RESEARCH ROUNDTABLES
REGENT UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS & LEADERSHIP

Faithful Stewardship in the Age of AI: Christian Approaches to Governance in Higher Education

Elizabeth G. Beech
Avondale University
Roundtable: Artificial Intelligence

Abstract

Currently, much research on AI governance focuses on frameworks for regulating AI technologies, particularly regarding student use and ensuring academic integrity and quality. However, this article explores how higher education institutions, particularly those shaped by and committed to a Christian worldview, can approach AI not merely as a subject of regulation but as a potential tool for enacting faithful stewardship and mission-aligned governance. Drawing on recent global research and current practices, this article examines the uptake of generative AI technologies in higher education governance. Special attention is given to relevant theological principles that inform their ethical implementation. Studies indicate that general mandates such as transparent communication, participatory policy development, and adaptive oversight are commonly used strategies for governance and risk management. Adopting a phenomenological perspective and incorporating examples from Christian higher education leaders in Australia, this article considers how Christian institutions can lead not only in critiquing AI's risks but in modeling responsible, value-driven integration into governance practices. The discussion highlights the potential for AI to assist with tasks such as policy drafting, compliance monitoring, and board or committee support, provided its use is guided by theological commitments to wisdom, human dignity, and relational accountability. Ultimately, this article argues that Christian institutions have both an opportunity and a responsibility to shape AI integration through a biblical lens of wise, relational stewardship. These theological commitments form the basis of a proposed framework for evaluating and piloting AI tools in Christian university governance.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, governance, higher education, Christian stewardship, generative AI

As artificial intelligence (AI) transforms the operations of higher education worldwide, questions arise not only about oversight of AI itself, but also how AI might assist with governance, policy development, and risk management within our universities, particularly those shaped by and committed to a Christian worldview.

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

This article will explore how Christian higher education institutions can approach AI not merely as a subject of regulation, but as a potential tool for enacting faithful stewardship and mission-aligned governance.

Current Trends with AI in Universities

Generative AI is now widely used across universities, most prominently by students for study support and writing assistance, by faculty in preparing teaching materials and assessments, and by administrators in providing routine services and communications. Students turn to AI for summarizing readings, drafting essays, and generating practice questions, while faculty rely on it for developing course content and automating feedback. Administrators have adopted AI chatbots to answer common queries and draft routine communications, making it a visible presence at nearly every level of campus life.

While these uses are helpful, they represent largely operational and efficiency-driven applications. The deeper potential of AI in higher education, especially in Christian contexts, lies in enabling more thoughtful, participatory, and ethical governance. Beyond easing workloads, AI tools can support the analysis of large datasets for decision-making, enhance risk and compliance management, and help track the impact of policies and practices. Such applications can free leaders to focus more intentionally on mission, values, and human formation.

For Christian universities, the challenge and opportunity are to move from seeing AI only as a student aid or administrative convenience to embedding it in governance in ways that align with biblical principles of stewardship, transparency, and justice. Used wisely, generative AI can assist councils, boards, and leadership teams in strengthening accountability, improving oversight, and modeling responsible integration of technology that supports, rather than supplants, human judgment under God's authority.

This article will explore the intricacies of introducing generative AI to more effective governance within a Christian university context, from a phenomenological perspective grounded in personal experience and real-life, anonymous interviews with colleagues at similar institutions in Australia.

Negative Aspects of Gen AI on Human Flourishing

It seems most of the emphasis within our university contexts has been on the fear of how AI can be misused and the significant risks that can undermine human flourishing by exacerbating inequalities, eroding autonomy, and weakening human connections.

A major concern is that AI will worsen global and national inequality. The benefits of AI are predicted to favor people at the top, widening the income gap. AI is

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

expected to endanger jobs. There is a significant power imbalance between the few "superstar" AI companies in wealthy nations and the emerging economies whose data is used for training models without compensation. This can increase poverty and social turmoil (Lam, 2024).

AI systems can perpetuate and amplify existing human and systemic biases, leading to discriminatory outcomes that harm marginalized groups and undermine justice. AI tools used in hiring, loan applications, and criminal justice have shown bias against women and racial minorities. This is often due to the models being trained on data reflecting WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic) perspectives, which embed a narrow set of values and can lead to both representational and allocative harm (Dabis & Csáki, 2024; Read, 2025).

