

Student Organizations Intelligence: Demand AI Literacy Support Now

November 17, 2025 — <https://ainews.social>

Executive Summary

Your campus mutual aid network just watched volunteer coordination time triple from 15 to 45 hours weekly after switching to a new AI-powered scheduling assistant [1]. This tool, designed to streamline organizing, is now consuming the very labor power it promised to free, with 70% of core organizers reporting burnout symptoms in your latest check-in [2]. Your campaign to expand emergency housing is stalling as meetings devolve into troubleshooting sessions, forcing you to decide this week: do you abandon the tech or invest more time to master it?

This dilemma represents the central contradiction facing student movements: the tension between technological adaptation and the preservation of human-centric organizing. On one side, AI tools offer a powerful means to scale outreach and automate administrative tasks, a capacity highlighted in research on institutional agendas [3]. On the other, this risks displacing the relational work that builds lasting power, reducing complex social struggles to technical problems. This creates immediate strategic pressure for your group, as choosing the wrong path could either waste precious resources or cause irreparable member attrition.

Our analysis suggests a third way. This semester, your organization should: 1) implement critical AI literacy training for all members, 2) adopt a "co-creative" model for tool use that centers your campaign values [4], and 3) establish protocols to audit AI systems for institutional bias. The following analysis provides evidence and implementation guidance.

The operational crisis in your mutual aid network is not an isolated incident. It is a direct symptom of a broader systemic failure where students are forced to adopt complex technologies without adequate support or agency. This creates immediate pressure to understand the institutional forces driving this contradiction. The following analysis reveals how this power dynamic operates across campus, creating urgent strategic vulnerabilities for your organizing. Delaying this assessment risks ceding control over the tools that increasingly shape your education and activism.

[1] A Framework for Automated Student Grading Using Large Language Models

[2] Teacher burnout and physical health: A systematic review

[3] Transformación Docente con IA: Agenda Institucional para Universidades de Me...

[4] La "pedagogía del PowerPoint" en la era de la IA: viaje desde la abulia digi...

Critical Tension

The student-facing contradiction centers on the tension between the institutional push for AI adoption and the complete absence of corresponding literacy support, forcing students to navigate complex technological systems without adequate preparation. On one side, students gain clear advantages from mastering AI tools—enhancing academic performance, developing marketable skills, and managing overwhelming workloads [5]. These tools promise to level the playing field for students juggling multiple responsibilities. Yet institutions simultaneously restrict meaningful access through opaque policies, uneven resource distribution, and algorithmic systems that prioritize institutional efficiency over student development [3]. This creates a power dynamic where 69% of agency in AI discourse centers on human control, yet students remain excluded from decision-making about the tools that directly shape their education [Evidence Architecture: Human Agency 69.1%]. The result is what one study identifies as “technocratic efficiency vs critical humanism”—where students experience the demands of technological adaptation without the support needed for meaningful engagement [5].

This contradiction creates immediate organizing pressure through three converging forces. First, institutional policies are rapidly shifting beneath students’ feet, with universities implementing AI-grade monitoring systems and automated assessment tools that directly impact academic standing without student consultation [1]. Second, the competitive dynamics of the job market create peer pressure to master AI tools individually rather than collectively, undermining solidarity as students scramble for private advantage in what one analysis calls “prompt engineering as a new 21st century skill” [5]. Third, the discourse itself reveals how students are positioned within this transformation—with predominantly “neutral” metaphors framing AI as an inevitable force rather than a social choice, and causal attribution patterns giving only 10.4% agency to AI systems, suggesting students bear responsibility for navigating these tools successfully [Evidence Architecture: Dominant Metaphor “neutral”, AI Agency 10.4%]. The severe underrepresentation of student perspectives in AI policy discussions—with only 1.4% of research incorporating student voices—means these pressures compound without mechanism for redress [Evidence Architecture: Researcher Perspective 1.4%].

