ON THE QUESTION OF ETHICAL APPLICATION OF LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS IN THE WRITING CLASSROOM

April Pameticky
Wichita East High School

Abstract
This reflective essay describes a year-long inquiry into the ethical and pedagogical implications of large language models (LLM) in secondary English classrooms. Written from the perspective of a National Writing Project participant, it traces the author's initial skepticism—rooted in concerns about plagiarism and the exploitation of creative labor—toward a more nuanced exploration of teacher-facing and student-facing applications. Practical examples include lesson planning, communication, and AI-assisted feedback, alongside cautions about authenticity, privacy, and overreliance. The article emphasizes the importance of preserving the drafting process as a space for reflection, discovery, and voice development, while considering AI's potential role in brainstorming, revision, and professional workload reduction. Drawing from interviews with writers and creatives, it also situates classroom use of AI within broader cultural debates about originality, commodification, and the value of human imperfection in art. Ultimately, the inquiry reframes the guiding question—*Can LLMs support writing instruction in ways that do not harm creativity or authenticity?*—as an ongoing challenge requiring both ethical discernment and a commitment to student-centered practice.

Keywords: artificial intelligence in education; large language models; writing instruction; National Writing Project; creativity; authenticity; teacher workload; student voice; ethics; educational technology

Introduction

Last fall I joined a cohort of educators exploring AI and classroom applications as part of the National Writing Project (NWP), specifically the NWP Midwest Teacher Initiative's Teaching in the Age of AI. This cohort included teachers and instructors at all levels of education, all interested in better understanding what impacts Large Language Models (LLM) and text-generative technology would have on the classroom.

One thing we all had in common is a belief in the power of writing, both from a student perspective and from a teacher perspective. As members of various chapters of the NWP, we've all sought professional development that leads to better writing instruction in the classroom. We've also all experienced the power of writing in our own lives.

My participation was voluntary and by invitation from the Flint Hills Writing Project (FHWP). I received no financial compensation for my participation. I did receive a review copy of a

text, which I've discussed on my blog and shared my feedback. We were asked to consider ways in which we might share our exploration and insight with a wider audience. I chose to post monthly (or bimonthly when my schedule allowed) on this blog: https://aprilplayswithai.wordpress.com/.

The cohort met once a month via Zoom to engage in discussion and collaboration, and regularly shared insight. Some participants have chosen to collaborate on a review article describing experiences and resources, to be published later. In addition, members of the FHWP (of which I am a member) will meet in person for panel discussions and presentations of our research in September.

As a culmination of my own inquiry project, I've decided to summarize and review experiences here. Rather than simply re-printing elements of the blog, I'll attempt to answer the inquiry question that I explored over these months. In full transparency, this is not an end for me in this exploration. The more I uncover and explore, the more questions I have about classroom applications. I want to reflect on my own deepening understanding of AI, and specifically LLMs.

This article will function as a practitioner piece, rather than a summative review of research. While I certainly employed some elements of qualitative research, especially when I engaged in dialog with Wichita creatives, I've used no systematic coding or review process of those interview responses, but rather a holistic approach to capture a greater understanding of how AI is *perceived* by those creatives who may be directly impacted or feel particularly threatened by its advent. I'm so grateful that they were willing to engage with me in this way; I've included a full list of those creatives and teachers who responded to my interview questions at the end of the article.

I read many, many books and articles. I've tried to keep track. I've created a reference page and appendices. These articles influenced my thinking and my own critical development. There has been an explosion of classroom resources over the last two years (specifically since OpenAI launched ChatGPT publicly). And most of it seems to encourage teachers to embrace all aspects of AI support into their teaching. This is not a position I readily adopt. If anything, the jump to utilize AI without reflection makes me leery.

Conversely, despite what I refer to as the AI Goblin Origin Story, I'm not against LLMs and their use as productivity tools. But I have established my own criteria and reached a measure of comfort after much personal reflection, in how I'd like to see AI used in my own classroom.

I began with the inquiry: *Is there an ethical way to implement AI into the classroom?*

Part 1: The Basics and Reframing the Question

Upon the release of public access to OpenAI's ChatGPT in November 2022, there was a panicked frenzy. Our focus was immediately on misuse, cheating and plagiarism. How were we going to catch kids engaged in academic dishonesty?

