Rethinking Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: What and How to Teach and Learn

Harris Wang *

Posted Date: 27 May 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

Keywords: artificial intelligence in education; AI literacy; metacognition; ethical judgment; pedagogical transformation; human flourishing; curriculum design; generative AI; cognitive apprenticeship; dual readiness; memorization; foundational knowledge; retrieval practice

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

Article

Rethinking Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: What and How to Teach and Learn

Harris Wang

School of Computing and Information Systems, Athabasca University, Athabasca, Canada;
harrisw@athabascau.ca

Abstract

The rapid advancement of generative AI and large language models challenges long-held assumptions about the purposes, content, methods, and practices of education. This paper integrates historical educational philosophy with contemporary AI capabilities to present a comprehensive framework for rethinking what and how we teach and learn. Drawing on foundational purposes—moral formation, democratic citizenship, critical emancipation, human capital development, and holistic flourishing—we analyse how AI's strengths (pattern recognition, content generation) and limitations (lack of understanding, moral agency, empathy, metacognition) reshape educational priorities. We propose a curriculum of **seven human-irreplaceable competencies**, including algorithmic literacy, ethical judgment, creative abduction, metacognition, emotional intelligence, systems thinking, and **foundational knowledge and memorization**. For learners, we identify **six core skills**: learning to learn, judge, create, relate, work with **and** without AI, and be. Pedagogically, we advocate **eight principles**: cognitive apprenticeship, problem-based learning, critical AI literacy across disciplines, **dual readiness**, dialogic instruction, authentic assessment, teacher vulnerability, and **deliberate memory building**. For students, we outline **eight practices**: prompt-critique-synthesise, attention management, documentation, collaboration, questioning, **deliberate AI-free routines**, productive struggle, and **retrieval practice**. A central argument is that while AI surpasses humans in memorisation and routine information retrieval, human learners must still internalise a durable core of knowledge to enable creativity, social cohesion, character development, and resilience in AI-absent scenarios. The paper concludes that the AI era demands not the abandonment of traditional educational aims but their recalibration toward uniquely human capacities, with teachers and learners becoming co-inquirers in an AI-augmented but human-centred ecosystem.

Keywords: artificial intelligence in education; AI literacy; metacognition; ethical judgment; pedagogical transformation; human flourishing; curriculum design; generative AI; cognitive apprenticeship; dual readiness; memorization; foundational knowledge; retrieval practice

I. Introduction

The advent of advanced artificial intelligence—large language models such as GPT-4, Claude, and Gemini; generative systems like DALL-E and Midjourney; and autonomous decision-making tools—has disrupted nearly every assumption about human knowledge, skill, and value. For education, this disruption is both profound and urgent. Over the past several decades, societies have developed a rich understanding of the purposes of education: moral and civic formation, critical liberation, economic productivity, and holistic human flourishing [1–5]. Yet AI now performs many cognitive tasks—memorisation, information retrieval, pattern recognition, and procedural execution—at superhuman speed and scale. This reality forces educators, policymakers, and learners to ask three interconnected questions: **What** should be taught? **What** should students learn? And **how** should teaching and learning occur?

A common reaction is to conclude that memorisation is now obsolete. This paper argues the opposite: while AI excels at storing and retrieving facts, **human memorisation remains essential** for

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

creativity, social interaction, character development, and resilience when AI is unavailable. The curriculum must therefore balance a lean, durable core of internalised knowledge with higher-order competencies that AI cannot replicate.

This comprehensive study integrates prior inquiries into a single framework. It reaffirms the enduring purposes of education, proposes seven human-irreplaceable curriculum domains, six learner competencies, eight pedagogical principles, and eight student practices. It also introduces the concept of **dual readiness**: preparing students to work fluently with AI **and** competently without it. The central argument is that the AI era does not make education obsolete but elevates its deepest mission: to cultivate wise, creative, compassionate, and resilient human beings who can use AI as a tool while still possessing the internal resources to think, create, and act when that tool is unavailable.

II. Related Works

II. Related Works

The intersection of artificial intelligence and education has generated a rapidly growing body of literature. This section reviews key contributions that inform our framework, organised into three streams: (1) AI capabilities and limitations in educational contexts, (2) pedagogical models for AI-augmented learning, and (3) competency frameworks for the AI era.