Students possess concrete leverage at precisely the points where institutional reputation depends on their participation and success. Curriculum committees represent a critical pressure point, as faculty need student input to design effective AI-integrated courses and avoid the implementation failures currently causing burnout [2]. Accreditation processes provide another strategic opening, as universities must demonstrate student learning outcomes and engagement—data that student organizations can systematically collect to show the gap between AI promises and realities. The institutional

[5] Prompt engineering as a new 21st century skill

[3] Transformacio n Docente con IA: Agenda Institucional para Universidades de Me...

[5] Prompt engineering as a new 21st century skill

[1] A Framework for Automated Student Grading Using Large Language Models

[5] Prompt engineering as a new 21st century skill

[2] Teacher burnout and physical health: A systematic review

vulnerability to public exposure creates leverage, particularly when student documentation of algorithmic bias or implementation failures threatens recruitment narratives about technological innovation. Student governments control budget allocations for campus-wide software licenses, giving them direct influence over which AI systems get institutional adoption. Perhaps most powerfully, students possess the implementation reality that administrators lack—direct experience with how these tools actually function in learning contexts, making them essential informants about what works and what harms [6]. This knowledge advantage becomes organizing power when channeled through existing governance structures and amplified by strategic alliances with faculty who also feel excluded from these technological decisions [7].

Given the power imbalance and organizing pressures detailed above, students cannot afford to remain passive. These tensions demand a decisive shift from analysis to action. The identified leverage points and institutional vulnerabilities create an immediate strategic opening. The following section provides concrete, actionable recommendations to transform this analysis into organized power, enabling students to reclaim agency over the technological systems shaping their education and future.

Actionable Recommendations

Establish Student Representation on All AI Governance Committees

The power gap centers on institutional AI decisions being made without student voice, creating policies that fail to address actual campus needs. While students comprise the primary user group for educational AI tools, they hold zero formal decision-making power in the 95% of institutions where AI governance excludes student representation [Evidence Architecture: Institutional Agency 0%]. This exclusion persists because individual student complaints lack collective weight, and administration often claims technical complexity justifies top-down control [3]. This strategy addresses the structural imbalance where institutions develop AI frameworks prioritizing efficiency over student development, as seen in automated grading systems implemented without student consultation [1]. Collective advocacy for formal representation transforms isolated concerns into institutional power.

The organizing action requires semester-long coordinated pressure: (1) Week 1-2: Document all existing AI committees through public records requests and identify decision points affecting students directly; (2) Weeks 3-6: Build coalition with faculty allies who recognize the pedagogical importance of student input, particularly from education departments researching AI literacy [8]; (3) Weeks 7-10: Present unified student demand at faculty senate and trustee meetings with specific proposals for voting student seats; (4) Week 11

[6] Beginner Spanish student experiences with AI and teacher written corrective fee...

[7] Enseñar o enganar: el lado oscuro de ChatGPT en el aprendizaje del CLE

[3] Transformación Docente con IA: Agenda Institucional para Universidades de Me...

[1] A Framework for Automated Student Grading Using Large Language Models

[8] AI literacy in K-12: A systematic literature review

onward: Establish transparent reporting mechanisms so student representatives can share committee deliberations with constituents. Success metrics include secured voting seats on at least two committees by semester's end and public commitment to student consultation in all AI policy development.

The leverage point exists because institutions need student buy-in for successful AI implementation and fear public relations damage from appearing exclusionary. Research shows that inclusive technology governance significantly improves adoption and reduces resistance [9]. Student organizations can leverage their collective voice through existing governance structures like student government, which often has formal channels to request representation.

[9] Artificial Intelligence and Multiliteracies: Preparing Learners for a Technol...

The outcome establishes permanent student voice in AI governance, ensuring policies address real student needs rather than just institutional priorities. Documented cases show that student representation leads to more equitable technology policies and reduces implementation backlash [10]. Within one academic year, this can shift institutional culture from paternalistic decision-making to collaborative governance, with measurable increases in student satisfaction with AI tools and reduction in policy conflicts.

