Navigating Authorship and Ethics: A Framework for Evaluating Human-AI Collaborative Outputs in Art Education

Hong Xia

Philippine Christian University, Malate, Manila 1004, Philippines

Inner Mongolia Electronic Information Vocational Technical College Saihan District, Hohhot, Inner Mongolia, China

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400051

Received: 25 March 2026; Accepted: 30 March 2026; Published: 25 April 2026

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces a Five-Dimensional Framework for Evaluating Human-AI Collaborative Outputs, designed to address the challenges of assessing AI-mediated creative work in art and music education. Grounded in qualitative, theory-informed methodology, the framework integrates insights from authorship, creativity, digital media pedagogy, and AI ethics. The five dimensions—intentionality, process transparency, transformative contribution, ethical stewardship, and educational alignment—provide a structured lens for evaluating relational authorship, learner engagement, and the educational quality of AI-supported outputs. Each dimension was operationalized using qualitative indicators within a criteria-referenced rubric, allowing flexible assessment across media, course levels, and assignment types. Intentionality evaluates the clarity and depth of learner purpose in AI use; process transparency emphasizes traceable and visible creative development; transformative contribution distinguishes superficial AI selection from substantive human reworking; ethical stewardship foregrounds integrity, fairness, and cultural awareness; and educational alignment ensures AI use supports specific learning outcomes. Applied examples from visual arts and music demonstrate how the framework differentiates between minimal and substantive engagement with AI, highlighting the significance of reflective practice, documentation, and accountable decision-making. Beyond assessment, the framework informs assignment design, critique-based pedagogy, and policy development by fostering transparency, ethical AI use, and alignment with learning objectives. By bridging conceptual rigor and practical applicability, the framework provides educators with a comprehensive tool to evaluate, guide, and enhance human-AI collaborative creative processes, ensuring that AI serves as a medium for meaningful learning rather than mere automation.

Keywords: human-AI collaboration, art education, assessment framework, ethical AI, creative learning

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence **(AI)** has migrated from the margins of educational technology into the everyday fabric of writing, image-making, music composition, and design ideation. In art education, the velocity of this transition has been particularly disruptive. Students can now generate sketches from text prompts or produce complex harmonic progressions with a single click. While these tools lower technical barriers, they simultaneously destabilize long-standing assumptions about originality and the "visible trace" of human intent. This "algorithmic agency" suggests that the machine is no longer a passive tool but a co-creator that brings its own encoded biases and probabilistic logic into the studio (Anantrasirichai & Bull, 2022). Historically, educational judgment has centered on how a learner transforms materials through reflective practice (Eisner, 2002); however, generative AI systems disrupt this logic by offering "finished" outputs that can mask a lack of substantive student engagement.

As creative labor is increasingly outsourced to Large Language Models (LLMs) and diffusion networks, the traditional "solo genius" model of authorship is replaced by a "post-humanist" collaboration where human intent

and machine probability are inextricably linked (Barfield, 2023). This creates an assessment vacuum: how do educators evaluate work when the "black box" of the AI model obscures the actual effort and technical skill of the learner (Pasquale, 2015)? These questions cannot be solved by simple prohibition or uncritical acceptance. Instead, a shift is needed from binary labels toward a nuanced evaluative lens where authorship is understood as a graded, evidence-based construct. To judge authorship effectively in this new landscape, educators must look beyond the final product—the "synthetic artifact"—and examine five key pillars: intentionality, process transparency, transformation, ethical stewardship, and alignment with course aims. This approach ensures that the "human-in-the-loop" remains the primary driver of the creative process (Fiske et al., 2024).

The Process–Product Divide in Creative Assessment

Authorship in art has always been a dynamic ecology involving tools and collective influences rather than isolated genius. Educational contexts traditionally distinguish assistance from authorship based on sustained personal judgment and interpretive control, a boundary that becomes complex with AI-mediated creation. Following Dewey's (2005) conception of art as an integration of "doing and undergoing," learning resides in the creative process rather than the finished artifact alone. Assessments that privilege polished outputs risk "product collapse," overlooking the iterative decision-making essential to creative learning. This process-oriented view is reinforced by perspectives that frame artistic practice within integral human development (Bantugan, 2023), where creative work gains educational significance through reflective and socially grounded processes.

