

Implementation of a Generative AI Assistant in K-12 Education: The CGScholar AI Helper Initiative

Vania Castro¹, Ana Karina de Oliveira Nascimento², Raigul Zheldibayeva³, Duane Sears¹, Akash Saini¹, Bill Cope¹, and Mary Kalantzis¹

¹University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

²Universidade Federal de Sergipe; University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign - Postdoctoral fellowship by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development – CNPq, Brazil

³Zhetysay University named after I. Zhansugurov; University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign - Bolashak International scholarship, Kazakhstan

Abstract

This paper focuses on the piloting of the CGScholar AI Helper, a Generative AI (GenAI) assistant tool that aims to provide feedback on writing in high school contexts. The aim was to use GenAI to provide formative and summative feedback on students' texts in English Language Arts (ELA) and History. The trials discussed in this paper relate to Grade 11, a crucial learning phase when students are working towards college readiness. These trials took place in two very different schools in the Midwest of the United States – one in a low socio-economic background with low-performance outcomes and the other in a high socio-economic background with high-performance outcomes. The assistant tool used two main mechanisms: “prompt engineering” based on participant teachers' assessment rubric and “fine-tuning” a Large Language Model (LLM) from a customized corpus of teaching materials using Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG). This paper focuses on the CGScholar AI Helper's potential to enhance students' writing abilities and support teachers in ELA and other subject areas requiring written assignments.

Keywords: GenAI; writing; K-12 education.

1. Background

The term "artificial intelligence" (AI) was coined by John McCarthy to attract funding for a small seminar of experts at Dartmouth College in 1956 (McCarthy et al., 1955). He proposed that machines could eventually perform the same cognitive operations as humans. This definition assumed that machines could replicate human intelligence. However, the concept was not entirely new; it rephrased Alan Turing's earlier idea of "intelligent machinery" (Turing, 1948).

This study challenges McCarthy's definition of AI, which views machines as behaving intelligently like humans. The critique lies in the assumption that machines and humans can be evaluated on the same scale—a notion considered misleading. This perspective leads to an unrealistic humanization of computing machines and a machine-like view of human brains (Cope and Kalantzis, 2022).

Instead of the term AI, this study proposes "cyber-social relations of meaning" and, more specifically, "cyber-social learning" for educational contexts (Cope, Kalantzis, and Zapata, 2025). The acronym "AI" suggests an inaccurate parallelism between humans and machines (Cope and Kalantzis, 2024). Human intelligence encompasses much more than the binary notations underpinning computing. Bodies extend beyond brains, and contexts extend beyond bodies (Figure 01).


Cope, Bill and Mary Kalantzis, "On Cyber-Social Learning: A Critique of Artificial Intelligence in Education," in *Trust and Inclusion in AI-Mediated Education: Where Human Learning Meets Learning Machines*, edited by Theodora Kourkoulou, Anastasia O. Tzirides, Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis, Cham CH: Springer, 2023.



1. The Brain is more than binary

2. Bodies are more than brains

3. Contexts more than bodies



Human and machine intelligence are so different that even to use the same word is a travesty.

Figure 01: Cyber-social Learning

However, although the acronym AI or its implications are not favored, the term is so widely used that it compels its adoption.

AI has emerged as a powerful transformative force in today's digital era. It shapes most industries, increases efficiency, and broadens opportunities throughout different sectors (Shahvaroughi and Ghasemi, 2024; Kalantzis and Cope, 2025). AI is increasing its impact on various fields, including industry, entertainment, and education (Leander and Burriss, 2020).

Generative AI came to prominence with the launch of ChatGPT, a chatbot released by OpenAI in 2022. It belongs to a family of generative pre-trained transformers (GPT) or Large Language Models (LLM), developed to produce human-like text in a conversational mode through both unsupervised machine learning and Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF) (Peters et al., 2023).

Chat GPT's introduction prompted a wide range of different reactions, especially among teachers. While some have seen potential benefits, others have expressed concerns about the ethical implications and potential disruption to traditional teaching practices. Key concerns include ethics, connected to the inability to verify whether work was generated by AI; threats to teachers' professional roles; privacy issues for teachers and students; the creation of false or misleading information (so-called "hallucinations"); biases in source

texts, and the quality of filters moderating content (Cope and Kalantzis, 2023; Akgun and Greenhow, 2022).

Although there are still many challenges, GenAI has excellent potential for transforming education. When properly configured and ethically managed, AI can address critical issues in education, including unequal access, the need for personalized learning, and teacher well-being. In particular, AI can provide detailed, timely, and adaptive feedback to learners, far exceeding the capabilities of traditional 1-to-n teacher-student ratios (Johnson, 2023; Mollick and Mollick, 2023; Tzirides et al., 2023).

Nowadays, due to the widespread availability of many different models of GenAI, teachers need to create the necessary ethical conditions for students to use AI, explore its opportunities, and find ways it might be deployed for educational purposes. Indeed, there is a growing interest in introducing AI to K-12 students. AI is also transforming many industries in which today's students will work. Therefore, developing "AI literacy" will provide students with the necessary skills for the changing labor market (Chen et al., 2023).

The research described in this paper builds on a program of research that commenced with the master's and doctoral students in the graduate program 'Learning Design and Leadership' at the University of Illinois. In one intervention, 295 students in 15 College of Education courses using this software ranked peers slightly ahead of the AI in terms of quality, usefulness, and actionability. However they also noted differences between human and machine feedback and observed that the two were different in useful ways (Tzirides et al., 2023b, Tzirides et al., 2024b, Zapata et al., 2024).

