Artificial Intelligence Education Studies
Volume 1, Issue 4, 2025, Page 31-38
https://doi.org/10.6914/aiese.010404

Artificial Intelligence Education Studies

Curriculum Restructuring in the Post-GPT Era: Transfer of Capability Value and Systemic Change in Teaching Paradigms

Aiqing WANG
Ningde Normal Universtiy, Email:379632319@qq.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5934-7493

Abstract

The comprehensive intervention of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) into the educational ecosystem represents far more than a mere technological iteration; it marks a discontinuous mutation in the history of curriculum design, comparable in profundity to the advent of the printing press or the internet. We are currently witnessing a fundamental reset of the "value" assigned to cognitive tasks. As the marginal cost of content generation approaches zero, the premium in education is shifting drastically from the retrieval and accumulation of information to its evaluation, curation, and synthesis. This report, based on an exhaustive review of global educational frontiers—including empirical cases from Singapore, China, and Western higher education institutions—provides an in-depth analysis of the educational landscape in the Post-GPT era. The analysis indicates that traditional capabilities centered on rote memorization and linear execution are depreciating at an accelerated rate. Conversely, skills emphasizing high agency, evaluative judgment, and human-machine collaboration are rapidly climbing the value chain. Future curriculum design must achieve a paradigm shift from "AI as Oracle," where students passively receive answers, to "AI as Partner" or "Cognitive Mirror," where students actively critique and refine outputs. This transition is essential to address the increasingly severe risks of cognitive offloading and skill atrophy.

Keywords Generative AI; Cognitive Offloading; Evaluative Judgment; Human-AI Collaboration; Curriculum Restructuring

1 Capability Depreciation: Skills Obsoleted by Zero Marginal Costs

In the Post-GPT era, specific cognitive tasks that once served as proxy indicators for intelligence or diligence are experiencing rapid inflation and value depreciation. This depreciation does not render these skills useless, but rather signifies that they are no longer sufficient as effective differentiators of human capability in academic or professional contexts.

1.1 The End of Mechanical Memory and Low-Order Retrieval

Historically, education systems have rewarded the accumulation of static facts. However, the ubiquity of GenAI tools has rendered the search-and-retrieve cognitive cycle largely obsolete. The ability to memorize and recite grammatical rules, historical dates, or definitions is no longer a competitive learning outcome. Across a broad spectrum of fields, from computer science to foreign language learning, the mastery of syntax—the grammatical rules of code or language—is giving way to the understanding of semantics, or the meaning and logic behind the structure.

In programming education, for instance, the rote memorization of specific syntax is being replaced by system architecture design capabilities. Since AI can generate high-quality boilerplate code instantly, the value of human programmers is no longer found in typing speed or library memorization, but in the planning of overall system

© The Authors 2025. Article History Received: July 10, 2025; Accpted: August 10, 2025; Published: November 30, 2025. ***Artificial Intelligence Education Studies***, ISSN 3079-8086 (print), ISSN 3079-8094 (online), a Quarterly, founded on 2025, published by Creative Publishing Co., Limited. Email: cpcl@cpcl.hk, https://ai-es.org, https://cpcl.hk.

architecture, the validation of logic between modules, and the review of AI-generated code. Similarly, if a learning objective targets an output that a Large Language Model (LLM) can generate with high accuracy within three seconds, that objective itself risks obsolescence. The locus of education is shifting from the accumulation of facts and data, which AI views as cheap commodities, to the dynamic application of concepts. This shift necessitates that curriculum designers re-examine every knowledge point: if it is merely searchable or generatable, its primary position in the classroom should be removed in favor of high-order analysis and critique of that knowledge.

1.2 The Collapse of the "Linear Executor" Model

The traditional student role has often been cast as that of an executor—one who receives instructions and produces standardized artifacts such as summaries, essays, or code snippets. This model faces a fundamental threat because GenAI is, by nature, a hyper-efficient executor. Assignments requiring students merely to summarize text are becoming meaningless and easily automated. Because AI can synthesize vast amounts of literature instantly, the simple capability to summarize is no longer scarce. Human value must now be demonstrated through critique, contextualization, or the intervention of a unique perspective atop the summary. If the education system continues to prioritize procedural compliance—following steps without questioning the rationale—the graduates it produces will face the direct risk of replacement by algorithms. In a GenAI environment, the machine is the executor; humans must evolve into architects and auditors responsible for defining task boundaries, assessing execution quality, and bearing ultimate ethical responsibility.

