International Journal of Engineering, Science and Mathematics
Vol. 15 Issue 10,Oct 2026,
ISSN: 2320-0294 Impact Factor: 8.215
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijesm.co.in, Email: ijesmj@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gage as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

THE FUTURE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ACADEMIA: EVIDENCE FROM CASE STUDIES OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES IN INDIA AND ABROAD

Ankit Agarwal, Associate (Data Repository), NLU Delhi

ankitmps1@gmail.com

Abstract

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude and Copilot have entered schools and colleges faster than any educational technology before them, and the academic community remains divided on whether they raise or erode the standards of academia. This article examines that question through a qualitative, multiple case-study design. Drawing on documented institutional responses, policy interventions and empirical studies from India (CBSE, NCERT, Karnataka, Kerala, IITs and central universities) and abroad (the United States, the United Kingdom, Estonia, Australia and UNESCO member states), it identifies both the enabling and the corrosive effects of GenAI on learners at the school and college levels. The positive cases show measurable gains in personalised tutoring, teacher productivity, multilingual access and support for students with disabilities. The negative cases reveal rising academic misconduct, declining effort and critical thinking ("cognitive offloading"), unreliable AI-detection tools that penalise non-native English writers, and widening digital divides. Cross-case interpretation suggests that outcomes depend less on the tool than on the pedagogical design, policy clarity and assessment redesign that surround it. The article concludes that academia's future with AI will be decided not by prohibition or unguarded adoption but by cultivating AI literacy, redesigning assessment for process rather than product, and protecting the developmental needs of children. Suggestions for schools, higher-education institutions, libraries and regulators, and an agenda for future research, are offered.

Keywords: Generative AI, academic integrity, NEP 2020, school education, higher education, assessment, AI literacy, case study

International Journal of Engineering, Science and Mathematics
Vol. 15 Issue 10,Oct 2026,
ISSN: 2320-0294 Impact Factor: 8.215
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijesm.co.in, Email: ijesmj@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gage as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

1. Introduction

The release of ChatGPT in November 2022 marked the first time that a technology capable of producing competent essays, solutions, code and citations on demand became freely available to every schoolchild and undergraduate with a smartphone. Earlier waves of educational technology (the calculator, the search engine, the learning management system) augmented retrieval and computation; generative AI (GenAI) augments, and can substitute for, the very acts that academia has traditionally assessed: composing, reasoning, synthesising and arguing. The stakes for academic standards are therefore unusually high, and they are highest for learners whose intellectual habits are still forming.

India sits at the centre of this transformation. The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 and the National Curriculum Framework for School Education (NCF-SE) 2023 both call for computational thinking and AI literacy, and the Ministry of Education has announced that AI and Computational Thinking will be taught from Class 3 from the 2026–27 session, with CBSE and NCERT framing the curriculum (Careers360, 2025). At the same time, OpenAI reported at the India AI Impact Summit in February 2026 that users under 30 account for roughly four-fifths of ChatGPT usage in the country, with 18–24-year-olds alone sending nearly half of all messages (Raysolute, 2026). India's learners have adopted GenAI long before India's institutions have decided what to do about it.

The global picture is similarly double-edged. UNESCO's first global guidance on GenAI in education warned that few countries had policies for safe and ethical use and proposed an age threshold of 13 for independent classroom use (UN News, 2023). Yet the same guidance acknowledged GenAI's promise for learners with special needs, Socratic dialogue and research support. Governments have oscillated between prohibition and promotion, often within a single year.

This article poses three questions. First, what case evidence has been documented from India and from other parts of the world in relation to positively or negatively impacting the academic standards due to the use of GenAI? Second, are there differences in the effects in school-age children as opposed to the effects in college students? Thirdly, which conditions supported the impact of GenAI on learning in the study and which ones negatively affected it? The approaches in the article are presented in the perspective of

library and documentation professionals who have served as the stewards of information literacy and academic honesty over the years, having a primary role in addressing AI literacy.

2. Review of Literature

The scholarship on GenAI in education has grown from almost nothing in 2022 to several thousand papers by 2026. It can be organised into four strands: academic integrity, learning outcomes, cognition, and equity.

