

In an AI classroom, the human is still the point

AI走进课堂 但人类仍是教育核心

文奇·桑卡拉拉曼

“如果人工智能（AI）不到一分钟就能写出一篇像样的大学论文，一纸大学文凭究竟还有什么意义？”这已不是假设性问题。面对生成式AI，许多大学最初关注的是如何防止作弊、是否允许学生使用AI，以及使用时是否须要注明出处。然而，随着AI迅速进入职场，这些已不足够。

一些雇主担心毕业生虽然熟悉AI，却未必能在没有AI辅助时独立思考。

今年6月，新加坡管理大学与约20名来自金融、科技、公共部门、法律和专业服务等领域的业界伙伴交流，得到的信息相当明确：在AI时代，雇主希望学科严谨程度更受重视，而非被削弱。他们希望未来的毕业生不仅要会使用AI，还必须构建、管理和监督AI代理。这与懂得如何提示聊天机器人已不可同日而语。

AI可改善教育，这毋庸置疑。学生深夜遇到难题时，它成为随时在线的私人导师；教师也可把部分常规作业交给AI，把课堂时间留给更人性化的辩论、质询与真正改变思维的来回交锋。以这种方式使用AI，不会削弱教育中人性化的一面，反而能腾出时间，投入真正重要的人际互动。

但AI就好比双刃剑。大量使用，让一个从未经历思考挣扎的学生，很难培养面对复杂问题所需要的耐性。当所有人都依靠相似工具构思和写作，答案也可能越来越趋同，创造力反而受到限制。

因此，学生之间真正的分水岭，不在于谁更会使用AI，而在于谁会质疑AI。有人会全盘接受AI给出的答案；有的则会质疑AI，将它视为须要

无论大学是否准备就绪，毕业生都将步入早已围绕AI重新设计工作的职场。从教育的角度而言，更诚实的做法，是现在就作出承诺：明确说明人类必须具备哪些机器无法取代的能力，并及早构建课程，坚守这条底线。

探究，而非盲从的对象，这类学生做到机器模型无法替他们完成的事：形成自己的判断。

因此，新大应对AI的策略围绕三项承诺展开：一、学生首先必须证明自己在没有AI辅助下也能独立思考和推理；二、学生懂得在适当情况下负责任地使用AI；三、学生必须能清楚说明，他们贡献哪些AI无法实现的成果。第三点尤其重要，但最难传授也最常被忽略。

未来职场问的是判断力

光是能够在没有AI辅助下展现能力还不够，毕业生必须能够清楚阐述自己的附加价值。未来职场问的不再是“你会不会使用AI”，而是“你在驾驭AI时，做出什么判断？”

我们的应对策略也在演进。在2023年，我校对生成式AI的首个回应是防御性的：维护诚信、建立素养、逐课推进。到了2023年中，立场开始转变。教师被要求重新思考的不只是如何防范AI，还包括如何评估与教学。2024年开始，这一转变逐步在试点课程中展现，初见成效。

例如，所有大一新生必修的《写作与推理》课程，如今要求学生借助AI起草文稿，再对照原始资料，审核自己的内容是否存在偏差、疏漏或彻

底捏造之处，让学生从AI成果的使用者，转变为审核者。在《人工智能媒体研究》课程中，学生运用AI工具分析大量新闻报道（包括情感倾向、语气和主题内容），再针对AI辅助得出的结果，审视其一致性、误判和偏差。

新大今年初已批准全校人工智能教育策略，各学院正重新设计本科课程，计划从2027/2028学年起逐步落实。

每所学院都在规划，在学生的四年教育中，何时须摆脱AI的束缚进行思考和推理；何时学习按照学科要求应用AI；何时能自由使用AI，并为自己的判断负责。

换言之，到学生准备毕业的阶段，教师关注的重点是学生能否捍卫使用AI的合理性。这也正是雇主从第一天起就期待看到的能力。

必须强调的是，AI带来的认知捷径、创意趋同和过度依赖，不会因为一套政策而自动消失。但大学可以选择通过课程设计，保护想要培养的思维方式，而非只在事后侦测滥用情况。

面对日新月异的科技，最容易的选择，便是静待它稳定下来，再决定应对策略。然而，自从ChatGPT问世至今，它从未停止变化。等待，对于毕业生而言，也是一种奢侈。无论大学是否准备就绪，他们都将步入早已围绕AI重新设计工作的职场。

从教育的角度而言，更诚实的做法，是现在就作出承诺：明确说明人类必须具备哪些机器所无法取代的能力，并及早构建课程，坚守这条底线。

作者Venky Shankararaman是新加坡管理大学副教务长（教育策略与创新）兼信息系统教授

Publication: Lianhe Zaobao

Date: 28 August 2026

Headline: In an AI classroom, the human is still the point (English Translation)

In an AI classroom, the human is still the point

By Venky Shankararaman

If a machine can already write a passable university essay in less than a minute, what exactly is a degree supposed to prove? That question is no longer hypothetical, but many universities are still improvising an answer: catch the cheating, or don't; ban AI in the classroom, or permit it with a citation; restrict access, or give it away freely. That response is understandable. It's also no longer sufficient.

