

TLIC PAPER

# Balancing Innovation and Integrity: Navigating the Challenges of Generative AI in Higher Education

Norman S. St. Clair ,  
Pamela D. McCray 

University of the Incarnate  
Word, San Antonio, TX, USA

[stclair@uiwtx.edu](mailto:stclair@uiwtx.edu)

## ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) tools in higher education has sparked a myriad of discussions, presenting both remarkable opportunities and significant challenges. The problem lies in the dual nature of GAI: while it holds immense potential to enhance learning experiences, foster deeper engagement, and enable personalized education, its misuse for academic dishonesty raises profound concerns regarding the integrity of assessments and the authenticity of student work. The purpose of this paper is to explore the implications of GAI integration in higher education, focusing on the need to reimagine and reform assessment strategies, develop learning environments that promote the ethical use of AI, and implement institutional support systems to ensure that academic integrity remains intact. Our scope includes an examination of faculty perspectives on the pedagogical potential of GAI, the challenges of maintaining academic integrity, and innovative assessment strategies that can mitigate these risks. The central question addressed is how educators and institutions can balance the benefits of GAI with the need to uphold academic standards and integrity.

## KEYWORDS

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI), higher education, innovative assessment strategies, academic integrity, institutional support systems

## 1 INTRODUCTION: THE RISE OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The rapid integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) in higher education has generated both enthusiasm and concern, as complex ethical and pedagogical challenges match its transformative potential. GAI tools such as ChatGPT and Google's Gemini offer promising avenues for enhancing learning experiences, enabling personalized instruction, fostering deeper engagement, and streamlining research processes. These large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated particular utility in facilitating tasks such as data organization, coding, and thematic

St. Clair, N. S., McCray, P. D. (2026). Balancing Innovation and Integrity: Navigating the Challenges of Generative AI in Higher Education. *International Journal of Advanced Corporate Learning (iJAC)*, 19(1), pp. 53–62. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijac.v19i1.58669>

This article is an expanded version of a paper presented at The Learning Ideas Conference, held in New York, NY, USA, June 11–13, 2025. Article submitted 2025-09-15. Revision uploaded 2025-10-16. Final acceptance 2025-11-12.

© 2026 by the authors of this article. Published under CC-BY.

analysis in both quantitative and qualitative research contexts [11], [13], [17]. Conversely, the increasing sophistication of AI-generated content has made it more difficult for educators to distinguish between student-created and AI-assisted work, threatening the credibility of traditional assessments and raising concerns about academic dishonesty and the authenticity of student output [2].

This duality presents a critical tension: while GAI can serve as a valuable secondary research and thought partner, it also risks undermining academic standards. As such, educators and institutions must reevaluate and transform their assessment strategies, promote the ethical use of AI, and provide clear institutional support to uphold academic standards. Drawing on our experience of integrating ChatGPT 4.0 into graduate coursework and an instrumental case study dissertation, this paper offers practical strategies for using GAI responsibly, maintaining methodological rigor, ensuring ethical compliance, and reinforcing the researcher's role as the primary analytic instrument.

## **2 FACULTY PERSPECTIVES ON OPPORTUNITIES AND CONCERNS**

For many educators, the introduction of GAI in the classroom creates excitement and opportunities for innovation. The potential for GAI tools to personalize learning, support student creativity, and facilitate engagement in complex tasks is undeniable. GAI applications such as ChatGPT and other AI-driven platforms can serve as assistants in drafting, brainstorming, and even generating research ideas.

### **2.1 Pedagogical potential of GAI**

GAI tools open new doors to student autonomy, enabling learners to experiment with ideas in ways that were previously impossible [2]. Furthermore, GAI has the potential to break down barriers for students who struggle with traditional academic tasks. For example, students with learning disabilities or those for whom English is not a first language may find GAI tools to be valuable resources for improving their writing, refining their thinking processes, and gaining confidence in their academic abilities. These technologies provide educators with new ways to differentiate instruction and support diverse learners, thereby enhancing inclusivity in higher education.

