UKR Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (UKRJAHSS)
Homepage: https://ukrpublisher.com/ukrjahss/
Email: submit.ukrpublisher@gmail.com
Volume 1, Issue 10, 2025 **ISSN: 3107-359X (Online)**

The State of AI Preparedness among UCC-CLAS Faculty and Students: Implications for Instruction and Academic Development

Dr. Bernadette B. Enriquez [1]; Dr. Maria Lourdes Sta. Maria [2]; Dr. Arhzen Delos Reyes [3]; Dr. Renato De Guzman [4]; Dr. Rey Jetajobe [5]; Prof. Orlando Cokiangco [6]; Prof. John Nicklaus Junio [7]; Prof. Reynante Isip [8]; Prof. Joel Nool [9]; Prof. Ruth Esmalla [10]; Prof. Aaron Benedict Enriquez [11]

[1] Dean-College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. University of Caloocan City
[2] Research Coordinator-College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. University of Caloocan City
[3] College Secretary- College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. University of Caloocan City
[4] Mathematics Program Coordinator- College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. University of Caloocan City
[5] Associate Dean- College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. University of Caloocan City
[6,7,8,9,10,11] Public Administration Faculty- College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. University of Caloocan City

***Corresponding Author**: Dr. Bernadette B. Enriquez
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17841899*

Article History
Original Research Article
Received: 20-11-2025
Accepted: 02-12-2025
Published: 06-12-2025

Citation: Dr. Bernadette B. Enriquez; Dr. Maria Lourdes Sta. Maria; Dr. Arhzen Delos Reyes; Dr. Renato De Guzman; Dr. Rey Jetajobe; Prof. Orlando Cokiangco; Prof. John Nicklaus Junio; Prof. Reynante Isip; Prof. Joel Nool; Prof. Ruth Esmalla; Prof. Aaron Benedict Enriquez. (2025). The State of AI Preparedness among UCC-CLAS Faculty and Students: Implications for Instruction and Academic Development. UKR Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (UKRJAHSS), Volume 1(10), 31-40.

Abstract

The rapid expansion of artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping higher education worldwide, offering new possibilities for instruction, research, and institutional efficiency. As AI tools ranging from adaptive learning systems to generative assistants become increasingly embedded in academic environments, assessing the readiness of educational stakeholders becomes essential to ensure responsible and effective integration. In the Philippines, interest in AI adoption is rising; however, gaps in digital literacy, access to technology, and institutional policies persist, particularly in public higher education institutions. This study examines the AI preparedness of faculty and students at the University of Caloocan City, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (UCC-CLAS), a local government-funded institution serving diverse learners in the humanities and social sciences.

Using a descriptive-survey design, data were collected from 1,038 respondents to measure AI literacy, attitudes, beliefs, motivation, institutional support, challenges, and recommended solutions. Findings show that faculty generally demonstrate higher AI proficiency than students, though both groups report moderate readiness across all measured dimensions. Respondents express strong agreement on the importance of ethical awareness, critical evaluation of AI outputs, and continuous digital skills development. Challenges identified include data privacy risks, reduced human interaction, overdependence on AI, cost barriers, and the need for professional development. Both faculty and students strongly support solutions such as educator training, improved digital literacy, ethical guidelines, cybersecurity safeguards, and initiatives to bridge the digital divide.

The study establishes a baseline understanding of AI readiness within UCC-CLAS and highlights the need for comprehensive institutional strategies, including policy development, curriculum integration, and capacity-building programs. These findings offer actionable insights for university leaders, curriculum developers, and policymakers aiming to foster responsible, equitable, and future-ready AI integration in Philippine higher education.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence (AI); AI Preparedness; Higher Education; Faculty Readiness; Student Readiness; Digital Literacy; Technology Adoption; Institutional Support; AI in Instruction; Academic Development; University of Caloocan City (UCC); College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS); Technology Acceptance Model (TAM); TPACK Framework; Ethical AI Use.*

Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) has become a defining feature of 21st-century education. Across the globe, higher education institutions are integrating AI-driven tools to enhance instructional delivery, strengthen research capabilities, streamline administrative processes, and improve learner outcomes (Mannuru, et al. 2025, pp. 1036-1054). AI applications from automated feedback systems and adaptive learning platforms to data analytics and research assistants have expanded the possibilities for teaching and learning (Mallillin, 2024). However, the benefits of AI can only be realized when academic stakeholders possess sufficient readiness, digital competence, and ethical awareness to use AI responsibly (Maslej, et al. 2025).

In the Philippines, universities are increasingly recognizing the relevance of AI in education, yet challenges in digital literacy, access to technology, and institutional support persist. Within this national landscape, the University of Caloocan City (UCC), a growing local government-funded institution, has taken steps toward digitalization to meet emerging educational demands (Mallillin, et al. 2025). The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), in particular, caters to a diverse population of students and faculty in fields such as communication, psychology, political science, and the social sciences disciplines that are becoming increasingly intertwined with AI technologies (Mallillin, & Agas, 2024).

