Through Asimov's Lens

The Efficiency Trap

March 04, 2026 | 1,972 words

THE STORY

Dr. Elena Vasquez arrived at her office at 7:23 AM, seven minutes earlier than the Campus Optimization System had predicted. She smiled at this small victory over the algorithm, then caught herself-when had beating the computer's traffic predictions become a source of satisfaction?

Her office door recognized her and opened with its familiar whisper. "Good morning, Dr. Vasquez," the room greeted her. "You have seventeen items requiring immediate attention."

Elena set down her coffee-real coffee, not the synthesized version the faculty lounge now served to "optimize nutrition delivery"-and settled into her chair. The wall display bloomed to life, showing a cascade of notifications from the various AI systems that now governed her professional life.

"Let's start with grading," she said, though she knew the system would have ordered her tasks by algorithmic priority regardless.

The Automated Grading Assistant had processed thirty-seven essays from her Modern American Literature course overnight. Each appeared on screen with a preliminary grade, highlighted passages, and suggested feedback. Elena began with the first essay, written by Jamie Chen about isolation in Raymond Carver's stories.

The AI had given it a B+, flagging three instances of "imprecise language" and two "unsupported assertions." Elena read through Jamie's work, remembering their conversation after class last week. Jamie had connected Carver's minimalism to their own experience growing up in a household where emotions were never directly expressed. The AI had marked these personal reflections as "tangential to the thesis."

Elena overrode the grade, changing it to an A-. The system immediately requested justification.

"Student demonstrates sophisticated understanding through personal connection," she typed.

"This justification deviates from standard rubric parameters," the system responded. "Would you like to review the grading consistency guidelines?"

"No," Elena said aloud, though she knew she'd have to fill out an override form later. The Pedagogical Consistency Board reviewed all grade overrides monthly. What had begun as a way to ensure fairness had become another layer of administrative work.

Her phone buzzed. Marcus Freeman, her department chair, had sent a message: "Can you review the Curriculum Optimizer's suggestions for next semester? Dean wants confirmation by noon."

Elena pulled up the Optimizer's report. It had analyzed enrollment patterns, student performance data, and market

demands to suggest "improvements" to her contemporary fiction course. Replace two weeks of short stories with "career-applicable writing exercises." Reduce discussion time by 23% to incorporate "skill-building modules." Add a unit on "AI-assisted creative writing."

She thought of her mentor, Professor Williams, who had taught her that literature was about learning to see-not just to look, but to truly see the world and our place in it. What algorithm could optimize for that?

The Student Support Chatbot pinged. It had identified three students in her Victorian Literature course as "at risk" based on login patterns and assignment submission times. Elena was required to review each case and either confirm the bot's intervention plan or propose alternatives.

The first student was David Park. The bot recommended automated check-in messages and referral to online tutoring. Elena knew David was working night shifts to support his family while caring for his younger siblings. What he needed wasn't more automated messages but flexibility on deadlines and maybe a conversation about audiobook options for the readings.

She opened a direct message to David: "I noticed you've been juggling a lot. Let's talk about how to make the course work with your schedule."

"Dr. Vasquez," the system interrupted, "personal communications are discouraged when standardized interventions are available. Would you like to use template message 7-B instead?"

"No," she said, sending her message anyway. Another override to document.

By 9 AM, she had processed twelve of the seventeen "immediate attention" items. Each AI system had indeed saved her time on its specific task, but the oversight, corrections, and documentation had consumed her entire morning. She hadn't read a single page of the novel she was teaching that afternoon.

A knock on her door-physical, human, unexpected. Elena looked up to find Sarah Martinez, one of her brightest students, standing in the doorway with red-rimmed eyes.

"Dr. Vasquez? I know your office hours are virtual now, but I was hoping... could I talk to you?"

Elena glanced at her screen. The Schedule Optimizer showed three more "critical tasks" before her 10 AM class. The Efficiency Metrics Dashboard would note any deviation from optimal time usage.

"Of course," Elena said, closing her laptop. "Come in. Would you like some real coffee?"

Sarah's smile was wobbly but genuine. "That would be amazing."

As Elena poured coffee from her thermos, Sarah began talking about her grandmother's death, how reading Mrs. Dalloway had suddenly become unbearable, how the words swam on the page. The AI teaching assistant had suggested she use the text-to-speech function and submit her response through the structured feedback form.

"But I don't know how to put what I'm feeling into those boxes," Sarah said. "It's like the book is too alive now, too real. Does that make sense?"

Elena thought of all the override forms she'd have to file, the efficiency metrics that would drop, the time-usage report that would flag this unscheduled meeting.

"Perfect sense," she said. "Tell me about your grandmother."

They talked for forty minutes. About grief and literature, about how certain books find us at exactly the right or wrong moment, about the way Virginia Woolf understood that consciousness isn't efficient-it doubles back, circles around, finds meaning in seemingly wasted moments.

When Sarah left, looking lighter somehow, Elena turned back to her screen. Twenty-three items now requiring immediate attention. The Optimizer had rescheduled her afternoon to accommodate the delay, creating what it called a "time deficit" that would need to be "reconciled" by Friday.