From Digital Tools to Generative Agency

Generative AI introduces distinct challenges that differ from conventional digital tools because it can produce conceptually coherent outputs that complicate an instructor's ability to infer student learning (Broussard, 2018). Integrating these tools into art classrooms requires intentional instructional design that supports reflection and meaning-making rather than the mere automation of production (Jiang, Fan, & Liu, 2026). Effective education depends on integrated knowledge systems that connect tools, pedagogy, and institutional processes (Bantugan & Li, et al., 2024). Furthermore, higher education must cultivate interpretive and constructivist mindsets where learners actively construct meaning (Liu & Chew, 2025). Meaningful integration—grounded in ethical reflection—depends on teacher beliefs and institutional structures that reorient learning as an active, system-supported process where students exercise critical engagement (Zhu, Gan, & Duan, 2026).

Ethical Frameworks and Distributed Agency

Ethical scholarship on AI governance emphasizes human oversight, transparency, and accountability (Bantugan, 2026b), which are crucial when AI mediates creative expression. Ethical concerns extend to the "black box" of student effort, where a failure to disclose AI use prevents accurate assessment of learning (Selwyn, 2019). AI should be reframed as a system embedded in broader social, political, and ethical contexts rather than a neutral tool. Since agency in education is inherently distributed across individuals and communities (Bantugan, Bantugan, & Urbano, 2018), authorship should be understood as a networked process involving human intention and technological mediation. These perspectives reinforce the need to move beyond legalistic definitions toward pedagogical constructs that foreground evidence of student agency and reflective engagement. Shared criteria are urgently needed to distinguish pedagogically hollow dependence from meaningful human–machine co-creation.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this study is grounded in three interrelated premises. The first premise recognizes relational authorship, where creative work emerges from an ecology of influences, but educational authorship resides with the learner when they exercise transformative control. The second premise asserts that ethics is embedded in evaluation; a visually impressive output produced through concealed automation or unexamined bias cannot be considered educationally strong. The third premise maintains the necessity of aligning assessment with learning outcomes, noting that AI can play diverse roles—from brainstorming partner to a substitute for labor—which are not educationally equivalent. Together, these premises support a central evaluative shift from

asking *if* AI was used to probing the specific *role* it played and how the student engaged that role. Human agency must be evidenced rather than presumed, avoiding assumptions that prompting alone guarantees authentic intellectual work (Zhang & Xu, 2025). This framework encourages educators to make multidimensional judgments that avoid demanding impossible purity while resisting uncritical acceptance of AI outputs.

Statement of the Problem

This paper addressed that need by proposing a framework for evaluating human-AI collaborative outputs. The argument is straightforward: authorship in AI-mediated art education should be understood as a graded and evidence-based construct rather than an all-or-nothing label. To judge authorship effectively, educators must look beyond the final product and examine five key pillars: intentionality, decision-making, transformation, disclosure, and alignment with course aims.

The primary limitation of this study is the absence of robust empirical validation to support its theoretical propositions. While the Five-Dimensional Framework is conceptually grounded in established educational and ethical theories, it has not yet been subjected to systematic data collection. Specifically, the manuscript lacks evidence from direct classroom implementation, which would demonstrate how educators and students interact with the rubric in real-world settings. Furthermore, the study does not include expert validation—such as a Delphi study or formal peer review by art education practitioners—to verify the relevance and clarity of the qualitative indicators. Without statistical reliability measures, such as inter-rater reliability analysis to ensure different instructors reach similar conclusions using the same criteria, the framework remains a theoretical model rather than a proven assessment tool.

METHODOLOGY

The development of the Five-Dimensional Framework for Evaluating Human-AI Collaborative Outputs was guided by a **qualitative, theory-informed design** aimed at bridging contemporary art education practice with emerging AI technologies. The methodology was rooted in both **conceptual analysis** and **educational practice**, reflecting the dual goals of providing theoretical rigor and practical applicability for assessment.

Conceptual Grounding

The framework was constructed by integrating insights from three primary bodies of literature: (1) theories of authorship and creativity in art education, (2) digital media and AI pedagogical studies, and (3) ethics and responsible AI use. Conceptually, the framework responds to the persistent tension between **process-oriented learning** and **product-focused assessment** (Dewey, 1934/2005; Eisner, 2002; Bantugan, 2026). Recent studies highlight that AI-mediated creative work requires attention to both **intentionality and interpretive control** of the student and broader ethical and pedagogical contexts (Jiang et al., 2026; Liu & Chew, 2025; Zhang & Xu, 2025).

