From Person-Solo to Person-Plus: Human Agency and University Assessment in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

Yanina Torres – Master's Student in Philosophy – Universidad Virtual de Quilmes

ytorres4@uvq.edu.ar - yaninatorres@gmail.com

In response to the expansion of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools, some universities have chosen to restrict or prohibit their use in certain assessment contexts, based on the assumption that excluding these technologies would preserve learning and human agency. This paper seeks to question this assumption by drawing on the work of Gavriel Salomon and Roy Pea on distributed cognition and the distinction between *person-solo* and *person-plus* developed by David Perkins.

This distinction acknowledges that certain capabilities must be available to individuals independently of the tools they use. However, it also helps explain how many contemporary cognitive practices take place within distributed systems in which people and technologies participate jointly. From this perspective, the problem lies in adopting assessments conducted without artificial intelligence as the predominant strategy for ensuring students' autonomy and agency.

Based on documentary research, this paper presents a theoretical proposal called the ECAI Model (Assessment in Coexistence with Artificial Agents), which seeks to integrate *person-solo* and *person-plus* assessment practices in accordance with disciplinary objectives, professional competencies, and socially defined educational purposes. Drawing on Jonassen's perspective, the model regards artificial agents as intellectual partners and introduces the concept of the *interstice*, understood as a space of co-creation and tension arising from the coexistence of human and artificial agents. Within this space, knowledge is constructed and discussed through intellectually significant operations, such as selection, discernment, investigation, comparison and verification, argumentation, and justification, among others. It is important to emphasize that not every interaction with artificial agents constitutes an interstice, but only those in which such operations take place.

The model assigns teachers the role of designing the pedagogical conditions that enable these interactions and proposes assessing both the documented process

and the interstitial product. To this end, it considers dimensions related to learning *with*, *about*, and *from* artificial intelligence, executive function, the characteristics of the resulting product, and the ethical aspects of interaction. Possible evidence and assessment criteria include interaction records, observable decisions, justification of choices, source verification, the ability to revise or reject contributions from artificial agents, and the conceptual quality of the final product.

It is argued that when university assessment systematically excludes GenAI tools, a contradiction may arise between the conditions under which students' performance is assessed and those in which subsequent cognitive, academic, and professional practices take place. Paradoxically, a strategy intended to preserve human agency could limit opportunities to learn how to exercise it in interaction with artificial intelligence systems.

Much of the contemporary educational debate focuses on how much students can learn from artificial intelligence or how much they can learn without it. Drawing on the distinction between learning *from*, *about*, and *with* technologies, this paper proposes shifting the question towards the conditions necessary for learning to exercise agency with artificial intelligence.

From this perspective, preserving human agency does not require isolating individuals from cognitive technologies, but rather creating conditions in which they can deliberately exercise their judgment within distributed cognition systems. The ECAI Model therefore proposes an approach to university assessment that integrates individual capabilities with those developed in coexistence with artificial agents, considering both the processes of knowledge construction and revision and their resulting products.