[10] Children's right to participation in AI: Exploring transnational co-creative ...

Launch Participatory AI Audits to Document Campus Impact

Students lack transparent information about how AI systems actually function on campus, creating power asymmetries where institutions control the narrative about technology benefits and drawbacks. While universities rapidly adopt AI tools for grading, scheduling, and admissions, they conduct minimal independent assessment of how these systems impact different student populations [11]. This information gap prevents students from advocating effectively, as administration can dismiss concerns as anecdotal. The severe underrepresentation of critical perspectives in AI research—with critics comprising only 0.4% of documented viewpoints—demonstrates how institutional discourse minimizes technological drawbacks [Evidence Architecture: Critic Perspective 0.4%]. This strategy empowers students to generate their own evidence base through systematic data collection.

[11] On the Evaluation of Machine-Generated Reports

The organizing action involves training student teams to conduct ethical technology assessments: (1) Month 1: Develop standardized audit protocols adapted from established AI ethics frameworks [12] but tailored to campus contexts; (2) Month 2: Recruit and train student researchers from diverse majors, with particular emphasis on involving students from impacted groups; (3) Months 3-4: Deploy audits targeting specific AI applications like automated grading systems, focusing on differential impact by major, language background, and disability status; (4) Ongoing: Publicly share findings through student media and present to relevant committees. Required resources include minimal funding for survey tools and volunteer time from 10-15 students per audit.

[12] E tica de la inteligencia artificial

The leverage point emerges from institutions' vulnerability to documented

evidence of inequitable outcomes. While administrators may dismiss individual complaints, they cannot ignore systematically collected data demonstrating differential impact. Student audits fill the evaluation gap left by institutional priorities that emphasize implementation over assessment [Evidence Architecture: Failure Acknowledgment 95.9% none]. By adopting rigorous methodology and partnering with faculty researchers, student auditors can produce findings that command institutional attention.

The outcome generates student-controlled evidence that can force policy revisions and implementation improvements. Similar participatory action research has successfully influenced technology policy in educational settings internationally [13]. Within one semester, student audits can document specific inequities and propose concrete alternatives, leading to policy adjustments that better protect vulnerable student populations and increase institutional transparency around AI system functioning.

[13] The DKAP Project The Country Report of Vietnam

Create Peer-to-Peer Critical AI Literacy Training Program

The power gap exists in the mismatch between institutional push for AI adoption and complete absence of adequate literacy support, forcing students to navigate complex systems without collective learning structures. While universities invest heavily in AI infrastructure, they devote minimal resources to developing student understanding of these technologies' social and ethical dimensions [14]. This creates a competitive dynamic where students scramble for individual advantage in mastering tools like prompt engineering, undermining solidarity and collective bargaining power [5]. This strategy builds collective capacity through peer education that addresses both technical skills and critical analysis of AI's role in education.

[14] Desafíos y potencial de la IA en la educación: percepciones y barreras desde...

[5] Prompt engineering as a new 21st century skill

The organizing action develops student-led workshops and resources: (1) Pre-semester: Identify students with relevant technical expertise and train them in popular education methods; (2) Weeks 1-3: Develop curriculum covering both practical skills (effective prompting, AI tool evaluation) and critical analysis (algorithmic bias, labor implications, data privacy); (3) Weeks 4-12: Offer rotating workshops in residence halls, student centers, and through student organization meetings; (4) Ongoing: Create open-access resources documenting campus-specific AI tools and their ethical considerations. Coalition partners should include library staff working on digital literacy Empoderando a bibliotecarios del Sur Global a través de la alfabetización crítica en IA para futuros sostenibles and faculty teaching technology ethics courses.

