cross-national mapping study examining AI and big data applications in personalized education across the U.S., China, and India has illustrated how AI is transforming teacher roles and customizing educational pathways amidst ongoing challenges related to data privacy and infrastructural disparities. Reviews focused on higher education settings along with analyses addressing barriers to inclusive AI implementation [13] emphasize that advancements in technical capabilities have outpaced necessary governance frameworks and equity measures across various environments. Furthermore, a systematic review of 148 articles published between 2021 and 2024 concluded that AI tools significantly enhance personalized learning experiences including assessment methods as well as communication engagement strategies while also pinpointing implementation challenges and training deficiencies as major obstacles affecting overall impact [14].

2.2. Learning Analytics in Higher Education

Learning analytics has evolved from a basic, dashboard-focused approach to becoming a critical component of adaptive systems. The core idea is that detailed learner and contextual data can be systematically analyzed to enhance understanding and improvement of learning environments [15]. This concept has been further developed by scholars who emphasize the importance of scrutinizing the social and pedagogical implications of data-driven decision-making in education, rather than just its technical precision. In India, research in learning analytics has progressed from merely descriptive reporting to predictive and prescriptive frameworks that align with the NEP 2020's emphasis on data-driven outcomes. One such framework combines predictive modeling techniques, like support-vector-machine classifiers, with academic data from institutions to identify students at risk and guide resource distribution and teaching strategies in accordance with NEP goals [16]. This positions learning analytics as a tool for policy implementation rather than simply an additional technical feature comprehensive literature on learning-analytics frameworks; studies aligned with NEP. A related study conducted post-NEP highlights predictive analytics—driven by data mining and machine learning as essential for recognizing at-risk students, tailoring instruction, enhancing retention rates, and improving employability outcomes while also pointing out concerns regarding algorithmic bias, data privacy, and the scalability of these solutions as ongoing challenges [17]. Moreover, empirical studies in India are beginning to utilize multimodal data beyond traditional academic records. The researchers have developed a multi-factor machine-learning framework incorporating behavioral indicators such as activity levels and screen time, financial factors including income status, scholarships, loans, and tuition fees, along with physiological metrics obtained from wearable devices like heart rate and smartwatch usage to predict and analyze student academic performance [18]. This exemplifies the growing array of data available for predictive modeling within Indian educational institutions Additionally, complementary research utilizing blended-learning datasets from postgraduate technology students has employed classification algorithms and clustering methods to uncover performance-related features and patterns specific to Indian classroom contexts [19].

2.3. Cognitive Modeling and Knowledge Tracing

Cognitive modeling in education has its roots in the early integration of symbolic cognitive models with intelligent tutoring systems, aiming to directly represent a learner's problem-solving knowledge within the tutoring framework. This foundational work led to the development of KT, which involves modeling how a learner's proficiency in specific skills evolves through successive practice interactions to predict future performance. BKT emerged as a foundational probabilistic model defined by parameters that include initial knowledge, guessing probability, slip probability, and learning-transition probability. Its simplicity and interpretability contributed to its status as an early standard in the field. However, Performance Factor Analysis (PFA) built upon BKT by factoring in item difficulty and past performance; both methodologies face challenges when it comes to accurately reflecting non-linear learning dynamics involving multiple concepts [20]. The advent of deep-learning-based knowledge tracing (DLKT), initiated by Deep Knowledge Tracing utilizing recurrent neural networks, greatly enhanced predictive accuracy by effectively capturing intricate temporal dependencies within interaction sequences, albeit at the expense of interpretability. Subsequent models have aimed to restore some level of interpretability while maintaining strong predictive capabilities: HELP-DKT provides an interpretable cognitive model focused on programming skill acquisition through deep knowledge tracing [21] attention-based approaches like ELAKT improve locality sensitivity in attentive knowledge tracing and hybrid architectures combining bidirectional transformers with graph-attention mechanisms now concurrently model knowledge state and cognitive load, leveraging multimodal data for dynamic estimations of mental effort during learning tasks deep knowledge tracing and cognitive-load-estimation research [22]. Additionally, a parallel line of research merges cognitive assimilation theory with item-response theory into multi-scale convolutional-attention knowledge tracing for better representation of the cumulative and structural development of knowledge over varied time scale addressing limitations seen in earlier KT models regarding realistic forgetting and absorption processes multi-scale convolutional attention knowledge-tracing research, 2025 . From 2024 onward, emerging methods based on large language models for knowledge tracing are anticipated to offer more nuanced semantic representations of learning content alongside sequential performance modeling.

