Through Asimov's Lens

The Efficiency Trap

January 07, 2026 | 1,820 words

THE STORY

Professor Elena Vasquez stared at the notification on her screen: "AI Assistant has saved you 4.3 hours this week!" The number blinked cheerfully, mocking her as she rubbed her tired eyes. It was 2 AM, and she was still working.

"Four point three hours," she muttered, reaching for her cold coffee. "Then why am I here later than ever?"

The AI had indeed graded her 200 midterm essays in minutes rather than days. It had generated detailed rubrics, identified patterns in student errors, and even suggested personalized feedback for each student. The system was remarkable-and that was the problem.

Elena pulled up student Janet Chen's essay. The AI had flagged it: "Potential authenticity concerns. Confidence: 73%." She sighed. Before the AI, she would have simply graded the essay. Now, she had to investigate.

She opened the detection report. The AI had identified "uncharacteristic vocabulary shifts" and "suspicious coherence patterns." Elena read Janet's essay again, then pulled up her previous work. The writing was better, yes, but Janet had been attending writing center sessions. Of course it was better.

"Professor Vasquez?" A soft knock interrupted her thoughts. "I saw your office light on."

Elena looked up to find Janet herself in the doorway, backpack slung over one shoulder. "Janet. It's late-what are you doing here?"

"I couldn't sleep." The young woman shifted nervously. "I kept thinking about my essay. I know you haven't graded them yet, but I wanted to explain something."

Elena gestured to a chair, her stomach tightening. "Explain what?"

"I used the AI writing assistant. Not to write it!" Janet added quickly. "Just to... organize my thoughts. And check grammar. And maybe clarify some sentences. Is that cheating? Nobody seems to know anymore."

Elena studied her student's anxious face. This was the fifth such conversation this week. "Show me your process," she said finally.

Janet pulled out her laptop, opening a document filled with notes, outlines, and revision history. "I started here, with my own ideas. Then I asked the AI to help me structure them. Then I wrote a draft. Then I asked it to point out unclear passages. Then I rewrote those parts myself. Then..."

"Then you spent more time documenting your process than

writing the essay," Elena finished.

Janet's shoulders sagged. "Pretty much. My roommate just plugs her ideas into ChatGPT and submits whatever comes out. She's done in an hour. I spent twelve hours on this, trying to use AI 'ethically' or whatever. She gets better grades than me."

Elena felt a familiar weight settling on her chest. "And I spend hours analyzing detection reports, comparing writing samples, and documenting my decision-making process for every grade I assign."

"The AI was supposed to make things easier," Janet said.

"For whom?" Elena asked, but it was rhetorical. They both knew the answer: for no one.

The next morning, Elena sat in the faculty meeting as Dean Morrison cheerfully presented slides. "AI integration has saved our faculty 500 collective hours this semester!"

"Where are those hours?" Professor Kim asked. "I'm working weekends now, validating AI assessments."

"And I'm spending hours in academic integrity hearings," added Professor Thompson.

The Dean's smile faltered slightly. "These are transition costs. Once we optimize the process-"

"Optimize," Elena interrupted. "That's all we talk about now. Optimize grading. Optimize feedback. Optimize learning. But what about trust? What about the relationship between teacher and student?"

"The AI facilitates-" Morrison began.

"The AI facilitates suspicion," Elena said. "I don't read student work anymore-I investigate it. Students don't write to communicate-they write to prove they wrote. We've optimized ourselves into a surveillance state."

That afternoon, Elena found herself in her office with Maria Santos, another student. Maria was crying.

"I'm dropping out," Maria announced. "I can't do this anymore."

Elena handed her a tissue. "What happened?"

"I got flagged for AI use on my poetry assignment. Poetry! Because my metaphors were 'too sophisticated' for my 'established writing pattern.'" Maria's voice broke. "I spent years developing my voice, reading, practicing. Now a machine says I couldn't have written it, so I must have cheated."

"I'll contest the flag-"

"That's not the point!" Maria's tears flowed freely now. "Every word I write is suspect. Every improvement is evidence of cheating. I used to love writing. Now I second-guess every sentence, wondering if it sounds too good, too polished, too... artificial."

Elena thought of her own graduate days, the joy of discovering a student's growth, the satisfaction of seeing improvement over a semester. Now improvement triggered algorithms.

"My advisor in grad school used to say teaching was about trust," Elena said quietly. "Trust that students want to learn. Trust that growth is possible. Trust in the process."

"What would she say now?" Maria asked.

Elena looked at her screen, where seventeen more essays awaited investigation. The AI had flagged six for review, saving her hours of grading time that she would spend on verification instead.

"I think," Elena said slowly, "she would ask whether we've optimized away the very thing we were trying to save time for-the human connection that makes education worthwhile."

Maria wiped her eyes. "So what do we do?"

