

● **TLDR:** The article makes a persuasive case for more personalized learning, stronger adult mentoring, and giving young people meaningful work. **I agree with much of that educational direction. I do not agree that the evidence presented proves these programs can replace conventional education broadly—or that entrepreneurship should become education’s overriding goal.**

My assessment: **these are promising models worth studying and testing, but the article repeatedly moves from impressive examples to conclusions those examples cannot establish.** Its enthusiasm is useful; its confidence needs qualification.

The ten takeaways below distinguish the article’s claims from my judgment. I also checked the programs’ public disclosures and relevant research.

● **1. The biggest opportunity is to redesign the learning experience around what students actually need.**

The article’s strongest argument is that adding AI to an unchanged school structure may miss the larger opportunity. Alpha reorganizes the school day; The Knowledge Society, or TKS, adds an intensive program alongside school.

I strongly agree. Better software alone cannot supply motivation, meaningful goals, supportive relationships, or opportunities to apply knowledge. Those elements need deliberate design.

Where I disagree: The article describes conventional education as virtually unchanged for 150 years and suggests nobody teaches creativity or agency. That sweeping characterization overlooks the variety of existing schools and teaching approaches. A compelling reform argument should identify specific failures rather than portray every classroom as the same assembly line.

● **2. Mastery and individual progress deserve more attention than simply advancing through a timetable.**

Alpha’s model seeks to identify what each student understands, locate missing prerequisites, and adjust instruction accordingly.

I strongly agree with the principle. A student struggling with algebra may need help with fractions, not another explanation of the current assignment. Similarly, students who have mastered a topic should have opportunities to advance.

My qualification: Mastery must include explanation, retention, and application to unfamiliar problems. Passing a sequence of software exercises is only one indicator.

The article's claim that incoming students averaged 2.2 grade levels behind also needs information about the assessment, benchmark, and student sample. Even if the finding is accurate, it does not establish the accusation that their previous schools were deliberately deceiving parents.

 3. “Two hours of academics” is an intriguing hypothesis, not an established universal formula.

The article presents Alpha's reported test scores and accelerated learning as decisive evidence.

I agree that some academic learning could become substantially more efficient. A randomized study involving 194 Harvard physics students found greater immediate learning gains with a carefully designed AI tutor than with an active classroom lesson. However, it studied two lessons, not an entire K–12 education. [Kestin and colleagues, *Scientific Reports*](#)

I do not agree that the article establishes that two hours will suffice across ages, subjects, and learning needs. We would need independently evaluated results, starting proficiency, cohort sizes, withdrawals, comparison groups, and longer-term retention.

Also, Alpha's afternoon projects involve additional learning. Organizing a festival or running a business can require writing, mathematics, research, and communication. The distinction between “academics” and “life skills” makes the two-hour headline less straightforward than it sounds.

One reason for extra scrutiny: an Alpha results page explicitly presents Gemini and Claude analyses of its assessment data. Those interpretations are not an independent educational evaluation. [Alpha's published results discussion](#)

 4. Human relationships remain central even when AI handles more routine instructional work.

Both programs emphasize adults who motivate, support, challenge, and believe in students.

I strongly agree. Making explanations readily available does not ensure that a discouraged student will persist, recognize a misunderstanding, or feel comfortable asking for help.

Where I disagree: The article goes too far in celebrating adults who provide no academic instruction. Subject expertise helps an educator recognize *why* a student is confused and choose an appropriate explanation. Mentoring and teaching can reinforce each other.

I would favor giving educators more time for individual support while preserving access to skilled instruction. The Harvard AI-tutoring researchers likewise explicitly recommend using AI to support, rather than entirely replace, in-person teaching. [Study discussion](#)

● **5. AI fluency should include knowing when AI is weakening your learning.**

The article correctly distinguishes an adaptive learning system from simply giving students a chatbot.

I agree with its concern about answer-seeking. A student can produce better homework while learning less.

A randomized high-school mathematics study found that students using an unrestricted GPT-based assistant performed better during practice but scored **17% lower on a subsequent unassisted assessment** than students without AI access. A version designed with tutoring safeguards largely eliminated that harm, although it did not produce a significant unassisted-test advantage in that experiment. [Bastani and colleagues, PNAS](#)

I disagree with dismissing conversational AI tutors categorically. The evidence points toward the importance of instructional design and context.