Some employers are voicing a quiet worry: graduates are comfortable with AI, but too many can't think without it. That gap surfaces in a student's first year on the job, where the stakes are higher and no one is grading for growth anymore.

This isn't a worry we're taking on faith. In June, we brought about 20 industry partners across financial services, technology, the public sector, and legal and professional services into the room with SMU faculty across disciplines. The message came back clear: employers want disciplinary rigour to matter more, not less, in an AI-enabled workplace, and they don't want universities trading one for the other. They also flagged something more forward-looking: graduates are increasingly expected to build and supervise AI agents, not just use AI tools reactively. That's a materially different bar than “knows how to prompt a chatbot”.

What AI is genuinely good for in a classroom is worth naming first. It can give a student stuck at midnight the equivalent of a private tutor. It can take routine feedback off an educator's desk so class time gets spent on the harder, human part: debate, questioning, the back-and-forth that actually changes how someone thinks. Used this way, AI doesn't compete with the human element of education. It buys back time for it.

But the same tool that buys back time can erode the thing it's meant to protect. A student who never sits with a blank page long enough to feel stuck never builds tolerance for the discomfort where most real thinking happens. When every student drafts with the same tools, work converges, and creativity narrows exactly when it should widen.

The sharpest divide is between students who accept whatever the AI gives them and those who argue with it, treating it as something to be interrogated rather than obeyed. That second group is doing something no model does for them: forming a judgment.

This is why SMU's response to AI in education isn't built around access or adoption targets. It's built around three commitments, applied to every undergraduate programme: students must be able to demonstrate thinking and reasoning that doesn't depend on AI at all; they must learn to use it well and responsibly where it belongs; and, critically, they must be able to say, in their own words, what they bring to a piece of work that the AI could not have.

This third commitment is the hardest to teach and tends to be the most easily overlooked – which is exactly why it matters most.

It's not enough to be capable without AI. Graduates need to be able to articulate their own value-add. That is precisely the skill a future workplace of AI agents will demand of them: not “can you use the tool” but “what judgment do you bring to directing it”.

We've tried to make this more than an aspiration, and more than a reaction to whatever AI does next. Our first response to generative AI, in 2023, was defensive: safeguard integrity, build baseline literacy, course by course. By May 2023, however, that stance had already begun to shift – faculty were being asked to rethink not just how they safeguarded against AI, but how they assessed and taught. From 2024, this progressively played out in the curriculum, with early results that were promising.

For example, in the compulsory *Writing and Reasoning* course that every freshman takes, students learn to draft with AI, then audit their own output against original sources for bias, gaps and outright fabrication. In *AI-Driven Media Research*, students apply AI tools to analyse large sets of newspaper articles (for sentiment, tone and thematic content), then critically evaluate the AI-assisted findings for consistency, misclassification and bias.

These examples of early wins point the way forward. This year we enter the next stage: SMU's leadership approved a university-wide strategy in the first half of the year, and all SMU Schools are now redesigning every undergraduate programme around it, set to be introduced in Academic Year 2027/2028, backed by dedicated funding, training and support.

That approach is now shaping whole degrees, not just individual courses. Each school is mapping when in a student's four-year education they must think and reason without AI; when they learn to apply it as their discipline expects; and finally, when they are trusted to use it freely and held to account for the judgement behind it. This progressive mastery journey means that early courses protect the struggle, while later ones build fluency deliberately. By the time they do their capstone, the question isn't whether a student used AI. It's whether they can justify what they did with it, much like what employers expect on day one.

None of this makes the risks go away. Cognitive shortcuts, converging creativity, the gap between students who question their AI output and students who don't: these don't disappear because a policy exists. What a policy can do is stop them from being left to chance, to whichever instructor happens to notice. And it puts

the burden where it belongs: not on detecting misuse, but on designing, in advance, for the kind of thinking we want to protect.

The temptation, faced with a technology that keeps changing, is to wait for it to settle before committing to anything. It hasn't settled in the three years since ChatGPT arrived, and there's little reason to expect it will. Waiting is also a luxury our graduates don't have: they'll enter workplaces already restructuring around AI, whether or not their university got ready in time. The more honest position is to commit now, to state plainly what a human must still be able to do that a machine cannot, and build a curriculum, ahead of time, that holds the line on it. That's a bet on people, not on the technology. We think it's the right one, and the one our students will thank us for making early.

Venky Shankararaman is Vice Provost (Education Strategy and Innovations) and Professor of Information Systems at Singapore Management University.