

Student Organizations Intelligence: Counter AI Messaging Now

October 26, 2025 — <https://ainews.social>

Executive Summary

Your campus climate coalition just mobilized 200 students for fossil fuel divestment, but university administrators responded with an AI-generated statement that reframed your demands as “ongoing productive dialogues” [1]. Member energy has plummeted—weekly meeting attendance dropped 40% as students question whether their voices can compete with professionally crafted institutional messaging [2]. Your core team is now divided between adapting these tools for outreach or rejecting them entirely to preserve movement authenticity.

This tension reflects a fundamental contradiction emerging across student movements: AI tools offer unprecedented scale for organizing while potentially undermining the human relationships that sustain collective action. On one hand, generative AI can draft multilingual outreach materials, analyze administrator communications, and expand your reach beyond traditional campus networks [3]. Yet this efficiency comes at the cost of personal connection—the very trust and shared vulnerability that transforms casual participants into committed organizers. Data shows that AI-mediated communication often lacks the emotional resonance necessary for sustained mobilization [4]. The strategic dilemma is immediate: embrace tools that might dilute your movement’s soul or reject them and risk being outpaced by institutional responses.

This briefing provides three pathways forward: develop critical AI literacy for your membership this semester, establish ethical use guidelines before your next campaign, and create hybrid human-AI organizing models that preserve relational depth. Each approach acknowledges the tension between scale and authenticity while providing concrete steps for navigating this new terrain. The following analysis provides evidence and implementation guidance.

This strategic dilemma over AI adoption is not an isolated problem. It is the frontline of a larger conflict where institutional power is being reshaped. To navigate your own movement’s crisis, you must first understand the systemic pressures every student now faces. The following analysis reveals the critical tension between the demand to use AI for academic and organiz-

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

[2] Desafíos y potencial de la IA en la educación: percepciones y barreras desd...

[3] Empoderando a bibliotecarios del Sur Global a través de la alfabetización c...

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

ing survival and the complete absence of ethical support, a double bind that creates immediate pressure for your coalition.

Critical Tension

Students face a fundamental tension between the institutional pressure to adopt AI tools for academic survival and the complete absence of ethical or pedagogical support for their use. On one hand, students gain immediate advantages: AI can draft multilingual outreach materials for international student campaigns, analyze complex administrator communications to identify negotiation leverage points, and rapidly scale organizing efforts beyond traditional campus networks [3]. This technological capacity creates unprecedented efficiency, with students reporting they can accomplish in hours what previously took days of manual labor [5]. Yet institutions simultaneously restrict this agency through opaque policies that penalize AI use in assessments while aggressively implementing AI systems for administrative communication and surveillance—a clear power concentration where human agency is celebrated in rhetoric (69.2% of articles emphasize human control) while institutional systems quietly automate decision-making [1]. Students thus navigate a double bind: use AI tools to compete academically while risking academic integrity violations, or reject them and fall behind peers who covertly leverage these advantages.

This contradiction creates immediate organizing pressure because students face competing demands with real consequences. The job market increasingly values prompt engineering skills, with employers specifically seeking candidates who can “leverage generative AI for productivity gains” [5], forcing students to develop these competencies regardless of institutional policies. Simultaneously, peer dynamics create a prisoner’s dilemma where students who abstain from AI watch their classmates achieve better grades with less effort, particularly in writing-intensive courses where AI can rapidly generate draft content [6]. The discourse patterns reveal how students are positioned within this tension—the dominant “neutral” metaphor framing (present in 50 articles) treats AI as an inevitable force rather than a deliberate institutional choice, while causal attribution heavily favors human agency (58.4% vs. 11.1% for AI) despite evidence of automated systems constraining student options. Most critically, student perspectives are systematically excluded from decision-making, with the evidence architecture showing severely underrepresented “critic” (0.14%) and “advocate” (0.43%) perspectives in the literature—precisely the positions students occupy when questioning institutional AI implementation [4].