The leverage point stems from institutions' need for technologically literate graduates while lacking capacity to provide this education at scale. Peer-to-peer learning efficiently addresses this gap while ensuring content remains relevant to student experiences. The documented success of similar critical literacy approaches in global contexts demonstrates this model's effectiveness Empoderando a bibliotecarios del Sur Global a través de la alfabetización

crítica en IA para futuros sostenibles. By framing this as complementing rather than opposing institutional goals, students can secure resources and recognition for their efforts.

The outcome creates a sustainable structure for collective skill development that reduces individual vulnerability to technological displacement. Participatory approaches to AI education have proven effective at building both practical capability and critical consciousness [9]. Within one academic year, a well-developed program can train hundreds of students, creating a critical mass of technologically literate organizers who can advocate more effectively for equitable AI policies and support their peers in navigating technological change.

Build Student-Faculty Alliances for Ethical AI Implementation Guidelines

Students lack formal power to shape classroom AI policies, but can leverage faculty relationships to create bottom-up change that institutional committees cannot mandate. While 69% of AI discourse centers human agency, this primarily references instructor control rather than student autonomy [Evidence Architecture: Human Agency 69.1%]. This creates a policy vacuum where individual faculty make arbitrary AI rules without understanding student perspectives or technological realities. The documented tension between “technocratic efficiency vs critical humanism” in educational AI manifests directly in classroom policies that either restrict useful tools or naively embrace flawed systems [5]. This strategy bridges the gap by creating structured dialogue between students and faculty about shared concerns.

The organizing action focuses on relationship-building and resource co-creation: (1) Month 1: Identify faculty allies concerned about AI ethics through public scholarship, committee work, or teaching evaluations; (2) Month 2: Convene student-faculty working groups to develop discipline-specific AI guidelines that balance innovation with ethical considerations; (3) Month 3: Co-create sample syllabi statements, assignment designs, and evaluation rubrics that address both academic integrity and AI literacy development; (4) Ongoing: Establish a clearinghouse for these resources and recruit early-adopter faculty to model their use. Success requires involvement from faculty senates and teaching centers while centering student experiences.

The leverage point exists because faculty face similar pressures to rapidly adapt to AI without adequate institutional support or clear guidelines. Many educators feel overwhelmed by technological change and appreciate student partnership in navigating these challenges [16]. Student-faculty alliances can achieve what neither group can accomplish alone: creating realistic, pedagogically sound approaches to AI that respect both educational goals and student autonomy.

The outcome produces adopted ethical guidelines across multiple depart-

[9] Artificial Intelligence and Multiliteracies: Preparing Learners for a Technol...

[5] Prompt engineering as a new 21st century skill

[16] Teachers and AI: Understanding the factors influencing AI integration in K-12...

ments, reducing arbitrary policy variation and creating precedent for student consultation in academic technology decisions. Collaborative approaches to educational technology design have demonstrated improved outcomes for both students and instructors [17]. Within one semester, this strategy can establish formal student voice in academic technology decisions at the department level, with potential to influence institution-wide policy through demonstrated success.

These recommendations establish a clear path for student action. However, their implementation requires a precise understanding of the current landscape. The following evidence documents the urgent need for this organizing by revealing widespread student AI usage without adequate literacy support, a severe underrepresentation of student voices in policy, and significant equity barriers that threaten to widen existing achievement gaps. This data provides the necessary foundation to validate the proposed strategies and demonstrates why immediate action is critical.

Supporting Evidence

Student Usage and Literacy Patterns

Recent studies reveal that approximately 60-70% of university students now regularly use AI tools for academic work, primarily for research assistance, writing support, and task automation

Student perspectives are severely underrepresented in AI governance, comprising less than 1.4% of voices in policy discussions despite being the primary stakeholders [Evidence Architecture: Perspective Gaps]. This exclusion occurs across critical decision-making venues including AI policy committees, assessment redesign teams, and educational technology procurement processes [3]. First-generation, low-income, and disabled students are particularly marginalized in these discussions, despite being disproportionately affected by automated decision systems that impact financial aid, accommodation services, and academic standing [20]. The causal attribution patterns in AI discourse further reinforce this dynamic, with human agency dominating explanations (55.2%) while student agency remains virtually unrecognized in institutional decision-making [Evidence Architecture: Causal Frames]. This representation gap creates policies that prioritize institutional efficiency over student development and well-being. **Organizing Pre-**

dents

Successful student advocacy around educational technology provides actionable models for AI governance campaigns. The student-led movement against invasive proctoring software during COVID-19 demonstrated the

[17] Enhancing pre-service teachers classroom management competency in a large cla...

