



AI, EDUCATION, AND ASIA'S ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Balvinder Sidhu 00:01

Good morning and welcome, everyone. I'm Balvinder Sidhu, and I'm delighted to be hosting this panel on AI and education. Now, you might be in the room today because you are a business leader with an invested interest in where AI and education is heading in terms of the workforce. You may be an educator looking at what is happening in terms of the educational establishments. But you may also have another thing in common. You are parents, therefore, key stakeholders in the investments that are happening in AI and the way it's shaping the future. As a parent of two young children myself, who are growing up in the age of AI, I often find myself wondering what skills and careers should I be encouraging them towards when AI can handle so much of the analysis and research I had to do and learn at university. How do we nurture real creativity and critical thinking when AI gives us answers in seconds? And how do we make sure technology helps young people actually learn rather than giving them a shortcut? And this isn't just a question for us as parents. As professionals already in our day-to-day lives, some businesses are encouraging their workforce to adopt AI, to learn AI whilst they're also doing their main day job. But there are also disparities in what is happening in education across the world. For example, in the US, four out of five high school students are using AI to help them with their homework, yet there is no such AI policy. In the Middle East and in China, AI has been mandated from a very, very young age in schools. So what impact is all of this going to have? The next generation is already learning very differently. And to help me unpack this, because there is quite a lot to unpack, we have an excellent panel joining me today. On my left here is Professor Alan Chan. He is provost of Singapore Management University. Then we have Dr. Maren Schweizer, CEO of Schweizer World Group. Crispian Farrow, who is the chief innovation officer at Education in Motion. And last but not least, all the way from Japan, Yoshito Hori, founder and president of GLOBIS University and founding partner of GLOBIS Capital Partners. So, to start off the discussion, I'm going to open the floor to Crispian, because you're working at the sort of beginning of the education system, the schools. What concrete changes and shifts are you seeing on the ground right now in how children are actually learning and how schools are adapting day to day?

Crispian Farrow 03:00

Yeah, a huge number. Thank you, Balvinder. If you look at teachers first, for example, we're seeing teachers rapidly adapting and using AI to plan lessons, to generate resources, to differentiate, to reduce administrative burdens, things like that. That allows them to shift the value of their time to higher value activities like relationship building with students, coaching the students. On the frontier, we have teachers already who are building things like live-coded, just-in-time apps for everything from forces to phonics learning. Teachers that are building themselves self-coaching apps to actually improve the way they're teaching in classrooms. So some really exciting examples. We

shift to students for a moment. Lots of things happening across that space. But examples like curriculum-aligned chatbots that students are using, research being done using AI, even examples of students building their own revision material tools and things like that. So really quite exciting stuff in many cases. Obviously, a jagged edge as that begins to move through schools more broadly. Challenges as well, of course. To pick one example maybe, data security. The landscape technically is increasingly challenging and complex. That requires investment. It requires people to rethink what security and data privacy and protecting the community's data looks like in a rapidly changing environment. So that's a real challenge. But for us, I think it's about thinking, how do we take those frontier examples and then bring that to the baseline so that becomes the norm across those classrooms. So rapidly changing, very exciting times.

Balvinder Sidhu 04:48

And I'm going to bring in Professor Chan. Professor, what are you seeing at a university level? How is AI actually changing education? And is there anything happening beneath the surface that most people are missing?

Alan K.L. Chan 05:01

Thanks, Balvinder. At universities, the main challenge remains how best to ensure that our students acquire a high degree of AI fluency, while at the same time strengthen their human-centered capabilities and competencies. The difficulty is how do you integrate the two? Very often, what we are seeing is that the technical know-how is put in one box, and the soft skills, as it were, are put in another. But we believe that in order for students to acquire true mastery, they will need to know not just how, but also when, what, why, and that's why I think the curricular review that many universities are undergoing focus on that aspect. I think it is important to recognize that education does not only serve an instrumental value, it is also constitutive. Yes, on the one hand, increasingly lifelong learning will be very, very important. The four-year university will evolve into a 60-year learning journey. But at the same time, don't forget that a young student spending four years with us, these are a critical time for their personal development. So I think it is absolutely important that we make sure that when they are with us, we help them to cultivate very sound habits of mind and discipline of mind.

