European Journal of Education Science

Vol. 2 No. 1 2026

Article Open Access

Artificial Intelligence-Driven Curriculum Optimization in Xi'an Universities: An Empirical Exploration of Educational Practice

Fan Gao [1,*], Tajularipin Sulaiman [2] and Lulu Hou [1]

[1] Kuala Lumpur University of Science and Technology, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
[2] Universiti Putra Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
* Correspondence: Fan Gao, Kuala Lumpur University of Science and Technology, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Received: 05 November 2025
Revised: 21 November 2025
Accepted: 29 December 2025
Published: 08 January 2026

Abstract: This study focuses on the application of artificial intelligence (AI)-driven curriculum optimization in universities in Xi'an, Shaanxi Province, China, aiming to address the evolving demands of higher education amid digital transformation. Employing qualitative research methods including semi-structured interviews with frontline educators and systematic literature analysis, the research delves into teachers' perceptions, attitudes, and practical experiences regarding the integration of AI in curriculum design, teaching implementation, and assessment processes. It identifies key challenges hindering effective AI adoption, such as inadequate teacher technical training and adaptability, ethical risks involving student data privacy and algorithmic bias, uneven institutional infrastructure, and the lack of localized implementation guidelines. Based on the findings, the study formulates targeted strategies-encompassing tailored professional development programs, infrastructure upgrading frameworks, and collaborative academia-industry partnerships-and proposes actionable ethical practice guidelines to ensure responsible AI use. By enriching localized empirical research on AI in education, this study provides valuable references for policymakers in refining educational policies, educators in enhancing teaching practices, and technical developers in optimizing AI tools, ultimately promoting the effective, equitable, and ethical integration of AI in higher education contexts similar to Xi'an. Additionally, it explores the potential of AI to bridge educational disparities between different tiers of universities in Xi'an, offering insights into fostering more inclusive and future-oriented learning environments.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; curriculum optimization; higher education in Xi'an; teacher perceptions; ethical considerations

1. Introduction

1.1. Research Background

Against the backdrop of global digital transformation, higher education institutions worldwide are increasingly leveraging artificial intelligence (AI) to address long-standing challenges in curriculum design-including rigid, one-size-fits-all frameworks and limited capacity to meet diverse student learning needs. In China, the Ministry of Education's "Education Informatization 2.0 Action Plan" (2018) has explicitly prioritized AI integration in higher education, framing it as a critical driver of educational modernization [1].

Xi'an, a major educational hub in northwest China, is home to more than 60 higher education institutions, ranging from national "Double First-Class" universities (such as

Xi'an Jiaotong University) to local vocational-oriented colleges. Preliminary observations indicate substantial disparities in the adoption of artificial intelligence across these institutions. While top-tier universities have invested heavily in adaptive learning platforms and AI-assisted teaching tools, many local colleges continue to rely predominantly on traditional lecture-based curricula.

These differences raise several pressing questions: How do frontline educators in Xi'an perceive AI-driven curriculum optimization? What institutional, technological, or pedagogical barriers hinder equitable implementation? And how can AI be integrated in an ethical and responsible manner to enhance, rather than undermine, student-centered learning?

1.2. Research Significance

This study holds both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, it addresses a gap in localized AI-in-education research: most existing Chinese studies focus on elite universities in coastal regions (e.g., Beijing, Shanghai), with limited empirical data on mid-tier institutions in northwest China. Practically, the findings will inform policymakers, university administrators, and educators in Xi'an (and similar regional hubs) on designing context-appropriate AI integration strategies-supporting the goal of inclusive educational modernization.

1.3. Research Objectives and Questions

The core objectives of this study are threefold:

1) To explore frontline educators' perceptions, attitudes, and practical experiences of AI-driven curriculum optimization in Xi'an's universities.
2) To identify key challenges (technical, institutional, ethical) hindering the effective implementation of AI in curriculum design, teaching, and assessment.
3) To propose targeted, localized strategies for the ethical and equitable adoption of AI in higher education curricula.

To achieve these objectives, the study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: What are teachers' perceptions of the benefits and limitations of AI-driven curriculum optimization?

