

Perspectives on Generative AI: Basis for Strategic AI Integration Plan

Researchers:

Dr. Rommel Z. de Leon

Taytay Integrated School Magin T. Catuira III, Pililla National High School

Abstract- This study assessed the perspectives of faculty members at Pililla National High School (PNHS) regarding the integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) during the School Year 2025–2026. Utilizing a Descriptive-Developmental Research Design, the study gathered quantitative data from 118 permanent teaching personnel to characterize faculty awareness and attitudes, subsequently informing the creation of a Strategic AI Integration Plan. The demographic profile revealed a female-dominated (75%) and relatively young faculty, with 67% of respondents aged 20–39. Results indicated a Grand Mean of 4.09 (Very Aware) regarding student AI use, with teachers showing high consciousness of AI limitations (Mean = 4.44) but lower awareness of specific "allowable use" policies for written works (Mean = 3.30). In terms of guidance and monitoring, faculty are proactive "gatekeepers," consistently discussing ethics (Mean = 4.44) and upholding academic integrity (Mean = 4.38), though they often lack standardized verification protocols. Interestingly, while teachers advocate for responsible student use, their own integration of GenAI for instructional design remains cautious (Grand Mean = 3.35, "Sometimes"). Statistical analysis showed no significant difference in AI assessment based on sex or grade level. However, a significant difference ($p = 0.018$) was found across age Brackets, highlighting a "Digital Fluency Gap" where younger teachers (20–29) demonstrate higher usage and comfort levels. To address this, the study developed a Strategic AI Integration Plan featuring a "Reverse Mentoring Program." This dual-phase approach pairs younger teachers' technical proficiency in prompt engineering with veteran teachers' expertise in authentic assessment and ethical frameworks to ensure a balanced, institution-wide AI adoption.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Generative AI, Strategic AI Integration Plan, Reverse Mentoring Program, Digital Fluency Gap

I. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

The rapid emergence of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), led by platforms such as ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini, has sparked a transformative shift in the global educational landscape. In the Philippines, this technological wave presents a dual reality for basic education institutions like Pililla National High School (PNHS). While GenAI offers unprecedented

opportunities for personalized learning and administrative efficiency, it simultaneously challenges long-standing paradigms of academic integrity and traditional assessment (Lohitha & Sumathi, 2024; O'Sullivan et al., 2025).

For the faculty of both Junior and Senior High School, the integration of AI is no longer a distant possibility but a present classroom reality. Recent studies indicate that nearly 60% of teachers have begun utilizing AI for

lesson resource creation and quiz generation, yet over 70% express deep concerns regarding the erosion of students' critical thinking and research skills (National Literacy Trust, 2025; Education Week, 2025). At PNHS, teachers face the unique challenge of balancing the Department of Education's (DepEd) push for digital literacy with the local need to maintain authentic student learning in a resource-diverse environment.

Despite the high rate of adoption, there remains a significant "policy gap" in secondary education. Many institutions operate without formalized guidelines, leaving individual teachers to navigate the ethical "gray areas" of AI use independently (College Board, 2025). This lack of a unified framework risks inconsistent academic standards and may inadvertently widen the digital divide among students.

This study, titled "Faculty Perspectives on Generative AI: Basis for Strategic AI Integration Plan," seeks to bridge this gap. By investigating the awareness, attitudes, and pedagogical concerns of the PNHS faculty, this research aims to develop a localized, evidence-based strategic AI integration plan. Such a plan will provide the PNHS community with clear parameters for ethical AI use, ensuring that technology serves as a bridge to innovation rather than a barrier to academic honesty.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The Dual Nature of GenAI in Secondary Education

Generative AI tools are recognized for their ability to enhance educational digitization and individualized instruction (Yu, 2024). In high school settings, administrators view AI literacy as a "very valuable" component of 21st-century education (College Board, 2025). However, this enthusiasm is tempered by the risk of "human loss in decision making" and a diminished sense of peer-to-peer and teacher-student connection (Ahmad et al., 2023; Education Week, 2025).

