



What does 'good teaching' mean in the AI age?

Jürgen Rudolph ^A	A	Murdoch University, Singapore
Fiona Xiaofei Tang ^B	B	Kaplan Business School Australia
Tania Aspland ^C	C	Kaplan Australia and New Zealand
Vanessa Stafford ^D	D	Kaplan Business School Australia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2025.8.2.1>

Introduction

Good teaching in the AI era remains what it has always been: a willingness to do whatever helps students learn (Brookfield et al., 2023). In *Teaching Well*, Brookfield et al. (2023) elaborate a learning-centred pedagogy—classroom democratisation, critical thinking and reflection, and the ethical negotiation of power—that does not become obsolete when a new technology arrives. Yet the rise of generative AI (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, Claude, Perplexity, and DeepSeek) has provoked both exuberance and anxiety across higher education (Rudolph et al., 2025). Public discourse oscillates between 'job-killer' narratives and boosterish promises of frictionless productivity, and the higher education sector is not immune to either (Rudolph et al., 2023). Against this backdrop, we anchor our analysis in what *Teaching Well* articulates as good teaching and examine how its core commitments can be defended—and, where needed, critically recontextualised—in the AI age.

In this Editorial, we critically examine GenAI's implications for good teaching in higher education. Using *Teaching Well* as our conceptual compass, we affirm that the fundamentals of effective teaching remain indispensable. We argue that techno-optimistic narratives require tempering: AI can augment teaching and learning, but it cannot substitute the human dimensions of pedagogy.

At the same time, we recognise that to uphold academic integrity, certain practices cannot remain unchanged in the face of AI's impact. In particular, assessment design requires urgent critique lest we fall into performative or uncritical integration—for example, slapping an 'AI-enabled' label to legacy tasks without substantive rethink and where necessary redesign, or imposing nominal 'No-AI' prohibitions that are neither enforced nor educationally justified (Perkins et al., 2025). We draw on Perkins et al.'s (2025) AI Assessment Scale (AIAS) to explore how educators can productively reshape

their assessment tasks, ensuring the use of AI is in alignment with sound pedagogical principles, rather than resorting to reactive or cosmetic measures.

The phrase "AI age" is defensible as shorthand for the accelerated diffusion of generative systems reshaping knowledge production, access, and assessment (Rudolph et al., 2023). Yet the label also risks reifying vendor narratives and collapsing important continuities in educational purpose, values, and ethics—precisely the hype that critical scholarship warns against (Hao, 2025; Mitchell, 2024; Rudolph et al., 2025). Following Lindgren (2024), who treats 'AI' as an empty signifier, we distinguish AI—the wider socio-technical assemblage of automation, algorithmic decision-making and datafication—from generative AI (GenAI), i.e., models that synthesise content such as large language and diffusion models. Used judiciously, "AI age" functions as an analytic convenience—not a total rupture—paired with scrutiny of who benefits, what is obscured, and whether practices are intentionally redesigned rather than merely rebranded. In what follows, most pedagogical claims target GenAI; when we mean the broader field, we say "AI" explicitly.

Our goal is to articulate a critical *and* constructive vision of good teaching in the AI age. We neither dismiss GenAI outright nor embrace it uncritically. Instead, we advocate a learning-centred use of GenAI: employ it where it demonstrably supports student learning and development, and resist uses that compromise academic integrity or sound pedagogy. We revisit core tenets of good teaching, show how GenAI challenges or reinforces them, and offer practical guidelines for educators and leaders to sustain pedagogical quality in an AI-saturated world.

Learning-centred teaching vs. techno-utopianism

A central message of *Teaching Well* is that good teaching is learning-centred, not teacher- or technology-centred. In practice, this means grounding our decisions in what helps students learn, rather than in what's trendy. It also means resisting the popular media 'hero teacher' trope (Brookfield et al., 2023) and, by extension, the fetish for shiny new tech tools for their own sake.

Overly optimistic narratives often portray AI as a *super-teacher* – an infallible tutor that can personalise learning perfectly or a saviour that will 'disrupt' all the old educational problems (Houser, 2025; Khan Academy, 2025; Selwyn, 2019). Such techno-utopianism risks substituting gadgetry for pedagogy. History counsels restraint: successive waves of 'revolutionary' EdTech—from correspondence courses and film to radio, television, early teaching machines, personal computers, the web, and dot-com e-learning—were routinely heralded as cure-alls yet yielded modest, uneven gains when divorced from pedagogy. Educational change has been more contingent than deterministic. We should resist both techno-fetishism and Luddism and insist on design-led implementation (Kefalaki et al., 2022).