1.3 From Task-Level Obsolescence to Role Redefinition

The depreciation of low-order cognitive tasks in the Post-GPT era should not be misread as a simple subtraction of content from the curriculum. Rather, it compels a redefinition of the learner's role. When tasks such as summarizing, paraphrasing, and drafting boilerplate texts can be executed near-instantly by GenAI, the question for educators is no longer *whether* to teach these tasks, but *why* and *to what depth*. In many existing syllabi, these activities are still treated as terminal learning outcomes; students are examined on their ability to reproduce standard formats, follow fixed rubrics, or "apply" templates. Under Post-GPT conditions, such outcomes merely demonstrate that the student can imitate what an AI can already approximate.

What becomes necessary is a vertical re-layering of these tasks within the learning sequence. Summarization, for instance, should be repositioned from an end product to an intermediate scaffold: students might first generate a summary with AI support, then be required to critique its omissions, reframe its perspective, or reconstruct alternative summaries for different audiences. In this sense, traditional skills are not discarded but repurposed as vehicles for higher-order capabilities such as audience sensitivity, rhetorical judgment, and epistemic stance-taking. The role of the learner shifts from that of the "Linear Executor," responsible for faithfully producing artifacts, to that of the "Reflective Architect," responsible for deciding which artifacts matter, under what constraints, and by which combinations of human and machine agency they should be created.

Curriculum restructuring must therefore abandon the assumption that a list of tasks automatically equates to a list of capabilities. The same observable output—for example, a literature review or laboratory report—can now be produced by qualitatively different cognitive processes. Without an explicit redefinition of roles, the system risks certifying students for competencies that have, in practice, been outsourced to algorithms. A Post-GPT curriculum must instead foreground those aspects of task performance that cannot be easily externalized: the setting of criteria, the justification of trade-offs, and the accountability for decisions made in ambiguous conditions.

2 The Neurological Imperative: Scaffolding Before Offloading

A critical dimension often overlooked in the rush to adopt tools is the neuro-pedagogical impact of early offloading. While professionals use AI to accelerate workflows based on established expertise, novices using AI risk never developing the neural pathways required for complex reasoning.

2.1 The Threshold of Internalization

Educational psychology posits that a learner must reach a specific "Threshold of Internalization" before they can safely offload a task to an external agent. If a student delegates the writing of an essay before they understand the neurological process of structuring an argument, they are not merely saving time; they are preventing the formation of the cognitive schemas necessary for logical thought. Therefore, the new curriculum must distinguish between "Pedagogical Mode," where AI is deliberately restricted to force internal cognitive processing, and "Professional Mode," where AI is unleashed for maximum efficiency. Schools must create "AI-Free Zones" not as a luddite reaction, but as a calculated pedagogical strategy to ensure the biological installation of core competencies. Only once the neural scaffolding is secure can the student effectively orchestrate the AI without becoming subservient to it.

2.2 Cognitive Atrophy and the "Illusion of Competence"

A burgeoning concern in recent research is the prevalence of cognitive offloading leading to irreversible cognitive atrophy. This dependency often triggers a dangerous variation of the Dunning-Kruger Effect. Students utilizing AI tools frequently develop an illusion of competence, overestimating their actual mastery while their metacognitive monitoring abilities degenerate. Research indicates that in logical reasoning tasks, participants overly reliant on AI tend to accept chatbot answers without reflection, leading to a significant decline in critical thinking capabilities. The loss of "Productive Struggle" is particularly damaging. Deep learning requires cognitive friction, known as "desirable difficulties." When AI eliminates this friction—by instantly fixing code errors or constructing perfect outlines—it short-circuits the psychological processes required to establish neural connections. Competence gained through such painless methods is extremely fragile and fails rapidly once AI assistance is removed or when facing unfamiliar contexts.

3 The Rise of High-Agency Capabilities: Core Competencies for Human-Machine Synergy

As low-order cognitive tasks are offloaded to AI, the focus of curriculum design must shift toward high-order, human-in-the-loop capabilities. These skills center not on competing with machines in calculation speed or memory capacity, but on managing, evaluating, and steering intelligent systems.

