

THE DOUBLE CRISIS: INTEGRITY OF EVALUATION AND EFFICACY OF PEDAGOGY IN THE ERA OF GENERATIVE AI

Luca Angelelli

Doctor of Theology, Pontifical Gregorian University (Rome)
Adjunct Lecturer at the Pontifical Gregorian University (Rome)
luca.ang@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-3034-2957>

Received 11 September 2025 / Accepted 3 December 2025

DOI: 10.64205/brasiliensis.14.27.2025.223

Published under Creative Commons license

Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)



Abstract: The advent of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools is provoking a seismic event in the academic world, triggering a “double crisis” that impacts both the integrity of evaluation and the efficacy of consolidated pedagogical methods. This article analyzes the nature of this crisis, examining the specific challenges faced by students, from the risk of atrophy of critical thinking to the difficult management of technological plagiarism, and by faculty, who are called to radically rethink their roles as evaluators and educators, as well as by institutions, prompted to rethink tools and formative objectives. The response to the crisis cannot be a mere prohibition, but requires a redesign of assignments and the promotion of new competencies, shifting from a paradigm of an instructor type charged with mere knowledge transmission, typical of certain courses and universities with many enrollees, to an instructor who is eminently a “curator of critical thinking” integrated into the new human-machine ecosystem.

Keyword: AI. Academic crisis. Academic integrity. Pedagogical redesign.

Resumo: O advento das ferramentas de Inteligência Artificial (IA) generativa está provocando um evento sísmico no mundo acadêmico, desencadeando uma “dupla crise” que afeta tanto a integridade da avaliação quanto a eficácia de métodos pedagógicos consolidados. Este artigo analisa a natureza dessa crise, examinando os desafios específicos enfrentados pelos estudantes — desde o risco de atrofia do pensamento crítico até a difícil gestão do plágio tecnológico —, bem como pelos docentes, que são chamados a repensar radicalmente seus papéis como avaliadores e educadores, e pelas instituições, instadas a reconsiderar instrumentos e objetivos formativos. A resposta a essa crise não pode ser uma mera proibição, mas exige um redesenho das atividades avaliativas e a promoção de novas competências, deslocando-se de um paradigma de docente encarregado da mera transmissão de conhecimentos, típico de certos cursos e universidades com grande número de matriculados, para um docente que seja eminentemente um “curador do pensamento crítico”, integrado ao novo ecossistema humano-máquina.

Palavras-chave: IA. Crise acadêmica. Integridade acadêmica. Redesenho pedagógico.

Introduction: The Horizon of the Double Crisis

The irruption of Generative Artificial Intelligence into the academic context is not a further, most powerful technological update, but a Copernican revolution that calls into question the fundamental pacts on which higher education rests: the pact of honesty between student and instructor, and the formative pact that sees the university as the primary place for the development of autonomous thought. The analysis of this phenomenon requires exploring the two faces of the same coin: the crisis experienced by students and that faced by instructors.

1. The Crisis from the Students' Point of View: Between Shortcut and Insecurity

Students are the first to interact with these tools, often moved by a combination of curiosity, academic pressure, and a search for efficiency that sometimes borders on intellectual laziness. The problematics that emerge are profound and stratified.

1.1. Atrophy of Fundamental Competencies: Cognitive Delegation

AI offers an almost instantaneous way out of the “noble toil” of intellectual work. Complex processes such as the synthesis of heterogeneous sources, the structuring of a coherent argumentation, and the search for effective prose are delegated to the machine. This not only impedes the development of analytical and argumentative skills but also disaccustoms the mind from managing complexity and tolerating uncertainty, key competencies in every field of knowledge.

An academic paper is the digital footprint of the writer's thought: the indiscriminate use of AI generates texts whose content and style are aligned with what is generally (statistically) considered accurate and valid (or plausible), namely writings that are correct, even sophisticated, but lacking depth and missing truly original and creative insights. The risk is that we end up with a generation of students incapable of developing and defending their own recognizable and, above all, personal intellectual “voice.”