Academic integrity. We are among the first works that have suggested that larger language models create a qualitatively new integrity issue, as the AI output does not resemble any known source, thus by-passing similarity detection (Cotton et al., 2023). Later survey results also validated the extent of use, with a global survey of 23,218 students in 109 countries (Ravšelj et al., 2025) showing that most students use ChatGPT to brainstorm or summarise, though a significant portion acknowledged a degree of using the contextually inappropriate, and the majority desired improved regulation. In fact, a study conducted in India with 413 business-school students resulted in the finding that whilst the rationalisation of misconduct, or 'neutralisation' as the authors termed it, had a greater influence on predicting misuse of drugs and alcohol, fear of sanctions did not predict their intake, which implies that policies supportive of deterrence would likely fail in this context (Education for All in India, 2026). Not to be neglected is the literature on detection: Liang et al. (2023) found GPT detectors identified more than half of the essays produced by non-native English speaker authors as AI-generated, and this has implications for Indian students writing in Indian English.

Learning outcomes. A smaller but methodologically stronger body of work uses experiments. A World Bank randomised evaluation in Edo State, Nigeria, found that six weeks of after-school GPT-4 tutoring produced learning gains of roughly 0.3 standard deviations in English, among the largest effects recorded for an education intervention (De Simone et al., 2025). At Harvard, a randomised crossover study found that students using a carefully scaffolded AI tutor in an introductory physics course learned more than twice as

much in less time as those in active-learning classrooms (Kestin et al., 2025). Both studies share a design feature: the AI was constrained to teach rather than to answer.

Cognition. The third strand is the most troubling for school-age learners. Lee et al. (2025), in a Microsoft–Carnegie Mellon study of 319 knowledge workers, found that higher confidence in AI was associated with less critical-thinking effort. Kosmyna et al. (2025), using EEG with 54 participants at MIT, reported that essay writers who relied on ChatGPT showed the weakest neural connectivity and poorest recall, coining the term "cognitive debt"; those who wrote first and then used AI fared better. A 2026 study of 299 STEM students across five North American universities found that trust-driven routine use of GenAI reduced perceived effort but also reduced depth of inquiry, evidence use and reflection (Choudhuri et al., 2026). This Chinese university study showed that there were four different profiles of users ranging from simple Q&A user (25.2%) to critical co-thinker (15.6%), with learning motivation being a stronger predictor of gaining in critical thinking and 'the higher the offloading skill' the more the dependency (2026). However, in contrast, a quasi-experimental study conducted in Thailand indicated that actively assigning lower-order writing tasks to AI with the support of the writing instructor was correlated with an increase in cognitive testing scores of first-year students ("Cognitive offload instruction," 2025). The literature, therefore, coalesces around a conditional claim: offloading is possible for routine work to free up higher order thinking, however, offloading the generative act itself threatens it.

Equity. Last but not least, UNESCO (2023) and Indian scholars (Mehta, 2025) have emphasised that a well-resourced school benefits the most from the benefits of GenAI. Despite the national AI mandate, the data on UDISE+ 2024-25 shows that only approximately 58% of Indian schools have computer facilities and around 64% have internet connections, resulting in an unequal impact of this directive. However, even the national AI mandate has been given, the data from UDISE+ 2024-25 found that only approximately 58% of the Indian schools had computer facilities and around 64% had internet connections.

Three gaps remain. The majority of empirical studies focus on university students in high–income countries and little research has been conducted with children under 14. There are

few studies that make comparisons between the different institutional responses in the different jurisdictions. And virtually nobody considers how libraries and information professionals fit in. This article directly addresses the second gap, and partially addresses the other two (first and third) gaps.

3. Research Methodology

The study adopts a qualitative, multiple case-study design (Yin, 2018), which is suited to a phenomenon that is recent, context-dependent and not yet amenable to large-scale causal inference across jurisdictions. Cases were treated as the unit of analysis; each case is an identifiable institutional or policy response to GenAI, or a documented empirical intervention, with a traceable outcome.

