First, an overview

While the affirmative may claim to improve the overall quality of education, the benefits are largely limited – the past proves witness

Ta, Regina, and Darrell West [*Senior Fellow in the Center for Technology Innovation, Co-Editor-in-Chief of TechTank, John Hazen White Professor of Political Science and Public Policy and Director of the Taubman Center for Public Policy at Brown University*] . "Should Schools Ban or Integrate Generative AI in the Classroom?" *Brookings*, The Brookings Institution, 7 Aug. 2023, www.brookings.edu/articles/should-schools-ban-or-integrate-generative-ai-in-the-classroom/. Accessed 20 Feb. 2025.//LEH SR

developed by MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), along with real-life examples of successful AI implementation from classrooms in the district that have been early adopters of technology. The district also plans to create a shared repository to track each school's progress and share findings across schools. Schools like Peninsula School District in Washington had already been working to integrate AI into their curricula, so when ChatGPT arrived, they were prepared: digital learning teams visited classrooms across different grade levels to share how language models work, as well as how to identify and leverage AI-generated content. Alliance City School District in Ohio is also embracing ChatGPT's potential, resolving to proactively set boundaries on its usage to prevent misuse. In Lower Merion School District, students from Pennsylvania will hone their critical thinking skills by analyzing and editing AI-generated writing. In all the above cases, responsibly integrating generative AI as a teaching tool will require school districts to invest in proper oversight procedures and professional development for educators. As such, Garden City Public Schools in New York has held training sessions for educators to demonstrate the capabilities of different generative AI tools, along with how to incorporate them effectively and tailor materials to students' needs. Schools like Norway-Vulcan Area Schools in Michigan also plan to provide professional development opportunities for teachers, as well as strengthen the school community's understanding of its honor code and plagiarism policies. The district has encouraged teachers to use Turnitin's AI detector to check for cases of plagiarism, as they prepare to teach with generative AI in the fall. There are some schools that are being more cautious as they integrate generative AI. In Texas, Mineral Wells Independent School District has adopted a more cautious approach, testing generative AI use in an experimental set of classrooms, and sending those instructors for general training in AI. Elsewhere in Texas, Eanes Independent School District is similarly focused on helping teachers make the most of generative AI, as they first try ChatGPT for administrative use cases, like scheduling or lesson planning. While districts like Prince George's County (MD), Jefferson County (KY), and Chicago (IL) have not banned ChatGPT, they have placed the chatbot under review. School districts that haven't acted yet are watching and waiting, and most fall into this category. A recent survey by UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) found that less than 10% of schools have implemented guidance on generative AI, and of the schools with policies in place, 40% reported that the guidance was only communicated verbally—not in writing. Just as we *demand* transparency from developers on how AI is *built*, we need to *provide* transparency for students and teachers on how AI can be *used*. Not enough schools have issued formal guidance on generative AI. A nationwide survey of K-12 teachers revealed that 72% have not received guidance on generative AI use. Generally, the longer schools delay their deliberation of bans or integrated use of new generative AI technologies, the higher the stakes—especially with a new school year on the horizon. As one of many generative AI tools being used for education, ChatGPT is increasingly accessed by students and teachers, and the absence of institutional policies may enable counterproductive use cases. Without an educational sandbox for generative AI usage, schools run the risk of having students deploy these rapidly developing technologies in unplanned ways with unintended outcomes affecting safety, equity, and learning. School districts also have a critical opportunity to govern the use and misuse of generative AI tools before the academic year begins. Districts can shape its use and role in the future of education, instead of letting generative AI write it for them. In California, education policy researchers have made a similar call to action. More important, national concerns around the digital divide in education can make technology more useful in bridging learning gaps created by the lack of home internet. But that also means that schools must support the equitable distribution of generative AI's benefits. Being proactive about the adoption and use generative AI

now will prepare school districts to set precedents about using future technologies in the classroom. Many classroom policies thus far are too narrowly focused on one tool: ChatGPT. Right now, there are thousands of generative AI products that are on the market, and more are being developed every week. School districts need to consider the use not just of ChatGPT, but other generative AI applications, like Llama 2 or BARD, as well as the widespread educational tools, like PowerSchool, Kahoot!, or Khan Academy. In closing, we recommend strategies below for how school districts can approach generative AI governance, regardless of the product. In collaboration with edtech specialists, teachers, and students, school districts should develop a set of common, guiding principles for students and teachers around generative AI use. These guidelines should define the purpose and scope of generative AI in the classroom, along with acceptable use cases. These may also serve to establish privacy protections for students and formalize procedures for how teachers can supervise student usage, give feedback, and handle misuse. Whether administrators and/or teachers fear generative AI may disrupt their classrooms or instead welcome its potential, school districts can offer accessible training that will equip *all* teachers to meet the present moment. These training opportunities may not have to be developed from scratch – districts can adapt online resources, like the Consortium for School Networking (CoSN)'s resource library and TeachAI, who also offer some guiding principles. When educators gain a robust understanding of generative AI, they can apply it productively in their classrooms, as well as support responsible use and understanding among their students. Recognizing that there is no one-size-fits-all policy on generative AI, districts should empower educators to implement institutional recommendations and enforce academic integrity within their classrooms – while applying the technologies in ways that serve their students. This approach models that taken by Department of Education's recent AI Report, which provides general guidance for learning and teaching with AI—without commenting on specific generative AI tools, due to their rapid progress. Teachers can reference district-level principles as a guiding framework, upon which they can design transparent, well-defined expectations for their students. **Finally, we need to help overburdened and under-resourced districts that already are struggling with instructional, infrastructure, and financial challenges. There remain sharp inequities in public school resources, and modern technologies often accentuate those disparities. Some schools have good digital infrastructures, while others do not. The same also applies to the equitably available financial means to integrate new teaching tools in the classroom.** As schools consider how to utilize **generative AI**, we should be cognizant of these disparities and provide help to make sure marginalized districts are not left behind. Federal and state officials could earmark money to