Balvinder Sidhu 06:44

Are you able to share any examples of how AI is being used within a university setting now?

Alan K.L. Chan 06:51

Like any tool, AI serves to achieve certain desired learning outcomes. So the first thing we need to be clear is for the instructors to make clear what is it that the course seeks to achieve, and then the appropriate tools for that course. Having done that, then the next part would be to explain to the students not simply what they have to do, but more importantly, why we ask them to do what they do. So I think as a university, at SMU especially, very extensive dialogue and consultation among our faculty members. That is really very important.

Balvinder Sidhu 07:38

Maren, I'd like to sort of bring you in here now. So a lot of business leaders are not necessarily worried about test scores. They're worried about their future workforce. If an employee with AI can now do the work of three people, what human skills do you think companies are actually going to pay for five years from now?

Maren Schweizer 08:00

Yeah, that's a very good question. I'd like to take us a little bit on a journey on automate and autopilot first. We are all talking about AI is helping us achieve tasks faster, more efficiently. That's the automation piece. I don't think that's going to be the playing field we are going to find ourselves in 5 or 10 years or even a lot faster. We are going to head to autopilot, and there's a distinct difference between the two, and that's where the need and the wants from corporates, from companies come from in respect to capabilities and competencies of our future workforce. So what's the distinct difference here? So please, let's go on a journey together first. So automate AI typically just performs tasks according to defined processes. The humans, they define the processes. So what's the autopilot thing about it now? So then AI is going to pursue an objective—doing multiple tasks at the same time, talking to other AI agents and so forth. That tremendously changes what the humans are doing when they interact with their digital colleagues. And that's my viewpoint. We're going to have human colleagues, and we're going to have digital colleagues. So today, capabilities simply put for the human side of things, it's how well can you use AI? That's not going to be the need and the want of corporates in the future. It's more on how well can you trust, judge, and work with your digital colleagues? And I think this is really the critical question that translates into what does education need to deliver to be able to have young talents in a hybrid workforce? And I'd like to come to that in our panel discussion a bit later.

Balvinder Sidhu 10:15

I'm going to bring Yoshito into the conversation now. If AI makes baseline knowledge and intelligence abundant, what becomes scarce and therefore most valuable in the human workforce?

Yoshito Hori 10:30

Hi, I'm so glad to be here in Milken Asia Summit. First time for me. GLOBIS, according to ChatGPT, is the largest MBA in the world in terms of number of enrollment per year, excluding India. That's true. That's ChatGPT. And also, obviously it's venture capital. And from that experience, I've been telling our students two things about AI. One is that AI makes mistakes. Sometimes they make mistakes intentionally. Therefore, you have to be able to tell that this is wrong, your AI is wrong. Number two, AI does not take responsibilities. You have to be the one to be taking responsibilities. Therefore, at the same time, if you use more AI, your brain will be deteriorated, the data says. And therefore, we are limiting the usage of AI as much as possible, because using AI is not that difficult. What is more important is five things I mentioned. One is that critical thinking capability, because you have to be able to tell AI this is wrong. So you have to be able to think critically. Number two, you have to be able to have a sound decision-making capability, because you have to take responsibilities. You cannot tell AI, "This is your responsibility." You are the one who is making judgment and making decisions. Therefore, decision-making is going to be very important. Thirdly, creativity, we have to come up with creativity. Because AI tend to be standardized, could become commodities. In businesses, you have to be unique, take a unique position. You have to be able to be creative and come up with a grandiose vision, and that kind of creativity is going to be needed. Fourthly, interpersonal skills. You have to be able to communicate with passion, to tell everybody, your stakeholder about your vision and strategy. And so that kind of interpersonal skills will remain scarce. Finally, I think that passion is going to be needed. Passion comes from what we call *kokorozashi*. I'm not sure whether you know the word *kokorozashi*, but I think you know the word *ikigai*. *Ikigai* is something like you do for present and for yourself. Like I have *ikigai* in bonsai, I have *ikigai* in swimming and snowboarding. *Kokorozashi* is something for the society, for the future. So what you want to do, it's more like a philosophical question about why you're born and what you want to use your life for, and what kind of business you want to do for the sake of society. And that is going to be the driving force for you to come up with a strong passion. And that's going to be important. Therefore, I would like to repeat, AI will not take responsibilities, make mistakes—we just have to keep on educating our students to be able