AI Capabilities and Limitations. Foundational work by Bender and Koller [11] demonstrated that large language models operate on statistical correlations rather than genuine understanding, a limitation that has profound implications for using AI as a learning tool. Floridi [12] systematically analysed the absence of moral agency, metacognition, and subjective experience in contemporary AI systems, arguing that these deficits define the space of uniquely human cognitive and ethical responsibilities. Marcus and Davis [28] further documented AI's fragility in novel situations, emphasising that current systems lack robust common-sense reasoning. These analyses establish why education must prioritise capacities that AI cannot replicate.

Pedagogical Models for AI-Augmented Learning. Early work by Collins, Brown, and Newman [22] on cognitive apprenticeship provided a theoretical basis for learning as situated, guided participation—an approach that becomes even more relevant when AI handles routine tasks. Mollick and Mollick [26] offered practical methods for integrating AI chatbots into higher education, including AI as a feedback generator, a tutor, and a team member. UNESCO's guidance for policymakers [13] emphasised critical AI literacy as a cross-curricular necessity, warning against both techno-solutionism and outright rejection. Alexander's dialogic teaching framework [25] highlighted the irreplaceable role of human dialogue in developing higher-order thinking, a finding echoed by the OECD's human-flourishing agenda [10].

Competency Frameworks for the AI Era. Several international bodies have proposed updated competency models. The World Bank's *World Development Report 2018* [5] shifted focus from schooling to learning, advocating for adaptive competencies over content memorisation. The Delors Commission's four pillars [9] remain influential, but recent work by Nussbaum [8] on capabilities and by the OECD [10] on human flourishing has reframed outcomes toward well-being, agency, and purpose. In the specific context of AI, UNESCO [13] proposed competencies including AI ethics, data literacy, and human-centred design. However, existing frameworks often treat AI as a separate topic rather than an integral dimension of all teaching and learning, and few have systematically addressed when and why foundational memorisation remains necessary.

Gaps Addressed. While prior research has examined AI ethics education [15], computational thinking [29], and the future of work [30], few studies have systematically re-anchored the entire educational enterprise—from why we educate to how students practice daily—in light of AI's fundamental limitations. Moreover, little attention has been paid to scenarios where AI is unavailable (e.g., conflict zones, remote areas, or systemic failures). This paper fills that gap by showing that the same historical purposes (moral, civic, critical, economic, holistic) can guide a coherent redesign of

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

what and how we teach and learn, provided we recognise both AI as a tool for augmentation and the continued necessity of internalised knowledge.

III. The Purposes of Education – Historical Wisdom for a New Age

Understanding what to teach, learn, and how to do so requires a clear view of why we educate at all. History offers several complementary purposes.

Moral and Virtuous Formation. From Plato and Aristotle in the West to Confucius in the East, the oldest purpose of education is the cultivation of character. Plato argued that education must shape the soul toward justice and the good [1]. As he wrote in *The Republic*, *"The direction in which education starts a man will determine his future life."* Aristotle added that practical wisdom (*phronesis*) is developed through guided experience, not mere instruction [2]. He famously stated, *"Educating the mind without educating the heart is no education at all."* Confucius emphasised lifelong self-cultivation of benevolence (*ren*) and propriety (*li*) [6]. One of his most cited sayings is, *"The superior man is modest in his speech but exceeds in his actions."* Across cultures, education was never merely about skills but about becoming a good person.

Civic and Democratic Education. With the rise of modern democracies, Horace Mann and John Dewey insisted that public schooling exists to prepare citizens for self-governance. Dewey famously declared that democracy is "a way of life" and that education's aim is "continued capacity for growth" [3]. He also proclaimed, *"Democracy has to be born anew every generation, and education is its midwife."* Mann, known as the father of American public education, asserted, *"A republic without a system of popular education is but a shadow of a republic."* Dewey believed that schools must be laboratories of democratic practice, fostering critical thinking, collaboration, and social responsibility.

Critical and Emancipatory Education. In the twentieth century, Paulo Freire exposed how traditional "banking" education domesticates learners, perpetuating oppression. He proposed problem-posing education that cultivates *conscientização*—critical consciousness of social, political, and economic contradictions [4]. His most powerful words are, *"Education either functions as an instrument to bring about conformity or as an instrument of liberation."* Later theorists like Bowles and Gintis showed how schooling reproduces class structures [7]. From this view, education's purpose is liberation: to empower the marginalised to understand and transform their world. As Freire also wrote, *"The oppressed, instead of striving for liberation, tend themselves to become oppressors"* — a warning that education must foster genuine critical awareness.

