Macrothink Institute™

Journal of Education and Training
ISSN 2330-9709
2026, Vol. 13, No. 1

Stacking the Future: Modular, AI-Centric Learning as the New Foundation of Higher Education

Jingyo Suh

Dept. of Accounting, Economics, & Finance, Tuskegee University

Tuskegee, AL 36830

Tel: 1-334-727-8803 E-mail: jsuh@tuskegee.edu

Received: June 28, 2025 Accepted: July 30, 2025 Published: August 19, 2025

doi:10.5296/jet.v13i1.22978 URL: https://doi.org/10.5296/jet.v13i1.22978

Abstract

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) is fundamentally transforming the global workforce, challenging the relevance and effectiveness of traditional higher education models. This paper argues that the long-standing academic major, rooted in rigid disciplinary boundaries and slow to adapt, is increasingly misaligned with the demands of a dynamic, AI-driven world. In response, we propose a shift toward modular, AI-centric learning paths as a more flexible, personalized, and future-ready alternative. Through a critical examination of the limitations of the current system - including inflexibility, siloed knowledge, skill mismatches, and lack of lifelong learning support - we highlight the urgent need for educational reform. We then present a compelling case for modular learning, emphasizing its ability to foster interdisciplinary thinking, embed AI literacy across all fields, and support the development of transferable, in - demand skills. This model empowers students to build customized, stackable credentials aligned with evolving career opportunities. The paper concludes with a comprehensive set of recommendations for implementing this transformation, including faculty development, industry collaboration, updated accreditation standards, and the integration of AI - powered learning technologies. By embracing modular, AI-integrated education, institutions can better prepare graduates for the complexities of the 21st-century workforce and ensure higher education remains relevant, inclusive, and responsive in the age of AI.

Keywords: AI Literacy, modular learning, higher education reform, workforce readiness, personalized learning, lifelong learning

1. Introduction

Higher education is facing a pivotal moment. For generations, universities have followed a

familiar model: students choose a major and follow a structured path toward expertise in a specific discipline. This system has long served as a reliable foundation for preparing graduates for traditional career paths. But the landscape is shifting. The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) and other rapid technological advancements are reshaping the world of work in profound ways (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2019). As industries evolve and the pace of change accelerates, the skills required to thrive in the workforce are becoming more complex and interdisciplinary (WEF, 2023). This raises a critical question: can the conventional major-based education system still meet the needs of today's and tomorrow's learners?

Experts across sectors agree that adaptability, lifelong learning, and the ability to work across disciplines are becoming essential (Deloitte, 2024; McKinsey & Company, 2023). Jobs that once demanded narrow expertise now call for a blend of technical know-how, critical thinking, and creative problem-solving (IBM, 2024). AI is not just automating tasks - it's transforming entire professions, creating new roles that require a deep understanding of both the technology and its broader implications (Autor, 2015; Russell & Norvig, 2020). Yet, many academic programs remain rooted in outdated structures, leaving graduates underprepared for the realities of a fast-changing job market.

Many students find themselves graduating with degrees that don't fully align with employer expectations (Burning Glass Technologies, 2021). The siloed nature of traditional majors often limits exposure to the cross-disciplinary skills that are increasingly in demand (PwC, 2023). While deep knowledge in a subject remains valuable, focusing too narrowly can prevent students from engaging with emerging fields like AI ethics, data literacy, or human-machine collaboration (Manyika et al., 2017). This growing mismatch between education and employment signals an urgent need for reform.

Simply adding a few AI-related courses to existing programs won't be enough. What's needed is a fundamental reimagining of how education is structured and delivered. Traditional majors often lock students into rigid pathways, limiting their ability to explore, adapt, and respond to the evolving demands of the workforce (Daniel, 2020). This rigidity can stifle innovation and hinder the development of the flexible mindset needed in a world where skills can become obsolete in just a few years (Davies et al., 2023).