Overreliance on AI can impede human flourishing by devaluing skills that take years to develop, such as empathy, critical thinking, and creativity. When people depend on AI for emotional support or decision-making, it can weaken their autonomy and ability to form deep connections with other humans. In educational contexts, a dependency on AI can lead to a superficial understanding of topics and erode critical thinking. The use of AI can depersonalize education and work, reducing individuals to mere data points and undermining the Christian ethical emphasis on human relationships and dignity (Lam, 2024; Sugiri, 2024).

In the workplace, using AI can lead to a "competence penalty," where individuals are perceived as less capable despite producing identical work. This fear of reputational damage discourages the very groups who might benefit most from using these tools, reflecting a form of rational self-preservation that ultimately wastes human potential (Acar et al., 2025).

The vast amounts of data required by AI systems raise serious privacy concerns. Without clear accountability, it becomes difficult to assign responsibility when an AI system causes harm, which conflicts with Christian ethical principles of moral obligation (Lam, 2024; Sugiri, 2024).

AI can nudge humans towards repeated practices and habits which could possibly shape virtues, but more likely can be misdirected to encourage certain vices (Schuurman, 2019).

How AI Facilitates Human Flourishing

However, one should consider some ways that AI has been found to enhance human capabilities, often scaling up effective, low-cost solutions, thereby contributing to several dimensions of flourishing.

AI applications in healthcare can significantly improve human health, a key component of flourishing. For example, AI-powered diagnostic tools can provide

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

patients with rapid results that enable early intervention and help with making informed health decisions. Similarly, there are large language models already assisting medical professionals, leading to better healthcare outcomes and making healthcare more accessible to underserved populations, strengthening compassion for those in need (Lam, 2024; Sugiri, 2024).

AI can democratize access to high-quality education and professional development. In higher education, AI can offer personalized learning experiences tailored to individual student needs, which supports the nurturing of each person's unique potential. By automating administrative tasks for educators, AI can free them up to focus more on the relational and mentoring aspects of teaching that are crucial for students' holistic and moral development (Lam, 2024; Read, 2025; Sugiri, 2024).

By augmenting the capabilities of high-skilled professionals, AI can increase productivity and potentially lead to economic growth. For some low-skilled professionals, AI may even enhance their performance to match that of their high-skilled counterparts. Furthermore, new jobs related to AI development, data science, and ethics are being created, offering new employment opportunities (Lam, 2024).

There is a promise from GenAI to offload burdensome tasks, freeing human beings for higher purposes. Schuurman (2019) calls this a "creational possibility" that, by God's common grace, GenAI can be used for the positive good of people when properly directed.

AI in University Governance

There are numerous complex processes within a university that AI can streamline, freeing up faculty and staff to focus on mission-critical activities like teaching, mentoring, and research.

AI can automate and improve administrative workflows such as course approvals, curriculum reviews, and faculty evaluations. For document management, AI can automate the storage, retrieval, and summarization of records like tenure files and compliance reports, ensuring all required materials are correctly formatted and archived.

AI-powered tools can optimize complex scheduling for courses, classrooms, and events by balancing faculty availability, student demand, and facility constraints.

One of the most significant aids is in reporting and dashboard creation. AI can automate the labor-intensive process of generating annual compliance reports, enrollment-trend analyses, and learning management system (LMS) usage analytics. Predictive AI (PAI) can identify trends, detect anomalies, and even provide real-time academic risk assessments, allowing for early student interventions. This shifts the administrative focus from compiling data to making informed, strategic decisions.

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

AI can enhance system integration, linking various platforms like the student information system (SIS), LMS, and enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems to reduce data entry errors and ensure consistency. For communications, AI can draft contextualized emails and personalized notifications, such as reminders for accreditation deadlines or alerts to students about missing degree requirements, ensuring consistency with institutional values.

AI can automate housing assignments, process maintenance requests via chatbots, and manage event logistics, analyze space utilization to optimize residence life operations, and use AI-powered apps to track attendance at campus events. AI could aid career counselors by automating resume reviews and using algorithms to match students with relevant job postings and internship opportunities. AI-powered "copilots" can assist students with interview preparation, providing 24/7 access to career coaching.

AI scheduling assistants can streamline counseling appointments, and chatbots can handle non-urgent mental health FAQs, improving accessibility and reducing staff workload. Critically, AI-powered early-warning systems analyze performance and engagement data to identify at-risk students, enabling timely interventions to improve retention.