### **2.2 Academic integrity concerns**

Despite the pedagogical promise of GAI, concerns about academic dishonesty loom large. Faculty worry about how easily students can misuse GAI tools to complete assignments with minimal effort, potentially bypassing the learning process entirely. The ability of GAI to generate sophisticated text, sometimes indistinguishable from human writing, complicates the task of educators who are tasked with evaluating students' understanding and intellectual growth. Studies by [8] have highlighted the difficulty faculty face in identifying GAI-generated work, as participants can only distinguish GAI-created content from human-authored work 50% of the time.

The level of sophistication in leveraging GAI challenges the foundations of academic integrity. As GAI becomes more integrated into the educational experience, the potential for students to misuse these technologies to plagiarize or fabricate

assignments increases. The traditional markers of originality, critical thinking, and intellectual effort risk being eroded, leading to growing concerns about the long-term impact of GAI on educational quality.

### 2.3 Balancing AI assistance with human judgment

Another concern is that balancing AI assistance with human judgment in research projects, especially when using qualitative methods, requires careful consideration of both the benefits and limitations of AI-driven tools [14]. According to [10], GAI, such as ChatGPT, can play a crucial role in qualitative research by acting as a consultant, methodological guide, and facilitator of data analysis. It can help explain research principles, outline methodological procedures, and provide examples from empirical research to assist researchers in navigating complex qualitative methodologies and theories.

Some researchers promote the efficiency gains of using AI to assist with data processing, coding, and thematic analysis, while others express concern [17]. Although AI can help in transitioning raw text to categorized data, the analysis relies on the tool's pre-trained knowledge, and the researcher must be aware of the human bias introduced during the AI training process. Additionally, the speed of coding with AI may compromise the depth of insights and fail to capture the nuances of the study population, particularly for novice researchers who may place overreliance on AI-generated outputs [17].

Therefore, researcher guidance, intervention, and judgment are crucial for developing effective AI and user engagement. The effectiveness of prompting strategies and the incorporation of domain-specific information into customized AI models to credibly address the research questions must be evaluated and documented [10]. The balance between AI assistance and human judgment highlights the importance of ethical oversight, critical engagement, and the responsible integration of AI into research methodologies.

## 3 REIMAGINING ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES IN THE AGE OF GAI

The introduction of GAI tools necessitates a fundamental shift in how educators assess student learning. Traditional assessment methods, such as written essays, take-home exams, and term papers, are particularly vulnerable to AI-assisted cheating. As [18] points out, conventional forms of assessment are becoming less effective at distinguishing between authentic student work and AI-generated outputs. This problem is exemplified in online learning environments where monitoring is limited.

### 3.1 The need for innovative assessments

In response to the assessment challenges, educators are increasingly advocating for the adoption of innovative assessment strategies designed to minimize the opportunities for GAI-assisted dishonesty. [8] suggest that assessments should shift away from static formats, such as essays and exams, and instead incorporate more dynamic, interactive forms of evaluation. These might include oral examinations, peer evaluations, and project-based learning, all of which require active student participation and critical thinking.

### 3.2 Oral examinations and presentations

Oral examinations offer a powerful alternative to traditional written assessments in the context of GAI. By requiring students to articulate their ideas verbally, educators can assess not only the depth of a student's knowledge but also their ability to think critically and respond in real time [18]. Oral presentations demand genuine engagement with course material, as students must demonstrate their understanding and defend their ideas in front of peers or instructors. This form of assessment reduces the likelihood of students relying on AI-generated content for knowledge depth, given the interactive and spontaneous nature of oral exams.

### 3.3 Peer evaluation

Another effective strategy is peer evaluation, where students assess one another's work based on a set of predetermined criteria. Peer evaluations not only foster collaborative learning but also encourage students to engage with course content on a deeper level, as they are required to analyze and critique the work of their peers [5]. In this context, peer evaluation provides a safeguard against AI misuse, as students are more likely to identify unoriginal or AI-generated content in their peers' work.