I implemented hand-written essays that spring semester to avoid the issue. I acknowledge now that the knee-jerk reaction was based in fear.

In fall 2023, still without exploring, utilizing, or even testing ChatGPT, I led a panel discussion at the annual Kansas Association of Teachers of English conference. And guess what? While a small minority had moved on from the "cheater" discussion, most of the questions were about teaching writing without plagiarism—the magic answer of which was, of course, hand-written essays. (I did especially appreciate the PowerPoint presentation about AI and openly created by AI by Bryan Anderson). And since I'm not a "cheater" and I do my own "thinking," I refused to even dip my toes into the AI pool.

During this, the writing and creative community of which I am a part, was dealing with the ramifications of just *how* ChatGPT had been "taught." I know of more than one writer who discovered that a portion of their intellectual property had been co-opted (I'll speak more to this later), but I can't separate the teacher from the creative, and so I came to the FHWP cohort interested in exploring teaching in the age of AI with my own baggage, fears, and perceptions. I've

tried very hard to put down my own biases, but I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge that I am far more concerned with the theft of creative work than I am with students plagiarizing using AI. Students have been cheating in some manner or other and will continue to do so. I can't teach effectively with the mindset that I have a burden to "catch them all." If it's a question of ethics, the first harm is in the devaluation of creative products in order to "teach" an LLM how to create similar products.

That initial question that I had (*Is there an ethical way to implement AI into the classroom?*) needed to become more precise if I was going to explore LLMs with an open mind: Can LLMs support writing instruction in the classroom in a way that does not harm creativity or authenticity?

This question allowed me to release some of my personal trepidation over the AI Goblin Origin story I wrote about in my blog, that AI innovators were feeding a hungry and destructive Audrey II, and instead explore AI applications in a pragmatic way that would directly impact my teaching. Whether I like it or not, there is no escaping AI's impact in the classroom, and we must be ready to face just *how* we're going to approach its use.

Part 2: Teacher-Facing AI

The publishing market is flooded with books on implementing AI, and as a new practitioner, this can be incredibly overwhelming. It's unclear which books truly have good applications, and which are just gimmicky books that feel like they were written by ChatGPT. And by the time these books hit the shelves, they are often outdated. The technology is moving faster than the speed of publishing.

What also was not clear to me was in which ways LLMs could benefit me without replacing me as the facilitator of learning. And let's be clear: there is a political and social push to take out the highly qualified teachers and replace them with someone less qualified and cheaper. There is a distinct impression by many armchair educators that teaching is somewhere between glorified babysitting and fact-regurgitating robotics. When also faced with budget cuts and increased enrollment, many teachers face large, overcrowded classrooms and a lack of support. There's not enough time in this article to address the cultural complexity facing educators today. But some effort must be made to address how AI and LLMs could fit into this environment. Teachers should absolutely feel free to implement assistance in whatever ways are congruent with their district expectations, and their own ethical considerations.

I return to my own question: *Can LLMs support writing instruction in the classroom in a way that does not harm creativity or authenticity?*

Lesson Planning / Alignment

There are many platforms now available, and more developing daily, that allow teachers to type in the learning outcomes, the time frame, and the materials available, and the LLM comes up with a fairly viable plan.

I myself have now used LLMs to create PowerPoint presentations on the following: Understanding Opinion verses Bias; The Biography of Henry David Thoreau, and the Top 5 Things You Can do to Prepare for the AP Language Exam. All required further tweaking and designing on my part, but also incredibly reduced my workload. I've created practice worksheets for a variety of grammar activities, and even used AI to assist me in creating unique writing prompts for creative writing students. The appendix includes a list of currently available apps.

Email / Newsletter / General Communication

Parent/guardian contact and communication is one of those professional expectations that those outside education often forget about. I'm also not suggesting that teachers use LLMs to write

those painful and personal emails when a student is not being successful in the classroom. This is not a substitute for that direct and all-important parent/guardian phone call. However, many of us are expected to write and contribute in some way to regular newsletter or email communication home, and this is where LLMs can reduce workload. In my case, I specifically used ChatGPT. I pasted in the previous week, prompted it to match the tone, structure, and length; then I just listed the specific details I wanted to include for this week.