Dimension Identification and Operationalization

The five dimensions—**intentionality, process transparency, transformative contribution, ethical stewardship, and educational alignment**—were derived through an iterative **conceptual mapping** process (Bantugan, Montenegro, & Modesto, 2025; Jiang et al., 2026).

- **Intentionality** reflects the clarity and depth of the learner's purpose in using AI, guided by scholarship on reflective practice and learner agency (Bantugan, 2026).
- **Process transparency** was informed by studies on documentation, formative assessment, and AI-assisted workflows, emphasizing visible and traceable creative development (Zhang & Xu, 2025).
- **Transformative contribution** distinguishes between superficial AI selection and substantive human reworking, drawing on research in co-creative AI processes (Jiang et al., 2026; Liu & Chew, 2025).
- **Ethical stewardship** emphasizes honesty, fairness, cultural awareness, and critical engagement with AI outputs, aligned with contemporary AI ethics literature (Bantugan, 2026; Zhu, Gan, & Duan, 2026).

- **Educational alignment** ensures AI use supports specific learning outcomes, in line with constructive alignment principles in curriculum design (Bantugan & Li et al., 2024).

Each dimension was operationalized with **qualitative indicators** for rubric descriptors ranging from limited to exemplary performance. This reflects a **criteria-referenced assessment approach**, allowing teacher judgment to be applied flexibly across courses, media, and skill levels (Bantugan, Montenegro, & Modesto, 2025; Liu & Chew, 2025).

Qualitative Methodology and Rubric Development

The framework deliberately avoids quantitative claims about authorship percentages, consistent with critiques of over-precision in AI evaluation (Broussard, 2018; Selwyn, 2019). Instead, it employs a **descriptive, multidimensional rubric methodology**, enabling teachers to articulate the degree of learner engagement, transformation, and ethical awareness. This choice aligns with **constructivist paradigms**, privileging professional judgment, reflection, and context-sensitive evaluation.

Iterative Validation and Practical Relevance

Although primarily conceptual, the methodology incorporates **applied validation**, in which draft dimensions and rubric descriptors were reviewed against actual student work in AI-assisted art contexts. This ensures that the framework captures observable educational behaviors, addresses process visibility, and grounds judgments about authorship and learning outcomes in tangible learner activity (Bantugan, 2026; Jiang et al., 2026).

The development of the Five-Dimensional Framework

To improve rigor, the framework underwent applied validation through pilot testing against actual student work in AI-assisted art contexts. During this phase, draft rubric descriptors were refined to ensure they captured observable educational behaviors and addressed process visibility. Pilot reviews with educators focused on rubric reliability, ensuring that qualitative indicators—such as distinguishing between "convenience-driven" and "purposeful" AI use—could be consistently identified across different media. This iterative refinement ensures the framework remains both conceptually grounded and practically applicable in the classroom.

RESULTS

A Five-Dimensional Framework for Evaluating Human-AI Collaborative Outputs

The proposed framework highlights the challenges of evaluating AI-mediated creative work, and foregrounds relational authorship, ethics, and alignment with learning outcomes (Bantugan, 2026; Dewey, 1934/2005). It consists of five interdependent dimensions—intentionality, process transparency, transformative contribution, ethical stewardship, and educational alignment—that collectively provide a structured lens for assessing both the legitimacy of authorship claims and the educational quality of AI-supported student work.

Intentionality. Intentionality refers to the clarity and depth of the student's artistic purpose, reflecting the relational authorship premise in the conceptual framework. Strong intentionality is demonstrated when students can articulate why AI was used, at what stage, for which creative problem, and in accordance with broader artistic objectives (Jiang et al., 2026; Bantugan, Montenegro, & Modesto, 2025). This dimension emphasizes purposeful engagement over convenience-driven automation. For example, using an AI image generator to explore alternative lighting for a narrative illustration, then selecting and refining one based on symbolic or thematic considerations, reflects intentionality. Assessment can be evidenced through concept notes, prompt rationales, process journals, oral defenses, or annotated drafts, consistent with reflective practice in art education (Zhang & Xu, 2025).