Until now, the growth of individual critical capacity has been built through research work, guided by instructors, where information and sources are compared to build a foundation of knowledge and processes. This “reference framework” is essential for evaluating further information

and contexts. Specifically, without a knowledge base and critical capacity, it is truly difficult to evaluate the outputs provided by AI, leaving one increasingly exposed to the hallucinatory issues of LLM models¹.

1.2. The Gray Area of Plagiarism and Individual Responsibility

Many students place the use of AI in the same category as an advanced semantic suggester and spell checker², failing to understand that submitting a machine-generated text as their own constitutes a violation of academic honesty. The absence of explicit guidelines in many institutions fuels this ambiguity but does not reduce the seriousness of the infraction, which can range from unintentional plagiarism to deliberate fraud. Although AI-generated text is increasingly difficult to identify, creating a certain confidence in its untraceability and impunity among students, some software and the eye of an experienced instructor can often spot anomalies: a perfection devoid of critical discernment, a lack of connection to class lectures, the use of spurious bibliographic sources. The risk of severe sanctions is real.

1.3. Psychological Scars: Dependence and Impostor Syndrome

The overuse of AI can erode confidence in one's own cognitive abilities and foster a dependence on it. A student may begin to doubt their ability to write a paragraph or formulate a hypothesis without the "digital suggester," creating a vicious cycle: the more AI is used out of insecurity, the deeper the insecurity becomes, and the more indispensable AI feels³. Moreover,

¹ The hallucinations of generative AI seem to be a problem linked to the very structure of general generative AI systems, which can be mitigated, but not eliminated. See, e.g., L. A. Floridi, "Conjecture on a Fundamental Trade-off between Certainty and Scope in Symbolic and Generative AI", *Philosophy & Technology* 38 (2025): 93, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-025-00927-z>; for a list of the typologies of hallucinations generated by LLMs, see J. I. Ziwei et al., "Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation", *ACM Computing Surveys* 55, no. 12 (2023): 1, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2202.03629>.

² The percentage of students who admit to a dishonest use of generative AI, used as an advanced assistance tool, is considerable and, according to one study, stands at 58%. See M. J. T. Tan and N. M. A. T. Maravilla, "Shaping integrity: why generative artificial intelligence does not have to undermine education", *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 7 (2024), <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1471224>.

³ "AI, transcending its role as a mere technological tool, has begun to significantly influence self-perception and human relationships. These dynamic highlights the importance of developing inclusive and adaptive policies that view AI as a complement, rather than a substitute, to human abilities", W. C. Morales-García et al., "Development and validation of a scale for dependence on artificial intelligence in university students", *Frontiers in Education* 9 (2024): sec. 5, "Implications", <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1323898>.

language models are designed to produce plausible, not truthful, text. The infamous “hallucinations” (invented facts, erroneous data, non-existent bibliographic citations) represent an ever-present trap. The student, solely responsible for their own work, risks compromising their academic reputation, both by submitting work with “hallucinatory” errors or biases produced by AI, and by presenting texts or research created entirely by AI systems as their own.

1.4. The Nightmare of False Accusation: When Honesty Is Not Enough

Alongside the concrete risk of sanctions for plagiarism, a parallel and insidious threat emerges: false accusation. If the academic climate is pervaded by suspicion, a student can see their original work unjustly labelled as an AI product. The sources of error are twofold: the unreliability of detection software, which does not produce 100% certain results, and the fallibility of human judgment, when an instructor bases their evaluation on subjective criteria such as a writing style deemed “too perfect” or impersonal.

This scenario leads to a dangerous reversal of the burden of proof, where the student is effectively forced to prove their innocence against an accusation that is, by its nature, almost impossible to definitively refute. Such a development is not only legally and ethically problematic but also poisons the educational relationship, replacing the pact of trust with an inquisitorial dynamic that profoundly damages the student’s serenity and motivation.