This paper argues for a bold shift: moving beyond the traditional major toward a modular, AI-integrated approach to learning. This model emphasizes flexibility, personalization, and relevance, allowing students to build their own educational journeys through stackable, updatable modules that reflect current trends and technologies. The advantages of this approach are significant. First, it supports personalized learning, enabling students to tailor their education to their interests and career goals. They can mix and match modules to develop interdisciplinary skill sets that align with emerging opportunities (Merrill, 2002). This customization can boost motivation and engagement, as students see a clear connection between their studies and their future (Hattie, 2012).

Second, embedding AI literacy across all fields - not just in computer science - ensures that graduates from every discipline understand how to work with AI tools and consider their ethical implications (Floridi, 2019; Trustworthy AI Initiative, 2024). This broad exposure

prepares students to navigate and shape the AI-driven world, regardless of their primary area of study. Third, modular learning supports rapid skill development. Because modules are shorter and more focused, they can be updated quickly to keep pace with technological change (Future of Education Report, 2024). This creates a dynamic, responsive educational ecosystem that evolves alongside industry needs (Drucker, 1999; Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014).

Of course, transitioning to this new model won't be easy. It will require collaboration among educators, institutions, and industry leaders, as well as changes to accreditation, faculty training, and departmental structures (Fullan, 2016; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2021). But the potential benefits - a more agile, future-ready workforce and a higher education system that truly meets the needs of society - make the effort worthwhile (Gardner, 2004).

This paper explores these themes in depth. We begin by examining the limitations of the current major-based system in the context of AI's rise. We then present a compelling case for modular, AI-centric learning paths and offer practical recommendations for how institutions can implement this transformative approach to better prepare students for the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century.

2. The Traditional Major: A Misfit in the AI Age

The traditional academic major, once a cornerstone of higher education, is increasingly showing its age. Originally designed during the Industrial Revolution and refined throughout the 20th century, this model was built for a world where careers were stable, predictable, and often lifelong (Bok, 2006; Toffler, 1970). Specializing deeply in one field made sense when industries moved slowly and job roles remained consistent. But in today's fast-paced, AI-driven world, that assumption no longer holds true (Frey & Osborne, 2017; Susskind & Susskind, 2017).

2.1 Inflexibility and Slow Response to Change

One of the most pressing issues with the traditional major is its lack of agility. Updating a curriculum to reflect new industry needs or technological developments - especially those related to AI - can take years due to institutional bureaucracy and approval processes (Kezar, 2001). By the time a revised program is rolled out, the job market may have already shifted again, leaving students with outdated knowledge (Christensen et al., 2008). This lag creates a persistent gap between what students learn and what employers actually need.

2.2 Siloed Learning and Missed Connections

Another major drawback is the compartmentalized nature of traditional majors. Students are often encouraged to stay within the boundaries of their chosen discipline, with limited opportunities to explore connections across fields (Klein, 1990). While general education requirements exist, they're frequently treated as separate from a student's core studies, rather than integrated into a cohesive learning experience (AAC&U, 2017). This siloed approach limits students' ability to think across domains - an essential skill in an era where real-world problems, especially those involving AI, demand interdisciplinary thinking.

2.3 AI's Broad Reach and the Risk of Knowledge Gaps

AI is no longer confined to tech sectors - it's transforming nearly every industry, from healthcare and finance to the arts and education. Yet, many students graduate without a basic understanding of how AI affects their field. A business student might not learn about AI-powered analytics, or a humanities major might miss how AI is reshaping communication and creativity (Davenport & Patil, 2012). The traditional major often fails to equip students with the cross-cutting knowledge needed to navigate a world where AI is everywhere.

2.4 A Gap in Practical, Transferable Skills

Beyond technical knowledge, today's employers are looking for skills like critical thinking, collaboration, ethical reasoning, and digital literacy - many of which are enhanced by or directly related to AI (WEF, 2023). Yet, traditional majors often emphasize theoretical depth over practical application (Carnevale et al., 2011). This can leave students well-versed in academic concepts but underprepared for the realities of the workplace.

2.5 Limited Personalization and Scalability

The one-size-fits-all nature of most majors also limits personalization. Students with niche interests or those eager to explore emerging fields often find few options within rigid degree structures (Means et al., 2013). While minors or electives offer some flexibility, they rarely provide the depth needed for true interdisciplinary expertise. In contrast, modern learning technologies now make it possible to tailor education to individual strengths and goals - something the traditional major struggles to accommodate.