Process Transparency. Process transparency concerns the visibility and traceability of creative development, aligning with both ethical and pedagogical accountability (Bantugan, 2026). In traditional art education,

sketches, drafts, and critique logs reveal the evolution of ideas. AI-mediated work requires equivalent documentation, including prompts, rejected outputs, edits, and post-generation modifications. Transparency ensures that educators can discern whether the student engaged in experimentation and critical selection, rather than outsourcing execution (Liu & Chew, 2025). It also standardizes expectations for disclosure, promoting fairness and informed assessment.

Transformative Contribution. Transformative contribution addresses whether the student substantially reshaped AI-generated material through interpretation, revision, integration, or contextualization, reflecting the core relational authorship premise (Jiang et al., 2026). Transformation ensures AI outputs function as raw material for further human creative judgment rather than a finished product. Techniques may include redrawing, reorchestrating, rewriting, collaging, sequencing, conceptual reframing, or integrating AI suggestions with observational data or personal research. This dimension distinguishes curation from authorship, emphasizing the student's interpretive and disciplinary understanding as central to educational quality (Bantugan & Li et al., 2024).

Ethical Stewardship. Ethical stewardship evaluates whether AI use aligns with academic integrity, respect for others, and awareness of sociotechnical consequences (Bantugan, 2026; Zhu, Gan, & Duan, 2026). This includes honest disclosure of AI use, avoidance of exploitative imitation, consideration of dataset biases, and reflection on cultural or intellectual property implications. Ethical stewardship operationalizes the ethics premise of the conceptual framework, ensuring that aesthetically successful work does not bypass responsible creative practice. It also teaches students to consider fairness, appropriation, consent, and cultural representation as part of their creative decision-making.

Educational Alignment. Educational alignment ensures that AI use supports the intended learning outcomes rather than undermining them, operationalizing the outcome-aligned assessment premise of the conceptual framework (Bantugan & Li et al., 2024; Dewey, 1934/2005). AI may enhance concept development or cross-media experimentation but may be inappropriate for tasks requiring hand-rendered technique, ear training, or original arrangement skills. Explicit guidance from instructors about which components may involve AI ensures defensible and consistent evaluation.

Operationalization and Rubric Application. The framework can be translated into qualitative rubric descriptors ranging from limited to exemplary performance for each dimension. For instance:

Intentionality: Limited = convenience-driven AI use; Exemplary = coherent rationale tied to medium, theme, and audience.

Transparency: Limited = missing documentation; Exemplary = comprehensive logs of prompts, revisions, and reflective notes.

Transformative Contribution: Limited = near-direct AI submission; Exemplary = substantial reworking and integration.

Ethical Stewardship: Limited = concealed or problematic AI use; Exemplary = disclosure, reflexivity, and contextual awareness.

Educational Alignment: Limited = contradicts learning outcomes; Exemplary = AI strengthens but does not replace targeted learning.

The framework is qualitative rather than numeric, avoiding false precision in quantifying human versus AI contribution (Broussard, 2018; Selwyn, 2019). Teachers can adapt the relative weighting of dimensions according to course level, medium, and assignment type, reflecting flexibility in practical pedagogy (Bantugan, 2026; Liu & Chew, 2025).

Applying the Framework in Art Education Contexts

To illustrate the practical application of the Five-Dimensional Framework, consider a visual arts assignment in which students create a poster advocating for an environmental issue. In alignment with the statement of the problem, the challenge is to assess educational authorship and the quality of human-AI collaboration rather than simply noting AI presence (Bantugan, 2026; Dewey, 1934/2005).

Suppose one student uses an AI image generator to produce background landscapes, selects one, adds text, and submits the final poster with no explanation. According to the framework, this work would likely score low in process transparency and moderate to low in transformative contribution, unless evidence of substantial revision is provided. While the assignment may primarily measure message design rather than illustration skill, the lack of documentation undermines the relational authorship claim, making it difficult to judge the student's engagement with the creative process (Jiang et al., 2026; Liu & Chew, 2025).