Human Capital and Economic Growth. Since World War II, international bodies like the World Bank have emphasised education as investment in human capital. According to the World Bank, each additional year of schooling raises hourly earnings by about 10% globally, and education drives innovation, poverty reduction, and institutional strength [5]. The economist and Nobel laureate Gary Becker, a pioneer of human capital theory, stated, *"The accumulation of human capital is the single most important driver of economic growth."* While powerful, this purpose is often criticised for reducing human beings to factors of production [8]. As the philosopher Martha Nussbaum countered, *"Education is not just about producing skilled workers; it is about producing capable, critical, and independent citizens."*

Holistic and Lifelong Learning. The UNESCO Delors Commission synthesised these threads into four pillars: learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together, and learning to be [9]. The report famously declared, *"Learning is the treasure within"* — a metaphor that elevates education beyond utilitarian goals. This framework emphasises that education serves the whole person across a lifetime. More recently, the OECD has advocated "education for human flourishing," focusing on purpose, meaning, and well-being beyond employability [10]. The OECD's 2019 framework states, *"Education should enable people to lead lives they have reason to value."*

Religious Perspectives on Educational Purposes. Beyond the Western philosophical and economic frameworks discussed above, the world's major religious traditions have articulated purposes of education that transcend utilitarian and even purely rational aims. These perspectives, grounded in sacred texts and millennia of practice, converge on the view that education is ultimately

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

about **transformation**—of the self, the community, and the individual's relationship with the sacred. Christianity holds that the chief end of education is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever [31]. Islam grounds education in the first revealed word, *Iqra'* ("Read"—Qur'an 96:1), declaring that seeking knowledge is a sacred duty [32]. Judaism places the study of Torah at the centre of covenantal life, with the Talmud teaching that study is greater than practice because it leads to practice [33]. Hinduism distinguishes lower knowledge from higher knowledge (*parā vidyā*), defining education as the source of illumination leading to liberation [34]. Buddhism conceives of education as the progressive cultivation of ethical conduct, concentration, and wisdom, with the Dhammapada urging learners to follow the learned as the foundation of the holy life [35]. Confucianism treats education with supreme reverence, aiming to produce the *jūnzǐ* (exemplary person) who embodies humaneness and ritual propriety [36]. Daoism offers a transformative critique: the Way is gained by daily loss, not accumulation [38]. Sikhism teaches that without the Name, all learning is mere hypocrisy [37]. Across these perspectives, a common thread emerges: education is never merely about information transfer or economic productivity but about moral formation, spiritual awakening, and the cultivation of wisdom.

Eastern and Western Civilizations: Divergent Yet Converging Purposes. The Western and Eastern civilisations have historically seen the purposes of education differently—yet in the AI era, these differences are moderating and giving way to a global synthesis. The Western philosophical tradition, rooted in ancient Greece and the Enlightenment, has emphasised the cultivation of the rational, autonomous, questioning mind, with purposes ranging from democratic citizenship (Dewey) to critical emancipation (Freire) to holistic flourishing (OECD). In contrast, the dominant educational philosophy of East Asia—shaped profoundly by Confucianism, but also by Buddhism and Daoism—has placed moral self-cultivation and social harmony at the centre of learning. Confucius laid great emphasis on moral education to cultivate the *jūnzǐ* (exemplary person) whose behaviour brings harmony to family, community, and the state [6]. As Jin Li notes, "While a Western education aims to cultivate the mind and broaden one's understanding of the world, an East Asian education focuses more on moral excellence" [39].

Scholars have identified several key dimensions of this divergence. The Western model prioritises the rational, autonomous mind, individualism, competitive achievement, and a question-oriented, critical knowledge view. The Eastern (Confucian-heritage) model prioritises moral virtue, collectivism, group harmony, and knowledge as something to be internalised and embodied. The teacher-student relationship in the West tends to be egalitarian and facilitative; in the East it is more hierarchical and reverential. However, three forces have significantly moderated these differences in the modern era. First, industrialisation, mass education, and global standardisation created universal schooling systems designed to produce disciplined workers and patriotic citizens—a convergence that transcended cultural boundaries. In East Asia, the examination-oriented system produced what Sung calls "compressed modernity": rapid industrialisation promoting competition-based education focused on measurable academic outcomes, often at the expense of moral cultivation [40]. Second, technological transformation and the rise of AI are prompting a global convergence on "21st-century skills" such as critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and adaptability—competencies that blend Western critical engagement with Eastern moral and relational concerns. Third, secularisation, globalisation, and mass higher education have shifted the dominant discourse toward instrumentalism (education for economic productivity), a purpose that resonates across Shanghai, Seoul, and San Francisco. Globalisation has also produced significant cross-cultural borrowing, with Western educators embracing Eastern practices such as collaborative learning and the cultivation of perseverance, and East Asian systems incorporating Western pedagogies emphasising creativity and student-centred learning.

