**The impact of AI and emerging technologies**

**on the universal right to education: new faces, new actions**

**A background for a pedagogical consideration of AI: the young mental health crisis as staring point**

[1] New Humanity (NH) appreciates the Special Rapporteur on the right to education call for input to contribute to the next thematic report which will focus on the AI in education (AIED): human rights-based use at the service of the advancement of the right to education. New Humanity thinks that **it is the time to open a public debate on this important topic for the future of the educational sector,** as SR has done opening the call for input for his Report. **Our goal will be to identify the main topics for caring for human beings flourishing in the AI Based Education environments responding to the SR call for input**. The global educational community needs a slow, quiet and deep reflection on its impact and how to introduce AI system in the schools and in the educational process driven by human rights. For that **we encourage to SR create an open ending working group on AI and emerging technologies and education** for continue working on these issues. Our input will be focusing on:

* The current situation of worldwide mental crisis and well-being in children and young people;
* The values and principles commitment with the realization of the right to education from a relational-based approach;
* Learn to live a flourish, autonomous and responsible life with the others and the planet means to empower people with new faces of the right to education as right to human decision, the right to middleware and the right to disconnect.

[2] At the present time, it is important to recognize (as starting point to thinking on AIED) that there is **a ‘particular situation’ between children, young and emerging technologies, the most important young mental health crisis ever**. It is important not to divide the technologies into different categories (internet, social media, AI, xR and so on) but put it all together as a continuum. There are not good and bad technologies for children. Technologies are waves that arrive to schools and childhood with more hype than results, more with commercial propose than pedagogical intention. Our recent history illustrates that the younger generations have never had the possibility to access to the technological innovations of their time as directly and quickly as they do now (from mobile devices to the Internet and social networks, including applications based on AI). Even without the mediation of the adult generations (parents, educators, schools, etc.). So, that relations generate dysfunctions and problems, as the young mental health crisis[[1]](#footnote-1).

[3] **Both science literature and juridical measures has explained the current young mental health crisis.** Books as ‘The attention merchants’, ‘La fabrique du crétin digital’ or ‘The anxious generation’ are deeping in the impacts of emerging technologies and its business model for the personality of young people[[2]](#footnote-2). In addition, most of the States in Europe are banning the mobile in the schools. In the US are also well know the lawsuits cases already filed by the city, the school district and the health and hospital corporation of New York, and the pioneer worldwide, filed by the Seattle school district against Meta, Facebok, Snap, TikTok, Alphabet, Google and Youtube[[3]](#footnote-3). But there are also initiatives to protect and to care of young worldwide as the Global Coalition for Digital Safety by World Economic Forum, the European strategy for a better internet for kids[[4]](#footnote-4) or the CRC General Comment (nº 25, 2021) children’s rights in relation to the digital environment. Recently, UNESCO recommended taking seriously the inclusion of technology and mobile phones in schools[[5]](#footnote-5) and the EU has published the ethical guidelines on the use of AI and data in teaching and learning for educators[[6]](#footnote-6) including the consideration on its own competences[[7]](#footnote-7).

[4] **Most of the family claims for not being alone to face that crisis**. While the care government measures on digital are arriving later, big tech companies continue to push up digital business models, enrich with AI, in the education sector. We have not really proven the effectiveness of AI digital technology for education, but we are welcoming the new wave based on AI when ‘a lot of the evidence comes from those trying to sell it[[8]](#footnote-8)’. We cannot let the AI system out of control in education, so we need not only an ethical guideline but a framework of AI international law, also for the right to education.

**The universal right to education from a relational-based approach**

[5] It’s necessary a **relational-based approach** **to the right to education in AI age**. In European context, the human rights-based approach (RHBA) is a methodology that include five working principles to human rights for all; meaningful and inclusive participation and access to decision-making; non-discrimination and equality; accountability and rule of law for all; and transparency and access to information supported by disaggregated data. By applying these principles, the HRBA identifies states and their institutions as duty-bearers that are accountable for respecting, protecting, and fulfilling human rights. The HRBA addresses individuals as rights-holders and empowers them to know, to claim and to enjoy their human rights[[9]](#footnote-9). In addition, **the word “relational” bring to recognize and highlight the social and relational dimension of the person** **and allows to take account the interdependences links between human beings and the communities which are necessary for its flourishing**.