2.6 Economic Pressures and the Lifelong Learning Gap

The economic consequences of this misalignment are significant. Graduates from outdated or oversaturated majors may face long job searches, underemployment, or the need for immediate retraining - despite having invested heavily in their education (Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2017). This raises serious questions about the return on investment for students and families (Goldrick-Rab, 2016), and about the accountability of institutions whose programs no longer align with workforce realities.

Moreover, the traditional major often treats education as a one-time event rather than a lifelong process (Knowles, 1980). Students are expected to graduate with all the knowledge they'll need for their careers. But in a world where AI and other technologies evolve rapidly, this mindset is outdated (Schön, 1983; Pink, 2005). Skills can become obsolete within just a few years, and yet the current system offers few pathways for continuous learning or upskilling (World Economic Forum, 2020).

2.7 The Industry-Academia Disconnect

Finally, there's a growing disconnect between what universities teach and what employers need. While institutions may consult with industry partners, the slow pace of curriculum reform means that feedback is often outdated by the time it's implemented. This makes it difficult to integrate emerging tools, technologies, and ethical considerations - especially

those related to AI - into academic programs in a timely way (MIT Task Force on the Work of the Future, 2020).

3. Rethinking Education: The Case for Modular, AI-Centric Learning

Given the growing disconnect between traditional academic structures and the demands of an AI-driven world, it's clear that higher education needs a bold reimagining (Reigeluth, 1999). This section argues that modular, AI-integrated learning paths offer a more effective and future-ready alternative. By addressing the shortcomings of the conventional major - its rigidity, disciplinary silos, skill mismatches, and lack of adaptability - this approach transforms education into a more dynamic, personalized, and relevant experience.

3.1 Built-In Flexibility and Agility

One of the most compelling strengths of modular learning is its flexibility. Unlike traditional majors, which often take years to revise, individual modules can be developed and updated quickly to reflect new technologies, industry trends, or emerging ethical concerns - especially those related to AI (Bonk & Graham, 2006; Oblinger, 2004). This allows institutions to stay current and ensures that students are always learning the most relevant material (Siemens, 2005). For instance, when a new AI model or regulation emerges, a corresponding module can be introduced almost immediately - something that's nearly impossible within the rigid structure of a traditional major.

3.2 Breaking Down Disciplinary Barriers

Modular learning also encourages interdisciplinary thinking by design. Instead of locking students into a single academic silo, it allows them to build learning paths that draw from multiple fields. A student interested in healthcare innovation, for example, could combine modules in biology, data science, AI ethics, and public policy. This kind of cross-disciplinary education mirrors the complexity of real-world problems and better prepares students to tackle them.

3.3 Making AI Literacy Universal

In today's world, AI literacy is essential - not just for computer scientists, but for professionals in every field (Crawford & Krumm, 2023). Modular learning makes it possible to embed AI-related content across disciplines. Courses like "AI for Business Strategy," "Ethical AI in Journalism," or "AI Tools for Creative Arts" can be integrated into diverse learning paths. This ensures that all students, regardless of their primary focus, graduate with a foundational understanding of AI's capabilities, limitations, and societal impact.

3.4 Sharpening Transferable Skills

Each module can be intentionally designed to build specific, transferable skills - such as critical thinking, collaboration, data analysis, and ethical reasoning (Bloom, 1956; Pellegrino & Hilton, 2012). These competencies are increasingly valued across industries and are often enhanced by AI tools. By stacking skill-focused modules, students develop a well-rounded, practical skill set that goes beyond theoretical knowledge and aligns with real-world demands.

3.5 Personalized Learning at Scale

Perhaps the most transformative aspect of modular learning is its potential for personalization. Students can tailor their education to match their interests, strengths, and career goals, creating unique learning journeys that reflect who they are and where they want to go (Kolb, 1984). This autonomy fosters deeper engagement and motivation, and it allows students to build highly specialized profiles that align with emerging roles in the AI economy (Prensky, 2001; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Christensen et al., 2008).