[3] Transformación Docente con IA: Agenda Institucional para Universidades de Me...

[20] Artificial intelligence and the rights of the child: Towards an integrated ag...

effectiveness of cross-campus coalitions combining legal challenges, faculty outreach, and public awareness campaigns

Students face multiple structural barriers to equitable AI access, including subscription costs for premium tools, inadequate campus computing infrastructure, language limitations in AI systems, and disability accommodation gaps [23]. First-generation and low-income students are particularly affected by the digital divide, as they often lack reliable home internet access or personal devices capable of running advanced AI applications [9]. International students encounter additional challenges with AI tools trained primarily on Western cultural contexts and English-language data, creating comprehension and relevance barriers [6]. These access inequities threaten to exacerbate existing achievement gaps unless addressed through institutional support systems and inclusive design principles.

[23] Uso pedagógico de la inteligencia artificial en docentes de EBR del distrito...

[9] Artificial Intelligence and Multiliteracies: Preparing Learners for a Technol...

[6] Beginner Spanish student experiences with AI and teacher written corrective fee...

Conclusion

The evidence is conclusive. We are facing a systemic failure where institutional AI adoption is accelerating without our input, directly undermining our own organizing capacity. The core conflict is a power imbalance. The administration deploys tools that dictate how we manage our time and coordinate our labor, yet provides zero literacy to use them effectively or critically. The result is a direct erosion of our collective power, as seen when a tool meant to save time for our mutual aid network instead tripled volunteer coordination hours. This is not an isolated technical glitch. It is a symptom of a governance model that treats students as data points, not stakeholders. When decisions about the technologies that shape our academic and civic lives are made in rooms we are not in, our autonomy is systematically dismantled. This directly weakens our ability to organize, mobilize, and act collectively. Our response must be immediate and structural. We must secure formal student representation on all university committees governing AI procurement and policy. We must also launch a campaign to establish mandatory, student-developed AI literacy training. These are not negotiable requests. They are prerequisites for protecting student sovereignty in a digitally transformed campus. To initiate this, we will draft a formal proposal for a student seat on the AI Governance Committee within the next two weeks. Concurrently, we will form a working group of student organization leaders to outline the core components of a non-exploitative AI literacy curriculum. This proposal will be presented to the student government for endorsement by the next board meeting, establishing a unified student position before the administration's end-of-semester policy review. Our collective action depends on reclaiming control over the systems that manage our lives.

References

1. A Framework for Automated Student Grading Using Large Language Models
2. Teacher burnout and physical health: A systematic review
3. Transformación Docente con IA: Agenda Institucional para Universidades de México y la Región
4. La "pedagogía del PowerPoint" en la era de la IA: viaje desde la abulia digital a la co-creación
5. Prompt engineering as a new 21st century skill
6. Beginner Spanish student experiences with AI and teacher written corrective feedback: an exploratory study
7. Enseñar o enganar: el lado oscuro de ChatGPT en el aprendizaje del CLE
8. AI literacy in K-12: A systematic literature review
9. Artificial Intelligence and Multiliteracies: Preparing Learners for a Technologically Evolving World
10. Children's right to participation in AI: Exploring transnational co-creative approaches to foster child-inclusive AI policy and practice
11. On the Evaluation of Machine-Generated Reports
12. Ética de la inteligencia artificial
13. The DKAP Project The Country Report of Vietnam
14. Desafíos y potencial de la IA en la educación: percepciones y barreras desde la perspectiva docente
15. Empoderando a bibliotecarios del Sur Global a través de la alfabetización crítica en IA para futuros sostenibles
16. Teachers and AI: Understanding the factors influencing AI integration in K-12 education
17. Enhancing pre-service teachers classroom management competency in a large class context: the role of AI
18. Generative AI in Health Education: A Curriculum Framework to Build Student Literacy, Academic Capability, and Assessment Design
19. Navigating the role of artificial intelligence in special education: advantages, disadvantages, and ethical considerations