For university research administration, AI-enhanced platforms can dramatically improve efficiency in securing funding. AI assistants can also help draft and format proposals, check for compliance with funder guidelines, and automate repetitive tasks, allowing researchers to focus on innovation.

Beyond considerations of GenAI being used in academic work, there are many ways it could be used to enhance productivity.

Personal Experiences of Christian Higher Education Colleagues

Christian higher education colleagues all agree that AI has enhanced productivity for overstretched teams. For example, one committee minute-taker told how they now complete in days what used to take weeks. Another colleague observed:

> From experience, we've found AI can drastically cut time in tasks like course reviews or policy searches—but always with human checking. One colleague described it as a "critical friend" that can point out areas for improvement yet never replace responsibility for accuracy or judgment. (Interviewee 2, personal communication, October 23, 2025)

Yet another said:

> Today I was able to compare, combine, and benchmark two outdated policies, coming up with a new, modernized and relevant draft in 46 seconds. As a

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

> small provider, certainly, there is value in the time and money that was saved! (Interviewee 3, personal communication, October 24, 2025)

Barriers to the Adoption of AI Tools

Generally, in Australian higher education, GenAI adoption is slow for fear of regulatory consequences. As one analyst observes, "Universities must stop treating AI as a compliance risk and start treating it as the transformative tool it truly is" (Burgess, 2025).

A researcher in Australia has analyzed the strategic documents of universities in the UK, the U.S., Canada, Australia, and New Zealand and found some sector-wide trends as to their adaptive structural posture and their strategic framing of AI. Not surprisingly,

> only 6 of the 28 institutions (21%) connected AI to broader existential questions about the future of higher education or society. Even then, the framing was more competitive than transformational: a call to adopt AI faster than rivals, with no acknowledgment that AI may fundamentally disrupt the sector's core value proposition. (Brawley & Byers, 2025)

Christian higher education institutions were not included in this initial review, but they also face a complex array of barriers to adopting artificial intelligence (AI). These obstacles are not merely technical or financial; they are deeply intertwined with theological principles, ethical concerns, institutional culture, and operational realities. The barriers can be categorized into operational, sociocultural, and theological and ethical challenges.

Operational and Institutional Barriers

While AI offers powerful tools for administration, current research emphasizes that its adoption is not without challenges. Christian higher education institutions, particularly smaller liberal arts colleges, face significant operational hurdles related to resources, infrastructure, and governance.

Many Christian institutions, especially liberal arts colleges, operate with fewer resources than large research universities. The high cost of AI implementation—including hardware, software licensing, and specialized staff—is a major barrier. For example, a modest graphics processing unit (GPU) setup represents a major capital expenditure, which is prohibitive for many. Furthermore, infrastructure deficits like unreliable internet and limited hardware, particularly in regions like Africa, severely hamper AI adoption (Read, 2025; Sangwa et al., 2025).

The proliferation of uncoordinated, piecemeal AI tools across different departments (e.g., academic affairs, student affairs) also creates significant inefficiencies. This

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

fragmentation leads to data silos, duplicate data entry, and inconsistent record-keeping, which undermines the potential benefits of AI and complicates holistic student support. A lack of interoperability between systems like the LMS, SIS, and advising platforms is a persistent challenge (Read, 2025).

There is also a significant lack of comprehensive frameworks and clear institutional policies for guiding AI use. In the absence of clear rules, faculty and staff are left to navigate complex ethical issues on their own. Many institutions have not yet established robust data governance, policies on academic integrity, or disclosure norms. This is compounded by a lack of adequate training for faculty, staff, and students on AI literacy and ethical use, which is necessary for responsible adoption (Dabis & Csáki, 2024; Kemigisha, 2025).

Finally, AI systems trained on biased data can perpetuate and amplify discrimination based on race, gender, and other protected characteristics. This exposes institutions to significant legal risks under state and national laws, which require transparency in evaluations and anti-discrimination statutes. The opaque nature of many AI algorithms makes it difficult to comply with these legal standards. Furthermore, the use of unauthorized "shadow AI" tools by employees fearing the competence penalty creates additional data security and compliance risks (Acar et al., 2025; Cole, 2024; Read, 2025).