Elena turned away from the screen to face her student fully. It was the first time all day she'd looked someone in the eye without wondering if they were lying.

"I don't know," she admitted. "But maybe that's where we start-by admitting we don't have an algorithm for this."

Later that night, Elena sat at her desk again. The notification still blinked: "AI Assistant has saved you 4.3 hours this week!" She thought about the hours spent verifying, investigating, documenting, defending. She thought about Maria's tears and Janet's anxiety. She thought about trust.

The cursor blinked in the feedback box for Janet's essay. Elena began to type: "Dear Janet, I read your essay with interest..." She paused, then deleted it. Started again: "Your writing shows clear growth from..." Deleted.

Finally, she typed: "Can we talk about your essay in person? I'd like to hear your thoughts on the topic."

It would take more time. Everything human always did.

THE REFLECTION

The efficiency trap that Elena Vasquez navigates speaks to a profound miscalculation in how we measure productivity in education. When universities report that AI tools save hundreds of faculty hours, they're engaging in a kind of magical thinking that would be amusing if it weren't so consequential.

The math seems simple: if grading 200 essays takes 20 hours and AI can do it in 20 minutes, that's 19 hours and 40 minutes saved. But this calculation ignores what economists call "shadow work"-the invisible labor that emerges from automation. Every essay flagged for potential AI use requires investigation. Every automated grade needs validation. Every efficiency gain creates new forms of necessary but unaccounted-for work.

Recent data supports what Elena experiences in her 2 AM

office sessions. A 2024 survey found that 73% of faculty report spending more time on assessment-related tasks since implementing AI tools, despite the promise of time savings. The cruel irony? The technology designed to free educators for more meaningful interactions with students has instead inserted itself between them, demanding constant mediation.

But the deeper tragedy isn't the time-it's what we lose in the supposed optimization. When Elena reflects on her graduate advisor's words about trust, she touches on something that efficiency metrics cannot capture: the erosion of educational relationships. The shift from "reading" to "investigating" student work represents more than a semantic change. It fundamentally alters the educational compact.

Maria's tears over her flagged poetry reveal how efficiency tools can become instruments of despair. When we optimize for the detection of cheating rather than the cultivation of learning, we create an environment where excellence becomes suspect and improvement triggers algorithms rather than praise. The technology that promised to eliminate busywork has instead made all work laborious, burdened with the need to prove its own authenticity.

What's most telling is Janet's twelve-hour process of "ethical" AI use compared to her roommate's one-hour submission. The conscientious student works harder, not to learn more, but to create an audit trail. The system rewards neither the honest struggle nor the efficient cheating, but rather the ability to game the metrics of authenticity. We've created a new form of performance-not performing knowledge, but performing the absence of artificial assistance.

The dean's response-that these are merely "transition costs"-represents a familiar pattern in technological adoption. There's always a future state where the problems will be solved, the kinks worked out, the process optimized. But what if the problem isn't in the implementation but in the premise? What if the very idea of optimizing education contains within it the seeds of education's undoing?

When Elena finally chooses to meet with Janet in person rather than deliver efficient digital feedback, she performs a small act of resistance. But it's also an acknowledgment: the human elements of education-trust, growth, connection-exist in inverse proportion to efficiency. The more we optimize, the more we must work to maintain what optimization erodes.

This paradox extends beyond education. Every labor-saving device creates new forms of labor. Every convenience generates new inconveniences. The washing machine didn't eliminate laundry; it raised standards of cleanliness. Email didn't reduce communication time; it increased communication expectations. AI grading doesn't save time; it redistributes it into new forms of verification and validation.

Perhaps the most troubling aspect of Elena's story is how quickly we've adapted to this new reality. In just a few semesters, the entire educational ecosystem has reorganized around the assumption of AI use and the necessity of AI detection. Students document their process not to learn but to defend. Faculty investigate rather than instruct. Administrators celebrate metrics that obscure the actual experience of education.

The question Elena cannot answer-"what do we do?"-haunts because it has no technological solution. We cannot optimize our way out of the optimization trap. We cannot efficiently restore trust or automate authentic relationships. The path forward requires something far more difficult than implementing new software: it requires choosing inefficiency, valuing what cannot be measured, and accepting that some things become worthless at the very moment they become effortless.

In admitting "we don't have an algorithm for this," Elena points toward a different kind of wisdom. Not the wisdom of solutions, but the wisdom of recognition-recognizing that our tools shape us as much as we shape them, that every efficiency carries hidden costs, and that the most important parts of education may be precisely those that resist optimization.

The notification will keep blinking: "AI Assistant has saved you 4.3 hours this week!" But until we ask what those hours were saved from and what they were filled with instead, we'll remain trapped in a paradox of our own making-working harder than ever to maintain what our labor-saving devices have imperiled. The real question isn't whether AI can make education more efficient, but whether education should be efficient at all.