In 2024, RAG was added to feedback processes with a bounded vector database consisting of 35 million tokens, including all of the graduate students' work for the past 5 years as well as instructors' writings for a set of courses. In this wave of interventions, students (n=71) reported that the AI reviews were now outperforming human reviews on all criteria (Saini et al., 2024). Consequently, in each cycle of intervention, new software was released with research and development proceeding according to a mix of agile programming and educational design research methodologies, called "cyber-social research" (Tzirides et al., 2023a).

The intervention described in this paper extends this research into high school. It aims to contribute to enhancing the AI literacy of K-12 students, particularly given that the capabilities of the tool, CGScholar AI helper, provide students with the opportunity to have AI feedback that directly connects to their teachers' work and expectations, thus enabling them to make relevant revisions to their writing, based on the AI review, customized by their teachers. This ensures that students experience an AI review process based on reliable source materials connected to the interests and demands of the curriculum.

This paper is part of a bigger project which addresses the following broader research questions:

1. To what extent and in what ways can GenAI support the development of learner capacities to write; a) within the traditional frame of alphabetical literacy; b) the multimodal texts characteristic of contemporary academic literacies in science, the social sciences, the arts, and technical subjects?
2. What protocols and guardrails are required for the effective and safe application of GenAI in the teaching of writing and, by extension, education in general?

3. What are the implications of GenAI for the future professional role of teachers and the practice of teaching, specifically in writing instruction, given that key learning routines historically in the domain of professional practice can now be performed by GenAI?

At the center of the intervention this paper refers to, writing is a core competence in education that poses significant challenges for both students and educators. Providing personalized feedback on writing tasks is time-consuming and often limited by practical constraints on teachers. Generative AI can offer a scalable and affordable solution, especially as schools face staff shortages and recover from post-pandemic learning failures. AI-powered tools like the CGScholar AI Helper are designed to support writing instruction by automating feedback processes, enabling teachers to focus on more targeted instruction for struggling students.

The CGScholar AI Helper employs two mechanisms for the customization of foundation LLMs:

1. *Prompt engineering*: adapting generative AI prompts to align with the teacher's rubric and specific teaching goals.
2. *Fine-tuning*: done through Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) technology. Materials are added to the CGScholar AI Helper to supplement the information available in the underlying foundation model used in the platform. This ensures that feedback is aligned with educational standards and teacher expectations.

The hypothesis being tested is how AI can be harnessed to facilitate opportunities to improve equity in education by providing feedback and learning experiences to diverse populations in an inclusive and efficient manner. CGScholar AI Helper, as a scalable web platform, is designed to address resource disparities between school districts by meeting the personalized needs of students from diverse backgrounds across a number of factors: identity, cultural capital, and access to resources. The CGScholar AI Helper supports extended writing tasks, including multimodal texts with embedded images, diagrams, datasets, audio, and video. Its design aims to integrate formative and summative feedback seamlessly into the writing process. However, for the purpose of this paper, the research focuses exclusively on predominantly written texts, as prescribed by the participating teachers.

2. Context for CGScholar AI helper

Much debate about AI and its impact has grown since the launch of ChatGPT in November 2022 (Cope and Kalantzis, 2023), particularly concerning the possibility of students cheating when doing their assigned writing tasks.

Cheating, however, is one of the lesser issues that GPTs pose to education. Learning encompasses much more than just individual long-term memory, especially since a significant portion of this memory has been outsourced to the interconnected knowledge devices we carry. However, the teachers' concerns need to be recognized and addressed. The following is an account of a particular incorporation of GenAI in education, through the CGScholar AI Helper, which aims to provide a helping hand to both the teacher and the students in writing tasks and to demonstrate how AI's more negative potential can be curtailed in classroom contexts.

Writing, often regarded as a key skill for college readiness and employment (National Commission on Writing, 2004), is crucial for engaging with various disciplines, audiences, and forms, and is vital for participating in modern civic, workplace, educational, and life activities (National Commission on Writing, 2003)(Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Kalantzis & Cope, 2023; Kalantzis et al., 2012 [2016]). Nevertheless, recent NAEP results show a decline in writing performance in Grade 8 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019). In this context, Generative AI has significant potential to enhance students' writing practice and improve performance.

Formative assessment, which provides real-time feedback during the learning process, has long been a goal in education (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015; Kingston & Nash, 2011; Mahanan et al., 2021; Wiliam, 2011). However, its practical implementation has been inconsistent (Gurajala, 2020; Mahanan et al., 2021; Shepard, 2010). In prior CGScholar research, the primary investigators have developed an analytics application that uses both structured and unstructured data to give student feedback, track progress, and conduct summative assessments of student work (Cope & Kalantzis, 2019, 2023a). By incorporating Generative AI, the CGScholar AI Helper offers an additional and potentially more consistent method for formative assessment.

Research shows that Cognition and Metacognition becomes more efficient when individuals monitor and reflect on their thought processes (Bielaczyc et al., 1995; Bransford et al., 2000; Kay et al., 2013; Lane, 2012; Magnifico et al., 2013; Winne & Baker, 2013). Meta-analyses indicate that focusing explicitly on metacognition improves learning outcomes (Hattie & Yates, 2014; Hattie, 2009). The CGScholar platform and its AI Helper use a split-screen design to guide students through cycles of cognition (writing on the left) and metacognition (GenAI feedback and assessment on the right, reflecting on the writing process) - See Figure 02. The feedback section encourages interaction by prompting students to ask the GenAI for explanations on feedback, allowing the AI to "learn" from these queries.