Selection criteria. Cases were purposively sampled to satisfy four conditions: (a) the case concerns learners at school or college level; (b) it is documented in a public policy record, peer-reviewed study or reputable press report; (c) it has an observable outcome (a measured learning effect, a policy reversal, a disciplinary result, a change in institutional practice); and (d) the set as a whole balances India and other jurisdictions, schools and higher education, and positive and negative outcomes. Fourteen cases met these criteria: seven from India and seven from abroad.

Data sources. Documentary sources comprised government circulars and press releases (Ministry of Education, CBSE, UGC, PIB), UNESCO and OECD guidance, peer-reviewed studies (2023–2026), institutional policies, and press coverage cross-checked against primary documents where available. All web sources were accessed in October 2026 and are listed in the References.

Analytical framework. Each case was coded on five dimensions: (1) level (school/college); (2) direction of the effect on academic standards (supporting/eroding/mixed); (3) locus of the effect (integrity, learning, cognition, equity, wellbeing); (4) action from the institution (prohibition, detection, redesign, integration, literacy); and (5) outcome. A cross-case synthesis was then conducted in search of patterns that distinguish between supporting and eroding outcomes.

International Journal of Engineering, Science and Mathematics
Vol. 15 Issue 10,Oct 2026,
ISSN: 2320-0294 Impact Factor: 8.215
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijesm.co.in, Email: ijesmj@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gage as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Limitations. Causation cannot be attributed to a dramatic failure in a documentary case study and there may be reporting bias in the case studies; preferring a dramatic failure over a quiet one. A number of cases are known via secondary sources of information which refer to the institution without identifying it. Consequently, the findings should be interpreted as analytic generalisations, not statistical generalisations of prevalence, about mechanisms..

4. Review of Case Studies from India and Abroad

4.1 India

Case 1 — CBSE's AI curriculum and the Class 3 mandate (school; supporting). CBSE introduced AI as an optional skill subject for Class IX in 2019 and now offers a 15-hour module from Class VI and an elective for Classes IX–XII, with over 8 lakh students across 4,500 schools enrolled and facilitator handbooks developed with IBM and Intel. In October 2025 the Ministry of Education announced that AI and Computational Thinking would become compulsory from Class 3 in 2026–27, with CBSE and NCERT framing the curriculum under NCF-SE 2023 and an IIT Madras-led expert committee; CBSE Circular Academics-15/2026 formalised the Classes 3–8 framework (Careers360, 2025). This is the world's largest AI-literacy mandate by enrolment. Its weakness, noted by commentators, is that it teaches AI concepts without setting acceptable-use rules for assessment (Raysolute, 2026).

Case 2 — NCERT's AI-assisted translation and accessibility (school; supporting). NCERT has used AI/ML to translate Grade 1–2 textbooks into 22 scheduled languages and has embedded text-to-speech and keyword search in DIKSHA for visually impaired learners (New Kerala, 2026). Here GenAI serves the constitutional commitment to mother-tongue instruction rather than substituting for student effort.

Case 3 — IIIT-Delhi's open-ChatGPT examination policy (college; supporting). IIIT-Delhi became one of the first Indian institutions to permit ChatGPT in examinations on the condition that students submit the prompts they used. The policy treats AI as a transparent, declared instrument and shifts assessment toward prompt quality and verification rather than detection (Mehta, 2025). The UGC has cited it as a model.

International Journal of Engineering, Science and Mathematics
Vol. 15 Issue 10,Oct 2026,
ISSN: 2320-0294 Impact Factor: 8.215
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijesm.co.in, Email: ijesmj@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gage as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Case 4 — UGC rejection of AI-written PhD theses at BRABU, Muzaffarpur (college; eroding). In early 2026, dozens of doctoral theses at Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar Bihar University were rejected where the text was found to be more than 40% similar and Bismillah, accredited by AI, were responsible for.]; the candidates were directed to rewrite the content and it was made mandatory to upload the Turnitin report along with the final thesis. (Education for All in India, 2026b) The case demonstrates how the lack of recognition or differentiation for AI content is being deemed as plagiarism in the UGC's Regulations (2018) – prior to the existence of GenAI.