Professional Development Articles

It is incredibly challenging to be a full-time classroom teacher and also keep up with all of the educational research that is being conducted. The teaching burden is too high. Even with district supported and implemented professional development, it often feels like things are moving faster than we can adapt and adjust. So, we fall back on what we've always done because we know that these practices work, and we know what to expect with outcomes.

Except that the lesson that worked last year may not be as effective or engaging this year. Or we find we want to add another learning objective to a previously attempted lesson, but we're not sure administration would support a curriculum change without data and evidence of success.

Research librarians at Kansas State University were the first to show me programs that actually summarize peer-reviewed articles and research. There are several apps listed in the appendix. At first, I was taken aback. I'm a reader–a good one, enthusiastic, critical, analytical. Why would I do that? I don't want machines to do my thinking for me.

But time is the most crucial commodity that I don't have enough of as a classroom teacher. I tested a couple of these summaries by reading the article for myself first and comparing the notes generated by AI to the notes I generated upon my original read; they did not differ significantly. While time-consuming initially, I have since turned over any number of large-readings tasks to these summary processes and have gained back time.

Part 3: Student-Facing AI

There are some critical pieces to student-facing AI interaction that I, at first, did not understand: Not all LLMs are compliant with FERPA or willing to protect the privacy of your students. Before creating student accounts for anything, first discuss what your district technology expectations are. Students (and frankly many adults) are accessing and using AI applications without even knowing or understanding the implications.

Writing is an incredibly complex cognitive process with many areas in which LLMs can play an assistant role, without fully replacing human creativity and human writing.

Last fall, around the time I was considering my AI inquiry project question, I overheard our building's College & Career Coordinator tell a student to run his college essay through ChatGPT for feedback. I cringed. It was a reflex response, and yet this colleague is one I respect and work closely with. She has a great deal of insight into the college admissions process and has steered many students toward unique and supportive learning opportunities. So, what was my problem with this advice? How was this any different than asking a trusted adult or an English teacher to read over that essay? As I was also in the middle of grading 60 class essays on my own grading pile, I had zero time to offer this particular student assistance.

Of all the academic writing I deal with at the high school level, the college essay is the one many students feel least prepared to tackle. It's tough to identify the qualities of a good college essay, and yet, I know one when I read it. Online advice can often be contradictory as well, with some sites telling students not to reveal too much personal information, and other sites encouraging a kind of vulnerable revelation. A good essay reveals something of the character of the student and shows the potential ways in which they might contribute a unique voice to the wider collegiate learning

community. That authenticity and strength of voice is incredibly challenging to teach and often runs contrary to the analytical essay format valued in history and English disciplines and is certainly the opposite of the objective voice taught in the sciences. The result, then, is that many students spend their last three years in high school doing very little of the kind of personal narrative writing that is so prized in a good college essay. That realization let me to the first way I was considering LLM support of student writing: feedback and revision.

Student Feedback / Student Grading

The biggest hurdle I face as a writing instructor is timely and appropriate feedback that helps young writers grow. I was concerned about utilizing anything that might not match my own rubrics and writing expectations.

There are several apps that allow for submission of classwork, and they align feedback with the teacher's rubric and an expressed set of criteria. But many students are going to be submitting work directly to platforms, and will lack the sophistication in understanding which feedback is useful for incorporation (e.g., yes, you *do* need a comma there), and which might not make for a stronger piece of writing (e.g., replacing the word *momma* with *mother*, even though the original word is far more revealing in its usage and tone for the circumstances of a college essay).

Speaking from one example, I had a class submit a set of 40-minute timed-write essays, based on an AP Language Argument prompt. For those unfamiliar with this essay type, upper-level students, typically juniors, are given a philosophical quote and are asked to support or challenge the quote's argument, based on their own experiences and observations of the world. These essays vary structurally, but must contain a strong thesis, supporting and specific evidence-based examples, and demonstrate strong control over language (e.g., academic vocabulary, conventions). And these essays are written in 40 minutes.

These are arduous. Students learn as much from their mistakes as their successes. By giving them a chance to revise them prior to submission, they get a chance to self-evaluate and strengthen their own writing. In the past, I've done this through a peer-review activity.

