

FACULTY SURVEY

Bridging the AI Skills Gap: Perspectives from Academia

AI Academy: Katie Xiong · Nicholas Huggins · Sean Hanrahan · Annaliese Thomas · Shahzada Ayan

BUSI 150 · Spring 2026 · Submitted to Dr. Chong Huang

This survey is part of a research project exploring how well university curricula align with what industry needs, and how AI tools are being used and managed in teaching. There are no right or wrong answers. Your honest experience and professional opinion is what matters.

Your responses are completely anonymous and will only be reported in aggregate. This survey has been reviewed by the University of the Pacific IRB, protocol IRB2026-70, exempt. Participation is voluntary.

Estimated time: approximately 7 to 8 minutes

Questions: 22 plus 1 optional

SECTION A · BACKGROUND AND TEACHING CONTEXT

These three questions help us understand who is responding and enable subgroup comparisons. Under one minute.

Q1. What is your primary discipline?

Please select the option that best fits.

- Accounting
- Finance
- Marketing
- Operations / Supply Chain
- Strategy / Entrepreneurship
- Management Information Systems (MIS)
- Economics
- Computer Science / IT
- Engineering
- Other (please specify below)

Q1 (Other). If you selected “Other”, please specify your discipline.

Q2. How many years have you been teaching in higher education?

- 0 to 4 years
- 5 to 10 years
- 11 to 20 years
- 21 or more years

Q3. Which level or levels do you primarily teach?

- Undergraduate only
- Postgraduate / Graduate only
- Both undergraduate and postgraduate
- Executive / MBA / Professional programs

SECTION B · SKILLS, CURRICULUM AND INDUSTRY ALIGNMENT

This section identifies where graduates fall short of employer expectations. The IPA grid at Q4 is the headline analytical instrument of the study.

Q4a. IMPORTANCE. For each skill area, rate how important it is for graduates in your field.

Q4, part 1 of 2. 1 = Not important at all → 5 = Essential

Q4b. PREPAREDNESS. For each skill area, rate how well prepared your graduates currently are.

Q4, part 2 of 2. 1 = Very underprepared → 5 = Very well prepared. These are the same skills as Q4a. Together, Q4a and Q4b form the Importance–Performance Analysis.

	IMPORTANCE					PREPAREDNESS				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Critical thinking and problem solving	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Technical / discipline-specific expertise	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
AI literacy (understanding AI concepts, risks, and responsible use)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ethical reasoning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Quantitative or analytical reasoning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Written and oral communication	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Applied AI and digital skills (using AI tools effectively for business tasks)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Research and inquiry methods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Team collaboration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q5. Based on your understanding, how well aligned is your programme with the skills you believe employers expect from graduates?

Not at all aligned 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely well aligned
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Q6a. Which THREE skill areas do you believe show the largest gaps between graduate capabilities and employer expectations?

Select exactly 3 options.

- ☐ Critical thinking and problem solving
- ☐ Technical / discipline-specific expertise
- ☐ AI literacy (understanding AI concepts, risks, and responsible use)
- ☐ Ethical reasoning
- ☐ Quantitative or analytical reasoning
- ☐ Written and oral communication
- ☐ Applied AI and digital skills (using AI tools effectively for business tasks)
- ☐ Research and inquiry methods
- ☐ Team collaboration

Q6b. Briefly explain why you selected those three areas. (Optional)

Approximately 80 words. You may skip this question.

Q7. Have you engaged with industry to inform your curriculum in the past 3 years?

For example advisory boards, employer meetings, professional bodies.

- ☐ Yes, actively
- ☐ Yes, occasionally
- ☐ No, but I plan to
- ☐ No, and I have no plans to

Q8. To what extent does your institution emphasise aligning the curriculum with how AI is used in business practice?

For example marketing analytics, financial modelling, operations automation, HR tools, strategy.

No emphasis at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very strong emphasis
	○	○	○	○	○	

SECTION C · AI IN TEACHING, ETHICS AND GOVERNANCE

This section first asks about your personal AI adoption, then how students engage with AI in your courses, and finally your institution's governance approach.

Q9. How often do you personally use AI tools for teaching, assessment, or course preparation?

For example ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, Google Gemini, Claude.

- Never
- Occasionally (a few times per term)
- Frequently (about weekly)
- Very often (multiple times per week)
- Daily or almost daily

skip to Q11

Q10. For what purposes do you mainly use AI tools in your academic work?

Select all that apply.

- ☐ Generating or editing teaching materials (e.g., slides, readings, exercises)
- ☐ Developing assessments, rubrics, or exam questions
- ☐ Providing feedback or personalised explanations to students
- ☐ Administrative tasks (e.g., drafting emails, reports, meeting summaries)
- ☐ Research-related tasks (e.g., literature scanning, drafting, data analysis)
- ☐ Marking or grading support
- ☐ Professional development or self-learning about AI
- ☐ I do not currently use AI tools

Q11. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about AI tools in your teaching?

Rate 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). If you do not use AI tools, answer based on what you would expect.

Strongly disagree						Strongly agree
	1	2	3	4	5	
(a) AI tools make my teaching more effective.	○	○	○	○	○	
(b) Using AI in my academic work saves me meaningful time.	○	○	○	○	○	
(c) I find AI tools easy enough to use without specialised training.	○	○	○	○	○	
(d) My colleagues in my department are increasingly using AI tools.	○	○	○	○	○	
(e) My institution actively encourages responsible AI use in teaching.	○	○	○	○	○	
(f) I feel confident I can use AI tools effectively and ethically.	○	○	○	○	○	

Q12. Overall, how would you describe your attitude toward using AI tools in your own academic work?

