Reimagining Educator Roles in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Engagement, Workforce Learning, and the Future of Digital Pedagogy

William J. Rothwell, The Pennsylvania State University, USA; Farhan Sadique, Kansas State University, USA (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4355-1297)

Abstract

This conceptual article examines the transformation of educator roles in the age of artificial intelligence (AI) and its implications for digital pedagogy and workforce learning. As AI, adaptive systems, and hybrid learning environments become increasingly embedded in education, traditional instructor-centered models are less aligned with learner expectations, engagement needs, and labor market demands. Drawing on engagement theory, digital learning research, and workforce education literature, the article argues that educators must move beyond content delivery toward the design of interactive, personalized, collaborative, and application-centered learning experiences. It proposes an AI-driven digital pedagogy framework organized around three commitments: engagement-centered design, AI-supported but human-led learning, and workforce alignment. The article further identifies four evolving educator roles — designer, facilitator, navigator, and coach; that reflect the pedagogical, ethical, and developmental responsibilities of teaching in AI-mediated environments. It concludes that AI should be understood as a catalyst rather than a solution, and that the future of education depends on educators' ability to integrate technology with human-centered, ethically grounded, and workforce-relevant learning practices.

keywords: artificial intelligence; digital pedagogy; educator role transformation; workforce learning

Introduction

The rapid rise of artificial intelligence (AI) and adaptive learning systems is transforming education at an unprecedented pace. Technologies once considered instructional supports are now core learning infrastructures shaping how knowledge is delivered, accessed, and applied across educational and workforce contexts (Holmes et al., 2019; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Generative AI, learning analytics, and immersive environments not only enhance instructional delivery but also redefine teaching and learning. These developments align with broader shifts associated with the Fourth Industrial Revolution, where digital technologies are reshaping labor markets and increasing demands for continuous learning, reskilling, and adaptability (World Economic Forum, 2023). Consequently, education systems face growing pressure to align learning with workforce needs while preserving human, relational, and engagement-centered dimensions of education.

Despite these advances, learner disengagement remains a persistent challenge in digital environments. Research consistently shows that online and hybrid learning contexts often experience lower engagement, higher dropout rates, and reduced motivation compared to face-to-face settings (Xu & Jaggars, 2014; Jordan, 2015; Saha et al., 2025). While digital tools offer flexibility and access, they can also contribute to distraction, fatigue, and learner isolation (Bailenson, 2021). This challenge is further intensified by a misalignment between traditional teaching models and contemporary learner expectations. Many approaches continue to rely on lecture-based, instructor-centered paradigms, despite evidence that effective digitally mediated learning requires interaction, learner presence, personalization, and timely feedback (Garrison et al., 2000; Hodges et al., 2020; Maier & Klotz, 2022; Saha et al., 2025; Selwyn, 2016). The result is a widening gap between how teaching is delivered and how learning is experienced.

The rapid integration of AI into education exposes a critical gap in the literature: the educator's role remains under-theorized in AI-mediated and workforce-oriented contexts. Although AI research has expanded across adaptive learning, intelligent tutoring, automated assessment, and analytics, significant gaps persist in guiding theories, pedagogical enactment, teacher development, and learner–instructor relationships (Chen et al., 2020; Crompton & Burke, 2023; Wang et al., 2024; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). For instance, Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) highlighted the lack of clarity regarding how educators can meaningfully integrate AI into pedagogy, a concern that remains evident in more recent work emphasizing systems and applications over educator role transformation.

Recent scholarship on generative AI further reinforces this gap. Qian's (2025) review highlights increasing attention to pedagogical integration, learner autonomy, and AI-supported collaboration, while cautioning against overreliance and the outsourcing of cognitive and metacognitive processes. Similarly, Seo et al. (2021) note that while AI enables personalized, real-time interaction, effective learning still depends on human-in-the-loop design, instructor presence, learner agency, and ethical boundaries.

In response, this conceptual article reframes educator roles in AI-mediated, workforce-aligned learning environments. Rather than positioning educators as knowledge transmitters, it conceptualizes them as designers of learning experiences, facilitators of collaboration, navigators of ethical and cultural complexity, and coaches for lifelong learning. The article makes three contributions. First, it integrates engagement theory—encompassing motivation, interaction, and active learning—to address disengagement in digital contexts. Second, it advances digital pedagogy by examining how AI reshapes instructional design and educator practice. Third, it connects these insights to workforce education, emphasizing preparation for continuous adaptation in dynamic professional environments.

Despite the rapid expansion of AI in education, a critical gap remains in understanding how educator roles should be reconceptualized to address learner engagement and workforce alignment. Existing research has largely focused on technological capabilities and system-level outcomes, with limited attention to how educators design learning experiences that balance AI efficiency with human-centered pedagogy. As a result, there is insufficient theoretical clarity on how engagement, pedagogy, and workforce preparation intersect in AI-driven learning contexts. This study adopts a conceptual and theory-building approach, synthesizing literature from digital pedagogy, engagement theory, and workforce education to develop a framework for understanding educator role transformation in AI-mediated learning environments.

AI and the Transformation of Learning Environments

Artificial intelligence (AI) is fundamentally reshaping learning environments across education and workforce development. Advances in generative AI, adaptive learning platforms, and learning analytics have expanded the capacity of educational systems to deliver personalized, scalable, and data-informed instruction. Generative AI tools now produce explanations, simulations, and feedback in real time, offering immediate support and enabling flexible learning pathways (Kasneci et al., 2023). Adaptive systems adjust instruction based on performance, while learning analytics provide insights into engagement and behavior, supporting more informed instructional decisions (Baker & Siemens, 2014). Together, these technologies are transforming not only how learning is delivered but also how it is conceptualized.