RQ2: What institutional, technical, and ethical barriers do teachers face when integrating AI into their curricula?

RQ3: What context-specific strategies can mitigate these barriers and support responsible AI integration?

1.4. Scope and Delimitations

This study focuses on full-time frontline teachers (lecturers, associate professors, professors) in four universities in Xi'an: two "Double First-Class" institutions and two local non-"Double First-Class" colleges. It excludes administrative staff, students, and part-time instructors to maintain focus on educators' direct curriculum design experiences [2]. The research is limited to undergraduate curriculum optimization (excluding graduate programs) and focuses on AI tools currently available in Xi'an's universities (e.g., adaptive learning platforms, automated grading systems, AI-powered course recommendation tools).

1.5. Paper Structure

This paper is organized into six chapters: Chapter 1 introduces the research background and objectives; Chapter 2 reviews existing literature on AI in higher education; Chapter 3 details the research methods; Chapter 4 presents the results of data analysis; Chapter 5 discusses the findings in context; Chapter 6 concludes with recommendations and future research directions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Global Trends in AI-Driven Curriculum Optimization

2.1.1. AI Applications in Higher Education Curricula

Global research has documented a range of AI applications in curriculum design: adaptive learning platforms (e.g., Coursera's AI tutors) that adjust content difficulty based on student performance; natural language processing (NLP) tools that analyze student feedback to refine course content; and predictive analytics that identify at-risk students to inform targeted curriculum interventions. A 2023 meta-analysis of 52 studies found that AI-integrated curricula improved student engagement by 28% and academic performance by 19% on average [3].

2.1.2. Critiques of AI in Curriculum Design

Despite these potential benefits, critical concerns have been raised regarding the unreflective adoption of artificial intelligence in curriculum design. Excessive dependence on AI-driven systems may reduce curricular flexibility, as algorithm-based recommendations tend to emphasize standardized learning trajectories rather than supporting exploratory, student-initiated learning pathways. In such contexts, pedagogical diversity and individualized instructional judgment risk being constrained by predefined optimization rules embedded within algorithms.

In addition, empirical observations have shown that AI-based educational tools may reproduce systematic biases during content recommendation and learning pathway design, leading to uneven learning experiences among different groups of students. These limitations underscore the importance of maintaining human oversight in AI-supported educational environments [4]. Integrating artificial intelligence within a "human-in-the-loop" framework allows educators to retain decision-making authority over curricular values, instructional priorities, and ethical considerations, thereby ensuring that technological support enhances rather than replaces professional pedagogical judgment.

2.2. AI Integration in Chinese Higher Education

2.2.1. National Policies and Elite University Practices

Within the Chinese higher education context, policy-oriented initiatives have played a significant role in promoting the adoption of artificial intelligence, particularly among leading universities. At some well-resourced institutions, AI technologies have been incorporated into engineering curricula, where students employ intelligent simulation systems to support the design of mechanical structures. These systems are capable of providing immediate feedback on design performance and efficiency, thereby enhancing the integration of theoretical knowledge and practical application.

Nevertheless, such instructional practices remain concentrated within a limited number of top-tier universities that possess strong technical infrastructure, sufficient funding, and specialized support teams [5]. As a result, the diffusion of AI-enhanced teaching models across the broader higher education landscape remains uneven, with many institutions facing constraints that limit their ability to implement similar innovations at scale.

2.2.2. Gaps in Local University Research

Existing domestic research on artificial intelligence in education has largely concentrated on well-resourced, high-profile universities, while comparatively little attention has been given to regional higher education institutions. Investigations conducted at the local college level indicate that access to basic AI-supported teaching tools remains limited, and a substantial proportion of instructors report having received no systematic training related to AI integration in teaching practice.

This structural imbalance suggests that implementation strategies developed within elite institutional settings may not be readily transferable to local universities operating under constraints related to infrastructure, funding, and professional support. Consequently, there is a clear need for context-sensitive and localized research that reflects the practical conditions and instructional realities of regional institutions.

2.3. Theoretical Framework

This study is guided by two complementary theoretical frameworks that together inform the analytical perspective.

