

What it looks like in practice

Nine routines from UK and US teachers on X between 2024 and 16 September 2026. Each row is a claim, labelled reported practice, practitioner claim or objection. The evidence column is a fetched page or a named paper, not the post. UK and US stay on the row. The live article already covers the Prompt Iteration Journal, Critique the Machine, the Socratic persona and reverse engineering. These rows add the keep-it-off-the-learner split, talk as the antidote, and the US explain-back check.

ROUTINE	TEACHER MOVE	WHAT YOU WOULD NOTICE	WHAT THE EVIDENCE SAYS	REPORTED BY
Normalise not using it ● reported practice	Name the rule in high-school physics: they already know how learning works, so opening a model does not fit that model.	No chatbot in the lesson. The thinking stays on paper and in talk.	A classroom claim, not a trial. NEU State of Education: AI (fetched, 2 Apr 2026): 66 per cent of secondary teachers in English state schools agreed critical thinking had declined because of AI, against 28 per cent in primary. The EEF Toolkit +8 months is a mean for plan, monitor and evaluate in the subject, not a finding about a ban.	@helenrey 4 Sep 2026 · UK "I think normalizing NOT using AI because that is better for your brain and learning is a more useful (and empowering) approach." open post
Teacher-mediated only ● practitioner claim	Any AI the class sees is on the teacher's screen. Learners talk about the output. Nobody prompts alone.	A projected window. Hands go up about the answer, not into a private chat.	William's reply to Boxer, 28 Aug 2026. OECD PISA 2025 (association, not cause): higher-performing learners tend to be those who do not use AI; AI use is associated with better outcomes when learners are explicitly taught to interpret and assess AI-generated information. Those are two findings, not one comparison. Not a trial of mediation.	@dylanwilliam 28 Aug 2026 · UK "I think I'm with you, but I would add a tweak: no student-facing AI that is not mediated by the teacher..." open post
Teachers yes, learners no ● practitioner claim	Staff may plan with a model. Learners produce in the room. Unsupervised writing is not the product.	The split is named in the staffroom. Take-home essays are treated as untrustworthy.	ResearchEd, 5 Sep 2026. The replies disagree, which is the finding. @paulhaigh (20 Jan 2025): teach them to use it and change homework, because workplaces will. @EnserMark (14 Jan 2025, page fetched): the goal of homework is thinking, not a finished file.	@daisychristo 6 Sep 2026 · UK "I spoke about the impact of AI on assessment - why students shouldn't use it, but teachers should!" open post

ROUTINE	TEACHER MOVE	WHAT YOU WOULD NOTICE	WHAT THE EVIDENCE SAYS	REPORTED BY
Blank-column planning ● reported practice	A human summary of a research book, with a blank column the teacher fills. Teacher-side, not a learner chatbot.	Two columns. The right one is handwritten. The photograph in the post is redrawn elsewhere, not republished.	Page fetched: Cogsci Book Summaries . "It's the interaction in making the summary that is important." "No AI was employed at any stage." EEF Teacher Choices on ChatGPT for KS3 science planning saved 25.3 minutes a week (56.2 vs 81.5). NFER: some teachers used the time for other teaching tasks; others reduced overall workload.	@helenrey 21 Jul 2026 · UK "... and then, use this handy summary with a blank column for your own use as a planning aide!" open post
Judge the tool by thinking ● practitioner claim	Before adopting a tool, name the thinking it forces. How human the voice sounds is not the test.	A staff conversation about the task, not about fluency.	The linked <i>Frontiers</i> paper (DOI 10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1860755) found a statistically significant advantage for a GPT-4o avatar on knowledge acquisition ($M=10.63$ vs 8.92 , $p=.036$). The tweet's "Little or no impact" line is the post's claim and is contradicted by that paper. The staff question still stands: judge the tool by the thinking it forces. Not a trial of this staff question.	@TeacherToolkit 21 Aug 2026 · UK "Teachers should: evaluate what an AI tool makes pupils think about, not how human it appears." open post
Talk, not a prompt lesson ● practitioner claim	Oral defence in the room. Learners explain, challenge and rebuild the idea out loud.	Talk, not a chatbot window. The product is a spoken account the class can hear.	Hebbes, Tes, 7 Apr 2026 (fetched): talk is how humans explore; AI is the exploit engine. Not a trial. UK teachers almost never posted a lesson where learners judged an AI answer and it worked.	@tes 7 Apr 2026 · UK "There is one area where AI cannot replace humans, and that should be key to our approach when countering AI's potential to undermine all that we do" open post · page: Tes, 7 Apr 2026
Explain-back, bot closed ● reported practice	A fluent homework answer is not accepted until the learner can say it in their own words with the bot closed. US listen; the post does not name a country or role beyond "my students".	A learner who wrote a finished file going silent when asked why. Handwriting alone is not the product.	US listen (country inferred from the display name, unverified in the post). The UK listen found no named classroom of this. @TheMayeflowers (identity unverified) is the closest first-person catch. Not a trial.	@MariaPeiro305 23 Aug 2026 · US listen, unverified "...I already see it with some of my students who use chatgpt to complete homework and

ROUTINE	TEACHER MOVE	WHAT YOU WOULD NOTICE	WHAT THE EVIDENCE SAYS	REPORTED BY
				later can't explain anything in class or pass a test." open post
Restrict the newest model ● reported practice	The newest agentic model is not allowed for learner work. US high-school history, Cutler's own classroom rule.	The restriction is named. This is one teacher's rule, not a school-wide policy.	Medium, 7 Sep 2026: "as far as my classroom teaching goes, Astra isn't allowed." Edutopia, 10 Jul 2026: at his school it is mostly up to the individual teacher; his own class prohibits AI unless he notes otherwise. Not a school policy.	@spinedu 7 Sep 2026 · US "I just published ChatGPT-6 Astra Can Do More of My Students' Thinking Than Ever. That's Why I'm Restricting It." open post
Literacy crowding Gatsby ● objection	The objection is that AI literacy is an extra requirement with nothing cut. US high school English.	A module that replaces nothing. Full books lose a week.	NYC Public Schools guidance (fetched): two 45-minute modules, not a course. The teacher's post said "coursework"; the city page says modules. Name the gap. Not a trial of literacy modules.	@didactickatydid 3 Sep 2026 · US "If Gatsby takes three weeks to read, I can't just tell the kids "read faster" when they take away a week for some new initiative." open post
What was not found. UK listen, 28 evidenced posts, 41 searches, and US listen, 32 evidenced posts, 47 searches, 16 Sep 2024 to 16 Sep 2026: no named UK classroom where a learner judged an AI answer and it worked; no UK Gemini or Copilot thinking lesson; no UK teacher treating prompting as thinking; no AI self-regulation routine; no teacher-posted AI anchor chart; no first-person Khanmigo post from a US classroom teacher; the phrase "they just ask ChatGPT" as teacher talk in either country.				

Every quote is verbatim from a named account and was checked against X's syndication endpoint on 16 September 2026. A tweet is a claim. The EEF +8 months figure is the Toolkit mean, fetched the same day. Country of @TheMayeflowers is taken from the US listen; identity unverified. Nothing here is a trial of the routine.