As educators, we must resist the allure of ubiquitous metrification – the obsession with quantifiable metrics or algorithmic outputs as proxies for teaching quality (Brookfield et al., 2023). The efficacy of teaching cannot be fully captured by AI analytics or automated dashboards any more than it can by simplistic student evaluations. *Teaching Well* reminds us that higher education is inherently ideological and context-dependent, not a value-neutral input-output system.

In the AI age, maintaining a learning-centred focus requires critical context-setting whenever we use AI. A good teacher in 2025 will ask: 'How does this AI tool enhance my particular students' learning in this specific context?' Framed by Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK), that is a TK–PK–CK judgement anchored in Contextual Knowledge (XK) (Mishra, 2019; Mishra et al., 2023). If a generative AI tool can instantly produce an essay or solve a problem, a naive techno-optimist might declare the human teacher obsolete for those tasks. But an effective, context-aware teacher will instead consider how to integrate that tool to support learning—for instance, by using GenAI-generated answers as a starting point for critique, comparison, or deeper inquiry by students. A good teacher re-centres on learning objectives: what students should learn and how GenAI may advance—or impede—that learning.

This approach requires a shift from detection/prohibition to design in the face of GenAI (Perkins et al., 2025). Rather than asking, 'How do we stop students from using GenAI?' (a reactive stance focused on the technology), a learning-centred teacher asks 'How might students *productively use* GenAI in a way that still meets the intended outcomes?' – or conversely, 'How do we redesign the task if we truly need to ensure students *don't* use GenAI here?' These questions put learning first, technology second.

Good teaching has always involved meeting students where they are and guiding them forward. AI doesn't change that. If anything, today's classrooms are more diverse in experience and learning preferences than ever, and *Teaching Well* emphasises adapting to this diversity through multiple teaching modalities. Brookfield et al. (2023) recommend the rule of three – using at least three different instructional approaches or media in a class session – to sustain engagement. GenAI can be one modality in the mix (e.g. an AI-driven simulation or brainstorming activity), but never the only one. A class that only consists of students interacting with a Large Language Model (LLM), for example, would violate the spirit of responsive and inclusive pedagogies.

Moreover, *Teaching Well* underscores that building trusting relationships with students is key to establishing teacher credibility and a sense of community (Brookfield et al., 2023). In this context, kindness is not sentimentality but a rigorous pedagogical stance that sustains presence, belonging, and humane practice (Aspland & Fox, 2022; Aspland et al., 2024). Complementing this, *compassion*—what Tan (2022) terms the *heartware* of teaching (mindsight, attentive love, storytelling)—names the human(e) architecture of pedagogy. Trust, community, kindness, and compassion arise from human interactions—listening, responding to feedback, showing empathy and authenticity—and these cannot be automated. When institutions lean too heavily on AI (e.g., AI tutors or grading bots) without a clear human presence, student–teacher trust and connection can erode, and motivation may suffer; recent guidance emphasises keeping humans in the loop and foregrounding human-centred design for precisely these reasons (Luo, 2024).

Conversely, when used judiciously under a teacher's guidance, GenAI can offload routine work and free time for high-touch interactions with students (Rudolph et al., 2023; Waring, 2025). The presence of GenAI in higher education should prompt *more* emphasis on the human elements of teaching, not less. AI can assist with certain tasks, but it cannot genuinely care for people or build the mentorship bonds that great teachers do. Nor does AI think or understand; it is neither intelligent nor artificial, but mirrors human cognition, aims, and errors rather than originating its own (Crawford, 2021; Rudolph et al., 2025; Vallor, 2024). Accordingly, the teacher's role as facilitator, motivator, and ethical guide becomes even more critical (Selwyn, 2019), and AI compels us to revisit graduate attributes: privileging adaptive expertise, critical AI literacy, and evaluative judgement in profession-relevant, workplace-simulated tasks over routine reproduction (Waring, 2025).

A learning-centred, contextual approach recognises inequities and variations in how AI affects learners. Not all students have equal access to current GenAI models or equal proficiency in using them; some may over-rely on GenAI and struggle when it fails them, while others may be unfairly suspected of misconduct due to biased or error-prone detectors. A good teacher should make GenAI's limitations explicit, teach ethical and documented use, and avoid sole reliance on automated detection—for example, by triangulating with process evidence or brief oral checks. *Teaching Well* reminds us that pedagogy is always entangled with power dynamics and institutional constraints, which

can derail well-intentioned innovations (Brookfield et al., 2022, 2023).