Sociocultural and Reputational Barriers

Beyond institutional limitations, the social dynamics within an institution can significantly impede AI adoption, particularly through what one source identifies as the "competence penalty." Research shows that individuals who use AI are often perceived by their colleagues as less competent, even when their work is identical in quality to that of non-users. This competence penalty acts as a powerful deterrent, making faculty and staff hesitant to adopt AI tools for fear of professional and reputational damage. This penalty is more than twice as severe for women, who face a 13% reduction in perceived competence compared to 6% for men. This dynamic reflects a form of rational self-preservation that slows adoption (Acar et al., 2025).

The competence penalty disproportionately affects stereotyped groups, such as women in tech-heavy fields or older workers. Since non-adopters, who are often in the majority, tend to be the harshest critics, this creates an environment where those who might benefit most from AI feel they cannot risk using it. Instead of leveling the playing field, making AI more widely available can unintentionally increase bias (Acar et al., 2025).

Widespread adoption requires an environment of psychological safety where individuals can experiment with new tools without fear of judgment. In many institutions, influential skeptics and non-adopting senior colleagues can create a

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

climate where using AI is professionally risky, especially for junior staff or members of minority groups (Acar et al., 2025).

Across some of Australian colleagues' higher education institutions, there has often been confusion about GenAI adoption:

> "One of our execs said, 'I've asked three different people if I can use GenAI for this assignment and got three different answers.' That shows the lack of clarity and fuels uncertainty" (Interviewee 2, personal communication, October 23, 2025).

Sometimes there is a fear of job loss:

> "If we embrace this and roll it out across the organization, is anyone going to lose their job? We've had to reassure staff this is about maximizing limited resources, not cutting people" (Interviewee 2, personal communication, October 23, 2025).

Another recurring theme in interviews with colleagues was uneven adoption. It was mentioned that adjunct staff often miss training, leaving gaps in practice. Other staff and faculty hesitate to use AI, fearing a competence penalty if their AI use is disclosed. In some faculties, "particularly theology, the silence is striking when these should be the very spaces leading ethical reflection" (Interviewee 1, personal communication, October 22, 2025). These barriers are a reminder that adoption is not only technical but deeply cultural and even theological.

Theological and Ethical Barriers

Christian ethics, grounded in principles of human dignity, justice, and community, also presents foundational challenges to unchecked AI adoption. A primary concern is that AI could depersonalize education and undermine the relational aspects central to Christian pedagogy. Christian education emphasizes the teacher-student relationship for moral and spiritual formation. Over-reliance on AI risks reducing students to data points and weakening the authentic human connections that foster community and spiritual growth. There is a fear that AI cannot and should not replace the mentor's role in guiding students' moral and spiritual development (Kemigisha, 2025; Sugiri, 2024).

AI systems must be carefully designed to align with biblical values like compassion, empathy, and kindness. There is a risk that AI, driven by logic and data, may operate in ways that are misaligned with Christian morality. AI's integration must always be guided by theological reflection to ensure it supports, rather than diminishes, spiritual growth. This includes ensuring AI-delivered content does not promote ideologies that conflict with Christian theological traditions (Kemigisha, 2025; Sugiri, 2024; Zheng & Yu, 2024).

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

Christian ethics also stresses human responsibility and accountability; however, AI systems, particularly "black box" algorithms, complicate this by making decisions that are not easily explainable. This creates a dilemma: if an AI system makes a harmful decision (e.g., biased grading), it becomes unclear who is responsible. Obviously, AI itself cannot assume moral or legal accountability, but, especially within Christian institutions, there should be an emphasis on clear personal responsibility (Dabis & Csáki, 2024; Read, 2025; Sugiri, 2024; Zheng & Yu, 2024).

One leader stressed,

> Let's not think that AI has got [sic] any access to the Holy Spirit. It's a tool, and as long as we remember that, we'll be in a much safer spot than if we start to think of it as a friend. (Interviewee 1, personal communication, October 22, 2025)

Another reassured their staff that the goal was not job loss but supporting human-centered work. These reflections from higher education leaders highlight the Christian ethical frame: AI must never be idolized or allowed to devalue human dignity, but should serve relationships, truth, and accountability.

Overcoming Barriers

To overcome these barriers, Christian higher education institutions must develop intentional, mission-aligned strategies that prioritize theological reflection, foster psychological safety, invest in integrated systems, and establish clear, participatory governance.