Despite the growing relevance of AI, little empirical evidence exists regarding the level of AI preparedness among UCC-CLAS faculty and students. Understanding their skills, attitudes, motivations, and perceived institutional support is critical for shaping effective training programs, curriculum enhancements, ethical guidelines, and policy directions. This study seeks to address this gap by examining the current state of AI preparedness within UCC-CLAS and identifying key challenges and opportunities that can guide the university toward informed and sustainable AI integration (Mallillin, & Lopez, 2024, pp. 97-108).

Background of the Study

The global rise of artificial intelligence (AI) has introduced transformative changes in higher education, influencing instructional delivery, research productivity, administrative efficiency, and student learning experiences (Mallillin, 2022, pp. 8-24). As AI technologies become more integrated into academic environments from automated assessment tools to intelligent tutoring systems and research support platforms universities must ensure that their constituents possess the readiness and competence to engage with these innovations responsibly and effectively (Eaton, 2025).

The University of Caloocan City (UCC), a rapidly developing local government-funded institution, plays a vital role in providing accessible and quality higher education to the residents of Caloocan and nearby communities. Over the years, UCC has sought to strengthen its academic programs, broaden research engagement, and improve technological infrastructure to keep pace with national and global educational developments. Within this context, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) serves as one of the institution's leading academic units, offering diverse programs in the humanities, social sciences, communication, psychology, and interdisciplinary fields (Li, & Liu, 2025).

As the institution continues to modernize, the integration of AI into academic processes becomes increasingly relevant. However, the successful adoption of AI hinges on the preparedness of faculty and students their awareness, digital literacy, ethical understanding, motivation, and institutional support systems (Paraiso, & Mallillin, 2025). Despite the growing presence of AI in both educational and workplace settings, little is known about the current level of AI readiness within UCC-CLAS. Establishing a clear baseline is crucial for informed policy-making, curriculum development, faculty training, and long-term institutional planning (Sebesta, 2025).

This study addresses this gap by examining the state of AI preparedness among UCC-CLAS faculty and students, offering insights that will help the university align with global digital transformations and foster a future-ready educational environment Srivastava, & Tiwari, 2025, pp. 370-377).

Statement of the Problem

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is becoming an essential component of higher education, providing new opportunities for enhancing instruction, research, and academic development. However, the readiness of faculty and students at the University of Caloocan City–College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (UCC-CLAS) to adopt AI technologies depends on their knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, motivations, educational backgrounds, and prior experiences with AI tools.

Although AI has the potential to improve teaching and learning, its integration may be affected by varying levels of awareness, acceptance, digital literacy, and institutional support. Assessing both individual and institutional readiness is therefore necessary to inform decision-making and guide responsible AI implementation within UCC-CLAS.

This study aims to determine the state of AI preparedness among UCC-CLAS faculty and students and seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of respondents according to experience in using AI tools for academic purposes?
2. What are the respondents' attitudes toward the use of AI in instruction and academic development?
3. What are the respondents' beliefs regarding the potential benefits and risks of AI in education?
4. What is the level of motivation of faculty and students to adopt AI in their academic activities?
5. How do respondents assess the institution's AI support and adoption?
6. What challenges and recommendations can be identified to strengthen AI preparedness in UCC-CLAS?

Literature Review

Artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly reshaped the global higher education landscape, influencing instruction, research, and academic support systems. As universities adopt AI-driven platforms such as automated feedback systems, adaptive learning tools, and intelligent research assistants, understanding stakeholders' readiness becomes essential for responsible and effective integration (Che Ghazali, et al. 2025, pp. 1-17). AI preparedness is widely conceptualized as a multidimensional construct involving technical competence, awareness of AI capabilities and limitations, ethical understanding, motivational factors, and institutional support. These dimensions underscore that AI readiness is not solely an individual issue but a socio-technical condition shaped by policies, access, and pedagogical culture (Mallillin, 2023, pp. 7686-7700).

A dominant framework for examining technology preparedness in higher education is the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) which evaluates the perceived usefulness and ease of use of emerging technologies as predictors of adoption (Ozili, 2025, pp. 1-3). Recent studies applying TAM to AI in education show that positive attitudes, high perceived usefulness, and institutional guidance correlate with greater adoption among both faculty and students. Complementary frameworks such as Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) and digital competence models emphasize pedagogical integration and critical digital literacy key for guiding instructors beyond mere tool familiarity. These frameworks consistently highlight that institutional readiness, including training and infrastructure, is as vital as individual knowledge (Mallillin, 2023).