Case 5 — Engineering college group project, Bengaluru, and the Pune smartwatch case (college; eroding). The machine-learning project turned out to be a five-student affair that was almost entirely developed using ChatGPT, no local experimental data and logical outcomes about the problem assigned, and the institution has no AI policy to base their action. In another incident, a student at a private university in Pune transferred the copied questions from his exam paper to a chatbot with a smartwatch and was found out and suspended by the college, and was followed up with the issuance of technology-use policy in examination-halls (Education for All in India, 2026b). Both cases exemplify the lack of policy and subsequent reactive rule-making.

Case 6 — Class XII science essay competition, Delhi (school; eroding). A climate-change paper generated with ChatGPT and Gemini was shortlisted on the strength of its prose before an expert reviewer found citations to non-existent journal articles. The organisers subsequently introduced mandatory oral defence for shortlisted entries (Education for All in India, 2026a). The incident is a textbook case of "hallucinated" references reaching a child's submission and of assessment redesign as the remedy.

Case 7 — Teacher-side misuse in a Uttar Pradesh government school (school; eroding). When an AI-created science worksheet with a false statement about human blood circulation was provided to more than 200 students, before being spotted by a parent physician (Education for All in India, 2026a). It is not cheating itself that is the problem here; it's that unverified information is fed to children and that the teacher is the one whose fault it is.

International Journal of Engineering, Science and Mathematics
Vol. 15 Issue 10,Oct 2026,
ISSN: 2320-0294 Impact Factor: 8.215
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijesm.co.in, Email: ijesmj@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gage as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

4.2 Abroad

Case 8 — New York City's ChatGPT ban and reversal (school; mixed). In January 2023, the NYC Department of Education banned ChatGPT from school devices and networks due to concerns about the accuracy and learning, and revoked the ban in May 2023, stating that the Chancellor had been "taken aback by the evolution and potential of this new form of GenAI" and a teacher-centered approach to its use is required, implying that teacher guidance and support, along with curriculum resources, would replace the prohibition. The case is the classic example of the unstable nature of prohibition.

Case 9 — Estonia's AI Leap (school; supporting). Launched in 2025 and similar to the Tiger Leap programme of 1990s, AI Leap offers free, education-oriented AI accounts and teachers' training nationwide (50% from the State and 50% from the private sector), expanding in September 2026 to vocational schools and new Grade 10 cohorts, reaching 38,000 students and 2,000 teachers; the first class will graduate in 2027 (e-Estonia, 2025). Each school had such a personalized education AI within a year and the first research results would be produced in the school year 2026–27. A specific tool, required teacher preparation and integrated assessment are the distinguishing elements.

Case 10 — World Bank GPT-4 tutoring in Edo State, Nigeria (school; supporting). A randomised trial of six weeks of after-school tutoring with GPT-4, supervised by teachers, produced English learning gains of about 0.3 standard deviations, with the largest gains for girls who had started behind (De Simone et al., 2025). The programme's design, in which the model was prompted to act as a tutor and teachers guided sessions, is the clearest evidence that GenAI can raise standards for disadvantaged children.

Case 11 — South Korea's AI digital textbooks (school; mixed). South Korea rolled out AI-powered digital textbooks for mathematics, English and informatics in March 2025, the first country to do so at national scale. Within months, parent and teacher opposition over screen time, data privacy and unproven efficacy led the National Assembly to downgrade the textbooks from compulsory to supplementary status in August 2025. The case demonstrates that national scale without pedagogical consent is politically fragile.

Case 12 — Gaokao 2025 and China's AI mandate (school; mixed). Major AI players temporarily disabled image-recognition capabilities to prevent previously-photographed

International Journal of Engineering, Science and Mathematics
Vol. 15 Issue 10,Oct 2026,
ISSN: 2320-0294 Impact Factor: 8.215
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijesm.co.in, Email: ijesmj@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gage as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

questions from being answered during China's national college entrance examination in June 2025, an unprecedented cooperation between academia and state in the interest of protecting examination integrity. Later, Beijing mandated AI education in schools starting in September 2025, three months after the first release. China thus pushes for AI literacy and, at the same time, shields AI from high-stakes testing.