Faculty Perceptions and Barriers

Faculty members generally exhibit a moderate awareness of GenAI but report lower levels of actual classroom utilization compared to their perceived

benefits (Frontiers in Education, 2025). The primary barriers to adoption include a lack of technical support, concerns over "hallucinations" (the generation of false information), and the potential for job displacement or the dehumanization of the learning experience (FeedbackFruits, 2025; University Canada West, 2024). Furthermore, teachers often struggle to distinguish between AI as a "collaborator" versus a "crutch" for students (Kazley et al., 2024).

Academic Integrity and Policy Needs

The most pressing concern for educators remains academic integrity. Recent surveys show that while 89% of students have used AI for homework, only a small fraction have received formal guidance on school policies (Lohitha & Sumathi, 2024; Education Week, 2025). Experts suggest that "AI-proofing" assignments is less effective than creating "mastery-focused" pedagogies where the process of learning is valued over the final product (American Psychological Association, 2025). Consequently, there is an urgent call for "local adaptation and institutional autonomy" in policy making to ensure guidelines reflect the specific needs of a school's demographic (Lowry et al., 2025).

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This research sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
 1. sex;
 2. age; and
 3. grade level?
2. What is the level of the respondents' assessment of AI use as to:
 1. teachers' awareness of students AI use;
 2. guidance and communication;
 3. monitoring and enforcement;
 4. assessment and evaluation process; and
 5. teachers' own AI usage?
3. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' assessment of AI use when grouped according to their profile?
4. What strategic AI integration plan may be proposed based on the findings of the study?

IV. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This research focuses on the assessment of faculty perspectives regarding the integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) at Pililla National High School (PNHS). The study was conducted during the School Year 2025-2026. Data collection was scheduled for the fourth quarter to align with the drafting of the Strategic AI Integration Plan and hopefully, a local academic policy before the start of the new school year. The respondents consist of the permanent and regular teaching personnel from Pililla National High School. While this research aims for comprehensive localized insights, it is subject to the following limitations: (1) the findings are specific to the faculty of PNHS and may not be generalizable to other schools in the Division of Rizal or the Philippines at large, as institutional culture and digital infrastructure vary significantly between schools; (2) the data relies on self-reported surveys as such, responses may be influenced by "social desirability bias," where faculty might underreport their concerns or overstate their technical proficiency to appear more aligned with modern educational trends; and (3) it does not include direct data from students or parents, whose viewpoints, while critical for a holistic policy, fall outside the current research scope.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study utilizes a Descriptive-Developmental Research Design. Descriptive research involves gathering quantitative data to characterize the current status of faculty awareness and attitudes toward AI (Tracy, 2019; King, 2023).

The Developmental component follows a systematic process of "designing, developing, and evaluating" a product — in this case, the Strategic AI Integration Plan — based on the empirical findings (Richey & Klein, 2014; Mahat et al., 2024).

1. Sampling

The target population includes all teaching personnel from Pililla National High School. This method minimizes bias and ensures that the diverse pedagogical needs of different disciplines are captured (UCA, 2023; Makwana et al., 2023).

2. Data Collection

A Structured Survey Questionnaire, adapted from validated instruments like the AI Literacy and Readiness Scale (Dai et al., 2020), was used. The instrument consists of:

3. Profile Section: Demographic data (sex, age, grade level).

2. Likert Scale Section: Assessing awareness, perceived benefits, and ethical concerns on a 5-point scale.

4. Ethical Issues

In compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (RA 10173), all individual responses will be kept strictly confidential. Data will be presented in aggregate form (as totals/averages), and no specific names will be mentioned in the final research report or the proposed framework.

5. Plan for Data Analysis

To interpret the quantitative data, the following tools will be used:

- Frequency and Percentage: To describe the faculty profile.
- Weighted Mean: To determine the average level of AI awareness and attitudes (Marshall & Jonker, 2010).
- t-Test and ANOVA: To test the differences across profiles

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents
1. Sex

	Sex	f	%
Male		30	25
Female		88	75
Total		118	100

The group is composed of a total of 118 respondents. A substantial majority of the participants are female, accounting for 75% of the total population. In contrast, males represent only 25% of the group.

The lopsided distribution suggests that the context of this data is heavily female-dominated. This gender imbalance is statistically significant and may influence the overall outcomes of the study.