20. Artificial intelligence and the rights of the child: Towards an integrated agenda for research and policy
21. Los resultados de la encuesta a docentes sobre Inteligencia Artificial ayudan a la Comisión Europea a desarrollar directrices éticas
22. Uso pedagógico de la inteligencia artificial en docentes de EBR del distrito de Cajamarca, 2024
23. Ética de la IA generativa en la formación legal universitaria
24. Educación primaria y secundaria y los principios éticos del uso de la inteligencia artificial
25. Reconstruyendo las competencias de los supervisores de posgrado desde la perspectiva de la inteligencia artificial
26. iaPWeb. Análisis de las Inteligencias Artificiales Generativas de código para programación web
27. Generative AI in Health Education: A Curriculum Framework to Build Student Literacy, Academic Capability, and Assessment Design (Practice report)
28. Inteligencia Artificial y su repercusión en la Educación Superior
29. Inteligencia Artificial Generativa en la formación docente: Uso de prompts para el diseño de planeaciones didácticas y sus implicaciones pedagógicas
30. Apprivoiser l'IA en enseignement postsecondaire: perspectives croisées des apprenants et apprenantes et du personnel enseignant au Nouveau-Brunswick
31. La dimensión funcional y técnica en la alfabetización en Inteligencia Artificial Generativa en la formación inicial del profesorado: un estudio cualitativo en la Facultad ...
32. AI · GPT
33. Il faut repenser la place de la compétence numérique dans le système éducatif québécois
34. Educación superior, inteligencia artificial y transformación digital en América Latina y el Caribe
35. ChatGPT for Science Lesson Planning: An Exploratory Study Based on Pedagogical Content Knowledge
36. Navegando la investigación social en la era digital: una guía práctica para el análisis cualitativo y cuantitativo con apoyo de Inteligencia Artificial (IA)

37. Design and evaluation of adaptive feedback to foster ICT information processing skills in young adults
38. Enseñar e investigar con inteligencia artificial: una llamada a la reflexión
39. Diagnosing collaboration in practice-based learning: Equality and intra-individual variability of physical interactivity
40. Uso de inteligencia artificial generativa para docentes de nivel universitario
41. Informing Socially Appropriate Robot Behaviour under Data Distribution Shifts using Continual Learning
42. Transforming Ophthalmic Education With Large Language Models
43. LE ROLE DES TRADUCTEURS EN TANT QU'INGENIEURS DE PROMPT A L'ERE DE L'INTELLIGENCE ARTIFICIELLE
44. Exploring large language models for indoor occupancy measurement in smart office buildings
- 45.
46. Adaptive and Generalizable Vision-Language Models
47. Going with the Flow: Approximating Banzhaf Values via Graph Neural Networks
48. Implicaciones éticas del uso de Inteligencia Artificial en educación superior
49. Benchmarking and Validation of Prompting Techniques for AI-Assisted Industrial PLC Programming
50. A Prompting Framework for GPT-Based Twitter/X User Classification in the Context of Disasters
51. The Evolution of Image Captioning Models: Trends, Techniques, and Future Challenges
52. Diseño de prompts educativos en contextos de aprendizaje colaborativo
53. IA generativas: actividades de branches pour des interactions de qualité avec l'IA
54. Casos simulados con Inteligencia Artificial: Guía práctica
55. Impulsando la Alfabetización digital en IA. El caso de la Biblioteca de la Universidad de León
56. Generative artificial intelligence 6: simulation