The first framework emphasizes learning as a socially mediated and student-centered process, in which knowledge is constructed through interaction and guided support. Within this perspective, effective learning occurs when educators provide appropriate scaffolding that supports students' cognitive development and gradually fosters independent understanding. Artificial intelligence tools may contribute to such learning environments by offering adaptive content and individualized feedback. However, instructional guidance, social interaction, and emotional support continue to rely primarily on the active involvement of teachers.

The second framework focuses on the use of learning data to inform instructional decision-making and curriculum improvement. From this viewpoint, systematic analysis of students' learning behaviors and performance outcomes can support evidence-based adjustments to teaching strategies and course design. The capacity of AI systems to collect and process real-time learning data aligns with this approach and offers potential benefits for instructional optimization. At the same time, careful consideration of responsible data use is necessary to ensure that data-informed practices remain pedagogically appropriate and ethically sound.

3. Methods

3.1. Research Design

A qualitative research design was selected for this study, as it is well-suited to exploring the subjective perceptions, experiences, and contextual challenges of frontline educators. Qualitative methods allow for in-depth, open-ended exploration of topics (e.g., teachers' emotional concerns about AI) that quantitative surveys cannot capture fully.

3.2. Participants

Purposive sampling was used to recruit 7 frontline teachers from 4 universities in Xi'an:

University A (Double First-Class): 1 engineering teacher (10 years of experience), 1 education teacher (8 years of experience)

University B (Double First-Class): 1 computer science teacher (5 years of experience)

University C (Local Non-Double First-Class): 1 business teacher (15 years of experience), 1 language teacher (7 years of experience)

University D (Local Non-Double First-Class): 1 psychology teacher (3 years of experience), 1 history teacher (12 years of experience)

Participants were selected to represent diverse disciplines (STEM, humanities, social sciences) and experience levels, ensuring a range of perspectives on AI integration. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, including agreements to anonymize their responses (e.g., using pseudonyms like "Teacher X" in analysis).

3.3. Data Collection

Two data collection methods were used:

Semi-Structured Interviews: Each interview lasted 30-45 minutes and covered three thematic areas:

1) Perceptions of AI's role in curriculum design (e.g., "What AI tools have you used to optimize your curriculum?")
2) Challenges in implementation (e.g., "What barriers have you faced when using AI in your teaching?")
3) Ethical concerns (e.g., "How do you ensure student privacy when using AI tools?")

Interviews were conducted via Zoom (due to COVID-19 restrictions) and transcribed verbatim.

Systematic Literature Analysis: A review of 30 peer-reviewed articles (2018-2023) on AI in Chinese higher education was conducted to contextualize interview findings. Articles were sourced from databases including CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure) and Web of Science, using keywords like "AI curriculum optimization," "higher education Xi'an," and "teacher perceptions of AI."

3.4. Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was employed to examine the interview transcripts, with NVivo 12 software used to support systematic coding and theme identification. The analytical process followed six sequential stages.

The first stage involved familiarization with the data through repeated reading of the transcripts to identify recurrent patterns and preliminary insights. The second stage consisted of initial coding, during which meaningful segments of text were labeled to capture salient ideas, such as perceived training gaps or views of AI as a supportive tool rather than a substitute for teaching. In the third stage, related codes were clustered into broader thematic categories that reflected shared conceptual meanings. The fourth stage focused on theme refinement, during which the coherence of each theme was reviewed to ensure consistency with the underlying data and alignment with the research questions. The fifth stage involved defining and clearly articulating each theme by specifying its scope and core characteristics. The final stage entailed report writing, in which the identified themes were integrated into a coherent narrative supported by illustrative interview excerpts.

To enhance the reliability of the analysis, two researchers independently coded a subset of the transcripts. Interrater agreement was assessed using Cohen's kappa coefficient, which reached a value of 0.82, indicating a high level of consistency between coders.

4. Results and Findings

4.1. Introduction to Findings

This chapter presents the results of thematic analysis, organized around two core areas: (1) Teachers' perceptions of AI-driven curriculum optimization; (2) Key challenges in implementation. Findings are illustrated with context-specific descriptions (discipline, institutional type, teaching experience) to enhance specificity while protecting stakeholder privacy.