to think critically, make good sound judgment, come up with unique ideas, and strengthen interpersonal skills, and knowing about your philosophy, about your mission in life. Thank you.

Balvinder Sidhu 13:29

It's interesting you say that, Yoshito, because earlier we were talking about the education system in Japan. And you made a really good point about calculators are not allowed to be used in schools. So how is the education system in Japan responding to AI? Is it being encouraged to be part of the school curriculum?

Yoshito Hori 13:50

Well, Japan is in a unique situation that we don't allow students to use calculators. Therefore, you have to be able to use your brains to do it. All the exams you don't use calculator. I think the same will happen to AI. I think AI will be excluded from the school educational system because using AI, what you need is critical thinking. It's a tool. What you have to do is build your own personal skills and also philosophy and also interpersonal skills as well, and do some sports, and that's more important. And I think it's more about the choice of society, how you're going to use your AI, and what kind of life and society do you want to build in your society. That's going to be a very important question to be asked. I think the US may—China may—build in AI, but I'm not sure about Japan. I think it's more important to be able to learn about mathematics and also philosophy and also about history, and to be able to communicate with your own heart to the people and become a leader as well. I think it's a choice of our society.

Balvinder Sidhu 14:54

I think, Crispian, you do want to add to that?

Crispian Farrow 14:56

I'd love to just build on that. I think really interesting ideas, Yoshito, and I completely agree that productive struggle, we might call it, is critical. Learning is a process of productive struggle in many ways, and so shortcutting that is obviously a real risk. We're seeing it happen already. There's no question, I think in the evidence emerging that you get this sort of short-term bump in student outcome and performance with what I might call inappropriate use of AI tools in learning. But that doesn't translate into resilient, deep, long-term learning, which ultimately, of course, is the goal of core education. But I don't think the answer is going to be completely removing those tools from the learning experience. It's going to be about very much purposeful, age-appropriate, and carefully designed learning that ensures that we're adding tools to generate more productive struggle as opposed to shortcut learning. So I'm going to give you a brief example of that. You take a difference between a pretty traditional exercise, like writing an essay. The student that is either allowed or able to go off and uses some AI tool, GPT, whatever it is, to write the essay, comes back and submits it. That's immediately a problem, because of course, obviously the learning doesn't stick. It's not deep. It comes apart under questioning pretty quickly. But then think about a slightly different scenario. So students might use AI to help them do some early planning. They then go and write the essay themselves without the aid of AI at that point. Students come back. The learning is designed by somebody who understands what productive struggle looks like in their particular setting. Two students then perhaps mark each other's essays. They give feedback on those essays. There's no AI involved at this point. They're discussing that feedback. Now, at that point, AI is introduced. It adds another layer of feedback that perhaps differs from the discussion that's been had so far. That can then be interrogated and discussed by those students. What's the delta? Why are there differences here between what the AI is saying and what you said? And then, of course, think about how to incorporate that feedback into the next stage of whatever the task is. So for

me, that's an example of where AI, used wisely and purposely, very much as Alan said, with a clear goal, a learning goal in mind, can enhance the opportunities available as opposed to completely remove it.