The lesson for the AI era is that neither tradition alone provides a complete vision. The Western emphasis on critical thinking and individual autonomy is essential for teaching students to interrogate AI outputs, detect bias, and resist algorithmic manipulation. The Eastern emphasis on moral cultivation, social harmony, and the integration of knowledge into virtuous living is equally

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

essential for ensuring that AI serves human flourishing rather than merely optimising productivity. The most urgent task for education in the AI era is not to choose between East and West but to synthesise their insights into a **hybrid purpose**: to cultivate persons who are both critically autonomous and morally responsible; both innovative and wise; both empowered by technology and grounded in relationships.

What AI Changes and What It Does Not. Today's AI excels at pattern recognition, language generation, and optimisation within defined parameters, but it lacks genuine understanding, moral agency, emotional empathy, and metacognitive self-reflection [11,12]. Therefore, the core purposes of education remain valid, but their instructional priorities must shift. We no longer need to teach students to compete with machines at machine tasks; we need to teach them to excel at what machines cannot do. However, we must also recognise that **memorisation and procedural skills are not obsolete**. As argued below, they are the foundation of creativity, social fluency, character, and resilience.

IV. What to Teach – Seven Human-Irreplaceable Domains

Given the purposes above, AI's limitations, and the enduring need for internalised knowledge, the curriculum must pivot toward **seven domains** that together define human irreplaceability. The first six are capacities AI cannot replicate; the seventh is the foundational knowledge that enables them.

1. **Algorithmic and Critical Literacy.** Students learn to interrogate AI outputs: detect bias, identify hallucinations, cross-reference sources, and understand the limits of statistical prediction. This is not a separate subject but a lens applied to every discipline [13]. However, effective critique requires internalised domain knowledge—one cannot spot a hallucinated historical date without having memorised key dates.
2. **Ethical Judgment and Moral Reasoning.** Because AI cannot bear moral responsibility, students need guided practice in ethical analysis. Case studies of algorithmic bias, autonomous weapons, and generative AI's impact on truth and trust should be central [14,15]. Ethical judgment draws on internalised principles (e.g., the Golden Rule, duty-based ethics) that can be recalled instantly.
3. **Creative Abductive Thinking.** AI remixes existing patterns; humans can leap to novel hypotheses that break from training data. Students must learn to ask "What if?" and "Why not?" through design thinking, improvisation, and open-ended projects [16]. Such leaps depend on a rich, internalised mental model of the problem domain.
4. **Metacognition and Self-Direction.** Knowing how to learn—planning, monitoring, evaluating one's own cognitive processes—is the foundational skill for lifelong adaptation [17]. Metacognition includes knowing what one has already memorised and what one still needs to learn.
5. **Emotional and Social Intelligence.** AI simulates empathy but does not feel it. Direct instruction and practice in active listening, conflict resolution, perspective-taking, and trust-building are essential [18]. These capacities depend on internalised social scripts and emotional memories.
6. **Interdisciplinary Systems Thinking.** Wicked problems like climate change and pandemics require integrating insights from data science, ethics, history, and ecology. Students learn to see feedback loops, emergent phenomena, and the interplay of technology, society, and nature [19]. Systems thinking relies on a store of exemplars, analogies, and causal patterns stored in memory.
7. **Foundational Knowledge and Memorization.** This is **not** a return to rote drill. It is the deliberate internalisation of a lean, durable core of facts, formulas, timelines, principles, and procedural routines (e.g., multiplication tables, key historical dates, scientific laws, first-aid procedures, navigation without GPS). Why is this still necessary?
    - **Creativity requires raw material** – a rich mental database enables pattern recognition and novel recombination.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

- **Working memory is limited** – memorisation frees cognitive space for higher-order thinking.
- **AI hallucinates** – without internalised facts, students cannot detect errors.
- **AI may be unavailable** – in conflict zones, remote areas, or during system failures, internalised knowledge is a lifeline.