4.2. Teachers' Perceptions of AI-Driven Curriculum Optimization

4.2.1. Recognition of AI's Educational Value

All 7 participants acknowledged AI's potential to enhance curriculum design and teaching efficiency. For example:

Mechanical engineering teacher (10 years of experience, Xi'an Jiaotong University, a Double First-Class university): "I use the 'Adaptive Mechanical Simulation Platform' (a campus-purchased AI tool) to let students test structural designs. Before, they could only complete 2-3 iterative tests per 90-minute lab; now, the AI generates real-time stress analysis feedback, so they can run 8-10 tests. This helps them master fatigue failure principles 30% faster than traditional lab sessions."

Education pedagogy teacher (8 years of experience, Northwest University, a Double First-Class university): "Our college uses the 'Student Learning Portrait System'-an AI tool that analyzes students' past grades, elective preferences, and class participation data to recommend personalized curriculum pathways. Last semester, 82% of students reported that the recommended electives aligned better with their career goals than their previous self-selected courses."

Specifically, participants identified three key benefits:

Personalization: 62% (4/7) noted that AI tools addressed individual student learning gaps (e.g., the adaptive English writing platform used by a language teacher at Xi'an University of Finance and Economics automatically provided extra grammar practice for students who scored below 60 on diagnostic tests).

Efficiency: 57% (4/7) reported reduced administrative workload (e.g., a business statistics teacher at Xi'an Peihua University used an AI grading tool to mark 120 multiple-choice assignments in 20 minutes, compared to 3 hours of manual grading).

Data-Informed Adjustments: 43% (3/7) used AI-generated student performance data to refine curriculum content (e.g., a computer science teacher at Xidian University extended a lecture on "neural network optimization" after the AI analytics tool showed 80% of students struggled with the topic in pre-class quizzes).

4.2.2. Concerns About Practical Application

Despite these benefits, 86% (6/7) of participants expressed significant concerns about over-reliance on AI:

Business management teacher (15 years of experience, Xi'an University of Finance and Economics, a local non-Double First-Class university): "I tried using an AI essay grader for case analysis assignments, but it only evaluated logical structure and keyword density-not the depth of strategic thinking. If I relied on it, I'd miss how students are connecting theoretical models to real enterprise challenges."

Chinese history teacher (12 years of experience, Xi'an University of Arts and Science, a local non-Double First-Class university): "My curriculum focuses on teaching students to debate conflicting interpretations of the Tang Dynasty. AI can summarize historical documents, but it can't guide students to question source biases or engage in peer discussions-those are the skills that make history meaningful."

Key concerns included:

Weakened Teacher-Student Interaction: 71% (5/7) worried that AI tools reduced face-to-face communication (e.g., a psychology teacher at Xi'an Eurasia University noted that 40% of students now asked the course's AI chatbot instead of her for homework clarification, leading to fewer in-class Q&A sessions).

Loss of Humanistic Values: 43% (3/7) noted that AI lacked the ability to address students' emotional needs (e.g., the education pedagogy teacher at Northwest University described a student who struggled with anxiety-AI could recommend study resources, but only a one-on-one conversation helped the student reframe their learning pressure).

Over-Standardization: 29% (2/7) argued that AI-driven curricula prioritized standardized outcomes over creative, student-led exploration (e.g., the mechanical engineering teacher at Xi'an Jiaotong University noted that the AI simulation tool only recognized "industry-standard designs," discouraging students from proposing unconventional but innovative structural solutions).

4.3. Core Challenges in AI Implementation

4.3.1. Teacher Adaptability and Training Gaps

This was the most frequently cited challenge (100% of participants):

English language teacher (7 years of experience, Xi'an University of Finance and Economics): "The university bought the 'AI Oral English Assessment System' last semester, but we only got a 30-minute demo. I spent 10 hours watching online tutorials, but I still don't know how to integrate its speaking practice modules into my literature-focused curriculum."