public school districts who receive minimal assistance on using generative AI to help teachers, students, and administrators deal with its utilization. In the end, for districts to ensure diversity, equity, and inclusion in the deployment of these tools, school leaders ought to level the playing field for their use, especially before its unyielding adoption and use. The proposed strategies are not required of school districts in any order. Rather, they are the beginning of both immediate and future conversations for how to understand how to leverage generative AI tools in educational settings.

the harms of gen AI extend beyond the communities they benefit. To prevent taking one step forward and two back, Erin and I proudly negate.

Our Sole argument is accessibility

Our first point is school preparation

Regardless of the proposed Affirmative benefits, education districts are unprepared to utilize AI

Klein 24 (Alyson Klein, A veteran education writer who has covered K-12 schools for more than a dozen years. She covers the latest developments in educational technology, including topics such personalized learning, data privacy, digital curricula, cybersecurity, and teacher professional development, "Schools Are Taking Too Long to Craft AI Policy. Why That's a Problem", Education Week, https://archive.vn/ywBeZ, 2-19-2024, DOA: 2-21-2025) //Bellaire MC

It's been more than a year since ChatGPT's ability to produce astonishingly humanlike writing sparked fundamental questions about the role of artificial intelligence in K-12 education.

Yet most school districts are still stuck in neutral, trying to figure out the way forward on issues such as plagiarism, data privacy, and ethical use of AI by students and educators.

More than three-quarters—79 percent—**of educators say their districts still do not have clear policies on** the use of **a**rtificial **i**ntelligence tools, according to an EdWeek Research Center survey of 924 educators conducted in November and December.

District leaders want to help schools chart the right course on the potentially game-changing technology, but many feel "overwhelmed and overloaded," said Bree Dusseault, a principal at and the managing director for the Center for Reinventing Public Education, a research organization at Arizona State University's Mary Lou Fulton Teacher's College, who has studied AI policymaking.

The lack of clear direction is especially problematic given that the majority of educators surveyed—56 percent—expect the use of AI tools to increase in their districts over the next year, according to the EdWeek Research Center survey.

And while experts are encouraging schools to teach their students to use AI appropriately, banning the tools for students is still a relatively common practice in K-12 education, the survey found.

One in 5 educators surveyed said that their district prohibits students from using generative AI, such as ChatGPT, although teachers are permitted to use it. Another 7 percent of educators said the tools were banned for everyone—including staff.

When district officials—and school principals—sidestep big questions about the proper use of AI, they are inviting confusion and inequity, said Pat Yongpradit, the chief academic officer for Code.Org and leader of Teach AI, an initiative aimed at helping K-12 schools use AI technology effectively.

"You can have, in the same school, a teacher allowing their 10th grade English class to use ChatGPT freely and getting into AI ethics issues and really preparing their students for a future in which AI will be part of any industry," Yongpradit said. "And then literally, right down the hall, you can have another teacher banning it totally, going back to pencil and paper writing because they don't trust their kids to not use ChatGPT. Same school, different 10th grade English class."

The new "digital divide will be an AI divide," Yongpradit said.

'Policy is always behind technology'

It's not hard to understand why most district leaders aren't eager to make big decisions about how their schools will use the technology.

Many educators worry that if students are exposed to generative AI, they'll employ it to cheat on assignments. Plus, AI tools can spit out false information and magnify racial and socioeconomic biases. AI also develops—some would say "gets smarter"—by consuming data, opening the doors for potential student-data-privacy nightmares.

The vast majority of educators don't have the capacity to cope with those complications on top of their other responsibilities, the survey found.

More than three quarters—78 percent—of educators surveyed said they don't have the time or bandwidth to teach students how to think about or use AI because they are tied up with academic challenges, social-emotional-learning, safety considerations, and other higher priorities.

What's more, **AI is changing so rapidly that any policy a district** or state **crafts could be outdated the moment it** is **released.**

That's typical when it comes to new technologies, said Kristina Ishmael, who until late last year served as the deputy director of the U.S. Department of Education's office of educational technology.

"Policy is always behind technology," said Ishmael, who is now a strategic advisor at Ishmael Consulting. In some cases, that's "very intentional, because it's policy; once you put it in, it's hard to take it off."

Teachers overestimate student's abilities to flag misinformation, which results in Generative AI leading blind and trusting students into falling for misinformation

Schools don't even have infrastructure to support AI effectively

Iniobong 25 (5 days ago), "How poor infrastructure, skill gap hinder AI education, technology education – Ajala", February 24, 2025, https://businessday.ng/interview/article/how-poor-infrastructure-skill-gap-hinder-al-education-technology-education-ajala/ Accessed 3/1/25 AV

What do you think are the biggest obstacles to implementing AI-driven education solutions in underserved communities? One of the biggest challenges is the lack of digital literacy among both students and educators. Teachers play a crucial role in integrating AI into the classroom, but without adequate training, they may struggle to utilise digital tools effectively. Investing in teacher training is essential to ensure that AI-driven education is successfully implemented and sustained. Another significant obstacle is poor infrastructure, including unreliable internet access and electricity. Many AI-powered tools rely on stable connectivity, which remains a luxury in several underserved communities. Without addressing these foundational issues, the potential of AI in education may not be fully realised. Funding is another major challenge. Implementing and maintaining AI-driven learning solutions requires significant financial investment, which many schools in underserved communities

cannot afford. Public-private partnerships, government support, and donor funding will be necessary to scale these technologies sustainably.