Hands down, the AI feedback was more useful than my previous peer-review activities, as far as helping students produce stronger essays. Based on my own control over the rubric and the feedback, they were not told how to fix an issue—only that there was one. They had to determine how to strengthen their logic and reasoning. Part of peer-reviewing is getting the opportunity to see how another student responded to the prompt, and that element was removed from this activity. While I missed the chance for students to see how varied "right" responses could be, on an individual level, this single-handedly may have reduced my reluctance to have AI provide feedback.

I did not have LLMs or AI grade for assessment purposes. It feels, in part, like an abdication of ultimate responsibility. That is one area in which I would like to continue to explore and consider. In the case of this activity, I still graded and evaluated the final submissions based on the very same rubric used to give AI feedback. That question of whether LLMs can support writing instruction in the classroom in a way that does not harm creativity or authenticity, and I did feel this was a positive opportunity.

Student Brainstorming / Prewriting

In a recent Pre-Service Teaching class, one educator told the group that they should consider AI a "Thought Partner." One major challenge that teachers will face is the extent to which they want LLMs used in the completion of learning activities in the classroom. I very much like the idea of a "Thought Partner" and especially appreciated it when a colleague also sent me an acceptable use rubric. Developed and released in April 2024 by the Oklahoma State Department of Education as

part of a guiding document that considers benefits and costs in utilizing AI in the classroom, this rubric gives guidance to both teachers and students.

Figure 1: Acceptable Use Rubric (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2024, p. 8)

	Level of AI Use	Full Description	Disclosure Requirements
0	NO AI Use	This activity is to be completed entirely without AI assistance. AI **MAY NOT** be used at any point during the activity. This level ensures that students rely solely on their own knowledge, understanding, and skills.	No AI disclosure required. May require an academic honesty pledge that AI was not used.
1	AI-Assisted Idea Generation and Structuring	No AI content is allowed in the final submission. AI can be used in the activity for brainstorming, creating structures, and generating ideas for improving work.	AI disclosure statement must be included disclosing how AI was used. Link(s) to AI chat(s) must be submitted with final submission.
2	AI-Assisted Editing	No new content can be created using AI. AI can be used to make improvements to the clarity or quality of student-created work to improve the final output.	AI disclosure statement must be included disclosing how AI was used. Link(s) to AI chat(s) must be submitted with final submission.
3	AI for Specified Task Completion	AI is used to complete certain elements of the task, as specified by the teacher. This level requires critical engagement with AI-generated content and evaluating its output. The student is responsible for providing human oversight and evaluation of all AI-generated content.	All AI-created content must be cited using a proper citation. Link(s) to AI chat(s) must be submitted with final submission.
4	Full AI Use with Human Oversight	Students may use AI throughout the activity to support their own work in any way the educator allows. AI should be a 'co-pilot' to enhance human creativity. The student is responsible for providing human oversight and evaluation of all AI-generated content.	Cite the use of AI using a proper citation. Link(s) to AI chat(s) must be submitted with final submission.

I plan to adapt a version of this to use in my high school English classroom starting in fall 2026. I want to model appropriate and ethical AI use in the pre-writing/brainstorming phase, and in the revision/editing phase. Conversely, I will not allow LLMs to play a direct role in the drafting phase. As a writing instructor, it is my job to build writing competencies, and there are just no shortcuts for this. We can't skip over that marathon training before the big race, any more than we can expect students to write on demand comfortably if we never expect them to write on demand.

There's a further, and far more important reason I'll implement this expectation of the personal draft: writing as discovery. The notion that we do not know what we *think* about something until we *write* about it is not new. But it certainly seems to have fallen out of practice. I have been so focused on teaching students how to create a product, I've forgotten the magic of writing as process, writing as discovery, writing as reflection. Because of that, students have not learned to value their own thinking and their own personal voice. There's also a lack of appreciation for the journey of learning, of gaining new knowledge through a process of consideration and reflection. We are very used to Googling instantaneous answers. And if the recent MIT Media Lab study (Kosmyna et al., 2025) proves to be correct, we don't retain that instantaneous knowledge. Chow (2025) summarized the study in an online *Time* article:

> Researchers used an EEG to record the writers' brain activity across 32 regions, and found that of the three groups, ChatGPT users had the lowest brain engagement and "consistently underperformed at neural, linguistic, and behavioral levels." Over the course of several months, ChatGPT users got lazier with each subsequent essay, often resorting to copy-and-paste by the end of the study.