3.6 Expanding Access and Equity

Personalized, modular learning also promotes greater equity. Students from diverse backgrounds can progress at their own pace, receive targeted support, and access content that fits their learning style and life circumstances (Ladson-Billings, 1995). The modular format is well-suited to blended and online learning, making education more accessible to non-traditional learners, working adults, and those in underserved communities (Means et al., 2013).

3.7 Institutional Innovation and Efficiency

For institutions, modularity offers a more efficient and innovative model. Instead of maintaining entire majors with declining enrollment, universities can focus resources on high-demand modules that serve multiple learning paths. Faculty can collaborate across departments, reducing redundancy and fostering interdisciplinary teaching. This structure also supports continuous experimentation with new teaching methods and technologies, which can be piloted and refined at the module level.

3.8 Supporting Lifelong Learning

In a world where skills quickly become outdated, education must be continuous. Modular learning naturally supports lifelong learning by allowing professionals to return for targeted upskilling without committing to a full degree (Candy, 1991; Tough, 1979). Stackable credentials and micro-modules make it easy to stay current in an AI-driven economy, where adaptability is key (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2024; OECD, 2024).

3.9 Financial Sustainability

Finally, modular learning can improve financial outcomes for both students and institutions. Students can acquire relevant skills more quickly and affordably, reducing the time and cost of education while increasing their return on investment. For universities, offering flexible, modular programs can attract a broader range of learners - including working professionals - creating new revenue streams and reinforcing their relevance in a competitive educational landscape.

4. Recommendations for a Future-Ready Higher Education System

Shifting from a traditional academic model to one centered on modular, AI-integrated learning is no small task. It requires a coordinated, system-wide effort involving educators, institutions, policymakers, and industry leaders (Fullan, 2016). The following

recommendations outline a practical roadmap for making this transformation both effective and sustainable, with the ultimate goal of preparing students for success in an AI-powered world (Kotter, 1996).

4.1 Form Interdisciplinary Curriculum Teams

To break down academic silos, institutions should establish cross-disciplinary teams to design new learning modules. These teams should include faculty from diverse fields - such as computer science, humanities, business, and the arts - alongside instructional designers and AI ethics experts. Their mission: to create stackable, interdisciplinary modules that embed AI concepts and tools into a wide range of subjects.

4.2 Develop a Campus-Wide AI Literacy Framework

Every student, regardless of major, should graduate with a foundational understanding of AI. To achieve this, universities should adopt a unified AI literacy framework that outlines essential knowledge areas: core AI concepts, ethical considerations, critical thinking, and practical tool use (AI Ethics Institute, 2023). This ensures AI education is integrated across disciplines, not confined to a few specialized courses.

4.3 Introduce Flexible Credit and Credentialing Systems

Higher education must move beyond the traditional degree as the sole marker of achievement. Institutions should implement systems for awarding micro-credentials, certificates, and digital badges for individual modules or module clusters. These stackable credentials allow students to build a portfolio of verified skills, offering more flexible and transparent pathways to employment (Lumina Foundation, 2023).

4.4 Prioritize Faculty Training in AI

Faculty are central to this transformation. Universities must invest in professional development programs that equip instructors with the skills to teach AI concepts, use AI-powered tools, and integrate ethical discussions into their courses (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Training should cover areas like prompt engineering, data literacy, AI-enhanced assessment, and discipline-specific applications (EDUCAUSE, 2024).

4.5 Strengthen Industry Collaboration

To ensure learning paths remain aligned with workforce needs, institutions should build strong, ongoing partnerships with industry (Porter, 1985). Employers can contribute to curriculum design, co-develop modules, and offer real-world learning opportunities such as internships and project-based experiences.

4.6 Establish Centralized Learning Path Advising

With more flexible learning options, students will need expert guidance. Universities should create centralized advising systems staffed by professionals trained in career counseling, AI trends, and modular curriculum design. These advisors can help students build personalized learning paths and understand the value of stackable credentials.

4.7 Integrate AI-Powered Learning Technologies

To support personalized learning at scale, institutions should adopt AI-driven educational tools. These include adaptive learning platforms, intelligent tutoring systems, AI-based assessments, and virtual labs for hands-on experience with AI applications (Baker & Inventado, 2014). These technologies enhance engagement, provide real-time feedback, and support individualized learning (Means et al., 2013).