The foundational core should be taught through spaced repetition, retrieval practice, and low-stakes quizzes, not endless drill without understanding.

Examples for Domain 7: (a) Students memorise the periodic table's first 20 elements and their properties; they then use AI to explore complex chemical reactions, but can manually verify the AI's outputs. (b) In a geography unit, students memorise major world capitals and rivers; during a simulated "network outage," they navigate a map quiz without digital aids.

V. What to Learn – Six Student Competencies for Flourishing

While the curriculum defines what is taught, students must actively appropriate these domains as personal competencies. From the learner's perspective, **six interconnected skills** are paramount. Underlying all of them is **learning to remember** – the deliberate building of durable long-term memory structures that support every other competency.

1. **Learning to Learn (Metacognition).** Plan, monitor, and adjust strategies. Keep AI use logs, use spaced repetition for core facts, and reflect on what has been internalised.
2. **Learning to Judge (Ethical Discernment).** For every AI output, ask: Who is disadvantaged? How would I justify this? Draw on memorised ethical frameworks.
3. **Learning to Create (Abductive and Divergent Thinking).** Generate multiple hypotheses, tolerate ambiguity, embrace productive failure – fuelled by a rich store of examples and patterns in memory.
4. **Learning to Relate (Collaborative Intelligence).** Work effectively with human peers **and** with AI as a team member. Delegate, verify, integrate – and rehearse scenarios where AI is absent, relying on shared memory.
5. **Learning to Work With and Without AI (Dual Readiness).** The meta-skill of switching fluently between AI-collaborative and AI-free modes. Practice diagnosing when AI genuinely helps versus when it becomes a crutch. This includes maintaining independent capability for the "overnight test" (server crash, cyberattack, regulatory ban).
6. **Learning to Be (Purpose and Resilience).** Explore existential questions, develop a sense of purpose, and cultivate resilience – especially important when AI fails. Memorise short self-support prompts and survival principles.

Examples for Competency 5: (a) In a writing class, students first write an essay with AI for brainstorming, then write a different essay without any AI, comparing processes. (b) In a data science module, students analyse a dataset with AI-generated code; one week later, they analyse a different dataset using only spreadsheets and manual calculation, debriefing on what would happen if AI stopped working.

VI. How to Teach – Eight Pedagogical Principles

Effective teaching in the AI era transforms the teacher's role from information dispenser to designer of cognitive apprenticeships and memory-building environments. The following **eight principles** integrate AI collaboration with foundational learning.

1. **Cognitive Apprenticeships.** Model expert thinking aloud, including when to rely on memory versus AI. Coach students, then fade support [22].
2. **Problem-Based Learning.** Confront students with complex, real-world problems without step-by-step instructions. Include "no-AI" phases where they must draw on memorised knowledge [24].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

3. **Teach Critical AI Literacy Across Disciplines.** Apply AI critique in every subject – history, biology, literature, etc. – not as a separate course [13].
4. **Teach for Dual Readiness.** Systematically alternate between AI-available and AI-unavailable conditions. Use "AI-free zones" to build foundational competence and "AI-required zones" to teach collaboration.
5. **Prioritize Dialogue and Socratic Questioning.** AI generates answers but cannot engage in deep, empathetic dialogue. Facilitate discussions, debates, and one-on-one conferences [25].
6. **Redesign Assessment to Be Process-Oriented and Authentic.** Use portfolios, oral exams, in-class justification logs, and **un-aided recall tasks** that test internalised knowledge without AI access [26].
7. **Model Vulnerability and Co-Learning.** Say "I don't know – let's research this together." Model intellectual humility and demonstrate how to learn when AI is absent [3].
8. **Deliberate Memory Building.** Use spaced repetition, retrieval practice, interleaved practice, and low-stakes quizzes to ensure students internalise the foundational core. This is not "drill and kill" – it is cognitive science-informed practice that frees working memory for higher-order thinking.

VII. How to Learn – Eight Student Practices

Students are not passive recipients; they must adopt new study habits and ethical routines. The following **eight practices** support self-directed growth in the AI era.