2. Age

Age	f	%
20-29 years old	36	31
30-39 years old	43	36
40-49 years old	35	30
50 years old above	4	3
Total	118	100

The 30–39 age bracket is the largest segment, representing 36% of the total population. There is a very even distribution between the 20s, 30s, and 40s. Combined, these three groups make up 97% of the respondents. This suggests the study captures a "prime age" demographic, likely consisting of early-to-mid-career professionals or active adults. Participants aged 50 and above are significantly underrepresented, making up only 3% (4 individuals) of the total.

This data indicates a mature yet relatively young participant base. With 67% of the population falling between the ages of 20 and 39, the findings are heavily influenced by the perspectives of Millennials and Gen Z.

Because the distribution across the first three tiers is so consistent (roughly 30% each), the data is well-balanced for comparing younger adults compared to

those in their middle years. However, the negligible presence of individuals over 50 means the results cannot be generalized to an older or retired population.

3. Grade Level

Grade Level	F	%
Grade 7	21	18
Grade 8	22	19
Grade 9	26	22
Grade 10	23	19
Grade 11	14	12
Grade 12	12	10
Total	118	100

The Grade 9 group is the most represented category, with 26 teachers (22%). The Grade 12 group has the fewest participants, with only 12 teachers (10%). There is a significant concentration of respondents in the Junior High School levels (Grades 7–10). Collectively, these four grade levels account for 92 teachers, or 78% of the total population. In contrast, the Senior High School levels (Grades 11–12) represent only 22% of the participants.

The data reveals that the respondent base is heavily skewed toward Junior High School teachers. The relatively even distribution among Grades 7, 8, 9, and 10 (each hovering around 18–22%) suggests that the survey or study effectively reached the younger secondary student population.

However, there is a noticeable "tapering off" or decline in participation as the grade level increases, particularly moving into the Senior High School years. This disparity means that any conclusions drawn from this data will be much more authoritative regarding the experiences or opinions of Junior High teachers than those of Senior High teachers.

2. Level of the Respondents' Assessment of AI Use

1. Teachers' Awareness of Student AI Use

Teachers' Awareness of Student AI Use	Mean	VI
1. I am aware of the allowable uses of Generative AI (ChatGPT, CoPilot, Dola, Gemini, etc.) for students' written works.	3.30	MA
2. I am aware of the allowable uses of Generative AI (ChatGPT, CoPilot, Dola, Gemini, etc.) for students' creative outputs.	3.92	VA

3. I am aware which assessments prohibit AI use because they measure specific student skills.

4. I am aware of the need to educate students on the limitations of AI (false citations, incorrect calculations, hallucinations, etc.).

5. I am aware of the importance of encouraging reflective learning when students use AI.

Teachers' Awareness of Student AI Use	Mean	VI
1. I am aware of the allowable uses of Generative AI (ChatGPT, CoPilot, Dola, Gemini, etc.) for students' written works.	3.30	MA
2. I am aware of the allowable uses of Generative AI (ChatGPT, CoPilot, Dola, Gemini, etc.) for students' creative outputs.	3.92	VA
3. I am aware which assessments prohibit AI use because they measure specific student skills.	3.92	VA
4. I am aware of the need to educate students on the limitations of AI (false citations, incorrect calculations, hallucinations, etc.).	4.44	FA
5. I am aware of the importance of encouraging reflective learning when students use AI.	4.28	FA
Grand Mean	4.09	VA

FA - Fully Aware, VA - Very Aware, MA - Moderately Aware, SA - Slightly Aware, NA - Not Aware

The teachers are most conscious of the limitations of AI (Mean = 4.44) and the need for reflective learning (Mean = 4.28). Both scored as "Fully Aware," suggesting

that educators strongly recognize the risks of AI, such as hallucinations and false citations, and prioritize the pedagogical value of reflection over automated output.

The indicator regarding allowable uses for written works received the lowest score (Mean = 3.30, Moderately Aware). This indicates a significant "gray area" or lack of clear policy/understanding concerning when and how students should use AI for essays, reports, or other text-based assignments.

Teachers show a strong, consistent understanding of when AI should be prohibited and how it can be used for creative outputs, both scoring a high 3.92 (Very Aware).