The acceleration of these changes was amplified by the global pandemic, which normalized hybrid and online learning across educational sectors. Institutions that once treated digital learning as supplementary were forced to adopt it as a primary mode of delivery almost overnight (Hodges et al., 2020). This rapid shift revealed both the potential and limitations of digital education: while access expanded, disparities in infrastructure, digital readiness, and learner support became more visible. In the post-pandemic landscape, hybrid models have become a lasting feature, blending in-person and digital experiences into more flexible learning ecosystems (OECD, 2023). This transition underscores the need to rethink the design and purpose of learning in digitally mediated environments.

A key transformation within this context is the shift from content delivery to learning ecosystem design. Traditional models emphasized knowledge transmission through lecture-based instruction, whereas AI-enabled environments prioritize interaction, personalization, and continuous feedback. Learning is increasingly conceptualized as a dynamic, ongoing process rather than a discrete event. Contemporary learning ecosystems integrate digital platforms, collaborative tools, workplace experiences, and informal networks (Luckin et al., 2016). As a result, educators are investing more effort in designing these environments, orchestrating resources and interactions to support meaningful engagement. This shift reflects a broader reconceptualization of teaching as the facilitation of learning rather than the delivery of content.

At the same time, the expansion of AI introduces a critical tension between personalization and disengagement (Saha et al., 2025). On one hand, AI systems can tailor learning experiences to individual needs, increasing relevance and motivation (Holmes et al., 2019). Personalized feedback and adaptive pathways support diverse learning styles and self-paced progress. On the other hand, excessive reliance on AI-driven personalization may reduce opportunities for social interaction, collaboration, and shared meaning-making. Learners risk becoming passive recipients of algorithmically curated content rather than active participants in the learning process (Selwyn, 2019). This paradox highlights the complexity of designing environments that balance efficiency with engagement.

The central implication is that technology alone does not resolve the problem of engagement. While AI enhances instructional capability, it cannot replace the pedagogical principles underlying meaningful learning. Engagement depends on interaction, relevance, challenge, and social connection—factors that require intentional design and facilitation (Kahu & Nelson, 2018). Without such design, AI may reinforce passivity and isolation; when thoughtfully integrated, however, it can support more interactive, responsive, and inclusive learning environments.

Ultimately, the transformation of learning in the age of AI reflects a deeper design tension at the intersection of technology, pedagogy, and adult learning. This shift can be understood as a *TechnoGogical Orientation*: the intentional design of learning environments in which technology actively shapes how learners access knowledge, interact, exercise judgment, and apply learning in authentic contexts (Rothwell et al., 2024). This orientation extends beyond traditional pedagogy and andragogy by emphasizing the co-design of human, technological, and contextual elements of learning. Educators must therefore move beyond viewing AI as a tool for efficiency and instead leverage it to support deeper engagement, critical thinking, collaboration, and workforce-relevant application. Technology should enhance—not replace—the human dimensions of education.

The Engagement Crisis in Digital and Workforce Learning

The expansion of digital and AI-mediated learning environments has renewed attention to a persistent and troubling issue: learner disengagement. Despite increased access to online education and workforce training, evidence continues to show low completion rates and high attrition across digital platforms. Massive open online courses (MOOCs), for example, often report completion rates below 15%, revealing a substantial gap between enrollment and meaningful participation (Reich & Ruipérez-Valiente, 2019). Similarly, students in online higher education courses are more likely to withdraw or fail compared to those in face-to-face settings (Xu & Jaggars, 2014). These patterns suggest that access alone does not ensure engagement or successful learning outcomes.

Several interrelated factors contribute to this engagement crisis. A primary issue is the persistence of passive instructional models in digital formats. Many online courses replicate lecture-based approaches through recorded videos, slides, and one-way communication, offering limited opportunities for interaction or active participation (Martin et al., 2020). This design fails to leverage the interactive potential of digital technologies and often results in superficial learning experiences. Moreover, course design frequently misaligns with contemporary learner expectations, where interactivity, immediacy, and personalization are essential.

Another contributing factor is the rise of digital fatigue, distraction, and isolation. Continuous screen exposure and the cognitive demands of navigating multiple platforms are associated with decreased attention, increased exhaustion, and reduced motivation (Bailenson, 2021). Learners also face competing stimuli, such as notifications and multitasking demands, which fragment attention and disrupt sustained engagement (Rosen et al., 2011). The absence of physical co-presence further contributes to feelings of isolation, weakening the sense of community that supports persistence (Borup et al., 2020). These challenges are particularly pronounced in workforce learning contexts, where individuals must balance training with professional and personal responsibilities.

The consequences of disengagement extend beyond education to workforce readiness and employability. Effective workforce education depends on the transfer of knowledge and skills to real-world contexts. When learners are disengaged, they are less likely to develop deep understanding, critical thinking, and the ability to apply knowledge in practice (Noe et al., 2014). This disconnect creates gaps between training and performance, undermining reskilling and upskilling efforts in rapidly evolving labor markets.