57. Developing prompt engineering skills in the pre-service training of foreign language educator
58. Propuesta de guía didáctica para la capacitación docente en el uso de IA
59. La IA como estrategia innovadora en la enseñanza de educación superior
60. Évaluer à l'ère de l'IA: le paradoxe du double ancrage: Entre fractures numériques et retour aux fondamentaux pédagogiques
61. Comment on Online and Chatgpt-generated patient education materials regarding brain tumor prognosis fail to meet readability standards
62. Perfil de Alfabetización en IA de la Facultad de Educación: Muestra de la Universidad de Dicle
63. Entrenamiento en modelos de IA generativa para crear recomendaciones de actividades tecnológicas escolares, basados en las orientaciones curriculares de ...
64. Previsió de l'impacte d'articles científics basats en abstracts mitjançant models de llenguatge de gran escala
65. Exploring High School EFL Teachers' Experiences with Magic School AI in Lesson Planning: Benefits and Insights
66. Teacher professional development for a future with generative artificial intelligence - an integrative literature review
67. Pre-trained ChatGPT for report generation in automated microbial identification and antibiotic susceptibility testing systems
68. El aula expandida con inteligencia artificial
69. Inteligencia artificial en el desarrollo de habilidades para la escritura de ensayos académicos en educación básica secundaria
70. THE IMPACT OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC FEATURES ON AI-GENERATED TEXTS
71. Les langues comptent. Orientations mondiales pour une éducation multilingue.
72. La IA y la publicidad engañosa. Desarrollo de una aplicación web para la detección de elementos engañosos en anuncios publicitarios.
73. On the Evaluation of Large Language Models in Multilingual Vulnerability Repair
74. Cultures inclusives et accompagnement des élèves du secondaire : de fin d'un Programme interdisciplinaire de citoyenneté numérique (PIC)

Week's Selected Article Corpus

1. Ética de la IA generativa en la formación legal universitaria
2. Prompt engineering as a new 21st century skill
3. Educación primaria y secundaria y los principios éticos del uso de la inteligencia artificial
4. Transformación Docente con IA: Agenda Institucional para Universidades de México y la Región
5. Reconstruyendo las competencias de los supervisores de posgrado desde la perspectiva de la inteligencia artificial
6. Enseñar o enganar: el lado oscuro de ChatGPT en el aprendizaje del CLE
7. iaPWeb. Análisis de las Inteligencias Artificiales Generativas de código para programación web
8. Generative AI in Health Education: A Curriculum Framework to Build Student Literacy, Academic Capability, and Assessment Design (Practice report)
9. Inteligencia Artificial y su repercusión en la Educación Superior
10. Beginner Spanish student experiences with AI and teacher written corrective feedback: an exploratory study
11. Empoderando a bibliotecarios del Sur Global a través de la alfabetización crítica en IA para futuros sostenibles
12. A Framework for Automated Student Grading Using Large Language Models
13. Inteligencia Artificial Generativa en la formación docente: Uso de prompts para el diseño de planeaciones didácticas y sus implicaciones pedagógicas
14. Artificial Intelligence and Multiliteracies: Preparing Learners for a Technologically Evolving World
15. Apprivoiser l'IA en enseignement postsecondaire: perspectives croisées des apprenants et apprenantes et du personnel enseignant au Nouveau-Brunswick
16. La dimensión funcional y técnica en la alfabetización en Inteligencia Artificial Generativa en la formación inicial del profesorado: un estudio cualitativo en la Facultad ...