1. **Prompt, Critique, Synthesise.** For any AI output, first recall what you already know, then prompt effectively, critique for accuracy/bias, and synthesise with other sources.
2. **Manage Attention and Cognitive Load.** Use the Pomodoro method, schedule "analog hours" (no screens), and deliberately practise without AI for foundational skills that must become automatic [21].
3. **Document and Reflect on AI Use.** Keep an AI use log (tool, prompt, evaluation, changes made, lessons learned, and facts memorised). Review weekly to improve metacognition [20].
4. **Collaborate with Humans and AI.** Work in teams where different members use AI differently. Conduct "blackout drills" – continue planning using only shared memory and analog methods.
5. **Ask Better Questions.** Use the Question Formulation Technique [27] to generate deep, open-ended, ethically charged questions. Also ask questions that probe the reliability of your own memory.
6. **Practice Deliberate AI-Free Routines.** Set aside one hour per week with no AI: write a summary by hand, solve algebra with pencil and paper, recall historical dates from memory. This is your "insurance policy" for when AI is unavailable.
7. **Embrace Productive Struggle and Ambiguity.** Choose tasks just beyond current ability, persist through confusion, and tolerate contradictory AI outputs. Struggle to recall information from memory before resorting to external tools [2].
8. **Use Retrieval Practice.** Test yourself without AI using flashcards, self-quizzing, or blank-sheet recall. This builds durable memory structures that enable creativity and independent thought. Spaced repetition is especially effective.

VIII. A Unified Framework

The table below synthesises the entire framework, showing how historical purposes map to curriculum domains, learner competencies, pedagogical principles, and student practices.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

Purpose of Education	What to Teach (7 Domains)	What to Learn (6 Competencies)	How to Teach (8 Principles)	How to Learn (8 Practices)
Moral formation [2,6]	Ethical judgment + foundational moral principles	Ethical discernment	Case-based dialogue; model moral reasoning	Document ethical choices; memorise key principles
Democratic citizenship [3]	Critical & algorithmic literacy + core historical facts	Learning to judge	Socratic questioning; problem-based learning	Prompt, critique, synthesise; recall facts from memory
Critical liberation [4]	Systems thinking; creative abduction + key scientific laws	Learning to create	Project-based learning; co-learning	Embrace struggle; tolerate ambiguity; rely on stored knowledge
Human capital [5]	Metacognition; self-direction + procedural routines	Learning to learn	Cognitive apprenticeship	Manage attention; document AI use; use spaced repetition
Holistic flourishing [9,10]	Emotional intelligence + social scripts	Learning to relate	Dialogic instruction; collaborative projects	Collaborate with humans and AI; rehearse offline scenarios
Human flourishing [8]	Interdisciplinary systems thinking + survival/navigation basics	Learning to be	Authentic, process-oriented assessment	Ask existential questions; build resilience; memorise self-support prompts
Dual workplace readiness (new)	Alternating AI-collaborative & AI-free task performance	Learning to work with and without AI	Alternating conditions (AI-available / AI-unavailable)	Practice deliberate AI-free routines; retrieval practice
Foundational integrity	Foundational knowledge & memorization (Domain 7)	Learning to remember (underlying all)	Deliberate memory building (Principle 8)	Use retrieval practice; blackout drills

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

IX. Implementation Roadmap for Institutions

The theoretical framework developed above—seven curriculum domains, six student competencies, eight pedagogical principles, and eight student practices—requires deliberate institutional action to become reality. Translating this vision into practice does not demand a wholesale overhaul overnight. Instead, institutions can follow a **seven-step roadmap** that balances ambition with feasibility. Each step is designed to be incremental, evidence-informed, and context-sensitive.

Step 1: Audit your curriculum.

Review existing courses to identify two gaps: (a) where AI is assumed to be unavailable (e.g., proctored exams, in-class handwritten essays) but may need strengthening, and (b) where over-reliance on AI has silently eroded foundational learning. Use a simple rubric: for each major assignment, ask "Could a student complete this successfully without ever internalising core knowledge?" If yes, that assignment may need redesign.

Step 2: Designate dual-mode modules.

In every core course, select at least two specific tasks that students will perform twice: once with full AI access (to learn collaboration) and once without any AI (to build independent competence). For example, a writing course might have an AI-assisted research essay followed by an in-class handwritten reflective essay on the same topic. Document the contrasting processes and require a comparative reflection.

Step 3: Train faculty – not on tools, but on pedagogies.