At its core, the engagement crisis reflects a misalignment between learning design and learner needs. Engagement is not merely desirable; it is essential for meaningful learning and skill development. Research positions engagement as a key mediator between instructional design and learning outcomes, influencing motivation, persistence, and achievement (Kahu & Nelson, 2018). In digital and workforce contexts, engagement must be intentionally designed through interactive activities, collaboration, and opportunities for reflection and application.

The central claim is that engagement is not optional—it is the primary design challenge of modern learning. Addressing this challenge requires a shift from content-centered instruction to learner-centered design, where engagement is embedded throughout the learning experience. This includes leveraging AI and digital tools not only for efficiency but to foster interaction, personalization, and meaningful participation. Ultimately, the effectiveness of digital and workforce learning depends on educators' and institutions' ability to design environments that actively engage learners and support the development of transferable skills in an increasingly complex world.

Theoretical Foundations of Engagement

Understanding engagement in digital and AI-mediated learning environments requires grounding in established motivational and psychological theories that explain how individuals interact with learning tasks. Among the most influential are Flow Theory, Self-Determination Theory, and Expectancy Theory. Together, these frameworks provide a coherent foundation for examining how engagement emerges and how it can be intentionally designed in educational and workforce contexts. Table 1 summarizes how these theories inform engagement-centered design and align with the evolving roles of educators in AI-mediated learning environments.

Table 1. Theoretical Foundations for Engagement-Centered AI Pedagogy

Theory	Core Engagement Principle	Relevance to AI-Mediated Learning	Connection to Educator Role
Flow Theory	Engagement occurs when challenge and skill are balanced.	AI can adjust task difficulty, pacing, and feedback to sustain optimal challenge.	Educator as designer of adaptive and meaningful learning experiences.
Self-Determination Theory	Engagement increases when autonomy, competence, and	AI can support autonomy and competence through personalized pathways and feedback, but human design	Educator as facilitator of interaction, social presence, and learner agency.

	relatedness are supported.	is needed to sustain relatedness and belonging.	
Expectancy Theory	Engagement depends on the perceived connection between effort, performance, and valued outcomes.	AI can provide progress tracking, personalized recommendations, and feedback linked to learner goals.	Educator as coach who helps learners connect learning activities to workforce outcomes and career development.

Flow Theory, originally developed by Csikszentmihalyi (1990), conceptualizes engagement as a state of deep immersion characterized by focused attention, intrinsic enjoyment, and a sense of control. Central to this state is the balance between challenge and skill: tasks that are too easy lead to boredom, while overly difficult tasks produce anxiety. In AI-mediated learning environments, adaptive technologies offer new possibilities for maintaining this balance. AI systems can dynamically adjust content difficulty, pacing, and feedback based on learner performance, helping sustain optimal engagement (Holmes et al., 2019; Saha et al., 2025). For example, AI-driven platforms can introduce increasingly complex tasks as learners demonstrate mastery, supporting the challenge–skill equilibrium necessary for flow. However, achieving flow remains contingent on thoughtful instructional design, as poorly implemented AI may disrupt rather than enhance engagement.

Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) complements this perspective by emphasizing the role of intrinsic motivation. Engagement is strengthened when three psychological needs are met: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. AI-mediated environments can support autonomy and competence through personalized pathways and immediate feedback, enabling learners to progress at their own pace. However, they often fall short in supporting relatedness, as digital interactions may lack the depth of human connection found in face-to-face settings. This limitation can contribute to isolation and reduced persistence. Consequently, effective AI integration requires intentional design that sustains social presence, meaningful interaction, and human facilitation alongside technological efficiency (Borup et al., 2020).

Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964) further extends the analysis by focusing on the cognitive mechanisms underlying motivation. Engagement depends on learners' perceptions that effort will lead to performance and that performance will result in valued outcomes. This alignment is especially critical in workforce learning contexts, where motivation is closely tied to career advancement, skill development, and employability (Noe et al., 2014). AI systems can strengthen this alignment by providing progress tracking, targeted feedback, and personalized recommendations linked to learner goals. However, if learners do not perceive the relevance or value of tasks, engagement may decline regardless of technological support.

Taken together, these theories suggest that engagement is not a singular construct but a dynamic interplay of cognitive, emotional, and social processes. Flow Theory emphasizes optimal challenge, Self-Determination Theory highlights motivational needs, and Expectancy Theory underscores goal alignment. In AI-mediated and workforce learning environments, these dimensions must be intentionally integrated rather than treated in isolation to sustain meaningful engagement.

Ultimately, these theoretical foundations reinforce that technology alone cannot guarantee engagement. AI must be embedded within pedagogical designs that address motivation, interaction, relevance, and purpose. By aligning challenge with skill, supporting autonomy and social connection, and linking effort to meaningful outcomes, educators can create learning environments that are both engaging and effective. This integrated perspective also supports the broader framework of the study, in which educators are reconceptualized as designers, facilitators, navigators, and coaches in AI-mediated learning environments.

From Teaching to Learning Design: Closing the Gap

For much of modern education, the dominant paradigm has been instructor-centered and lecture-based, grounded in the assumption that knowledge is scarce and must be transmitted from expert to novice. This model emphasizes content coverage, standardized pacing, and recall-based assessment. While efficient for delivering information at scale, it has shown persistent limitations in fostering deep learning, critical thinking, and long-term retention (Freeman et al., 2014). In digital environments, this paradigm has often been replicated through recorded lectures and slide-based instruction, resulting in passive learning experiences that do little to address engagement challenges (Martin et al., 2020).