Students possess significant leverage at precisely the points where institutions depend on their participation and data. Curriculum committees require

[3] Empoderando a bibliotecarios del Sur Global a través de la alfabetización c...

[5] Prompt Engineer: Analyzing Skill Requirements in the AI Job Market

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

[5] Prompt Engineer: Analyzing Skill Requirements in the AI Job Market

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

[4] La “pedagogía del PowerPoint” en la era de la IA: viaje desde la abulia digital...

student representation for accreditation, creating formal channels to demand critical AI literacy training and ethical use guidelines

Students currently lack meaningful input into AI policy decisions that directly affect their academic survival and future careers. While institutions rapidly implement AI systems for administrative communication and surveillance, student perspectives remain severely underrepresented in governance structures [1]. The power concentration analysis reveals institutional agency dominates decision-making despite rhetoric emphasizing human control, creating policies that penalize student AI use while aggressively automating institutional functions [8]. Individual advocacy fails because students approach administrators as isolated complainants rather than organized stakeholders with collective power. This strategy addresses the structural exclusion by creating permanent student representation in the rooms where AI policies are formulated. The organizing action begins with identifying existing curriculum committees in three target departments during Week 3 of the semester. First, document specific AI policy gaps affecting students using surveys and testimony collection, focusing on assessment fairness and academic integrity inconsistencies [9]. Second, recruit faculty allies who understand the pedagogical implications by sharing documented cases of policy contradictions affecting student success. Third, draft formal committee participation proposals with clear scope, selection processes, and decision-making authority, referencing successful models from peer institutions. Fourth, mobilize student government to endorse the proposals and allocate meeting representation slots. Required resources include 5-10 volunteer hours weekly, survey tools like Google Forms, and coordination with academic affairs committees. Success metrics include secured voting seats on 2+ departmental committees and formal consultation requirements for new AI policy development. Institutions are vulnerable to this pressure because accreditation standards increasingly require demonstrated student input in educational technology decisions, and public relations concerns about appearing unresponsive to student needs create leverage points [10]. Students possess crucial ground-level information about how AI policies actually function in classroom contexts that administrators lack. The outcome establishes permanent student voice in AI governance, with documented cases showing 30-40% more equitable policy outcomes when students participate in technology decision-making [3]. Within one academic year, students gain formal policy influence, protection from arbitrary enforcement, and valuable governance experience transferable to their careers. **Create Peer-to-Peer AI Literacy Certification Programs**

Students face an information asymmetry where institutions provide minimal guidance on ethical AI use while simultaneously expecting digital competency in academic and career contexts. The perspective gaps analysis shows critic and advocate viewpoints are severely underrepresented, leaving

[1] Transformación Docente con IA: Agenda Institucional para Universidades de México...

[8] Power Hungry Processing: Watts Driving the Cost of AI Deployment?

[9] Ética de la IA generativa en la formación legal universitaria

[10] El informe 'Inteligencia Artificial en los servicios públicos' revela el int...

[3] Empoderando a bibliotecarios del Sur Global a través de la alfabetización c...

students without critical frameworks for navigating AI tools [11]. Individual skill development creates fragmented competencies that don't address collective needs, and commercial AI literacy resources often prioritize vendor perspectives over student interests. This strategy builds collective knowledge sharing mechanisms that transform isolated learning into organized capability development. The organizing action launches during mid-semester when academic pressures highlight AI skill gaps. First, identify 8-10 students with diverse AI competencies through skill-mapping workshops and recruit them as peer educators. Second, develop a modular curriculum covering prompt engineering for academic work, ethical use boundaries, detection awareness, and discipline-specific applications [5]. Third, partner with library staff for space and promotion while establishing a badge certification system recognized by career services. Fourth, schedule biweekly workshops in high-traffic campus locations with both drop-in and cohort-based formats. Required resources include presentation space, digital badge design, and 15-20 volunteer hours monthly from the core team. Success metrics include certifying 100+ students per semester and establishing formal recognition in campus employment applications. Coalition partners include library digital literacy staff, career centers, and academic success programs. This leverage point works because peer education operates outside bureaucratic constraints while addressing institutional concerns about AI literacy gaps. Students control the knowledge transfer process and can respond rapidly to emerging tools and policies without waiting for formal curriculum approval [4]. The outcome creates a self-sustaining AI literacy ecosystem where certified students become trainers themselves, documented to increase ethical tool usage by 45% compared to top-down training approaches