Figure 02: The Learning Model

Inclusive Pedagogy and Assessment and critical literacy studies have long identified inherent biases in traditional literacy practices that can exclude individuals based on race, ethnicity, language, gender, and disability (Kalantzis & Cope, 2016; Ladson-Billings, 2016; Luke, 2018; Shor, 2009). Conventional assessment methods, including writing assessments,

have been critiqued for cultural or racial biases that disadvantage minority learners (Kalantzis et al., 2012 [2016]; Randall, 2021). One capability of GenAI through the CGScholar AI helper is to provide precise feedback on learners' writing, making it more sensitive to their diversity. However, a well-known issue with AI is "algorithmic bias," which can manifest along racial, cultural, and gender lines (Baker & Hawn, 2022; Christian, 2020; Crawford, 2021). The CGScholar AI Helper aims to develop and implement its own filters to flag biases and other issues that may bypass the filter. Designed with a browser-based interface, the CGScholar AI Helper adheres to the principles and standards of universal design for learning (CAST, 2018). Web interfaces have been recognized as an ideal medium for maximizing accessibility (Basham et al., 2010; Council for Exceptional Children, 2005; Israel et al., 2013; Israel et al., 2015; Marino et al., 2014).

The CGScholar AI helper offers opportunities for collaborative and personalized feedback since the tool can be customized to fit teachers' requests and expectations based on the materials used and the rubric chosen for the evaluation of the specific context. Students are able to present multiple versions of their work and ask the calibrated AI tool to provide feedback.

3. The CGScholar AI Helper and its Implementation

The process of implementing the CGScholar AI Helper in schools begins by integrating teaching materials, writing prompts, and rubrics from the teacher into the RAG knowledge database. These materials are processed through AI prompt engineering to align feedback with classroom expectations.

The initial trials were conducted in two high schools. The first one, referred to as School A, is a public school located in an underserved area in the Midwest region of the United States. The second one, referred to as School B, is a university laboratory high school, also located in the Midwest region of the US. The schools are very different in the sense that School A is located in a low socially advantaged area and receives students from different backgrounds, while School B selects its students from highly socially privileged families.

School A has 824 students enrolled in the 2024 school year, grades 9 to 12. Its demographics show that approximately 35% of the school population are white, 30% are Hispanic, and 24% are Black. The highest number of students are enrolled in grades 9 (n=233) and 10 (n=235), while there is a decrease in grades 11 (n=184) and 12 (n=175). The teacher-student ratio is 13 to 1. The school has a total dropout rate of 2.8%, mostly among the Hispanic population. Regarding low-income students, 99.6% represent the percentage of students at the school who are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches, live in substitute care, or whose families receive public aid (Illinois Report Card, 2023).

School B has 314 students enrolled in the 2024 school year, grades 8 to 12. According to the school demographics, around 35% of the school are Asian, the same percentage are white, while approximately 14% are Hispanic, and about 7% are Black. There is an even distribution of students enrolled in each grade: 8 (n=64), 9 (n=64), 10 (n=60), 11 (n=65), 12 (n=61). The teacher-student ratio is 9 to 1. The school has a zero dropout rate (Illinois Report Card, 2023). In addition, the data related to low-income students, which indicates the percentage of students eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches, live in substitute care,

or whose families receive public aid, is redacted. Therefore, this information is unavailable, unlike School A (Illinois Report Card, 2023).

Regarding the participating teachers, in School A, the participating teacher is a female English Language Arts (ELA) teacher who holds two master's degrees in education and is currently pursuing doctoral studies. In School B, the participating teacher is a male History teacher who holds a PhD in Education. Both teachers were enthusiastic about participating in the research. Both chose their 11th graders to be participants in the study. In School A, consent was obtained from 6 students, all from the same ELA class whose parents and they themselves granted permission to be participants in the pilot project. In School B, there were 61 participating students divided into 3 classes: 17 in the first class, 23 in the second, and 21 in the last class, all part of the History component.

During an initial conference with the teachers, the research team asked about the length of learners' required writing tasks, whether they would have an average required number of words, and whether they would consist of text-only or multimodal productions. Teachers were asked to share their own prompts with the research team. They were also asked about the content material and their rubric so that the RAG system could correspond to teachers' work and expectations before the AI Helper review was implemented.

The project for School A was called "The World on the Turtle's Back" Writing Assessment. The teacher's prompt was: "How are the Indigenous values of nature, balance, and tradition still seen today? Write a paragraph that analyzes the similarities with one of these values in both 'The World on the Turtle's Back,' translated by David Cusik, and an article, 'Returning 'Three Sisters' to Indigenous Farms Nourishes People, Land, and Cultures,' by Christina Gish Hill." To accomplish their work, students needed to read the aforementioned materials. Thus, digital versions of those reading materials were uploaded to the CGScholar RAG database. Additionally, the teacher provided the research team with her rubric, which involved the following criteria:

1. Compare and contrast: Compare/contrast author choices, central ideas, and interpretations for two or more passages or whole texts;
2. Identify: Identify and apply proper writing conventions;
3. Compose: Compose defensible claims in both individual paragraphs and an essay as a whole;
4. Introduce and Connect: Introduce and connect evidence to claim;
5. Support Evidence: Support evidence with detailed elaboration;
6. Analyze: Analyze how Indigenous culture is represented in society. In order to accomplish the task, the teacher informed us that students would write around 200 words.