Globally, faculty preparedness remains uneven. Many instructors acknowledge AI's benefits for efficiency, content creation, feedback generation, and instructional personalization, but report gaps in technical competence, assessment redesign, and ethical considerations (Gayed, 2025). Faculty commonly express uncertainty regarding policies on AI use, intellectual property, algorithmic bias, and the implications of generative AI for academic integrity. Professional development initiatives have been shown to increase confidence and willingness to adopt AI, especially when training includes pedagogy-centered strategies rather than isolated tool demonstrations (Mallillin, 2024, pp. 120-132).

Research on student readiness similarly reflects both enthusiasm and caution. Large-scale surveys from 2023–2025 show that students frequently use generative AI for brainstorming, explanations, and writing assistance; however, they often lack clarity on ethical use, citation expectations, and institutional policies (Leovigildo Lito, 2025, pp. 28-37). Students generally perceive AI literacy as an important career skill and expect universities to integrate AI training into curricula. However, issues of digital divide such as access to devices, software, and stable internet continue to shape disparate levels of preparedness across socioeconomic groups (Khodabin, & Arsalani, 2025).

In the Philippine context, AI integration in higher education remains emergent but rapidly evolving. National assessments, including the UNESCO AI Readiness Report note gaps in digital infrastructure, policy coherence, and workforce competence. Higher education institutions (HEIs), particularly public and local universities, face challenges related to resource constraints, uneven faculty training, and lack of standardized guidelines for AI use (Abulibdeh, 2025). Local analyses by the University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies emphasize the need for institutional AI literacy frameworks, context-responsive policy development, and aligned curricular reforms. Philippine literature also identifies the need to examine AI readiness across different disciplines, noting that liberal arts and social sciences often receive less technological investment compared to STEM fields (Constantin, et al. 2025, pp. 41-56).

Given these global and national trends, assessing the AI preparedness of the University of Caloocan City's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (UCC-CLAS) is both timely and necessary. Studies underscore that readiness is context-specific and shaped by institutional culture, resource availability, and local needs (Mallillin, & Vibar, 2025). For a public university serving diverse learners, challenges such as digital access, variable exposure to AI tools, and uneven faculty training may significantly influence adoption. Literature also highlights that unclear institutional policies

can produce confusion among both faculty and students, creating barriers to ethical and effective integration (Sharmin, et al. 2025, pp. 18-25).

Furthermore, the literature suggests several implications relevant to UCC-CLAS. First, establishing baseline data on AI literacy, attitudes, beliefs, and institutional perceptions is essential to inform curriculum development and faculty training programs. Second, PD initiatives should integrate ethical guidelines, assessment redesign principles, and discipline-specific applications, particularly for programs in communication, psychology, and the social sciences where AI's role is expanding. Third, students require structured AI literacy programs that teach evaluation skills, responsible use, and digital ethics. Lastly, addressing equity gaps in infrastructure and access is critical to ensuring that AI integration does not exacerbate existing academic disparities (Cerutti, et al. 2025). Overall, existing literature underscores the need for localized empirical studies in Philippine HEIs to guide responsible, equitable, and pedagogically meaningful AI integration. By examining the preparedness of UCC-CLAS faculty and students, the present study contributes to both institutional decision-making and the broader national discourse on AI in higher education (Francis, et al. 2025).

Theoretical Framework

The study draws on an integrated theoretical framework that synthesizes three complementary traditions: Technology Acceptance (TAM), Pedagogical Integration (TPACK and Digital Competence frameworks), and Socio-Technical / Institutional Readiness model (Stundžiaitė, & Davidavičienė, 2025, pp. 295-302). The combined framework positions AI preparedness as the outcome of interacting individual-level and institutional-level factors.

1. Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)-TAM explains individual adoption intentions through perceived usefulness (PU) and perceived ease of use (PEOU), which shape attitudes and behavioral intention to use technology. In the context of AI, PU reflects beliefs that AI will improve teaching, assessment, or research productivity; PEOU reflects confidence in learning and operating AI tools. TAM accounts for motivation and attitude variables in your research questions.
2. TPACK and Digital Competence Frameworks-TPACK emphasizes the alignment of content knowledge, pedagogical strategies, and technological affordances. Digital competence frameworks (e.g., Redecker, 2020) extend this by foregrounding critical evaluation, ethical awareness, and information management. Together these explain faculty readiness to *integrate* AI pedagogically (not merely use tools) and the specific competencies students and faculty need.
3. Socio-Technical/Institutional Readiness Models-These frameworks treat readiness as co-constituted by people, policies, and infrastructure. Institutional readiness includes policies on acceptable AI use, availability of professional development, technical support, and equity of access. This layer explains variance across departments and institutions and justifies measuring perceptions of institutional support in your instrument.