[6] A relational-based approach is also connected to **the cultural dimension of the right to education** given that: “a universal right that is not informed by proper appreciation of cultural diversity cannot be truly universal; instead, it lays the groundwork for the domination of one country by another, for instance, or for the assimilation of one group in a country by another. Recognizing the cultural dimension of the right to education, however, does not translate into encouragement to appreciate nothing but the diversity of cultural identities; it is also about cultivating what underpins our common identities, our common humanity. Put simply, it is impossible to have one without the other” (A/HRC/47/32, par. 8)[[10]](#footnote-10) and that has a particular importance for developing AI in an educational context. **Link AIED and cultural dimension of right to education is a keystone for its developments**.

[7] This approach recognizes and supports personal autonomy and, at the same time, safeguard the ‘relational goods’ and human relationships because human rights are fully realized when we protect, promote, and to care for relationships between human beings. For the educational context, **the relational-based approach to the right to education also means both to protect the right of the families and to put the rights of the children in their family context** as the best form to care and to protect the young and children autonomy and the progressive development of his own personality in front to the ‘big tech’ risk and abuses. After all, States and civil organizations has got a subsidiarity role front to the main responsibility of the families and for that reason also digital literacy is as important for children as for the families.

**Principles for a normative approach to AI in right to education**

[8] The own Report’s title is, in fact, a **normative approach to AI and right to education** which our organization agree. In addition, it’s also on the same way of the others Special Rapporteur Reports on the close topic in emerging technologies, for example: “issues and challenges to the right to education in the digital age (2016)”; another one, on the “Impact of the digitalization of education on the right to education (2022)” and on “Securing the right to education: advances and critical challenges (2023)”[[11]](#footnote-11). In all of those, there is the same keystone ideas:

1. Education is not just a commercialization service or product but, above all, a universal human right for serving to the full development of the human personality from the sense of his own’s dignity and the belonging to the human family, and an indispensable means of realizing other human rights (**principle of human dignity and unity of human family**).
2. Emerging technologies must service and enforce the realization of the universal right to education respecting the principle of best interest of the child, the right of the families in education and the role of law and democratic culture in the States (**principle of justice**).
3. Emerging technologies, included diverse types of generative AI and immersive devices for XR (as glasses), must respect the 4A framework for the right to education. So, Digital (& AI) education cannot replace the human education relationships and the places for face-to-face education (**principle of human care**).

[9] Those ideas are also contained in the other official document which could be used as foundation framework for the SR Report on AI and right to education. For example, the JRC Science for policy report ‘the impact of AI on learning, teaching and education[[12]](#footnote-12)’.The Council of Europe Recommendation on the impact of AI on the education sector [CONF/AG(2023)REC4] and the Report on AI and Education: A critical view through the lens of human rights, democracy and the rule of law[[13]](#footnote-13). Most of these documents highlight the ethical dimension in AI as keystone for its developments in many fields as education, so currently we can speak on an international ethical framework for AI in education (AIED)[[14]](#footnote-14). There is a very big proliferation of ‘ethical frameworks’ but it’s clear that it’s necessary also the legal ones (as the European AI Act) because as ‘greenwashing’ has occurred, we are witnessing technological ‘ethic-washing’.

**The [human] right to human decision in education environments**

[10] The irruption of AI is like a new wave, may be a tsunami, for the ongoing processes of digitalization of education, both theoretical levels (regarding the meaning of education, its agents and the sense of their relationships), practical dimension or pedagogical direction, concerning the form of education in a digital context. All these dimensions are covered by the right to education, but we also need to think on the new faces of this right in the IA age in three directions: the right to human decision, the right to middleware and the right to disconnect.

[11] AIED could adopt a different form to introduce itself. The most common and well Known one has to do with its most visible element, that is, with what it can ‘generate’. This is why ChatGPT (in its different versions), Anthropic or other AI apps to generate text, voice, imagine, video has success. These apps have the hype in the headlines about what they can do imitating humans’ skills. But there is also another type of AIED, not so visible because it is embedded in educational platforms[[15]](#footnote-15). We will focus on that connecting it with the new faces of the right to education.

[12] The Institute for Ethics in AI at University of Oxford offers an interesting contribution on the deliberation on the [human] right to a human decision and the personal data protection which is a necessary contribution for protecting and promoting the personal dignity of human being. For example, the Yuval Shany paper on the right to a human decision under international human rights law examining the origins of the rights and its possibilities to become a new human right[[16]](#footnote-16). In the same way, the works of its Director, J. Tasioulas on a Human Right to a Human decision, and Linda Eggert on the foundation of a rights against algorithmic decision play an important role for its theoretical foundation. **In order to situate this right in the educational context of digitalization and plataformization process is necessary don’t forget the important role of human educational agent and its ‘tact’ and ‘form’ of teaching**[[17]](#footnote-17). Those differences in the ‘form of teaching’ are in the foundation of educative pluralism and in the freedom to choose a particular education based on philosophical, religious or pedagogical conviction.