An emerging model shifts the focus toward active, personalized, and collaborative learning. Strategies such as problem-based learning, simulations, peer instruction, and project work consistently produce stronger outcomes in comprehension and transfer (Prince, 2013; Rothwell et al., 2025). Personalization tailors pathways, pacing, and support to individual learners, while collaboration emphasizes the co-construction of knowledge through dialogue and teamwork. These approaches align more closely with contemporary learner expectations and workforce demands, where adaptability, communication, and problem-solving are essential (Noe et al., 2014). Importantly, this model reframes learning as a participatory process rather than a unidirectional transmission of information.

AI plays a complex role in this transition. On one hand, it enables personalization by analyzing learner data and adapting content in real time, offering targeted feedback and differentiated pathways (Holmes et al., 2019). Learning analytics can identify misconceptions, recommend resources, and support timely interventions. On the other hand, AI risks reinforcing passivity if used primarily to automate content delivery or provide ready-made answers. Overreliance on AI-generated explanations may reduce learners' engagement in inquiry, reflection, and collaborative problem-solving (Selwyn, 2019). Thus, the impact of AI depends less on the technology itself and more on how it is integrated into pedagogical design.

The critical shift, therefore, is from teaching as content delivery to teaching as the design of learning experiences. In this model, educators function as architects of environments that structure interaction, challenge, feedback, and reflection. Learning design involves orchestrating tasks, tools, social interaction, and assessment into coherent experiences that promote engagement and meaning-making (Goodyear, 2015). Rather than asking "What content should be covered?", the guiding question becomes "What experiences will enable learners to achieve desired outcomes?" This perspective aligns with design-based approaches that emphasize alignment among objectives, activities, and assessment (Laurillard, 2012).

Designing for learning also requires attention to temporal structure—what occurs before, during, and after learning activities. Pre-learning tasks activate prior knowledge and set expectations; in-session activities emphasize interaction and application; post-learning reflection consolidates understanding and supports transfer. Digital tools, including AI, can support each phase through scaffolding, feedback, and collaboration, but only when embedded within intentional designs that prioritize engagement and coherence.

Ultimately, closing the gap between teaching and learning requires rethinking the educator's role. Educational effectiveness depends not on the volume of content delivered but on the quality of learning experiences designed. By embracing learning design, educators can leverage AI and digital tools to support active participation, personalization, and collaboration while avoiding passive consumption. This shift is essential for preparing learners to navigate complex, evolving environments and to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

The Four Dimensions of Educator Role Transformation (Reframed for AI & Workforce)

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into education and workforce systems is redefining what it means to teach. Educator roles are shifting from content delivery toward facilitating complex, technology-mediated learning experiences that prepare learners for dynamic labor markets. This transformation can be understood across four interrelated dimensions reflecting both pedagogical change and workforce alignment.

The first shift is from lecturer to designer of AI-enhanced learning experiences. Traditional instruction emphasized knowledge transmission, whereas contemporary environments require interactive, applied learning. Approaches such as experiential learning, simulations, and case-based instruction enable learners to engage with real-world problems and develop transferable skills (Kolb, 1984). AI supports this shift by enabling personalized learning pathways and adaptive feedback, allowing learners to progress based on performance and need (Holmes et al., 2019). In workforce contexts, this translates into scenario-based learning where learners practice decision-making in environments that mirror professional settings, strengthening the connection between education and employment.

The second dimension involves a shift from authority to facilitator of collaborative intelligence. In an era of information abundance, educators are no longer the sole source of knowledge but instead guide interactions among learners, peers, and AI systems. Learning increasingly occurs through human–AI–peer collaboration, where knowledge is co-constructed through dialogue and problem-solving. AI can support this process by generating insights, suggesting alternatives, and augmenting discussion, but meaningful learning remains grounded in human interaction (Luckin et al., 2016). This collaborative model reflects contemporary workplace demands for teamwork, communication, and innovation.

The third transformation is the move from knowledge provider to navigator of AI, ethics, and culture. The proliferation of algorithmic systems introduces challenges related to misinformation, bias, and ethical decision-making. Educators must help learners critically evaluate sources, understand how AI systems function, and recognize their broader implications (Williamson, 2023). This includes addressing issues such as algorithmic bias, data privacy, and responsible AI use. Developing AI literacy alongside critical thinking is essential for preparing learners to navigate complex digital environments and make informed decisions in professional contexts.

The fourth dimension reflects a shift from instructor to coach and mentor for lifelong workforce learning. As careers become more fluid and require continuous adaptation, educators play a key role in supporting long-term development. Coaching emphasizes performance improvement through feedback, goal setting, and reflection (Grant, 2014), while mentoring supports broader personal and professional growth, including resilience and career planning (Eby et al., 2013). Although AI can provide data-driven insights and automated feedback, it cannot replace the relational and emotional dimensions of human guidance. Effective coaching and mentoring rely on trust, empathy, and contextual understanding.

Together, these four dimensions illustrate a comprehensive transformation of educator roles in AI-mediated, workforce-oriented environments. Educators are no longer defined by what they know, but by how they design learning experiences, facilitate collaboration, guide ethical inquiry, and support continuous development. This evolution reflects a broader shift toward learning systems that are adaptive, interactive, and aligned with the demands of the modern workforce.