1.5. From Recipients to Protagonists: The Active Role of Students in the New Academic Pact

The crisis experienced by students is therefore polyhedral: it moves between the temptation of cognitive delegation, the ethical ambiguity of technological plagiarism, the psychological fragility of dependence, and the threat of unjust suspicion. However, relegating students to the role of passive victims of this transformation would be a pedagogical error. They must become conscious protagonists in constructing the solution to the crisis. The redefinition of the academic pact cannot be a top-down process; on the contrary, it requires an authentic dialogue in which institutions actively listen.

It is essential to involve students to understand their perspectives, the pressures they face, but, above all, what they deem fundamental for their education in a context increasingly permeated by AI. Asking them which skills they consider crucial for their professional and human future is not a paternalistic concession but a strategic necessity. The active participation of students is the indispensable condition for transforming the crisis into an opportunity for shared renewal, where the new rules are the result of a common commitment to a fairer, more effective university that is in step with the times.

2. The Crisis from the Faculty's Point of View: Between Suspicion and Redesign

Faculty are on the front lines, with the dual task of educating and assessing in a radically new context, often without adequate tools ⁴.

2.1. The Collapse of Traditional Assessment

Plagiarism detection systems have, until now, been primarily calibrated to find “copy-paste,” not to identify original text generated *ex novo*. As for the new AI detectors, we are witnessing a technological confrontation, analogous to the old armour versus cannon standoff⁵, between generation and detection. In any case, current detection systems, besides being circumventable, present unacceptable rates of false positives and false negatives⁶, making them unreliable and legally risky (that is, useless) tools.

In many humanities and social science disciplines, the take-home written assignment has served for centuries as a primary instrument for

⁴ See M. J. T. Tan and N. M. A. T. Maravilla, “Shaping integrity”; J. A. Oravec, “Artificial Intelligence Implications for Academic Cheating: Expanding the Dimensions of Responsible Human-AI Collaboration with ChatGPT and Bard”, *Journal of Interactive Learning Research* 34, no. 2 (2023): 213–37.

⁵ The analogy describes the endless race in developing armour capable of resisting the latest type of armour-piercing projectile, which in turn will require new armour in a continuous escalation of means and costs. In the confrontation between AI text generation and AI detection software, there is an asymmetry, as the former evolve toward the ability to generate texts indistinguishable from those produced by a human author and can be instructed to bypass checks for automatic text generation. How to discriminate between human and non-human, if the differences tend to disappear and “imperfections” and style can be adapted and/or simulated at will?

⁶ See D. Dalalah and O. M. A. Dalalah, “The false positives and false negatives of generative AI detection tools in education and academic research: The case of ChatGPT”, *The International Journal of Management Education* 21, no. 2 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100822>; moreover, the detection systems themselves are susceptible to bias: see H. Liang et al., “GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers”, *Patterns* 4, no. 7 (2023): <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100779>.

assessing a student's deep comprehension and critical capacity. With the spread of generative AI, this instrument has lost much of its probative validity: how can an instructor certify that an essay reflects the student's actual abilities and not their (or someone else's) skill in formulating prompts?

In the absence of definitive proof, the instructor is forced to become a detective, basing suspicions on stylistic clues: a "too perfect" text, an impersonal style, repetitive structures, a suspicious coherence. This method is subjective, ambiguous, laborious, and above all, does not yield certain results.

2.2. The Urgent Need for a Pedagogical Revolution

The crisis induced by AI necessitates the search for a new pedagogy, aimed at providing tools useful for the global development of the student, in a social and cultural context characterized by a continuous, rapid, and substantial evolution as never before. On one hand, it is necessary to develop a strategic vision of what is and will be necessary for the formation of the human person, in a world characterized by an increasingly fast and culturally and socially impactful technological development. This is an inevitable task for any entity involved in education, which at the same time can never be considered complete, as it is tied to the continuous and rapid technological evolution.

It is this rapidity that seems to challenge philosophical, social, and psychological reflection, forcing it to chase events, with difficulty in identifying a general framework that contains them and allows for future projections. Banally, without a vision of the future, it is difficult to orient a pedagogy today that is destined to form the people of tomorrow.

On the other hand, it is necessary to take up the challenge of identifying, as far as possible, the general principles of development, accompanying this strategic, necessarily multidisciplinary reflection with tactical implementations to address the problems currently generated by the use of AI.