AI is now entangled in these dynamics: it embeds corporate power and training-data bias. An educator committed to equity, therefore, has to critically evaluate outputs with students—for example, examining where an LLM's answer may reflect hidden biases or omit salient perspectives—rather than treating AI as an objective oracle. Holding a learning-centred, context-aware stance helps guard against AI evangelists' grandiose, uncritical claims (Rudolph et al., 2025). We position AI as a tool in the service of pedagogy, not an autonomous pedagogue.

Fostering critical thinking and reflection in an AI world

A hallmark of good teaching is cultivating students' critical thinking. As *Teaching Well* (Chapter 8) clarifies, critical thinking is not monolithic but a variety of practices across analytic logic, scientific reasoning, pragmatism, psychoanalytic inquiry, and critical theory (Brookfield et al., 2023). Crucially, it is not a mere 'doubting game' of disembodied rationalism: robust critical thinking engages affective and cultural dimensions, questions one's own assumptions, and takes shape differently across Western and non-Western traditions (Brookfield et al., 2023).

Why is this relevant to AI? Because generative systems excel at surface fluency—mimicking argumentative structure without cultivating the habits of mind that critical thinking requires. Over-reliance on such tools can erode critical thinking, independent analysis and problem-solving (Kasneci et al., 2023; Popenici et al., 2023). If an LLM can draft a passable essay or solution in minutes, some students may accept it uncritically, short-circuiting their own cognitive engagement. Our task, therefore, is to design for agency: keep students in the driver's seat of inquiry—even as AI sits in the passenger seat—and use AI outputs as objects to critique, compare, or extend, rather than as substitutes for thinking.

One approach is to make a critical evaluation of GenAI outputs a learning exercise. Rather than prohibiting GenAI outright, a teacher might ask students to critique an LLM-generated essay or verify the sources and accuracy of a GenAI-produced answer, thereby positioning GenAI as an object of analysis rather than a proxy for student thinking.

Such strategies use GenAI as a tool for inquiry—prompting students to verify information, compare perspectives, and synthesise revised answers with their own reasoning. The goal is to ensure students practise the process of reasoning, not merely consume correct outputs. For example, an assignment can require students to (1) prompt an LLM for an initial idea on a complex question, (2) conduct independent research to support or refute that idea, and (3) reflect on how interacting with the system shaped their understanding. In this way, GenAI becomes a catalyst for metacognitive reflection rather than a substitute for thought: students must think about thinking, including GenAI's 'thought' process.

Teaching Well also underscores the importance of critical reflection for students and teachers (Chapter 10): questioning assumptions and viewing practice through multiple lenses—students' eyes, autobiography, peers, and theory (Brookfield, 2017; Brookfield et al., 2023). In a pervasive GenAI environment, new assumptions warrant scrutiny, notably that technology is right or neutral. Teaching students to critique AI aligns with teaching them to critically evaluate sources, authorities, and their own initial beliefs—a continuation of the age-old educational aim to cultivate independent, sceptical, yet open-minded thinkers. Indeed, learning with AI can foster epistemic humility: students quickly see that fluent systems can be wrong or biased, prompting fact-checking and consideration of alternative viewpoints—classic critical-thinking behaviours.

On the instructor's side, AI demands intensified critical reflection on our teaching practice. As *Teaching Well* argues, good teaching means continually examining our pedagogical assumptions and remaining open to change. GenAI compels us to rethink long-standing assessment routines, such as the essay, as the automatic 'gold standard'. If what we care about is argumentation or critique, we might evidence it more validly through oral defences, annotated evidence trails, or partial-AI work with a short rationale. Critical reflection may reveal that some traditional tasks were due for renewal irrespective of GenAI, while others (e.g., in-class debates, viva-style examinations) gain renewed value. The point is not to respond out of alarmism or fad, but through inquiry into how design choices affect learning. Teaching in a critically reflective key keeps us open to change and experimentation rather than drifting onto automatic pilot. GenAI is a test case for that stance, requiring judicious experimentation coupled with rigorous evaluation of impact on learners.

Good teaching in the AI age recommits to critical thinking and reflection—both in what we ask students to do and in how we ourselves adapt. We should design learning so that students critically evaluate GenAI outputs rather than accept them, and we should exercise professional judgement about when and how AI belongs in our pedagogy. In doing so, AI remains a means to the timeless end of cultivating thoughtful, informed, critically engaged learners, rather than a shortcut that undermines that very goal.