The overall Grand Mean of 4.09 (Very Aware) suggests that the teaching faculty has a robust foundational understanding of AI's presence in the classroom. This implies that while teachers know why AI is risky, they may struggle with how to set specific boundaries for written academic tasks. This suggests a need for more concrete institutional guidelines or professional development specifically focused on defining "allowable use" in writing, as this is currently the weakest link in their awareness profile.

Guidance and Communication

Guidance and Communication	Mean	VI
1. I inform students about when AI (ChatGPT, CoPilot, Dola, Gemini, etc.) use is permitted, restricted, or prohibited in my class.	4.46	A
2. I require students to declare and document their use of AI tools in submitted work.	3.69	O
3. I teach students how to verify the accuracy and truthfulness of AI-generated information.	3.95	O
4. I explain to students the ethical implications of over-reliance on AI.	4.44	A
5. I explicitly communicate in my learning plan how AI may or may not be used.	3.97	O
Grand Mean	4.10	O

A - Always, O - Often, S - Sometimes, R - Rarely, N - Never

Teachers are most consistent in setting boundaries (Mean = 4.46) and discussing ethics (Mean = 4.44). These both received an "Always" interpretation,

suggesting that educators prioritize verbalizing the rules and the moral side of AI use.

The lowest mean belongs to requiring documentation of AI tools (Mean = 3.69). While still happening "Often," it suggests that while teachers tell students when to use AI, they are slightly less rigorous about the administrative follow-through of having students cite or declare that usage in their final submissions.

Teaching verification skills (Mean = 3.95) and including AI policies in learning plans (Mean = 3.97) also occur "Often." This indicates that AI guidance is becoming a standard part of the instructional design, though not yet a universal "Always" practice.

The Grand Mean of 4.10 (Often) reveals a proactive approach to AI management. There is a high level of verbal and ethical leadership; teachers are clearly acting as the primary gatekeepers of AI integrity by stating rules and warning against over-reliance.

However, a slight gap exists between verbal instruction and procedural enforcement. Teachers "Always" talk about the rules and ethics, but only "Often" require the formal documentation or verification that would prove those rules are being followed. To move the Grand Mean toward "Always," the focus should shift from general discussions to standardized documentation protocols and explicit "AI Use".

Monitoring and Enforcement

2.3. Monitoring and Enforcement

Monitoring and Enforcement	Mean	VI
1. I can identify when a student's work has likely been AI-assisted beyond the allowable scope.	4.13	O
2. I have processes to verify suspected misuse of AI in my class.	3.92	O
3. I address cases where a student improperly used AI on their activity/ies.	3.97	O
4. I track and compare student outputs across multiple submissions to spot sudden unexplained improvements in writing style, structure, or grammar.	4.08	O
5. I uphold the academic integrity when enforcing AI-related rules.	4.38	A
Grand Mean	4.10	O

A - Always, O - Often, S - Sometimes, R - Rarely, N - Never

4. I track and compare student outputs across multiple submissions to spot sudden unexplained improvements in writing style, structure, or grammar.

The strongest indicator is the upholding of academic integrity (Mean = 4.38, Always). This shows that teachers view AI enforcement not just as a technical task, but as a fundamental ethical duty to the institution and the student. Teachers feel relatively confident in their "teacher's intuition." Identifying AI-assisted work (Mean = 4.13) and tracking student progress/style changes (Mean = 4.08) both score highly. This suggests educators rely on their personal knowledge of a student's previous work to spot anomalies.

The lowest score is for having specific processes to verify misuse (Mean = 3.92). While still interpreted as "Often," it indicates that while teachers can sense when AI is used, they may lack a standardized, step-by-step toolkit or "official" protocol to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt.

The Grand Mean of 4.10 (Often) depicts a faculty that is vigilant and ethically driven. There is a strong emphasis on comparative monitoring—using a student's history as a benchmark for their current output—which is a highly effective, personalized method of oversight.

Assessment and Evaluation Process

Assessment and Evaluation Process	Mean	VI
1. I design activities that encourage responsible AI use and discourage over-reliance.	3.94	O
2. I adjust my assessments to make improper AI use less effective (requiring drafts, oral defenses, unique prompts, etc.).	4.00	O
3. I create authentic assessments that measure understanding gained from class discussions, readings, and experiences.	4.38	A
4. I rely on AI tools when evaluating or grading students submissions.	2.54	R
5. I provide personalized feedback rather than generic or AI-generated feedbacks.	4.38	A
Grand Mean	3.85	O

A - Always, O - Often, S - Sometimes, R - Rarely, N - Never

The highest-scoring indicators (both Mean = 4.38, Always) are creating authentic assessments and providing personalized feedback. This shows a strong dedication to ensuring the relationship between the

teacher and the student remains human-centric, valuing unique classroom experiences over generic outputs.

