

# Educators' Perspectives on AI in Education

By Estelle Ciesla, Ryan Heshmati, Evelyn Tsoi, and Siya Verma / January 2025

## IN THIS FACT SHEET:

- ▶ Survey results on educators' perspectives on AI in education
- ▶ Key takeaways on AI policy considerations for governance teams, including that educators favored:
  - » Using AI for schoolwork
  - » Schools providing guidelines and use policies for AI use
  - » Warnings for student misuse of AI, as opposed to punitive measures
- ▶ Resources for AI in education

Faced with the lack of regulations related to artificial intelligence (AI) in their schools, a group of high school students from the San Francisco Bay Area decided to take action. They started by asking U.S. high school students, and later U.S. high school teachers, how they thought AI should be regulated in schools. Partnering with the [Stanford Deliberative Democracy Lab](#), they used the Deliberative Polling method — a democratic exercise that shows what a sample of the public thinks when it is well-informed about an issue. The first Deliberative Poll, held in October 2023, brought together more than 100 students nationwide. The second, in June 2024, involved more than 80 educators who came together to discuss the following questions:

- ▶ Should AI tools be used in schools, and if so, when and how?
- ▶ How can we ensure that students do not use AI tools to cheat or plagiarize?
- ▶ Could AI tools negatively impact students' critical-thinking skills?

- ▶ How can schools leverage AI tools for the benefit of the students' education?
- ▶ Can students and educators use AI tools responsibly?

In a meeting with CSBA's AI Taskforce: Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence, Stanford faculty and student researchers agreed to publish their findings in a pair of fact sheets. The resources aim to provide governance teams with the perspectives of those affected most by this technology — students and educators. This fact sheet is the second in the series and summarizes results from a second deliberative exercise with educators on their perspectives of AI in education. The first fact sheet in this series can be found [here](#).

## Methodology

Deliberative polling is designed to foster discussions on important public policy issues. Researchers facilitate small group deliberation and plenary sessions with policy experts. All participants receive resources and materials before the group deliberations.

Two surveys were conducted to gather educators' opinions on AI policies — one before and one after the facilitated deliberations. Educators were provided a series of proposals about AI use in education for consideration and asked to indicate their support for each proposal. This approach allows for measuring shifts in opinion resulting from the discussions. An increase in support for a proposal may suggest that participants encountered new information that made the proposal more compelling, while a decrease in support indicates they discovered factors that made them less favorable toward the policy.

Of the 80 educators that participated, 75 completed both surveys. These results are therefore only indicative of the opinions of those who filled out both surveys. It is also important to note that educators self-selected to participate, and therefore the results reflect the opinions of this sample only and cannot be generalized to the entire U.S. high school teacher population.

## Results

### *Experience and perceptions of AI*

Eighty-eight percent of educators in the sample had experience with AI tools such as ChatGPT and expressed high interest in spending more time exploring these tools. The deliberations left educators feeling that AI had a more positive impact on their school environments and personal lives. A similar effect was observed for students, although they generally assessed AI to have more of a positive impact than educators.

Participants were asked to select from statements reflecting their understanding of AI. The statement that received the most support from both students and educators was that AI tools may misinterpret user questions or provide incorrect responses based on imperfect or incomplete data. Among teachers, the statement, “Using AI in schools will prepare students for the job market” saw the most significant shift in opinions, with agreement increasing from 55 percent to 77 percent after deliberation. In contrast, student agreement with this statement remained steady at 54 percent both before and after deliberations. The statement that lost the most support among teachers following deliberation was, “Students will become dependent on AI tools to complete schoolwork,” with agreement dropping from 60 percent to 47 percent. Interestingly, student agreement with this statement increased slightly as a result of deliberations, rising from 58 percent to 59 percent.

Three statements failed to gain majority approval from educators, both before and after deliberations:

- ▶ The increased use of AI tools will lead to students losing their ability to think critically
- ▶ AI-generated work is difficult to recognize
- ▶ Educators will become dependent on AI tools

In contrast, students showed majority approval for the statements above, except for “AI-generated work is difficult to recognize.” Forty-nine percent of students surveyed agreed that AI-generated work is difficult to recognize compared to thirty-six percent of educators.

### **AI regulation in high schools**

Similar to the student poll, the most widely supported policy proposal among educators was that schools should provide guidelines and resources on AI usage, with an average of 90 percent agreeing both before and after deliberation. One participant noted, “We can probably all agree that at the beginning of the year, we have too much training, and a lot of it isn’t really useful or worth our time. If this is the future, then this would be 100 percent worth our time to be trained on.” The most significant shift in opposition among educators was to the proposal “AI tools should be banned on school devices and school internet,” with opposition rising from 60 percent

to 81 percent after deliberation. While a majority of students also opposed this proposal before and after deliberations, their opposition only increased from 54 percent to 58 percent. Overall, teachers were more strongly opposed to banning AI than students were.