[13] The recent ‘Blueprint for AI Bill of Rights: making automated systems work for the American people[[18]](#footnote-18)’ is a place where the right to human decision has been recognized as “you should be able to opt out, where appropriate, and have access to a person who can quickly consider and remedy problems you encounter. You should be able to opt out from automated systems in favor of a human alternative, where appropriate (…) human consideration and fallback should be accessible, equitable, effective, maintained, accompanied by appropriate operator training, and should not impose an unreasonable burden on the public (p. 46)”. In addition, in this document ‘education’ and ‘schools’ belong to the group of ‘sensible data’ and ‘sensitive domain’ respectively, where is necessary a human consideration with an ‘appropriate operator training’. The African Convention on Cyber Security and Personal Data Protection is one of the clearest written on that right: ‘a person shall not be subject to a decision which produces legal effects concerning him/her or significantly affects him/her to a substantial degree, and which is based solely on automated processing of data intended to evaluate certain personal aspects relating to him/her[[19]](#footnote-19)”. In the same way, in Europe is also important to ensure ‘that algorithmic systems are based on adequate datasets to avoid discrimination and enable human supervision of all outcomes affecting people's safety and fundamental rights[[20]](#footnote-20)’ so there is a ‘**right not to be subject to a decision based solely on automated processing**[[21]](#footnote-21)’.

**The right to *middleware* for platform environments also in education**

[14] Other important expressions of the ‘right to a human decision’ would be the possibility **to decide and bettering the control on how the platform’s users want to experiment or to live the digital**. It’s the case of ‘middleware[[22]](#footnote-22)’ [middle software] where Prof. Ethan Zuckerman is suing Meta to defend the right of users to develop or using middleware in the platform, as Facebook. In this case, the Zuckerman’s goal is to let users pick the algorithms that filter out the content they don’t want to see and select content that interests them. The link with the right to human decision is that they ‘argue that it establishes the rights of users, families and schools to self-police the content they encounter online, using technical means to block material they find objectionable’. So, in that cases they have a right to choose.

[15] As Fukuyama et al.[[23]](#footnote-23) proposes, there would be **a solution for ending with the platform monopoly** (more thinking in democratic term than economics). The algorithms, based in a commercial model, are not as important for free economy as to liberal and deliberative democracy. As they introduce ‘the scale of today’s platforms gives them extraordinary power to reach broad audiences, much like the network television oligopoly of the 1950s and ’60s, and their control over what appears and is disseminated on their platforms can shape both beliefs and behavior’. So, as they argue, the ‘middleware is an opportunity to introduce competition and innovation into markets currently dominated by the principal internet platforms’.

[16] In the current context of digitalization of education and its platformization it is necessary both to put in action a ‘right to middleware’ as opportunity to break the platform monopoly and to recognize the ‘right to human decision’ for all members of educational community (student, teachers but also to the parents). The contribution of those rights for education is not only the possibility to choose but **the value of recognition**. Only a human agent could educate to another human being because the essential for this process is the meeting between two freedoms and the mutual recognition, as philosophers as Levinas has defined as ***otherness***[[24]](#footnote-24). As L. Eggert expose[[25]](#footnote-25), quoting A. Hills, a morally worthy action, as she puts it, ‘is right action for the right reasons’. If you have moral understanding, and you act on that basis, you will act for the right reasons. In educational words, AI systems can perform many tasks which are performed in educational processes by a human agent, but completely lacking for the educational meaning. The AI agent is blind for this kind of pedagogical deliberation. **The AI systems in education needs a human supervision and not only by professors or teachers but also by the families**.

[17] We think that those rights work in education as a wall or fence **to protect the humanist’s core of educational phenomenon and to help us to understand what a human task is and why it is important not to leave it to the machines**. Beyond the fact that a ‘smart’ machine could do it better (here *better* is not a moral condition but merely a synonymous of *more efficiently*), it is necessary to remember that vocational education e. g. is also important not just for the outcomes or products but why work makes us human too. For that, together other competences or skills, professors and teachers also become in ‘appropriate operator training’ for the educational platform’s universe, and while it is clear the meaning of ‘legal effects’ is very difficult to identify what we can understand by ‘significantly affects to a substantial degree[[26]](#footnote-26)’ in education.