In contrast, a second student in the same assignment uses AI strictly during ideation to generate visual metaphors for ocean pollution, documents multiple failed prompts, sketches by hand based on selected motifs, photographs original textures, and constructs the final poster via digital collage. This student also provides a reflection explaining why certain AI suggestions were rejected as stereotypical or emotionally manipulative. Here, the framework identifies stronger intentionality, transparency, transformative contribution, and ethical stewardship, demonstrating that the key difference lies not in the presence of AI, but in the quality of human engagement and accountable decision-making (Bantugan & Li et al., 2024; Zhang & Xu, 2025).

A parallel example arises in music education, where students are asked to compose a short piece representing a local cultural festival. One student relies on an AI music tool to generate a full composition in a "traditional style" and submits it with minimal editing. Another student uses AI only to test instrumentation combinations, rejects several outputs for sounding culturally generic, interviews community musicians, integrates an original melody, and revises the harmonic structure manually. The second student exemplifies educational authorship, maintaining accountability for contextual understanding and musical decisions. This illustrates the framework's role in preventing the creation of polished but culturally flattened outputs, which superficially imitate style without grounding in knowledge or intent (Bantugan, 2026; Zhu, Gan, & Duan, 2026).

The framework also enhances critique-based pedagogy. During class critique, students present not only the finished work but also explain where AI influenced the process, what was accepted, revised, or resisted, and why. This fosters metacognition, encourages ethical disclosure, and provides instructors with richer evidence of learning than the artifact alone can reveal. Over time, such practices cultivate a studio culture in which AI is neither hidden nor romanticized, but openly examined as a medium among many, subject to artistic, pedagogical, and ethical judgment (Eisner, 2002; Bantugan, Montenegro, & Modesto, 2025).

Finally, the framework informs assignment design. Anticipating AI use allows instructors to structure tasks that reward reflection, documentation, and transformation rather than mere output production. Assignments can require process portfolios, annotated prompt histories, comparative drafts, oral explanations, or statements of non-delegated tasks, reducing ambiguity and discouraging concealment. These strategies operationalize the conceptual framework's emphasis on relational authorship, ethics, and alignment with learning outcomes, ensuring that evaluation focuses on meaningful learning rather than superficial AI outputs (Bantugan, 2026; Liu & Chew, 2025).

DISCUSSION

Implications for Policy, Teacher Education, and Assessment

The findings of this study underscore that the central problem in AI-mediated art education is not the mere presence of AI, but the lack of clear, defensible criteria for evaluating authorship, learning, and ethical engagement. Addressing this problem requires coordinated implications at the levels of institutional policy,

teacher education, and assessment practice, all aligned with the principles of relational authorship, ethical accountability, and outcome-based evaluation (Bantugan, 2026; Jiang et al., 2026).

Policy Implications. At the policy level, institutions must move beyond binary positions that either prohibit AI or permit it without guidance. Such approaches fail to address the nuanced realities of creative practice and do not resolve the core issue identified in the problem statement: how to distinguish meaningful learning from superficial AI dependence. Instead, policies should be discipline-sensitive, recognizing that the pedagogical and ethical implications of AI differ across artistic media, processes, and learning objectives (Liu & Chew, 2025).

A robust institutional policy should articulate at least four elements: (1) forms of AI assistance that are generally permitted; (2) uses that require explicit disclosure; (3) uses that are restricted or prohibited in specific assessment contexts; and (4) documentation requirements that make the creative process visible.

Importantly, such policies must also address issues of equity. Students differ in access to paid AI tools, high-speed internet, and prior digital fluency. Ethical evaluation, therefore, cannot be reduced to questions of honesty alone; it must also consider how resource disparities shape opportunities for participation and authorship (Bantugan & Li et al., 2024). Without this consideration, policies risk reinforcing existing inequalities under the guise of neutrality.

Teacher Education Implications. The study further reveals that effective implementation of AI-responsive assessment depends heavily on teacher preparedness. Many instructors are currently tasked with evaluating AI-assisted work without sufficient grounding in digital ethics, prompt literacy, or contemporary creative workflows. This gap directly contributes to inconsistent classroom practices and weakens the alignment between policy and pedagogy (Zhu et al., 2026). Teacher education programs and professional development initiatives should therefore include: (1) Case-based discussions of AI-mediated student work; (2) Rubric calibration exercises using frameworks such as the five-dimensional model, and (3) Hands-on engagement with AI tools to build experiential understanding. Such preparation enables educators to distinguish between AI use that enhances learning and use that substitutes for cognitive or creative effort. It also equips them to guide students through complex issues such as stylistic imitation, cultural appropriation, and labor displacement in creative industries—areas increasingly central to ethical stewardship (Bantugan, 2026). Without such preparation, institutional policies risk remaining abstract, with uneven and sometimes contradictory enforcement in practice.