Both students and educators favored corrective policies over punitive measures for AI-related offenses. Consistent with the student poll results, the most supported penalty (77 percent) among educators was, “Students who violate their school’s AI policy should be subject to a warning and/or grade deduction.” However, for repeated AI-related offenses, educators were less supportive of more severe consequences (41 percent) such as grade deductions and/or suspensions or expulsions.

When it came to limiting their own use of AI, educators strongly opposed all proposals to do so. They were against restrictions on AI detection tools for verifying the authenticity of student work, as well as on AI grading assistants and the use of AI to create teaching materials such as curricula, worksheets, and essay prompts.

One educator, while discussing AI grading assistants, emphasized the practical benefits:

*I have about 150 students that I have to grade essays for ... so I find myself using AI to help grade the students’ work sometimes. I do go back, and I check to make sure that AI is grading to the standards that I want my students to be writing. It has helped me a lot because I’m not wasting my entire planning period reading 100 essays every single week and I’m able to use that time to do other things I need to do to prepare for my class.*

In contrast, students supported limiting the use of AI for verifying the authenticity of their work, grading their assignments, and creating teaching materials. The stark difference in perspectives between educators and students underscores the varying impact AI has on each group, highlighting the importance of involving both in discussions about regulating AI in high schools.

Finally, educators were asked where they place their trust. Before and after deliberations, only seven percent trusted social media platforms and just 24 percent trusted the creators of AI tools. Instead, they placed the highest trust in their schools (73 percent post-deliberation) and people in their communities (60 percent post-deliberation). Similarly, students also trusted their schools and community members the most, with fewer than half expressing trust in AI tool creators and social media platforms. However, students were generally more trusting of new technologies than their teachers.

## Key takeaways

The following are important items for governance teams to consider when designing policies on AI usage in schools:

- ▶ **Broad support for AI:** After deliberations, a majority of both students (62 percent) and educators (72 percent) supported the use of AI as a resource for schoolwork.
- ▶ **Opposition to AI bans:** Educators (81 percent) were more strongly opposed to banning AI tools on school devices and the internet than students (58 percent) after deliberation.
- ▶ **Top policy proposal:** The most favored policy was, “Schools should provide guidelines and resources to teach students how to use AI responsibly,” with 90 percent of educators supporting it.
- ▶ **Preference for corrective penalties:** Both students and teachers favored corrective measures, such as warnings or grade deductions, over punitive actions for unauthorized AI use.
- ▶ **Divergence on AI use by teachers:** Teachers opposed restrictions on their own AI usage for tasks like grading or creating materials, whereas students supported such limitations.
- ▶ **Trust in technology:** Students showed more trust in new technologies like social media and AI than teachers.

Overall, the results of this exercise indicate that high school educators, as well as students, believe that AI use should be responsibly regulated to prevent harmful biases and the spread of misinformation; however, the numerous benefits to the classroom must be kept in mind when crafting AI policy.

## Resources

The Stanford Deliberative Democracy Lab encourages students and educators to use the materials from this deliberative event for discussions in classrooms across the country. Find more information [here](#), along with other surveys on AI in education on Stanford’s Deliberative Democracy Lab [website](#).

### California School Boards Association

CSBA’s AI Taskforce is aimed at equipping boards of education with the necessary knowledge and tools to navigate the complexities of integrating AI into the work of public school districts and county offices of education. The task force’s online library features a [Resources and News](#); a page for [Scenarios and Resolutions](#) to peruse resolutions LEAs have already passed and explore a list of AI-related scenarios that board members have experienced (including policy implications); and a [Promising Practices and Policies](#) page, which includes details on successful practices in California. <https://csba.pub/ai-taskforce>

---

## California Department of Education

### Artificial Intelligence in California: Learning with AI, Learning about AI

<https://bit.ly/4iKAr2H>

---

## AI for Education

### GenAI Chatbot Prompt Library for Educators

<https://bit.ly/3ZYV1ow>

### Chatbot Cheat sheet

*A comparison chart of the different AI chatbots currently available that breaks down the key features, costs, and limitations of popular AI platforms.*

<https://bit.ly/3P158mo>

**Estelle Ciesla** is a full-time research assistant at Stanford’s Deliberative Democracy Lab.

**Ryan Heshmati** is a senior at Saratoga High School in California.

**Evelyn Tsoi** is a senior at Arcadia High School in California.

**Siya Verma** is a freshman at the University of Pennsylvania.

Their research was supported by **Alice Siu, Ph.D.**, associate director, Deliberative Democracy Lab Senior Research Fellow, Center on Democracy, Development and the Rule of the Law.



**Stanford** | Deliberative  
Democracy Lab  
*Center on Democracy, Development and the Rule of Law*