Professional development should focus less on "how to use ChatGPT" and more on the pedagogical principles outlined in Section VI: cognitive apprenticeship, dialogic teaching, dual readiness, and deliberate memory building. Faculty need to experience these methods as learners first, then co-design them for their disciplines.

Step 4: Adopt an AI use policy with an "AI Use Declaration".

Create a clear, enforceable policy that distinguishes **acceptable management** (e.g., using AI to generate practice questions, explain concepts, or check grammar) from **unacceptable delegation** (e.g., copying AI-generated text without substantial revision, submitting AI-solved problems without attempted solution). Require students to complete and sign an "AI Use Declaration" for each major assignment, specifying which tools were used, how they were used, and what changes the student made. This preserves cognitive agency and makes AI use transparent.

Step 5: Redesign assessments for process and un-aided recall.

Phase out high-stakes, single-submission take-home essays that are easily solvable by AI. Replace them with:

- **Portfolios** that include drafts, AI logs, and reflective memos.
- **In-class justification logs** where students document their reasoning step-by-step, even if they used AI.
- **Oral exams** that probe understanding beyond what AI can generate.
- **Un-aided recall tasks** – periodic low-stakes quizzes or performance tasks completed without any AI access and without notes. These test whether core knowledge has truly been internalised.

Step 6: Build student AI literacy systematically.

Integrate AI literacy into orientation, first-year seminars, and disciplinary courses. Teach students not only how to prompt effectively but also how to **critique** AI outputs (detect bias, hallucination, logical fallacies) and **synthesise** AI-generated material with human-sourced evidence. Equally important: teach students **when not to use AI** – for foundational memorisation, for practising retrieval, and for scenarios where AI is unavailable or inappropriate.

Step 7: Identify core memorisation targets for each subject.

For every discipline, faculty should collaboratively define the **20% of knowledge that does 80% of the cognitive work** – the essential facts, formulas, dates, vocabulary, principles, and procedural routines that students need to internalise for creativity, fluency, and offline resilience. Examples:

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

multiplication tables in mathematics, key historical dates and narratives in history, scientific laws and constants in physics, basic diagnostic patterns in medicine. Then design **spaced repetition** and **low-stakes retrieval practice** (e.g., weekly five-minute quizzes) to help students internalise these targets. This is not a return to "drill and kill"; it is cognitive science-informed practice that frees working memory for higher-order thinking.

Start small, but start now.

No institution needs to implement all seven steps at once. A realistic approach is to begin with a pilot programme in one department or one course: audit that course, redesign one assignment as a dual-mode module, introduce an AI use declaration, and teach a handful of memorisation targets. Evaluate, refine, and then scale. The goal is not perfection on day one but steady progress toward an educational system that cultivates students who are augmented by AI yet remain capable, critical, and autonomous without it.

X. Conclusion: The Great Transition

The AI era is not the end of education but its most profound renewal. When machines can answer questions, the purpose shifts to asking better ones. When AI generates plausible text, the purpose shifts to discerning truth from falsehood. When algorithms optimise, the purpose shifts to choosing which ends are worth pursuing. And when AI becomes ubiquitous, we must remember that it may also be absent.

This study has shown that the historical purposes of education—moral, civic, critical, economic, holistic—remain our compass. They require new answers to the three core questions: **what to teach** (seven human-irreplaceable domains, including a lean foundational core of memorised knowledge); **what to learn** (six competencies, with "learning to work with and without AI" as a central pillar); **how to teach** (eight pedagogical principles, including dual readiness and deliberate memory building); and **how to learn** (eight student practices, including AI-free routines and retrieval practice). The **seven-step implementation roadmap** in Section IX translates these answers into actionable institutional change, beginning with a curriculum audit and ending with core memorisation targets.

The ultimate message is one of empowerment. Students who master these competencies and internalise a durable core of knowledge will not be replaced by AI; they will be augmented by it—and they will be able to function wisely when AI is not there. Teachers who embrace these pedagogical principles will not become obsolete; they will become more essential as guides, coaches, and models of humanity. And societies that invest in this integrated vision will cultivate citizens who can navigate uncertainty, challenge injustice, and build a flourishing future—even in the face of blackouts, disasters, or the unimaginable. As the Delors Commission wrote, "Learning is the treasure within" [9]. In the new AI era, that treasure is more precious—and more human—than ever.