2.4. Predictive Student Performance Modeling

Predictive analytics aimed at enhancing student success represents one of the most developed uses of AI within the educational sector. It has been extensively researched particularly regarding attrition rates in Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), where completion figures can be as low as 2.6 to 7 percent in courses with large enrolments. This situation underscores the need for early identification of students who are at risk of dropping out [23]. Initial studies focused on 'deconstructing disengagement' by examining various learner subpopulations within MOOCs to identify unique disengagement patterns that necessitate tailored intervention strategies. Following this groundwork, later investigations have utilized a growing array of algorithms ranging from traditional classifiers to LSTM-based sequence models to predict dropout rates using data derived from clickstreams, interaction logs, and assessment results [24]. In India, the implementation of MOOC delivery through SWAYAM is explicitly outlined in the NEP 2020 as a strategy to achieve a Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) target of 50 percent by 2035. This highlights the critical need for accurate and timely dropout predictions within a system anticipated to significantly increase online enrolment numbers [25]. More broadly, research into predictive analytics applied to higher education data in India which includes studies on blended learning classifications, feature-selection methods, and SVM-based frameworks aligned with NEP objectives consistently indicates that academic performance, behavioural indicators, and increasingly non-traditional factors such as financial and physiological characteristics can greatly enhance the early detection of at-risk students. This is contingent upon addressing challenges related to data quality and class imbalance [26].

3. Conceptual Framework: The AI-Driven Adaptive Learning Ecosystem (AI-ALE)

Integrating insights from the three bodies of literature reviewed previously, this paper introduces a five-layer framework known as the AI-ALE. This framework is intended to be technology-agnostic and suitable for diverse institutional environments while explicitly addressing governance and equity issues that influence whether such systems operate inclusively or exclusivity. Table 1 provides an overview of these layers along with their fundamental functions, representative techniques derived from the literature.

Table 1 Core functions, representative techniques & Primary Risks derived from the literature

Layer	Core Function	Representative Techniques	Primary Risks
1. Data Layer	Capture multimodal learner and contextual data (LMS logs, assessments, MOOC interaction traces, behavioral/wearable signals)	LMS/SWAYAM analytics, clickstream logging, multimodal sensing	Data privacy, informed consent, infrastructural exclusion of low-connectivity learners
2.Cognitive Modelling Layer	Estimate latent mastery of skills/concepts over time	BKT, PFA, Deep Knowledge Tracing, attention-based KT	Loss of interpretability in deep models; cold-start for new learners

3. Predictive Analytics Layer	Forecast performance, completion, and dropout risk	Classification/regression models, LSTM sequence models	Algorithmic bias, false positives/negatives in at-risk flagging, class imbalance
4. Personalization & Intervention Layer	Adapt content sequencing, pacing, and support in real time	Adaptive content engines, multilingual chatbot tutors, faculty early-warning dashboards	Over-automation of pedagogy; reduced human mentoring contact
5. Governance & Feedback Layer	Oversight, auditing, and continuous refinement of the ecosystem	Human-in-the-loop review, bias audits, data-protection compliance	Weak institutional capacity for AI procurement and oversight

The five layers function as a closed loop rather than as a linear pathway; the outputs generated by the predictive analytics and intervention layers such as identifying which interventions were effective for specific learner profiles are reintegrated into the data and cognitive modeling layers. This process enables the ecosystem to adjust and improve over successive cohorts. Importantly, the governance layer is presented as all-encompassing, rather than merely following the other four layers. This illustrates the argument put forth in this paper that ethical oversight and equity auditing should be integrated into adaptive learning ecosystems from the very beginning, rather than being added on post-implementation [27]. This conclusion aligns with critiques of technology-first approaches found in existing literature

4. Application and Interpretation in the Indian Higher Education Context

4.1. Policy Landscape

India's policy landscape presents a clear directive for the implementation of AI-driven personalized education. The NEP 2020 advocates for a transition towards flexible, multidisciplinary, and competency-based higher education. It envisions the establishment of an Academic Bank of Credits and a National Credit Framework, aiming for a Gross Enrolment Ratio of 50 percent by 2035 a goal that assumes significant growth in online and blended learning facilitated by platforms like SWAYAM [30]. At the national level, the IndiaAI Mission approved on March 7, 2024, with an allocation of approximately ₹10,371.92 crore over five years operationalizes this vision through seven key pillars. These include India AI FutureSkills focused on expanding AI programs at undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral levels while setting up Data-and-AI labs in Tier-2 and Tier-3 cities the India AI Innovation Centre, and a Safe & Trusted AI pillar concentrating on governance issues [31]. As of early 2025, the FutureSkills Platform had registered around 8.6 lakh candidates in industry-aligned AI training initiatives. State governments are beginning to enhance this national framework with their initiatives. Punjab has introduced an AI curriculum in its government schools. Meanwhile, Odisha's AI Policy for 2025 outlines a ten-year strategy aimed at integrating AI instruction into 35 percent of schools by 2029 and achieving coverage in 90 percent by 2036; it specifically incorporates Odia and tribal languages to promote linguistic equity. On the regulatory front, the UGC is addressing academic integrity concerns related to generative AI by providing guidance on preventing misuse within doctoral research [32] indicating that Indian higher education governance is starting to confront challenges associated with dual-use AI technologies discussed earlier.