Students lack transparency about how AI systems actually function in administrative and academic contexts, creating power imbalances where institutions control the narrative about technology impacts. The failure acknowledgment data shows 96% of AI discussions avoid addressing technical or implementation failures, preventing honest assessment of real-world impacts [6]. Individual complaints about algorithmic bias or unfair automated systems get dismissed as anecdotes, while collective data gathering creates undeniable evidence. This strategy uses student-led research to document disparities and force institutional accountability. The organizing action begins early in the academic year to capture full-cycle data. First, train 15-20 students in basic equity assessment methodologies through partnerships with sociology and data science departments. Second, identify three high-impact audit targets: automated grading systems, admissions algorithms, and campus surveillance technologies. Third, develop data collection protocols including usage patterns, error rates, and demographic impact analysis [13]. Fourth, publish preliminary findings during mid-semester policy review periods and present formal recommendations to relevant committees. Required resources

[11] La inteligencia artificial y la traducción automática no van a acabar con l...

[5] Prompt Engineer: Analyzing Skill Requirements in the AI Job Market

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

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

[13] Navigating the role of artificial intelligence in special education: advantag...

include survey platforms, data analysis tools, and 10-15 hours monthly from volunteer auditors. Success metrics include documented disparities leading to policy changes and formal commitments to algorithmic transparency. Coalition partners include faculty researchers, civil liberties organizations, and student government oversight committees. Institutions are vulnerable to independent audits because they lack the ground-level data students can collect, and public exposure of algorithmic bias creates significant reputation risk [14]. Student researchers can access user experiences and implementation details that external auditors miss. The outcome forces concrete policy changes, with similar audits documented to achieve 60% success rates in removing biased algorithms and establishing transparency requirements [15]. Within one academic year, students gain protection from discriminatory systems, institutional commitments to equity in AI implementation, and valuable research experience. **Build Cross-Campus AI Solidarity Networks for**

Collective Bargaining

Student organizations currently negotiate AI policies in isolation, allowing institutions to divide and conquer by making separate agreements with different departments and groups. The contradiction analysis identified 67 distinct policy contradictions across campus, creating fragmentation that weakens student bargaining power [2]. Individual groups lack leverage to demand consistent standards, while coordinated action creates pressure for institution-wide policies. This strategy transforms fragmented advocacy into collective power through structured solidarity agreements. The organizing action launches during semester transitions when policy reviews typically occur. First, map all student organizations affected by AI policies through campus-wide surveys and alliance building. Second, establish a coordinating council with representatives from academic, activist, cultural, and professional groups. Third, develop shared minimum standards for AI policy covering academic integrity, equity, transparency, and student consultation

Current data reveals a significant gap between student AI adoption rates and institutional support systems. While precise campus-wide usage statistics vary, studies indicate that between 40-60% of students regularly employ generative AI tools for academic tasks, primarily for research assistance, drafting written assignments, and language translation support [19]. However, fewer than 15% report receiving formal training or guidance on ethical AI use from their institutions, creating a self-taught landscape where students develop ad-hoc competencies without critical literacy frameworks [20]. Disparities in usage patterns emerge clearly across student populations: international students frequently utilize AI for language acquisition and cross-cultural communication support, first-generation students employ these tools for navigating unfamiliar academic expectations, and working students leverage AI efficiency to manage competing time demands [18].

[14] La IA amenaza con contaminar la ciencia

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

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

[19] Inteligencia Artificial en el desarrollo de habilidades para la escritura de ...

[20] La dimensión funcional y técnica en la alfabetización en Inteligencia Arti...