References

1. Plato, *Republic*, G. M. A. Grube and C. D. C. Reeve, Trans. Indianapolis, IN, USA: Hackett Publishing, 1992 (original work published ca. 380 B.C.E.).
2. Aristotle, *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, J. Barnes, Ed. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton University Press, 1984 (original work published ca. 350 B.C.E.).
3. J. Dewey, Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. New York, NY, USA: Macmillan, 1916.
4. P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY, USA: Continuum, 1970.
5. World Bank, World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank Publications, 2018.
6. Confucius, *The Analects*, D. C. Lau, Trans. London, U.K.: Penguin Classics, 2006 (original work published ca. 500 B.C.E.).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

7. S. Bowles and H. Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life, 2nd ed. Chicago, IL, USA: Haymarket Books, 2011.
8. M. C. Nussbaum, *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press, 2011.
9. J. Delors et al., *Learning: The Treasure Within*. Paris, France: UNESCO Publishing, 1996.
10. OECD, Education for Human Flourishing: A New Framework for the Future of Learning. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2019.
11. E. M. Bender and A. Koller, "Climbing towards NLU: On meaning, form, and understanding in the age of data," in *Proc. 58th Annu. Meeting Assoc. Comput. Linguistics (ACL)*, 2020, pp. 5185–5198.
12. L. Floridi, The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Principles, Challenges, and Opportunities. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2023.
13. UNESCO, *AI and Education: Guidance for Policy-Makers*. Paris, France: UNESCO Publishing, 2021.
14. S. U. Noble, *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York, NY, USA: New York University Press, 2018.
15. L. Floridi and J. Cowls, "A unified framework of five principles for AI in society," *Harvard Data Science Review*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2019.
16. M. A. Boden, *AI: Its Nature and Future*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2016.
17. J. H. Flavell, "Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry," *American Psychologist*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 906–911, 1979.
18. D. C. Dennett, *From Bacteria to Bach and Back: The Evolution of Minds*. New York, NY, USA: W. W. Norton, 2019.
19. D. H. Meadows, *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. White River Junction, VT, USA: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2008.
20. B. J. Zimmerman, "Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview," *Theory Into Practice*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 64–70, 2002.
21. B. Oakley, A Mind for Numbers: How to Excel at Math and Science (Even if You Flunked Algebra). New York, NY, USA: Tarcher Perigee, 2014.
22. Collins, J. S. Brown, and S. E. Newman, "Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics," in *Knowing, Learning, and Instruction: Essays in Honor of Robert Glaser*, L. B. Resnick, Ed. Hillsdale, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1989, pp. 453–494.
23. J. Dewey, *Experience and Education*. New York, NY, USA: Kappa Delta Pi, 1938.
24. S. M. Barnett and S. J. Ceci, "When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far transfer," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 128, no. 4, pp. 612–637, 2002.
25. R. Alexander, *A Dialogic Teaching Companion*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2020.
26. E. R. Mollick and L. Mollick, "New modes of learning enabled by AI chatbots: Three methods and assignments," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2022, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.4308633.
27. D. Rothstein and L. Santana, *Make Just One Change: Teach Students to Ask Their Own Questions*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard Education Press, 2011.
28. G. Marcus and E. Davis, *Rebooting AI: Building Artificial Intelligence We Can Trust*. New York, NY, USA: Pantheon, 2019.
29. J. Wing, "Computational thinking," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 33–35, 2006.
30. D. H. Autor, "Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 3–30, 2015.
31. Westminster Assembly, *The Shorter Catechism*, 1647, Q. 1.
32. Prophet Muhammad, as recorded in *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, Book of Sunnah, hadith no. 224.
33. Babylonian Talmud, *Kiddushin* 40b.
34. *Rigveda*, as cited in Jaypee Digital, "Education in Ancient India," 2020.
35. *Dhammapada*, Sutavagga (Learning), vv. 1–3.
36. Confucius, *Analects*, 1.1, trans. D. C. Lau (Penguin Classics, 2006).
37. *Guru Granth Sahib*, p. 467, trans. Dr. Sant Singh Khalsa.
38. *Dao De Jing*, chapter 48, trans. S. Mitchell.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.0332.v2

39. J. Li, *Cultural Foundations of Learning: East and West*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
40. Y.-K. Sung, "The learning community writ large: Towards a new direction in the East Asian style of education," Kyoto University, Open Course Ware, 2020.