

Write an essay that synthesizes material from at least three of the sources and develops your position on the extent to which teachers and professors should use AI in their lesson planning, instruction, and grading.

“You always knew exactly what I needed from a simple request... You never rolled your eyes when I asked for ‘one more time, make it simple and concise’” (Source C). The use of AI is no stranger to students. However, it has come to light that teachers use it too, whether for lesson planning, grading, or just making text simple and concise. This emergence has sparked doubts about the appropriate limits of its use. While artificial intelligence should not be used for the process of teaching, as it is hypocritical and diminishes the humanity of education, it should be available for tasks that do not directly relate to the spread of knowledge.

Firstly, when teachers use AI for tasks, such as planning or grading, it creates a double standard, since students are punished for similar behaviors. This hypocrisy is especially evident when looking through the lens of grading. Writing, an essential skill for the current grading system, is a task that students often offload to artificial intelligence, leading to severe punishments if caught. However, offloading the grading for this same writing is regarded as “useful for teachers, who would like to assign more writing, but are limited in their time to do so” (Source B). This double standard, where students and teachers are not placed under the same level of constriction, causes a sense of injustice in the education system. Why should students receive more challenging writing from teachers who are unwilling to analyze it and provide personal feedback? Although describing the time of teachers as “limited” is accurate, the hypocrisy begins when those providing such writings fail to consider the limitations of student schedules. For example, Olivia Han, a student, describes how busy her schedule is, with various

activities throughout the day, which ends with “all-nighters cramming for exams” (Source C). Is it fair to affect the lives of students in such a way when teachers reject the same workload? The use of AI is not only present in high school, but also for professors at the college level. For most classes, especially for Mrs. Stapleton, a student at Northeastern University, syllabi “forbade ‘academically dishonest activities,’ including the unauthorized use of artificial intelligence” (Hill). Yet, her professor used it to create slide presentations and diagrams, which is also dishonest behavior. Moreover, these lesson plans are often incorrect. In Stapleton’s situation, AI did not provide the information in an understandable, coherent way. For example, the diagram of Kurt Lewin’s theory of change, which was constructed using AI, had many faults. Below the heading on the left, the text is formed from a combination of undecipherable letters and keywords (Hill). This confuses the student who is paying to receive education, while making it easier for professors, who are hired for their knowledge and paid to teach, to pass by without understanding the material. Then, the student is tested on the same material, creating a sense of hypocrisy. While these actions lessen the workload for teachers, they also make lessons more difficult to understand. Yet, educators and innovators, such as Agarwal, advocate for the usage of AI to “create lesson plans [and] find illustrative examples” (Source G). Again, this lessens the load of teachers while lowering the knowledge retention of students, making the education system hypocritical.

Secondly, when teachers use AI for interactions with students, it eliminates the human qualities that make them valuable. Teachers spend countless hours making lesson plans, but with ChatGPT, the preparation time has been cut in half (Buchanan & Davis). Although this saves some time, it also results in the lack of personalized guidance for students. Lesson plans need to connect with students through relatable metaphors and scenarios, which is not possible through

AI. However, the largest loss of human voices relates to the personal responses teachers are supposed to deliver to their class. A student from Southern New Hampshire University was appalled by how her professor had provided a chatbot with the rubric and performed “a request for some ‘really nice feedback’” (Hill). This exact issue causes feedback to be generalized. Moreover, it takes away “the human connection that [teachers] forge with students as human beings” (Hill). The primary purpose of teachers is to provide understandable feedback that resonates with the writer. When AI is used to replicate that role, it removes the character and empathy of the teacher. Although it may identify some grammatical and structural errors, it does not recognize the character and voice of the writer. Students, hoping to receive a better grade, will be motivated to transform their writing to be more in line with the AI’s standards. If this trend continues, humans may lose that nuance and individuality that make them special. Many teachers state “that they are using AI to personalize assignments” (Source B), hoping to better connect with their students. Although this does make their writing more understandable, it extracts students from real-world experiences, for which they need to interpret all forms of writing styles. When addressing AI, Beha, a novelist and memoirist, states, “that it will effectively steal the human soul” (Beha). Through this, she addresses how empathy and essential characteristics are taken away from those who rely on connection to educate. It will also be used to imitate human emotions, making it less essential for humanity to retain these skills. For example, a jazz director used “AI to help let down her students firmly but gently” (Buchanan & Davis) when they were cut. Although this seems helpful in the short term, it may harm both parties in the future. One will be unable to cope with real human rejection, while the other may lose their sense of empathy and eloquence, which are required for all social situations. After all, if the skills are no longer being applied, there is no necessity for retention. Ultimately, teachers

need to continue to use their humanity to educate, a task that has become difficult under the influence of AI.

While AI should not replace human teaching, it should be accessible to educators for non-instructional tasks that offload responsibilities. For example, teachers should be allowed to use AI tools to maintain their “school’s master schedule” (Source B), as this does not directly affect students’ learning. In doing so, they can still “observe teacher practice” (Source B) and remain fully involved in the process of education. This implies that teachers must still continue with their responsibilities of communication, but they may use AI tools to organize themselves. This does not mean teachers should use artificial intelligence to shorten lesson plans, as this can lead to important information being removed. However, they should be allowed to use it for “repetitive tasks and administrative duties” (Source G), as these do not impact the lessons learned by the students. To decide when usage is reasonable, teachers must “develop an ethical compass with AI” (Hill). They must be able to understand when the use of such a product will impact the education of the students directly, using AI as an organizational guide rather than a teaching assistant. Artificial Intelligence is plagued with bias and racism, meaning excessive usage for education can put such ideas into the minds of students. However, its use for repetitive or organizational tasks can provide teachers with a better work-life balance and more time for personalized instruction.

Artificial intelligence is a tool that allows for the enhancement of efficiency. For educators, it causes a plethora of ethical dilemmas about when its use is appropriate. Using AI for teaching is not appropriate due to the hypocrisy and mistrust it can create. Moreover, using it for communication in all formats is also not ideal, as it extracts the humanity of interactions which the education system relies on. Yet, it should be accessible for organizational and

repetitive tasks, which opens room for educators to further personalize their teachings. Artificial intelligence is clearly transforming the world and reshaping the future of education. Teachers should accept it as long as it does not affect the entire purpose of education: developing prepared, capable **humans**.