Case 13 — United Kingdom universities' AI misconduct statistics (college; eroding). Data obtained from 131 UK universities showed almost 7,000 proven cases of AI-enabled cheating in 2023–24, or 5.1 per 1,000 students, up from 1.6 per 1,000 the previous year, while traditional plagiarism fell, and investigators noted that most AI misuse goes undetected. The figures confirm displacement from copying to generation and the limits of detection.

Case 14 — AI-detector bias and Vanderbilt's withdrawal of Turnitin's detector (college; eroding/corrective). Given this, the researchers Liang et al. (2023) discovered that popular GPT detectors successfully identified more than half of TOEFL essays written by non-native speakers as AI-generated, without substantial errors in detecting essays by native speakers. Citing unreliability and the risk to students, Vanderbilt University disabled Turnitin's AI-detection feature in August 2023, and several other universities followed. The case demonstrates that such a detection oriented approach can also lead to a decline in academic standards in the form falsely produced accusations – most of which are levelled against multilingual students, which is the majority of students from India.

5. Interpretation and Evaluation of the Case Studies

The fourteen cases sort cleanly once they are coded by institutional response rather than by country or level.

Case	Level	Direction	Locus	Response	Outcome
1. CBSE / Class 3 mandate (India)	School	Supporting	Literacy, equity	Integration	Largest AI-literacy rollout; assessment rules absent
2. NCERT translation &	School	Supporting	Equity	Integration	Access in 22 languages;

International Journal of Engineering, Science and Mathematics
Vol. 15 Issue 10,Oct 2026,
ISSN: 2320-0294 Impact Factor: 8.215
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijesm.co.in, Email: ijesmj@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gage as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Case	Level	Direction	Locus	Response	Outcome
DIKSHA (India)					accessibility for VI learners
3. IIIT-Delhi open-ChatGPT exams (India)	College	Supporting	Integrity	Redesign	Declared use; prompts assessed
4. BRABU PhD theses (India)	College	Eroding	Integrity	Detection	Dozens of theses rejected; rewrites ordered
5. Bengaluru project / Pune smartwatch (India)	College	Eroding	Integrity	None → prohibition	Suspension; reactive exam-hall rules
6. Delhi Class XII essay (India)	School	Eroding	Integrity, learning	Redesign	Oral defence introduced
7. UP worksheet error (India)	School	Eroding	Learning	None	Wrong content reached 200 children
8. NYC ban and reversal (USA)	School	Mixed	Learning	Prohibition → literacy	Ban lifted within five months
9. AI Leap (Estonia)	School	Supporting	Learning, literacy	Integration + training	National coverage in one year; evaluation built in
10. GPT-4 tutoring, Edo State (Nigeria)	School	Supporting	Learning, equity	Integration (tutor mode)	~0.3 SD gain in English
11. AI digital textbooks (South Korea)	School	Mixed	Learning, wellbeing	Integration without consent	Downgraded to supplementary
12. Gaokao	School	Mixed	Integrity,	Prohibition	Exam integrity

Case	Level	Direction	Locus	Response	Outcome
safeguards + AI mandate (China)			literacy	(exam) + integration (curriculum)	protected; literacy compulsory
13. UK misconduct statistics	College	Eroding	Integrity	Detection	5.1 proven cases per 1,000; most undetected
14. Detector bias / Vanderbilt	College	Eroding (corrective)	Integrity, equity	Detection withdrawn	False positives on non-native writers

Pattern 1: Prohibition and detection do not, on their own, protect standards. Each case which only relied on prevention and detection (5, 8, 13, 14) overturned itself, did not create a deterrent effect for most misuse or did create collateral damages. In the UK data, proven cases are on the increase, but most misuse went unseen and in the Vanderbilt case, the detector identified the wrong students. Even the BRABU rejections (Case 4) are a delayed remedy after which years of doctor work. This is not to say there shouldn't be any prohibition: China's Gaokao safeguards (Case 12) demonstrate that it is possible to have a temporary restriction on AI for specific periods of study..