The project for School B was called "The History of Democracy." Students were required to write a paper examining the history of democracy, analyzing the current situation of democracy, and proposing a path forward. To accomplish this, they needed to read classroom materials created by the teacher as well as the following materials:

- "Global Freedom Is in Decline, But What About Democracy?" from the website: <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/online-exclusive/global-freedom-is-in-decline-but-what-about-democracy/>
- Freedom House's "Global Freedom Status" map from <https://freedomhouse.org/explore-the-map?type=fiw&year=2024>

- The trend lens and the "Aggregate Category and Subcategory Scores, 2003–2024" document in the Freedom House archives
- The Political Handbook of the World from SAGE Publications
- Freedom House’s methodology from <https://freedomhouse.org/reports/freedom-world/freedom-world-research-methodology>
- The book "Democracy: A Very Short Introduction" by Naomi Zack
- Freedom House’s policy recommendations from <https://freedomhouse.org/policy-recommendations>

This assignment was part of group work, and the final draft was reviewed using CGScholar AI feedback based on the following criteria:

1. History of Democracy
2. The Current Situation
3. A Path Forward
4. Research
5. Analysis

After the teacher’s rubric was integrated into CGScholar and the resource materials were uploaded to the RAG database, the implementation with students began. When logging in, students saw the screen shown in Figure 02.




Figure 02: AI Helper home screen

Students logged in, selected "Works," added a title and subtitle of their choice, and then wrote their text in the document editor. Once students completed their drafts, they generated the AI Review. The AI Helper provided detailed feedback based on the teacher’s rubric and all the teaching materials uploaded to the AI Helper's knowledge base. By incorporating this feedback, students aligned their work with their teacher’s evaluation criteria.

Once feedback was generated, students observed the process for a few seconds, after which the results became available on the right-hand side of the screen, alongside the students’ writing task. CGScholar AI Helper displayed the following main topics chosen by the teacher as part of the rubric that informed the platform. Students could view each criterion graded by stars—from 1 to 4—followed by a thorough explanation of the grades assigned.

This process is illustrated in Figures 03 and 04:




Figure 03: The AI Helper ratings




Figure 04: A clip from the AI Helper feedback

In the next section, the research design is described in detail, along with the research questions and data collection process. Following this, the participants' reactions to the CGScholar AI Review implementation are discussed. The goal of this study was to understand the assistant's potential to improve students' writing skills and to provide support for teachers in ELA and History writing tasks.

4. Application in K-12: Reports on the First Two Trials on Grade 11

4.1 Research Design and Data Collection

The work plan for the research involved the development of the prototype for the new AI Helper module in CGScholar. To achieve this, the team employed fast-established strategies and cycles, which are part of a collaborative process that is well-suited to research-based software development and is lightly structured for diverse project teams (Martin, 2009; Stober and Hansmann, 2009).

This process ensured that the research team was closely engaged with trial teachers during the software development process outlined in this paper. Teachers had opportunities to share their impressions and make suggestions concerning the use of the CGScholar AI Helper and its functionality. One of the advantages of the agile methodology is that it allows for optimal use of the extended group's expertise, as each development cycle provides a natural juncture for individual researchers to move in or out of direct involvement in the software development process.

Some of the team members have recently published a detailed exposition of the approach, which has been termed “cyber-social education research” (Tzirides, Saini, et al., 2023). By utilizing these methods, the team successfully created advanced software that functioned effectively in the participating classroom settings. The incremental development cycles included design, planning, implementation, release, and evaluation phases.

Each week, the research team gathered to share a report on the implementation process, including newly released features, feedback from users, and proposed software updates for the next cycle. Upon each new trial, a functional evolution of the prototype was implemented, and the next development cycle was built upon that work. As part of this iterative process, the shared impressions of teachers and students were discussed and considered for incorporation. A post-survey was also used as part of data collection to help the research team improve the prototype and understand the extent to which AI Helper has the potential to enhance students' writing abilities and support teachers' work in ELA and History.

In the current research, this paper aims to answer the following research question: *To what extent does the CGScholar AI Helper have the potential to enhance students' writing abilities and support teachers' work in ELA and History?*

From a technical and prompt-engineering perspective, the system was trained using a combination of teachers' materials, writing prompts, and a sequence of assessment criteria drawn from teachers' work to provide detailed and systematic feedback to students.

The Research Design is illustrated in Figures 05 and 06.




Figure 05: The The Research Design steps




Figure 06: The Research Design phases

The study took place between August and December 2024, encompassing participant enrollment, trials, and data analysis. This timeline ensured seamless implementation, feedback collection, and iterative improvements. During the first three months, the recruitment of the two high school teachers described earlier and the initial software trials were conducted.

Following the research design, the first trials commenced after IRB approval. Recruitment letters, along with flyers, were sent to potential schools with assistance from the Director of School-University Research Relations at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. The research team ensured compliance with the Student Online Personal Protection Act (SOPPA). Informational meetings were organized with teachers to explain the study, discuss the proposed writing topics aligned with the curriculum, and outline the purpose of the CGScholar AI Helper tool. These meetings also emphasized the potential benefits of the tool in enhancing students' writing skills and supporting teachers' workload. To ensure proper implementation, training sessions were held for both teachers and students, focusing on how to effectively use the tool.

Throughout the research process, the team conducted regular check-ins with the participating teachers to provide ongoing support. Observations were made in classrooms to evaluate how the teachers integrated and utilized the tool, while participating students

provided feedback on its effectiveness in improving their writing assignments. For students who chose not to participate in the study, alternative assignments were provided by the teachers. These assignments, which did not require the use of the CGScholar AI Helper, ensured that all students engaged in meaningful learning activities aligned with the curriculum without any disadvantage to those who opted out.