- Very positive. I actively embrace and advocate for AI use
- Cautiously positive. I see benefits but proceed carefully
- Neutral. I neither embrace nor avoid AI tools
- Cautiously negative. I have significant reservations
- Very negative. I avoid AI tools and am concerned about their broader impact

Q13. In your courses, how often do students engage with AI tools as part of learning activities or assignments?

- Never. AI tools are not permitted or used in my courses skip to Q15
- Rarely. Permitted but students seldom use them
- Occasionally. Used for specific tasks or assignments
- Frequently. Integrated into many learning activities
- Very often. A core part of how students learn and produce work

Q14. For what purposes do students mainly use AI tools in your courses?

Select all that apply.

- ☐ Improving readability and refining written work
- ☐ Brainstorming and generating ideas
- ☐ Data analysis, coding, or simulations
- ☐ Searching sources and conducting literature review
- ☐ Creating visuals, presentations, or summaries
- ☐ Learning, understanding, or self-tutoring with AI
- ☐ Completing assessments (essays, reports, problem sets)
- ☐ Not allowed to use AI in my courses
- ☐ Not sure. I cannot observe how students use AI outside class

Q15. Based on your experience, how much do you agree with the following statements about student learning?

Rate 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

Strongly disagree	Strongly agree				
	1	2	3	4	5
(a) AI use is helping my students achieve stronger learning outcomes.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(b) AI use is helping my students develop practical, job-ready skills.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(c) AI use is reducing students' ability to think independently.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(d) AI use is weakening students' critical thinking and problem-solving skills over time.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(e) My students are well prepared to use AI ethically and responsibly.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q16. How concerned are you about each of the following AI-related risks in your teaching context?

Rate 1 (Not at all concerned) to 5 (Extremely concerned).

Not at all concerned	Extremely concerned				
	1	2	3	4	5
(a) Difficulty distinguishing student-authored work from AI-generated submissions (academic integrity)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(b) Students becoming over-reliant on AI and losing core skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(c) Misinformation or AI "hallucinations" in student work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(d) AI systems amplifying social biases	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(e) Surveillance and privacy risks from AI tools	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(f) AI widening inequalities among students (digital divide, access gaps)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(g) Reduced social connection or wellbeing in AI-mediated learning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q17. How important is it to address ethical and responsible AI use within your courses or programme?

Not important at all	1	2	3	4	5	Essential, core curriculum element
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Q18. How would you describe your institution’s current guidelines or policies on AI use in teaching and assessment?

- Clear, comprehensive, and useful
- Exist but need clarification or significant revision
- Currently being developed
- No formal guidelines or policies exist
- I am not aware of whether guidelines exist

Q19. How much do you trust your institution’s AI governance approach to protect against risks and support responsible AI use?

If you answered “I am not aware of whether guidelines exist” at Q18, please select “Cannot assess”.

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 Completely

◦ ◦ ◦ ◦ ◦

- Cannot assess. I am unaware of my institution’s governance approach

SECTION D · LOOKING AHEAD

These final questions ask where you think AI in education is heading over the next few years.

Q20. Should AI literacy be required for all students before graduation, regardless of their discipline?

AI literacy means understanding AI’s capabilities, limitations, ethical risks, and responsible use.

- Yes. It should be a mandatory graduation requirement for all students
- Yes. But as a strongly recommended element, not mandatory
- No. It should remain discipline-specific or optional
- Unsure

Q21. Over the next five years, what impact do you expect AI to have on student learning outcomes in your field?

- Very positive. Significant and measurable improvement in student learning and graduate readiness
- Somewhat positive. Modest net benefits with manageable risks
- No significant impact expected
- Somewhat negative. Risks outweigh benefits, gradual erosion of core skills
- Very negative. Substantial harm to learning and graduate quality
- Too early to say

Q22. If you could make one change to your curriculum to better prepare students for an AI-influenced workplace, what would it be?

Please keep your answer to around 150 words.

Q22b. Any additional thoughts on AI in your teaching context, or on the relationship between academia and industry? (Optional)

You may skip this question. Approximately 200 words maximum.

Thank you for completing this survey. Results are reported in aggregate.

HOW THESE ITEMS WERE USED

From the methods section of the manuscript. Not shown to respondents.

Q4a and Q4b are the paired importance–preparedness battery behind the Importance–Performance Analysis and its paired-samples comparison.

Q5 is the dependent variable in the three-predictor regression, which accounted for 38.5% of variance using the AI Benefit Index, AI use frequency, and industry engagement as predictors.

Q16 forms the seven-item Risk/Concern Index, Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.937$. The manuscript notes this magnitude can indicate either strong internal consistency or item redundancy, and inspects the items separately for that reason.

Q12 is a single-item measure and one of three standardised inputs to the descriptive k -means partition, alongside the AI Benefit and Risk/Concern indices.

Three two-item composites are named in the manuscript, the AI Benefit Index, the Subjective Norms index, and the Governance Clarity index, with Spearman–Brown coefficients of 0.881, 0.758 and 0.724. The manuscript does not specify which items constitute each, so they are not assigned here.

The instrument was developed from a structured synthesis of eighteen source articles, coded for constructs and measurement implications and consolidated into eight thematic domains. It was refined from an initial twenty-question version to the final twenty-two.

Fielded February to March 2026 to a 1,021-member frame of editorial board members at ABDC A and A*-ranked business and management journals. 170 complete responses, 16.7% response rate.