AI Becomes Education Infrastructure as Guardrails and Human Skills Move Center Stage

AI in EdTech Weekly

2026-06-08

AI Becomes Education Infrastructure as Guardrails and Human Skills Move Center Stage

By AI in EdTech Weekly • June 8, 2026

This week's coverage shows AI shifting from classroom experiment to institutional system: districts, universities, and governments are expanding access while tightening rules, testing safety, and rethinking what learners should still do themselves. The brief also tracks the practical uses gaining traction, the evidence behind them, and the signals education leaders should watch next.

AI becomes education infrastructure

The biggest shift this week is structural. AI in education is no longer mainly a classroom-level experiment; it is being treated as infrastructure by districts, universities, and governments. In K-12, **79% of districts** now report having AI guidelines, up from 57% in 2025, and **70%** are training staff on instruction-focused generative AI tools. But only **41%** of initiatives focus directly on teaching and learning, while leaders still cite staffing, funding, and expertise gaps as major blockers. Cybersecurity is the dominant worry: **98%** of respondents are concerned AI will enable new attacks, and many district vetting processes still skip basic checks on safety and accessibility [1].

Higher ed is moving in the same direction. Ethan Mollick notes that many schools, including U Penn, now offer school-wide AI access, arguing that safe and equitable access is a necessary foundation and that HIPAA- and FERPA-compliant systems lower risk for large numbers of students and researchers [2, 3, 4]. But provision alone does not guarantee adoption. At Harvard, students were offered ChatGPT EDU, Gemini, and Claude, yet uptake lagged because some students distrusted university monitoring and saw centrally provided AI as a possible surveillance tool [5].

The governance gap remains wide. Only about **1 in 3 students** say their school

has a school-wide AI policy, many report teacher-by-teacher inconsistency, and **67%** believe more AI use for schoolwork harms critical thinking. At the same time, roughly **85%** of teachers and students report using AI for schoolwork, while **4 in 5** U.S. teachers receive no formal guidance on AI and **2 in 3** get none on one-to-one instruction or personalization [6, 5].

National strategies are emerging faster than shared capacity

Outside individual institutions, governments are starting to treat AI education as a national capability. China has launched an AI Empowering Education action plan that incorporates AI into teacher qualifications and expands AI education for primary and secondary students [5]. Malta's AI for All program pairs free paid-tier ChatGPT access with a required responsible-use course designed by the University of Malta [5]. Anthropic's $200 million partnership with the Gates Foundation is aimed at evidence-based AI tutors for U.S. schools, career guidance tools, literacy and numeracy apps in Africa and India, and public goods such as benchmarks, datasets, and knowledge graphs [5].

But the global build-out is uneven. One Edtech Podcast discussion noted that **40%** of ChatGPT web traffic comes from middle-income countries, while high-income countries host **77%** of global data-center capacity and low-income countries less than **0.1%**; **87%** of AI models come from countries containing just **17%** of the world's population [7]. In Jordan, sandboxes with education authorities and universities are being used to test what local systems can actually absorb before scaling solutions, with the broader argument that coordination and innovation governance may matter more than technology procurement alone [7, 8].

Guardrails are tightening where stakes are highest

As access expands, restrictions are becoming more explicit — especially for young learners and high-stakes academic work. The AFT has called for no screens in pre-K through second grade except where needed, no student-facing AI in elementary schools, supervised AI for older students, and a ban on social companion chatbots for students under 16 [9]. In New York, NYSUT passed a similar resolution and said AI use in any grade should be educator-led and designed to promote critical thinking, digital literacy, and civic readiness rather than replace human instruction or judgment [10].

The debate is not settled. A counterargument from Tech & Learning says the wrong target is the device itself, not passive learning. That critique argues for a **purpose-first** approach: explicit instruction on when AI supports learning, when it gets in the way, and why schools still need strong privacy, safety, accessibility, and evidence standards instead of blanket avoidance [9].

Higher ed is drawing its own lines. UC Berkeley Law has barred AI from conceptualizing, outlining, drafting, revising, translating, or editing work submitted

for credit, limited AI use in research, and prohibited uploading course materials into generative AI systems [5].

> "In the classroom, we don't want students to write the best possible paper, but rather the best possible paper that the student is capable of." [5]

At the same time, some districts are choosing guidance over blocking. Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District has explicitly avoided immediately blocking AI sites, instead focusing on responsible use, verification, and ongoing privacy education as AI features spread across already-approved tools [11]. University of Central Florida professor Humberto López Castillo offers a similar higher-ed playbook: set expectations upfront, model acceptable use, learn from student experimentation, and use hallucinations as teachable moments to reinforce that humans remain responsible for verification [12].