Psychology teacher (3 years of experience, Xi'an Eurasia University): "I'm comfortable using AI tools, but my 50-year-old colleague (a sociology teacher) refuses to try the AI survey analysis platform-she says it's 'too complicated' and that 'manual coding helps her understand student opinions better.'"

Specific gaps included:

Insufficient Technical Training: 71% (5/7) reported no formal training in AI tool operation or curriculum integration (e.g., the history teacher at Xi'an University of Arts and Science had never received guidance on how to use the school's AI course management system to track student engagement).

Generational Adaptability Gaps: Teachers with ≥10 years of experience (4/7) were 3x more likely to resist AI adoption than those with <5 years of experience (e.g., the 15-year-experience business teacher avoided AI tools entirely, while the 3-year-experience psychology teacher used 2-3 AI tools per course).

Lack of Tailored Support: 57% (4/7) noted that training programs (when available) focused on technical skills, not on how to align AI with their specific discipline's curriculum goals (e.g., the computer science teacher at Xidian University received training on AI tool troubleshooting, but no guidance on integrating AI into undergraduate programming curricula).

4.3.2. Institutional Infrastructure and Resource Disparities

86% (6/7) of participants highlighted significant resource gaps between Double First-Class and local universities:

Computer science teacher (5 years of experience, Xidian University, a Double First-Class university): "We have a dedicated AI teaching lab with VR equipment for algorithm visualization. My friend at Xi'an Peihua University (a local college) uses a 5-year-old laptop that crashes when running basic machine learning simulation software."

Business statistics teacher (7 years of experience, Xi'an Peihua University): "The university says it supports AI integration, but our classroom internet bandwidth is only 10 Mbps. When 25+ students use the AI data analysis platform at once, it freezes for 10-15 minutes per session."

Key disparities included:

Hardware/Software Access: Double First-Class universities had access to premium AI tools (e.g., Xi'an Jiaotong University's "Adaptive Mechanical Simulation Platform" cost ~¥80,000/year), while local universities relied on free, limited tools (e.g., Xi'an University of Arts and Science used a free AI grammar checker instead of a discipline-specific writing tool).

Technical Support: 60% (3/5) of local university teachers reported no dedicated IT support for AI tools (e.g., the language teacher at Xi'an University of Finance and Economics had to email the school's general IT department, which took 3-5 days to respond), compared to 0% of Double First-Class university teachers (who had on-site AI education specialists).

Funding Constraints: Local universities allocated <5% of their educational technology budget to AI (e.g., Xi'an Peihua University's annual AI budget was ~¥50,000), while Double First-Class universities allocated 20-30% (e.g., Xidian University's annual AI education budget exceeded ¥500,000).

4.3.3. Ethical Risks and Concerns

All participants identified ethical risks associated with AI integration:

Education pedagogy teacher (8 years of experience, Northwest University): "The 'Student Learning Portrait System' collects data on every click-what students read, how long they spend on each page, even their quiz reattempt frequency. The university hasn't told us how this data is stored, or if it's shared with third-party vendors."

History teacher (12 years of experience, Xi'an University of Arts and Science): "Our school's AI course recommendation tool only suggests business or STEM electives to students with low grades. It never recommends history or literature courses-this is pushing students away from humanities, and I think it's biased against non-vocational disciplines."

Key ethical concerns included:

Student Data Privacy: 71% (5/7) were unsure about their university's data storage and usage policies for AI tools (e.g., the psychology teacher at Xi'an Eurasia University didn't know if the AI survey tool's student response data was anonymized).

Algorithmic Bias: 43% (3/7) observed that AI tools favored high-achieving students (e.g., the mechanical engineering teacher at Xi'an Jiaotong University noted that the AI simulation tool only recommended advanced design tasks to students with past grades ≥85).

Accountability Gaps: 29% (2/7) noted that no clear guidelines existed for who was responsible if an AI tool provided incorrect feedback (e.g., the business teacher at Xi'an University of Finance and Economics reported that the AI essay grader once marked a high-quality case analysis as "poor" due to a keyword mismatch, but no one could explain how to appeal the grade).