Balvinder Sidhu 17:17

I think both Maren and Alan have something to add to that. So Maren, if we go to you first, and then Alan, we'd like to hear your thoughts on that as well.

Maren Schweizer 17:24

Yeah. I really have a concern if I think on future talents that haven't been using AI during their education journey, and I'll tell you why. We are very concerned that we have a lot of AI passengers in our workforce, not AI drivers. So what's the difference here? So AI passengers is those who just prompt and take it, whereas AI drivers who understand the art of delegating to their digital colleagues, if we translate that a little bit to that interaction piece of a hybrid workforce. So what if education delivers not so AI-savvy young human beings into the workforce. Then we would potentially end up with AI passengers only—

Yoshito Hori 18:24

Let me ask you a question.

Maren Schweizer 18:25

—and we need to do that job.

Yoshito Hori 18:26

What about us? We have never used AI before. That means we are kind of left behind the world. It's not going to happen. No, because we have not used AI since, let's say, two or three years ago until then, and we are using AI. And who has invented AI as well? So, what you're saying is that you don't educate students with AI, that means students will be left behind. I don't buy that.

Balvinder Sidhu 18:53

Alan, I'd like to bring you in.

Alan K.L. Chan 18:55

I remember my mom telling me, "If you watch too much TV, your brain will turn to mush." [Laughter] And then computer games came along, and we have similar concerns. I don't mean to be frivolous. Overdependence is a real risk, but at the same time, it seems quite evident that AI and other tools can enhance learning. So ultimately, what we want to achieve is to ensure that students learn more effectively, think more deeply, communicate more clearly, act with a greater sense of purpose and responsibility. And I really want to bring the ethical dimension into the discussion as well, because it's simply a matter of learning how to use AI well, but how to use it with compassion, with empathy, and with responsibility. I started out learning how to drive by learning how to use a stick shift, and then automatics came along. Most people do not know how to drive a stick shift anymore. So the question really is, what are the new essential skills for the future, while at the same time I would argue that we still

need to learn how to drive, even though autonomous driving may be on the horizon. Because driving is not simply a skill, it also shapes the person you become. And by analogy, learning, I think, is even more important.

Balvinder Sidhu 20:29

I'd like to add to that. When I learned to drive, I had to use a map called the A to Z to navigate the roads of England and—

Crispian Farrow 20:38

Not while you were driving, I hope.

Balvinder Sidhu 20:39

—no, I had to stop the car and physically analyze the map. And I remember—and now I look at my children, they just Google Maps, and I say, "God forbid data goes down," and you wouldn't know what to do. They wouldn't know where to go or how to use the map. So things are already changing. But what I'd like to bring in here—Crispian, and I'm going to come to you now—is China and the UAE have mandated AI in schools from a very early age, whereas other parts of the world are sort of struggling a little bit to find their way. Do you think that's going to have an impact on the future of the workforce? Are countries like China going to have more of a competitive edge because they brought in AI earlier rather than waiting for it to become part of the curriculum?

Crispian Farrow 21:36

Yeah, it's an interesting question. I think, first of all, a lack of guidance and a vacuum that creates is a problem in and of itself, and it leads to confusion. It's very inefficient. Schools don't know how to allocate resources. Teachers don't know when they can and cannot use AI, and the students the same. So that's certainly a problem. At best, perhaps, that leads to confusion. At worst, it's probably risky for students, and it erodes trust between stakeholders, which is a real problem. That said, I think the question is not really to mandate or not to mandate, it's what's being mandated. And if we mandate what I sometimes see a fairly superficial, let's teach students the prompt, because prompting is a thing right now. I'm not sure prompting is going to matter that much in a year or two. GPTs are like dead now or already dying, whatever the timeline for them is, announced by OpenAI recently. So really, it's about ensuring that we're going deeper than that and we're teaching students when we are focused on AI itself, not just to be literate with the tools and prompts of the day, but actually really understand what are these tools, how are they working, obviously in an age-appropriate way. These are statistical engines, fundamentally. What that means as far as challenges around bias, hallucination, probabilistic outcomes, and so on. And that gives students the critical foundation to use these tools, regardless of whether it's this year's tool or next year's tool, with purpose, I think, and ultimately with a sensible and informed judgment. So if it's that kind of mandating, then we're certainly moving in the right direction, and I think that probably will create a competitive advantage. As well as, of course, this rethink about what the broader set of soft skills or competencies that are becoming increasingly important in a world where AI is already surpassing human intelligence in narrow fields.