AI and Workforce Education: Bridging Learning and Work

Artificial intelligence (AI) is accelerating a profound transformation of the global workforce, reshaping job roles, required competencies, and career pathways. Automation, machine learning, and data-driven systems are not only replacing routine tasks but also augmenting human capabilities, creating demand for new forms of expertise. As a result, workers must engage in continuous reskilling and upskilling to remain relevant in rapidly evolving labor markets (World Economic Forum, 2023). This shift challenges traditional educational models that prepare individuals for static careers and instead calls for systems that support lifelong learning and adaptability.

Within this context, career and technical education (CTE) and higher education institutions play a critical role in preparing learners for uncertain and dynamic futures. These institutions must move beyond delivering disciplinary knowledge to cultivating transferable skills such as problem-solving, collaboration, digital literacy, and adaptability (Carnevale et al., 2013). AI technologies offer significant opportunities to support this shift through personalized learning pathways, real-time feedback, and data-informed instruction. However, their effectiveness depends on pedagogical integration. Simply embedding AI into existing curricula is insufficient; institutions must redesign programs to align learning outcomes with evolving workforce demands.

A key development in this transformation is the emergence of learning ecosystems that integrate academic, workplace, and digital experiences. These ecosystems extend beyond traditional classrooms to include online platforms, professional networks, industry partnerships, and informal learning environments (Siemens, 2005). Learning is thus distributed across contexts, enabling individuals to acquire and apply knowledge in real-world settings. AI facilitates this integration by connecting system components, tracking learner progress, and supporting adaptive learning. For example, workplace simulations and AI-driven training platforms can replicate complex professional scenarios, allowing learners to practice skills in safe, controlled environments (Holmes et al., 2019; Rothwell et al., 2025).

The integration of learning and work further underscores the importance of authentic, experience-based learning. Employers increasingly value competencies that can be applied in practice, including critical thinking, communication, and the ability to work with emerging technologies. Programs incorporating project-based learning, internships, and industry collaboration are better positioned to bridge the gap between theory and practice (Billett, 2011). While AI enhances these approaches through data-driven insights and personalized guidance, it cannot replace the need for human interaction and contextual understanding.

The central implication is that educator roles must align with continuous workforce development. In AI-driven environments, educators function not merely as instructors but as facilitators of learning pathways that extend across time and context. They must design experiences that integrate academic knowledge with practical application, support learners in navigating complex career trajectories, and foster the skills required for lifelong learning.

This shift also requires reconsidering how learning outcomes are structured. Bloom's Taxonomy has long provided a framework for cognitive development, progressing from remembering and understanding to application, analysis, evaluation, and creation (Bloom et al., 1956). However, in adult and workforce learning, application is not simply one level among others; it is the central mechanism through which knowledge becomes meaningful and transferable. Accordingly, Bloom's Taxonomy can be reoriented through an application-centered lens for AI-mediated adult and workforce learning.

Table 2. Application-Centered Adaptation of Bloom's Taxonomy for Adult and Workforce Learning

Traditional Bloom's Emphasis	Application-Centered Adult Learning Emphasis	AI-Mediated Pedagogical Implication	Educator Role
Remember	Retrieve essential knowledge needed for action	AI can provide just-in-time explanations, summaries, and reminders.	Curator of essential knowledge
Understand	Interpret concepts in relation to real problems	AI can generate examples, analogies, and scenario explanations.	Sensemaker

Apply	Use knowledge in authentic tasks and workplace-like situations	AI can support simulations, role plays, practice tasks, and immediate feedback.	Designer of applied learning experiences
Analyze	Diagnose situations, compare options, and identify patterns	AI can support case analysis, decision trees, and data-informed reflection.	Facilitator of inquiry
Evaluate	Judge quality, ethics, feasibility, and consequences	AI can support multiple perspectives, but educators guide ethical reasoning and contextual judgment.	Navigator of ethics and context
Create	Produce solutions, plans, tools, or innovations for real use	AI can assist with prototyping, drafting, testing, and iteration.	Coach for performance and transfer

This application-centered adaptation does not reject Bloom's Taxonomy; rather, it reorients it for adult and workforce learning (Bloom et al., 1956; Kolb, 1984). Instead of positioning application as a midpoint between understanding and analysis, it becomes the central pathway through which remembering, understanding, analyzing, evaluating, and creating are activated. In AI-mediated environments, this shift is particularly important because learners can access information rapidly, yet still require structured opportunities to apply, test, critique, and transfer that knowledge.

Moreover, educators must support learners in adapting to continuous technological change. This includes fostering AI literacy, enabling learners to critically engage with the tools shaping their work environments (Long & Magerko, 2020; Sadique, 2026), as well as developing resilience and adaptability for navigating uncertain career trajectories. In this sense, education extends beyond preparation for employment to empowering individuals to shape their own professional futures.

Ultimately, bridging learning and work in the age of AI requires reimagining both educational structures and educator roles. By integrating academic, workplace, and digital learning into cohesive ecosystems—and aligning pedagogy with the demands of continuous workforce development—education systems can better prepare individuals for the challenges and opportunities of a rapidly evolving world.

Institutional and System-Level Implications

The transformation of educator roles in AI-mediated learning environments cannot occur at the individual level alone; it requires coordinated institutional and system-level change. As digital technologies become embedded in teaching and workforce education, faculty are expected to adopt new pedagogies, integrate AI tools, and support increasingly complex learning ecosystems. However, these expectations often exceed available support structures. Professional development must therefore extend beyond technical training. While many institutions offer workshops on learning management systems or AI tools, these efforts often focus on operational skills rather than rethinking pedagogy, assessment, and learner engagement (Trust et al., 2017). Effective development should instead address instructional design, engagement strategies, ethical AI use, and the relational dimensions of teaching.