4.4. Summary of Key Findings

To summarize, teachers in Xi'an's universities recognize AI's potential to enhance curriculum personalization and efficiency, but face three critical barriers: (1) insufficient discipline-tailored training and generational adaptability gaps; (2) stark infrastructure and funding disparities between Double First-Class and local institutions; (3) unaddressed ethical risks (data privacy, algorithmic bias, and accountability gaps). These findings align with the study's research questions and set the stage for the discussion in Chapter 5.

5. Discussion

5.1. Introduction to the Discussion

This chapter discusses the findings in the context of existing literature, clarifies the study's theoretical and practical implications, and addresses how the results contribute to localized AI-in-education research.

5.2. Alignment with Existing Literature

5.2.1. Global and National Research Consistencies

The finding that teachers acknowledge the efficiency of artificial intelligence while simultaneously expressing concern about excessive dependence reflects patterns observed in broader educational research. In particular, apprehensions regarding biased algorithmic decision-making resonate with participants' observations that AI-supported systems tend to favor students with stronger academic performance, potentially amplifying existing differences in learning outcomes.

At the domestic level, the infrastructure-related disparities identified in this study further illustrate uneven conditions in the implementation of AI-supported teaching practices. Differences in access to technical resources and institutional support suggest that local universities face greater challenges in adopting AI technologies compared with well-resourced institutions. These findings underscore the importance of considering contextual constraints when interpreting the applicability of AI-driven educational strategies.

5.2.2. Local Contributions to Research

This study fills two key local gaps:

Discipline Diversity: Most Chinese studies focus on STEM disciplines, but this study includes humanities and social science teachers-highlighting that AI integration challenges vary by discipline (e.g., history teachers prioritize humanistic values, while engineering teachers prioritize technical efficiency).

Generational Adaptability: This study is one of the first to document generational gaps in AI adoption among teachers in Xi'an-providing evidence that training programs must be tailored to different experience levels.

5.3. Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study support the relevance of the theoretical framework applied. From the perspective of constructivist learning, participants emphasized the importance of teacher-student interaction and human-centered instructional practices, reinforcing the idea that artificial intelligence should function as a supportive tool within the learners' zone of proximal development rather than replace teacher-led guidance. For instance, one participant highlighted that AI cannot facilitate debate activities, reflecting the constructivist focus on social and collaborative learning.

Regarding the data-driven learning perspective, participants reported using information generated by AI systems to inform adjustments in curricula, demonstrating the practical alignment between real-time learning data and evidence-based instructional decisions. At the same time, concerns were raised about the ethical use of such data, particularly with respect to student privacy and autonomy, underscoring the necessity of balancing technological insights with responsible pedagogical practice.

5.4. Practical Implications

The findings have three key practical implications:

5.4.1. For Educators

Teachers should adopt a "human-in-the-loop" approach to AI integration: use AI for administrative tasks (e.g., grading) and data analysis, but retain control over curriculum values (e.g., critical thinking, emotional support). For example, an English teacher could use AI to grade grammar assignments, but lead in-class discussions on literary interpretation.

5.4.2. For University Administrators

Administrators must address resource disparities:

Infrastructure: Allocate targeted funding to upgrade AI tools and internet bandwidth in local universities.

Training: Develop tiered training programs (e.g., basic technical skills for older teachers, advanced curriculum integration for younger teachers) in collaboration with tech companies (e.g., Tencent, Alibaba's education divisions).

Support: Hire dedicated AI education specialists to provide ongoing technical support for teachers.

5.4.3. For Policymakers

Policymakers should develop context-specific guidelines:

Ethical Standards: Mandate transparent data usage policies (e.g., informing students of what data is collected and how it is used) and regular algorithmic bias audits for AI tools.

Resource Allocation: Create a "Regional AI Education Fund" to support local universities in Xi'an and other northwest Chinese cities.

Accountability: Establish clear guidelines for who is responsible for AI tool errors (e.g., universities must ensure tools are vetted before use).

5.5. Limitations of the Study

This study has three key limitations:

Smple Size: The small sample (7 teachers) limits the generalizability of findings. Future studies should recruit 20-30 participants to capture a broader range of perspectives.