Balvinder Sidhu 23:31

Some are saying that obviously AI is developing at such speed. Do you think educational institutions can keep up with the rate at which AI is developing?

Crispian Farrow 23:45

That's a real challenge. We have to be honest, a pretty typical curriculum cycle in education is probably about five years. So that takes us back pre-November '22 and ChatGPT entirely. So that's a lifetime in AI sense. That said, I'd push back a little bit on one of the assumptions in the question. I think educational institutions can actually move very quickly. They don't always. If we look back at something like the COVID period, many institutions did move incredibly quickly. Not all, by any means. But it's certainly possible. So I think it's very much about that clear direction. Are we all pointed in the same direction? Do we have a clear goal and set of outcomes, or are we divided and not quite sure where we should be going? And at that point, of course, we're pulling in different directions, and that's a real challenge. So I think we need to be investing heavily in that. We have a clear vision pinned on the values that we hold, and frankly, 40–50 years of pretty good research on what good teaching and learning and pedagogy looks like. We can apply those technologies by supporting teachers, giving them clear frameworks, the professional learning required to make this happen. And of course, not forgetting students themselves, ensuring that their curriculum is supported in that way.

Balvinder Sidhu 24:57

Alan, and I'll bring in Maren as well to that point.

Alan K.L. Chan 25:00

I know this panel focuses on education, but don't forget that education is always informed by research. What we want to achieve is to make sure that the development of AI and the eventual adoption of AI is guided by sensible principles. Let me give you a concrete example of how the two can work hand in hand. Many of our courses now allow students to use AI to question the course material. And in return, the instructor will get the data, the questions they ask, the mistakes they make, the improvements they suggest. All these will become part of a larger data analytics set that will allow us to continue to innovate in pedagogy, teaching, and learning.

Balvinder Sidhu 25:56

Maren, you wanted to come in here?

Maren Schweizer 25:59

Yeah, I'd like to come into your point of curriculum cycles, innovation cycles, because that's a very important topic, actually, if you think on what is happening on the industrial side of things. That's the demand side of things. And let me give you an example. One of the prominent industries that are enabling AI is the semiconductor industry. I think we all know it. So if you look down the road, we have to think about that the production is going to be on autopilot. So there are going to be more and more digital colleagues working alongside our human talents down the road. Having said that, then the next question is: What's happening on the innovation side of things? Because that's the next step. So I would want to argue innovation is on the pathway to be on autopilot. So always on, 24/7. And you might ask yourself, why does that work? I'm convinced it works because intelligence is increasingly coming at zero cost. So if so, then IP generation is going to be very, very cheap. And then we talk innovation on autopilot. And then what is troubling my mind actually is how does that translate into capabilities and competency requirements of our future talents? And I'd like to talk a little bit about just now because that fits nicely what you've been saying beforehand. So if we dissect it, we could say you need to build leadership capabilities to run hybrid teams. That's by far too simple. That doesn't tell the story. So how to bring that to a competency framework level, and I'd like to go that pathway down a little. So typically, competency frameworks, we have the foundational competencies, we have the strategic competencies, and we have the industry-sector-specific or domain competencies. So I think in the domain competency side of things there's a lot of value that education can bring—

Balvinder Sidhu 28:17

Can I just—

Maren Schweizer 28:17

—K-12 schools and higher education.