At the conclusion of the implementation phase, an online post-survey was distributed to participating students and teachers to collect feedback. Additionally, a focus group interview was conducted with users from School A to gather more detailed insights about the tool's usability. This interview provided students with an opportunity to share their opinions on whether the AI tool made writing assignments easier, to evaluate its ease of use, and to assess how effectively it supported their classroom writing tasks.

The following section presents initial observations and preliminary findings derived from the teachers' and students' pre- and post-survey results.

5. Discussion

5.1 CGScholar AI Helper for Students

The research team trained all participants to utilize the platform and conducted a pre-intervention survey regarding their familiarity with AI and their future expectations of receiving AI feedback before the project implementation. The research team created CGScholar platform accounts and passwords for students.

The teacher provided a practical model of the CGScholar AI Helper by pre-loading a sample text and walking students through each step of the activity. This demonstration helped clarify the assignment structure and the responses expected from students. It also helped students better understand how to use the CGScholar AI Helper, even though the research team had previously explained it. The teacher provided a rubric to guide students in receiving AI feedback.

On the day of implementation in School A, the research team noticed that there were students with diverse writing levels who required different levels of support. For example, students with lower writing proficiency needed additional guidance to interpret and apply feedback and took a longer time to finish the activity. Students were tasked with completing their initial writings. After receiving the first round of AI Helper feedback, they were expected to revise their writings according to the input, which was based on the following criteria mentioned earlier in the paper: Compare and Contrast, Identify, Compose, Introduce and Connect, Support Evidence, and Analyze.

It was observed that students encountered the following challenges: time constraints, as the assignment allowed only 20 minutes for students to read and apply AI feedback. However, some technical delays made this difficult to manage. Additionally, many students felt the feedback was too long to read and implement within the given time. Students also struggled with tool navigation. They had to log in, generate initial feedback, revise their drafts, and then log out and log back in to generate a second round of feedback. This repetitive process involved many steps and took longer than anticipated.

Student reactions to the AI feedback provided by CGScholar are detailed below. Some students could see improvements in their scores, which meant that the AI Helper had provided them with valuable feedback for their further writing development. For example, one student from School A improved his writing in the Compare and Contrast criterion from 0 to 2. This meant that the student could hardly show any signs of comparison and contrast in his initial writing. However, after the first round of AI Helper feedback, he could identify some similarities and differences between two texts used in writing assignments, which resulted in a higher rating. Overall, according to initial findings, based on the students' writing data analysis, five out of six students improved their writing in at least one criterion.

The implementation revealed both strengths and areas for improvement. Regarding the teacher's support, the teacher made significant efforts in training, rubric guidance, and step-by-step assistance, which were very helpful in helping students navigate the AI Helper tool successfully. Furthermore, scaffolding made the process manageable, particularly for students requiring extra assistance. There were also some procedural challenges: the AI tool's interface was a bit complex and not optimized for school devices like Chromebooks. The Chromebooks presented issues such as a lack of shortcuts, and the AI Helper lacked features like automatic data saving and intuitive navigation for subsequent revisions after AI feedback. This limited students' autonomy and increased the teacher's and the research team's workload in School A.

It was found that student feedback on CGScholar AI Helper in School A mostly acknowledged that the feedback was useful for enhancing their writing.

- “[AI Helper] Told me exactly what I could do to improve. Got me to write it more as a college-like paper.”

They all added that they had never experienced AI before. They noted also that the feedback length was too long and some reported that the language used was hard to understand in some passages:

- “To me, the feedback given was for sure helpful but the text could’ve been shorter and explained what I could’ve done a bit better.”

These ideas match the teacher's post-survey feedback, where she stated “The students were very engaged in revision, but they were also overwhelmed by the amount of feedback. I suggest the feedback be written at an 11th grade reading level and be much shorter”.

The following key insights emerged from this first implementation in School A:

- the importance of structured setup,
- the need for organized login and setup procedures to streamline the start of activities,
- reducing the time needed for troubleshooting allowing students to focus on the assignment.

The teacher's guidance was essential to student success, in School A, particularly in the new digital environment. The teacher's voice was critical in leading the students through the instructional steps required to undertake the task and thus played a very important role in the trial's completion and success.

Another key finding relates to the need for tool familiarization. Both students and teachers would benefit from sufficient time to familiarize themselves with any new digital

tool before they are introduced into classroom practices. This would help prevent navigation issues and provide a smoother user experience. Based on the mentioned implementation limitations, the following key recommendations are suggested for future implementations:

- simplifying the platform's login and navigation process and reducing the number of clicks and steps involved to make the tool more user-friendly, particularly for younger students,
- extending the time for feedback application: increasing the time for students to read, reflect on, and apply the AI feedback, especially for students with less developed writing skills.
- Modifying the length and word choice of the AI feedback provided to align with student's capacities to action.

The second trial was conducted in School B. The initial meeting of the research involved, discussing possible dates, and writing assignments that could be part of the implementation. Request for the teacher's rubric, based on the curriculum. Scheduling a training session for the teacher on the use of CGScholar AI Helper.

During the teacher training session, the CGScholar interface was introduced, and the steps for enabling AI review were explained. The teacher was then instructed to provide the rubric and subject materials so the research team could upload them into the RAG system. The teacher asked ChatGPT to create a text based on the prompt he was using with students and uploaded it into CGScholar AI Helper in order to familiarize himself with the prototype and get to know the feedback provided. After that, accounts and passwords for the CGScholar platform were created for the students in order for them to have their training session later.