One practical safeguard gaining traction is pre-deployment testing. Jason La Greca's "How to Break Your Chatbot" framework is meant to stress-test student-facing bots against jailbreaks and manipulation attempts before schools release them, and one AI in Education Podcast discussion argued it is probably unethical to deploy a chatbot to students without testing it first [13].

Don't Deploy a Chatbot Until You Do This (1:22)

The practical uses gaining traction are teacher-centered

The classroom uses with the clearest traction are not the most futuristic ones. An analysis of more than 13,000 teacher AI conversations found the dominant use cases in lesson planning, differentiation, assessment, and reflection on practice [14].

That matches what practitioners are describing. Dr. Sarah Thomas frames AI as a **creativity amplifier**: something that can automate routine work, such as turning a spoken presentation run-through into bullet-point speaker notes, while preserving teacher judgment for the parts that matter most [15, 16]. In the classroom, she points to students using AI as a writing tutor for formative feedback and brainstorming, with the expectation that teachers still review the work and students still verify the output [15]. Her guardrails are practical: protect COPPA, FERPA, and student PII; read privacy policies; verify outputs; and teach students to spot errors through "find the lie" exercises across multiple models [15]. She is equally direct that AI does not replace the relational core of teaching [15].

AI as a Creativity Amplifier with Dr. Sarah Thomas (4:39)

Project-based creative use is also proving more durable than simple output generation. In middle school, Jessica Pack describes using Adobe Express to teach AI citizenship alongside storytelling, moviemaking, and iterative prompting. In one example, creativity-based projects helped long-term English learners improve across reading, writing, listening, and speaking while strengthening confi-

dence and self-concept [17, 18].

At the school-model level, Primer says it is using AI first to remove administrative load from teachers, send real-time alerts when a student is struggling with a specific concept, and combine signals from direct instruction, exit tickets, virtual tutoring, and learning apps into a shared mastery dashboard for teachers, students, and families [19]. But Primer also says it rejects a future in which AI replaces teachers and only wants student-facing tools that clear a high bar for academic outcomes and mapping to standards [19].

The evidence is getting clearer about both gains and distortions

Some of the week's strongest research signals were positive. In England, a study of 259 science teachers found that ChatGPT users completed assigned tasks in **69%** of the control group's time, with equivalent output quality, and reallocated time toward more human work such as relationship-building [14]. In a Stanford law study, professors blindly preferred Gemini 2.5 Pro responses to peer-written answers to office-hour questions **75%** of the time and rated the model's responses less harmful; Ethan Mollick added that newer models performed even better [20, 21].

But the risks are now more specific, too. In one study, identical student writing received meaningfully different AI feedback depending on the demographic and motivational persona attached to the student, including less constructive criticism and more praise for some Black, Hispanic, Asian, female, and "unmotivated" profiles [14]. A separate analysis of 370,000 college admissions essays found more stylistic diversity after ChatGPT's arrival, but convergence around fewer original ideas, with human-written essays containing up to eight times more new ideas [14]. Mollick made the same point more broadly: once many people use AI on the same prompt, similarities become obvious [22].

There are also mounting signs that overreliance can damage learning. In UC Berkeley computer science classes, failing grades rose sharply in spring 2026, and instructors pointed to increased AI reliance, weak math preparation, and understaffing as possible contributors [23]. Teachers on Reddit describe blatant AI use as a weekly reality in some classes and say they are responding with oral assignments, in-class handwritten work, required revision histories, or assignments that require students to use AI and then critique or substantiate its output. In those threads, AI detectors were often viewed as unreliable or counterproductive [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30].

The deeper higher-ed critique is shifting from cheating to task value. Lance Eaton argues that students' turn to AI often reflects a widening gap between what institutions say assignments are for and what the work actually feels like, forcing a harder question about which learning experiences remain worth doing when basic production becomes cheap [31, 32].