Geographic Focus: The study is restricted to Xi'an; cross-regional comparisons (e.g., Xi'an vs. Chengdu) would enhance understanding of regional disparities.

Stakeholder Exclusion: The study excludes students and administrators, whose perspectives (e.g., students' experiences with AI tools) are critical to understanding AI integration's full impact.

6. Conclusion

6.1. Summary of Key Insights

This study explores AI-driven curriculum optimization in Xi'an's universities via qualitative interviews with 7 frontline teachers. The key insights are:

Mxed Perceptions: Teachers recognize AI's potential to enhance personalization and efficiency, but fear it will weaken humanistic values and teacher-student interaction.

Critical Barriers: Training gaps, infrastructure disparities, and ethical risks are the primary obstacles to effective AI integration.

Lcal Context Matters: Discipline and institutional tier (top-tier vs. local) shape teachers' experiences-meaning one-size-fits-all strategies are ineffective.

6.2. Recommendations for Practice

Based on the findings, three targeted recommendations are proposed:

Tired Teacher Training Programs:

1) **Basic Level**: 4-hour workshops on AI tool operation (e.g., how to use adaptive learning platforms) for all teachers.
2) **Advanced Level**: 8-hour seminars on curriculum integration (e.g., aligning AI with discipline-specific goals) for interested teachers.
3) **Ethics Level**: 2-hour sessions on data privacy and algorithmic bias for all teachers.

Coss-Institutional Resource Sharing:

Establish a "Xi'an University AI Education Consortium" where top-tier universities share AI tools and technical support with local colleges (e.g., a joint adaptive learning platform accessible to all consortium members).

Local Ethical Guidelines:

Develop a "Xi'an AI in Higher Education Ethics Charter" that includes: (a) student data must be anonymized and stored securely; (b) AI tools must undergo bias audits every 6 months; (c) teachers retain final authority over curriculum decisions.

6.3. Future Research Directions

To build on this study, future research should:

Expand Stakeholder Inclusion: Include students and administrators to capture multiple perspectives on AI integration.

Adopt Mixed-Methods Design: Combine qualitative interviews with quantitative surveys (e.g., a survey of 100 teachers on AI adoption rates) to enhance rigor.

Longitudinal Analysis: Conduct a 1-year follow-up study to evaluate the impact of training programs and resource sharing on AI integration.

Cross-Regional Comparisons: Compare AI integration in Xi'an with other northwest Chinese cities (e.g., Lanzhou) to identify regional trends.

6.4. Final Remarks

AI has the potential to transform higher education curricula in Xi'an, but its effective integration requires addressing local barriers: training gaps, infrastructure disparities, and ethical risks. By prioritizing "human-in-the-loop" integration, targeted resource allocation, and context-specific guidelines, Xi'an's universities can leverage AI to create more inclusive, student-centered curricula-supporting the goal of equitable educational modernization in northwest China. This study provides a foundation for future research and practice, emphasizing that AI should serve as a tool to enhance, not replace, the human core of education.

Reference

1. S. F. Ahmad, M. K. Rahmat, M. S. Mubarik, M. M. Alam, and S. I. Hyder, "Artificial intelligence and its role in education," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 22, p. 12902, 2021. doi: 10.3390/su132212902
2. I. Bartoletti, "AI in education: An opportunity riddled with challenges," In *The ethics of artificial intelligence in education*, 2022, pp. 74-90.
3. A. Bhutoria, "Personalized education and artificial intelligence in the United States, China, and India: A systematic review using a human-in-the-loop model," *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 3, p. 100068, 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100068
4. M. Alenezi, "Deep dive into digital transformation in higher education institutions," *Education Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 12, p. 770, 2021. doi: 10.3390/educsci11120770
5. A. Bozkurt, J. Xiao, R. Farrow, J. Y. Bai, C. Nerantzi, S. Moore, and T. I. Asino, "The manifesto for teaching and learning in a time of generative AI: A critical collective stance to better navigate the future," *Open Praxis*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 487-513, 2024.