



From Automation to Augmentation: Teaching AI Literacy in Media and Design Education

Peggy Bloomer

Central Connecticut State University, USA

Abstract

The rapid evolution of generative artificial intelligence since 2023 has fundamentally altered creative practice, educational expectations, and professional standards in Media and Design fields. AI tools have moved beyond experimental novelty to become embedded within everyday creative workflows, reshaping how designers ideate, prototype, iterate, and evaluate visual work. This paper argues that Media and Design education must respond by teaching AI literacy as a studio-based, ethical, and skill-driven practice—shifting emphasis from automation toward augmentation rather than replacement. Grounded in studio pedagogy and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) frameworks, the paper examines how AI can be integrated into hands-on assignments, iterative design sprints, and critique-based learning. In this model, students engage AI systems as collaborative tools for exploration and variation while retaining human authorship, conceptual control, and critical judgment. Key competencies include prompt design, evaluative and strategic decision-making, ethical reasoning around bias and authorship, and fluency with industry-standard AI-enabled software. These skills are increasingly essential for career advancement, as the creative job market favors designers who can combine human creativity with intelligent systems rather than compete against them. The paper also addresses persistent pedagogical and institutional challenges, including uneven access to technology, gaps in AI literacy among students and faculty, technical limitations of current tools, and the lack of clear ethical and academic guidelines. By embedding experimentation, reflection, critique, and ethical inquiry into studio workflows, Media and Design programs can transform AI from a disruptive force into an inclusive and professionally relevant learning resource. Teaching AI as an augmentative creative partner prepares students to adapt to rapidly changing industry conditions while sustaining reflective, ethical, and human-centered design practice.

Keywords: *AI literacy, studio pedagogy, generative artificial intelligence, design education, human–AI collaboration, ethical design practice.*

1. Introduction

The rapid emergence of generative artificial intelligence since 2023 has intensified ongoing transformations within Media and Design education, reshaping creative workflows, professional expectations, and classroom practices. While digital tools have long influenced design production, recent AI systems differ in both scale and integration. Image generators, large language models, and AI-assisted creative software are now embedded directly within ideation, prototyping, editing, and production environments, altering how students and professionals approach visual communication and creative labor. At the same time, these developments have emerged alongside broader institutional shifts shaped by the lingering effects of pandemic-era remote learning, growing attention to equity and decolonization within curricula, and increasing pressure for career-oriented technological adaptation within higher education.

These converging conditions have produced a significant pedagogical tension within Media and Design programs. On one hand, institutions and industries increasingly emphasize acceleration, efficiency, automation, and rapid technological adoption. On the other hand, studio-based design education has historically depended upon slower forms of reflective practice grounded in critique, iteration, experimentation, and material inquiry [13]; [6]. As generative AI tools become normalized within creative industries, educators face the challenge of integrating emerging technologies without reducing design education to software training or automated production.

This paper argues that the design studio can function as a system boundary that mediates between accelerating technological infrastructures and enduring disciplinary practices. Rather than treating AI as either a threat to creativity or a neutral productivity tool, the paper positions studio pedagogy as a critical environment for teaching students how to engage AI systems reflectively, ethically, and strategically. In



this model, generative AI operates not as a replacement for creative labor, but as an augmentative tool within iterative and critique-based learning processes.

Grounded in studio pedagogy and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) frameworks, the paper examines how AI literacy can be integrated into hands-on design assignments, collaborative critique, and process-oriented workflows [13]; [6]. Drawing from classroom-based approaches in Media and Design education, the discussion focuses on how students use AI systems for ideation, variation, and experimentation while maintaining human authorship, evaluative judgment, and conceptual control. By framing AI literacy as a reflective and ethical studio practice rather than solely a technical competency, the paper proposes a transferable pedagogical model for integrating generative AI into creative disciplines while sustaining human-centered approaches to design education [14].

2. Educational Transformation Across Time

Studio-based learning has long occupied a central role in Media and Design education, emphasizing iterative making, critique, experimentation, and reflection as core components of creative practice. Rather than treating knowledge as something transmitted primarily through lecture or standardized instruction, studio pedagogy positions learning as an active and situated process shaped through dialogue, revision, and material engagement. Schön's concept of the "reflective practitioner" describes design education as a process of reflection-in-action, in which students develop understanding through cycles of making, testing, and revising within complex problem spaces [13]. Similarly, Cross argues that design disciplines cultivate distinct "designerly ways of knowing" grounded in synthesis, visualization, and iterative inquiry rather than linear problem-solving alone [6].