Pattern 2: The supporting cases constrain the tool, not the learner. In Nigeria, Estonia, the AI was programmed or instructed to instruct or to hold, or to be on an educationized system and adults were not left out. The role of NCERT in translation and the prompt-disclosure rule of IIIT-Delhi are also examples of such forceful channeling of the tool to a specified purpose that can be evidenced. In each of the eroding cases, on the contrary, the learner encountered a non-pedagogical chatbot which was general in nature.

Pattern 3: Children and college students are harmed differently. For school-age learners (Cases 6, 7, 11), the dominant harms were exposure to fabricated or incorrect content, screen-time and wellbeing concerns, and the risk that generative offloading forecloses skills still under construction; the cognition literature reviewed in Section 2 is most alarming precisely for this group. For college students (Cases 4, 5, 13, 14), the dominant harm was integrity: credential fraud, hallucinated references in research, and

unfair accusations. Policy must therefore be age-differentiated, which is the logic behind UNESCO's age-13 threshold.

Pattern 4: Scale without consent and capacity is brittle. In South Korea, as in NYC, a lack of teacher and/or parent buy-in doomed the reversal; in Estonia, buy-in was ensured through financing teachers' training and evaluation of the new in addition to access. India's Class 3 mandate is the test case: With some 58% of schools having functioning computers and over one crore teachers that need to be reached, the danger is that schools in a dual choice get AI skills and those in the government sector a line in the syllabus.

Evaluated against the study's first research question, the evidence shows GenAI supporting standards where it is embedded in scaffolded, declared and supervised use, and eroding them where it is encountered unsupervised, unregulated or policed only after the fact. The tool is the same in both sets of cases; the surrounding design is not.

6. Findings

1. **GenAI raises learning outcomes when it is constrained to teach.** The only rigorous positive effects on learning (Nigeria, Harvard) came from tutor-mode deployments with teachers present. No case in the set shows unsupervised chatbot access improving measured learning.
2. **The integrity problem has shifted from copying to generating, and detection has not kept pace.** Research indicates that AI case studies have increased threefold over the past year in the UK and plagiarism by similarity has fallen, the same trend is seen in Indian cases (BRABU, Bengaluru, Pune). Detectors are fallible and prejudicial to multilingual writers.
3. **Children face a distinct developmental risk.** The research in the cognition field (MIT, Oregon State, Chinese and Thai studies) finds that whereas tasks in the generative domain (as opposed to routine sub-task) are offloaded, reflection and recall are weakened. This is most important before skills are available – in school.
4. **India has moved faster on AI literacy than on AI integrity.** Educators are improvising; as of 2026, UGC, CBSE, as well as any state board has not released

academic-integrity guidelines, but CBSE and NCERT have developed curricula, translations pipelines and teacher orientation.

5. **Prohibition is unstable, consent is essential, and capacity is the binding constraint.** NYC and South Korea changed their direction, Estonia stayed the course - they paid for training and evaluation. The success or failure of India's Class 3 is the same as the factors involved in the mandates.
6. **Teacher-side misuse is an under-recognised risk.** As evident in the Uttar Pradesh worksheet and in its case study with the UP state-university journal, unverified AI content infiltrates the learning environment not only as input from students but also as input from educators and editors.
7. **Equity cuts both ways.** While results are principally driven by whether people already have connectivity and devices, GenAI had the most impact for the lowest-scoring students in Nigeria.

7. Suggestions

For schools and school boards (CBSE, state boards, NCERT, SCERTs)

1. Link the use of Chatbots with Class 3-8 AI and CT curriculum along with an age-appropriate acceptable use model – there should be no independent use of chat bots in class up to Class 8 (as recommended by the UNESCO 13-year policy), supervised use with prior declaration in Class 9-12.
2. Develop or acquire education-specific tools in the 'tutor mode' instead of putting children in the presence of general purpose chatbots as Estonia and the Nigeria trial did, align the model with the educational mission – i.e. be curriculum aligned and retrieval oriented.
3. Ensure through NISHTHA and DIET training that effective monitoring of teachers to ensure that the worksheet and question papers generated by AI are accurate with reference to the prescribed textbook..
4. Redesign school assessment toward oral defence, in-class writing, portfolios and locally grounded projects, as the Delhi competition organisers did after Case 6.