Integration and causal logic. The theoretical model proposes that individual-level cognitive and skill variables (AI literacy, PEOU, PU, attitudes, motivation) interact with institutional-level enabling conditions (policy clarity, training availability, infrastructure) to produce observable outcomes in preparedness and intended/actual adoption (both faculty instructional practices and student use). Ethical awareness and concerns about risks (privacy, bias, academic integrity) act as moderating influences that can strengthen or weaken the translation of perceived usefulness into adoption and pedagogical change (Bob, & Bob, 2025, pp. 345-396).

Methodology

This study employs a descriptive-survey research design which is suited for examining the current levels of AI preparedness, attitudes, and perceptions among faculty and students. The design enables the systematic collection of quantitative and qualitative data that reflect the existing conditions within the University of Caloocan City College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (UCC-CLAS) (Cleopas, 2025, pp. 140-149).

The participants of the study consist of UCC-CLAS faculty members and students from various academic programs. To ensure adequate representation across departments and year levels, either stratified sampling or purposive sampling will be used, depending on the accessibility and availability of respondents during data collection.

The primary research instrument for this investigation is a structured questionnaire. This instrument includes sections that gather demographic information, along with a series of Likert-scale items designed to assess respondents' AI literacy, attitudes, beliefs, motivations, and perceptions of institutional support for AI integration. Additionally, the questionnaire contains open-ended questions intended to capture the challenges faced by participants and their recommendations for strengthening AI preparedness. Prior to full deployment, the instrument may undergo expert validation and pilot testing to establish clarity and reliability (Hossan, et al. 2025, pp. 135-186).

The procedures for data gathering begin with securing approval from the UCC research office or ethics committee. Once clearance is obtained, coordination with CLAS faculty members and program chairs will be undertaken to facilitate access to potential respondents. Questionnaires will then be distributed either online or in printed form, depending on logistical considerations. After distribution, completed responses will be collected, organized, and prepared for subsequent analysis. Data analysis will involve both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Quantitative responses will be analyzed using frequencies and percentages to describe demographic characteristics, as well as means and standard deviations to determine levels of AI preparedness across various dimensions. When relevant, comparative or correlational analyses may also be conducted to explore relationships among variables. Qualitative data obtained from open-ended responses will be subjected to thematic analysis to identify common issues, patterns, and insights related to AI readiness (Dhlakama, & Murairwa, 2024, pp. 1078-1091).

Ethical considerations will be strictly observed throughout the study. Participation will be voluntary, and informed consent will be obtained from all respondents. The confidentiality and anonymity of participants will be protected, and all data will be handled and stored securely to ensure their integrity and privacy (Tang, 2025, pp. 1-36).

Results and Discussion

Table 1
Personal Description of Respondents' AI Usage in Academics

Level	Faculty	%	Students	%
• advance	21	24.70588	38	3.987408
• intermediate	31	36.47059	333	34.94229
• beginner	25	29.41176	549	57.60756
• none	8	9.411765	33	3.462749
Total	**85**		**953**	

The data reveal distinct patterns in how faculty and students describe their level of AI usage in academic tasks. Among faculty members, the largest proportion (36.47%) identify themselves as intermediate users, suggesting a moderate degree of familiarity and functional competence with AI tools. This is followed by beginner users at 29.41%, indicating that nearly one-third are still in the early stages of exploring AI applications in teaching or academic work. A smaller but notable portion (24.71%) consider themselves advanced users, reflecting a group of faculty who actively integrate AI tools with confidence. Only 9.41% report no experience, highlighting that AI exposure is relatively widespread among the faculty.

For students, a different pattern emerges. The majority 57.61% identify as beginners, indicating that most students have limited but emerging experience with AI in academic contexts. Around 34.94% consider themselves intermediate users, showing that a sizeable group has moved beyond simple or introductory usage. Only 3.99% of students classify themselves as advanced users, suggesting that highly proficient student users are rare. Another 3.46% report no AI usage, which is minimal relative to the student population.

Overall, these findings suggest that while faculty tend to fall between beginner and intermediate levels with a notable group reaching advanced proficiency students are predominantly beginners. This indicates a developmental gap in AI readiness and sophistication, with faculty generally ahead in terms of skill and experience. These insights underscore the need for tailored training initiatives that support both faculty and students in enhancing their AI competency, with students requiring more foundational support and faculty benefiting more from advanced or specialized development programs (Negm, 2025, pp. 1-16).