2.1 The Critique as a Reflection Point

At the center of studio pedagogy is critique culture, which functions as both a teaching method and a social structure within design education. Critique encourages students to articulate decisions, evaluate alternatives, and situate their work within broader cultural and communicative contexts. At the same time, contemporary scholarship has increasingly examined the limitations and inequities embedded within traditional critique models, particularly around authority, hierarchy, accessibility, and student vulnerability. Recent approaches to design education have therefore sought to reframe critique as a more collaborative, reflective, and inclusive process rather than a purely evaluative performance. These conversations intensified during and after the COVID-19 pandemic, which forced rapid shifts toward remote and hybrid learning environments across creative disciplines. The pandemic disrupted assumptions about the physical studio as the singular site of design education and prompted broader reconsiderations of pedagogical space, participation, and technological mediation. Digital collaboration tools, asynchronous workflows, and online critique environments became normalized within many programs, expanding how studio interaction could occur while also revealing inequalities in access to technology, workspace, and institutional support. As a result, post-pandemic design education increasingly operates within hybrid conditions where physical and digital practices continuously intersect.

2.2 Generative AI Prompts as Inquiry

The rapid emergence of generative AI has introduced another layer of transformation within higher education discourse. Much of the initial response to tools such as ChatGPT and AI image generators focused on concerns surrounding plagiarism, academic integrity, automation, and assessment. However, more recent scholarship has shifted toward questions of integration, literacy, and critical use [11]; [10]. Rather than viewing AI solely as a threat to educational practice, scholars increasingly argue that students must develop the ability to critically interpret, evaluate, and direct AI systems within professional and creative contexts.

These discussions also connect to longer traditions of reflective and critical pedagogy. Dewey framed education as an experiential process grounded in inquiry, reflection, and active engagement with social conditions rather than passive information transfer [7]. Freire similarly emphasized education as a dialogic process in which learners critically examine systems of power and develop agency through participation and reflection [8]. Together, these frameworks reinforce the importance of pedagogical models that encourage critical engagement with technology rather than passive technological adoption. Current AI discourse often frames integration as adoption or resistance; this binary obscures how pedagogical space itself can function as mediation.



3. Conceptual Framework: The Studio as System Boundary

As generative AI becomes increasingly integrated into creative industries, Media and Design education faces pressure to adapt quickly to changing technological conditions. However, rapid adoption alone does not necessarily produce meaningful learning or critical engagement. Within this context, the design studio can be understood as a system boundary: a pedagogical space that mediates between accelerating technological infrastructures and the slower reflective processes associated with disciplinary learning, critique, and creative inquiry.

In accessible terms, a system boundary is not simply a barrier or point of separation. Instead, it is a space of negotiation and exchange where different forms of knowledge, practice, and decision-making interact. In the context of design education, the studio operates as a boundary between technological systems and human interpretation. Students encounter AI-generated outputs, algorithmic suggestions, and automated workflows, but these systems are filtered through critique, reflection, revision, and discussion. Rather than accepting technological outputs as neutral or authoritative, the studio creates opportunities to pause, evaluate, and contextualize them within broader creative, ethical, and communicative frameworks [13].

This pedagogical approach requires interruption as a deliberate educational stance. Contemporary AI systems often prioritize speed, optimization, and efficiency, encouraging users to move rapidly from prompt to output with minimal reflection. Design education, however, has historically emphasized slower forms of inquiry grounded in process, experimentation, and iteration. Within the studio, interruption functions not as resistance to technology itself, but as a method for creating reflective distance from automated systems. Critique sessions, process documentation, revision cycles, and collaborative discussion all interrupt the immediacy of AI production by requiring students to explain choices, assess outcomes, and reconsider assumptions [7]; [8].

3.1 Generative AI Automation versus Augmentation

This distinction is particularly important in conversations surrounding automation and augmentation. Automation often frames AI as a mechanism for replacing or streamlining human labor, reducing creative practice to efficiency and output. Augmentation, by contrast, positions AI as a tool that expands exploratory capacity while maintaining human judgment, authorship, and responsibility. In this model, AI does not eliminate the need for disciplinary expertise; instead, it increases the importance of interpretation, evaluation, and intentionality within creative workflows [14]; [12].