Significant institutional barriers continue to constrain innovation. Faculty workload remains a persistent challenge, as designing interactive, AI-enhanced, learner-centered experiences requires substantial time and effort. In many cases, educators are expected to implement these changes without adjustments to teaching loads or additional resources (Kezar, 2014). Traditional incentive structures—particularly those tied to tenure and promotion—often prioritize research output over teaching innovation, creating misalignment between institutional goals and faculty motivations (Boyer, 1990). Without structural support, even highly motivated educators may struggle to sustain meaningful change.

Addressing these challenges requires systemic shifts in how institutions value and support teaching. Recognizing and rewarding instructional innovation through promotion criteria, funding, and formal recognition is essential. Institutions can encourage experimentation by incorporating evidence of teaching effectiveness, student engagement, and learning outcomes into evaluation processes. Communities of practice also play a critical role, enabling educators to collaborate, share expertise, and sustain pedagogical change (Cox, 2013). In AI-enabled environments, such networks can further support the exchange of best practices for integrating emerging technologies.

The integration of AI also raises important questions about balancing efficiency with human-centered learning. While AI can streamline administrative tasks, automate assessment, and provide real-time analytics, an overemphasis on efficiency risks reducing education to measurable outputs and neglecting its relational, ethical, and developmental dimensions (Selwyn, 2021). Institutions must therefore adopt a balanced approach that leverages AI to enhance learning while preserving opportunities for dialogue, mentorship, and collaborative inquiry, and ensuring transparency and ethical use.

Policy frameworks and leadership practices are central to achieving this balance. Institutional leaders must articulate clear visions for AI integration aligned with educational values such as equity, inclusion, and learner well-being (UNESCO, 2023). This includes establishing guidelines for responsible AI use, investing in infrastructure and support systems, and fostering cultures that encourage innovation while maintaining quality. At the system level, policymakers can further support these efforts by addressing issues such as digital inequality, funding disparities, and access to professional development.

Ultimately, transforming educator roles depends on aligning institutional structures with the demands of AI-mediated learning. By investing in meaningful professional development, addressing structural barriers, and maintaining a human-centered approach to technology integration, institutions can empower educators to design engaging, equitable, and future-oriented learning experiences.

Toward a Framework for AI-Driven Digital Pedagogy

The increasing integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into education requires a framework for digital pedagogy that moves beyond tool adoption toward intentional learning design. Discussions of AI in education often begin with the question, "What can AI do?" A more pedagogically meaningful question is, "What learning experiences should educators design, and how can AI responsibly support them?" This shift is critical because technology alone does not transform learning; transformation depends on how technologies are embedded within pedagogical strategies that prioritize engagement, human development, ethical judgment, and real-world relevance (Williamson, 2023; Saha et al., 2025).

This article proposes an AI-Driven Digital Pedagogy Framework organized around three core commitments: engagement-centered design, AI-supported but human-led learning, and workforce alignment. Together, these commitments form the conceptual foundation of the framework, clarifying both the priorities of AI-mediated pedagogy and the human-centered principles educators must sustain as learning environments become increasingly adaptive, automated, and data-informed.

Table 3. Core Commitments of the AI-Driven Digital Pedagogy Framework

Core Commitment	Guiding Question	Educator Responsibility	Role of AI
Engagement-Centered Design	How do we design learning experiences that keep learners actively involved?	Design interactive, challenging, collaborative, and meaningful learning experiences.	Supports adaptive pathways, personalization, analytics, and real-time instructional adjustments.
AI-Supported but Human-Led Learning	How do we use AI without losing the human center of education?	Preserve dialogue, trust, contextual judgment, ethical reasoning, empathy, and interpretation.	Assists with feedback, content generation, recommendations, grading support, and routine instructional tasks.
Workforce Alignment	How does learning connect to real-world performance, employability, and lifelong development?	Connect learning to authentic tasks, skill transfer, professional judgment, and career development.	Supports simulations, workplace scenarios, performance feedback, and career-aligned learning pathways.

The first commitment, engagement-centered design, positions learner engagement as the primary driver of instructional decision-making. Rather than treating engagement as a post hoc outcome, it must be intentionally designed into learning environments from the outset. This involves interactive tasks, meaningful challenges, collaborative opportunities, and activities that encourage learners to apply, question, and extend their knowledge (Kahu & Nelson, 2018). AI can support these processes through adaptive pathways, personalized content, and real-time analytics that enable timely instructional adjustments. However, these capabilities must be guided by pedagogical intent; without it, AI risks reinforcing passive consumption rather than fostering deeper engagement.

The second commitment, AI-supported but human-led learning, emphasizes that AI should augment—not replace—the educator's relational, ethical, and interpretive roles. While AI can support functions such as grading, feedback generation, content recommendation, and learning analytics, it cannot replicate core human dimensions of teaching, including building trust, facilitating dialogue, recognizing learner needs, interpreting context, and guiding ethical judgment (Holmes et al., 2019; Rothwell et al., 2024). Within this framework, educators remain central, ensuring that AI use is pedagogically meaningful, ethically responsible, and responsive to learners' lived experiences.