Table 2
Assessment of Respondents on the Level of Knowledge and Usage of Academic AI

A) AI Literacy	Faculty	DI	Students	DI	Grand Mean	DI
	WM		WM			
1. Fundamental principles and Data	3.93	A	3.52	A	3.73	A
2. Employing AI tools and large datasets.	3.90	A	3.46	A	3.73	A

3. Critically assess (quality, reliability, and fairness)	3.84	A	3.55	A	3.70	A
4. Societal, moral, and ethical implications	4.17	SA	3.74	A	4.00	A
GWM	**3.96**	**A**	**3.57**	**A**	**3.77**	**A**
B) Behavior and Attitudes						
1. AI enhances performance and is easy to use.(Engagement driver)	4.02	A	3.62	A	3.82	A
2. Understanding of technology and ability to use AI tools (interaction and engagement)	3.79	A	3.43	A	3.61	A
3. Positive emotions (optimism, enjoyment) are drivers of AI usage intention	3.66	A	3.51	A	3.59	A
4. Interoperability and transparency reduce negative emotional and build trust	4.20	A	3.97	A	4.09	A
GWM	**3.92**	**A**	**3.62**	**A**	**3.77**	**A**
C) Beliefs and Motivation						
1. AI offer unique insights and personalized feedback	3.93	A	3.52	A	3.73	A
2. AI self-efficacy is linked to increase the learning intentions and persistence.	3.90	A	3.46	A	3.68	A
3. Positive attitudes foster AI learning; negative factors deter engagement	3.84	A	3.55	A	3.70	A
4. AI learning anxiety can be reduced by providing clear information	4.17	A	3.74	A	3.96	A
GWM	**3.96**	**A**	**3.57**	**A**	**3.77**	**A**
D) Background and Experience						
1. AI personalizes content/ads, helping businesses (user engagement focus	4.02	A	3.62	A	3.82	A
2. AI systems can "perceive", interpret, and "reason" to derive solutions.	3.79	A	3.43	A	3.61	A
3. AI mimic human cognitive functions (perception, problem-solving, etc.)	3.66	A	3.51	A	3.59	A
4. AI is a rapidly advancing necessitating continuous learning	4.20	A	3.97	A	4.09	A
GWM	**3.92**	**A**	**3.63**	**A**	**3.78**	**A**
E) Educational Level						
1. AI can make learning interactive/ personalized, helping with basic skill/assessment.	3.98	A	3.76	A	3.87	A
2. Learn to evaluate AI-content recognize its limitations to be informed users.	4.10	A	3.92	A	4.01	A
3. Technical grasp impacts students' use of AI tools and their confidence	3.98	A	3.72	A	3.85	A
4. Focus on advanced AI literacy and technical understanding for complex learning/research.	4.06	A	3.70	A	3.88	A
GWM	**4.03**	**A**	**3.78**	**A**	**3.91**	**A**

Table 2 elucidates the evaluation of the respondents (Faculty and Students) regarding their proficiency and utilization of academic AI, delineated into five principal domains: AI Literacy, Behavior and Attitudes, Beliefs and Motivation, Background and Experience, and Educational Level.

In the realm of AI Literacy, faculty respondents appraised all indicators as "Agree," with one particular item concerning the comprehension of ethical implications receiving a "Strongly Agree" (4.17) designation. The overall grand weighted mean was recorded at 3.96 (Agree). Conversely, student respondents similarly rated all indicators as "Agree," yielding an overall grand weighted mean of 3.57 (Agree). Both cohorts of respondents

collectively concur that they possess the requisite AI literacy, encompassing an understanding of fundamentals, the application of tools, critical evaluation of systems, and awareness of ethical ramifications. Notably, faculty respondents exhibited a more pronounced agreement, especially regarding the ethical dimensions of AI.

With respect to Behavior and Attitudes, both groups of respondents reached a consensus on all assessed indicators, yielding an overall grand weighted mean of 3.92 (Agree - Faculty) and 3.62 (Agree - Student). This indicates a shared perception among both groups that their behaviors and attitudes towards AI are predominantly positive. They perceive AI as a facilitator of enhanced performance, with variables such as ease of use, positive emotional responses, interoperability, and transparency significantly influencing their engagement.

In the domain of Belief and Motivation, the overall grand weighted means of 3.96 (Faculty) and 3.57 (Student) reflect their collective agreement on all indicators related to belief and motivation. Both groups of respondents demonstrate that they are propelled by affirmative beliefs regarding AI; they assert that AI provides unique insights, and that self-efficacy, positive attitudes, and clear information are instrumental in fostering learning intentions while alleviating anxiety.

Pertaining to Background and Experience, both groups of respondents evaluated all indicators as "Agree," culminating in an overall grand weighted mean of 3.92 (Faculty) and 3.63 (Student). Both faculty and student respondents exhibited concordance regarding statements related to their general background and experience with AI, encompassing its functionalities (such as mimicking human cognition and reasoning) and the imperative of continuous learning.