### 3.4 Collaboration and project-based learning (PBL)

Collaborative projects that require group interaction and problem-solving also help mitigate the risk of GAI misuse. Group projects demand a level of real-time interaction and cooperation that AI tools cannot replicate. Students are expected and often required to contribute to group discussions, problem-solving processes, and decision-making activities, making it challenging for AI-generated content to play a central role in completing the task [5], [18].

These collaborative efforts can center on Project-based learning (PBL). PBL is another promising alternative to traditional assessments because it centers on critical thinking. PBL involves students working on complex, real-world problems that require sustained inquiry and the application of knowledge across disciplines [8]. This form of learning emphasizes process over product, encouraging students to engage in critical thinking, collaboration, and creative problem-solving. By focusing on projects that require continuous interaction with the subject matter and reflection on learning, educators can create an environment where AI-generated content is less useful and less likely to be used dishonestly [8].

## 4 CULTIVATING ETHICAL AI USE IN THE CLASSROOM

Educators need to carefully examine the ethical implications of using AI in the classroom for inquiry- and research-based projects. AI should be viewed as a supportive tool rather than a replacement for human interpretation. Authors of [12] posit that the use of AI in higher education has raised concerns over privacy, accuracy, and ethical dilemmas. While GAI presents opportunities for enhanced efficiency and insight generation, the following ethical considerations and challenges remain paramount.

#### 4.1 Promoting self-regulated learning (SRL)

In addition to rethinking assessment strategies, educators must actively cultivate a culture of ethical AI use. This action begins by encouraging self-regulated learning (SRL), where students take ownership of their educational journey and use GAI as a tool for growth rather than a shortcut. Authors of [8] argue that students need to develop a sense of responsibility for their learning outcomes. By fostering environments that prioritize SRL, educators can help students understand that the true purpose of AI is to enhance their thinking, not replace their intellectual effort [5].

Self-regulation involves setting personal learning goals, monitoring progress, and reflecting on performance [1], [5]. Instructors can promote SRL by providing clear guidelines on how to use GAI tools responsibly and by creating assignments that require students to engage in reflective practices. For example, educators might ask students to submit a reflective journal detailing how they used GAI in their work, what they learned from it, and how it contributed to their understanding of the subject [6]. Such practices help students develop a more ethical and intentional approach to using AI in their academic work.

#### 4.2 Co-regulated learning environments

Beyond self-regulation, co-regulated learning environments play a crucial role in guiding the ethical use of AI. Co-regulation involves collaboration between educators and students in the learning process, creating opportunities for shared responsibility and collective decision-making [6], [8]. In these environments, educators model the ethical use of AI, guiding students in understanding both the benefits and potential pitfalls of these tools [9]. By working together, students and faculty can create a learning culture that emphasizes the responsible use of technology, academic honesty, and intellectual growth.

#### 4.3 Transparency and accountability

A primary concern in using GAI is transparency: emerging scholars and researchers must clearly disclose the role of AI in their methodologies to uphold academic integrity. The lack of transparency regarding AI-assisted research may raise questions about authenticity and accountability [17]. Researchers should maintain a detailed audit trail of their manually generated documents and their interactions with the GAI infrastructure, including prompts and outputs. It is also essential that researchers consistently employ and document their rigorous data collection and analysis processes to maintain the credibility and trustworthiness of the research [20].

#### 4.4 Avoiding over-reliance on AI

Maintaining the researcher's role as the primary analytical instrument prevents AI from unduly influencing interpretations. For example, over-reliance on AI tools can jeopardize this role, as AI-generated content may lack the depth and insight derived from human experience [16], [19]. Moreover, AI systems are prone to "hallucinations," producing plausible-sounding but incorrect or nonexistent information, which can mislead researchers and compromise the quality of academic

work [3], [16]. Authors of [4] posit that large language models (LLMs) are not designed to process and represent information at the level of human cognitive engagement. However, they may be trained to give this impression to users [4]. We experienced this phenomenon multiple times when triangulating with ChatGPT and asking for scholarly references to support the output. Over half of the cited references were either nonexistent or invalid.