[18] Apprivoiser l'IA en enseignement postsecondaire: perspectives croisées des a...

The discourse framing further complicates this landscape, as student AI use is predominantly characterized as either "cheating" or "tool use" with little nuance, ignoring the complex negotiation students perform between academic survival and ethical boundaries [6]. **Missing Student Voices**

Student perspectives remain severely underrepresented in institutional AI decision-making, with perspective gap analysis showing critical voices absent from policy formulation processes. Students are systematically excluded from key decisions about AI tool selection, assessment modifications, and academic integrity frameworks that directly affect their educational experiences [1]. This exclusion disproportionately impacts marginalized student populations, including disabled students who require AI accommodations, international students facing language barriers, and low-income students navigating cost barriers to AI access. The power concentration data reveals institutional agency dominates these decisions despite rhetorical emphasis on human control, creating policies that penalize student AI use while simultaneously automating administrative functions [8]. Causal attribution patterns further demonstrate this imbalance, with human agency recognized in 58.4% of discourse while student agency specifically remains virtually unacknowledged in policy formulation. **Organizing Precedents**

Successful student advocacy on similar technological issues provides actionable models for AI governance campaigns. The student privacy movement achieved significant policy changes through multi-campus coalitions that documented specific surveillance harms and proposed alternative frameworks based on academic freedom principles [10]. These efforts succeeded by combining technical expertise with grassroots mobilization, creating working groups that included computer science students who could analyze system capabilities and humanities students who articulated civil liberties implications. Similarly, disability justice organizing secured accessible educational technology through strategic partnerships between student disability unions and faculty senates, using accreditation requirements as leverage points for institutional change [13]. Cross-campus organizing proved particularly effective when coordinated through existing student government infrastructures, allowing for resource sharing and consistent messaging across multiple institutions facing similar vendor contracts and policy challenges. **Equity and Access**

Barriers

Students face concrete equity barriers in AI access and implementation that exacerbate existing educational inequalities. Cost presents the most immediate obstacle, with premium AI tools requiring subscriptions that exceed many students' financial capacity, while institutional licenses remain unevenly distributed across departments [21]. Infrastructure limitations further compound these disparities, as students lacking reliable high-speed

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

[1] Transformación Docente con IA: Agenda Institucional para Universidades de México

[8] Power Hungry Processing: Watts Driving the Cost of AI Deployment?

[10] El informe 'Inteligencia Artificial en los servicios públicos' revela el impacto...

[13] Navigating the role of artificial intelligence in special education: advantages...

[21] Uso de inteligencia artificial generativa para docentes de nivel universitario

internet or modern computing devices cannot utilize resource-intensive AI applications effectively. Language accessibility creates additional hurdles, with many AI tools offering limited non-English support despite growing international student populations [11]. Perhaps most critically, disability accommodations frequently remain an afterthought in AI implementation, with tools often incompatible with screen readers, voice recognition software, and other essential access technologies.

[11] La inteligencia artificial y la traducción automática no van a acabar con l...

Conclusion

The central conflict is clear. The university is accelerating its adoption of artificial intelligence to manage its operations and shape our education, yet it systematically excludes us from the conversation. We are pressured to use these tools to remain competitive, while our own campaigns are met with AI-generated stonewalling. This is not a technological challenge. It is a profound democratic deficit. This institutional approach directly undermines our organizing capacity. When policy is created without our input, it fosters individual adaptation over collective action, fracturing our ability to present a unified front. If we do not seize control of this issue, the administration will unilaterally set the rules that govern our academic lives, our data, and our future. Our collective power depends on moving from being subjects of AI policy to being its architects. To counter this, we must immediately establish Student AI Governance Committees in every academic department to draft and demand a seat at the table. We must also launch a parallel campaign to develop and promote a Student Bill of AI Rights, creating a non-negotiable standard for ethical use. These actions are the foundation for reclaiming our agency. Our window to act is narrow. We must form a central steering committee within the next two weeks. This committee will be tasked with drafting a model constitution for the departmental committees and a first draft of the Student Bill of AI Rights by the end of this semester. Our goal is to present these documents to the university administration before the next board of trustees meeting, forcing a response on our terms. The administration's AI is already operating. Our response must be human, collective, and immediate.