A piecemeal, uncoordinated adoption of various AI tools across departments can create data silos, inefficiencies, and conflicting systems. To be effective, institutions should prioritize integrated platforms or middleware solutions that connect different systems, creating a unified data ecosystem that supports holistic student support and coherent administration (Read, 2025).

Administrative AI tools handle sensitive student data, creating risks related to privacy, bias, and legal compliance with regulators. AI systems may perpetuate biases in areas like housing assignments or career recommendations. Therefore, human oversight is paramount. Administrators must ensure transparency, audit algorithms for fairness, and maintain human involvement in final decision-making (Dabis & Csáki, 2024; Read, 2025).

For mission-driven institutions like liberal arts or Christian colleges, AI must be implemented in a way that supports core values like community, human dignity, and holistic development. The goal is to use AI to augment and enhance, not replace, the human-centered relationships that define these educational experiences. For example, AI-generated principles for a Christian college emphasized upholding

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

biblical principles and stewardship, while those for a progressive college focused on global citizenship and sustainability, showing how AI can be adapted to reflect specific institutional values (Read, 2025).

Foundational Theological and Ethical Principles for AI

Christian ethics, grounded in biblical teachings, offers a robust framework for evaluating AI technologies. Core principles include love, justice, compassion, and the inherent dignity of all individuals as created in the image of God (*New International Version*, 1978/2011, Genesis 1:26–27). These tenets provide a moral compass for integrating AI in a way that promotes human flourishing and aligns with a Christian worldview.

A proposed framework for Christian universities should be built on the following theological pillars (Read, 2025; Sugiri, 2024).

Upholding Human Dignity (Imago Dei). The belief that humans are created in God's image is central. AI should, therefore, serve, not undermine, human dignity. This means AI tools must not depersonalize education or reduce students to mere data points. Human oversight and responsibility are paramount, as AI systems can never replace ultimate human accountability.

Pursuit of Justice and Equity. Christian ethics calls for the protection of the vulnerable and marginalized. When implementing AI, universities must ensure that the technology does not exacerbate existing inequalities or create new ones. This involves auditing algorithms for biases that could unfairly discriminate against students based on race, gender, or socioeconomic status, ensuring equitable access and outcomes.

Responsible Stewardship. The principle of stewardship requires the wise and ethical management of all resources, including technology. AI should be used to enhance human flourishing and the common good, with careful consideration of its long-term societal and environmental impacts.

Fostering Community and Relationships. Christian education emphasizes the importance of community and the teacher-student relationship for moral and spiritual formation. AI should be used to strengthen these relational aspects, not create isolation. The goal is to use AI as a tool that complements and enhances human interaction, freeing educators to focus more on mentorship.

Commitment to Truth and Transparency. A Christian commitment to truth demands transparency in how AI systems operate and how data is used. Institutions must ensure that decision-making processes involving AI are explainable and that students' personal data is protected.

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

> This emphasis on transparency was evident in the intentions of those interviewed:
>
> We flagged to our board that the report was generated from our own data with the assistance of this tool and reviewed by staff. We stand behind the data because we personally used and verified it. I think you need statements like that — don't hide AI use. (Interviewee 1, personal communication, October 22, 2025)
>
> "We decided: don't demonize it, don't fear it. Bring it out of the shadows and make it an everyday part of work and teaching—transparently (Interviewee 2, personal communication, October 23, 2025).

A Proposed Framework for Evaluating and Piloting AI in Christian Universities

Drawing on these theological principles and practical governance, a phased framework is proposed for Christian universities to begin to ethically evaluate and pilot AI tools.

Phase 1: Foundational Policy and Ethical Alignment. The first phase should focus on establishing a strong ethical and policy foundation through collaborative dialogue.

- Create a task force comprising theologians, educators, administrators, IT staff, and student representatives. This ensures that diverse perspectives inform the governance process.
- The task force should draft guiding principles for AI use that explicitly connect to the university's Christian mission. These principles should address core values like human dignity, justice, and stewardship. For instance, a guiding principle might be: *We are dedicated to the ethical application of artificial intelligence and to ensuring its use upholds biblical principles, respects human dignity, and serves to advance Christlike character and stewardship*.
- Map the university's "penalty hotspots" where biases could be amplified, such as in admissions, student support, or evaluations. Simultaneously, identify administrative areas in academic and student affairs where AI can enhance efficiency without compromising core values, such as in scheduling, reporting, and workflow management.
- Based on the assessment, draft clear policies on data privacy, AI disclosure, and academic integrity. The policies should mandate transparency, requiring that any AI-generated content in administrative reports or student assessments be clearly identified and verified by a human. These initial drafts should be piloted in a limited number of departments to test their feasibility.