In this scenario, the ineffectiveness of traditional assessment methods is not a collateral problem, but the symptom that the paradigm itself is obsolete. If the final work (the product) is no longer a reliable indicator of the student's competencies, insisting on evaluating it as such is simply useless. The strategic response lies, therefore, in a reversal of perspective: shifting the center of gravity of assessment from the product to the process.

This change is not a simple workaround, but a pedagogical choice; evaluating the process means considering, examining, and developing the student's entire intellectual journey: the formulation of research questions, the selection and critique of sources, the structuring of arguments, the management of dead ends, the redrafting of drafts... In this perspective, the objective is no longer just to submit a text that is impeccable, but to demonstrate having undertaken a conscious and, above all, critical research journey.

This approach pushes the student to acquire a meta-cognitive awareness: by learning to reflect on their own way of working, they not only acquire the most effective methodologies but also understand which effort is productive and which is dispersive, learning to achieve results in the best and most intellectually efficient way (less demanding). They should also be trained to select the most suitable tools, i.e., those that produce the best results not only in achieving the intended goal but also those that prove to be more "secure" and which, by interacting with them, lead to innovative and original results.

Tools such as research diaries, annotated bibliographies (in which the choice of each source is justified), critical discussions of intermediate drafts, and oral sessions where the argumentative path is defended make visible and assessable that work of thought that AI cannot simulate. In this way, the university reaffirms its primary mission: not to train producers of texts, but minds capable of managing complexity, navigating uncertainty, and building personal, autonomous, responsible, critical, and innovative knowledge. However, this is not simply about adding new tools to current pedagogy or multiplying teaching hours and courses; we must actually rethink education itself, using AI tools to make information transmission more efficient, leaving teachers with the primary task of building students' capacity to develop critical, structural, and process sensitivity. This requires a costly undertaking in terms of human and economic resources to redefine pedagogy and curricula⁷: embracing the AI revolution also means being able

⁷ Quantifying the costs of process-based assessment requires first redesigning pedagogical architecture itself, a transformation that cannot be anticipated precisely in advance. The realistic pathway involves redistributing, rather than merely adding, faculty effort: foundational content delivery, traditionally dominating first-year large-enrollment courses, could migrate to AI-mediated multimedia learning, allowing students to acquire disciplinary basics more efficiently. This reallocation would free faculty from routine lectures and grading to invest in dialogical seminars, critical thinking development, and mentoring, higher-order activities where human-machine collaboration yields maximum pedagogical benefit. The challenge is not primarily financial but institutional and cultural: redesigning curricula, reconceiving faculty roles, and building technological infrastructure. Reliable cost estimation requires pilot implementations; institutions cannot quantify resource requirements for a pedagogy that does not yet exist. Rather than delaying transformation pending cost analysis, a more pragmatic approach involves designing flexible implementation models that permit continuous assessment and iterative refinement.

to organize educational activities, specifically reformulated, so as to delegate basic and repetitive tasks to trained agents, thereby freeing up precious faculty work hours for higher-level tasks.

2.3. The Additional Burden on Faculty

The current situation has repercussions for faculty as an additional workload: the time and mental energy previously dedicated to evaluating the quality of ideas are now partially diverted towards investigating their authorship. This dynamic configures a sort of unofficial “tax on innovation”: a silent but demanding work, imposed by technology, which finds no counterpart in terms of institutional recognition. Paradoxically, the most conscientious and pedagogically sensitive instructors are those most predisposed to paying its consequences, in terms of burnout. Another response to this situation could be strategic disengagement, whereby faculty, noting the inadequacy of the effort-to-reward ratio, might choose to retreat to more traditional and controllable, yet increasingly ineffective, pedagogical methods.

The issue also lies in academic evaluation systems that almost exclusively privilege scientific production, without considering how pedagogical innovation is an essential pillar of the university’s mission. We are facing a latent crisis that can be defused by formally recognizing pedagogical (re)design as an important academic activity and explicitly including it in the evaluation criteria for career progression and for adequate remuneration. Otherwise, the crisis of pedagogy will inevitably transform into a crisis of the faculty, progressively eroding the educational capacity of the university.