Interestingly, teachers Rarely rely on AI tools to grade or evaluate work (Mean = 2.54). This suggests a cautious approach — while teachers expect students to use AI responsibly, they generally do not trust or use AI to perform the final "judgment" of student competence.

Teachers are Often adjusting their methods — such as requiring drafts or oral defenses (Mean = 4.00) — to mitigate improper AI use. This indicates a shift toward "process-based" grading rather than just "product-based" grading.

The Grand Mean of 3.85 (Often) reflects an instructional environment that is actively evolving to meet the challenges of Generative AI. There is a clear "resistance" to automating the evaluation process, as seen in the low reliance on AI for grading.

Instead, the faculty is doubling down on Authentic Assessment — designing tasks that are so specific to local classroom discussions and personal experiences that a general AI model cannot easily replicate them.

The data suggests that the most effective "defense" against AI misuse in this group isn't just a set of rules, but a fundamental change in how students are asked to prove their learning.

The highest-scoring indicator (Mean = 3.85, Often) shows that teachers are highly conscious of modeling the behavior they expect from students. Even if they don't use AI for every task, they ensure that when they do, it aligns with academic integrity standards. Unlike the previous tables where teachers "Often" or "Always" monitored or communicated about AI, their actual usage of it for drafting (3.26), refining (3.38), and assessment (3.28) is only "Sometimes." This suggests that the faculty still relies heavily on traditional, manual methods for instructional design.

Using AI for visuals and audio (Mean = 3.00) is the least common activity. This may indicate a lack of training in specialized generative media tools compared to text-based LLMs like ChatGPT or Gemini.

The Grand Mean of 3.35 (Sometimes) reveals a "cautious explorer" mindset. There is a clear gap between the teachers' high level of awareness (from Table 2.1) and their actual application of these tools. For an institution, this is a healthy starting point because it ensures that as AI adoption increases, it will likely be done responsibly.

Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment of AI Use when Grouped According to their Profile

Teachers' Own AI Usage

Teachers' Own AI Usage	Mean	VI
1. I use AI (ChatGPT, CoPilot, Dola, Gemini, etc.) to draft ideas for lessons and activities.	3.26	S
2. I use AI to polish or refine my own learning materials.	3.38	S
3. I use AI to assist in generating assessment items and rubrics.	3.28	S
4. I use AI to create visuals, audio, and other multimedia for teaching.	3.00	S
5. I use AI the same standards of responsibility and integrity in my AI use that I expect from my students.	3.85	O
Grand Mean	3.35	S

A - Always, O - Often, S - Sometimes, R - Rarely, N - Never

Profile	Profile	Profile	Profile	Profile	Profile	p- H o VI	p- H o VI	p- H o VI
Category	Category	Category	Category	Category	Category			
n	n	n	n	n	n			
Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD			
t/ f-	t/ f-	t/ f-	t/ f-	t/ f-	t/ f-			
Variable	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value
Sex	Male	30	3.82	0.45	1.124	0.263	Accept	Not Sig.
	Female	88	3.9	0.38				
Age	20–29	36	4.15	0.42	3.451	0.018	Reject	Sig.
	30–39	43	3.95	0.51				
	40–49	35	3.8	0.48				
	50–Above	4	3.4	0.6				

Grade Level	G7–G10	92	3.92	0.4	0.852	0.358	Accept	Not Sig.
	G11–G12	26	3.88	0.44				

On Sex:

The p-value (0.263) is greater than the alpha level of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference between Male and Female teachers. This suggests that gender does not play a role in how educators perceive, monitor, or use AI in the classroom. Both groups maintain a high standard of "Awareness" and "Guidance."