3.2 Encouraging Technological Fluency

Three pedagogical shifts help support this framework within Media and Design education. The first is the development of slow technological fluency. Students must learn not only how to operate AI tools, but also how to critically engage them. This means moving beyond rapid prompt generation toward reflective experimentation, iterative refinement, and consideration of how systems shape outcomes. Slowing the interaction process encourages students to recognize patterns, limitations, biases, and inconsistencies that may otherwise remain invisible within highly automated workflows [11].

3.3 Using Disciplinary Knowledge to Support AI Practice

The second shift involves reinserting disciplinary knowledge into AI-supported practice. Generative systems can quickly produce visual variation, but they do not replace foundational knowledge of typography, composition, hierarchy, accessibility, rhetoric, or audience. Without disciplinary grounding, students risk treating AI outputs as finished solutions rather than starting points for critical development. Studio pedagogy therefore remains essential because it situates technological experimentation within broader histories, methods, and principles of design practice [6].

3.4 Making Process Visible

The third shift focuses on making processes visible. Traditional studio education often emphasizes sketches, drafts, critique notes, and iterative development as evidence of learning. AI-supported workflows require similar forms of transparency. Process documentation, reflective writing, prompt iteration records, and collaborative critique help students articulate how decisions were made and how



technological systems influenced outcomes. Making process visible reinforces accountability, strengthens critical reflection, and shifts evaluation away from polished outputs alone [9].

Viewed through this framework, the studio does not function as a site of technological resistance or passive adoption. Instead, it becomes a mediating space where students learn to critically navigate AI systems while sustaining reflective, ethical, and human-centered approaches to creative practice.

4. Case Study: Writing in the Discipline Studio Implementation

The conceptual framework outlined above was implemented within an undergraduate Writing in the Disciplines (WID) course in Graphic/Information Design focused on research, visual communication, and process-oriented studio practice [3]. The course was developed as part of a broader curricular effort to strengthen discipline-specific writing, multimodal communication, and research literacy within design education. Structured around the production of a 2,500–3,000-word research monograph paired with a professionally designed printed and digital publication, the course positioned writing, research, and visual communication as interconnected rather than separate practices [3]. Rather than functioning as a technical AI training environment, the course operated as a studio-based learning space in which students critically examined how generative AI systems influence design research, ideation, writing, and visual development. This approach aligns with scholarship emphasizing reflective and experiential learning within design education [13]; [6].

The course structure emphasized iterative development through proposal writing, annotated bibliographies, peer review workshops, visual integration exercises, and staged draft revisions distributed across a sixteen-week sequence [3]. Students progressed from topic development and literature review into qualitative research methods, visual analysis, drafting, revision, and final monograph production using Adobe InDesign. The curriculum intentionally framed design students as reflective practitioners capable of producing original disciplinary scholarship rather than simply visual artifacts.

A central component of the course involved collaboration with university librarians and research support staff, an approach also connected to a curriculum development initiative focused on sustainable research access and library-integrated design pedagogy. Within the course, librarian collaboration emphasized information literacy, source evaluation, citation practices, and ethical research methods alongside AI-supported creative production. Students were introduced to generative AI systems within the broader context of research methodologies rather than as isolated productivity tools. Librarian-led instruction focused on distinguishing scholarly research from unverifiable AI-generated summaries, identifying bias within generated outputs, and evaluating the credibility of visual and textual information sources. This reinforced the idea that AI literacy requires contextual interpretation and critical inquiry rather than simple technical proficiency [11]; [10].

4.1 The AI Engagement Protocol

To support reflective engagement, the course adopted an AI engagement protocol that structured how students incorporated generative systems into assignments. Students documented when and how AI tools were used throughout their process, including prompt construction, generated outputs, revisions, and evaluative decisions. Rather than prohibiting AI use or permitting unrestricted automation, the protocol positioned AI systems as collaborative tools subject to critique and revision. This approach shifted emphasis away from whether AI was used toward how students interpreted, refined, and contextualized generated material within disciplinary frameworks.

Prompt documentation became a particularly important pedagogical practice. Students maintained process logs containing prompts, screenshots, revision notes, and short reflections explaining why certain outputs were selected, revised, or rejected. These process records functioned similarly to sketchbooks or design journals traditionally used within studio education. By making AI interaction visible, students were encouraged to recognize how prompt specificity, typographic direction, audience framing, and iterative refinement shaped generated results. Documentation also exposed recurring limitations within generative systems, including repetitive visual conventions, inaccuracies, and formulaic stylistic tendencies. This emphasis on process transparency reflects broader calls for human-centered AI engagement and accountability within creative workflows (Shneiderman; [9]).