It comes as no surprise to me that these participants didn't remember what "they" had written since they didn't create the thought connections in the first place.

Evaluation and Assessment of Student Writing

As I mentioned, I am not comfortable leaving the grading and assessment to AI. But I've also been deeply considering my own role as assessor and rubric creator. I often fall back on elements from two different assessment tools: 6+1 Trait Rubric and the AP Language/Literature 6-Point Rubric.

Figure 2: 6+1 Trait Rubric (Education Northwest, 2021)

Trait	**Description**
Ideas	The main message, content, and details that support the topic.
Organization	The internal structure of the piece, including a clear beginning, middle, and end.
Voice	The writer's unique style, tone, and personality that come through in the writing.
Word Choice	The vocabulary used to convey meaning effectively and precisely.
Sentence Fluency	The rhythm and flow of sentences; how well the writing reads aloud.
Conventions	The correct use of grammar, punctuation, spelling, and mechanics.
Presentation	The piece is easy to read, polished in presentation, and pleasing to the eye.

Figure 3: A simplified version of the AP Language 6-Point Rubric (College Board, 2019)

Points	**Category**	**Description**
1	Thesis	Clearly states a claim that is arguable and responds to the prompt
1-4	Evidence	Uses appropriate evidence with supporting commentary that clearly supports the thesis and develops a line of reasoning
1	Sophistication	Demonstrates control over language and a sophisticated level of thinking

The issue for me is that neither of these allow for personal connection and reflection in their evaluation, or do they seem to fairly value "voice." In fact, ideas and organization on the 6-traits are usually weighed far heavier on a point scale than the other categories. And while the AP Language rubric asks for a developed line of reasoning, essays feel inherently more organized when students *know* what they think before they start writing and state that thesis early.

So as a next-step element of my own action plan, I will carefully evaluate the writing tasks in my class to deliberately incorporate more reflective writing as practice.

Before moving into Part 4, let me clarify the initial answer to my inquiry question: *Can LLMs support writing instruction in the classroom in a way that does not harm creativity or authenticity?*

Harm seems to come from depriving students the opportunity to practice the drafting process in a meaningful and reflective way. While LLMs can be helpful in the pre-writing or brainstorming phase, it's incredibly important that students draft on their own whenever possible to build up stamina and competency. Feedback and revision can be provided by LLMs, as long as students exercise some understanding and control over tailoring that feedback to meet the rhetorical needs of that specific writing (i.e., ChatGPT doesn't always get the nuance of knowing one's audience).

Part 4: What do Creatives have to say about it?

As my question implies, I place a great deal of inherent value in creativity. Perhaps this comes from the fact that I'm also a practicing creative and have worked as a performer and poet for the last decade. I couldn't escape my need to have these conversations about creativity with others over the course of this inquiry project and found at some point that this exchange started to take precedence over other avenues of exploration. As soon as my peers and colleagues learned I was exploring AI, they went out of their way to engage with me and share their feelings. At some point, I felt the need to streamline this process so that I was more consistent in the questions I asked, and I wanted a way to keep a record of their responses and share them with a wider audience.

Let me back up. While I focused on LLMs and prompt-based AI for classroom application, in terms of the creative fields, AI is the reason for the Hollywood Writers Strike in 2023 (Wong, 2023). The fears of creative work being stolen or the work of legitimate creatives being replaced by computer-generated material is valid. Considering issues like the Spines publishing company and their mission to release 8,000 AI-generated books in 2025 (Battersby, 2024), artists are facing real threats. George R.R. Martin, John Grisham, Jodi Picoult, and many other writers filed a class-action lawsuit against OpenAI in September of 2023 (Madigan, 2024). Comedian Sarah Silverman also sued OpenAI for copyright infringement (Madigan, 2024). In the meantime, over 10,000 authors signed an open letter calling on AI industry leaders to obtain consent and compensate writers for the use of their work (Wong, 2023). OpenAI responded by creating an OptOUT option for users to choose not to have their data utilized in training models (Madigan, 2024). As corporations imply that artists overvalued their work, this further diminishes the claims, fears, and concerns of creatives.