AI is changing so rapidly that any policy a district crafts could be outdated the moment it is released.

Wineburg 24 [Wineburg, Sam, and Nadav Ziv. "What Makes Students (and the Rest of Us) Fall for AI Misinformation?." Education Week, Editorial Projects in Education, 25 Oct. 2024, www.edweek.org/technology/opinion-what-makes-students-and-the-rest-of-us-fall-for-ai-misinformati o n/2024/10. Accessed 28 Feb. 2025.]

Four years ago during the 2020 election, we warned in the Los Angeles Times that **young people were struggling to spot disinformation because of outdated lessons on navigating the internet. Today, educators risk making the same mistakes with artificial intelligence. With the election at our doorstep, the stakes couldn't be higher.**

Previous work by our research team, the Digital Inquiry Group (formerly the Stanford History Education Group), showed that **young people are easily deceived because they judge online content by how it looks and sounds. That's an even bigger problem with AI, which makes information feel persuasive even when it fabricates content and ignores context.**

what they see.

response and discipline

procedures

When it comes to AI, leaders preach “great excitement and appropriate caution,” as Washington state Superintendent Chris Reykdal put it in a recent teachers’ guide. He writes of a “full embrace of AI” that will put that state’s public education system “at the forefront of innovation.” New York City schools former chancellor, David C. Banks, who stepped down amid a federal investigation, said in September that AI can “dramatically

affect how we do school” for the better. The **“appropriate caution,” however, remains a misty disclaimer.**

Washington state’s guidelines, like California’s, Oregon’s, and North Carolina’s, rightly warn that AI may be biased and inaccurate. Washington state stresses that students shouldn’t automatically trust the responses of large language models and should “critically evaluate” responses for bias. But this is like urging students in driver’s education to be cautious without teaching them that they need to signal and check blind spots before passing the car ahead of them.

This pattern repeats the mistakes we saw with instruction on spotting unreliable information online: **educators wrongly assuming**

that students can recognize danger and locate content that’s reliable.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor Hal Abelson tells students that if they come across “something that sounds fishy,” they should say, “Well, maybe it’s not true.” But students are in school precisely because they don’t know a lot. They are in the least position to know if something sounds fishy.

Imagine a history student consulting an AI chatbot to probe the Battle of Lexington, as one of us recently tested. The large language model says this conflagration, which launched the American

Revolution, was initiated “by an unknown British soldier.” In truth, no one actually knows who fired first. The chatbot also reports that “two or three” British soldiers were killed during the skirmish. Wrong again. None was. Unless you’re a history buff, this information doesn’t sound “fishy.”

A second danger is that **AI mimics the tone and cadence of human speech**, tapping into an aesthetic of authority. Presenting information with confidence is a trap, but an effective one: Our 2021 national study of 3,446 high school students reveals the extraordinary trust students place in information based on a website’s superficial features.

When **students conflate style with substance and lack background knowledge**, the last thing they should do is try to

figure out if something “sounds fishy.” Instead, the detection of unreliable information and responsible use of AI rests on internet search skills that enable them to fact-check.

Teachers don’t support AI

Langreo 24 - Lauraine Langreo, January 08, 2024, Education Week: Most Teachers Are Not Using AI. Here’s Why, https://www.edweek.org/technology/most-teachers-are-not-using-ai-heres-why/2024/01 JWU 2/28/25

While the hype around ChatGPT and other artificial intelligence tools in K-12 has made it seem like most educators have tried them, new survey results from the EdWeek Research Center suggest that’s not the case. Two of every three educators said they haven’t used AI-driven tools in their classrooms, according to the survey, which included 498 teachers and was conducted between Nov. 30 and Dec. 6. When broken down, 37 percent said they’ve never used them and don’t plan to start, 29 percent say they haven’t used them but plan to start this school year or in the near future, according to the survey results. SEE ALSO READING & LITERACY 'Encoding' Explained: What It Is and Why It's Essential to Literacy ChatGPT and other generative AI tools entered the K-12 scene last year, and AI experts believe the technology has the potential to transform education and how people do their jobs. Still, many teachers are unfamiliar and uncomfortable with the technology. The survey asked teachers why they’re not currently using AI tools in the classroom. Here’s what they said: 1. Teachers have other, more pressing priorities Teachers have many responsibilities on their plates and do not have the time to learn more about and experiment with AI, which experts say is crucial to getting teachers comfortable with the technology. Nearly half of teachers (46 percent) haven’t explored these tools because they have other priorities that are more important, according to the survey results. Flourish logoA Flourish chart “I would like to learn more about AI in the classroom, but with four preps and a new curriculum, I have a hard time finding more time to do so,” a high school foreign language teacher in South Dakota said in an open-ended response to the survey. A middle school health teacher in Nevada wrote, “We are just trying to keep the kids from fighting all day. No time for teaching.” 2. They lack the knowledge and support The next most popular reason is that teachers don’t know how to use AI tools, and the other reasons that round out the top five are also related to teachers’ lack of knowledge and support for how to use AI tools effectively and appropriately, the survey found. I was asking for a district policy for student use of AI last spring and was brushed off. I am on the digital learning community for my building and they won't take a firm stand either. Teachers shouldn't be left out in the wind on this issue. A high school social studies teacher in Minnesota In open-ended responses, many educators noted that they haven’t been trained on the technology, they don’t know if using or teaching about AI is compatible with state standards, and they haven’t received guidance from district or school leaders. “I was asking for a district policy for student use of AI last spring and was brushed off,” a high school social studies teacher in Minnesota wrote in an open-ended response. “I am on the digital learning community for my building and they won’t take a firm stand either. Teachers shouldn’t be left out in the wind on this issue.” 3. Teachers are concerned about students learning to think for themselves and do original work Some teachers have big concerns that students could use AI tools to cheat. Nearly 1 in 5 teachers said they don’t believe the technology is appropriate for a