4.8 Redesign Assessment Strategies

Traditional exams aren't enough to measure the diverse skills students gain through modular learning. Assessment should focus on real-world application through project-based work, portfolios, simulations, and interdisciplinary problem-solving tasks (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005; Biggs & Tang, 2011). These methods better reflect students' ability to apply knowledge in practical, AI-enhanced contexts.

4.9 Update Accreditation Standards

Accrediting bodies must evolve to recognize modular learning and stackable credentials. Current standards, often built around traditional degree structures, need to be revised to validate the rigor and relevance of these new educational models (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2024).

4.10 Establish Ongoing Curriculum Refresh Mechanisms

Given the rapid pace of AI development, curriculum must be continuously updated. Institutions should implement systems for regular review based on labor market data, industry input, and alumni feedback (Schön, 1983). Modular design makes this easier, allowing for quick updates to individual components without overhauling entire programs (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995).

4.11 Communicate the Value of Modular Learning

Clear communication is essential to build trust and understanding among students, parents, employers, and the public. Institutions should develop strategies to explain the benefits of modular, AI-centric learning - such as improved career readiness, flexible credentials, and real-world relevance. Transparency about outcomes and opportunities will encourage broader adoption.

4.12 Advocate for Supportive Policy and Funding

Finally, systemic change requires policy support. Educational institutions should work together to advocate for public funding and policies that support modular learning, faculty training, and curriculum innovation. Grants, incentives, and national strategies can accelerate the shift toward a more responsive and inclusive higher education system.

5. Conclusion

As artificial intelligence continues to reshape the global workforce, the traditional structure of higher education - anchored in rigid academic majors - is proving increasingly inadequate. The challenges are clear: outdated curricula, siloed disciplines, limited adaptability, and a

growing disconnect between academic preparation and real-world demands. In contrast, modular, AI-centric learning paths offer a compelling and future-ready alternative.

This paper has argued that modular education not only addresses the shortcomings of the current system but also unlocks new possibilities for personalization, interdisciplinary learning, and lifelong skill development. By embedding AI literacy across all fields, fostering transferable competencies, and enabling students to build flexible, stackable credentials, this model aligns education with the dynamic realities of the 21st-century economy.

However, realizing this vision requires more than curriculum reform - it demands a systemic transformation. Institutions must invest in faculty development, reimagine assessment, build strong industry partnerships, and advocate for supportive policies and funding. Most importantly, they must place students at the center of this change, empowering them to take ownership of their learning in ways that are meaningful, relevant, and adaptable.

The future of higher education lies not in preserving outdated structures, but in embracing innovation that prepares learners for a world where change is constant and AI is ubiquitous. By adopting modular, AI-integrated learning paths, we can build an educational system that is not only more responsive and inclusive but also truly capable of preparing graduates for the opportunities and challenges of the AI-powered future.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

Authors contributions

Not applicable.

Funding

Not applicable.

Competing interests

Not applicable.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Macrothink Institute.

The journal’s policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

References

AAC&U. (2017). *Fulfilling the promise of liberal education*. Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2017). *Artificial intelligence, automation, and work*. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.3386/w24196

AI Ethics Institute. (2023). *Framework for ethical AI literacy in higher education*. AI Ethics Institute Press.

Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *29*(3), 330. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.3.3

Baker, R. S., & Inventado, P. S. (2014). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 627643). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139519526.016

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook I: The cognitive domain*. David McKay.

Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton University Press.

Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. (2006). *The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs*. Pfeiffer.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Burning Glass Technologies. (2021). *The new foundational skills of the digital economy*. Burning Glass Technologies.

Candy, P. C. (1991). *Self-direction for lifelong learning: A comprehensive guide to theory and*

practice. Jossey-Bass.

Carnevale, A. P., Smith, N., & Strohl, J. (2011). *Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce: The undereducated American*. Lumina Foundation.