The third commitment, workforce alignment, reflects the need to prepare learners for rapidly evolving professional contexts. AI-driven pedagogy must support the development of competencies such as problem-solving, collaboration, digital literacy, adaptability, and ethical technology use (Sadique, 2026; World Economic Forum, 2023). Learning experiences should connect theory with practice to enable transfer across academic, professional, and community settings. AI can support this alignment through simulations, scenario-based practice, performance feedback, and personalized pathways linked to career goals. However, effective workforce alignment requires more than aligning content with labor-market trends; it demands intentional learning design that integrates knowledge, practice, and human judgment.

Building on these commitments, the framework identifies four pedagogical design principles—active learning, continuous feedback, social presence, and ethical awareness—that guide implementation. These principles translate the framework into actionable design decisions for developing effective AI-mediated learning environments.

Table 4. Pedagogical Design Principles for AI-Driven Digital Pedagogy

Design Principle	Meaning for Learning Design	AI-Mediated Example	Risk if Ignored
Active Learning	Learners construct knowledge through application, problem-solving, inquiry, and practice.	AI-supported simulations, case analysis, role plays, scenario-based tasks, and problem-based activities.	Learners become passive consumers of AI-generated content.
Continuous Feedback	Learners receive timely, meaningful information that helps them improve performance.	AI-generated formative feedback, adaptive hints, progress dashboards, and personalized recommendations.	Feedback becomes delayed, generic, automated, or disconnected from learner goals.
Social Presence	Learners experience connection, belonging, and meaningful interaction with instructors and peers.	AI-supported discussion prompts combined with instructor facilitation, peer collaboration, and reflective dialogue.	Digital learning becomes isolating, transactional, and overly individualized.

Ethical Awareness	Learners critically examine responsible AI use, data privacy, bias, transparency, and professional consequences.	AI critique assignments, bias audits, responsible-use reflections, and ethical decision-making scenarios.	Learners use AI uncritically or in ways that undermine trust, integrity, and equity.

The first design principle, active learning, emphasizes learner participation in constructing knowledge through discussion, problem-solving, experimentation, and application. Research consistently shows that active learning produces stronger engagement and outcomes than passive instruction (Freeman et al., 2014). In AI-mediated environments, this may include simulations, adaptive problem sets, scenario-based role plays, and collaborative inquiry. For example, in an AI-supported teacher education course, students might use generative AI to design lesson plans, followed by peer critique and instructor-guided reflection to evaluate assumptions, bias, and instructional effectiveness. However, AI must invite participation rather than replace it; reliance on AI-generated answers without reflection, analysis, or application risks weakening learning.

The second principle, continuous feedback, supports learning progression, motivation, and performance improvement. AI systems can provide immediate, data-informed feedback that helps learners identify gaps, adjust strategies, and monitor progress (Siemens & Baker, 2022). Yet feedback should not be reduced to automated correction. Effective feedback remains dialogic, reflective, and developmental. Educators play a critical role in helping learners interpret feedback, connect it to goals, and apply it for sustained improvement.

The third principle, social presence, addresses the relational dimension of digital learning. Learners are more likely to remain engaged when they experience connection, belonging, and meaningful interaction (Garrison et al., 2000). AI can support this by generating prompts, summarizing contributions, or personalizing communication. However, social presence ultimately depends on human facilitation. Educators must design opportunities for dialogue, peer interaction, and collaborative problem-solving to prevent AI-mediated learning from becoming isolating or transactional.

The fourth principle, ethical awareness, is foundational to AI-driven pedagogy. As AI increasingly shapes learning processes, educators and learners must critically examine issues such as data privacy, algorithmic bias, academic integrity, transparency, and the broader consequences of automation (UNESCO, 2023). Ethical awareness should be embedded throughout learning design, enabling learners to understand not only how to use AI tools, but also when, why, and with what implications.

Together, the three core commitments and four design principles form a framework for AI-driven digital pedagogy that is both technologically informed and human-centered. The effectiveness of AI integration is determined not by the sophistication of tools, but by the quality of the learning experiences educators design. While AI can personalize content, generate feedback, simulate scenarios, and support analytics, educators remain responsible for creating meaning, sustaining human connection, guiding ethical judgment, and linking learning to authentic performance.

In this sense, AI does not diminish the role of educators; it amplifies it. Educators become designers of engagement, facilitators of human–AI collaboration, navigators of ethical and cultural complexity, and coaches for lifelong workforce learning. By prioritizing engagement, maintaining human-led instruction, aligning learning with workforce demands, and embedding ethical awareness, this framework offers a pathway for designing digital learning environments that are innovative, responsible, and meaningful in the age of AI.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, as a conceptual paper, the proposed framework has not been empirically tested, and its effectiveness across diverse educational and workforce contexts remains to be validated. Second, the analysis synthesizes existing literature and may not fully capture rapidly evolving practices in AI-mediated learning environments. Third, the framework is primarily oriented toward higher education and workforce learning, and its applicability to other contexts, such as K–12 settings, warrants further investigation. Future research should employ empirical and longitudinal designs to examine how the proposed educator roles and engagement-centered AI pedagogy influence learner outcomes, autonomy, and skill transfer in practice.

Conclusion

Educator role transformation in the age of artificial intelligence is not optional; it is essential. As AI becomes embedded in learning systems, technology alone cannot resolve persistent challenges related to engagement, relevance, and learner success. Rather than a solution, AI should be understood as a catalyst—expanding possibilities while exposing the limitations of traditional pedagogical models (Holmes et al., 2019). Its effectiveness depends on how it is integrated into intentionally designed learning experiences that prioritize interaction, reflection, and meaningful application.