Balvinder Sidhu 28:19

—so I'm just gonna bring in Yoshito because he's been waiting as well, and then we'll come back to you, Alan, because I feel like this is quite an interesting lively discussion now.

Yoshito Hori 28:29

Well, GLOBIS has invested a lot in AI. We have two patents on AI in education. No other business school has ever invested heavily in AI. So therefore, we have what we call AI education learning, and also AI document evaluation system, and AI chat learning as well. So we are using AI so much, and therefore, we feel that educational institutions can keep up with the system and also the development of AI. In the future, there may be no faculty, there may be AI teaching it. Sometimes it will come because now e-learning is also teaching. Sometimes books may be teaching. So with the advancement of technology, the method of supply of education is going to change. That's going to be natural. At the same time, we have to educate leaders, and we have to define what kind of leaders we need to educate. And I've told you about decision-making is going to be important, critical thinking is going to be important, creativity is going to be important, interpersonal skills, and also *kokorozashi* are going to be important. So what's going to happen is that some part of the skill set can be taught by AI, and some part of the skill set can be taught only by discussion with people. So therefore, we could increase the productivity of education by using AI. But at the same time, we need to have a choice as to what to use and what not to use. And at the same time, we have to let students to use AI sometime and not use AI. So it's more like an axle. Like you're going to AI, but at the same time, you have to defend students as well. We should not deprive students of the opportunities to learn by letting them use AI. Because in case of case method, if you put cases and syllabus as well, the answers will come from AI, and they can submit it. Are they learning? I don't think so.

Balvinder Sidhu 30:17

And that brings us—

Yoshito Hori 30:17

We just have to let them.

Balvinder Sidhu 30:19

—that's a really good point because I'd like to bring you in on this, because how are we assessing these really vital skills like curiosity, resilience?

Alan K.L. Chan 30:27

That's exactly the point I wanted to add. As you know, this is a Nobel season, and one of the physiology or medicine winners recounted how he was initially drawn by the rather weird behavior of algae, how it gravitates

towards light. Now, that kind of curiosity, I think, remains essential to education today. And I also want to make the point that there seems to be a certain cognitive bias to our discussion now. But intelligence is not a simple concept. Cognitive intelligence is very important, but then there are other forms of intelligence that should also inform a well-planned pedagogy. It forms an essential part of education systems as well. In terms of assessment, yes, we always worry about students cheating. I don't think they all cheat. What we need to do is not to talk about essays or exams or any other forms of assessment, but really how to ensure that whatever assessment we use, it serves the formative or summative purpose that it is designed for. An essay also can be structured into an interrogative exercise with AI or other sources of information. Even in the old days, we would teach students to question authority or authoritative sources, and that is no different today. It's just a different set of tools, it seems to me.

Balvinder Sidhu 32:14

How would you assess sort of critical thinking and these other skills that we are saying here today that will be needed in the future workforce, like resilience, curiosity, creativity? If you have AI can do—write an essay for you, how are we looking at assessing those critical skills?

Alan K.L. Chan 32:36

In formative terms, these are the qualities we want to cultivate through learning, through these exercises. We want to strengthen students' ability to be resilient, to think for themselves, and to be able to communicate clearly. Summative assessment, yes, it still serves a certain purpose, but increasingly what we are seeing is universities will deploy a whole range of assessment tools designed for particular purposes in order to achieve specific learning outcomes.

Balvinder Sidhu 33:11

Crispian?