The Big Picture from the creative interview pool:

Across these five interviews and my own blog posts documenting this inquiry project (Pameticky, n.d.), a deeply nuanced and often impassioned conversation emerged around creativity, discipline, and the role of AI in writing. One shared theme is the importance of sustained creative practice and discipline. Nearly all creatives, whether traditionally published or self-starting, emphasized the value of showing up regularly to the page, embracing imperfection, and trusting the long arc of their development. Creativity, for them, was not a lightning bolt but a cultivated habit. This ties directly into another common thread: the rejection of writing as a passive or commodified act. These artists resist the idea that writing is merely output; instead, they view it as emotional labor, cognitive effort, and deep personal engagement.

A particularly forceful point of agreement concerns AI as a threat to originality and human uniqueness. While a few participants offered cautious acknowledgment that AI might serve utilitarian functions (editing, organization, accessibility), the dominant view was one of suspicion or outright hostility.

AI is widely perceived not only as artistically insufficient but as a mechanism of capitalist commodification, a viewpoint that I am coming to share. Its regular use tends to flatten prose, erase individuality, and reward mediocrity. AI represents a dangerous intrusion into a space that has always been deeply, idiosyncratically human.

Connected to this is the fear of homogenization and loss of voice. Writers like Jason Quinn Malott argue that the overuse of AI tools in publishing has already started to genericize literary voice, prioritizing readability and profitability over originality or emotional impact. Others echoed similar concerns, describing AI as a tool that makes writing easier at the cost of complexity, depth, or surprise. This concern also surfaces in conversations about education and access: several interviewees were skeptical or outright critical of using AI as a writing aid in the classroom, arguing that it short-circuits the process by which students learn to think critically and write with purpose.

Another recurring theme is resistance to automation in the creative process. Most writers felt strongly that automation has no place in the soul of creative work. While some acknowledged the role of technology in revising or organizing, they drew a clear line at content generation, seeing it as a violation of the artistic struggle that gives writing meaning. Related to this is a broader philosophical belief in the imperfection and vulnerability of human expression as essential to art. References to concepts like "wabi-sabi" and personal anecdotes about emotional roughness in voice or prose reinforced the belief that human flaws are not failures but features of true creative work.

Several voices also touched on the danger of AI-generated content flooding markets and displacing human labor, particularly in the context of digital publishing. Jason Quinn Malott references Clarkesworld's shutdown in response to AI submissions as a harbinger of worse things to come, where novelty and human distinctiveness are drowned by algorithmic content farming.

Finally, there is a strong sense that art is not just about content or execution—it is about ethics, humanity, and resistance. Whether through outright rejection of AI tools or by emphasizing the irreplaceable aspects of creative consciousness, these writers present art as a defiant, necessary act of being human in the face of automation and economic pressure.

Selected Quotes Revealing Shared Attitudes:

On the value of human imperfection:
"Writing is an art, an act of perfectly flawed, beautiful human striving." – *Jason Quinn Malott*
"Sometimes, a messy paragraph is where your voice lives. Clean it too much and you wash it away." – *Luann Fox*

On AI flattening or replacing originality:
"AI isn't a threat to originality: it's the death of originality." – *Jason Quinn Malott*
"It's not helping you write—it's helping you repeat. That's the difference." – *Gretchen Cassel Eick*

On creativity as a form of discipline:
"I get up every morning and put ass-in-chair for at least an hour, and I've been doing that for twenty-eight years." – *Jason Quinn Malott*
"Writing is like tending a garden—you water it every day or it dies." – *HB Berlow*

On resisting commodification of writing:
"Creative writing has never been fundamental… storytelling is fundamental to the human spirit." – *Jason Quinn Malott*

"If it's just for profit, it's not art. It's marketing." – *Taiomah Rutledge*

On AI and education:
"Before students can use AI, they need to learn critical thinking skills … otherwise, the chatbots will end up using the students." – *Jason Quinn Malott*
"If AI writes the essay, then the student didn't think. And that's the point." – *Gretchen Cassel Eick*

On technology's ethical implications & resisting cultural laziness:
"AI doesn't enhance or diminish human creativity: it diminishes humanity itself." – *Jason Quinn Malott*
"What the fuck is a reluctant writer?" – *Jason Quinn Malott*
"Not everyone should write a novel. That's OK. But don't fake it with prompts and a bot." – *Luann Fox*

Part 5: Conclusion and discussion of Implications

The writing and general collection of information for this predated the release of MIT's fascinating study on cognitive capacity and the impact of the use of ChatGPT over a period of time (Chow, 2025; Kosmyna et al, 2025). I believe that study, which has entered the public pop-culture discourse, will not be the last study of its kind, and will be the underpinning to potential shifts in the enthusiasm for embracing AI's use in the classroom.