#### 4.5 Data privacy and integrity

The ethical use of AI involves safeguarding research data used in AI-assisted research efforts. For example, study participant data, such as interview transcripts, should be anonymized and de-identified before being used with GAI, and file masking techniques should be employed [7]. The study data, GAI triangulation prompts, and GAI output documentation should be stored on a secure cloud-based infrastructure using research team role-based access protocols to protect data privacy and its integrity [14].

### 5 LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

GAI can serve as a valuable tool in the inquiry and research process when used responsibly and ethically. By maintaining researcher oversight, ethical integrity, and methodological rigor, we can harness the potential of AI without compromising the fundamental principles of qualitative inquiry [15]. From our experience, we propose the following best practices for researchers integrating GenAI into their research projects:

- a) Establish clear protocols to delineate the roles of AI and the researcher.
- b) Use of structured prompts and specific domain sites, such as research protocols and processes, to ensure that the AI outputs align with the research objectives and questions.
- c) Prioritize researcher oversight in all AI-assisted processes.
- d) Maintain transparency in documenting AI engagement.
- e) Continuously evaluate and refine the role of AI in the research process that adheres to institutional policies.

### 6 INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND AI DETECTION TECHNOLOGIES

According to [2], institutional support is crucial in addressing the challenges posed by GAI in higher education. Universities must develop clear, comprehensive policies that outline the ethical use of AI tools and the consequences of academic dishonesty. As the capabilities of GAI continue to evolve, institutions must also invest in AI detection technologies.

#### 6.1 The role of institutional policies

Institutional policies regarding AI usage must be continually reviewed and updated to align with the rapid advancements in technology. Policies should be communicated effectively to both faculty and students to ensure a shared understanding of the standards expected in scholarly work. Furthermore,

institutions should implement educational policies and offer educators training and development opportunities, equipping them with the necessary tools and knowledge to navigate the evolving landscape of GAI in education [2]. Workshops on designing AI-resistant assessments, fostering SRL, and promoting ethical AI use can empower faculty to better support students in using AI as a learning aid rather than a means of circumventing academic integrity. These training programs should also include guidelines on how to detect AI-generated content and how to respond when students misuse AI tools.

## 6.2 AI detection tools and academia-industry collaboration

As the capabilities of GAI continue to evolve, institutions must also invest in AI detection technologies. AI detection tools that analyze the structure, coherence, and originality of written content can help educators identify instances where students have relied too heavily on AI-generated outputs. However, [18] detection tools are not a cure-all; they must be integrated into a broader strategy that includes education, policy, and assessment reform. Collaboration between academia and industry is essential in developing more sophisticated detection tools. Institutions should partner with technology companies to create AI-detection software that can keep pace with the rapid advancements in GAI capabilities. These collaborations can lead to the development of systems that not only detect AI misuse but also provide insights into how students are utilizing AI, enabling educators to refine their teaching practices accordingly [8].

## 7 DISCUSSION: HIGHER EDUCATION EXPERIENCE AND PERSPECTIVE

Along with being a corresponding author for our paper, I am also a professor with three decades of experience in higher education, having chaired numerous dissertation committees. I have had the privilege of guiding countless master's and doctoral students through their research journey, including this paper's coauthor. This extensive background has provided me with deep insight into both the potential and the challenges posed by integrating GAI in academia. Throughout my career, I have developed innovative pedagogical approaches and led research projects that emphasize intellectual rigor and academic integrity. My experience working closely with graduate students and navigating the evolving academic landscape informs my perspective on the ethical use of AI, promoting innovative assessment strategies, ensuring equitable access to AI tools, and fostering an academic environment that values integrity while embracing technological advancements.

To navigate the complexities, educators and institutions must adopt innovative assessment strategies, promote the ethical use of AI, and provide strong institutional support. Institutions must invest in AI detection technologies and ensure that AI serves as an additive rather than a substitute for original intellectual effort [2], [5]. Graduate education is a realm where AI can provide unparalleled support, particularly in automating repetitive tasks such as data analysis, drafting, and organizing research. However, as noted in the literature, this brings a challenge: AI-generated content often blurs the line between student work and machine assistance.