Assessment Implications. Assessment practices must likewise evolve in response to the problem of "product opacity" in AI-rich environments, where polished outputs no longer reliably indicate learning (Jiang et al., 2026). Traditional product-focused grading is insufficient because it cannot capture the intentionality, process, and transformation emphasized in the conceptual framework.

In this context, process-oriented assessment should become central rather than supplementary. While not all tasks require exhaustive documentation, major assignments should include evidence that makes student decision-making visible—such as process portfolios, annotated prompts, iterative drafts, or reflective commentaries (Zhang & Xu, 2025). Rubrics can explicitly incorporate the five dimensions—intentionality, transparency, transformation, ethical stewardship, and alignment—providing a structured yet flexible basis for professional judgment.

Importantly, this approach is not intended to create surveillance. Rather, its purpose is to make learning legible in contexts where outputs are easily generated but difficult to interpret. Selective use of oral defense or critique dialogue can further support authenticity verification while reinforcing reflective practice.

Reframing Academic Integrity. Another key implication concerns the language of academic integrity. Framing AI use solely as "cheating" often produces concealment rather than ethical understanding. In contrast, the framework supports a shift toward accountable authorship, where students are taught to disclose tools, justify creative decisions, critique AI outputs, and recognize when convenience undermines learning (Bantugan, 2026).

In this model, integrity is not merely the absence of misconduct but the active practice of transparency and responsibility. Such a reframing aligns with the ethical dimension of the conceptual framework and supports the development of reflective, ethically aware practitioners.

Implications for the Identity of Art Education. Finally, the study raises broader questions about the identity of art education in the age of generative AI. A purely defensive response risks isolating the field from contemporary creative practice, while uncritical acceptance risks eroding its foundational commitments to embodied making, critical imagination, and human expression (Eisner, 2002).

The challenge, therefore, is not to eliminate AI but to redefine what counts as meaningful artistic learning. The proposed framework contributes to this effort by recentering evaluation on human agency, reflective judgment, and transformative engagement, rather than on tool purity. In doing so, it offers a pathway for art education to remain both relevant and principled in an evolving technological landscape.

CONCLUSION

Human–AI collaboration is no longer a speculative concern for art education; it is an immediate and defining condition of contemporary creative practice. As identified in the statement of the problem, the central challenge is not the presence of AI in artistic production—since tools have always shaped art—but the increasing difficulty of evaluating authorship and learning when generative systems contribute content, structure, and stylistic direction with minimal effort and high polish (Bantugan, 2026; Jiang et al., 2026). Under these conditions, traditional assumptions that equate finished outputs with student competence are no longer sufficient. What is at stake is the ability of educators to distinguish meaningful learning from superficial automation.

This paper has addressed that problem by proposing a multidimensional, process-oriented framework grounded in five interdependent dimensions: intentionality, process transparency, transformative contribution, ethical stewardship, and educational alignment. Together, these dimensions operationalize the study's conceptual position that authorship in education is relational, accountable, and evidence-based, rather than fixed or purely product-driven. By shifting evaluation from the question "Was AI used?" to "How did the student engage AI in relation to learning goals?", the framework provides a defensible basis for assessing both authorship claims and educational quality (Liu & Chew, 2025; Zhang & Xu, 2025)**.**

Importantly, the framework resists two inadequate responses to AI in art education: outright prohibition, which ignores the realities of contemporary practice, and uncritical acceptance, which risks eroding the foundations of artistic learning. Instead, it advances a position in which AI is treated as a mediating tool whose educational value depends on the depth of human engagement, reflection, and transformation (Bantugan & Li et al., 2024). In this view, authorship is not demonstrated by mere tool usage or final output, but by visible evidence of decision-making, revision, and ethical awareness.