3. Beyond the Crisis: Towards an Ethical and Strategic Integration of AI

If the purely prohibitionist approach is destined to fail, the real challenge lies in transforming AI from a threat to a pedagogical resource through its ethical and strategic integration⁸. This means going beyond the emergency reaction to build a new formative ecosystem in which human-machine interaction is conscious, purposeful, and transparent. The stipulation of a “new academic pact” thus becomes the architecture to

⁸ See UNESCO, *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research* (UNESCO, 2023), <https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535>.

govern this integration, defining with precision how the three main actors, institutions, faculty, and students, must act to make it possible.

3.1. The Role of Institutions: Providing the Framework and Resources

It is up to institutions to create a framework that enables a safe and equitable integration of AI, tackling the challenge of transforming AI from a threat into a pedagogical resource⁹.

Universities must develop regulations that go beyond the condemnation of plagiarism, explicitly defining what constitutes an ethical and pedagogically valid use of AI (e.g., brainstorming, stylistic correction, preliminary synthesis...) and what represents a violation of academic integrity.

This framework must be founded on transparency: institutions must promote a culture of intellectual honesty rather than suspicion, for example by requiring students to explicitly declare their use of AI in their work (through a “declaration of use” or footnotes). In parallel, guarantee protocols must be implemented to protect students from false accusations and from the reversal of the burden of proof.

Institutions must actively invest in their development, which also means providing continuous training for faculty not only on technological tools but also on new pedagogical methodologies. Furthermore, it is fundamental to reform the evaluation criteria for academic careers, recognizing pedagogical innovation as a high-value activity, on par with scientific research: this is a cultural change that must supplant a *de facto* paradigm in the academic world, which can be summarized by the aphorism *publish or perish*.

Another aspect not to be underestimated is the mitigation of the potential *digital divide*, ensuring equitable access to essential technological tools and promoting a culture of inclusivity.

3.2. The Responsibility of Faculty: Redesigning the Educational Experience

Faculty are the catalysts who transform academic policy into pedagogical practice. Their role must evolve from “transmitter of knowledge” to “curator of critical thinking,” a task that requires courage and creativity. In this perspective, the redesign of pedagogical

⁹ See A. Laudadio, “Ehi ChatGPT, ridefinisci ontologicamente la pedagogia e la formazione!”, *Lifelong, Lifewide Learning* 23, no. 46 (2025), <https://doi.org/10.19241/lll.v23i46.986>.

methodologies must shift from a product-based assessment to a process-based one: it is necessary to design tasks and activities that make the intellectual journey visible and assessable, especially moments of meta-cognitive reflection in which the student is asked to justify their methodological choices.

It is important to teach *with* AI, not *against* it. This does not mean abandoning the precious cultural and pedagogical treasure of the past (recent and remote); dialogical methods like the Socratic one can be revived in a modernized key¹⁰: instead of asking AI to “write a text on Kant,” the instructor can teach students, after they have developed their own interpretation through guided reading, to use AI to challenge it: “Act as if you were Kant and critique my interpretation.” When AI tests an interpretation the student has genuinely developed, it stimulates rather than delegates thinking.

Teaching how to ask the right question to an AI is a sophisticated skill that makes the difference between a trivial and inefficient use of AI and a truly intelligent and effective one. Instructors must train students in *critical prompt engineering*: not only how to construct effective prompts, but especially how to evaluate, integrate, and contest the received responses, verifying every piece of information against original sources. By critical prompt engineering I mean the ability to formulate efficient prompts capable of identifying and preventing hallucinations, generic responses, and unreliable sources. It is a cross-cutting thought process, applicable to any discipline, which, beyond the necessary skills, entails continuous critical verification of results.

But this raises a deeper question: a crucial epistemological skill for the AI era is what might be termed “critical suspension of belief”, the capacity to recognize plausibility without conferring credibility. Students must learn that LLMs are designed to be convincing, not truthful. This requires developing what we might call “epistemic vigilance” specific to AI: the ability to maintain productive skepticism toward outputs that pass cognitive heuristics of competence and coherence. Unlike traditional source criticism, which teaches to identify biased sources, AI epistemology teaches to identify hallucinations that masquerade as knowledge. This is not cynicism but methodological rigor: training students to ask “is this plausible or true?” rather than “is this well-argued?”

¹⁰ See P. O. Dacquino, “Insegnare a pensare criticamente: Il metodo socratico”, *Forum. Supplement to Acta Philosophica* 8 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.17421/2498-9746-08-03>. According to this approach, AI restores the authentic Socratic method to pedagogy: not dominated by professorial authority but characterized by mutual interrogation. Unlike human teachers, whose authority can intimidate nascent thinking, AI possesses opinions but no authority. This enables the recovery of the medieval ‘disputatio,’ where knowledge emerges from mutual interrogation rather than one-way transmission.

This discipline-specific approach to AI epistemology reveals a critical caveat: the integration of AI into pedagogy is not discipline-neutral. The nature of knowledge, and therefore the role of AI, differs radically across disciplines: for example in theology and philosophy, AI can summarize doctrine or arguments but cannot “reason theologically” or “think philosophically”; in mathematics, AI can compute but cannot “see” mathematical truth; in empirical sciences, AI can synthesize data but cannot replicate the researcher’s embodied encounter with phenomena (and so on).

Faculties must resist the temptation to apply AI universally across disciplines. Rather, each discipline must engage in explicit reflection on what constitutes knowledge and creativity within their field, and therefore where and how AI genuinely enhances (vs. corrupts) the intellectual formation of practitioners.

3.3. The Protagonism of Students: A Commitment to Their Own Education

Students must evolve from passive recipients to co-designers of their journey within the university. This is not a new idea, for example in the Ignatian vision, the students are protagonists of their own formation¹¹, but the challenge of redefining pedagogy in the era of AI requires deeper involvement. As protagonists, students have the right and duty to participate in defining new rules, express educational needs, and evaluate pedagogical methodologies. Academic integrity must be understood as the foundation of intellectual growth and credibility, as the value and reputation of their degree. Concretely, students must use AI as a “cognitive exoskeleton” to enhance, not replace, thinking, organizing workflows where AI handles, for example, low-value-added tasks (formatting, preliminary summaries, source research), freeing time for critical analysis and creativity.

To avoid confusion, it is important to recognize that AI literacy is not a standalone competency, rather it is an evolution of research methodology education. Universities have long updated curricula as tools evolved: when Google Scholar emerged, institutions integrated it into methodology courses, teaching students to formulate queries and recognize biases, precisely what constitutes good prompting. Critical prompt engineering is not an advanced skill but the methodological discipline of formulating clear questions and evaluating responses, core activities in any research methodology course. The structural parallel is direct:

¹¹ See F. Ramírez Fueyo, “Los Ejercicios espirituales como fuente inspiradora de la pedagogía ignaciana”, *Ignaziana* no. 36 (2023): 5-52.

formulating research questions ↔ formulating effective prompts;
 evaluating source credibility ↔ evaluating AI accuracy;
 integrating sources critically ↔ verifying AI information against primary sources;
 documenting research ↔ declaring AI use.

As students develop methodological maturity through standard research curricula, they simultaneously develop sophistication in using AI critically: tool and methodology co-evolve.

AI literacy must be integrated into research methodology from the beginning: first-year students learn to recognize hallucinations and verify outputs, as they progress they integrate AI as a research instrument with transparency. Universities have always taught the distinction between plausible and accurate information, identifying biased narratives despite their authority; teaching epistemological vigilance toward AI outputs extends this traditional critical literacy. Concrete strategies (hallucination exercises, verification workflows, explicit epistemological modeling) are developments of existing practice, consequently integrating AI into academic research is not departing from traditional methodology but evolving it in response to new tools. This updated methodology equips students with the critical, autonomous judgment that has always defined rigorous scholarship.