Teachers as lifelong learners

Another key theme from *Teaching Well* (especially Chapter 13) is that good teachers are lifelong learners. In the journey of a teaching career, one does not 'arrive' at perfection; rather, teachers evolve by reflecting on experience, learning new skills, and even learning from failures. Brookfield et al. argue that while we improve our technical repertoire over time, what truly keeps teachers effective is learning in other dimensions – *politically, ontologically, somatically, and emotionally (POSE)*. To stay engaged and teach well, we must learn how to navigate institutional politics and advocate for good practices (political learning), how to re-examine our identity and purpose as educators (ontological learning), how to listen to our bodies and manage stress (somatic learning), and how to handle the emotional rollercoaster of teaching (emotional learning). These forms of professional

growth go far beyond the latest tech tool. They cultivate resilience and adaptability – traits that are indispensable in the current AI-driven upheaval.

When GenAI appeared seemingly overnight (the release of ChatGPT in late 2022 stunned many by showing GenAI could perform tasks traditionally used for assessment (Mills et al., 2023)), it was a jarring experience for educators. Yet, the shock and uncertainty surrounding GenAI is not unprecedented. It marks another inflection point in the long journey of pedagogical adaptation to change. Those teachers who have cultivated the habit of learning by doing and ‘failing well’ were better positioned to respond constructively (Brookfield et al., 2023, 2024). For example, early adopters of AI in their teaching trialled small changes: for example, redesigning an assessment by adding a brief AI-use reflection journal. Not all experiments succeeded, but the cycle of trying, observing, and iterating is how practice improves—and collegial sharing accelerates that learning. Many institutions stumbled in their early responses to AI and assessment. Those missteps nonetheless seeded refinement and better practice. Imperfect, proactive action proved preferable to inertia because it catalysed the discourse and subsequent improvements (Perkins et al., 2025).

A critical aspect of teachers’ continuous learning today is precisely learning about AI —when, why, and whether to use it. This is where the *political and ontological* facets of learning matter. Politically, teachers need to engage in institutional decision-making about AI (for example, contributing to course-level policy or advising on academic-integrity strategies). It is important that teacher voices guide these policies because when teachers step into leadership roles, they must carry forward the insights of classroom practice (Brookfield et al., 2023). Yet some educational leaders are swept up in AI evangelism or, conversely, AI paranoia, and lose sight of pedagogical fundamentals. Sector guidance cautions against one-size-fits-all responses to GenAI—whether blanket prohibitions or rapid, top-down tool adoption without consultation and staff development—because such approaches are unlikely to be pedagogically workable in classrooms (Cassidy, 2023; Lodge et al., 2023; Perkins et al., 2025).

The notion of *learning leadership* is pertinent here: it treats leadership as distributed and ‘from below’, oriented on helping others learn while we ourselves continue learning (Brookfield et al., 2023; Preskill & Brookfield, 2009; Preskill et al., 2023). Applied to AI, a learning-oriented leader, for instance, convenes faculty forums on AI’s impacts, learns from teachers’ experiences on the ground, and pilots and evaluates policies before scaling. Such learning leadership also questions assumptions (for example, that GenAI-detection tools will resolve academic integrity concerns) and fosters communities of practice rather than imposing top-down mandates. More broadly, AI integration should be approached as a shared learning process in which teachers, professional staff, administrators, and students act as learning partners.

Ontologically, the rise of AI challenges us to rethink our identity as teachers. If one’s self-concept as a teacher rested on being the ‘sage on the stage’, the advent of LLMs capable

of generating answers, exemplars, feedback, and code with convincing fluency (but without understanding) can unsettle that stance and induce a mini-identity crisis. Long before GenAI, in 1970, Paulo Freire (2000) discredited the ‘banking’ model of education—teaching as one-way deposit and withdrawal—and argued instead for learners as co-creators of knowledge. *Teaching Well* reminds us that what matters most is not the volume of content we transmit but the forms of learning we model and facilitate—intellectual curiosity, ethical reasoning, empathy, and judicious inquiry. These are aspects of our teaching selves that AI cannot authentically enact. Teachers may therefore relinquish the role of sole answer-giver and adopt the roles of a ‘guide by the side’—coach, facilitator, mentor, and designer of learning. That shift long predates AI; GenAI simply gives it fresh urgency. Yet, teachers are far from obsolete. On the contrary, our responsibilities in helping students make sense of knowledge, discern truth, and develop as whole persons are more vital than ever in the AI age. The identities of the good teacher are thus evolving, not diminishing. We can take heart in the fact that the dispositions we cultivate—curiosity, integrity, compassion, adaptability—are exactly what learners need to navigate a world saturated with AI. In this sense, we, too, remain learners, figuring out how to navigate a new landscape. We need not have all the answers. What’s important is remaining committed to the underlying mission of higher education and being willing to learn new tools and methods to advance it.