3.1 Evaluative Judgment and Epistemic Vigilance

In the Post-GPT era, the most critical competency is Evaluative Judgment—the ability to assess the quality, accuracy, relevance, and potential bias of information. Given that GenAI operates on probabilistic statistics rather than deterministic logic, it inevitably generates hallucinations. Students must be trained as rigorous editors and auditors, capable of using credible sources to cross-verify AI outputs. This raises the bar for foundational domain knowledge, as a novice cannot effectively audit an expert-level AI. Consequently, foundational knowledge is learned not for memorization, but to establish a coordinate system for truth verification capable of passing a Turing Test of authenticity. Furthermore, detecting biases embedded in AI training data—whether cultural, statistical, or logical—has become a core skill. Curricula are introducing exercises requiring students to analyze AI-generated narratives for Eurocentrism or gender stereotypes, cultivating structural critical capabilities regarding algorithmic outputs.

3.2 Prompt Engineering as Epistemological Dialogue

Although Prompt Engineering is often misunderstood as a simple technical trick, it is evolving into a complex form of communication requiring extreme linguistic precision and iterative logic. Efficient AI utilization is no longer about a single query but an iterative dialogue, exemplified by the "Toe-Hold" strategy. In this approach, students first ask AI to explain a concept to gain a foothold, then immediately switch to authoritative databases for verification, before returning to AI for synthesis. This "sandwich" workflow requires the student to possess the ability of Problem Decomposition—breaking down complex issues into units AI can handle. Additionally, setting context and simulating roles involves training high-dimensional communication skills, requiring humans to clearly define task boundaries and success criteria.

3.3 Orchestration of Agency and Human-Machine Co-creation

Future work environments will be hybrid intelligence environments where co-creation is the norm. This demands a curricular shift from using tools to collaborating with agents. Research shows that efficient collaboration involves dynamically switching agency between human and machine. Students need to learn to identify which tasks should be delegated to AI, such as generating massive variations of sketches, and which must remain in human hands, such as final aesthetic decisions and semantic intent. By creating Journey Maps, students can visualize the collaboration process, clarifying where humans intervened, redirected, or vetoed AI suggestions. The emerging skill of Collaging and Refinement requires students to synthesize fragmented AI outputs into an organic whole, demanding high integration capabilities and aesthetic intuition.

3.4 Meta-Cognition and Self-Regulation in Human–AI Teams

High-agency capabilities do not emerge automatically from exposure to advanced tools; they require explicit cultivation of meta-cognitive and self-regulatory skills. In human–AI collaboration, students must constantly monitor not only the quality of outputs, but also the trajectory of their own reliance on the system. This involves asking questions such as: *When am I delegating appropriately, and when am I outsourcing prematurely? Which parts of my reasoning am I still actively holding, and which parts have I allowed the AI to silently determine?*

Meta-cognitive training in this context shifts from generic study strategies to specific "AI interaction literacy." Students can be guided to maintain reflective logs of their prompting choices, document points at which they overrode AI suggestions, and annotate moments of surprise or discomfort with AI outputs. These artifacts can then be revisited to surface patterns of dependence, over-trust, or under-utilization. By turning AI traces into objects of reflection, the curriculum helps learners develop what might be called "second-order agency": the ability to choose not only what to think about, but which cognitive functions to retain as human responsibilities and which to delegate.

Self-regulation also entails the deliberate design of friction. If students notice that they habitually reach for AI assistance at the earliest sign of difficulty, instructors can introduce structured delays—for example, requiring a handwritten sketch of a solution path before any AI query is allowed. Such mechanisms do not demonize AI; rather, they insert a temporal buffer during which the learner' s own hypothesis generation can occur. Over time, these routines build a form of cognitive stamina that is crucial if human beings are to remain more than supervisors of automated processes. In this sense, meta-cognition and self-regulation are not peripheral soft skills, but the central governance layer of human–AI hybrid intelligence.

4 Structural Reorganization of Teaching: Combating "Cognitive Atrophy"

To cultivate these new skills, simply adding an AI Literacy module to existing curricula is insufficient; pedagogy itself must adapt to the reality of AI's presence.

4.1 Reintroducing "Desirable Difficulties" and the "Cognitive Mirror" Framework

To counter cognitive offloading, curriculum designers are intentionally reintroducing friction into the learning process. The Cognitive Mirror framework represents a disruptive instructional design where AI is reprogrammed as a "teachable novice." The student must explain concepts to the AI, which is programmed to deliberately exhibit confusion or ask clarifying questions. This employs a Diversion Guardrail Mechanism that limits the AI's knowledge scope to feedback based solely on student input. This forces students to reconstruct their knowledge system through the Protégé Effect, externalizing implicit understanding into explicit explanation. Additionally, to verify high-stakes capabilities, institutions are returning to analog assessment methods. In-class handwritten exams and oral defenses are becoming the only reliable means to ensure that the student—not the AI—possesses core knowledge.

