engageli

WHITEPAPER

# Advancing Human Intelligence With AI

## A Business Case for Active Learning

As organizations adapt to distributed workforces and rising skills gaps, the pressure on corporate learning and development (L&D) to deliver measurable outcomes at scale has intensified. While AI tools have historically been positioned as force-multipliers for content creation and automation, their real value lies in their ability to enhance human intelligence. This white paper presents data-driven comparisons of learning modalities and introduces the strategic case for adopting active virtual learning powered by AI and engagement tools.

Many L&D leaders in enterprise still operate under legacy assumptions:

- That active learning is only effective in in-person settings.
- That virtual engagement tools can't replicate or scale live interaction.
- That passive formats, while suboptimal, are the most economical at scale.

These assumptions are not just outdated - they are costly. This paper compares passive and active formats across key enterprise metrics: retention, scalability, facilitation load, and cost.

## Effectiveness comparison of passive in-person vs. virtual

| Dimension | Passive In-Person | Passive Virtual |
|---|---|---|
| **Learning Outcomes** | Moderate retention | Lower retention; higher risk of disengagement |
| **Engagement** | Slightly better due to physical presence | Low - multitasking is common |
| **Attention Span** | Longer - structure helps | Shorter - distractions are everywhere |
| **Accountability** | Peer presence adds pressure | Minimal - no one notices you're tuned out |
| **Participation** | Low, but some spontineity | Very low unless deliberately prompted |
| **Completion Rates** | High | Often 10-20% lower |
| **Failure Risk** | Elevated | 1.5 times higher than in-person |

**Bottom line:** Passive formats, especially virtual, offer reach - but at the expense of retention, engagement, and completion.

## Effectiveness comparison of active learning modalities

| Dimension | Active In-Person | Active Virtual (No Tools) | Active Virtual (Tools + Producer) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Learning Outcomes** | High | Moderate | High - meets or exceeds in-person |
| **Engagement** | Strong - peer energy, social cues | Medium - flat, low interactivity | Strong - tools replicate live interaction |
| **Scalability** | Low (25 - 40 learners) | Moderate (50 - 75) | High (120 - 150+) |
| **Facilitation Load** | High - manual engagement | High - still solo | Low - producer manages flow |
| **Personalization** | Good but hard to scale | Low | High - driven by engagement data |
| **Analytics** | Manual or missing | Sparce | Rich - real-time dashboards |

**Bottom line:** Adding engagement tools and a virtual AI producer transforms active virtual learning into a high-performing, scalable model.

## Ranking training models from best to worst

| Training Model | Retention | Max Class Size | Instructor Load | Cost Per Learner |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Active Virtual (Tools + Producer)** | 85 - 90% | 120 - 150 | Low - shared with AI and producer | Approx. $30 |
| **Active In-Person** | 85 - 90% | 25 - 40 | Medium - shared with learners | Approx. $360 |
| **Active Virtual (No Tools)** | 70 - 80% | 50-75 | High - manual facilitation | Approx. $19 |
| **Passive In-Person** | 55 - 65% | 100 - 300 | Low - mostly lecture | Approx. $180 |
| **Passive Virtual** | 30 - 50% | 1,000+ | Low - pre-recorded | Approx. $10 |

**Bottom line:** Only active virtual with AI tools achieves high retention, scalability, and cost-efficiency simultaneously.

## Cost analysis of active virtual vs. in-person training

| Cost Category | Virtual Training | In-Person Training |
|---|---|---|
| Instructor Fees | $8,000 | $80,000 |
| Producer / Support | $4,800 | $8,000 |
| Instructional Design | $6,000 | $6,000 |
| Platform / Tech | $1,500 | $5,000 |
| Scheduling / LMS | $1,500 | $1,500 |
| Communication | $2,000 | $2,000 |
| Analytics | $2,000 | $1,000 |
| Recording | $2,000 | $0 |
| Travel (Instructor) | $0 | $5,000 |
| Travel (Learners) | $0 | $150,000 |
| Venue / Setup / Food | $0 | $100,000 |
| **Total** | **Approx. $30,000** | **Approx. $360,000** |
| **Per Learner (1,000)** | **Approx. $30** | **Approx. $360** |

**Bottom line:** Virtual active learning with tools and AI costs roughly one-tenth per learner compared to in-person training.

## The case for the AI producer

Less than 30% of organizations use a dedicated human producer for virtual learning (ATD, 2019). Meanwhile, fewer than 20% of instructors can successfully manage engagement and tech in real-time without support.

# Bridging the gap with AI

An AI producer bridges the gap between the lack of dedicated producers and the need for support in facilitating active training:

- Monitors learner engagement in real time
- Sends targeted nudges to instructors
- Acts as a personal tutor, reinforcing difficult concepts and providing individualized support
- Answers learner questions instantly
- Auto-generates polls and quizzes
- Checks for understanding dynamically throughout the session
- Writes notes and class summaries
- Automates breakout room assignments
- Moderates chat and escalates critical issues

**Bottom line:** AI producers make scalable active learning achievable for every instructor, not just expert facilitators. By automating the core facilitation tasks of a human producer, AI enables consistent delivery, reduces instructor fatigue, and ensures data-driven engagement - cost-effectively and at scale.

**Less than 30% of organizations use a dedicated human producer for virtual learning. Meanwhile, fewer than 20% of instructors can successfully manage engagement and tech in real-time without support.**

# Strategic implications

To achieve enterprise-grade learning outcomes, L&D leaders must evaluate not just content quality, but also delivery model effectiveness. Key takeaways:

- **Retention:** Active virtual learning with tools and AI matches or beats in-person delivery.
- **Efficiency:** Employees would need to repeat passive virtual sessions 2x to achieve the same learning gains.
- **Class size:** One instructor can train 1,000 learners in ~7-9 sessions virtually vs. 25-40 sessions in person.
- **Cost:** Active virtual is up to 90% less expensive per learner than in-person.

This is not about replacing instructors - it's about augmenting them. AI-powered delivery models democratize effective training at scale while reducing overhead and risk.

# Final thought

AI is not the future of L&D: it is the present. The question is no longer *if* organizations should adopt active, AI-enabled learning strategies, but *how fast* they can pivot to models that drive measurable business impact.

For enterprises ready to modernize their learning ecosystems, the data is clear: AI-powered active learning is the path to scalable intelligence development.

**This is not about replacing instructors - it's about augmenting them. AI-powered delivery models democratize effective training at scale while reducing overhead and risk.**

## Sources


- EDUCAUSE (2022). Scaling Online Learning.
- Frontiers in Education (2023). Remote Active Learning Effectiveness.
- Frontiers in Psychology (2023). Online Learning Analytics.
- Inside Higher Ed (2021). Faculty Experiences with Online Teaching During the Pandemic.
- Kizilcec, R. F. (2020). Online learning engagement strategies.
- OECD (2021). The State of Education Post-COVID.
- Training Industry (2023). Learning and Development Cost Benchmarks.
- UNESCO (2021). Future of Learning Report.
- U.S. Department of Education (2020). Distance Education in IPEDS.


# Learn more

engageli

**Organizations interested in experiencing the power of scalable, virtual active learning may request a personalized demonstration of Engageli.**

Book a demo