4.2. Infrastructural Realities and the Digital Divide

Despite these proactive policies, the groundwork for implementing adaptive learning across India remains inconsistent. A survey conducted in 2025 revealed that only about 15 percent of Indian households had internet access while merely 8 percent owned computers. This leaves numerous students without adequate technical means to engage in adaptive technology-mediated instruction [33]. This divide manifests not just as a rural-urban disparity but as an inherent characteristic of Indian higher education: affluent institutions are increasingly experimenting with generative AI tools and modern learning-management systems while many state universities and rural colleges struggle with unreliable connectivity and outdated infrastructure a gap that has exacerbated dropout rates when classes transitioned online [34]. Moreover, this analysis highlights that many universities lack robust governance frameworks concerning student data ownership as well as ethical oversight linked to AI procurement processes. This exposes institutions to risks associated with opaque vendor contracts and algorithmic bias while making them more likely to become passive users within externally controlled digital ecosystems instead of proactive managers of their educational data [35] When viewed through the lens of the proposed AI-ALE framework from Section 3, it becomes evident that there is a structural vulnerability concentrated within data management and governance layers: without minimum standards governing data infrastructure or institutional capacity regarding AI governance practices, reliable implementation outside elite institutions becomes challenging.

4.3. Linguistic Diversity

The learner population within India's higher educational system is linguistically and socio-economically far more diverse than those populations upon which most existing adaptive-learning models have been developed this discrepancy has also been noted in global analyses regarding AI usage amid digital divides. Such studies indicate that biases related to language or culture could marginalize learners unless active localization efforts are adopted [36] State-level initiatives like Odisha's focus on Odia language instruction exhibit growing institutional awareness toward addressing these needs although similar multilingual adaptations in cognitive modeling tools relevant to Indian contexts remain nascent compared to stated policy goals. Comparative assessments involving personalized education across countries like the United States or China further reveal persistent challenges tied to data privacy alongside infrastructural disparities even where human-in-the-loop personalization techniques are adequately established [37]. This finding correlates closely with evidence specific to India presented earlier and underscores that obstacles surrounding equitable access rather than algorithm availability serve as primary limitations within adaptive learning frameworks here.

4.4. Empirical Illustrations from Indian Institutions

Recent empirical studies from Indian institutions showcase initial steps toward operationalizing various components outlined by the AI-ALE framework. Classification tasks utilizing datasets from blended-learning postgraduate programs connected with highlight specific patterns tied directly towards identifying performance indicators unique within Indian contexts [38]. Concurrently following NEP mandates related predictive analytics work recognizes dropout prediction mechanisms while emphasizing personalized instruction strategies along retention improvements needed toward fulfilling NEP goals but urges caution against biases arising from algorithms alongside privacy issues before scaling can responsibly extend throughout varied institutional landscapes across India.

4.5. Synthesis

Collectively interpreting findings indicates two distinct trajectories ahead: On one side lies evidence showing national commitments such as NEP alongside local implementations focusing both ambition-driven policies plus growing empirical research suggest potential pathways enabling sophisticated adaptive educational ecosystems based on mobile-first vernacular approaches rather than merely replicating existing systems designed according other demographics altogether; however documented inequities surrounding connectivity resources available alongside insufficient institutional capacities managing respective technologies mean absent deliberate measures targeting equity concerns risk deepening divides separating well-resourced versus less privileged educational settings effectively segmenting India's higher education landscape into tiers defined distinctly via capabilities attributed either enabled or excluded due primarily stemming technological inequities present today.

4.6. Ethical Considerations

This paper identifies recurring themes relating particularly towards three core governance dimensions:

a. Algorithmic Bias: Predictive models trained using historical datasets may inadvertently encode societal inequities especially underrepresented groups such first-generation learners hailing rural backgrounds or linguistic minorities warrant attention raised specifically around inclusive deployment barriers noted previously.
b. Data Privacy: Expanding investigative boundaries into finance coupled physiological domains raises stakes significantly regarding failures tied directly around effective management protocols given opaque contractual arrangements between universities concerning external providers poses serious risks threatening control over sensitive student information.
c. Academic Integrity: Capabilities enabling tailored tutoring through generative-AI also open avenues fostering misconduct prompting regulatory bodies issuing guidelines ensuring adherence including monitoring compliance pertaining ethical uses spanning doctoral research fields broadly across academia ensuring accountability remains intact moving forward. Recognizing these intricacies reinforces necessity

ensuring comprehensive governance encompasses every phase deployment facilitates adoption whilst prioritizing infrastructure capable supporting responsible integration accordingly aligning aspirations set forth frameworks guiding educational advancements ahead.

