OFFLOADING DOK 1: A COGNITIVE APPROACH TO RESTORING CRITICAL THINKING IN K-12 LEARNING

J. Maddry

Grand Canyon University (UNITED STATES)

Abstract

This presentation introduces a research-informed, design-based approach to integrating artificial intelligence (AI) in K–12 education through the intentional offloading of selected lower-level cognitive tasks. The approach is grounded in a synthesis of learning science research and design-based analyses of instructional practice, drawing on evidence from cognitive load theory, educational neuroscience, and classroom-based AI-supported learning environments. Across this body of work, findings consistently indicate that persistent emphasis on memorization and recall can overburden working memory and limit opportunities for higher-order thinking, transfer, and creative problem solving. These patterns have emerged across multiple instructional contexts, highlighting the need to articulate design principles that foreground cognitive offloading as a core consideration in contemporary learning design.

The session explores how instructional design can leverage AI to align with how the brain learns by managing cognitive load, supporting schema formation, and maintaining engagement through meaningful challenge. Drawing on a synthesis of research and practice, the presentation examines how long-standing instructional practices that prioritize recall and procedural accuracy often conflict with established principles of learning science, particularly under conditions of increased cognitive demand. Using practice-embedded examples, the session illustrates how AI can function as a cognitive partner that supports teacher decision-making and deepens student engagement, rather than replacing core learning processes. Design-based reasoning is used to surface emerging instructional design principles that clarify how purposeful task automation influences cognitive demand and instructional effectiveness.

Attendees will gain a design-oriented perspective on how AI enables more informed instructional planning, along with principles for identifying tasks appropriate for automation and developing cognitively balanced lessons that align learning design with contemporary learning science.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, cognitive learning, instructional design, critical thinking, professional development.

1 INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of artificial intelligence in K–12 education has intensified longstanding tensions between instructional efficiency and cognitive rigor (Sweller, 1988; Hess et al., 2009). AI-powered tools increasingly automate feedback, generate instructional materials, and support content access. While these capabilities offer practical advantages, their adoption has often occurred without sufficient alignment to learning science, resulting in continued overreliance on low-level cognitive tasks centered on recall and procedural accuracy (Hess et al., 2009; Ellerton, 2021). Research in educational psychology has consistently demonstrated that working memory is limited in capacity and duration, and instructional designs that overemphasize lower-level tasks can constrain opportunities for analysis, transfer, and problem solving (Sweller, 1988; Sweller et al., 2011).

Frameworks such as Webb's Depth of Knowledge (DOK) distinguish between surface-level recall and cognitively demanding forms of reasoning, highlighting that meaningful learning requires engagement beyond memorization (Webb, 2005). However, curricular pressures and accountability demands frequently reinforce instructional practices that privilege DOK 1 tasks. Studies of cognitive rigor indicate that task difficulty is often conflated with cognitive complexity, resulting in learning environments that increase workload without deepening understanding (Hess et al., 2009).

This paper argues that AI, when intentionally designed and implemented, can support a redistribution of cognitive effort by offloading selected DOK 1 tasks. Rather than positioning AI as a substitute for instruction, the proposed approach frames AI as a cognitive partner that preserves teacher agency while creating space for higher-order thinking. The purpose of this paper is to synthesize relevant learning science research and design-based analyses to articulate instructional design principles for cognitively aligned AI integration in K–12 contexts.

https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2026.0661
ISBN: 978-84-09-82385-7

2 METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a design-based, research-informed methodology grounded in systematic synthesis of peer-reviewed literature and practice-based analysis (Ayres & Paas, 2009; Sweller et al., 2011). Rather than reporting outcomes from a controlled experimental intervention, the methodology integrates findings from cognitive load theory, metacognition research, and studies of technology-supported learning environments to examine how task automation influences cognitive demand (Flavell, 1979; Norman et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2026).

Sources included empirical and theoretical studies addressing working memory limitations, schema construction, metacognitive regulation, and cognitive rigor (Sweller, 1988; Ayres & Paas, 2009; Flavell, 1979; Norman et al., 2019; Webb, 2005; Hess et al., 2009). These sources were analyzed using an analytic lens focused on Depth of Knowledge levels, distinctions between intrinsic and extraneous cognitive load, and alignment with principles of effective instructional design (Sweller, 1988; Ayres & Paas, 2009; Webb, 2005). Design-based reasoning was employed to identify recurring instructional challenges and surface patterns in how AI-mediated task offloading alters instructional conditions (Hess et al., 2009; Norman et al., 2019).