The future of education will be shaped not by the adoption of advanced technologies, but by how educators redesign learning environments to meet the needs of contemporary learners and evolving workforce demands (Williamson, 2023). This shift requires movement toward experience-based, collaborative, and adaptive learning models that leverage AI while preserving the human dimensions of teaching. Ultimately, engagement, human connection, and workforce relevance must remain central to educational practice. These elements are critical for fostering deep learning, supporting lifelong development, and preparing individuals to navigate complex and rapidly changing professional landscapes. Without them, even the most advanced technologies will fall short of transforming education in meaningful ways.

References

Baker, R. S., & Siemens, G. (2014). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 253–274). Cambridge University Press.

Bailenson, J. N. (2021). Nonverbal overload: A theoretical argument for the causes of Zoom fatigue. *Technology, Mind, and Behavior, 2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1037/tmb0000030

Billett, S. (2011). *Vocational education: Purposes, traditions and prospects*. Springer.

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. David McKay.

Borup, J., Graham, C. R., West, R. E., Archambault, L., & Spring, K. J. (2020). Academic communities of engagement: An expansive lens for examining support structures in blended and online learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 68*(2), 807–832. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09744-x

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Carnevale, A. P., Smith, N., & Strohl, J. (2013). *Recovery: Job growth and education requirements through 2030*. Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED584413

Chen, X., Xie, H., Zou, D., & Hwang, G.-J. (2020). Application and theory gaps during the rise of artificial intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 1*, 100002. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2020.100002

Cox, M. D. (2013). The impact of communities of practice in support of early-career academics. *International Journal for Academic Development, 18*(1), 18–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2011.599600

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer.

Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*(2), 254–267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.04.005

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*(23), 8410–8415. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 2*(2–3), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6

Goodyear, P. (2015). Teaching as design. *HERDSA Review of Higher Education, 2*, 27–50.

Grant, A. M. (2014). The efficacy of executive coaching in times of organisational change. *Journal of Change Management, 14*(2), 258–280. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2013.805159

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *EDUCAUSE Review*. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Jordan, K. (2015). Massive open online course completion rates revisited. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 16*(3), 341–358. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v16i3.2112

Kahu, E. R., & Nelson, K. (2018). Student engagement in the educational interface. *Higher Education Research & Development, 37*(1), 58–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1344197

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? *Learning and Individual Differences, 103*, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Kezar, A. (2014). *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change*. Routledge.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.

Laurillard, D. (2012). *Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology*. Routledge.

Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020). What is AI literacy? In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI conference* (pp. 1–16). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson.

Maier, U., & Klotz, C. (2022). Personalized feedback in digital learning environments. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 3*, 100080. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100080

Martin, F., Sun, T., & Westine, C. D. (2020). A systematic review of research on online teaching and learning. *Computers & Education, 159*, 104009. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104009

Noe, R. A., Clarke, A. D. M., & Klein, H. J. (2014). Learning in the twenty-first-century workplace. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*, 245–275.

OECD. (2023). *AI and the future of skills: Volume 2: AI and education*. OECD Publishing.

Prince, M. J. (2013). Does active learning work? *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*(3), 223–231.

Qian, Y. (2025). Pedagogical applications of generative AI in higher education. *TechTrends, 69*, 1105–1120. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-025-01100-1

Reich, J., & Ruipérez-Valiente, J. A. (2019). The MOOC pivot. *Science, 363*(6423), 130–131. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav7958

Rosen, L. D., Lim, A. F., Carrier, L. M., & Cheever, N. A. (2011). Educational impact of task switching. *Psicología Educativa, 17*(2), 163–177. https://doi.org/10.5093/ed2011v17n2a4

Rothwell, W. J., Zaballero, A., & Sadique, F. (2024). Measuring ROI in technology-based learning. In R. A. Reiser et al. (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (5th ed., pp. 237–251). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003502302-20

Rothwell, W. J., Zaballero, A. G., Sadique, F., & Bakhshandeh, B. (2024). *Revolutionizing the online learning journey*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003431046

Sadique, F. (2026). Strategic workforce development. In S. Dhiman (Ed.), *The Palgrave encyclopedia of leadership and organizational change*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-51650-4_238-1

Saha, S., Rahbari, F., Sadique, F., Velamakanni, S. K. C., Farooque, M., & Rothwell, W. J. (2025). Next-gen education: Enhancing AI for microlearning. *ASEE Annual Conference Proceedings*. https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2--56998

Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury.

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers?* Polity Press.

Selwyn, N. (2021). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury.

Seo, K., Tang, J., Roll, I., Fels, S., & Yoon, D. (2021). AI and learner–instructor interaction. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18*, 54. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00292-9

Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning, 2*(1), 3–10.

Trust, T., Carpenter, J. P., & Krutka, D. G. (2017). Professional learning networks in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 35*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2017.06.001

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO Publishing.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.

Wang, S., Wang, F., Zhu, Z., Wang, J., Tran, T., & Du, Z. (2024). Artificial intelligence in education. *Expert Systems with Applications, 252*, 124167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124167

Williamson, B. (2023). *Education, data and the rise of AI*. Routledge.

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology, 45*(3), 223–235.

World Economic Forum. (2023). *The future of jobs report 2023*. World Economic Forum.

Xu, D., & Jaggars, S. S. (2014). Performance gaps in online vs. face-to-face courses. *The Journal of Higher Education, 85*(5), 633–659. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2014.11777343

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). AI applications in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16*, 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0