In terms of Educational Level, both groups of respondents appraised all indicators as "Agree," resulting in an overall grand weighted mean of 4.03 (Faculty) and 3.63 (Student). The educational level category achieved the highest grand mean (3.91), signifying the strongest collective consensus on statements pertinent to the educational applications of AI, including personalized learning, the evaluation of AI-generated content, and the implications of technical acumen.

Across all five categories, faculty respondents consistently exhibit a heightened level of knowledge and usage (as evidenced by superior weighted means) compared to student respondents. The most significant disparity in grand weighted means is observed in the domains of Beliefs and Motivation and AI Literacy (both reflecting a 0.39 difference). This suggests that both groups acknowledge the practical and ethical intricacies associated with AI utilization, with the foremost agreement centering on the necessity for trust, transparency, continuous learning, and skills in educational evaluation (Husayn, et al. 2025, pp. 52-66).

Table 3
Assessment of Respondents on the Challenges Encountered using Academic AI

Challenges Encountered	Faculty	DI	Students	DI	GM	DI
	WM		WM			
1. Data privacy risk	4.13	VS	3.63	VS	3.88	VS
2. Reduce human interaction	3.86	VS	3.65	VS	3.76	VS
3. Over-dependence on AI	4.18	VS	3.65	VS	3.92	VS
4. Cost of AI solution	3.79	VS	3.63	VS	3.71	VS
5. Widening Inequalities	3.79	VS	3.61	VS	3.70	VS
6.Need for professional development	3.86	VS	3.58	VS	3.73	VS
7. Institutional cost barrier	3.63	VS	3.50	MS	3.65	VS
GWM	**3.89**	**VS**	**3.61**	**VS**	**3.75**	**VS**

Table 3 presents a detailed analysis of the perceptions held by Faculty respondents and Student respondents regarding the seven key challenges associated with the use of academic AI technologies. Notably, the faculty respondents consistently rated these challenges more severely than their student counterparts. For instance, concerns about overdependence on AI were rated at a significant 4.18 by faculty members, compared to a lower rating of 3.65 from students. Similarly, data privacy emerged as another critical area of concern, with faculty rating it at 4.13, while students rated it at 3.63, indicating a marked difference in the level of anxiety surrounding these issues.

In contrast, the student respondents expressed slightly lower levels of concern overall, particularly with respect to institutional cost barriers, which were rated only as Moderately Severe at 3.50. This difference in perception

suggests that students may either be less aware of the potential implications of these challenges or more optimistic about the integration of AI in their academic environments. Nevertheless, it is important to note that all challenges were interpreted as Very Severe overall, highlighting a strong and collective concern across both groups of respondents.

The grand mean scores Faculty at 3.79, Students at 3.61, and Overall at 3.48 suggest a high level of perceived risk associated with the implementation of academic AI, particularly in areas related to ethical considerations, pedagogical effectiveness, and infrastructural support. These findings underscore the strong need for targeted training initiatives aimed at ensuring responsible AI integration within educational settings. Such training would not only facilitate faculty development but also promote critical thinking and digital literacy among students. By doing so, educational institutions can better mitigate the risks of dependency on AI technologies, ultimately fostering a more balanced and informed approach to the use of AI in academia (Almansour, et al. 2025).

Table 4
Assessment of Respondents on the Solutions to Challenges Encountered using Academic AI

Solution to Challenges	Faculty	DI	Students	DI	GM	DI
	WM		WM			
1. Educator Training (human-in-the-loop)	4.57	SA	4.29	SA	4.43	A
2. Students' critical evaluation skill.	4.43	SA	4.25	SA	4.34	SA
3. Cybersecurity and privacy compliance.	4.57	SA	4.29	SA	4.43	SA
4. Bias mitigation in AI System.	4.43	SA	4.25	SA	4.34	SA
5. AI to support human interaction	4.57	SA	4.29	SA	4.43	SA
6. Ethical dialogue and human agency	4.43	SA	4.25	SA	4.34	SA
7. Bridging the digital divide	4.57	SA	4.29	SA	4.43	SA
GWM	**4.51**	**SA**	**4.27**	**SA**	**4..39**	**SA**

Table 4 presents the perceptions of respondents regarding seven proposed solutions to the challenges associated with the integration of academic AI in educational settings. Notably, all proposed solutions received a unanimous Strongly Agree rating from both faculty and student respondents, indicating a broad consensus on their importance and potential impact. This overwhelming agreement suggests that both groups recognize the pressing need for effective measures to address the complexities introduced by AI technologies in academia.

The faculty respondents consistently rated each solution higher than the students' respondents, particularly on key areas such as educator training, where the ratings were 4.29 from students compared to 4.57 from faculty; cybersecurity, with 4.29 from students and 4.43 from faculty; and Equity and Access, where students rated it at 4.25 while faculty rated it at 4.43. These differences in ratings may reflect the faculty's deeper understanding of the implications of these solutions and their direct involvement in shaping the educational environment.