This approach emphasizes transferability rather than statistical generalizability, allowing design principles to inform practice across diverse K-12 settings while acknowledging contextual variability. Ethical considerations were addressed by limiting analysis to published research and documented instructional practices, with no collection or analysis of student-level data.

3 RESULTS

The synthesis yielded three interrelated findings relevant to intentional offloading of DOK 1 tasks in AI-supported learning environments.

3.1 Identification of tasks appropriate for offloading

Across instructional contexts, DOK 1 tasks were consistently characterized by factual recall, basic comprehension, and routine procedural execution (Webb, 2005). These tasks typically require learners to retrieve or reproduce information without engaging in analysis, interpretation, or conceptual integration. Common examples include vocabulary review, factual retrieval, initial summarization, and basic skill rehearsal.

From a cognitive load perspective, tasks that emphasize recall and routine processing rely heavily on working memory for information maintenance rather than schema construction. When such tasks dominate instructional time, cognitive resources are disproportionately allocated to holding and reproducing information, limiting opportunities for deeper meaning-making and conceptual understanding (Sweller, 1988; Sweller et al., 2011). While DOK 1 tasks serve an important role in establishing foundational knowledge, they do not, in isolation, promote higher-order reasoning or transfer.

Research on cognitive rigor reinforces this distinction by demonstrating that task difficulty is often mistaken for cognitive complexity. Hess et al. (2009) note that increasing the volume or speed of recall-oriented activity may intensify cognitive effort without deepening cognitive demand. Similarly, Ellerton (2021) argues that instructional approaches grounded primarily in memorization constrain learners' ability to integrate knowledge meaningfully, thereby limiting deep learning and transfer.

Taken together, these findings suggest that DOK 1 tasks are necessary but insufficient for supporting higher-order learning outcomes. Because such tasks primarily involve information maintenance rather than conceptual processing, they are well suited for AI-supported automation when instructional goals remain clearly defined. Offloading these tasks allows instructional time and cognitive resources to be reallocated toward activities that require analysis, application, and reasoning, without removing essential content exposure.

3.2 Cognitive redistribution and instructional depth

Offloading lower-level tasks to AI was associated with a redistribution of cognitive effort within lessons. Cognitive load theory distinguishes between intrinsic load inherent to the learning task and extraneous load imposed by instructional design, with learning most likely to occur when extraneous demands are minimized (Sweller, 1988; Ayres & Paas, 2009). When instructional environments are dominated by routine

processing, working memory resources are consumed by information maintenance, limiting opportunities for schema construction, integration, and higher-order reasoning (Sweller et al., 2011).

Empirical evidence from technology-rich learning environments demonstrates that learning designs which actively manage task complexity and cognitive load are associated with increased engagement, adaptability, and performance (Wang et al., 2026). These findings suggest that the instructional value of technology is not derived from automation alone, but from how effectively cognitive demands are redistributed across tasks. When cognitive resources are preserved for conceptual processing, learners are better positioned to engage in analysis, explanation, and application rather than procedural repetition.

This redistribution of cognitive effort is particularly relevant for supporting transfer of learning. Research on transfer indicates that far transfer depends on learners' ability to abstract underlying principles and apply them across contexts, a process that is constrained when cognitive resources are saturated by rote activity or excessive task demands (Barnett & Ceci, 2002). Instructional designs that prioritize recall and procedural accuracy may therefore increase task completion without improving learners' capacity to generalize or apply knowledge meaningfully.

Taken together, these findings suggest that AI-enabled offloading does not eliminate cognitive challenge but repositions it at more conceptually demanding levels. By reducing extraneous cognitive load associated with routine tasks, AI creates instructional conditions that support higher-order processing aligned with analysis, application, and transfer. Rather than simplifying learning, this approach preserves rigor by ensuring that cognitive effort is directed toward processes most closely associated with deep understanding.