Critique sessions were also restructured to accommodate AI-supported workflows. Traditional studio critiques often prioritize final visual outcomes; however, projects involving generative systems required greater attention to process transparency and evaluative reasoning. During critiques, students presented not only finished work but also process documentation, prompt iterations, failed outputs, and



revision strategies. Peer discussion focused on how AI-generated material was interpreted, modified, and integrated into broader design objectives rather than simply evaluating technical polish. In this sense, critique functioned as a form of reflective inquiry consistent with Dewey's experiential learning framework and Freire's dialogic model of education [7]; [8].

4.2 Evaluating AI in Assessment Rubrics

Assessment criteria similarly prioritized transparency, revision, and critical reflection alongside final project quality. Course rubrics evaluated research focus, argument development, revision practices, citation ethics, peer critique participation, and visual integration rather than polished production alone [4]. Students were assessed on their ability to identify limitations within generated outputs, revise material through disciplinary principles, and articulate the reasoning behind design decisions. This process-oriented structure responded directly to broader concerns surrounding automation and the changing role of creative labor within AI-supported industries [1].

One assignment required students to develop a design research proposal connected to a final monograph project [3]. A student initially used a broad AI prompt requesting "a modern sustainability poster for college students," which produced visually polished but generic imagery reliant upon predictable environmental symbolism. Through critique, research integration, and revision, the student refined the prompt to specify audience, rhetorical goals, typographic hierarchy, and accessibility considerations while incorporating scholarly sources on sustainable communication design. In a reflective process statement, the student observed that the revision process revealed how strongly generative systems defaulted toward familiar visual clichés unless directed through more intentional design reasoning. The assignment therefore shifted attention away from rapid image production toward evaluative and conceptual development rather than technical novelty alone [12].

Viewed collectively, these pedagogical strategies positioned AI literacy as a reflective studio practice rather than a purely technical competency. The course framework did not treat AI as either a replacement for design education or a tool to be excluded from the classroom. Instead, the studio functioned as a mediating environment where students learned to critically navigate AI-supported creative systems through documentation, critique, revision, and disciplinary inquiry.

5. Discussion: Conserving What Works

The rapid integration of generative AI into higher education has often been framed through narratives of disruption, acceleration, and institutional transformation. Within these discussions, design education is frequently positioned as either resistant to technological change or obligated to rapidly adapt to emerging industry standards. However, the case study presented here suggests that meaningful innovation does not require abandoning longstanding pedagogical structures within studio education. Instead, many of the practices historically associated with studio learning—including critique, iterative development, reflection, research documentation, and collaborative inquiry—remain essential for navigating AI-supported creative environments.

5.1 AI Integration into Studio Pedagogy

Studio pedagogy has historically emphasized dialogue, process, and evaluative judgment rather than purely technical production [13]; [6]. These characteristics become increasingly important within AI-supported workflows where systems can rapidly generate polished visual outputs, written summaries, and compositional variations with minimal effort. Without reflective structures, students may begin to equate speed with quality or automation with expertise. The Writing in the Disciplines course discussed in this paper intentionally resisted this tendency by embedding AI interaction within slower cycles of drafting, peer critique, process documentation, revision, and research-supported argumentation [3]. Students were required not simply to generate outputs, but to explain how and why particular decisions were made, what revisions occurred, and how disciplinary principles informed the final work.

Within this framework, critique culture functioned as a stabilizing pedagogical force rather than an outdated educational tradition. In the AI-supported studio, critique became a mechanism for slowing technological acceleration long enough for reflection and interpretation to occur. Peer review sessions, prompt analysis, process journals, and revision workshops interrupted the immediacy often encouraged by generative systems. Rather than treating AI outputs as inherently innovative or inherently invalid, students examined how generated material related to audience, accessibility, rhetorical intent, visual hierarchy, and ethical communication practices. This reflects Dewey's understanding of education as



reflective inquiry grounded in experience and Freire's emphasis on dialogue as a critical educational process [7]; [8].

The case study also demonstrates that the spatial and social dynamics of studio education remain highly significant within AI-era learning environments. While post-pandemic educational discourse often emphasizes flexibility, remote access, and digital integration, the collaborative structure of the studio continues to shape how students learn from one another through observation, discussion, and shared experimentation. The WID course integrated librarian collaboration, peer workshops, and collective critique sessions not simply as supplementary activities, but as central components of the pedagogical model [3]. Students learned to negotiate AI-supported creative processes collectively, comparing outputs, discussing failures, and evaluating how technological systems shaped research and design decisions.