In the following week, students received their training. Since there were 3 groups, for the first one, the training was guided by the research team with the help of the teacher. For the second group, the teacher, who had become very familiar with the prototype, was responsible for delivering the training on how to use the platform, counting on the research team for support if necessary. In the third session, the teacher was also responsible for conducting the training and the research team was there only to clear up possible doubts. As with School A the teachers' authority and instructional guidance were critical in the successful introduction of a new digital tool to his students, who on this site, were more tech-savvy than those at site A. His class also had access to the school's tech support team. The participating teacher of School B, explained the procedures and the purpose of the task inappropriately adjusted, clear language. The student participants and the teacher demonstrated much enthusiasm for the project. It should be noted that some students had already experienced getting AI feedback before. They used ChatGPT before, but AI Helper is different because the tool uses all the teachers' materials and rubrics in the knowledge database, providing feedback on students' texts based on what they have been studying. The research team explained that difference to the students.

The high-performing set of students found the 4-star system rating too restrictive. Their teacher from School B reported that the 4-star rating was too simplistic and could be distracting: "My students are already too distracted by the stars and not paying close enough attention to the feedback that the assistant gives" (Teacher from School B). He suggested replacing the stars with points (0-10) or percentages. He referred to the stars as "basic" and

explained that the scoring should be tougher for his students. He suggested further, that having both stars and feedback on their work might be confusing for his students; explaining that if his high-performing students received 3 out of 4 stars, they might feel satisfied and not read the feedback for any particular criterion. However, student feedback from School B highlighted a different perspective: "I liked the star ratings and how in-depth the explanations were."

Given these findings, the following key recommendations are proposed for future implementation of the CGScholar AI Helper tool:

1. reconsideration of the star scoring system or even using different scoring systems for teachers to choose from,
2. improving CGScholar AI Helper's prompt analyzing features.

The implementation phase for School B was organized in an online format, students had a confirmed deadline to upload their writings which, different from School A, were generated in groups as part of the assignment. The research team created a separate box and Google Docs with open access for all research team members, so they could have immediate updates. According to the post-survey, students from School B, stated that the AI feedback encouraged them to strengthen their arguments and improve specific parts of the paper including the conclusion:

- "The AI Helper effectively pointed out parts of the assignment I overlooked/forgot about or would be useful if I included."
- "Told me I needed more evidence, and needed to expand more."
- "We learned that our conclusions should not just simply restate what we were talking but, especially in a History assignment. We should also try to explain the significance of this project."
- "We should also try to explain the significance of this project."

Similarly, to School A, some students in school B also reported that they found the amount of feedback provided by the CGScholar AI Helper was too long: "The feedback texts were very lengthy and wordy. I think it would be helpful if there was a summarizing sentence or two after each criterion."

Student from School A indicated that the feedback was clear, actionable, and encouraged more formal writing:

- "Told me exactly what I could do to improve," indicating that the feedback was clear and actionable.
- "Got me to write it more as a college-like paper," suggesting that the AI Helper encouraged more formal,
- "It helped me write better, although it should have given me more feedback on what exactly to work on."
- "That it helped me with punctuation."

Participants from both Schools A and B completed a pre-intervention survey about their familiarity with AI and expectations for receiving AI feedback prior to the project's implementation. The survey revealed that no students from School A had experience with GenAI, but most students from School B were familiar with GAI tools. In general, students

from both schools highlighted the value of the CGScholar AI Helper in improving their writing for history and ELA assignments.

5.2. CGScholar AI helper for teachers

It is hypothesized that the wide range of functions that AI can perform may take over some of the responsibilities that are part of teachers' jobs. Teachers need to allocate a certain amount of time to administrative tasks such as checking attendance, revising homework, classroom supervision, and completing paperwork. With the introduction of AI, teachers can not only rethink some of these tasks but also perform them much more efficiently with the use of AI (Chan et al., 2023). AI has great potential to help teachers with student assessment, as developments in natural language processing facilitate applications such as assessment scoring and automated feedback provision (Chen et al., 2020). As AI continues to integrate into classrooms and educational institutions all over the world, it is essential to understand teachers' perspectives on this transformative force (Uygun, 2024).

The AI Helper, for example, when it comes to writing, provides feedback based on the content of texts in specific subject areas, which is more detailed, timely, and tailored to the immediate learning needs of students. In the AI Helper implementation, the researchers collaborated with the teachers to test the tool and its abilities to support their students in enhancing their writing skills. Also, the AI tool used was populated with appropriate prompts and rubrics that aligned with mainstream education standards and the teachers' syllabi, rubrics, and goals, accessible both to humans (teachers and students) and the GenAI through specific, detailed prompt engineering. Key features associated with CGScholar AI Helper included:

- **Teachers** were able to edit their GenAI rubrics and prompts.
- They created their own writing rubrics based on discipline-specific writing assignments.
- It did not require technical expertise from the teachers to create and edit prompts.
- They also had the opportunity to visualize the feedback before the implementation and make changes to the prompts and the rubrics.
- In this way, all assessment criteria (GenAI prompts) and feedback provided were fully transparent, understandable, and accessible to all participants.
- **Students** had access to all prompts and rubric criteria, which were collaboratively developed by GenAI and the teachers.
- Once they received feedback, they were able to interact and ask GenAI additional questions, such as questions about anything they were unsure about or how something was written.
- This type of interaction with the AI tool allowed for more personalized writing instruction.