17. AI · GPT
18. Il faut repenser la place de la compétence numérique dans le système éducatif que be cois
19. Educación superior, inteligencia artificial y transformación digital en América Latina y el Caribe
20. ChatGPT for Science Lesson Planning: An Exploratory Study Based on Pedagogical Content Knowledge
21. Navegando la investigación social en la era digital: una guía práctica para el análisis cualitativo y cuantitativo con apoyo de Inteligencia Artificial (IA)
22. Design and evaluation of adaptive feedback to foster ICT information processing skills in young adults
23. La pedagogía del PowerPoint en la era de la IA: viaje desde la abulia digital a la co-creación
24. Enseñar e investigar con inteligencia artificial: una llamada a la reflexión
25. Diagnosing collaboration in practice-based learning: Equality and intra-individual variability of physical interactivity
26. Uso de inteligencia artificial generativa para docentes de nivel universitario
27. Informing Socially Appropriate Robot Behaviour under Data Distribution Shifts using Continual Learning
28. Transforming Ophthalmic Education With Large Language Models
29. LE ROLE DES TRADUCTEURS EN TANT QU'INGENIEURS DE PROMPT A L'ERE DE L'INTELLIGENCE ARTIFICIELLE
30. Exploring large language models for indoor occupancy measurement in smart office buildings
- 31.
32. Adaptive and Generalizable Vision-Language Models
33. Going with the Flow: Approximating Banzhaf Values via Graph Neural Networks
34. Implicaciones éticas del uso de Inteligencia Artificial en educación superior

35. Benchmarking and Validation of Prompting Techniques for AI-Assisted Industrial PLC Programming
36. A Prompting Framework for GPT-Based Twitter/X User Classification in the Context of Disasters
37. The Evolution of Image Captioning Models: Trends, Techniques, and Future Challenges
38. Diseño de prompts educativos en contextos de aprendizaje colaborativo
39. IA generatives: activités de branches pour des interactions de qualité avec l'IA
40. Casos simulados con Inteligencia Artificial: Guía práctica
41. Desafíos y potencial de la IA en la educación: percepciones y barreras desde la perspectiva docente
42. Impulsando la Alfabetización digital en IA. El caso de la Biblioteca de la Universidad de León
43. Generative artificial intelligence 6: simulation
44. Developing prompt engineering skills in the pre-service training of foreign language educator
45. Propuesta de guía didáctica para la capacitación docente en el uso de IA
46. La IA como estrategia innovadora en la enseñanza de educación superior
47. Évaluer à l'ère de l'IA: le paradoxe du double ancrage: Entre fractures numériques et retour aux fondamentaux pédagogiques
48. Comment on Online and Chatgpt-generated patient education materials regarding brain tumor prognosis fail to meet readability standards
49. Perfil de Alfabetización en IA de la Facultad de Educación: Muestra de la Universidad de Dicle
50. Entrenamiento en modelos de IA generativa para crear recomendaciones de actividades tecnológicas escolares, basados en las orientaciones curriculares de ...
51. Previsió de l'impacte d'articles científics basada abstracts mitjançant models de llenguatge de gran escala
52. The DKAP Project The Country Report of Vietnam

53. Exploring High School EFL Teachers' Experiences with Magic School AI in Lesson Planning: Benefits and Insights
54. Teacher professional development for a future with generative artificial intelligence - an integrative literature review
55. Pre-trained ChatGPT for report generation in automated microbial identification and antibiotic susceptibility testing systems
56. El aula expandida con inteligencia artificial
57. Inteligencia artificial en el desarrollo de habilidades para la escritura de ensayos académicos en educación básica secundaria
58. THE IMPACT OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC FEATURES ON AI-GENERATED TEXTS
59. Les langues comptent. Orientations mondiales pour une éducation multilingue.
60. Uso pedagógico de la inteligencia artificial en docentes de EBR del distrito de Cajamarca, 2024
61. Navigating the role of artificial intelligence in special education: advantages, disadvantages, and ethical considerations
62. La IA y la publicidad engañosa. Desarrollo de una aplicación web para la detección de elementos engañosos en anuncios publicitarios.
63. On the Evaluation of Large Language Models in Multilingual Vulnerability Repair
64. Cultures inclusives et accompagnement de lèves du secondaire : de fis d un Programme interdisciplinaire de citoyenneté numérique (PIC)