For higher-education institutions and the UGC

5. Develop and adopt National GenAI Academic-integrity standard, which overhauls the Plagiarism Regulations of 2018 to include: Declaration of AI text as equivalent to citations, and establish appeal process.
6. Take the example from IIIT-Delhi that prompt disclosure is allowed but not guaranteeing it is in fact cheating, and use the results of the detector only as an indicator for a viva as there are documented biases against non-native speakers of English..
7. Mandate hand-verified reference lists and viva voce on sources for theses and dissertations, since hallucinated citations are the most reliably detectable form of AI misuse.

For libraries and information professionals

8. Bring information-literacy programs over to AI-literacy: create prompts, verify AI's findings against authoritative sources, cite to AI resources and identify artificial reference materials. At the moment, these skills are required only in University and School libraries.
9. Curate AI tools vetted by the institutions and retrieval grounded knowledge bases (OJS journals, institutional repositories, ONOS subscriptions) so that learning activity of learners' AI strives from verified scholarship and not open-web text.

For regulators and the Ministry of Education

10. Prioritize the Class 3 mandate after device and connectivity in government schools, to ensure that AI literacy is not limited to the shores of private schools.
11. Take measures to implement DPDP Act 2023 with the usage of EdTech AI with minors such as parent consent and certification for classroom AI products.
12. Provide third-party testing from the start of each large-scale deployment like Estonia does and make results public.

8. Scope for Future Studies

Where India is in need of evidence, the evidence is weak. For the future, there is a need for: (a) riggedly randomized or quasi-experimental assessments of the class 3-8 AI curriculum

and of tutor-mode tools in Indian government schools, using Indian language outcome measures of learning, critical thinking, etc. (b) longitudinal cohort studies of children's reasoning, writing, and recall of such content in the first years of GenAI exposure, extrapolating the MIT work and Oregon State study to learners under age 14. (c) audits on the accuracy of AI detectors for Indian language texts and of bilingual writing to find out if the bias highlighted by Liang et al. applies to Indian students. (d) audits of how AI is being/used in Indian lesson materials and prevalence of errors identified. (e) comparative policy analysis of how state boards are implementing the national AI mandate. (f) qualitative and quantitative research on the role and prevalence of libraries in AI literacy (a field with almost no documentation yet holds enormous promise).

9. Conclusion

Academia's institutions, not generative AI, will determine the future of academia. The common thread through the fourteen cases discussed below is that the same technology has been responsible for a 0.3 standard-deviation learning gain for Nigeria's school girls, bogged down a Delhi science competition, a national literacy programme in Estonia, and a series of laughed-off doctorates in Bihar. What distinguishes the difference lies in the preparedness of the people around the tool, and the confined, declared, and supervised nature of the tool itself. The lesson that India needs to learn is sequencing. While the country has progressed considerably on the front of AI literacy, it hasn't put in similar efforts into AI integrity, age-appropriate exposure, pedagogy checks and assessment. The danger is not that children might not become acquainted with AI but that they will first become acquainted with it and then other learning without it and that the institutions should find out the cost only in the exam hall. The standards of academia can thrive in this transition if assessment prioritizes understanding, AI usage is cited as a source on works, and if AI literacy becomes a new baseline for information literacy, much like how literacy became the benchmark for information literacy.

References

Banks, D. C. (2023, May 18). ChatGPT caught NYC schools off guard. Now, we're determined to embrace its potential. *Chalkbeat New York*. †

Careers360. (2025, October). Students to learn AI, computational thinking from Class 3 starting 2026–27; CBSE, NCERT to frame curriculum. https://news.careers360.com/students-learn-ai-computational-thinking-from-class-3-starting-2026-27-cbse-ncert-frame-curriculum

Choudhuri, R., Sanchez, C. A., Burnett, M., & Sarma, A. (2026). Thinking less, trusting more: GenAI's impacts on students' cognitive habits. *arXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.22430