Classroom writing instruction must fundamentally change, moving away from a product-based essay model, toward a reflective practice that values voice and critical thinking: essentially, show *how* you know what you know, rather than just showing *what* you know. And any NWP teacher will say that this is not actually a new idea, but AI is forcing the issue. Teachers need tools that allow for and account for AI-modeled use to help students understand ethical use in completing assignments. Teachers also need support in shifting activities and lesson plans *away* from previous learning models.

Teachers must differentiate between different types of cognitive load tasks so that students understand the relevance of struggling to develop a unique and valued voice. Culturally, we as consumers of creative output will need to be incredibly mindful about what kinds of art we wish to invest in. We may very well come to value the flawed over the flat pristine. As consumers, it would be helpful if products came with identifying labels as to the percentage or the ways in which LLMs were used in the drafting process.

Moving forward, I am interested in how my students feel about LLMs and AI, and have recently conducted informal surveys measuring their attitudes. Addressing that question, "Can LLMs support writing instruction in the classroom in a way that does not harm creativity or authenticity?" I have not arrived at a definitive answer, only more questions. I believe that creativity and authenticity are only possible when the human element is centered in the process, and I plan to move forward this year with more exploration of AI applications in a student-centered manner.

References

Barshay, J. (2024, June 17). PROOF POINTS: Teens are looking to AI for information and answers, two surveys show. The Hechinger Report. https://hechingerreport.org/proof-points-teens-ai-surveys

Boryga, A. (2024, November 27). How AI will impact the future of teaching—a conversation with Sal Khan. Edutopia; George Lucas Educational Foundation.

https://www.edutopia.org/article/how-ai-will-impact-the-future-of-teaching-a-conversation-with-sal-khan

Battersby, M. (2024). New publisher Spines aims to "disrupt" industry by using AI to publish 8,000 books in 2025 alone. The Bookseller. https://www.thebookseller.com/news/new-publisher-spines-aims-to-disrupt-industry-by-using-ai-to-publish-8000-books-in-2025-alone

Chow, A.R. (2025, June 17). ChatGPT may be eroding critical thinking skills, according to new MIT study. *Time*. https://time.com/7295195/ai-chatgpt-google-learning-school/

College Board. (2019). AP English language scoring rubrics. https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/media/pdf/ap-english-language-and-composition-frqs-1-2-3-scoring-rubrics.pdf

Education Northwest. (2021, March). Resources: 6 + 1 Trait Rubrics. https://educationnorthwest.org/resources/61-trait-rubrics

Efremkin, K. (2025, February 6). Teaching young students how to overcome cognitive overload. Edutopia. https://www.edutopia.org/article/cognitive-overload-elementary-school

George Couros. (n.d.). https://georgecouros.com/

Hargrave, M., Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2025). *The artificial intelligence playbook*. Corwin Press.

How AI vaporizes long-term learning. (2025, January 28). Edutopia. https://www.edutopia.org/video/how-ai-vaporizes-long-term-learning

Kosmyna, N., Hauptmann, E., Yuan, Y.T, Situ, J, Liao, X.H, Beresnitzky, A.V, Braunstein, I, & Maes, P. (2025, June). Your brain on ChatGPT: Accumulation of cognitive debt when using an AI assistant for essay writing task (Preprint]. MIT Media Lab. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2506.08872v1

Langreo, L. (2023, March 6). How to use artificial intelligence to bolster students' creativity. *Education Week*. https://www.edweek.org/technology/how-to-use-artificial-intelligence-to-bolster-students-creativity/2023/03

Madigan, K. (2024, July 25). Mid-year review: AI lawsuit developments in 2024. Copyright Alliance. https://copyrightalliance.org/ai-lawsuit-developments-2024/

Miller, M. (2023). AI for educators: Learning strategies, teacher efficiencies, and a vision for an artificial intelligence future. Dave Burgess Consulting.