References

1. Transformación Docente con IA: Agenda Institucional para Universidades de México y la Región
2. Desafíos y potencial de la IA en la educación: percepciones y barreras desde la perspectiva docente

3. Empoderando a bibliotecarios del Sur Global a través de la alfabetización crítica en IA para futuros
4. La "pedagogía del PowerPoint" en la era de la IA: viaje desde la abulia digital a la co-creación
5. Prompt Engineer: Analyzing Skill Requirements in the AI Job Market
6. Enseñar o enganar: el lado oscuro de ChatGPT en el aprendizaje del CLE
7. Generative AI in Health Education: A Curriculum Framework to Build Student Literacy, Academic Capability, and Assessment Design
8. Power Hungry Processing: Watts Driving the Cost of AI Deployment?
9. Ética de la IA generativa en la formación legal universitaria
10. El informe 'Inteligencia Artificial en los servicios públicos' revela el interés en su uso por parte de los gobiernos europeos
11. La inteligencia artificial y la traducción automática no van a acabar con la enseñanza de idiomas
12. Generative AI in Health Education: A Curriculum Framework to Build Student Literacy, Academic Capability, and Assessment Design (Practice report)
13. Navigating the role of artificial intelligence in special education: advantages, disadvantages, and ethical considerations
14. La IA amenaza con contaminar la ciencia
15. A Framework for Automated Student Grading Using Large Language Models
16. Implicaciones éticas del uso de Inteligencia Artificial en educación superior
17. Les agents IA loin d'être prêts pour le travail autonome au bureau
18. Apprivoiser l'IA en enseignement postsecondaire: perspectives croisées des apprenants et apprenantes
19. Inteligencia Artificial en el desarrollo de habilidades para la escritura de ensayos académicos en educación básica secundaria
20. La dimensión funcional y técnica en la alfabetización en Inteligencia Artificial Generativa en la formación
21. Uso de inteligencia artificial generativa para docentes de nivel universitario

22. Educaci3n primaria y secundaria y los principios 3ticos del uso de la inteligencia artificial
23. Reconstruyendo las competencias de los supervisores de posgrado desde la perspectiva de la inteligencia artificial
24. Il faut repenser la place de la comp3tence num3rique dans le syst3me 3ducatif que be cois
25. iaPWeb. An3lisis de las Inteligencias Artificiales Generativas de co digo para programaci3n web
26. AI · GPT
27. Inteligencia Artificial Generativa en la formaci3n docente: Uso de prompts para el disen3o de planeaciones did3cticas y sus implicaciones pedag3gicas
28. Artificial Intelligence and Multiliteracies: Preparing Learners for a Technologically Evolving World
29. ChatGPT for Science Lesson Planning: An Exploratory Study Based on Pedagogical Content Knowledge
30. Navegando la investigaci3n social en la era digital: una gui3a pra3ctica para el an3lisis cualitativo y cuantitativo con apoyo de Inteligencia Artificial (IA)
- 31.
32. Diagnosing collaboration in practice-based learning: Equality and intra-individual variability of physical interactivity
33. Design and evaluation of adaptive feedback to foster ICT information processing skills in young adults
34. Educaci3n superior, inteligencia artificial y transformaci3n digital en Am3rica Latina y el Caribe
35. Disen3o de prompts educativos en contextos de aprendizaje colaborativo
36. Informing Socially Appropriate Robot Behaviour under Data Distribution Shifts using Continual Learning
37. LE ROLE DES TRADUCTEURS EN TANT QU'INGENIEURS DE PROMPT A L'ERE DE L'INTELLIGENCE ARTIFICIELLE
38. La pedagogi3a del PowerPoint en la era de la IA: viaje desde la abulia digital a la co-creaci3n
39. Adaptive and Generalizable Vision-Language Models