Good teaching in the AI age still implies teachers who are learning and growing. We continue to reflect, experiment, and collaborate with peers, remaining open to change while anchored in educational values. AI will not replace great teachers, but there is a legitimate concern that institutions may be tempted to deploy it as a cost-cutting substitute (Rudolph et al., 2023; Selwyn, 2019). Crises in higher education are often leveraged to justify managerial ‘efficiencies’ and austerity—“never let a good crisis go to waste” (Fleming et al., 2021)—so AI policy deserves the same scrutiny (Tan et al., 2024). The antidote is active, evidence-informed engagement: learn about AI, shape its use through sound pedagogy, and assert the educator’s irreplaceable role. In doing so, we not only use AI judiciously but also teach through and about AI, extending our repertoire. Thus, good teaching—rooted in human connection and professional judgement—remains the cornerstone of learning, however capable the tools become.

Rethinking assessment: From cheating panic to authentic design

Assessment should evidence what students are intended to learn, not merely what is convenient to test. Final examinations and multiple-choice tests are rarely authentic (Biggs et al., 2019; Brookfield et al., 2023). More broadly, constructive alignment asks us to declare the intended outcomes as verbs, design teaching and learning activities that elicit those verbs, and judge performance against transparent standards rather than a Bell curve (Biggs et al., 2019; Biggs & Tang, 2011). Students learn what is assessed. Thus, the remedy for mismatches between curriculum and assessment is to align tasks with the outcomes we actually

value—argumentation, critique, problem-solving, design, communication—rather than rely on proxies (Biggs et al., 2019; Biggs & Tang, 2011). The AI era does not overturn these principles. It sharpens them, making it even more important to specify the construct, set appropriate conditions, and gather evidence that students can use knowledge in academically and professionally appropriate ways.

Among pedagogical practices, assessment has been the most immediate locus of GenAI's disruption. Assessments such as take-home essays, case analyses, and coding exercises can now be partially or wholly automated, provoking what many described as an *assessment crisis* (Lodge et al., 2023; U.S. Department of Education, 2023). From late 2022, early institutional responses towards GenAI tools like ChatGPT tended towards restrictive, surveillance-oriented measures, with closed-book, in-person examinations (a return to pen-and-paper), blanket prohibitions, and growing reliance on detection tools rather than task redesign (Cassidy, 2023; Chaka, 2023; UNESCO, 2023).

Many instructors quickly found that current AI-detection software is unreliable—prone to false positives and demographic bias, and easily evaded (Chaka, 2024; Perkins et al., 2024; Sadasivan et al., 2024; Weber-Wulff et al., 2023). In hindsight, these reactions are understandable—the terrain of academic integrity shifted almost overnight—but they are not sustainable as long-term solutions. We should be less preoccupied with catching cheaters and more concerned with whether our assessments are valid measures of learning (Dawson et al., 2024). GenAI is an opportunity to confront long-standing weaknesses in assessment design that are now plainly visible.

One constructive response has been the development of GenAI assessment scales. Rather than policing use, Perkins et al.'s (2025) AI Assessment Scale (AIAS) treats GenAI as a design variable to be specified alongside outcomes, conditions, evidence, and criteria. The AIAS aligns the permitted level of GenAI use in a task with the task's intended outcomes and conditions, replacing binary rules (AI allowed/not allowed) with a design framework. In its updated form, the scale offers five non-hierarchical levels—No AI (Level 1), AI Planning (Level 2), AI Collaboration (Level 3), Full AI (Level 4), and AI Exploration (Level 5)—with no level intrinsically 'better'; selection is outcome-led. Where the purpose is to evidence independent writing or problem-solving, a No AI (Level 1) task under appropriate conditions is warranted. Where the goal is to develop students' ability to work with AI (e.g., in research workflows), a higher level (e.g., AI Collaboration or Full AI) can require students to use AI and then document, critique, and build upon its contributions in line with the learning outcomes.