4.2 From "Product Assessment" to "Process Assessment"

The focus of assessment is moving from the final static product to the dynamic generation process. Assignments now frequently require the submission of process artifacts, including version histories, complete chat logs with AI, and reflective essays on how AI was utilized. This transforms student editing decisions, prompt strategies, and critical modifications of AI output into assessable entities. In design courses, Journey Maps document critical decision points in human-machine collaboration, verifying human agency and preventing passive acceptance of AI generation.

4.3 Hybrid Studio Models and Capstone Experiences

Structural reorganization at the course level is most visible in the emergence of hybrid studio models and capstone experiences explicitly designed for human–AI co-creation. Traditional lecture–seminar formats, even when augmented with AI tools, often leave the underlying pedagogy unchanged. By contrast, studio-based and lab-based designs can make the orchestration of human and machine agency the explicit subject of learning.

In a hybrid studio, students might be tasked with developing a policy brief, prototype, or multimedia narrative over several weeks. AI systems are available throughout as drafting assistants, data explorers, or scenario simulators. However, the evaluation rubric concentrates on how students frame the problem, document their decision checkpoints, and justify the pattern of delegation across the project lifecycle. The studio thus becomes a safe microcosm of future workplaces, where the primary challenge is not the absence of tools, but the abundance of them.

Capstone projects can also serve as culminating tests of Post-GPT curriculum restructuring. Unlike traditional capstones that focus on individual mastery of content, Post-GPT capstones can foreground “systemic agency”: the ability to assemble a constellation of human and non-human resources, align them toward a complex objective, and remain accountable for the ethical and epistemic consequences. Students might, for example, lead an AI-augmented community consultation, design an AI-supported intervention in a school, or audit an existing AI deployment for bias and unintended effects. In each case, the substantive topic is intertwined with a meta-level inquiry into what it means to exercise leadership in a world of pervasive AI.

These hybrid models require institutional commitment in terms of scheduling, staffing, and infrastructure. Yet they also offer the clearest proof-of-concept that curriculum restructuring is not merely rhetorical. When studios and capstones are redesigned around AI-aware forms of practice, the entire ecosystem—from assessment to advising—begins to realign around the realities of hybrid intelligence.

5 The Crisis of Authenticity and the New Aesthetic Education

As the marginal cost of creating ”good enough” text, images, and music drops to zero, the definition of creativity is undergoing a painful transformation. The curriculum must address the crisis of authenticity that arises when the provenance of an artifact becomes ambiguous.

5.1 Curating the Human Element

In a world flooded with synthetic media, the premium shifts to the ”Human Trace.” Education in the arts and humanities must pivot from technical proficiency—which AI can mimic—to the cultivation of a distinct, irreplaceable voice and the ability to contextualize work within the human condition. The curriculum must teach students how to inject personal experience, emotional vulnerability, and cultural idiosyncrasy into their work—elements that statistical models, lacking consciousness, cannot authentically replicate. Assessment in creative fields will increasingly focus on the rationale behind choices rather than the polished nature of the final output, valuing the ”messiness” of human exploration over the sterile perfection of algorithmic generation.

5.2 The Ethics of Co-Authorship

We are entering an era of ambiguous authorship where lines between tool, collaborator, and creator are blurred. Higher education must lead the development of a new ethical framework for co-authorship. This involves more than avoiding plagiarism; it requires a sophisticated understanding of intellectual attribution. Curricula must include modules on the philosophy of mind and copyright ethics, guiding students to navigate the moral landscape of using a system trained on the collective work of humanity. Students must learn to declare the extent of AI involvement transparently, moving toward a model of ”Declared Hybridity” rather than hidden assistance.

6 Institutional Infrastructure: From Policing to Integration

The transformation of the curriculum necessitates a parallel transformation in institutional infrastructure and policy. The initial reaction of many institutions—policing and banning—is proving unsustainable and pedagogically unsound.