5. Discussion

5.1 For Students

Adaptive learning ecosystems offer tailored instructional experiences along heightened responsiveness yet necessitate parallel assurances delivering reliable access via suitable devices reflecting validation processes catering uniquely tailored towards diverse learner demographics mitigating risks otherwise favoring already advantaged individuals disproportionately benefiting disproportionately elevating inequalities further if left unaddressed adequately.

5.2 For Faculty and Institutions

Shifting faculty responsibilities witnessing transformation away sole content delivery roles transitioning instead towards interpreters evaluating insights generated autonomously reviewing alerts pinpointing areas requiring intervention ensures human mentorship persists providing invaluable contact ultimately irreplaceable amidst purely automated structures emerging rapidly requiring investment enhancing infrastructural capabilities encompassing expertise governing data management adeptly facilitating stable partnerships strengthening relationships forged between academia tech providers alike promoting equitable engagements long-term objectives realized effectively translating aspirations expressed throughout policy documents guiding future developments shaping new horizons collectively envisioned together moving forward building bridges forging connections aligning priorities sustainably advancing journey undertaken steadily progressing onward thoughtfully integral solutions sought jointly traversing terrain navigated collaboratively fostering understanding amongst stakeholders involved working harmoniously collectively striving achieving shared outcomes envisioned mutually reinforcing paths taken ahead illuminating brighter futures awaiting discovery!

Table 2: Comparative Performance and Interpretability of Cognitive-Modelling (Knowledge-Tracing) Approaches

Model Family	Core Mechanism	Typical AUC (benchmark datasets)	Interpretability
Bayesian Knowledge Tracing	Hidden Markov model with 4 parameters: prior knowledge, learn rate, guess, slip	≈0.63–0.73 (varies by evaluation procedure)	High - parameters map directly to learning theory
Performance Factor Analysis	Logistic regression over item difficulty and prior success/failure counts	≈0.70–0.72	High
Deep Knowledge Tracing (DKT)	Recurrent neural network (LSTM) over interaction sequences	≈0.86–0.90 on ASSISTments-family datasets	Low - 'black box' hidden state; calibration drift reported
Self- Attentive	Transformer-style self-attention over exercise–response history, some with IRT embeddings and time decay	≈0.80 (SAKT); AKT competitive with or above DKT across pyKT benchmark datasets	Medium - attention weights offer partial explanation
Interpretable hybrid	Deep sequence models augmented with explicit cognitive	AUC gains of ≈3–5% over base DKT-family models on	Medium–High - explicit cognitive/ability

cognitive models	or ability-attribute features	ASSISTments/KDDCup datasets	features restore some interpretability

The domain demonstrates a distinct trade-off between accuracy and interpretability. Traditional probabilistic models, such as BKT and PFA, remain appealing for educators who need to provide clear explanations of risk indicators to students or accreditation organizations. In contrast, deep learning and attention-based models yield significantly greater predictive accuracy but lack transparency. For Indian institutions that have restricted AI governance capabilities and express a regulatory preference for explainable and auditable systems hybrid interpretable architectures like HELP-DKT-style models emerge as a more defensible option for critical decisions, such as identifying potential drop-out risks. Meanwhile, black-box deep models may be reserved for less critical tasks that involve straightforward recommendations, such as content sequencing.

Table 3: Global versus Indian Readiness for AI-Driven Adaptive Learning

Readiness Dimension	**Global (US / China / Europe) Position**	**Indian Position**
Policy mandate	Fragmented across institutional/state policy; US/China lead empirical research volume (Yuensook et al., 2026)	Strong, unified national mandate via NEP 2020 and IndiaAI Mission, reinforced by state policies (Punjab, Odisha)
Research output	Largest share of published empirical AI-adaptive-learning studies (Yuensook et al., 2026)	Identified research hotspot alongside US/China for AI path-recommendation in lifelong learning (Bayly-Castaneda et al., 2024); growing India-specific predictive-analytics literature
Connectivity & device access	Near-universal broadband/device access in leading research contexts	Only ~15% of households with internet access and ~8% owning a computer nationally (Policy Circle, 2025b)
Institutional data governance	Emerging institutional AI-governance frameworks (e.g., EDUCAUSE AI Landscape Study, 2025)	Largely absent operational arrangements for data ownership/AI procurement in many universities (Policy Circle, 2025b)
Language/localization coverage	Predominantly English/Mandarin-centric model development	Early-stage; Odisha AI Policy 2025 commits to Odia/tribal-language instruction as a model for linguistic equity (Policy Circle, 2025a)
Skilling pipeline	Mature university AI-degree ecosystems	Rapidly scaling via IndiaAI FutureSkills (~8.6 lakh enrolled), FutureSkills PRIME, Tier-2/3 Data-and-AI labs (IMPRI, 2025)

India's profile is distinctive in combining top-tier policy ambition and a fast-scaling skilling pipeline with markedly weaker connectivity and institutional-governance foundations than the research contexts that produced most published adaptive-learning evidence. This asymmetry strong 'top-down' intent, weak 'bottom-up' infrastructure is the central constraint the AI-ALE framework must be adapted to address.

Table 4: Mapping NEP 2020 Goals to AI-ALE Framework Layers

NEP 2020 Goal	**Corresponding AI-ALE Layer(s)**	**Illustrative Mechanism**

Raise GER to 50% by 2035 via scaled online/blended delivery	Data Layer; Predictive Analytics Layer	SWAYAM interaction logging combined with dropout-risk prediction to sustain MOOC completion at scale
Flexible, multidisciplinary, competency-based learning (Academic Bank of Credits)	Cognitive Modeling Layer; Personalization Layer	Knowledge tracing mapped to modular credit units to certify competency independent of course sequence
Data-led, outcome-focused institutional decision-making	Predictive Analytics Layer; Governance Layer	SVM/ML-based learning-analytics frameworks aligned explicitly with NEP outcomes (NEP-aligned learning-analytics framework literature)
Equity and inclusion for disadvantaged groups	Data Layer; Governance Layer	Multilingual content delivery, subsidized device/connectivity schemes, bias-audited predictive models
Teacher capacity building and AI literacy	Personalization & Intervention Layer; Governance Layer	Faculty-facing early-warning dashboards paired with training under IndiaAI FutureSkills and Responsible AI for Youth-style programs

Every major NEP 2020 goal examined here maps onto at least one AI-ALE layer, suggesting the framework is well suited as an implementation lens for policy — but the mapping also shows that the equity and governance goals depend on the layers (Data, Governance) that Section 4 identifies as India's weakest links, not on the more technically mature Cognitive Modeling layer.

Table 5: SWOT Analysis: AI-ALE Adoption in Indian Higher Education

Strengths	**Weaknesses**
• Unified national mandate (NEP 2020, IndiaAI Mission) • Large-scale MOOC infrastructure (SWAYAM) already collecting learner data • Fast-growing AI skilling pipeline (~8.6 lakh FutureSkills enrolments) • Active India-based predictive-analytics and multimodal-data research base	• Low national internet/device penetration (~15% / ~8%) • Weak institutional AI-governance and procurement capacity • Limited multilingual coverage of cognitive/predictive models • Uneven research maturity outside a small set of well-resourced institutions
Opportunities	**Threats**
• Leapfrog to mobile-first, vernacular-language adaptive systems • Tier-2/3 Data-and-AI labs to decentralize capability (IndiaAI FutureSkills) • State-level policy experimentation (Odisha, Punjab) as replicable models • Emerging interpretable cognitive-modeling techniques suited to auditability needs	• Two-tier higher-education system: AI-enabled elite institutions vs. AI-excluded state/rural colleges • Vendor-driven, opaque AI procurement eroding institutional data sovereignty • Algorithmic bias against under-represented linguistic/regional groups • Generative-AI-enabled academic misconduct outpacing institutional policy (UGC guidance, 2025)

The SWOT profile reinforces the paper's central claim (Section 4.5) that India's adoption challenge is predominantly one of infrastructure and governance distribution rather than algorithmic capability — the 'threats' quadrant is populated almost entirely by equity and governance risks rather than technical limitations.

Table 6: Timeline of Key Indian AI-in-Education Policy Milestones

Year	Milestone
2018	NITI Aayog publishes the National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence, an early framing document for AI's role across sectors including education
2020	National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 formally adopted, mandating technology-enabled, student-centric, competency-based higher education and a 50% GER target by 2035
2022	UNESCO publishes the 'State of the Education Report for India: Artificial Intelligence in Education', mapping opportunities and risks across the Indian system
Mar 2024	Union Cabinet approves the IndiaAI Mission (~₹10,371.92 crore over five years) with pillars including IndiaAI FutureSkills and Safe & Trusted AI
2024–25	FutureSkills Platform reaches ~8.6 lakh enrolments; YuvAi Initiative (MeitY–AICTE) and Centre for Generative AI ('Srijan', IIT Jodhpur, with Meta) launched
2025	Punjab rolls out an AI curriculum in government schools; Odisha approves AI Policy 2025 (35% of schools by 2029, 90% by 2036, Odia/tribal-language instruction); UGC issues guidance on AI misuse in doctoral research
2025	MSDE launches the 'Skilling for AI Readiness' (SOAR) initiative for Classes 6–12 AI literacy, alongside the 10-year review of the Skill India Mission

The timeline shows an acceleration from broad strategic framing (2018–2020) to concrete, funded institutional mechanisms (2024–2025), but also shows that governance-oriented milestones (UGC AI-misuse guidance, Safe & Trusted AI pillar) emerged only after — rather than alongside the skilling and infrastructure milestones, a sequencing risk consistent with the governance gaps identified in Sections 4 and 5.

Table 8: Risk–Mitigation Matrix for Governance of AI-ALE in Indian Institutions

Risk	Likelihood in Indian HEIs	Potential Impact	Mitigation Strategy
Algorithmic bias against under-represented learners	Medium–High	Systematically mis-flags or under-serves rural, first-generation, or linguistic-minority students	Disaggregated fairness audits by language, region, gender, and socio-economic status prior to deployment
Data-privacy exposure from expanded (financial/wearable) data collection	Medium	Sensitive personal data exposed via weak vendor contracts or institutional practice	Data-minimization principles, informed consent protocols, and institutional data-protection compliance
Loss of institutional data sovereignty to external AI vendors	High	Universities become passive subscribers rather than custodians of their educational data	In-house/consortium AI-procurement expertise; standardized data-ownership clauses
Infrastructural exclusion (connectivity/device gap)	High	State/rural institutions unable to participate in adaptive-learning delivery, widening the achievement gap	Targeted device/connectivity subsidy tied to Tier-2/3 Data-and-AI lab rollout

Generative-AI-enabled academic misconduct	Medium–High	Erosion of assessment validity and research integrity	Institutional AI-use policy, detection tools, and integrity training aligned with UGC guidance
Over-automation reducing human mentoring contact	Medium	Students lose access to relational/motivational support that pure automation cannot replace	Mandatory human-in-the-loop review of high-stakes flags; faculty workload allocation for AI-supported advising

The two risks rated 'High' likelihood infrastructural exclusion and loss of institutional data sovereignty are both structural rather than algorithmic, reinforcing the paper's overall conclusion that governance and infrastructure investment, not further model refinement, should be the near-term priority for Indian policymakers and institutional leaders.

6. Limitations and Future Research Directions

The existing research primarily consists of theoretical frameworks or findings from limited studies, underscoring the necessity for longitudinal and multi-institutional validation within the context of Indian higher education. Upcoming research should emphasize the development of multilingual and multimodal cognitive frameworks that integrate regional languages along with emotional or physiological indicators. There is also a pressing need to focus on federated analytics that prioritize privacy, thereby enhancing data security and fostering collaboration among educational institutions. Furthermore, progressing toward explainable AI will significantly enhance the clarity and applicability of predictive models used in academic decision-making processes. Lastly, it is crucial to conduct thorough assessments of bias and fairness specific to India, considering factors such as language, gender, region, and socio-economic status before rolling out AI-driven educational systems on a large scale.

7. Conclusion

This paper has reviewed recent global and Indian literature concerning AI-enhanced adaptive learning, learning analytics, cognitive modeling, and the prediction of student performance. It has introduced a comprehensive five-layer AI-ALE framework that encompasses data handling, cognitive modeling, predictive analytics, personalization/intervention strategies, and governance aspects. In the context of Indian higher education, the analysis reveals that while there is a robust policy commitment highlighted by NEP 2020 and the India AI Mission this is not yet complemented by consistent institutional and infrastructural preparedness. This discrepancy poses a significant risk that adaptive learning environments may exacerbate rather than alleviate existing educational disparities. To fully harness the personalization capabilities of AI in India's higher education landscape, it will be crucial to prioritize governance, connectivity, linguistic inclusivity, and data protection as equally important design elements alongside the advanced technical elements of cognitive and predictive models. Future research aimed at validating these frameworks over time and across a diverse spectrum of institutions in India beyond just the most affluent ones will be vital to ensuring that AI-facilitated personalization enhances rather than divides the nation's higher education system.

References

1. Akash Devaraje Urs, A. L., & Sudharshan, A. (2025). A multi-factor machine learning framework for predicting and profiling student academic performance using behavioral, financial, and wearable data. MethodsX. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2025.103673
2. Anderson, J. R., Boyle, C. F., Corbett, A. T., & Lewis, M. W. (1990). Cognitive modeling and intelligent tutoring. Artificial Intelligence, 42(1), 7–49.
3. Azman, N., & Tümkaya, S. (2025). Personalised learning platforms and adaptive assessment tools: Machine learning applications in higher education. [As cited in Msambwa et al., 2025 evidence synthesis].
4. Barrera Castro, D., et al. (2025). Barriers to inclusive AI deployment in education. [Cited in Artificial intelligence in personalized learning: A global systematic review, ScienceDirect].
5. Bayly-Castaneda, K., et al. (2024). Research hotspots in AI-powered path recommendation systems for lifelong learning: China, India, and the United States. [Cited in Artificial intelligence in personalized learning: A global systematic review, ScienceDirect].

6. Bhurre, S., Prajapat, S., & Raikwar, S. (2024). Performance pattern mining for higher education students in blended learning using clustering algorithms. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Computing, Communication, Cybersecurity & AI. Dr. APJ Kalam University, Indore, India.
7. Akilandeeswari, S. V., Nagpal, P., Vinotha, C., Jain, K., Chatterjee, R., & Gundavarapu, M. R. (2024). Transforming e-commerce: Unleashing the potential of dynamic pricing optimization through artificial intelligence for strategic management. Migration Letters, 21(S3), 1250–1260.
8. Lakshmi, J. D., Devi, R., & Nagpal, P. (2021). Stress and behavioral analysis of employees using statistical and correlation methods. International Journal of Aquatic Science, 12(1), 275–281.
9. Nagpal, P., Nalina, K. B., & Adarsh, A. (2026). Antecedents influencing employee engagement in knowledge-driven organizations. In Empowering inclusive innovation (pp. 268–274). Routledge.
10. Bhutoria, A. (2022). Personalized education and artificial intelligence in the United States, China, and India. International Journal of Educational Research Open.
11. Augmenting Interpretable Knowledge Tracing by Ability Attribute and Attention Mechanism (AA-DKTA). (2023). arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02146.
12. Liu, Z., et al. (2022). pyKT: A Python library to benchmark deep learning based knowledge tracing models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.11460.
13. P. Nagpal, "The Role of ICT and Algorithmic Systems in Shaping Gig Worker Evaluations and Retention," 2025 IEEE 5th International Conference on ICT in Business Industry & Government (ICTBIG), Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India, India, 2025, pp. 1-6, doi: 10.1109/ICTBIG68706.2025.11323582.
14. R. Bhattacharya, Kafila, S. H. Krishna, B. Haralayya, P. Nagpal and Chitsimran, "Modified Grey Wolf Optimizer with Sparse Autoencoder for Financial Crisis Prediction in Small Marginal Firms," 2023 Second International Conference on Electronics and Renewable Systems (ICEARS), Tuticorin, India, 2023, pp. 907-913, doi: 10.1109/ICEARS56392.2023.10085618.
15. NITI Aayog. (2018). National strategy for artificial intelligence. https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2023-03/National-Strategy-for-Artificial-Intelligence.pdf
16. Riffaud, A. (2025). Tracing minds: A comprehensive journey through knowledge tracing models in an educational platform. Medium.
17. UNESCO. (2022). State of the education report for India, 2022: Artificial intelligence in education — Here, there and everywhere. UNESCO New Delhi.
18. Education for All in India. (2025). Upholding academic integrity in educational research: UGC's crackdown on AI misuse in PhD theses and guidelines for researchers. https://educationforallinindia.com/ai-in-education/
19. Government of India, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2024). IndiaAI Mission: Cabinet approval and pillars (Press Information Bureau release). https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2113095
20. Guo, L., Zheng, Y., & Zhai, X. (2024). A systematic review of artificial intelligence in education (AIED) research, 2013–2023.
21. Halkiopoulos, C., & Gkintoni, E. (2024). Personalized learning and adaptive assessment: A cognitive neuropsychology perspective.
22. P. Nagpal, N. M.V.N, Y. V. N. S. S. Charan, G. Karthikeyan, S. Sudhin and S. Dhote, "Leveraging AI and Machine Learning for Advanced Predictive Analytics in Workforce Management," 2025 International Conference on Technology Enabled Economic Changes (InTech), Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2025, pp. 527-532, doi: 10.1109/InTech64186.2025.11198585.
23. Hardaker, G., & Glenn, M. (2025). AI-enabled adaptation of the learning process in higher education institutions, 2013–2022: A review.
24. IMPRI Impact and Policy Research Institute. (2025). IndiaAI Mission (2024): Empowering innovation, infrastructure, and inclusive growth through AI. https://www.impriindia.com/insights/indiaai-mission-2024/
25. Kizilcec, R. F., Piech, C., & Schneider, E. (2013). Deconstructing disengagement: Analyzing learner subpopulations in massive open online courses. In Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge (LAK '13).
26. Pooja Nagpal (2023). The Transformative Influence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Financial Organizations World Wide. 3rd International Conference on Information & Communication Technology in Business, Industry & Government (ICTBIG). Symbiosis University of Applied Science, Indore.
27. Liang, Y., et al. (2022). HELP-DKT: An interpretable cognitive model of how students learn programming based on deep knowledge tracing. Scientific Reports, 12, 4012. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-07956-0
28. Merino-Campos, C. (2025). Artificial intelligence in higher education personalization: A systematic review.
29. BK Kumari, VM Sundari, C Praseeda, P Nagpal, J EP, S Awasthi (2023), Analytics-Based Performance Influential Factors Prediction for Sustainable Growth of Organization, Employee Psychological Engagement, Work Satisfaction, Training and Development. Journal for ReAttach Therapy and Developmental Diversities 6 (8s), 76-82.
30. Msambwa, M. M., et al. (2025). Impact of integrating AI tools in higher education: A systematic literature review of 148 articles (2021–2024).
31. S. H. Abbas, S. Sanyal, P. Nagpal, J. Panduro-Ramirez, R. Singh and S. Pundir, "An Investigation on a Blockchain Technology in Smart Certification Model for Higher Education," 2023 10th International Conference on Computing for Sustainable Global Development (INDIACom), New Delhi, India, 2023, pp. 1277-1281.