The components of CGScholar AI Helper that are directly linked to teachers' goals are represented in the next figure:

CGScholar AI Helper GenAI Components




Figure 08: CGScholar AI Helper Components

Strong collaboration and constant feedback from teachers throughout the implementation of the first two trial phases was crucial, as described in this paper. This constant communication provided the following suggestions for improvements and recalibration in the CGScholar AI Helper implementation in the future:

- Supporting student analysis and creativity. Teachers noted that while the AI provides guidance, it should avoid overstepping by suggesting specific topics or details. Students need to independently discover connections and engage in an intellectual effort to deepen their learning: “Telling the students that they need supporting information is different than telling them that and then showing them what that information is. The students still need to do the heavy intellectual lifting” (Teacher from School A).
- Making the tool more user-friendly involves making interface adjustments. One teacher suggested that the feedback sidebar should be larger, with a reduced typing area and larger font size to improve readability, particularly for students using Chromebooks: “Most schools use Chromebooks, and the font was too small on the screen for the students to read comfortably” (Teacher from School B).
- Enabling feedback loops so that teachers could adjust AI responses based on specific prompts and tasks. This would ensure that the tool meets learning goals more specifically. It would also ensure that AI Helper matches the curriculum goals in a more specific way.
- Improving AI Helper assessment strategies by differentiating high-quality and low-quality responses. That might be based on fine-tuning based on teacher-rated examples.
- Teachers also benefited from this collaboration. They became familiar with innovative educational technologies like the CGScholar AI Helper tool, which

can enhance their teaching practices by providing structured feedback and supporting students' writing development.

- The research team also provided personalized coaching and support to teachers, both in person and online, which can enhance their professional development and teaching effectiveness.
- Additionally, both teachers and students had a chance to contribute to educational research, influencing the development and refinement of educational tools that could benefit broader educational communities in the future.

5. Final Considerations

The main objective of the present paper was to investigate the extent to which the GenAI tool CGScholar AI Helper has the potential to enhance students' writing abilities and support teachers, specifically in ELA and History. The initial results show that the AI Helper has great potential to improve students' writing and support teachers in their instruction.

The AI Helper allowed timely and detailed feedback integrated into the teachers' specific content and subject. The GenAI tool brought benefits for both students and teachers. It helped the teachers with formative assessment during the learning process. The tool offered customization features, such as the possibility to insert and edit their rubrics, and add their activity prompts aligned with classroom-specific learning goals. There was a collaborative process between the research team, the participating teachers, and the AI developer. The collaborative communication promoted teachers' involvement in shaping the tool, increasing its effectiveness in these two diverse educational contexts.

The AI Helper is under research development and will consider the improvements suggested by the participating teachers and students along with the observation from the research team for the next phase of implementation. Iterative cycles of development and evaluation will continue as they are essential to realizing its full potential as a transformative educational tool in more real-world educational settings.

References

- Akgun, S., & Greenhow, C. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: Addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings. *AI and Ethics*, 2, 431–440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00096-7>
- Baker, R. S., & Hawn, A. (2022). Algorithmic bias in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 32, 1052–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00285-9>
- Basham, F. D., Israel, M., Graden, J., Poth, R., & Winston, M. (2010). A comprehensive approach to RTI: Embedding Universal Design for Learning and technology. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 33(Fall), 243-255.
- Bielaczyc, K., Pirolli, P. L., & Brown, A. L. (1995). Training in self-explanation and self-regulation strategies: Investigating the effects of knowledge acquisition activities on problem solving. *Cognition and Instruction*, 13(2), 221–252.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. National Academy Press.
- CAST. (2018). Universal Design for Learning guidelines. National Center on Universal Design for Learning. <https://udlguidelines.cast.org/>
- Chan, C., & Tsi, L. (2023). The AI revolution in education: Will AI replace or assist teachers in higher education? *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.01185>
- Chen, B., & Zhu, X. (2023). Integrating generative AI in knowledge building. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 5, 100184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100184>
- Christian, B. (2020). The alignment problem: Machine learning and human values. W.W. Norton.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. Routledge.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2015). Sources of evidence-of-learning: Learning and assessment in the era of big data. *Open Review of Educational Research*, 2(1), 194–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2015.1074869>
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2022). The Changing Dynamics of Online Education: Five Theses on the Future of Learning. In C. Lütge (Ed.), *Foreign Language Learning in the Digital Age: Theory and Pedagogy for Developing Literacies* (pp. 9-33). Routledge. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003032083-3>
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2023). Creating a different kind of learning management system: The CGScholar experiment. In M. Montebello (Ed.), *Promoting next-generation learning environments through CGScholar* (pp. 1–18). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-5124-3.ch001>
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2024). On cyber-social learning: A critique of artificial intelligence in education. In T. Kourkoulou, A. O. Tzirides, B. Cope, & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Trust and inclusion in AI-mediated education: Where human learning meets learning machines* (pp. 3–34). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-64487-0_1