"What kinds of learning experiences are still worth showing up for when the baseline production of work is cheap, but the cost of accessing education is incredibly high?" [31]

What This Means

- **For district and school leaders:** Reaching policy coverage is not the same as being operationally ready. The real work now is teacher guidance, cybersecurity capacity, vendor safety review, accessibility, and family trust [1, 5].
- **For universities:** Expect expansion and restriction at the same time. School-wide AI access is spreading, but institutions are drawing harder lines around high-stakes writing, judgment formation, and source verification [2, 5, 33].
- **For teachers and L&D teams:** The strongest use cases remain planning, differentiation, formative feedback, administrative relief, and project-based creation. The weakest use case is still unsupervised substitution of student thinking [14, 15, 19, 17, 23].
- **For edtech builders and investors:** Capability is no longer enough. Products increasingly need privacy compliance, source transparency, standards mapping, accessibility information, and evidence that they can withstand misuse by students [4, 9, 13, 34].
- **For anyone thinking about the future of learning and work:** The broader economic bargain is getting murkier. Chalkbeat notes that AI could reduce the performance edge of more-educated workers in some workplace-like tasks, leaving schools and learners preparing for a more uncertain payoff to traditional schooling alone [35].
- **For self-directed and lifelong learners:** AI keeps lowering the barrier to access and building. Duolingo says its model reaches learners across the socioeconomic spectrum and is expanding beyond languages into math and music, while Andrew Ng is teaching non-coders to build working web apps through iterative prompting. But both examples still point back to the same disciplines: specificity, feedback, iteration, and continued practice [36, 37].

Watch This Space

- **National AI capability agendas:** China's teacher-certification push, Malta's training-gated public access model, and Jordan's sandbox approach suggest that national AI education strategies are moving from rhetoric to implementation [5, 7].
- **A student-safety testing layer for AI:** Common Sense Media's new Youth AI Safety Institute aims to create safety standards and open evaluations for children's AI products, while large partnerships are starting to publish benchmarks and districts are being urged to stress-test chatbots before deployment [38, 5, 13].

- **A parallel human-skills strategy:** Schools are increasingly asking not just for an AI strategy but for a human skills strategy, including authentic interaction, discussion skills, and clearer policies for what should remain face-to-face and student-generated [39].
- **More transparent study tools:** NotebookLM's new Source Attribution shows the exact prompts and sources behind an artifact, and its mobile app now creates briefing docs and study guides on the go — a sign that study tools are moving toward auditability rather than opaque generation [34, 40].
- **Platform control over agentic AI:** After Amazon's win against Perplexity over AI agents logging in on behalf of users, education platforms could try to do the same with LMS access — a potentially important development for online courses and agentic study tools [41].

Sources

1. Report: School IT Officials Worried About AI Adoption, Cybersecurity
2. X post by @emollick
3. X post by @emollick
4. X post by @emollick
5. Why One Law School Just Banned AI (and 11 other AI in Education news stories)
6. What to Do About AI? Begin by Talking About It
7. #329 AI, Sovereignty and the New Education Divide
8. #329 AI, Sovereignty and the New Education Divide
9. Devices Down Is The Wrong Goal
10. New York teachers union calls for aggressive limits on AI and screens for youngest students
11. Homecoming Queen: How One Educator Returned to Her Childhood District To Lead Its Edtech Efforts
12. 4 Strategies For Teaching With AI Effectively
13. Don't Deploy a Chatbot Until You Do This
14. Catching Up: Student Influencers, AI's Mirror Problem & The Power of Early Work Experience
15. AI as a Creativity Amplifier with Dr. Sarah Thomas
16. X post by @coolcatteacher
17. Moviemaking in the Classroom: Where Every Student Has a Story
18. X post by @coolcatteacher
19. Inside Primer's Growing Network
20. X post by @emollick
21. X post by @AndrewCurran_
22. X post by @emollick
23. r/Teachers post by u/ArcaneKnight47
24. r/Teachers comment by u/sassperillashana

25. r/Teachers comment by u/Snts6678
26. r/Teachers comment by u/justlooking837
27. r/Teachers comment by u/Individual_Divide220
28. r/Teachers comment by u/NotAFloorTank
29. r/Teachers comment by u/Hour-Economy-2734
30. r/Teachers comment by u/jensmith20055002
31. Apathies and Artifices in Education
32. substack
33. The AI Hypocrisy Story Nobody Saw Coming
34. X post by @NotebookLM
35. For generations, more schooling meant better jobs. Could generative AI upend that bargain?
36. ¡Pilas Pues!: EDUCACIÓN Y TECNOLOGÍA con Luis Von Ahn
37. Build Your Own App In Just 30 Minutes! Full Course with Andrew Ng
38. Edtech Show & Tell June 2026
39. How Do We Teach Conversation? | Liza Garonzik
40. X post by @NotebookLM
41. Can AI Agents Be Banned From Your LMS?