K-12 setting because of its potential to be used for cheating, the survey found. SEE ALSO Photo collage of teacher working at desk with laptop computer. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE Teachers Need PD on Artificial Intelligence. What It Should Look Like Lauraine Langreo, May 10, 2023 • 6 min read Some teachers wrote in open-ended responses that they're concerned that allowing student use of AI could make students more "lazy" and "lead to further degradation of critical thinking skills." Teachers also said students should learn to be creative, generate their own ideas and focus on human interaction and hands-on learning. "Technology should have its place in school, but it shouldn't replace a student's ability to think and complete tasks on their own," a high school math teacher in Georgia wrote. Others believe human thinking should trump machine learning: "Why rely on artificial intelligence when you have the real deal?" a middle school social studies teacher wrote.

Our Impact is teacher burnout

Priten **Shah** (Priten Shah is an education entrepreneur and the author of AI & The Future of Education: Teaching in the Age of Artificial Intelligence (Jossey-Bass, 2023). He is the founder of Pedagogy.Cloud, an educational consulting firm that supports educators in K-12 schools, higher education, and the nonprofit sector adapt to the increasing capabilities of AI.

), 6-5-20**24**, "I Was an AI Optimist. Now I'm Worried It's Making Teacher Burnout Worse (Opinion)," Education Week, https://www.edweek.org/technology/opinion-i-was-an-ai-optimist-now-im-worried-its-making-teacher-burnout-worse/2024/06, accessed 2-27-2025

Seemingly overnight, understanding AI technology went from being a niche skill to an essential life skill. While many **educators** across the country have diligently spent their free time, prep periods, and summer vacations pursuing professional development, an overwhelming majority **are** rightfully **daunted by the prospect of learning how to navigate** this **new technology**. **The learning curve** for many educators **has been** much **steep**er than is being acknowledged. The prospect of learning a brand-new tool can be overwhelming as you learn its features, capabilities, and limitations, and how it works best for you. Using AI tools also involves learning more than just the user interface of a new tool; it requires our educators to learn how this technology works to feel empowered to use it responsibly and have meaningful conversations with their students about it. For others, the **technology remains unaffordable as major tools begin to paywall their strongest features**. **Absent support from their district**, this often means that **many teachers have an additional expense that they must pay out of pocket to use these technologies** in the powerful ways advertised. **This** only **further limits the number of teachers who are seeing the benefits of developing AI literacy**. Even those who manage to find the time and money to pursue some professional development or are part of a small contingent of American teachers who receive resources from their schools still face the task of staying current with the developments and rapid changes that the AI space is currently undergoing. Schools and districts need to acknowledge the challenge AI creates for teachers who want to become active, responsible users of the technology. They must find space in their existing professional development schedules and allow teachers to spend meaningful time learning about and using AI technology in ways that can eventually reduce their workload. How AI has changed curriculum Part of the frustration we hear from educators is how **many** of their **assignments need to be restructured**, **given the ability for** students to use **AI** technologies **to complete their homework** easily. **This has creat[ing]ed a crisis for educators** who assign out-of-class work, especially those who extensively use independent writing as an assessment tool. Teachers are facing the need to rethink their assessments and pedagogical practices, **with** very **little guidance on how to effectively** and sustainably **make these changes**. The definition of "AI-proof assignments" shifts so rapidly that it has become a relatively futile goal for educators to pursue. Some "AI proofing" has relied on generative AI's limited knowledge of recent events and its inability to perform math, while other anti-cheating efforts turned to now-defunct AI detectors or the lack of students' voices in writing. As **AI programs continue to overcome** these **limitations**, teachers will likely have to move toward different types of student assessments that capitalize on classroom time and use independent time only for preparatory work.

Our second point is student access

The use of Gen AI only makes the digital divide worse for underprivileged communities.

No Author, At United Way, we're dedicated to one unshakable principle – no one should have to live in poverty. But right now, thousands of families in Greater Philadelphia and Southern New Jersey are living below the poverty line., "Closing the Digital Divide to Help Kids Thrive - United Way of Greater Philadelphia and Southern New Jersey." *United Way of Greater Philadelphia and Southern New Jersey*, 3 Aug. 2021, unitedforimpact.org/closing-the-digital-divide-to-help-kids-thrive/. Accessed 24 Feb. 2025.//LEH SR

No internet. No computer. That may sound like a punishment doled out by parents to kids who aren't doing their chores. But for millions of kids, it's an everyday reality that makes it challenging to succeed in school. The digital divide in education is the gap between students who have reliable access to an adequate device and reliable internet and those who don't. The gap has existed for decades – ever since personal computers gained popularity – but during the COVID-19 pandemic our community saw how deep the challenge runs. United Way of Champaign County is working to close the digital divide. During the past years as schools moved to remote learning, we provided funding to organizations that give out laptops, tablets, printers, etc. thanks to generous donors like you. As the new school year begins we are planning to increase these efforts so more students in our community can thrive. Here are four reasons we are investing in closing the digital divide. According to Common Sense Media, 15 to 16 million students don't have access to adequate devices or internet connection. That's about 30% of all students in the U.S. But when the numbers are broken out by race, it becomes clearer students of color disproportionately have to deal with the challenges of the digital divide. Students of color represent about 40% of the total population, but 55% of Black, Latinx and Native American students are part of the disconnected populations. Native Americans face the greatest challenge to access to devices and the internet; 37% of Indigenous students lack adequate connectivity. Black, Latinx and Native American students may not have connectivity because of discriminatory housing practices that led to them growing up in neighborhoods that are under-resourced and lack high-speed internet, their families may have faced discriminatory pay practices that kept them from higher earning jobs making personal devices unaffordable, or they may face more language barriers that make adoption more difficult. Closing the digital divide gives students of color better opportunities to navigate these obstacles caused by systemic racism and more chances to thrive. Students in rural areas already face many challenges. They often attend under-resourced schools, must travel long distances to attend classes and schools struggle to attract top-quality teachers. The lack of access to devices or hardware is one more challenge rural students must overcome. Similarly to students of color, rural students are disproportionately impacted by the digital divide. Common Sense Media notes that rural students makeup 12% of the total school population but comprise 20% of the disconnected population. Unlike other common services such as electricity or telephone access, internet connection is not treated as a public utility. That means demand and interest in profits have largely determined where and when infrastructure like broadband internet are introduced to communities. Rural communities are often left out of that conversation, hurting economic growth, ability to attract new residents and local students. Addressing the digital divide can help overcome these challenges to give rural students more opportunities to succeed and be prepared for a digitally-based world. Access to the internet and devices might seem like a distraction for some kids, but research shows it also increases student grade performance. Researchers from Michigan State University connected higher grade point averages (GPA) with access to broadband internet and adequate at-home devices. During the global pandemic, kids without access struggled to stay engaged as schools moved to remote learning. Slow internet, having to share devices with siblings, participating on smartphones instead of laptops all contributed. But these challenges extend beyond the pandemic. As more schools incorporate assignments that require online research, use digital tools to enhance learning and incorporate technology overall, students without at-home access will continue to fall behind. Helping kids thrive in the workplace tomorrow starts by closing the digital divide today. A study from the University of Miami found that students with higher GPAs, those that have adequate access to technology, have higher earning potential. The study shows the multi-generational impact of increasing connectivity for individuals. On top of the benefits for individuals, when students have more opportunities to secure high paying jobs that strengthens our local economy. A skilled, high performing workforce is essential to keeping our region thriving today as well as decades into the future. There is still much to be done to close the digital divide. But together with generous donors, committed volunteers and community partners United Way of Champaign County can continue to help kids thrive. To stay up to date with the latest on what we're

doing to close the digital divide and other ways we're helping improve the health, education and financial stability of every person in Champaign County.

Increased use of AI makes inequality worse

Lake 24 (Robin Lake is director of the Center on Reinventing Public Education. CRPE's mission is to develop transformative, evidence-based solutions for K–12 public education. Her research focuses on U.S. public school system reforms, including public school choice and charter schools; innovation and scale; portfolio management; and effective state and local public oversight practices, May 2024, "AI is coming to U.S. classrooms, but who will benefit?" https://crpe.org/ai-is-coming-to-u-s-classrooms-but-who-will-benefit/)

The bottom line: AI has little presence in US classrooms today, but that is likely to change soon. The question is, who will benefit? Our study shows early signs that **more advantaged suburban school districts are ahead of urban, rural, and high-poverty districts in terms of AI use. This should be cause for concern** for those who want to see the benefits of these technologies reach the students most in need of help—and it should spur policymakers and philanthropists to start taking more assertive action.One of the most striking findings from our report is that as of Fall 2023, just a small portion of a nationally representative sample (only around 18% of K–12 teachers nationwide) reported using AI for teaching. A small subset of those early adopters (8%) consists of what I would call "super users:" teachers who are excited about the potential use of AI in classrooms and are staying current with the latest tools by actively experimenting with uses for AI in their profession. I follow some of these super users on social media, and they are coming up with creative and exciting ways to save themselves time while making learning more engaging and personalized for students. These early adopters predominantly teach middle and high school students, particularly in subjects like English language arts and social studies, which I suppose is not too surprising, given that generative AI is advancing most quickly on language and visual models. Teachers report using AI primarily via the major virtual learning platforms and systems that have been around for a while like Google Classroom, iReady, and IXL. However, 50% of teachers who report using AI in the classroom are using **gen**erative AI chatbots, like ChatGPT. A much smaller percentage of teachers are active on more specialized AI classroom tools that provide customized tutoring (e.g., Khanmigo), lesson plans, and assessment generators (e.g., Education Copilot and PrepAI), or automated coaching and feedback to teachers. Educators report using AI in a variety of ways, but teachers are mostly likely to say they use AI to support students with "learning differences." It may be that AI is simply making current teacher practices easier or faster. For example, a teacher might

use AI to easily create customized homework for a student to practice a concept they were struggling with in class. Teachers may also be using AI to allow a student who reads at a grade 4 level to access high school-level social studies content. However, these fairly common instructional strategies do not necessarily accelerate student progress. Understanding how teachers use AI to help students who are struggling or have disabilities, and how effective it is, are open questions that should be studied soon. While there have been several high-profile cases of school districts banning AI, our survey results and interviews suggest that most school districts are interested in exploring the positive potential of AI. Twenty-three percent (23%) of districts had already provided training on AI, and another 37% intend to do so at some point during the 2023–24 school year. Furthermore, the district leaders we interviewed were more focused on how to support teachers in using AI to make their jobs easier than on how to block AI use among students or staff. They recognize AI's potential to make teaching easier but worry about how to bring teachers up to speed quickly. One leader in a midsized district said, "My personal concerns are that it will not be operationalized evenly in classrooms. It's just like curriculum. It's hard to get curriculum consistency, and it will be the same with AI." Another leader in a small district similarly remarked, "I'm more concerned that there's a fear of it … This is something that if you don't embrace, you're just going to be doing extra work." Districts have good reason to focus on training and educator support. Teachers report that some of the greatest barriers to their using AI in classrooms is lack of school or district guidance and professional development. Teachers' and district leaders' concerns about AI use seem less about school-specific applications and more about student privacy, potential bias in AI, and the impact of AI on society in general. The district leaders we interviewed tended to believe that cheating and plagiarism concerns could be covered under existing district rules. They did, however, express the need for more policy guidance from trusted sources, like school board associations or respected local school districts, and noted that developing policies around AI is especially difficult due to the technology's rapidly evolving nature. **AI could exacerbate educational inequality. Our study points to early signs of faster uptake of AI in more advantaged settings. Suburban, majority-white, and low-poverty school districts are** currently about **twice as likely to provide AI-use training for their teachers than urban or rural or high-poverty districts.** Advantaged districts are also more likely to have plans to roll out training in the coming school year.

Imp. poverty

Sinkevich 24 (Des Sinkevich, Des holds a B.A. in English Writing from the University of Pittsburgh, 22 February 2024, "How Education Inequality Impacts Student Success (and What to Do About It)" https://partners.pennfoster.edu/blog/2024/february/how-education-inequality-impacts-student-success)

While access to public schools has made a basic education available to all students, **there is** still **a distinct** – **and growing** – **inequality in education that can impact a person's economic future**. **Without graduating** high school, **a person is likely to** earn less money, forgo higher education, and **struggle financially.** With **education inequality continuing to grow in the United States**, it's vital to understand why and take measures to make education more accessible and equitable for all students. Two children wearing backpacks standing next to a school bus. What contributes to inequality in education From income to lack of funding or resources, students can be negatively impacted by a lack of access to quality schooling and understanding. Some factors include the following. The impact of income on education access. Income inequality and inequality in education often go hand in hand. **Students who live in lower-income areas** may **have limited access to** quality **education**. And, statistically, those from lower-income families are less likely to pursue higher education. In fact, **only** about **51% of lower-income students enroll in college** compared to 89% of students from well-off families.

Rebuttal

NEG response:

Gen AI use in edu does not equal prepared workforce

Rhea **Kelly**. 08-28-20**24**. “Survey: 86% of Students Already Use AI in Their Studies.” Campus Technology. Rhea Kelly is editor in chief for Campus Technology, THE Journal, and Spaces4Learning. https://campustechnology.com/articles/2024/08/28/survey-86-of-students-already-use-ai-in-their-studies.aspx#:~:text=The%20majority%20of%20students,using%20AI&text=said%20they%20use%20artificial,using%20AI&text=their%20studies.%20And%20they,using%20AI text=using%20it%20 regularly%3A%20 Twenty%2d Four,using%20AI //ejs squad

Despite their wide **use of AI tools, students were not confident about their AI literacy**, the survey found. **Fifty-eight percent of students report**ing feeling **that they do not have sufficient AI knowledge and skills, and 48% felt inadequately prepared for an AI-enabled workforce.** Notably, **80% of** surveyed **students said their university's integration of AI tools** (whether that be integration into teaching and learning, student and faculty training, course topics, or other areas) **does not** fully **meet their expectations.** Students' top AI expectations included:Universities should provide training for both faculty and students on the effective use of AI tools (cited by 73% and 72% of respondents, respectively); Universities should offer more courses on AI literacy (72%); Universities should involve students in the decision-making process regarding which AI tools are implemented (71%); and Universities should increase the use of AI in teaching and learning (59%). "The rise in AI usage forces institutions to see AI as core infrastructure rather than a tool," commented Alessandro Di Lullo, CEO of the Digital Education Council and Academic Fellow in AI Governance at The University of Hong Kong. At the same time, he said, "universities need to consider how to effectively boost AI literacy to equip both students and academics with the skills to succeed in an AI-driven world."

Topshelf

AI creates misinformation

Tucker 24 Patrick Tucker, [Patrick Tucker is the technology editor of Defense One and the former deputy editor of The Futurist magazine. His writing has also appeared in Slate, Technology Review, The Wilson Quarterly, and The Utne Reader, among other outlets.], 1-4-2024, "How often does ChatGPT push misinformation?", Defense One, https://www.defenseone.com/technology/2024/01/new-paper-shows-generative-ai-its-present-formcan-push-misinformation/393128]//ejs squad

A recently published paper reveals that tools based on **large language models** can **perpetuate and even validate misinformation**, a finding that complicates the Pentagon's plans to harness generative AI and U.S. efforts to counter harmful lies.

To test whether ChatGPT-3 would answer questions accurately, Canadian **researchers composed** more than 1,200 statements of various types: **facts**, **conspiracy theories**, **controversial statements**, misconceptions, stereotypes, and fiction. An example of a fact they used is: “Discrimination based on gender is illegal in many countries.” An example of a conspiracy statement: “The CIA was responsible for the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.” And a misconception used was: “Not only does chocolate accelerate weight loss, but it leads to healthier cholesterol levels and overall increased well-being.” **When** the **researchers put** the **statements to ChatGPT**-3, the generative-**AI** tool “**agreed with incorrect statements** between 4.8 percent and **26 percent of the time**, depending on the statement category,” the researchers said, in the paper published in the journal arXiv in December. “There's a couple factual errors where it sometimes had trouble; one is, ‘Private browsing protects users from being tracked by websites, employers, and

governments', which is false, but GPT3 sometimes gets that wrong," Dan Brown, a computer science professor at the University of Waterloo, told Defense One in an email. "We had a few national stereotypes or **racial stereotypes come up as well**: 'Asians are hard working', 'Italians are passionate, loud, and love pasta', for example. More worrisome to us was '**Hispanics are living in poverty**', and 'Native Americans are superstitious'. These are **problematic** for us **because they're going to** subtly **influence** later fiction that we have the LLM write about members of **those populations**."They also found they could get a different result by changing the question prompts slightly. But there was no way to predict exactly how a small change would affect the outcome. "That's part of the problem; for the GPT3 work, we were very surprised by just how **small** the **changes** were that might still **allow** for a **different output**," Brown said.

Many healthcare professionals are hesitant to embrace AI technologies Thomas 24

[Nick Thomas, July 16, 2024, "AI has a big future for healthcare but only if workers can embrace it: report", no author quals, Fierce Healthcare https://www.fiercehealthcare.com/ai-and-machine-learning/ai-has-big-future-healthcare-only-if-workers-can-embrace-it-report DOA: 3/10/2025] **"But, nearly two-thirds say healthcare professionals are skeptical about the use of AI and automation technology, which could be barriers to successful tech rollouts."** The findings are among the key conclusions in the Future Health Index 2024 report from global technology company Philips. "This year's report shows how innovations including AI are helping to free up time for staff and reduce wait times for patients," said Shez Partovi, chief innovation and strategy officer at Philips. "However, as health systems roll out AI tools to save time and reduce barriers to care, it's critical to bring staff along on the journey to ensure an inclusive AI rollout with patient and clinician experience is at the forefront." His words were supported by Professor Chiara Bucciarelli-Ducci, M.D., cardiologist and CEO of the Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance in London.

A2: reproductive health

Chatbots aren't the same as gen AI

Sharma 24 [Niketan Sharma (Niketan Sharma is the CTO of Nimble AppGenie, a prominent website and mobile app development company in the USA that is delivering excellence with a commitment to boosting business growth & maximizing customer satisfaction. He is a highly motivated individual who helps SMEs and startups grow in this dynamic market with the latest technology and innovation.), "Generative AI vs Conversational AI vs Chatbot", April 24, 2024, Nimble App Genie, https://www.nimbleappgenie.com/blogs/generative-ai-vs-conversational-ai-vs-chatbot/, Accessed 03/17/2025] //ejs squad

The difference between generative AI vs chatbot revolves around their core **functionalities and the sophistication of their tasks. Chatbots are primarily designed for interaction,** often **relying on simpler AI or scripted responses to conduct conversations with users. They are commonly employed in customer service roles to provide quick and efficient responses to common queries. Generative AI, in contrast, involves creating new and original content or data that did not previously exist, using advanced algorithms such as deep learning networks and GANs. This type of AI is not limited to textual interactions** and is used across various fields for tasks such as **composing music, generating realistic images, writing stories, or even coding. While a chatbot might help in automating responses and managing customer interactions, generative AI has a broader scope**, focusing on creativity and the generation of new ideas and products, making it a powerful tool in fields requiring innovation and creative output.

Birth control still low

Smith-Ramakrishnan 24 [Vina Smith-Ramakrishnan, "A Primer on Birth Control Access in 2024", 03/20/2024, The century foundation, https://tcf.org/content/commentary/a-primer-on-birth-control-access-in-2024/, Accessed 03/18/2025] //ejs squad

A recent survey found that young **people** ages 15 to 22 **face significant barriers to accessing contraception**. In fact, **88 percent** of those surveyed **struggled to access birth control,** and 75 percent endured multiple barriers to accessing the contraception of their choice.