Conclusion: A New Academic Pact for the Future

Generative artificial intelligence forces us to ask a fundamental question: what is the purpose of the university today? If the answer is to *produce texts*, then the crisis is terminal. If, instead, the answer is to *form minds capable of critical, creative, and autonomous thought*, then AI becomes a catalyst for a reform that can no longer be postponed.

The way out of the “double crisis” lies not in more sophisticated software or stricter prohibitions, but in the stipulation of a new academic pact, an architecture of shared responsibility, founded on the ethical and strategic integration of AI, where every actor assumes a proactive role.

This new perspective calls on institutions to govern the transition in dialogue with students and faculty, providing a framework of clear rules and real support; it commits faculty to become architects of new educational experiences, shifting the focus from the product to the process; and it invests students with the role of conscious protagonists of their own formation, transforming them from recipients to co-constructors of knowledge.

This means engaging in a journey that is certainly arduous because it is intrinsically multidisciplinary and multi-sectoral, in which many challenges will have to be faced and many questions answered.

How will we redefine the concept of “originality” and “authorship” in a context where human-machine collaboration will become the norm? Where does the contribution of the tool end and that of the human intellect begin, and how can it be fairly assessed?

How will the figure of the instructor evolve? If their task is no longer to transmit information that is now accessible to all, what new skills and virtues (intellectual, ethical, even emotional) will be required of the “coach of critical thinking” called to guide students in a world of potentially limitless knowledge?

How can we ensure that this new hybrid human-machine ecosystem does not create an even deeper *digital divide*, rewarding those who can afford access to more advanced AI tools?

What investments are necessary in terms of human resources and tools to continuously analyze and adapt one’s academic and pedagogical structure to an ever-faster (technological, cultural, and social) development?

Is this the beginning of a Darwinian selection of academic institutions?

Bibliographical References

- Cotton, D. R. E, P. A Cotton, and J. R Shipway. “Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT.” *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 61, no. 2 (2023): 228–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>.
- Dacquino, P. O. “Insegnare a pensare criticamente: Il metodo socratico.” Forum. Supplement to Acta Philosophica, 8 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.17421/2498-9746-08-03>.
- Dalalah, D., and O. M. A. Dalalah. “The false positives and false negatives of generative AI detection tools in education and academic research: The case of ChatGPT.” *The International Journal of Management Education* 21, no. 2 (2023): 100822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100822>.
- Floridi, L. A. “Conjecture on a fundamental trade-off between certainty and scope in symbolic and generative AI.” *Philosophy & Technology* 38 (2025): 93. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-025-00927-z>.
- Laudadio, A. “Ehi ChatGPT, ridefinisci ontologicamente la pedagogia e la formazione!” *Lifelong, Lifewide Learning* 23, no. 46 (2025): 15–27. <https://doi.org/10.19241/lll.v23i46.986>.

- Liang, H. and others. “GPT detectors are biased against non-native english writers.” *Patterns* 4, no. 7 (2023): 100779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100779>.
- Morales-García, W. C. and others. “Development and validation of a scale for dependence on artificial intelligence in university students.” *Frontiers in Education* 9 (2024): 1323898. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1323898>.
- Oravec, J. A. “Artificial intelligence implications for academic cheating: Expanding the dimensions of responsible human-AI collaboration with ChatGPT and Bard.” *Journal of Interactive Learning Research* 34, no. 2 (2023): 213–37.
- Ramírez Fueyo, F. “Los Ejercicios espirituales como fuente inspiradora de la pedagogía ignaciana.” *Ignaziana*, 36 (2023): 5–52.
- Tan, M. J. T., and N. M. A. T. Maravilla. “Shaping integrity: Why generative artificial intelligence does not have to undermine education.” *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 7 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1471224>.
- UNESCO. *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. UNESCO, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535>.
- Wangdi, T. and others. “Using ChatGPT as an assessment tool in education: A systematic literature review of practices and limitations.” *Issues in Educational Research* 35, no. 2 (2025): 818–37.
- Ziwei, J. I. and others. “Survey of hallucination in natural language generation.” *ACM Computing Surveys* 55, no. 12 (2023): 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2202.03629>.