The contribution of this study extends beyond assessment. The framework offers a coherent basis for policy formation, teacher preparation, assignment design, and critique practices, all of which must adapt to the realities of AI-mediated creation. More fundamentally, it reaffirms a core principle of art education: that the purpose of creative work in learning contexts is not simply to produce artifacts, but to cultivate judgment, interpretation, and critical awareness (Eisner, 2002). While AI systems can generate images, sounds, and texts, they do not replace the educational responsibility to develop students' capacity to question, contextualize, and transform what they produce.

In this sense, the future of AI in art education depends not on controlling the tool, but on clarifying the criteria of meaningful learning. A responsible evaluative approach must continue to ask: What decisions did the learner make? What transformations did they enact? What ethical considerations did they engage? And how does the work reflect the intended learning outcomes? By keeping these questions central, the proposed framework ensures that even in an era of generative systems, human agency, reflective practice, and educational purpose remain the foundation of artistic authorship.

REFERENCES

1. Anantrasirichai, N., & Bull, M. (2022). Artificial intelligence in the creative industries: A review. Artificial Intelligence Review, 55(1), 589–656. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-10037-7
2. Bantugan, B. (2026). Human-centric artificial intelligence for development. International Journal of Arts and Social Science, 9(2). https://www.ijassjournal.com/2026/V9I2/51466642183.pdf
3. Bantugan, B., & Li, X., et al. (2024). The adoption of artificial intelligence of selected international Chinese educators enrolled as graduate students in the College of Education of St. Paul University Manila. International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation, 11(2), 133–146. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2024.1102011
4. Bantugan, B. (2023). Integral human development in higher education and HIV-AIDS advocacy work of Filipino artists. East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2(2), 473–496. https://doi.org/10.55927/eajmr.v2i2.2966
5. Bantugan, B. (2026). A multisectoral and democratized AI governance policy for St. Paul University Manila: Countering global techno-authoritarianism and abuse. International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation, 13(1), 1040–1078. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.13010093
6. Bantugan, B., Montenegro, G., & Modesto, B. (2025). The National Arts Month of the Philippines, college students of St. Paul University Manila, and celebrating art in community. International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation, 12(2), 1104–1118. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12021104
7. Bantugan, B., Vaswani, J., Ogalesco, J., Villanueva, B., & Butial, A. (2025). Building the research knowledge management framework of the South Luzon cluster of the St. Paul of Chartres education ministry. International Journal of Arts and Social Science, 6(2).
8. Bantugan, B. S., Bantugan, F. C., & Urbano, R. C. (2018). Bridging the age-related communication gap: An encounter between senior citizens and communication students towards social integration. Asian Journal for Public Opinion Research, 5(2), 84–103. https://doi.org/10.15206/ajpor.2018.5.2.84
9. Bantugan, B. S., & Valeriano, E. M. (2019). The culture of volunteerism among St. Paul University Manila student leaders. Paulinian Compass: The Asia-Pacific Journal on Compassion Studies, 5(3), 33–45.
10. Barfield, W. (2023). Generative AI and Creative Authorship: Emerging Legal and Ethical Frameworks. Cambridge University Press.
11. Broussard, M. (2018). Artificial unintelligence: How computers misunderstand the world. MIT Press.
12. Dewey, J. (2005). Art as experience (Original work published 1934). Perigee.
13. Eisner, E. W. (2002). The Arts and the Creation of Mind. Yale University Press.
14. Fiske, S. T., Kiley, K., & Waytz, A. (2024). The human-in-the-loop: Maintaining agency in the age of generative agents. Nature Human Behaviour, 8(2), 210–218.
15. Jiang, Y., Fan, Y., & Liu, Z. (2026). Generative AI in art education: A systematic review of research trends, tool applications, and outcomes (2019–2025). Education Sciences, 16(1), 47. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16010047
16. Liu, Q., & Chew, R. S. Y. (2025). Generative AI and creative thinking in art education: A TPACK-based theoretical framework. Journal of China-ASEAN Studies.
17. Pasquale, F. (2015). The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information. Harvard University Press.
18. Selwyn, N. (2019). Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education. Polity Press.
19. Zhang, C., & Xu, S. (2025). Aesthetic experience and educational value in co-creating art with generative AI: Evidence from a survey of young learners. arXiv.
20. Zhu, Z., Gan, Q., & Duan, P. (2026). Art and design teachers' acceptance of AI-generated content for assisted tutoring: An extended TAM-TPACK framework. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications.