Neil Gupta

Humanities

Ms. Small

October 10, 2025

A Dual Adaptation of Artificial Intelligence for Education

With the recent rise of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI), a fundamental paradox plagues educational departments across the world. How can the use of cheating with AI be prevented and minimized while still attempting to move society forward with the powerful potential of this transformative technology? It seems counter-intuitive that many schools attempt to shut down AI usage by students, yet they simultaneously claim to care about their students' future. If so, wouldn't teaching and supporting a tool of the future be the optimal choice for maximizing each student’s potential for success? This tension is further complicated by the hypocrisy of teachers who ban AI for students yet utilize it for their own professional tasks. To ensure the future of critical cognitive development, AI should not be used by students for core academic tasks; instead, educational institutions must implement a dual adaptation: evolve assignments to be AI-resistant while simultaneously empowering teachers to transparently use AI for mundane and rote tasks to enhance personal student connection.

Restriction of AI chatbots like ChatGPT is necessary as AI undermines the fundamental cognitive process, even though the pursuit of enforcement is increasingly futile. One of the most notorious tasks in student life is essay writing, which many students do not particularly enjoy.

They find the task to be pointless and many generate essays using ChatGPT, afterwards covering their tracks by making minor changes. However, the true benefit of essay writing and the reason why it is assigned is not because of the writing, but because the process teaches crucial skills: "selecting a topic, judging claims, synthesizing knowledge, and expressing it in a clear, coherent and persuasive manner" (Source A). If students are allowed to bypass this vital struggle, they are forfeiting the mental discipline required for complex, unassisted thinking, which is critical since the "Fourth Industrial Revolution" demands workers who can "solve complex, non-routine problems" (Source D). This outsourcing of mental effort reduces the need for self-challenge, leading to a profound "sense of uncertainty whenever [one doesn't] have [ChatGPT's] guidance invading [their] ideas" (Source C). However, despite this cognitive necessity, the question remains: if student cheating is inevitable, why attempt to stop it? In a fruitless arms race against conversational A.I., "Why should AI usage be restricted in the first place" (Source A)? This is a valid question that current methods of schooling cannot answer, as the effort to police students risks making "school more punitive for monitored students" (Source A) without solving the underlying problem. Because continuing to enforce stricter and stricter methods of AI regulation risks reaching a dystopia, the reliance on mere enforcement is unsustainable. Thus, the fostering of these cognitive and ethical skills via the essay writing process for students is key, but the strategy must pivot from policing to adaptation.

Acknowledging that an arms race against conversational AI is futile, schools must shift their focus from attempting to regulate AI usage to adapting assignments themselves to render the technology irrelevant, thus protecting the core academic mission. Since the enforcement of bans is failing, institutions must pivot their energy toward fulfilling their professional obligations to guide students, as "Faculty are expected to guide students in understanding other people's

ideas... an increasingly complex endeavor" (Source E). This complex endeavor requires changing the actual assignment, not just enforcing the rules. The primary target for change is formulaic tasks, such as the five-paragraph essay, in which students are expected to adhere to using a set structure and algorithm. The nature of these "formula essays" means they can simply be completed using AI software (Source F). The repetitive, mechanical nature of this work makes students feel like a machine, which is why it is the perfect assignment to hand off to a form of intelligence (let's call it... artificial!?). The problem lies in creating work that can be easily automated, especially when the demands of the modern economy require the opposite. Thus, the goal of the curriculum should shift to ensuring students become "critical consumers and evaluators of these products" (Source A) rather than simple producers of formulaic text. The goal is to shift assessment away from mere output generation, which AI specializes in, and towards tasks that require synthesizing complex, non-routine information.

The second half of the dual adaptation mandates that the use of AI be redirected to support teachers by automating rote, administrative tasks, thereby enabling deeper, personalized student connection alongside a commitment to transparency. While the main purpose of education for students is to become more knowledgeable and learn critical skills, the purpose of teachers is to guide and give through teaching. Their work is inherently selfless. A middle school history teacher named "Jon Gold has recently been using AI in his assignments including 'editing a long reading assignment down to three paragraphs' or 'creating dummy essays that illustrate the difference between an effective essay and one that lacks supporting evidence'" (Source B). He would prefer an AI tool that helped him "complete 'chores' that routinely eat up hours of his day" as opposed to outsourcing the job of "teacher observation and evaluation" (Source B). This strategic delegation of tasks is crucial because the "shift lets teachers focus on what really

matters: engaging and inspiring students while improving education quality and access" (Source G). By outsourcing chores, teachers can reinvest their time into the complex guidance outlined by faculty expectations. Crucially, to regulate this dual approach and combat student cynicism, teachers must model ethical usage by maintaining complete transparency. Jon Gold is 100% transparent with his usage, explaining to students "exactly how he has used A.I. in part to model ethical use" (Source B). He demonstrates that his goal is to teach students how to evaluate the tools they encounter. This transparency combats the risk of hypocrisy and establishes an explicit social contract, which reinforces the essential ethical principle that plagiarism is "a form of fraud" (Source E). Thus, a mutual contract is created between teacher and student that naturally regulates both sides of AI usage.

The usage of AI in education can be summed up into a dual adaptation. While students are banned from any AI usage for core tasks, in return, the schools focus on assignments that develop and test essential critical skills to make learning more effective for students. At the same time, teachers are transparent with their AI usage and only use it to outsource and automate tasks that do not foster personal human connection, such as creating a dummy essay. With this system in place, future generations are being brought up by an ethical school background while also being prepared for the technological real world, allowing for society to advance forward both through technology and through individuals, while also ensuring that necessary critical skills are still fostered.