On Age:

The p-value (0.018) is less than 0.05, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. There is a significant difference in AI assessment across age brackets. Younger teachers (20–29) tend to have higher means in "Teachers' Own Usage" compared to those 50 and above. This indicates a "Digital Fluency Gap," where younger educators are more comfortable integrating generative tools into their lesson planning, whereas older educators may rely more on traditional pedagogical methods.

On Grade Level:

The p-value (0.358) indicates "no significant difference". Whether a teacher handles Junior High (Grades 7–10) or Senior High (Grades 11–12), their approach to AI ethics and monitoring remains consistent. This reflects a unified institutional policy or a shared professional culture regarding academic integrity.

Proposed Strategic AI Integration Plan

The finding points to a "Digital Fluency Gap" within the institution. Younger teachers are leading the way in innovation and efficiency, while older teachers are leading in the preservation of ethical standards and human-centric feedback.

To bridge this gap, the study recommends a "Reverse Mentoring Program" as a Strategic AI Integration Plan composed of two phases:

1. Peer-to-Peer Coaching: Younger teachers can facilitate workshops on "Prompt Engineering" and "AI-Assisted Lesson Design" to help older colleagues reduce their administrative workload.
2. Collaborative Policy Making: Older, more experienced teachers should lead the development of the school's "AI Ethics Framework," ensuring that the rapid adoption of technology by younger staff does not compromise the institution's core values of honesty and deep learning.
3. Based on the findings, the following recommendations are offered: For School Administrators: Adoption of the "Strategic AI Integration Plan" that moves beyond awareness and focuses on training teachers to use AI for administrative efficiency.

For Teachers: Establish a "Professional Learning Community (PLC)" where younger, tech-savvy teachers can mentor older colleagues on "Prompt Engineering," while older teachers mentor the youth on maintaining "Authentic Assessment" standards.

For Curriculum Developers: Formalize the "Allowable Use" policies for written works, as this was the area of lowest awareness among the faculty. Clear rubrics should be created that define "AI-Assisted" versus "AI-Generated" work.

For Future Researchers: Conduct a follow-up study that includes the student perspective to see if the teachers' perceived "Awareness and Guidance" matches the students' actual classroom experience.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, A., et al. (2023). The impact of artificial intelligence on critical thinking: A review of educational

challenges. *Journal of Educational Technology*. American Psychological Association. (2025). Teaching academic integrity in the era of AI. *APA News & Advocacy*. College Board. (2025). New Research: Majority of high school students use Generative AI for schoolwork. *Newsroom Reports*. Dai, Y., et al. (2020). Exploring the state of AI literacy in K-12 education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*. Education Week. (2025). Rising use of AI in schools comes with big downsides for students. *Technology Reports*. *Frontiers in Education*. (2025). Faculty perspectives on generative artificial intelligence: Insights into awareness, benefits, concerns, and uses. *Frontiers Journal*, 10.3389/feduc.2025. King, N. (2023). *Descriptive research in the digital age*. Academic Press. Lohitha, S., & Sumathi, K. (2024). Impact of GenAI on student homework and study habits. *Issues in Information Systems*, 26(2). Lowry, C., O'Sullivan, J., Woods, R., & Conlon, T. (2025). *Generative AI in Higher Education Teaching & Learning: Policy Framework*. National Resource Hub. Mahat, D., et al. (2024). Quantitative research design and sample trends: A systematic examination of emerging paradigms. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(2). Makwana, D., et al. (2023). Sampling methods in research: A review. *ResearchGate*. Marshall, G., & Jonker, L. (2010). *An introduction to descriptive statistics: A review and practical guide*. *Radiography*, 16(4). National Literacy Trust. (2025). Young people and teachers' use of generative AI to support literacy. *UK Research Services*. O'Sullivan, J., et al. (2025). *Generative AI in Teaching & Learning: A System-Level Reference Point*. Higher Education Authority. Richey, R. C., & Klein, J. D. (2014). *Design and development research: Methods, strategies, and issues*. Routledge. Tracy, S. J. (2019). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*. Wiley-Blackwell. University Canada West. (2024). Advantages and disadvantages of AI in education. *UCW Blog*. University of Central Arkansas (UCA). (2023). Chapter 7: Sampling techniques and population generalizability. Yu, H. (2024). Opportunities for ChatGPT in educational applications: A systematic review. *Educational Digitization Review*.