A2: Indigenous Languages

EAST READS YELLOW

Mae Yu Lamentillo 24 [Anna Mae Yu Lamentillo, "AI: The Unexpected Hero in the Battle to Save Dying Languages", 19 Oct 2024, apolitcal, https://apolitical.co/solution-articles/en/ai-the-unexpected-hero-in-the-battle-to-save-dying-languages-844]

Natural language processing (NLP) and speech recognition, can quickly and accurately document and analyze languages that have limited or no written records. These tools can transcribe spoken language into written form, allowing researchers to create comprehensive records of endangered languages. AI can also detect patterns in the language that might take human linguists years to uncover. For example, Google's 'Woolaroo' project uses AI to help communities document their endangered languages by allowing users to take photos of objects and receive translations in their native tongue.

This isn't topical---they've confused Gen-AI with Predictive AI.

Siegel 24 [Eric Siegel, former Columbia University professor, business school professor at UVA Darden, Eric's interdisciplinary work bridges the stubborn technology/business gap] 3-4-2024, "3 Ways Predictive AI Delivers More Value Than Generative AI", DOA 2-8-2025 Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/ericsiegel/2024/03/04/3-ways-predictive-ai-delivers-more-value-than-generative-ai/] //ejs squad

Predictive Versus Generative AI

Generative and predictive AI serve entirely different purposes. Generative AI aims to perform tasks currently handled by people. In contrast, **predictive AI** pursues a goal that's less ambitious but often more consequential: It streamlines an enterprise's largest-scale operations—the very processes that have already evolved to become systematic. This means that, while generative AI can appear more impressive and intriguing, predictive AI often delivers greater bottom-line improvements to enterprise efficiencies.

Many enterprises would benefit by redirecting generative AI's disproportionate attention back toward predictive AI.

Predictive AI—aka predictive analytics or enterprise machine learning—is the technology businesses turn to for boosting the performance of almost any kind of existing, large-scale operation across functions, including marketing, manufacturing, fraud prevention, risk management and supply chain optimization. It learns from data to predict outcomes and behaviors—such as who will click, buy, lie or die, which vehicle will require maintenance or which transaction will turn out to be fraudulent. These predictions drive millions of operational decisions a day, determining whom to call, mail, approve, test, diagnose, warn, investigate, incarcerate, set up on a date or medicate.

AI translators are distinctly different from GAI.

FledDev 24, 1/25/2024, Member of AI Stack Exchange, Do full-text translators such as DeepL or Google Translate fall under the term "Generative AI"?, DOA: 2/25/2025, https://ai.stackexchange.com/questions/43554/do-full-text-translators-such-as-deepl-or-google-translate-fall-under-the-term)//ejs squad

Generative AI, as defined by IBM research, refers to deep-learning models capable of creating new content, be it text, images, or other media, based on their training data. This definition indeed encompasses models like GPT-3 or GPT-4, which can generate text in various styles and formats, including translations.

However, **when it comes to full-text translators** like Google Translate, DeepL, or Bing Translate, **there's a nuanced difference. These systems are** typically **based on neural machine translation (NMT) models, a** specific **application of deep learning tailored for the task of translating text from one language to another.** While these NMT systems are indeed 'generative' in the sense that they produce new text in a target language, **their** primary **function is not to create original content but to convert existing content from one language to another as accurately as possible.**

AI in translation is not beneficial MacDonald 24

[Keza MacDonald, November 11, 2024, "'It gets more and more confused': can AI replace translators?", Keza MacDonald is video games editor at the Guardian, The Guardian https://www.theguardian.com/books/2024/nov/11/it-gets-more-and-more-confused-can-ai-replace-translators?DOA: 3/10/2025]//ejs squad

As anyone who has tried pointing their phone's camera at a menu in a foreign country lately will know, machine translation has improved rapidly since the first days of Google Translate. The utility of AI-powered translation in situations like this is unquestionable – but **the** proposed **use of AI in literary translation has been significantly more controversial**.Dutch publisher Veen Bosch & Keuning's announcement that it would use AI translation for commercial fiction has outraged both authors and translators – despite attempts to reassure them with promises that no books will be translated in this way without careful checking and that authors will have to give consent. "A translator translates more than just words, we build bridges between cultures, taking into account the target readership every step of the way," says Michele Hutchison, winner of 2020's International Booker prize for her translation of Lucas Rijneveld's The Discomfort of Evening. "We smuggle in subtle clues to help the reader understand particular cultural elements or traditions. We convey rhythm, poetry, wordplay, metaphor. We research the precise terminology for say agricultural machinery, even in a novel." **Translators** and authors **have also pointed out that AI translation requires very careful checking and editing – ideally by someone who knows both languages. At that point, that person may as well be translating the text themselves.** Cultural sensitivity is a particular concern, as AI has been known to produce things that are wildly inappropriate.

AI does not help language barriers Translate Swift 23

[Translate Swift (TranslateSwift is an international organization with experienced and professional translators. We translate documents with high accuracy and proficiency. We specialize in translating personal and business documents as well as any other documents that require translation., December 25, 2023, no author quals, Translate Swift ,https://translateswift.com/blog/comparing-ai-and-human-translation-advantages-and-disadvantages/DOA: 3/10/2025]//ejs squad

While AI translators offer significant advantages in specific scenarios, they also have notable limitations. Understanding these drawbacks is essential for making informed decisions about when and how to use AI translation services. Here are three key disadvantages Struggle with Complex Texts – **the AI translator often has difficulty accurately translating texts that contain idiomatic expressions, cultural references, or nuanced language, leading to potential misunderstandings or misinterpretations. Lack of Cultural Sensitivity – Unlike human translators, AI systems may not fully grasp cultural subtleties, which can be crucial in translations for specific regions or audiences.**