One key strategy for mitigating the risks of AI misuse is to adopt alternative assessment methods that go beyond traditional written assignments, which are vulnerable to AI-generated responses. Oral exams and peer evaluations, for instance, provide opportunities for students to engage with material in ways that require genuine intellectual effort. Furthermore, project-based learning, which

emphasizes collaboration and problem-solving, makes it more challenging for AI to substitute for meaningful student contributions [8].

In my view, faculty members should also lead by example in incorporating AI into their research practices. I've personally encountered a delicate balance between using AI as an aid and over-relying on it. My recommendation for faculty is to be transparent about when and how AI is used in research, ensuring that AI is positioned as a supporting tool rather than the creator of intellectual output.

The importance of equity in AI access cannot be overstated. Universities should establish AI literacy programs and resource hubs that equip students with the necessary training and tools to engage confidently with AI. In my teaching, I emphasize the importance of developing proficiency in AI for all students, as it is becoming increasingly integrated into both academic and professional environments [8].

I contend that trust and credibility are fundamental for both faculty and students when integrating AI into academic work. I advocate for the development of institutional policies that clearly outline acceptable uses of AI in research and coursework. These policies should be rooted in transparency and equity, particularly in application and assessment, encouraging both faculty and students to disclose when AI has been used and how it contributed to their work. Creating a culture of openness and honesty surrounding AI use will help maintain trust within the academic community and ensure that AI serves to enhance, rather than diminish, the credibility of scholarly work [2].

## 8 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The risks of AI misuse still need to be addressed directly, rather than being dismissed as paranoia among educators and researchers. AI detection tools are one way to mitigate these risks, but they must be part of a broader strategy that includes education, policy development, and assessment reform. However, detection tools alone are insufficient, as they can mistakenly flag legitimate content. Therefore, we recommend that institutions not only invest in detection technologies but also train faculty to recognize the nuances of AI-generated content. Moreover, AI-resistant assessments should focus on real-world applications and critical thinking, areas where AI is less effective at substituting human input [18].

Looking forward, we believe the future of higher education lies in how well we integrate AI into our teaching and research practices while maintaining our commitment to academic integrity. We should not be afraid of AI; instead, we should become proficient in its use and comfortable with allowing it to represent our voice when appropriate. The key is to remain vigilant about where AI assists and where it overreaches, ensuring that our own intellectual contributions stay at the forefront. By doing so, the entire academic community, comprising administrators, instructors, and students, can harness AI's potential to enhance the educational experience while upholding the values of integrity, trust, and originality that are central to higher education.

## 9 DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

*Statement: During the preparation of this work, the author(s), Norman S. St. Clair and Pamela D. McCrau, used ChatGPT 4.0 in order to improve the readability of the document.*

After using this tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed, and we take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