This emphasis on mediation also reframes boundary-setting as a form of institutional and pedagogical design. AI integration within higher education is frequently discussed in terms of permissibility or prohibition; however, the course model presented here suggests that the more productive question concerns how institutions structure technological engagement. Documentation requirements, transparency protocols, rubric-based assessment criteria, and process-oriented evaluation frameworks created conditions in which experimentation remained accountable to disciplinary learning outcomes [4]. These boundaries did not restrict creativity. Instead, they preserved spaces for reflection, revision, and critical inquiry within increasingly automated workflows.

5.2 The Importance of Technology, Space, and Social Interaction

Viewed more broadly, the studio operates not only as a pedagogical model but also as an architectural and institutional form that organizes relationships between technology, space, and social interaction. The design studio structures attention, collaboration, critique, and iterative development through both physical and institutional arrangements. In the context of generative AI, these structures become increasingly valuable because they maintain conditions in which human judgment remains central to creative practice. Conserving critique, reflective inquiry, and collaborative learning is therefore not a rejection of technological innovation, but a necessary strategy for ensuring that AI integration remains aligned with ethical, human-centered, and disciplinary forms of education [14]; [12].

6. Transferability Across Disciplines

Although this paper focuses on Media and Design education, the proposed framework is adaptable across a range of disciplines currently negotiating the rapid integration of generative AI into teaching and professional practice. The concept of the studio or classroom as a mediating system boundary is particularly relevant in fields where technological acceleration intersects with reflective, collaborative, and disciplinary forms of learning. Across these contexts, the framework emphasizes that AI literacy should not be reduced to technical proficiency alone, but integrated into pedagogical structures that support critique, interpretation, revision, and ethical inquiry [14]; [12].

In architecture education, studio culture has long emphasized critique, iterative development, and collaborative problem-solving. As AI-assisted visualization, modeling, and drafting tools become increasingly common, architectural studios face challenges similar to those emerging within design education. Maintaining critique-based inquiry and process transparency can help ensure that technological efficiency does not replace contextual reasoning, spatial analysis, or ethical decision-making. Architectural education has historically relied upon studio environments that combine technical experimentation with reflective discussion, making the field especially well positioned to adapt AI within existing pedagogical traditions rather than through purely technological acceleration.

Engineering education similarly benefits from approaches that balance technical fluency with reflective practice. While AI systems may support simulation, coding, optimization, and data analysis, engineering pedagogy continues to require forms of collaborative evaluation and human oversight that cannot be fully automated. Structured reflection and process documentation help students critically assess both the capabilities and limitations of AI-supported systems. In these contexts, reflective inquiry reinforces professional responsibility by encouraging students to consider not only whether systems function efficiently, but also how automated systems shape decision-making, public safety, and institutional accountability.

6.1 Including AI Workflows and Transparency into Documentation, Revisions, and Critiques



The framework also has implications for humanities education, particularly within seminar-based courses increasingly affected by large language models and AI writing tools. Rather than centering instruction solely around detection or prohibition, humanities classrooms can incorporate reflective documentation, revision analysis, and dialogic critique to help students examine authorship, interpretation, and the social implications of automated language production [7]; [8]. AI-supported writing environments raise important questions concerning originality, voice, and interpretation that align closely with longstanding humanities traditions centered on critical reading and reflective analysis.

6.2 Recognizing Ethical and Social Consequences of AI

In health, communication, and data-centered disciplines, AI literacy likewise requires more than technical competency alone. Students must learn to evaluate bias, interpret outputs critically, and understand how algorithmic systems shape professional decision-making and public outcomes [5]; [2]. This is particularly significant in fields where AI increasingly influences diagnosis, communication systems, predictive analytics, and institutional decision-making. Educational models that emphasize transparency, documentation, and collaborative evaluation can help students recognize the ethical and social implications embedded within technological systems rather than treating AI outputs as neutral forms of authority.

Across these disciplines, the proposed framework offers a transferable pedagogical model that positions reflective inquiry, transparency, collaborative critique, and process-oriented learning as essential components of ethical AI integration. Rather than advocating a universal technical solution, the framework encourages institutions to adapt existing disciplinary practices in ways that preserve human judgment, contextual interpretation, and collaborative learning within increasingly automated educational environments.