3.3 Implications for teacher decision-making

Offloading also highlight the role of AI as a cognitive partner in instructional planning. Research on metacognition and self-regulated learning emphasizes that effective learning depends not only on awareness of cognitive processes, but on ongoing monitoring, control, and strategic adjustment in response to task demands (Flavell, 1979; Norman et al., 2019). When instructional environments are dominated by routine cognitive demands, these regulatory processes are constrained by limited working memory capacity (Sweller, 1988; Sweller et al., 2011).

By supporting the automation of selected lower-level tasks, AI can reduce extraneous cognitive load and preserve cognitive resources for instructional decision-making. Cognitive load research suggests that such redistribution enables individuals to engage more fully in planning, evaluation, and adaptation rather than information maintenance alone (Sweller, 1988; Ayres & Paas, 2009). In classroom contexts, this shift allows teachers to more effectively interpret student thinking, design tasks that prioritize cognitive rigor, and guide learning processes aligned with higher-order goals.

From this perspective, purposeful automation does not diminish professional agency but strengthens it by restoring the cognitive conditions necessary for informed instructional judgment (Hess et al., 2009). AI functions not as a replacement for pedagogical expertise, but as a support that enables educators to exercise that expertise more deliberately.

4 CONCLUSIONS

This paper demonstrates that intentional offloading of DOK 1 tasks represents a viable instructional design strategy for restoring cognitive space for higher-order thinking in K–12 learning environments. Grounded in cognitive load theory, the findings reinforce that learning is most effective when extraneous cognitive demands are minimized and working memory resources are preserved for schema construction, integration, and transfer (Sweller, 1988; Ayres & Paas, 2009). When aligned with learning science, AI can support cognitive balance by managing routine demands while preserving meaningful challenge, rather than simplifying learning or reducing rigor.

By reframing AI as a cognitive partner rather than an efficiency tool, this approach addresses persistent misalignments between instructional practice and cognitive theory. Depth of Knowledge frameworks emphasize that recall-oriented tasks are necessary but insufficient for deep learning, particularly when instructional environments prioritize coverage over cognitive demand (Webb, 2005; Hess et al., 2009). Intentional task offloading enables instructional designs that foreground analysis, application, and transfer without removing essential content exposure.

For educators and instructional designers, these findings underscore the importance of evaluating tasks not only by content coverage but by cognitive demand and regulatory complexity. Professional

development efforts should therefore emphasize design literacy, metacognitive awareness, and informed task selection rather than tool adoption alone (Flavell, 1979; Norman et al., 2019). Future research should examine how these design principles operate across subject areas and grade levels and explore how educators develop expertise in metacognitively guided task automation. As AI continues to evolve, maintaining alignment with how students learn will remain essential to ensuring that technological innovation supports, rather than constrains, critical thinking.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the contributions of her cofounder, Claire Smizer-Muldoon, for thoughtful dialogue and contributions that informed the development of the ideas presented in this paper.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Sweller, “Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning,” *Cognitive Science*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 257–285, 1988.

[2] P. Ayres and F. Paas, “Interdisciplinary perspectives inspiring a new generation of cognitive load research,” *Educational Psychology Review*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2009.

[3] N. L. Webb, *Depth-of-knowledge levels for four content areas*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, 2005.

[4] K. K. Hess, B. S. Jones, D. Carlock, and J. R. Walkup, “Cognitive rigor: Blending the strengths of Bloom’s taxonomy and Webb’s depth of knowledge to enhance classroom-level processes,” 2009. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED517804

[5] N. F. Ellerton, “On critical thinking and content knowledge: A critique of memorisation-driven curricula,” *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, vol. 41, Article 100975, 2021.

[6] J. H. Flavell, “Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry,” *American Psychologist*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 906–911, 1979.

[7] E. Norman, G. Pfuhl, R. G. Sæle, F. Svartdal, T. Låg, and T. I. Dahl, “Metacognition in psychology,” *Review of General Psychology*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 403–424, 2019.

[8] T. Wang, J. Zheng, S. Li, Y. Zhang, X. Hu, and S. P. Lajoie, “Exploring students’ cognitive load in a computer-simulated learning environment through multimodal data,” *Educational Technology & Society*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 118–135, 2026.

[9] S. M. Barnett and S. J. Ceci, “When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far transfer,” Psychological Bulletin, vol. 128, no. 4, pp. 612–637, 2002.