## 10 REFERENCES

- [1] A. Bandura, "Social cognitive theory of self-regulation," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 248–287, 1991. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90022-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90022-L)
- [2] D. R. E. Cotton, P. A. Cotton, and J. Shipway, "Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT," *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 228–239, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- [3] S. Joshi, "Comprehensive review of AI hallucinations: Impacts and mitigation strategies for financial and business applications," *International Journal of Computer Applications Technology and Research*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 38–50, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.7753/IJCATR1406.1003>
- [4] M. T. Hicks, J. Humphries, and J. Slater, "ChatGPT is bullshit," *Ethics Inf Technol*, vol. 26, p. 38, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09775-5>
- [5] T. Issa and M. Hall, "A teamwork framework for preventing breaches of academic integrity and improving students' collaborative skills in the AI era," *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 19, p. e38759, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e38759>
- [6] T. Ito and T. Umemoto, "Self-regulation, co-regulation, and socially shared regulation of motivation for collaborative activity: Comparison between university students and working adults," *Jpn Psychol Res*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 397–409, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12337>
- [7] K. Kaiser, "Protecting respondent confidentiality in qualitative research," *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 1632–1641, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732309350879>
- [8] J. Lodge, P. de Barba, and J. Broadbent, "Learning with generative artificial intelligence within a network of co-regulation," *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, vol. 20, no. 7, p. 2, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.7.02>
- [9] J. A. Matthews and C. R. Volpe, "Academics' perceptions of ChatGPT-generated written outputs: A practical application of Turing's Imitation Game," *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 82–100, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.8896>
- [10] N. Mazeikiene and J. Kasperiuene, "AI-enhanced qualitative research: Insights from Adele Clarke's situational analysis of TED talks," *The Qualitative Report*, vol. 29, no. 9, pp. 2502–2526, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2024.7652>
- [11] D. L. Morgan, "Exploring the use of artificial intelligence for qualitative data analysis: The case of ChatGPT," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 22, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231211248>
- [12] I. A. Olohunfunmi and A. Z. Ahmad Zulfadhli Khairuddin, "Exploring ethical dilemmas of AI generative tools among higher education students: A systematic review," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Innovation & Entrepreneurship in Computing, Engineering & Science Education (InvENT 2024)*, in Advances in Computer Science Research, vol. 117, 2024. [https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-589-8\\_24](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-589-8_24)
- [13] F. Pattyn, "The value of generative AI for qualitative research: A pilot study," *Journal of Data Science and Intelligent Systems*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 184–191, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.47852/bonviewJDSIS4202964>
- [14] M. Perkins and J. Roe, "Generative AI tools in academic research: Applications and implications for qualitative and quantitative research methodologies," in *Handbook of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education*, 2025, pp. 76–91. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035338764.00012>

- [15] D. B. Resnik and M. Hosseini, “The ethics of using artificial intelligence in scientific research: New guidance needed for a new tool,” *AI Ethics*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 1499–1521, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00493-8>
- [16] V. L. Rulfi and I. Spada, “Guidelines for the use of generative AI in research paper writing,” in *Proceedings of the GENerative, Explainable and Reasonable Artificial Learning*. 2023. <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3571/short3.pdf>
- [17] R. C. Slotnick and J. Z. Boeing, “Enhancing qualitative research in higher education assessment through generative AI integration: A path toward meaningful insights and a cautionary tale,” *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, vol. 2025, no. 182, pp. 97–112, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20631>
- [18] Y. Xie, S. Wu, and S. Chakravarty, “AI meets AI: Artificial intelligence and academic integrity—A survey on mitigating AI-assisted cheating in computing education,” in *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference on Information Technology Education. Association for Computing Machinery*. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3585059.3611449>
- [19] A. K. Y. Yanamala and S. Suryadevara, “Navigating data protection challenges in the era of artificial intelligence: A comprehensive review,” *Revista de Inteligencia Artificial en Medicina*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 113–146, 2024. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3926743>
- [20] R. K. Yin, *Case Study Research Design and Methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 2014.

## 11 AUTHORS

**Norman S. St. Clair**, Ph.D., is a Professor of Education at the University of the Incarnate Word (UIW) Dreeben School of Education. He has also spent a significant part of his career in administrative and international roles while guiding students’ experiential learning. He was the founding director of the China Incarnate Word Education Center in Guangzhou, where progress depended on cultural awareness, patience, and long-term relationships. He is an AI Fellow at UIW, and he has raised questions about how new tools intersect with reflection, research, and professional judgment while creating space for experiential learning that is careful, reflective, and ethically grounded (E-mail: [stclair@uiwtx.edu](mailto:stclair@uiwtx.edu)).

**Pamela D. McCray** is an accomplished professional with a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership and Evaluation and over two decades of executive leadership experience in the technology sector, providing a strong foundation in both academic scholarship and practical industry knowledge. She continually seeks ways to integrate emerging technologies into her scholarly research and teaching practice, opening new avenues for adult learning and pedagogical approaches (E-mail: [pmccray@student.uiwtx.edu](mailto:pmccray@student.uiwtx.edu)).