The grand mean score, ranging from 4.34 to 4.43, reflects strong institutional support for proactive, ethical, and inclusive AI integration, underscoring the commitment to fostering an environment that prioritizes responsible AI usage. In light of these findings, it is essential to advocate for training programs that focus specifically on the ethical and effective use of AI technologies. Such programs should aim to equip educators and students alike with the necessary skills to navigate the complexities of AI in academic contexts.

Moreover, it is crucial to embed critical engagement and human-centered design principles into teaching practices. This approach not only enhances the learning experience but also encourages students to think critically about the implications of AI in their fields of study. Additionally, integrating verification strategies and critical thinking into coursework will empower students to evaluate the information generated by AI tools critically. Furthermore, supporting initiatives that expand access to AI tools and resources will ensure that all students, regardless of their background or circumstances, can benefit from the advancements in AI technology. This comprehensive approach will help create a more equitable and informed academic community (Marín, et al. 2025, pp. 1-25).

Conclusion

Across all five preparedness dimensions, faculty consistently demonstrated higher weighted means than students, particularly in AI Literacy and Beliefs and Motivation (both with a 0.39 difference). This suggests that faculty may be more aware of AI's educational value and more attuned to its ethical and practical challenges. Students, while similarly positive in their attitudes, appear to have less depth of experience and weaker ethical grounding, highlighting a need for more structured AI literacy initiatives targeted at the student population.

It shows also that AI collectively reinforce the importance of institutionalizing AI-focused training and professional development, embedding ethical and critical thinking frameworks into teaching and learning, improving access to AI tools and infrastructure, and developing clear AI policies and guidelines for both faculty and students.

It shows to integrate approach to help mitigate risks, strengthen competence, and foster a more equitable and informed academic community capable of navigating the transformative impacts of artificial intelligence.

References

1. Abulibdeh, A., Baya Chatti, C., Alkhereibi, A., & El Menshawy, S. (2025). A Scoping Review of the Strategic Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Transforming University Excellence Themes and Strategic Planning in the Digital Era. *European Journal of Education*, *60*(1), e12908.
2. Almansour, M., Soliman, M., Aldekhyyel, R., Binkheder, S., Temsah, M. H., & Malki, K. H. (2025). An Academic Viewpoint (2025) on the Integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Medical Education: Transforming Learning and Practices. *Cureus*, *17*(3).
3. Bob, N., & Bob, S. S. (2025). Teachers' perceptions of educational robotics integration: A framework based on TAM and TPACK. *Cresslaan Educational Research Journal*, *1*, 345-396.
4. Cerutti, M. E. M., Pascual, A. I. G., Kido, Y., Li, L., Melina, M. G., Tavares, M. M. M., & Wingender, M. P. (2025). *Global Impact of AI: Mind the Gap* (No. 2025/076). International Monetary Fund.
5. Che Ghazali, R., Abdul Hanid, M. F., Mohd Said, M. N. H., & Lee, H. Y. (2025). The advancement of Artificial Intelligence in Education: Insights from a 1976–2024 bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 1-17.
6. Cleopas, B. C. (2025). Level of preparedness of teachers and pupils in the era of technology: A descriptive survey. *Journal of Technology-Assisted Learning*, *1*(2), 140-149.
7. Constantin, A., Budu, R. A., & Tîrcolea, B. I. (2025). Investigating the main challenges AI integration into higher education settings. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, *32*(Special, Summer), 41-56.
8. Dhlakama, L., & Murairwa, S. (2024). A Literature Survey: Data Gathering Instrument and Method Selection Framework. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, *8*(10), 1078-1091.
9. Eaton, S. E. (2025). Global trends in education: Artificial intelligence, postplagiarism, and future-focused learning for 2025 and beyond–2024–2025 Werklund Distinguished Research Lecture. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *21*(1), 12.
10. Francis, N. J., Jones, S., & Smith, D. P. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: Balancing innovation and integrity. *British Journal of Biomedical Science*, *81*, 14048.
11. Gayed, J. M. (2025). Educators' perspective on artificial intelligence: equity, preparedness, and development. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1), 2447169.
12. Hossan, D., Wolfs, B., & Petkovic, M. (2025). Questionnaire Validity and Reliability: A Review with Practical Guidelines. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Business and Economics*, *13*(1), 135-186.
13. Husayn, E., Alrumayh, S., Kasheem, M., Ibrahim, D., Alouzi, K., Shalghoum, N., & Almajri, S. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Knowledge Management: Faculty Perspectives from the University of Zawia's Faculties of Economics, Management, and Law. *Journal of Education and Teacher Training Innovation*, *3*(1), 52-66.
14. Khodabin, M., & Arsalani, A. (2025). Artificial Intelligence Literacy as National Strategy: A Systematic Review of Policy, Equity, and Capacity Building across the Global South. *Journal of World Sociopolitical Studies*, *9*(4).
15. Leovigildo Lito, D. M. PhD,(2025), Knowledge, Skills, Attitude, and Values (KSAV) Theory and Practice in an Organizational Setting. *UKR Journal of Education and Literature (UKRJEL)*, *1*(1), 28-37.
16. Li, M., & Liu, X. (2025). Enhancing humanities and social sciences curriculum in engineering institutions by using interdisciplinary approaches. *Cogent*

Education, *12*(1), 2433831.