The strength of the AIAS is that it requires intentional assessment design rather than reactive policy. As Perkins et al. (2025) caution, simply labelling a take-home task 'No AI' without redesigning its conditions, evidence, and criteria is largely unenforceable and risks devolving into performance theatre. Students may sign declarations while covert use persists, leaving staff either unaware or chasing detections. Validity and security erode because policy and task are misaligned. Everyone is pretending AI isn't there when it

is. This is the very definition of a performative, uncritical response to AI: a policy on paper with no real impact on learning.

The opposite error is performative embrace: re-badging a legacy assignment as "Level 4: Full AI" without adapting rubrics, process evidence, or support, thereby confusing expectations and allowing students to lean on AI in ways that mask learning—a false sense of knowledge creation. Both extremes—knee-jerk prohibition and uncritical integration—should be avoided. The remedy is design-led alignment of outcomes, conditions, evidence, and criteria (Perkins et al., 2025).

In practice, a thoughtful approach to AI-era assessment begins with design, not detection: build tasks that make learning visible through intermediate artefacts, drafts, short oral checks, and brief reflective justifications, and avoid high-stakes reliance on error-prone detectors (Chaka, 2024; Dawson et al., 2024; U.S. Department of Education, 2023; UNESCO, 2023). Second, specify permitted AI use in line with outcomes and conditions. State up front what you are assessing and align the task design accordingly: if the target is independence, require 'No AI' under authenticated conditions; if the intended outcome is working with AI, permit its use and require evidence and rationale, in line with the AIAS framework (Lodge et al., 2023; Perkins et al., 2025).

Third, assess judgment and voice, not just answers. Adjust criteria to credit how students select, verify, adapt, attribute, and add voice to AI-mediated work, drawing on the literature on evaluative judgement (Bearman et al., 2024). Fourth, sequence evidence across time and modes to strengthen validity: combine brief in-class no-AI writing, an AI-assisted draft with commentary, and an oral defence, aligning with programme-level assessment principles (van der Vleuten et al., 2012; Perkins et al., 2025). By sequencing and mixing modes (written, oral, in-class, take-home), we get a fuller picture of student capability and discourage overreliance on any one tool. Finally, plan for equitable access and teach critical AI literacy: guarantee access to approved tools, teach their limitations and ethics, state clear boundaries for permitted versus prohibited functions, and spell out reasonable adjustments for accessibility tools that use AI (e.g., screen readers, speech-to-text), so that access needs are met without undermining the assessment construct (OECD, 2023; Rudolph et al., 2025; UNESCO, 2023; U.S. Department of Education, 2023; Waring, 2024).

Conclusion

Good teaching in the AI era remains anchored in distinctly human work: contextual responsiveness, critical thinking, ethical judgement, and relationships that sustain learning (Brookfield et al., 2023). Our position has been deliberately critical and constructive. We cautioned against both techno-optimism and performative panic, and argued instead for design-led responses—especially in assessment—so that what we value is what we actually elicit and judge. In practice, this means treating GenAI as a design variable (not a policing problem): make learning visible, specify permitted

use in line with outcomes and conditions, and evaluate students' judgement, not just their answers (Perkins et al., 2025). It also means stepping back from a narrow fixation on 'catching' misuse and returning validity to the centre of assessment conversations (Dawson et al., 2024).

Looking ahead, our call is simple but exacting. First, teach from principles: keep *Teaching Well's* commitments in view—democratisation, critical reflection, humane pedagogy—and let those principles govern where AI belongs and where it does not. Second, redesign with evidence: pilot, evaluate, and share what works, rather than imposing blanket bans or tool mandates. Third, keep the human in the loop: kindness, compassion, and professional judgement cannot be automated; they must frame every AI decision we make. Good teaching in the AI age is neither nostalgic nor credulous. It is the steady, sceptical, and hopeful craft of educators who learn, design, and lead so that technology remains a means, not a master. The end—thoughtful, informed, critically engaged graduates—stays firmly in view.

Highlights of Issue 8(2)

The issue of 8(2) provides a diverse mix of studies, reflections, and reviews that echo, in different ways, our central question: what does it mean to 'teach well' in the AI age? Some of the articles take AI head-on—looking at its influence on student engagement (Ala and co-authors), the impact of GenAI information quality and adoption (Essien and co-authors), the risks it poses to critical thinking (Mohammadkarimi & Omar), and the factors shaping students' perceptions, acceptance, and adoption of GenAI tools (Stroud & Du). Other pieces explore its pedagogical and ethical implications—from the integration of large language models into language classrooms to co-created (Xu), culturally relevant assessment frameworks for teacher education (Naidu & Sevnarayan), and even broader digital transformations through metaverse and 'second life' learning environments (Tegoan and co-authors). Perkins and co-authors' commentary on the AI Assessment Scale (AIAS) is especially provocative, which reminds us that simply labelling or detecting AI use is no substitute for designing assessments that foster judgement, voice, and equity.