Christensen, C. M., Horn, M. B., & Johnson, C. W. (2008). *Disrupting class: How disruptive innovation will change the way the world learns*. McGraw-Hill.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2024). *Accreditation and the future of higher education*. CHEA.

Crawford, K., & Krumm, A. (2023). *AI and education: A global perspective*. Oxford University Press.

Daniel, J. S. (2020). *Education and the COVID-19 pandemic*. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09464-3

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development in the age of AI*. Learning Policy Institute. https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311

Davenport, T. H., & Patil, D. J. (2012). Data scientist: The sexiest job of the 21st century. *Harvard Business Review*, *90*(10), 7076.

Davies, A., Fidler, D., & Gorbis, M. (2023). *The future of skills: Employment in 2030*. Pearson.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7

Deloitte. (2024). *Global human capital trends: The AI-powered future of work*. Deloitte Insights.

Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. HarperBusiness.

EDUCAUSE. (2024). *Top IT issues in higher education*. EDUCAUSE.

Floridi, L. (2019). *The ethics of AI*. Oxford University Press.

Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *114*, 254280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019

Fullan, M. (2016). *Coherence: The right drivers in action for schools, districts, and beyond*. Corwin.

Future of Education Report. (2024). *Accelerating skills for a dynamic workforce*. Global Education Futures.

Gardner, H. (2004). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic Books.

Goldrick-Rab, S. (2016). *Paying the price: College costs, financial aid, and the betrayal of the American dream*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226404486.001.0001

Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203181522

IBM. (2024). *The CEO study: Leading with AI*. IBM Institute for Business Value.

Kaplan, A., & Haenlein, M. (2019). Siri, Siri, in my hand: Who's the fairest in the land? On the interpretations, illustrations, and implications of artificial intelligence (AI). *Business Horizons*, *62*(1), 1525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.08.004

Kezar, A. J. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualizations*. Jossey-Bass.

Klein, J. T. (1990). *Interdisciplinarity: History, theory, and practice*. Wayne State University Press.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall/Cambridge.

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

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business School Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465491. https://doi.org/10.2307/1163320

Lumina Foundation. (2023). *A stronger nation: Learning beyond high school*. Lumina Foundation.

Manyika, J., Chui, M., Miremadi, M., Bughin, J., George, K., Willcox, D., & Zivin, G. (2017). *Jobs lost, jobs gained: Workforce transitions in a time of automation*. McKinsey Global Institute.

McKinsey & Company. (2023). *Generative AI and the future of work in America*. McKinsey & Company.

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2013). *The effectiveness of online learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811311500307

Merrill, M. D. (2002). First principles of instruction. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *50*(3), 4359. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02505024

MIT Task Force on the Work of the Future. (2020). *The work of the future: Building a better world with robots, AI, and us*. MIT Press.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2021). *Fostering careers for the 21st century: Opportunities and challenges*. The National Academies Press.

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195092691.001.0001

Oblinger, D. G. (2004). The next generation of learners. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, *27*(3), 1215. https://doi.org/10.5334/2004-8-oblinger

OECD. (2024). *Skills outlook 2024: Bridging the digital and green skills gap*. OECD Publishing.

Pellegrino, J. W., & Hilton, M. L. (Eds.). (2012). *Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century*. National Academies Press.

Pink, D. H. (2005). *A whole new mind: Why right-brainers will rule the future*. Riverhead Books.

Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Free Press.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, *9*(5), 16. https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816

PwC. (2023). *Global Hopes and Fears Survey 2023: Trust in AI*. PwC.

Reigeluth, C. M. (1999). *Instructional-design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2020). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.

Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, *2*(1), 310.

Susskind, R., & Susskind, D. (2017). *The future of professions: How technology will transform the work of human experts*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2155-8256(17)30099-6

Toffler, A. (1970). *Future shock*. Random House.

Tough, A. M. (1979). *The adult's learning projects: A fresh approach to theory and practice in adult learning* (2nd ed.). Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Trustworthy AI Initiative. (2024). *Building ethical AI: Guidelines for development and deployment*. Global AI Policy Forum.

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

Wiggins, G. P., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

World Economic Forum. (2020). *The Future of Jobs Report 2020*. World Economic Forum.