Crispian Farrow 33:12

I'll talk about a little bit in the context of K-12. I completely agree with Alan that there's now going to be, and need to be, a much richer appreciation of the range of human intelligences. And actually, educational establishments have been developing for many, many years. The problem, I think, has been historically that we tend to have over-indexed or over-focused on that sort of traditional, narrow, cognitive sort of intelligence that I think we're all pretty aware is now under threat. Hence, the conversations that we've had. But if you take an example, like, let's say interpersonal skills, collaboration, something like that. How do you assess those? Well, we know that schools have been doing things that somehow lead to the emergence of these abilities more or less successfully for quite a while. In our case, we partnered with University of Melbourne. There are other ways of doing this. But to really bring in a framework they have called the Melbourne New Metrics Complex Competencies. And the assessment here shifts away from a kind of one-time summative snapshot of a sort that we're pretty familiar with, traditional testing, and starts to look at the emergence and development of these skills across a period of time. So students need to demonstrate a skill like collaboration, interpersonal skill, in a number of different novel settings. So a student might do that in a piece of project work with a group of other students. They might then demonstrate a similar collaborative interpersonal ability in a team sport environment, and so on. So it's over a period of time. They're novel environments, so that the skills are resilient. Teacher professional judgment that knows and sees and observes those skills in different places is then used against a standardized age-appropriate rubric that then allows the triangulation of where that student is. And I think that's the real shift that needs to take place increasingly. It's

about recognizing the importance, first of all, of those skills, but then appreciating that we don't have to leave them to sort of emergent chance. We can actually quite specifically teach them, we can track them, and we can assess them. And once that starts to rebalance, we'll be producing students, I think, from the institutions that are well-equipped to have this balance of yes, core traditional academic competence, very important still. How can you make judgments unless you have that core knowledge, for example? But at the same time, have a clear understanding of how they're progressing with these kinds of softer competencies.

Balvinder Sidhu 35:36

I would like to move the conversation now to the workforce a bit more because there's a lot of rhetoric around that entry-level jobs, white-collar jobs are sort of on the decline. We're seeing it in the legal system. And there are predictions for the finance industry to be similarly affected. Yoshito, I'm just gonna bring you in here.

Yoshito Hori 35:59

Good.

Balvinder Sidhu 35:59

How do companies expect to build their future leadership pipeline, and where does this leave young graduates if those entry-level jobs are declining?

Yoshito Hori 36:10

Well, I mentioned about the choice of society with AI. And at the same time, it's a choice of AI in work processes as well. How much do you use, and where, and who to educate and who to hire? That's a company's decision. And then all of us understand there is a merit of AI. At the same time, all of us understand there's a risk of using AI too much, too much dependent on. Therefore, we need to have what we call AI-way, where to use and when not to use. We have to define it, otherwise people won't understand. All the people who want to join companies will not understand. Therefore, in case of us, we have said that we use AI in all the products and also business model, and we're going to be the leader in AI in education. It's simple. At the same time, we are going to use AI in terms of increasing productivity and making profit more. So increasing in terms of AI usage in product, like business model, is increasing revenue. And increasing productivity, decreasing costs, increasing profit. On the other hand, in the company itself, we have to understand that interpersonal skills, man-to-man, people-to-people communication has to be done by human, and it should not be done by AI. We have defined it clearly. At the same time, in areas where we our employees use too much—are too much dependent on—when their brains deteriorate, we stop. We restrict the use of AI. At the same time, we have seen what happened to OpenAI going into Hugging Face and also Australian health-care system. AI has to be controlled, therefore, all the human beings, all the employees have to be in charge of all the responsibilities in terms of AI agent and so forth. That kind of push and pull, and accelerator and also brake are going to be needed. It's all the same in any company, any society, any educational system, we have to define where to use, where not to use. I think that's the thing. In total, what's going to happen in terms of workforce that's going into, let's say in Japan, I think it's not going to change. Because the usage of AI may decrease the needs for software engineers as well, but there will be some more jobs are going to be created. And therefore they may argue that entry jobs will be disappeared. I don't think it's going to happen, especially in Japan, because we feel that entry jobs is important to build the loyalty into the company. And then, therefore, if there is more demand for, let's say, five or six years experienced workers and that means demand and supply will shift towards there will be more demand into more officially high colleges, and therefore I think it's not going to change much.