Not every contribution is about AI, and that's important. Other articles take us back to enduring concerns: how students experience the hidden costs of academic conventions such as the APA referencing style (Goegan & Roberts); how soft skills are cultivated through work placements (Mikrut & Collins); how simulations create engagement and flow in management education (Zhang & Choi); and how institutions and learners alike navigate sustainability and learning dynamics across different higher education models (Liu and co-authors). These bring to mind that questions of motivation, integrity, and development remain at the heart of teaching—whether or not AI is in the room.

We also have pieces that stretch the boundaries of what counts as scholarship in refreshing ways. An opinion piece uses BTS songs to spark new thinking about services marketing pedagogy (Noor), whilst book reviews bring critical perspectives on multilingual education (Tang), learning

resources (Waresindo & Rohmatulloh), critical management studies (Rudolph), and even how academics themselves might approach AI in writing and research (Rohmatulloh & Winarni). Taken together, these contributions do not give us a single answer to 'good teaching', but they do show us the richness of the conversation when numerous voices and approaches are in play. Reading across this issue, we are struck by how the real question isn't whether we should use AI, but how we teach well with and around it.

References

- Bearman, M., Tai, J., Dawson, P., Boud, D., & Ajjawi, R. (2024). Developing evaluative judgement for a time of generative artificial intelligence. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 0(0), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2335321>
- Biggs, J., Harris, C. W., & Rudolph, J. (2019). Teaching for quality learning at changing universities: A tour de force of modern education history—an interview with Professor John Biggs. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 2(1), 54–62. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2019.2.1.6>
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Open University Press / McGraw-Hill Education.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2017). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Brookfield, S. D., Rudolph, J., & Tan, S. (2022). Powerful teaching, the paradox of empowerment and the powers of Foucault: An interview with Professor Stephen Brookfield. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 131–145. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2022.5.12>
- Brookfield, S. D., Rudolph, J., & Tan, S. (2023). *Teaching well: How to nurture effective learning in higher education*. Routledge.
- Brookfield, S. D., Rudolph, J., & Tan, S. (2024). 'Failing well' in teaching about race, racism and white supremacy: An interview with Stephen Brookfield. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 364–389. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2024.7.1.23>
- Cassidy, C. (2023, January 10). Australian universities to return to 'pen and paper' exams after students caught using AI to write essays. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/jan/10/universities-to-return-to-pen-and-paper-exams-after-students-caught-using-ai-to-write-essays>
- Chaka, C. (2023). Detecting AI content in responses generated by ChatGPT, YouChat, and Chatsonic: The case of five AI content detection tools. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 94–104. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.12>
- Chaka, C. (2024). Accuracy pecking order—How 30 AI detectors stack up in detecting generative artificial

intelligence content in university English L1 and English L2 student essays. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 127-139. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2024.7.1.33>

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.

Dawson, P., Bearman, M., Dollinger, M., & Boud, D. (2024). Validity matters more than cheating. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(7), 1005-1016. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2386662>

Fleming, P., Rudolph, J., & Tan, S. (2021). 'Never let a good crisis go to waste': An interview with Professor Peter Fleming on dark academia, the pandemic and neoliberalism. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 110-120. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2021.4.2.14>

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.; M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum. (Original work published in 1970.)

Hao, K. (2025). *Empire of AI: Dreams and nightmares in Sam Altman's OpenAI*. Penguin Press.

Houser, K. (2025, January 25). *Sal Khan wants to give every student on Earth a personal AI tutor*. Freethink. <https://www.freethink.com/consumer-tech/khanmigo-ai-tutor>

Ismail, F., Crawford, J., Tan, S., Rudolph, J., Tan, E., Seah, P., Tang, F. X., Ng, F., Visser Kaldenbach, L., Naidu, A., Stafford, V., & Kane, M. (2024). Artificial intelligence in higher education database (AIHE V1): Introducing an open-access repository. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2024.7.1.35>

Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>

Kefalaki, M., Diamantidaki, F., & Rudolph, J. (2022). Editorial 5(SI1): Technology and education: Innovation or hindrance? *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 5(SI1), 6-11. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2022.5.s1.1>

Khan Academy. (2025). *Khanmigo: AI-powered personal tutor & teaching assistant*. <https://www.khanmigo.ai/>

Lindgren, S. (2024). *Critical theory of AI*. Polity.