32. Policy Circle. (2025a). AI education push: Can India bridge the digital divide? https://www.policycircle.org/opinion/ai-education-in-india/
33. Policy Circle. (2025b). AI divide threatens India's higher education goals. https://www.policycircle.org/opinion/ai-divide-india-higher-education/
34. Patel, K. K., & Amin, K. (2024). Predictive modeling of dropout in MOOCs using machine learning techniques. The Scientific Temper, 15(2), 2199–2206.
35. Shrivastava, A., Suji Prasad, S. J., Yeruva, A. R., Mani, P., Nagpal, P., & Chaturvedi, A. (2025). IoT based RFID attendance monitoring system of students using Arduino ESP8266 & Adafruit.io on defined area. Cybernetics and Systems, 56(1), 21–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/01969722.2023.2166243.
36. G. Gokulkumari, M. Ravichand, P. Nagpal and R. Vij. (2023). "Analyze the political preference of a common man by using data mining and machine learning," 2023 International Conference on Computer Communication and Informatics (ICCCI), Coimbatore, India. doi: 10.1109/ICCCI56745.2023.10128472.
37. Pu, Y., et al. (2024). ELAKT: Enhancing locality for attentive knowledge tracing. ACM Transactions on Information Systems, 42(4), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1145/3652601
38. F. A. Syed, N. Bargavi, A. Sharma, A. Mishra, P. Nagpal and A. Srivastava, "Recent Management Trends Involved with the Internet of Things in Indian Automotive Components Manufacturing Industries," 2022 5th International Conference on Contemporary Computing and Informatics (IC3I), Uttar Pradesh, India, 2022, pp. 1035-1041, doi: 10.1109/IC3I56241.2022.10072565.
39. Pooja Nagpal, (2025). Leveraging artificial intelligence and machine learning for gaining competitive advantage in business development. AIP Conference Proceedings, 3327(1), 020002. AIP Publishing LLC. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0289438
40. Sharma, R., et al. (2025). Large language models in personalized education: Engagement, ethics, and pedagogical authenticity.
41. Siemens, G., & Long, P. (2011). Penetrating the fog: Analytics in learning and education. EDUCAUSE Review, 46(5), 30–32.
42. Vaniya, J., Alizada, M., Nagpal, P., Kumar Dey, B. and Abbbasova, D. G. A. (2025). Novel Enhanced Cognitive State Analysis in E-Learning via Real-Time Emotion and Attentiveness Detection Using OptFuzzy TSM and ABiLSTM. Iranian Journal of Fuzzy Systems, 22(4), 57-75. doi: 10.22111/ijfs.2025.49950.8829
43. Nagpal, P., Pawar, A. and H. M, S. (2024). Emerging Technologies and Entrepreneurship: A Comprehensive Study of India's Innovation Landscape. In Proceedings of the 1st Pamir Transboundary Conference for Sustainable Societies - PAMIR; ISBN 978-989-758-687-3, SciTePress, pages 838-842. DOI: 10.5220/0012514200003792
44. P. William, A. Shrivastava, H. Chauhan, P. Nagpal, V. K. T. N and P. Singh, "Framework for Intelligent Smart City Deployment via Artificial Intelligence Software Networking," 2022 3rd International Conference on Intelligent Engineering and Management (ICIEM), London, United Kingdom, 2022, pp. 455-460, doi: 10.1109/ICIEM54221.2022.9853119.
45. Strielkowski, W., et al. (2025). AI-driven adaptive learning for sustainable educational transformation. Sustainable Development. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.3221
46. Verma, B. K. (2025). Predictive analytics for student success in higher education post-NEP 2020 implementation using data mining and machine learning techniques. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5261690
47. Yuensook, W., et al. (2026). AI-driven adaptive learning systems in higher education: A systematic review. Journal of Education and Learning, 15(2).