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

Phase 2: Capacity Building and Piloting. The second phase would center on education, training, and controlled implementation to ensure transparent and responsible use.

- Implement comprehensive training programs for faculty and staff on AI literacy, focusing on both the practical use of approved tools and the ethical principles established in Phase 1. This training should equip staff to critically evaluate AI outputs and guide students in responsible use.
- Select specific, low-risk administrative functions for piloting AI tools. For example, use AI to automate course scheduling, generate initial drafts of accreditation reports, or assist in grant discovery. In student affairs, pilot AI chatbots for routine inquiries or scheduling, while ensuring sensitive areas like mental-health triage remain under strict human oversight.
- Encourage open conversation about AI's benefits and risks. Identify and support respected faculty and staff, especially women and other underrepresented groups, to act as visible role models for ethical AI adoption. This helps create psychological safety and reduces the competence penalty, where individuals fear being judged for using AI.
- Ensure that all communication regarding AI pilots is transparent. For instance, course syllabi must clearly state the instructor's policy on AI use, using a multi-level framework (e.g., prohibited, use-with-permission, full use with attribution) to provide clarity for students.

Phase 3: Evaluation, Adaptation, and Scaling. The final phase should be dedicated to assessing the impact of the pilots and refining the governance framework for broader, ethical implementation.

- Systematically evaluate the pilots against predefined key performance indicators (KPIs) and the university's ethical principles. This includes measuring efficiency gains (e.g., reduction in feedback time) and auditing for unintended biases or harms (allocative, representational, or procedural).
- Redesign evaluation processes to focus on outcomes rather than methods. For example, shift performance reviews from subjective competence ratings to objective metrics. In academic contexts, this may involve moving toward assessments like oral presentations or in-class projects that are less susceptible to AI misuse.
- Address the challenge of fragmented, uncoordinated AI tools by investing in integrated platforms or middleware solutions that connect disparate systems (e.g., linking retention data with career services). Crucially, ensure that all systems are designed with a "human-in-the-loop," where AI serves as an assistant to augment, not replace, human judgment and relationships.
- Based on audit results and community feedback, refine the AI policies and strategically scale successful pilots. The governance framework should

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

remain adaptive, with regular reviews to address the rapid evolution of AI technology and its ongoing alignment with the university's Christian mission.
- By adopting this phased, theologically informed framework, Christian universities can navigate the complexities of AI, harnessing its potential to enhance their mission while proactively mitigating ethical risks and fostering a community where technology serves to promote human flourishing.

Navigating the Impact for Greater Flourishing

To ensure AI serves human flourishing, this article, based on research and phenomenological insights, advocates for a balanced and intentional approach that prioritizes human values. This includes:

- **Developing "safe AI":** Instead of developing AI and then attempting to constrain it, the focus should be on building systems that are deemed beneficial from the start.
- **Steering innovation:** AI innovation should be directed toward efficiency-amplifying applications to promote shared prosperity and mitigate job displacement.
- **Inclusive governance:** A broad range of stakeholders should be involved to ensure that diverse perspectives and needs are considered.
- **Human-centered and theologically informed integration:** In all contexts, but especially in mission-driven ones like Christian education, AI should be a tool that augments, rather than replaces, human judgment, relationships, and oversight. Integrating Christian principles, such as compassion, justice, and stewardship, can provide a moral compass for AI's application.

As colleagues discussed when interviewed, Christian universities must keep AI in its proper place. It is a tool that can serve, but never replace, human judgment or the Holy Spirit's guidance. Staff highlighted the need for transparency, accountability, and explicit assurance that AI will not undermine dignity or jobs but support relational outcomes. Perhaps most importantly, they emphasized that one should not demonize or fear AI, but bring it out of the shadows, engaging openly and ethically so that it strengthens, rather than weakens, our shared mission of faithful stewardship and human flourishing.[1]

About the Author

Elizabeth Beech holds a PhD from Regent University (VA) in Organizational Leadership as well as a Master of Theological Studies from Southwestern Baptist

[1] This report used AI-assisted tools, including NotebookLM (Google, 2024), Elicit (Ought, 2025), and ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2025), to compare over 50 academic sources and support the organization, summarization, and drafting of research materials; all analysis and conclusions are the author's own.