AI fluency should include checking claims, recognizing uncertainty, protecting personal information, and demonstrating understanding without assistance.

● **6. Purpose and curiosity are valuable—but children should have room to develop both gradually.**

The article encourages adults to expose children to different experiences and support the interests that emerge.

I agree strongly with that advice. Meaningful interests can give students a reason to work through difficult material. Exposure also helps young people discover possibilities their immediate surroundings might not offer.

My reservation: Finding a life purpose should not become another performance requirement. A teenager should be allowed to explore, change direction, or remain uncertain.

I also disagree that purpose plus curiosity necessarily supplies everything else. Students still need foundational knowledge, practice, guidance, and material support. Enthusiasm does not automatically overcome a learning difficulty or an inaccessible opportunity.

● **7. Real projects can give young people opportunities that conventional assignments often lack.**

The examples—organizing events, interviewing older adults, building prototypes, and presenting to professionals—are among the article’s most useful contributions.

I strongly agree with expanding these opportunities. Projects can require students to combine knowledge, negotiate responsibilities, revise after feedback, and answer to someone beyond their teacher.

My qualification: An impressive finished product does not reveal how much the student understands or how much assistance produced it.

Claims of “master’s- and PhD-level work” need a defined standard and independent assessment. Reproducing a sophisticated demonstration is valuable, but it is different from conducting original research.

I would assess whether students can explain their choices, identify limitations, and apply what they learned to a new problem.

 8. Entrepreneurial agency is worth teaching; entrepreneurship is too narrow a destination for everyone.

The article treats entrepreneurship as the career of the future and emphasizes business creation, fundraising, and profit.

I agree with teaching initiative: identifying a problem, organizing resources, trying a solution, and taking responsibility for results. Those abilities matter in nonprofits, public service, research, trades, and established organizations.

I disagree with treating company formation or wealth as the leading measures of educational success. A capable nurse, teacher, technician, or community organizer can make an enormous contribution without founding a business.

The claim that entrepreneurship requires no permission, grant, or employer also understates practical constraints. People still need resources, customers, expertise, and sometimes institutional access.

For PSA, I would define agency as **the capacity to improve something that matters to others**, with business creation as one possible expression.

 9. Exceptional alumni stories do not establish what a program causes for the typical student.

TKS’s reported alumni achievements are impressive and deserve investigation.

I agree that ambitious teenagers can accomplish more when they receive expert guidance, capable peers, and access to professional networks.

I disagree with the implication that TKS avoids selection simply because it does not select by grades. Screening for curiosity, drive, and work ethic is still selection. TKS's own website explicitly calls the program selective and describes more than 25,000 applications. [TKS admissions and financial-aid information](#)

That does not invalidate the program. It changes what we can conclude from its results.

To evaluate its contribution, I would want outcomes across whole cohorts, completion rates, and comparisons with similarly motivated students who did not participate. Venture funding and standout alumni show possibilities; they do not establish average educational benefit.

 10. Affordability and broad access remain unresolved—and supplementary programs offer a useful starting point.

The article describes expensive schools alongside lower-cost options, scholarships, and ambitions for free digital access.

I agree that these approaches could expand opportunity. However, access to software does not provide the entire environment described: mentors, transportation, equipment, peer groups, project funding, and sustained adult attention.

TKS offers financial aid but explicitly states that its aid funds are limited. That is meaningful assistance, not evidence that everyone who could benefit can participate. [TKS financial-aid policy](#)

My judgment for PSA: A community program alongside existing schools is a plausible way to test these ideas. It could combine supervised AI learning, local mentors, and projects addressing community needs while students continue their regular schooling.

That would allow PSA to examine the practical questions the article leaves open: Who participates? Who benefits? Who struggles? What does effective support cost?

 What I would carry into PSA's thinking

The most useful experiment would be a modest community learning pilot combining **targeted academic support, human mentoring, and a meaningful local project**. Evaluate students' independent understanding, confidence, participation, and cost—not just the sophistication of their final presentations.

The article gives PSA several worthwhile ideas to test. It does not yet provide sufficient evidence to adopt its strongest claims about replacing schools, eliminating academic teaching, or making entrepreneurial success the organizing purpose of education.