[18] **The platforms are** **not a mere interface to connect or to match users**, **resources and tools to find or get something in a more efficiency way through algorithm (so without human touch),** **but also a mechanism for absorbing big data which belongs to its human users**. That platforms can drive and management most of the human activities. Next to this, in the near future in education, **we will have to pay attention to other form to absorb big data under promise to create a more interesting experiences for education**, like the extended reality (XR) which to improve and enhancement the human capabilities. The form to enter into that reality will be through glasses or others not invasive brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) and for that also the important of establishing the neuro-rights in the educational sector as we mention before.

**Learning the right to disconnect and the importance of virtue for human being flourishing in the online life**

[19] In the same way as lines before we wrote on the right to human decision, internet and mobile devices are also forcing new thoughts on the links between workers and its companies in the digital spaces. Most countries around the world have laws to protect the life of the employees out of work’s time. So, protect his own time after work but also privacy and its data, at the same time. Generally, **this right to disconnect for the world of work means that employees can ignore work-related communications outside of normal work hours**. This right to disconnect in the school has other meaning but the same importance for the live of young people. Teaching to disconnect would be also a skill to learn in schools.

[20] One of the most important learnings for doing in the schools it is not just to develop competences or digital skills but **to learn to disconnect from the online life**. It’s true that our live is ‘*onlife*’, as Floridi established[[27]](#footnote-27) (so as a continuum from offline to online and come back), but what does it mean to learn to disconnect as a right in education? We have found a very good definition in the last UNESCO Report, quoted before[[28]](#footnote-28):

‘**the importance of learning to live both with and without digital technology**; to take what is needed from an abundance of information but ignore what is not necessary; to let technology support, but never supplant, the human connection on which teaching and learning are based. The focus should be on learning outcomes, not digital inputs. To help improve learning, digital technology should be not a substitute for but a complement to face-to-face interaction with teachers (p. v)’.

[21] For many years, education process was focusing on teaching to live with technologies but forgot the learning to live without ones. Currently, it’s as important to learn to life without connection as developing digital skills. In fact, disconnection would be a part of the core of digital skills. Maybe it’s a ‘learning paradox’ but children and young people in school (but also adults) must learn about how to disconnect. But disconnect is not just about to close one device. Learn to disconnect means to develop a strong virtue to face the digital life. Development not only digital skills or values but virtues[[29]](#footnote-29).

**Principles for driven an AIED from a ‘Roma Call for AI Ethics’ initiative**

[22] Both educative platform and wearable technologies would exploit the vulnerabilities of the young people as we said[[30]](#footnote-30). For this reason, education is among the areas where some uses of AI have been categorized as High-Risk in the UE AI Act[[31]](#footnote-31):

(a) AI systems intended to be used to determine access or admission or to assign natural persons to educational and vocational training institutions at all levels;

(b) AI systems intended to be used to evaluate learning outcomes, including when those outcomes are used to steer the learning process of natural persons in educational and vocational training institutions at all levels;

(c) AI systems intended to be used for the purpose of assessing the appropriate level of education that an individual will receive or will be able to access, in the context of or within educational and vocational training institutions at all levels;

(d) AI systems intended to be used for monitoring and detecting prohibited behaviour of students during tests in the context of or within educational and vocational training institutions at all levels.

[23] AI systems must be conceived, designed and implemented to serve and protect human beings and the environment in which they live. This fundamental outlook must translate into a commitment to create living conditions (both social and personal) that allow both groups and individual members to strive to fully express themselves as recognize Roma Call for AI Ethics, and where AI will be driven under these principles adopted in the Call[[32]](#footnote-32): transparency (AI systems must be understandable to all); inclusion (these system must not discriminate against anyone because every human being has equal dignity); responsibility (there must always be someone who takes responsibility for what a machine does); impartiality (AI systems must not follow or create biases); reliability; security and privacy (these systems must be secure and respect the privacy of users).

[24] In short:

1. The starting point to thinking on AIED must be the current situation of mental crisis in children and young people around the world.
2. AIED must respect and promote the values and principles which are commitment with the realization of the right to education for all.
3. Human right education would also contain information and learnings about the ‘neurorights’.
4. Learn to live an autonomous and responsible life with the others and the planet means to empower people with new faces of the right to education as right to human decision, the right to middleware and the right to learn to disconnect, for preserving dignity, freedom, justice, and the human care in the educational process.
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