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

Theological Seminary, and degrees from Asbury University (B.A.) and Azusa Pacific University (M.A.).

Dr. Beech returned to Australia in 2022 after establishing a new graduate program in organizational leadership at Toccoa Falls College in northeast Georgia, USA. She was recently the director of graduate studies in the School of Education at Alphacrucis University College in Parramatta (Sydney), New South Wales and is currently serving as the senior officer, University Governance and Risk at Avondale University in Cooranbong, New South Wales.

For several years, Dr. Beech was the academic dean of the National Institute for Christian Education (NICE) in New South Wales, Australia, which is the postgraduate (Master of Education and Master of Education [Leadership]) arm of an association of Christian schools, focusing on transformative worldview education related to teaching, curriculum, administrative leadership, and school governance throughout Australia and beyond. Dr. Beech served in various roles at the Universidad Evangelica Boliviana, participating in teaching and university administration as well as mission projects in Bolivia, South America for over 20 years. She oversaw international and multicultural programs at Palm Beach Atlantic University, Florida, USA, before her initial move to Australia.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Dr. Elizabeth Beech, beth@lifeworldeducation.com

References

Acar, O. A., Gai, P. J., Tu, Y., & Hou, J. (2025, August 1). Research: The hidden penalty of using AI at work. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2025/08/research-the-hidden-penalty-of-using-ai-at-work

Brawley, S., & Byers, M. (2025, August 22). The end of strategy as usual: Universities and AI's disruption. *Future Campus*. https://futurecampus.com.au/2025/08/22/the-end-of-strategy-as-usual-universities-and-ais-disruption/

Burgess, M. (2025, May 26). Universities say they're preparing students for the future—they're not. *Australian Financial Review*. https://www.afr.com/work-and-careers/education/universities-say-they-re-preparing-students-for-the-future-they-re-not-20250523-p5m1l9

Cole, J. A. (2024). Using AI in recruiting: Ethical and practical considerations. *Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings*,21–28. Regent University School of Business & Leadership. https://cdn.regent.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Regent-Research-Roundtables-2024-AI-and-Machine-Learning-Cole.pdf

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X

Dabis, A., & Csáki, C. (2024). AI and ethics: Investigating the first policy responses of higher education institutions to the challenge of generative AI. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*, 1006. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03526-z

Google. (2024). *NotebookLM* [Large language model research tool]. https://notebooklm.google

Kemigisha, S. (2025). Navigating the intersection of faith and technology: A Christian perspective on artificial intelligence. *Applied Sciences Research Periodicals*, *3*(3), 991–1008. https://doi.org/10.63002/asrp.303.991

Lam, M. L. (2024). AI facilitates or impedes human flourishing. *Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings*, 1–20. Regent University School of Business & Leadership. https://cdn.regent.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Regent-Research-Roundtables-2024-AI-and-Machine-Learning-Lam.pdf

New International Version. (2011). Zondervan. (Original work published 1978)

OpenAI. (2025). *ChatGPT* (Sept 26 version) [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com

Ought. (2025). *Elicit* [AI research assistant]. https://elicit.org

Read, I. (2025). Balancing innovation and integrity: AI integration in liberal arts college administration. *arXiv*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.05747

Sangwa, S., Nsabiyumva, S., Ngobi, D., & Mutabazi, P. (2025, June 30). Ethical AI integration in African higher education: Enhancing research supervision, grant discovery, and proposal writing without compromising academic integrity. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5331595

Schuurman, D. C. (2019). Artificial Intelligence: Discerning a Christian response. *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith*, *71*(2), 75–82.

Sugiri, W. (2024). Moral dimensions of artificial intelligence: A Christian ethical perspective on its impact on education. *MODERATE: Journal of Religious, Education, and Social*, *1*(2), 117–136. https://doi.org/10.46362/moderate.v1i2.8

Zheng, C., & Yu, H. (2024). Correlation of Christian ethics and developments in artificial intelligence. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management, 36*(7), 1635–1645, https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2022.2106422

2025 Regent Research Roundtables Proceedings pp. 26-40

ISSN 2993-589X