6.1 The Evolution of Academic Integrity

The traditional cat-and-mouse game of plagiarism detection is ending. AI text detectors have proven unreliable, yielding false positives that damage student trust. Consequently, institutions are shifting from a policing model to a ”Trust and Verify” model centered on oral validation. The ”Viva Voce” (oral defense), once reserved for doctoral candidates, is being adapted for undergraduate assessments. If a student cannot verbally articulate and defend the logic of their written submission, the submission is invalid, regardless of what a software detector says. This structural change re-centers the human interaction in education and renders AI-generated cheating futile, as the student remains the ultimate guarantor of the knowledge.

6.2 Faculty as Orchestrators of Intelligence

The role of the professor is shifting from the ”Sage on the Stage” to the ”Orchestrator of Intelligence.” Faculty are no longer the primary gatekeepers of information. Instead, their value lies in their ability to design learning experiences that force students to grapple with information. This requires a massive investment in faculty development, specifically in the AI-TPACK (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) framework. Teachers must understand not just how AI works, but how it intersects with the specific epistemology of their discipline. A history professor must understand how LLMs hallucinate historical facts differently than a biology professor understands how AlphaFold predicts protein structures.

6.3 A Roadmap for Institutional Transition

Given the scale of change implied by Post-GPT curriculum restructuring, institutions require a phased roadmap rather than ad hoc experimentation. A minimal three-stage trajectory can be outlined. In the *diagnostic phase*, universities conduct audits of current assessment tasks, program outcomes, and hidden curricula to identify where low-order cognitive tasks dominate and where AI use is already pervasive, whether acknowledged or not. This phase often reveals a significant misalignment between official policies that restrict AI and tacit practices in which both students and staff quietly rely on it.

The *design phase* involves multi-stakeholder working groups—including students—that re-specify graduate profiles, prioritize high-agency capabilities, and redesign signature assessments. Here, policy and pedagogy must be co-developed: there is little value in issuing AI policies that are impossible to enforce or in designing AI-rich assignments in the absence of clear academic integrity guidelines. Institutions that succeed in this phase often pilot new course formats, such as AI-augmented oral examinations or process-based portfolios, before scaling them.

Finally, the *institutionalization phase* focuses on embedding successful practices into routine operations. This includes revising program accreditation documents, updating quality assurance criteria, and recognizing AI-pedagogical expertise in promotion pathways. Without such structural reinforcement, early innovations risk remaining isolated “islands of practice” that disappear with individual champions. By articulating a roadmap that moves from diagnosis to design to institutionalization, universities can avoid oscillating between panic-driven bans and uncritical enthusiasm. Instead, they can position themselves as deliberate stewards of human capability in an age of rapidly advancing machine intelligence.

7 Conclusion: The Graduate Profile of the Post-GPT Era

Curriculum restructuring in the Post-GPT era is not a simple patch upgrade, but a redefinition of what it means to be an educated person. Future graduates will not be distinguished by “knowledge-that” — as knowledge itself has become ubiquitous and cheap — but by “thinking-with,” or how they think synergistically with intelligent systems. In such an environment, the central pedagogical question shifts from *what* students know to *how* they exercise agency, judgment, and responsibility in hybrid human–AI systems.

The graduate of this new curriculum system is defined firstly by **cognitive resilience**. They have weathered “desirable difficulties” and possess the mental fortitude to think deeply without AI assistance, avoiding technical dependency and the illusion of competence produced by effortless offloading. Secondly, they demonstrate **hybrid intelligence fluency**, skillfully switching between human-led and AI-led workflows and using precise context setting, decomposition, and orchestration to activate machine potential. Thirdly, they possess **epistemic vigilance**, acting as rigorous auditors of information with deep domain knowledge to identify hallucinations, bias, and hidden assumptions in algorithmic outputs. Finally, they are **process-oriented**, valuing the trajectory of iteration and reflection over the mere submission of results, and able to make their decision paths, not just their products, available for scrutiny.

Crucially, this graduate profile is not an abstract wish list; it is a direct response to the systemic pressures mapped out in this article. The depreciation of low-order tasks requires resilience against cognitive atrophy. The neurological imperative to scaffold before offloading demands that students internalize core schemas before delegating work to machines. The rise of high-agency capabilities and the crisis of authenticity call for graduates who can curate the "human trace" in their outputs and assume ethical responsibility for co-authored work. In this sense, the Post-GPT curriculum is a mechanism for re-aligning educational outcomes with the realities of hybrid intelligence rather than denying or ignoring those realities.