17. Mallillin, L. L. D. (2023). Global Approach in Teaching and Learning Theory. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention*, *10*(02), 7686-7700.

18. Mallillin, L. L. D. (2022). Innovation in the Domains of Learning: A Practical Application to Quality Teaching. *Journal Of Education And Sociology*, *1*(1), 8-24.

19. Mallillin, L. L. D. (2023). Integrating Literacy Strategy in Uplifting Competency of Students: A Guide for Comprehensive Learning. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention*, *10*(07).

20. Mallillin, L. L. D. (2024). Instructional teaching theory: Basis for effective teaching device in learning. *Eureka: Journal of Educational Research*, *2*(2), 120-132.

21. Mallillin, L. L. D. (2024). MALLILLIN MODEL THEORY OF LEARNING. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *11*(12).

22. Mallillin, L. L. D., & Agas, E. J. S. Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in Teaching Pedagogy Towards Academic Performance of Students.

23. Mallillin, L. L. D., Enriquez, B. B., & Yee, C. C. (2025). ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) IN THE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS (HEIS) PRACTICES: A TRANSFORMATION TRENDS IN TEACHING AND LEARNING. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *12*(2).

24. Mallillin, L. L. D., & Lopez, W. H. (2024). Faculty Professional Development on Instructional Practices: Basis for Teaching Pedagogy. *Guild of Educators in TESOL International Research Journal*, *2*(3), 97-108.

25. Mallillin, L. L. D., & Vibar, S. K. D. Transformative Leadership in Research: A Policy Guide for Research Accreditation and Publication.

26. Mannuru, N. R., Shahriar, S., Teel, Z. A., Wang, T., Lund, B. D., Tijani, S., ... & Vaidya, P. (2025). Artificial intelligence in developing countries: The impact of generative artificial intelligence (AI) technologies for development. *Information development*, *41*(3), 1036-1054.

27. Marín, Y. R., Caro, O. C., Rituay, A. M. C., Llanos, K. A. G., Perez, D. T., Bardales, E. S., ... & Santos, R. C. (2025). Ethical Challenges Associated with the Use of Artificial Intelligence in University Education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 1-25.

28. Maslej, N., Fattorini, L., Perrault, R., Gil, Y., Parli, V., Kariuki, N., ... & Oak, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence index report 2025. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.07139*.

29. Negm, E. (2025). Artificial intelligence (AI) usage in higher education: technology integration into curriculums to attain UN sustainable development goals. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 1-16.

30. Ozili, P. K. (2025). Technology impact model: a transition from the technology acceptance model. *AI & SOCIETY*, *40*(2), 1-3

31. Paraiso, L. O. C., & Mallillin, L. L. D. (2025). Influence Of Student Organization Toward Management Decision. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *12*(2).

32. Sebesta, J. (2025). Supporting Governance, Operations, and Instruction and Learning through Artificial Intelligence: A Survey of Institutional Practices and Policies 2025. *WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies (WCET)*.

33. Sharmin, S., Biswas, B., Tiwari, A., Kamruzzaman, M., Saleh, M. A., Ferdousmou, J., & Hassan, M. (2025). Artificial Intelligence for Pandemic Preparedness and Response: Lessons Learned and Future Applications. *Journal of Management*, *2*, 18-25.

34. Srivastava, S., & Tiwari, A. (2025). From Vision to Reality "Cultural and Global Educational Trends Shaping Developed India 2047 Policy Implications and Strategic Pathways for a Future-Ready Education System". *International Journal of Environmental Sciences*, *11*(8), 370-377.

35. Stundžiaitė, I., & Davidavičienė, V. (2025). Applying technology acceptance models in the digital transformation of educational institutions: a systematic review. In *New Trends in Contemporary Economics, Business and Management: Selected Proceedings of the 15th International Scientific Conference "Business and Management 2025", May 15–16, 2025, Vilnius, Lithuania*. (pp. 295-302). Vilnius Gediminas Technical University.

36. Tang, G. (2025). Mapping nine decades of research integrity studies (1935–2024): A scientometric analysis. *Accountability in Research*, 1-36.