Lodge, J. M., Howard, S., Bearman, M., & Dawson, P. (2023). *Assessment reform for the age of artificial intelligence*. Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA). <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/resources/corporate-publications/assessment-reform-age-artificial-intelligence>

Luo, J. (2024). How does GenAI affect trust in teacher-student relationships? Insights from students' assessment experiences. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 30(4), 991-1006.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2024.2341005>

Mills, A., Bali, M., Eaton, L., et al. (2023). How do we respond to generative AI in education? Open educational practices give us a framework for an ongoing process. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 16-30. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.34>

Mishra, P. (2019). Considering contextual knowledge: The TPACK diagram gets an upgrade. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 35(2), 76-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2019.1588611>

Mishra, P., Warr, M., & Islam, R. (2023). TPACK in the age of ChatGPT and Generative AI. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 39(4), 235-251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2023.2247480>

Mitchell, M. (2024). The metaphors of artificial intelligence. *Science*, 386(6723). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adt6140>

OECD. (2023). *Generative AI in the classroom: From hype to reality?* EDU/EDPC 11. [https://one.oecd.org/document/EDU/EDPC\(2023\)11/en/pdf](https://one.oecd.org/document/EDU/EDPC(2023)11/en/pdf)

Perkins, M., Roe, J., Vu, B. H., Postma, D., Hickerson, D., McGaughan, J., & Khuat, H. Q. (2024). Simple techniques to bypass GenAI text detectors: Implications for inclusive education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(1), 53. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00487-w>

Perkins, M., Roe, J., & Furze, L. (2025). How (not) to use the AI assessment scale: Reflections and recommendations. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2025.8.2.15>

Popenici, S., Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Tan, S. (2023). A critical perspective on generative AI and learning futures: An interview with Stefan Popenici. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 311-331. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.5>

Preskill, S., & Brookfield, S. D. (2009). *Learning as a way of leading*. Jossey-Bass.

Preskill, S., Rudolph, J., & Tan, S. (2023). Learning leadership personified: An interview with Professor Stephen Preskill. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 324-336. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.12>

Rudolph, J., Ismail, F., Tan, S., & Seah, P. (2025). Don't believe the hype: AI myths and the need for a critical approach in higher education. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 6-27. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2025.8.1.1>

Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Aspland, T. (2023). Editorial 6(2): Personal digital assistant or job killer? Generative AI and the teaching profession in higher education. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.1>

Sadasivan, V. S., Kumar, A., Balasubramanian, S., Wang, W., &

- Feizi, S. (2024). Can AI-generated text be reliably detected? *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=OOgsAZdFOt>
- Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity.
- Tan, E. (2022). 'Heartware' for the Compassionate Teacher: Humanizing the academy through mindsight, attentive love, and storytelling. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 5(2), 152-159. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2022.5.2.ss1>
- Tan, S., Rudolph, J., & Tan, S. (2024). Riding the generative AI tsunami: Addressing the teaching and learning crisis in higher education. In J. Rudolph, J. Crawford, C. Y. Sam, & S. Tan (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of crisis leadership in higher education* (pp. 135-154). Palgrave Macmillan.
- UNESCO (Miao, F., & Holmes, W.). (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2023). *Artificial intelligence and the future of teaching and learning: Insights and recommendations*. <https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/ai-report/ai-report.pdf>
- Vallor, S. (2024). *The AI mirror: How to reclaim our humanity in an age of machine thinking*. Oxford University Press.
- van der Vleuten, C. P. M., Schuwirth, L. W. T., Driessen, E. W., Dijkstra, J., Tigelaar, D. L., Baartman, L. K. J., & van Tartwijk, J. (2012). A model for programme-level assessment fit for purpose. *Medical Teacher*, 34(3), 205-214. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.652239>
- Waring, P. (2024). Artificial intelligence and graduate employability: What should we teach Generation AI? *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 22-25. <https://journals.sfu.ca/jalt/index.php/jalt/article/view/1817>
- Waring, P. (2025). Imagining the AI-powered university of today and tomorrow. In S. Popenici, J. Rudolph, F. Ismail, & S. Tan (Eds.), *Handbook of AI and higher education*. In press. Edward Elgar.
- Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltýnek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Šigut, P., & Waddington, L. (2023). Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00146-z>