From a policy perspective, the Post-GPT curriculum is therefore best understood not as a defensive shield against technological disruption, but as a constructive blueprint for a new social contract around knowledge and capability. Education systems that merely attempt to "catch" AI misuse will find themselves locked into an unwinnable enforcement game as tools evolve faster than detection regimes. By contrast, those that redesign expectations — telling students explicitly that they will be evaluated on what cannot be delegated, on how they govern rather than bypass AI — send a coherent signal to learners, employers, and society at large. The graduate profile of the Post-GPT era is, in this sense, a public commitment: a statement that universities remain responsible not only for transmitting disciplinary content, but for cultivating the forms of judgment and character necessary to inhabit a world saturated with synthetic intelligence.

At the same time, this reorientation is not without risk. If restructuring remains confined to isolated courses or enthusiastic early adopters, systems will continue to produce graduates whose formal credentials rest on tasks that machines can perform more cheaply and reliably. There is therefore a pressing need for longitudinal and comparative research that tracks how different models of AI-integrated curricula affect not only immediate performance, but long-term capability, equity of access, and labor market trajectories. Questions of who benefits from hybrid intelligence — and who is further marginalized by it — must become central to both curriculum studies and education policy.

In this new era, the most valuable knowledge is that which machines cannot yet replicate: judgment based on complex contexts, deep ethical reasoning, metaphorical thinking across domains, and empathy in interpersonal interaction. The future of curriculum design lies in cultivating the wisdom of the human-in-the-loop — technically proficient, yet spiritually independent of technology. The ultimate goal is to produce graduates who are not merely users of AI, but its masters, its critics, and its moral compass; individuals who can work *with* intelligent systems without surrendering their own intelligence in the process.

To Cite This Article Aiqing WANG. (2025). Curriculum Restructuring in the Post-GPT Era:
Transfer of Capability Value and Systemic Change in Teaching Paradigms. *Artificial Intelligence Education Studies*, *1*(4), 31-38. https://doi.org/10.6914/aiese.010404

Reference

[1] Ajjawi, R., Bearman, M., & Boud, D. (2021). Performing standards: A critical perspective on the contemporary use of standards in assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 26(5), 1–15.

[2] Bearman, M., & Ajjawi, R. (2023). Learning to work with the black box: Pedagogy for a world with artificial intelligence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 54(5), 1160–1173.

[3] Bjork, E. L., & Bjork, R. A. (2011). Making things hard on yourself, but in a good way: Creating desirable difficulties to enhance learning. In M. A. Gernsbacher, R. W. Pew, L. M. Hough, & J. R. Pomerantz (Eds.), *Psychology and the real world: Essays illustrating fundamental contributions to society* (pp. 56–64). Worth Publishers.

[4] Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: A wake-up call for educational systems and practices. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 18(1), 201–213.

[5] Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland, E., Mollick, E. R., Lifshitz-Assaf, H., Kellogg, K., Rajendran, S., Krayer, L., Candelon, F., & Lakhani, K. R. (2023). Navigating the jagged technological frontier: Field experimental evidence of the effects of AI on knowledge worker productivity and quality. *Harvard Business School Technology & Operations Mgt. Unit Working Paper*, 24–013.

[6] Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., ... & Wright, R. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 71, 102642.

[7] Fullan, M., Quinn, J., & McEchen, J. (2018). *Deep learning: Engage the world change the world*. Corwin Press.

[8] Lodge, J. M., Howard, S., Bearman, M., & Dawson, P. (2023). Assessment redesign for generative AI: A taxonomic approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–16. Advance online publication.

[9] Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–16.
[10] Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054.
[11] Mollick, E. R., & Mollick, L. (2023). Assigning AI: Seven approaches for students, with prompts. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4475995
[12] Risko, E. F., & Gilbert, S. J. (2016). Cognitive offloading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(9), 676–688.
[13] Sullivan, M., & Kelly, A. (2024). The authenticity crisis: Re-evaluating assessment in the age of artificial intelligence. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 22(1), 45–62.
[14] UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO Publishing.
[15] Zamfirescu-Pereira, J. D., Wong, R. Y., Hartmann, B., & Yang, Q. (2023). Why prompting is hard: A user-centered evaluation of large language model prompt engineering. *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–13.

Editor *Xin HUANG cpcl@cpcl.hk*