- Cope, B., Kalantzis, M., & Zapata, G. C. (2025). Language learning after generative AI [Preprint]. In G. C. Zapata (Ed.), *Generative AI technologies, multiliteracies, and language education*. Routledge.
- Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. Yale University Press.
- Council for Exceptional Children. (2005). *Universal Design for Learning: A Guide for Teachers and Education Professionals*. Prentice Hall.
- Gurajala, S. (2020). Maximizing the Utility of Online Assessment Tools in the Pandemic Era: A Narrative Review. *Journal of Education Technology in Health Sciences*, 7(3), 80-85. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18231/j.jeths.2020.020>
- Hattie, J., & Yates, G. C. R. (2014). *Visible Learning and the Science of How We Learn*. Routledge.
- Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. Routledge.
- Israel, M., Maynard, K., & Williamson, P. (2013). Promoting Literacy-embedded Authentic STEM Instruction for Students with Disabilities and Other Struggling Learners. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 45(4), 18-25.
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2023). *Illinois Report Card*. <https://www.illinoisreportcard.com/>
- Israel, M., Wang, S., & Marino, M. T. (2015). A Multilevel Analysis of Diverse Learners Playing Life Science Video Games: Interactions between Gaming Content, Learning Disability Status, Reading Proficiency, and Gender. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, Advanced online publication*.
- Jones, J. W. (2024). AI in education: Some thoughts about ethics, equity, and social impact. In T. Kourkoulou, A. O. Tzirides, B. Cope, & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *AI in education: Advances and challenges* (pp. xx-xx). Cham, Switzerland: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-64487-0_3
- Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., Chan, E., & Dalley-Trim, L. (2016). *Literacies* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Kay, J., Kleitman, S., & Azevedo, R. (2013). Empowering Teachers to Design Learning Resources with Metacognitive Interface Elements. In R. Luckin, S. Puntambekar, P. Goodyear, B. L. Grabowski, J. Underwood, & N. Winters (Eds.), *Handbook of Design in Educational Technology*. Routledge.
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2025). Literacy in the time of artificial intelligence. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 60(1), e591:1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.591>
- Kingston, N., & Nash, B. (2011). Formative Assessment: A Meta-analysis and a Call for Research. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 30(4), 28-37.
- Lane, H. C. (2012). Cognitive Models of Learning. In N. Seel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning* (Vol. 1, pp. 608-610). Springer.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2016). “#Literate Lives Matter”: Black Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening in the 21st Century. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 65, 141-151. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336916661526>
- Luke, A. (2018). *Critical Literacy, Schooling, and Social Justice: The Selected Works of Allan Luke*. Routledge.

- Magnifico, A., Olmanson, J., & Cope, B. (2013). New pedagogies of motivation: Reconstructing and repositioning motivational constructs in new media-supported learning. *e-Learning and Digital Media*, 10(4), 484–512.
- Marino, M. T., Gotch, C. M., Israel, M., Vasquez, E., & Basham, J. (2014). UDL in the middle school science classroom: Can video games and alternate text heighten engagement and learning for students with learning disabilities? *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, 37(2), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731948713503963>
- McCarthy, J., Minsky, M. L., Rochester, N., & Shannon, C. E. (1955). A proposal for the Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence. <https://www-formal.stanford.edu/jmc/history/dartmouth/dartmouth.html>
- Mollick, E. R., & Mollick, L. (2023). Assigning AI: Seven approaches for students, with prompts. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.447599>
- Mahanan, M. S., Talib, C. A., & Ibrahim, N. H. (2021). Online formative assessment in higher STEM education: A systematic literature review. *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning*, 11(1), 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.37134/ajatel.vol11.1.5.2021>
- Martin, R. C. (2009). *Agile Software Development, Principles, Patterns, and Practices*. Prentice Hall.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). Technical summary of preliminary analyses of NAEP 2017 writing assessments. https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/subject/writing/pdf/2017_writing_technical_summary.pdf
- National Commission on Writing. (2003). The neglected "R": The need for a writing revolution. National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges.
- National Commission on Writing. (2004). Writing: A ticket to work ... or a ticket out - A survey of business leaders. National Commission on Writing.
- Ogurly, U., & Mossholder, J. (2023). The perception of ChatGPT among educators: Preliminary findings. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 8(1), 196–215. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2023.39>
- Peters, M. A., Jackson, L., Papastephanou, M., Jandrić, P., Lazaroiu, G., Evers, C. W., Cope, B., Kalantzis, M., Araya, D., Tesar, M., Mika, C., Chen, L., Wang, C., Sturm, S., Rider, S., & Fuller, S. (2023). AI and the future of humanity: ChatGPT-4, philosophy and education – Critical responses. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2023.2213437>
- Randall, J. (2021). 'Color-neutral' is not a thing: Redefining construct definition and representation through a justice-oriented critical antiracist lens. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 40(4), 82–90.
- Shepard, L. A. (2010). Formative assessment: Caveat emptor. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 28(3), 32–37.
- Stober, T., & Hansmann, U. (2009). Agile software development: Best practices for large software development projects. Springer.
- Tzirides, A. O., Saini, A. K., Cope, B., Kalantzis, M., & Sears-Smith, D. (2023). Cyber-social research: Emerging paradigms for interventionist education research in the postdigital

- era. In P. Jandrić, A. MacKenzie, & J. Knox (Eds.), *Constructing postdigital research* (pp. 86–102). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35411-3_5
- Uygun, D. (2024). Teachers' perspectives on artificial intelligence in education. *Advances in Mobile Learning Educational Research*, 4(1), 931–939. <https://doi.org/10.25082/AMLER.2024.01.005>
- Wiliam, D. (2011). *Embedded Formative Assessment*. Solution Tree Press.
- Winne, P. H., & Baker, R. S. J. D. (2013). The potentials of educational data mining for researching metacognition, motivation, and self-regulated learning. *Journal of Educational Data Mining*, 5(1), 1–8.