7. Conclusion: Ethical Augmentation as Educational Design

The rapid emergence of generative AI has intensified ongoing questions surrounding technology, labor, creativity, and educational practice across higher education. Within Media and Design disciplines, these transformations are particularly visible because AI systems now operate directly within the processes of ideation, visual production, communication, and critique. Yet the challenge facing educators is not simply whether AI should be adopted or resisted. Rather, the larger question concerns how educational structures can shape meaningful relationships between technological systems and human learning.

7.1 The Studio as a Technological Mediator

This paper has argued that studio pedagogy offers an important framework for addressing this challenge because it already contains practices capable of mediating technological acceleration through reflection, critique, and iterative inquiry. The studio functions not as a nostalgic holdover from pre-digital creative culture, but as an adaptive pedagogical environment in which emerging technologies can be critically integrated without abandoning disciplinary knowledge or human-centered approaches to learning. Longstanding studio practices—including process documentation, collaborative critique, revision cycles, and reflective discussion—remain essential precisely because generative AI systems increasingly privilege speed, automation, and frictionless production.

The proposed framework also suggests that teaching, theory, and technology evolve together rather than separately. AI literacy cannot be reduced to software proficiency alone because technological systems inevitably reshape how students understand authorship, expertise, labor, and creative judgment. As scholars of reflective and critical pedagogy have long argued, education is not simply the transfer of technical information but the cultivation of inquiry, interpretation, and ethical agency [7]; [8]. Within AI-supported creative environments, these capacities become even more important. Students must learn not only how to generate outputs, but how to question systems, evaluate assumptions, identify biases, and situate technological production within broader social and disciplinary contexts. Within this framework, interruption emerges as a future-facing educational practice rather than an obstacle to innovation. Slowing workflows through critique, documentation, revision, and discussion creates opportunities for reflective engagement that highly automated systems often discourage. Interruption allows students to examine how AI systems structure decisions, reproduce conventions, and shape creative possibilities. In this sense, reflective pause becomes a necessary condition for ethical technological engagement rather than a rejection of technological progress itself.



7.2 The Role of Educators and AI Practice

This perspective also reframes the role of educators within AI-era institutions. Educators increasingly function as boundary designers responsible for shaping the conditions under which technological systems enter learning environments. Decisions surrounding transparency, critique structures, documentation requirements, collaboration, and assessment are not secondary administrative concerns; they are forms of institutional and pedagogical design that determine how students engage emerging technologies. Establishing boundaries does not restrict innovation. Instead, boundaries create the reflective conditions necessary for experimentation, accountability, and meaningful disciplinary learning.

As generative AI continues to transform creative and educational environments, Media and Design programs are uniquely positioned to model forms of ethical augmentation that preserve human judgment while engaging technological change critically and constructively. The future of AI in education will not be determined solely by the capabilities of intelligent systems, but by the pedagogical structures through which those systems are interpreted, challenged, and made accountable within shared learning environments [14]; [12].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The development of the Writing in the Discipline course discussed in this paper was supported in part by a curriculum development grant from Central Connecticut State University.

REFERENCES.

- [1] Autor D. H. and Reynolds E., "The Nature of Work After Generative AI", *MIT Work of the Future Brief*, Cambridge, MIT, 2024.
- [2] Benjamin R., *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2019.
- [3] Bloomer P. A., *WID Rubrics and Assessment Materials*, unpublished instructional materials, Central Connecticut State University, 2026.
- [4] Bloomer P. A., *Writing in the Disciplines: Design (Graphic/Information) Syllabus*, unpublished course document, Central Connecticut State University, 2026.
- [5] Crawford K., *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2021.
- [6] Cross N., *Designerly Ways of Knowing*, London, Springer, 2006.
- [7] Dewey J., *Experience and Education*, New York, Macmillan, 1938.
- [8] Freire P., *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York, Continuum, 1970.
- [9] Gray C. M., Toombs A. L., and Thomas J. W., "Designerly Ways of Working with AI", *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, New York, ACM Press, 2024.
- [10] Holmes W. and Luckin R., "Generative AI and Education: Emerging Questions", *British Journal of Educational Technology*, vol. 55, no. 1, 2024, pp. 1–8.
- [11] Kasneci E. et al., "ChatGPT for Good? On Opportunities and Challenges of Large Language Models for Education", *Learning and Individual Differences*, vol. 103, 2023.
- [12] Mollick E., *Co-Intelligence: Living and Working with AI*, New York, Portfolio, 2024.
- [13] Schön D. A., *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*, New York, Basic Books, 1983.
- [14] Shneiderman B., *Human-Centered AI*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2022.