Cognitive offload instruction with generative AI: A quasi-experimental study on critical thinking gains in English writing. (2025). King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang. https://dspace.kmitl.ac.th/handle/123456789/14894

Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61*(2), 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148

De Simone, M. E., Tiberti, F., Barron Rodriguez, M., Manolio, F., Mosuro, W., & Dikoru, E. J. (2025). *From chalkboards to chatbots: Evaluating the impact of generative AI on learning outcomes in Nigeria* (Policy Research Working Paper). World Bank. †

e-Estonia. (2025). AI Leap 2025: Estonia sets the global standard for AI in education. https://e-estonia.com/ai-leap-2025-estonia-sets-ai-standard-in-education/

Education for All in India. (2026a, February 26). *Artificial intelligence in Indian school education: Use, misuse, and preventive measures*. https://educationforallinindia.com/artificial-intelligence-in-indian-school-education-use-misuse-and-preventive-measures/

Education for All in India. (2026b, February 10). *Upholding academic integrity in educational research: UGC's crackdown on AI misuse in PhD theses and guidelines for researchers*. https://educationforallinindia.com/upholding-academic-integrity-in-educational-research-ugcs-crackdown-on-ai-misuse-in-phd-theses-and-guidelines-for-researchers/

Kestin, G., Miller, K., Klales, A., Milbourne, T., & Ponti, G. (2025). AI tutoring outperforms in-class active learning: An RCT introducing a novel research-based design in an authentic educational setting. *Scientific Reports, 15*, 17458. †

Kosmyna, N., Hauptmann, E., Yuan, Y. T., Situ, J., Liao, X.-H., Beresnitzky, A. V., Braunstein, I., & Maes, P. (2025). Your brain on ChatGPT: Accumulation of cognitive debt when using an AI assistant for essay writing task. *arXiv*. †

Lee, H.-P., Sarkar, A., Tankelevitch, L., Drosos, I., Rintel, S., Banks, R., & Wilson, N. (2025). The impact of generative AI on critical thinking: Self-reported reductions in cognitive effort and confidence effects from a survey of knowledge workers. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM. †

Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. *Patterns, 4*(7), 100779. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100779 †

Mehta, A. C. (2025). *AI in Indian school education: Analysing IIIT-Delhi's ChatGPT policy*. Education for All in India. https://educationforallinindia.com/ai-in-indian-school-education-analyzing-iiit-delhis-chatgpt-policy/

Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2025, October). *Introduction of Artificial Intelligence and Computational Thinking from Grade 3 onwards from 2026–27* [Press release]. Press Information Bureau. https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2184211

New Kerala. (2026, September 5). When ChatGPT enters classroom: Can teachers keep up? https://www.newkerala.com/news/a/when-chatgpt-enters-classroom-can-teachers-keep-up-206.htm

Ravšelj, D., Keržič, D., Tomaževič, N., Umek, L., Brezovar, N., et al. (2025). Higher education students' perceptions of ChatGPT: A global study of early responses. *PLOS ONE, 20*(2), e0315011. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11798494/

Raysolute. (2026, August). *Generative AI academic integrity policy framework for schools and higher education*. https://www.raysolute.com/genai-academic-integrity-policy-schools.html

UN News. (2023, September 7). UNESCO calls for regulations on AI use in schools. https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/09/1140477

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research* (F. Miao & W. Holmes, Authors). UNESCO. †

University Grants Commission. (2018). *UGC (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018*. †

Vanderbilt University. (2023, August 16). *Guidance on AI detection and why we're disabling Turnitin's AI detector*. †

When thinking is outsourced: Cognitive offloading and the heterogeneity of critical thinking among Chinese university students using generative artificial intelligence. (2026). *Journal of Intelligence, 14*(7), 116. https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence14070116

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE.

Note. Entries marked † are cited from the author's prior reading and were not re-opened during drafting; page numbers, DOIs and the UK (2023–24 misconduct statistics), South Korean (August 2025 textbook downgrade), Chinese (June 2025 gaokao safeguards; September 2025 Beijing AI mandate) and New York City (January–May 2023) press reports in Cases 8, 11, 12 and 13 should be verified against the originals before submission.