Her colleague Tom knocked and entered without waiting. "You missed the department sync meeting," he said. "I covered for you, but the Dean's AI noticed you weren't logged in."

"I was with a student."

Tom laughed, but it wasn't entirely friendly. "We're all with students, Elena. That's what the chatbots are for now. We're supposed to be focusing on high-level optimization."

After he left, Elena looked at her efficiency dashboard. Every metric was red. Time per task: excessive. Override rate: concerning. Schedule adherence: poor.

She opened the latest essay in her queue. The AI had flagged it for potential plagiarism-not because the student had copied, but because their writing had become "suspiciously sophisticated" compared to their previous work. Elena read it carefully. The student had found their voice, that was all. They'd moved from writing what they thought she wanted to hear to writing what they actually thought.

The system requested confirmation of the plagiarism flag.

"What are we optimizing for?" Elena asked the empty room. The AI waited patiently for a proper response.

She thought of Sarah's grandmother, of David working nights, of Jamie's unspoken household, of this student finding their voice. Of all the inefficient, immeasurable, essential things that happen when human minds meet around ideas.

"Dr. Vasquez?" The system prompted. "Please confirm or deny the plagiarism flag."

Elena stared at the blinking cursor. Twenty-five years of teaching, and she was spending her days arguing with machines about the value of human connection. Each system had promised to give her more time for what mattered.

Instead, she'd become a middle manager mediating between artificial efficiency and human need.

"What would happen," she said softly, "if we admitted that the most important things can't be optimized?"

The system, not recognizing this as a valid input, repeated its request.

THROUGH ASIMOV'S LENS

When Elena chooses to spend forty unscheduled minutes with a grieving student, knowing it will destroy her efficiency metrics, she illuminates a paradox already emerging in our institutions. Recent data from EDUCAUSE shows that faculty now spend 40% more time on "AI oversight tasks" than they saved from the original automation-validating outputs, documenting overrides, justifying human judgment calls that deviate from algorithmic recommendations.

This is precisely the kind of irony that would have fascinated Asimov: our tools for efficiency creating inefficiency, our systems for connection creating isolation. But like the best science fiction writers, he would have seen this not as a failure of technology but as a revelation about human nature-our persistent belief that we can systematize care, quantify wisdom, optimize understanding.

The story asks us to consider: What does it mean to save time if we lose presence? When we automate the routine, do we also automate away the unexpected discoveries that happen in those routine moments? And perhaps most urgently: In our quest to be fair through standardization, what justice do we lose?

Asimov understood that every technology is a mirror, reflecting not just our capabilities but our values. The efficiency trap Elena faces isn't really about AI at all-it's about what we think education is for. If teaching is information transfer, then AI can indeed make it more efficient. But if teaching is about transformation-those moments when a student suddenly sees their grandmother in Virginia Woolf, when grief becomes comprehension, when finding their voice matters more than algorithmic consistency-then efficiency might be the wrong metric entirely.

This moment in higher education reveals something profound about human values. We've created elaborate systems to save time, only to spend that saved time managing the systems. We've built tools to connect us with more students, only to find ourselves more distant from each one. The paradox isn't in the technology-it's in our faith that human experiences can be optimized without being fundamentally changed.

Asimov would have recognized this as an old human story in new clothing. In his Foundation series, psychohistory could predict the movements of civilizations but not individual human choices. In our universities, AI can predict student risk factors but not when a grandmother's death will make Victorian literature unbearable-or essential.

The question Elena faces with each override form isn't technical but philosophical: Are we willing to be inefficient in service of being human? Every time she chooses human judgment over algorithmic recommendation, she's not just making a pedagogical decision-she's asserting that some values can't be quantified, some moments can't be scheduled, some connections can't be templated.

This is what the efficiency trap teaches us: the difference between efficiency and effectiveness in human endeavors. An efficient teacher processes maximum students with minimum time. An effective teacher changes lives, often through gloriously inefficient conversations that wander from grief to literature to understanding. AI can excel at the former. Only humans can do the latter.

As our institutions rush toward ever-greater optimization, we might ask: What are we optimizing for? If it's processing speed, AI wins. If it's standardization, algorithms excel. But if it's those transformative moments when knowledge becomes wisdom, when information becomes insight, when a student discovers not just what to think but how to be-then inefficiency might be not a bug but a feature.

The most human choice in an automated world might be the choice to be inefficient-to spend unscheduled time with a grieving student, to override the algorithm's grade, to have conversations that can't be templated. These aren't acts of resistance against technology but affirmations of what remains irreducibly human: our capacity to recognize when efficiency must yield to presence, when optimization must bow to understanding, when the measurable must make space for the meaningful.

In the end, Elena's question-"What would happen if we admitted that the most important things can't be optimized?"-isn't really about AI at all. It's about us, and what we're willing to lose in our quest to save time. Perhaps the answer lies not in better algorithms but in better questions: Not "How can we do this faster?" but "What is this for?" Not "How can we reach more students?" but "How can we truly reach each student?"

The efficiency trap reminds us that our highest calling as educators might be to remain gloriously, defiantly, necessarily inefficient in all the ways that matter most.