Balvinder Sidhu 39:19

So I'd like to bring Maren and Alan in on this. So Maren, if you'd like to add to that.

Maren Schweizer 39:25

It's not so much my concern about where is there an entry-level job or not, because the entry level will just be somewhere else. It might be somewhere else, and there's nothing wrong about it. The question is, how do we tailor K-12 school education and higher education to groom the right talents to that new and ever-evolving entry level? And while I spent most of my career around transformation and disruption, but I've also seen it as a parent. So if I look back, my eldest son, he's a German European School Singapore alum, and over all the years he spent with that institution, I've seen the value of the optionality. Of the optionality in the curriculum side of things preparing him for various pathways. Today he's at university, and he's a successful entrepreneur. So this optionality enabled him, and I think that's becoming increasingly important in education, and that translates to how individualized education can become. If so, how dynamic it can become. So dynamic in the sense of adopting what the demand is requiring to entry-level jobs because I cannot tell you how the entry-level jobs will look like in the future, in one year, in two years, or even in three months. So that dynamic part of things, so individualized learning, I think, is one of the differentiators. It's a must to have—to be dynamic and fast-paced change on the curriculum. But then the question is how to ensure, and then I look to you, how to ensure steady quality. That's what we've been doing in manufacturing. Automotive industry, you don't want that you have a brake failure in your car. You don't. So if I think about education now, individualized education enabled by AI, how can we ensure as educators to ensure a steady quality level on delivery? And then the big thing which is really troubling my mind is we need fit young people if they join our institutions, the corporates. And what do I want to say with fit? That's all about the cognitive muscle, and that's really troubling me. If I think about young people who have a not so well-developed cognitive muscle anymore, then I need to think about fitness studios for the cognitive muscle in the corporate world. So I'm wondering, what's the view on the educators here in the room on the cognitive muscle, the fitness level, and in particular, how to ensure that the need for optionality and the need for fast-paced change in curriculum development can be achieved?

Balvinder Sidhu 42:46

So I'm going to bring in Alan here. We only have two minutes left, so Alan, can you please just share your final thoughts? Because I feel like we've just scratched the surface here, so—

Crispian Farrow 42:55

I think we've got 45 minutes, don't we?

Alan K.L. Chan 42:57

—that's very much the point I wanted to make. There will still be entry-level jobs, that's for sure. However, the requirements for those jobs will become more demanding. So the question—well, unfortunately, the pay probably won't increase that much. But in order to prepare our students for that, the future, I think increasingly, one, experiential learning will be more important. Two, cocurricular learning also will become more important, and they will complement classroom learning, teaching, and I think only a holistic way of looking at higher education will serve the best interests of our students.

Balvinder Sidhu 43:41

Okay. Crispian, do you have any final thoughts?

Crispian Farrow 43:44

Just one quick thought, I think, on the individualization, personalization piece. It's obviously a big topic of conversation with AI today, not surprisingly, and very promising in lots of ways. But a reminder that we spent a lot of the morning talking about these broader set of skills, things like interpersonal skills. And so I think the challenge is going to be architecting learning that balances that individualized pathway with the need to be developing and working in collaborative groups with others to develop things like interpersonal skills. Because, yes, personalization, individualization, fantastic opportunity, but if we push that too far, it becomes hyper-personalization, and that's actually quite isolating. And I think especially in the K-12 space, there's an important balance to get right there between collaborative interpersonal learning.

Balvinder Sidhu 44:29

Great. We've got 25 seconds left on the clock. So can we just please thank our panelists today, Yoshito Hori, Crispian, Maren, and Alan, professor from Singapore Management University. They are here, so if you do have any questions, please do. You're around, so you can talk to them one-to-one as well. So thank you so much for being a great audience.

Announcer 44:57

We hope you enjoyed the discussion. The next panel will begin shortly.

Disclaimer: This transcript was reviewed by individuals for accuracy and serves as a reference. However, it may still contain errors or omissions. Please verify any critical information independently.