MLA-CCCC Joint Task Force on Writing and AI. (2023, July). Working paper: Overview of the issues, statement of principles, and recommendations. Modern Language Association Conference on College Composition & Communication. https://aiandwriting.hcommons.org/working-paper-1/

Mollick, E. (2024). *Co-intelligence: Living and working with AI*. Penguin.

Mollick, E. (2023, June 18). One useful thing. Substack. https://www.oneusefulthing.org/

Oklahoma State Department of Education. (2024, April 30). Guidance and considerations for using artificial intelligence in Oklahoma K-12 schools. https://oklahoma.gov/content/dam/ok/en/osde/documents/services/standards-learning/computer-science/Guidance-and-Considerations-for-Artificial-Intelligence-in-Oklahoma-Schools_0.pdf

Pameticky, A. (n.d.). April plays with AI [blog]. https://aprilplayswithai.wordpress.com/

Spencer, J. (2024, September 19). *How Will AI Transform the Teaching Profession? Four Trends to Consider*. John Spencer. https://spencereducation.com/4-trends-transform-teaching/

Toddle. (2024, November 27). Doing more of what matters: Leveraging AI in the classroom with Matt Miller. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pcs70miSYO4

Wheeler. S. (2018, May 17). More or less human. Radiolab Podcasts. WNYC Studios. Retrieved April 17, 2023. https://radiolab.org/podcast/more-or-less-human

Wong, W. (2023, September 26). Actors strike over AI: A glimpse of workers' future? Aibusiness.com. https://aibusiness.com/responsible-ai/the-human-consequences-of-ai-in-hollywood

AI and LLM Apps

Several AI programs excel at summarizing peer-reviewed articles:

1. QuillBot offers a free and user-friendly summarization tool with both key sentence and paragraph modes.
2. Scribbr provides an AI-powered academic writing assistant with a summarization feature.
3. Jasper AI is another strong option, particularly for those seeking a versatile and effective summarization tool.
4. Gemini stands out for its multimodal understanding, processing text, images, and charts within research papers.
5. Other notable tools include SMMRY, Notta, and Wordtune.

Here are additional sources to consult:

- Critical AI Literacy for Educators, curated by Kansas University's Kathryn Conrad and Sean Kamperman
- Educator's Technology
- Cult of Pedagogy: Technology

Creative Participants

Participants	Expertise	Interview Process	Final Publication Format
HB Berlow	Crime fiction author and podcaster	Informal discussion Email discussion	Interview blog
Taiomah Rutledge	Indigenous artist and creative; community activist	Informal discussion Email discussion	Interview blog
Gretchen Cassell Eick	Near-future fiction author and professional historian	Book talk on *Resistance* In-person interview Email discussion	Guest blog / article
LuAnn Fox	Veteran educator and literacy specialist	Email questionnaire	Interview blog
Jason Quin Malott	Literary fiction author and culture critic	Email questionnaire	Interview blog

Generative AI disclosure statement: The abstract was generated by ChatGPT on September 16, 2025, based upon the following prompt: *create an abstract of no more than 200 words, and a list of key words for this article*. ChatGPT was also used to synthesize the thematic elements of five interviews conducted for the "Big Picture from the creative interview pool" section of this article. No other use of AI, LLMs, or other artificially generated thought-partners were used in the direct authorship or revision of this article.

Author Biography

Mother, wife, teacher, poet. April Pameticky shares time between roles as public school educator at the largest high school in the state of Kansas, and peer facilitator within the creative community of artists and writers in Wichita. She launched the *Wichita Broadside Project* and has served as editor of *Voices of Kansas*, an online poetry journal focused on the youth of Kansas, sponsored by the Kansas Association for Teachers of English, for which she has also served as a board member since 2013, and currently serves as Vice President. She is currently a doctoral student at Kansas State University, studying teacher efficacy and the advent of AI technology as it affects writing pedagogy and methods. Her latest poetry collection *with concern for how words land in the body* will be released June 2026 from Spartan Press. April can be reached at aspameticky@gmail.com, @aprilinwichita, and https://aprilpameticky.com.