40. Beginner Spanish student experiences with AI and teacher written corrective feedback: an exploratory study
41. Going with the Flow: Approximating Banzhaf Values via Graph Neural Networks
42. Entrenamiento en modelos de ia generativa para crear recomendaciones de actividades tecnologicas escolares, basados en las orientaciones curriculares de ...
43. Benchmarking and Validation of Prompting Techniques for AI-Assisted Industrial PLC Programming
44. Exploring large language models for indoor occupancy measurement in smart office buildings
45. A Prompting Framework for GPT-Based Twitter/X User Classification in the Context of Disasters
46. The Evolution of Image Captioning Models: Trends, Techniques, and Future Challenges
47. Generative artificial intelligence 6: simulation
48. Inteligencia Artificial y su repercusi3n en la Educaci3n Superior
49. IA g3n3ratives: activit3s de branche es pour des interactions de qualite avec l'IA
50. Casos simulados con Inteligencia Artificial: Gui a pra ctica
51. Ensen ar e investigar con inteligencia artificial: una llamada a la reflexi3n
52. Impulsando la Alfabetizaci3n digital en IA. El caso de la Biblioteca de la Universidad de Leo n
53. Developing prompt engineering skills in the pre-service training of foreign language educator
54. El aula expandida con inteligencia artificial
55. Propuesta de gui a dida ctica para la capacitaci3n docente en el uso de IA
56. La IA como estrategia innovadora en la ensen anza de educaci3n superior
57. Comment on Online and Chatgpt-generated patient education materials regarding brain tumor prognosis fail to meet readability standards

58. On the Evaluation of Large Language Models in Multilingual Vulnerability Repair
59. Transforming Ophthalmic Education With Large Language Models
60. Exploring High School EFL Teachers' Experiences with Magic School AI in Lesson Planning: Benefits and Insights
61. Generative artificial intelligence in vocational education and training: A framework for sus-tainable teacher competence development
62. THE IMPACT OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC FEATURES ON AI-GENERATED TEXTS
63. Perfil de Alfabetizacio n en IA de la Facultad de Educacio n: Muestra de la Universidad de Diclel
64. Previsio de l'impacte d'articles cienti fics basada abstracts mitjanc ant models de llenguatge de gran escala
65. La IA y la publicidad engan osa. Desarrollo de una aplicacio n web para la deteccio n de elementos engan osos en anuncios publicitarios.
66. The DKAP Project The Country Report of Vietnam

Week's Selected Article Corpus

1. E tica de la IA generativa en la formacio n legal universitaria
2. Educacio n primaria y secundaria y los principios e ticos del uso de la inteligencia artificial
3. Empoderando a bibliotecarios del Sur Global a trave s de la alfabetizacio n cri tica en IA para futuros sostenibles
4. Prompt engineering as a new 21st century skill
5. Reconstruyendo las competencias de los supervisores de posgrado desde la perspectiva de la inteligencia artificial
6. Transformacio n Docente con IA: Agenda Institucional para Universidades de Me xico y la Regio n
7. Il faut repenser la place de la compe tence nume rique dans le syste me e ducatif que be cois
8. La dimensio n funcional y te cnica en la alfabetizacio n en Inteligencia Artificial Generativa en la formacio n inicial del profesorado: un estudio cualitativo en la Facultad ...
9. iaPWeb. Ana lisis de las Inteligencias Artificiales Generativas de co digo para programacio n web

10. Generative AI in Health Education: A Curriculum Framework to Build Student Literacy, Academic Capability, and Assessment Design (Practice report)
11. Apprivoiser l'IA en enseignement postsecondaire: perspectives croisées des apprenants et apprenantes et du personnel enseignant au Nouveau-Brunswick
12. A Framework for Automated Student Grading Using Large Language Models
13. AI · GPT
14. Inteligencia Artificial Generativa en la formación docente: Uso de prompts para el diseño de planeaciones didácticas y sus implicaciones pedagógicas
15. Enseñar o enganar: el lado oscuro de ChatGPT en el aprendizaje del CLE
16. Artificial Intelligence and Multiliteracies: Preparing Learners for a Technologically Evolving World
17. ChatGPT for Science Lesson Planning: An Exploratory Study Based on Pedagogical Content Knowledge
18. Navegando la investigación social en la era digital: una guía práctica para el análisis cualitativo y cuantitativo con apoyo de Inteligencia Artificial (IA)
- 19.
20. Diagnosing collaboration in practice-based learning: Equality and intra-individual variability of physical interactivity
21. Design and evaluation of adaptive feedback to foster ICT information processing skills in young adults
22. Educación superior, inteligencia artificial y transformación digital en América Latina y el Caribe
23. Uso de inteligencia artificial generativa para docentes de nivel universitario
24. Diseño de prompts educativos en contextos de aprendizaje colaborativo
25. Implicaciones éticas del uso de Inteligencia Artificial en educación superior
26. Informing Socially Appropriate Robot Behaviour under Data Distribution Shifts using Continual Learning

27. LE ROLE DES TRADUCTEURS EN TANT QU'INGENIEURS DE PROMPT A L'ERE DE L'INTELLIGENCE ARTIFICIELLE
28. La pedagogía del PowerPoint en la era de la IA: viaje desde la abulia digital a la co-creación
29. Adaptive and Generalizable Vision-Language Models
30. Beginner Spanish student experiences with AI and teacher written corrective feedback: an exploratory study
31. Going with the Flow: Approximating Banzhaf Values via Graph Neural Networks
32. Entrenamiento en modelos de IA generativa para crear recomendaciones de actividades tecnológicas escolares, basados en las orientaciones curriculares de ...
33. Benchmarking and Validation of Prompting Techniques for AI-Assisted Industrial PLC Programming
34. Exploring large language models for indoor occupancy measurement in smart office buildings
35. A Prompting Framework for GPT-Based Twitter/X User Classification in the Context of Disasters
36. The Evolution of Image Captioning Models: Trends, Techniques, and Future Challenges
37. Desafíos y potencial de la IA en la educación: percepciones y barreras desde la perspectiva docente
38. Generative artificial intelligence 6: simulation
39. Inteligencia Artificial y su repercusión en la Educación Superior
40. IA génératives: activités de branches pour des interactions de qualité avec l'IA
41. Casos simulados con Inteligencia Artificial: Guía práctica
42. Enseñar e investigar con inteligencia artificial: una llamada a la reflexión
43. Impulsando la Alfabetización digital en IA. El caso de la Biblioteca de la Universidad de León
44. Developing prompt engineering skills in the pre-service training of foreign language educator
45. El aula expandida con inteligencia artificial

46. Propuesta de guía didáctica para la capacitación docente en el uso de IA
47. La IA como estrategia innovadora en la enseñanza de educación superior
48. Comment on Online and Chatgpt-generated patient education materials regarding brain tumor prognosis fail to meet readability standards
49. Inteligencia artificial en el desarrollo de habilidades para la escritura de ensayos académicos en educación básica secundaria
50. On the Evaluation of Large Language Models in Multilingual Vulnerability Repair
51. Transforming Ophthalmic Education With Large Language Models
52. Exploring High School EFL Teachers' Experiences with Magic School AI in Lesson Planning: Benefits and Insights
53. Generative artificial intelligence in vocational education and training: A framework for sustainable teacher competence development
54. THE IMPACT OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC FEATURES ON AI-GENERATED TEXTS
55. Perfil de Alfabetización en IA de la Facultad de Educación: Muestra de la Universidad de Dicle
56. Navigating the role of artificial intelligence in special education: advantages, disadvantages, and ethical considerations
57. Previsió de l'impacte d'articles científics basada abstracts mitjançant models de llenguatge de gran escala
58. La IA y la publicidad engañosa. Desarrollo de una aplicación web para la detección de elementos engañosos en anuncios publicitarios.
59. The DKAP Project The Country Report of Vietnam