

AI Audiovisual Literacy (AIAL): Reshaping Film Education in the Era of Generative AI and Text-to-Video Technologies

Zhiqiang Sui, School of Journalism and Communication, Shandong Normal University, Shandong Province, China, Specializes in Film Theory and Film History research. Email address: zhiqiangsui26@gmail.com

Abstract

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into film production is reshaping the cinematic landscape, prompting a reimagining of film education. AI technologies, particularly text-to-video generative AI, have revolutionized content creation, allowing for the automatic generation of visual and audio elements from written prompts. This paper introduces AI Audiovisual Literacy (AIAL) as a pedagogical framework that equips film students with the skills to critically engage with AI tools and their creative outputs. AIAL extends traditional media literacy by incorporating AI's ethical, creative, and technical dimensions. It advocates for a shift in curriculum and teaching practices to foster an understanding of AI's role in film creation, emphasizing critical thinking, creativity, and ethical reflection. The paper explores AIAL's application in film education, examining how it addresses machine-assisted creativity, posthuman authorship, and the evolving concept of cinematic temporality. It also considers institutional strategies for integrating AIAL, including curriculum redesign, faculty development, and ethical guidelines. By adopting AIAL, film schools can empower students to navigate AI technologies as collaborators, ensuring they are prepared for a future where human creativity and AI coexist and complement each other in storytelling.

Keywords

AI Audiovisual Literacy, film education, curriculum redesign, critical media literacy

Introduction

In recent years, artificial intelligence has moved from the periphery of film production to its very center, prompting urgent questions for educators. The year 2023 marked a turning point: Hollywood was rocked by strikes, as writers and actors protested the encroachment of AI in scriptwriting and performance. Their concerns highlighted a reality that film students and educators must now confront – AI is no longer a speculative theme within science fiction cinema, but a practical tool and disruptor within the filmmaking process. From AI-driven editing software to algorithms that

can generate entire scenes, the cinematic arts are experiencing a digital revolution. Notably, text-to-video AI systems have emerged that can transform written prompts directly into video content, granting creators an unprecedented ability of “scriptwriting, visual and audio generation, and editing” (Torin 2025).

Within film and media education, these technological advances call for a fundamental rethinking of curriculum and pedagogy. Traditionally, film programs have taught students to read film (through analysis of narrative, *mise-en-scène*, editing, etc.) and to create film using cameras, lights, and editing suites. Now, students must also learn to critically read AI-generated images and to create with AI as a collaborator. Scholars and educators are beginning to articulate frameworks for this new literacy. One promising model is AI Audiovisual Literacy (AIAL), introduced by Farinacci as “a new model for integrating AI into media and audiovisual education” (Farinacci 2024) designed to bridge our understanding of AI with established film education approaches. AIAL emerges from the recognition that while core principles of media literacy – critical thinking, creativity, understanding of form and context – remain vital, they must be extended to address the specific challenges and opportunities presented by AI. As Farinacci argues, AI’s integration into media “prompts a necessary reevaluation of human cultural and artistic legacies” (Farinacci 2024) and demands teaching strategies that confront AI mechanisms, biases, and the political economy of technology.

The significance of this moment has been likened to previous great shifts in communication technology. “Generative AI art is completely different from previous computer art in terms of ontology, and we have to admit that the AIGC revolution, even in the whole history of art, is a revolutionary invention no less than 19th-century photography or 16th-century perspective” (Han 20). Kalantzis and Cope suggest that generative AI represents a milestone in human meaning-making as momentous as the invention of the printing press (Kalantzis 2025). The rise of AIGC requires new literacies in the 21st. In this paper, we explore AIAL as a comprehensive framework for such literacy in film and television education. The discussion is structured into thematic sections: first, we define AIAL and discuss why it is especially relevant in the context of text-to-video AIGC. We then examine how AIAL points to pedagogical shifts, requiring changes in teaching practice and curriculum design. Next, we discuss machine-assisted creativity and posthuman authorship, investigating how creative roles and notions of the author shift when AI is in the mix. We proceed to cinematic temporality, considering how AI-generated content alters our conception of time in both the creation and experience of cinema. We then address the ontology of AI-generated images – what it means for an image to be “real” or “authentic” when

it's produced by an algorithm – and the related epistemological concerns about knowledge, truth, and critical media literacy in the age of AI. A newly added section discusses how institutions can implement AIAL, including policy implications for film schools and universities. Finally, the conclusion synthesizes these discussions, reinforcing the imperative for film education to actively shape an AI-informed future of storytelling rather than passively react to it.

By engaging with academic literature, case studies, and theoretical perspectives, we aim to demonstrate that AIAL is not just a buzzword but a necessary evolution of film and media literacy. In a world where a student can input a script idea into a generative model and receive a fully rendered scene in minutes, educators must ensure that the next generation of filmmakers and audiences are equipped to question, interpret, and creatively leverage such capabilities. This paper offers an expanded view of how that can be achieved.

Defining AIAL and its Relevance to Text-to-Video AIGC

Artificial Intelligence Audiovisual Literacy (AIAL) is a pedagogical framework that integrates AI awareness and competencies into the traditional domains of film and media education. In essence, AIAL seeks to broaden audiovisual literacy – the ability to critically understand and create film/television content – by incorporating the technological, ethical, and creative dimensions introduced by AI. Farinacci defines the AIAL framework as an attempt to “capture the complexity of media and audiovisual education in the face of AI’s systemic innovation” (Farinacci 2024) combining classical film education approaches with new parameters specific to AI. Concretely, AIAL builds upon three established orientations in media education: educating “about” media (focusing on form, aesthetics, and representation), educating “with” media (using media as a tool for learning and expression), and educating “for” media (preparing students for production roles and industry contexts). AIAL infuses each of these orientations with critical questions related to AI. For example, when educating “about” media, AIAL asks how AI-generated films adhere to or deviate from traditional aesthetics – “Are AI-generated films/audiovisuals considered creative? Do they primarily remix existing material, or do they demonstrate innovation?”(Farinacci 2024). When educating “with” media, it prompts examination of AI’s influence on the creative process – “Is AI changing the languages and techniques used in film representations? Are AI productions homogenizing creativity?”(Farinacci 2024). And in educating “for” media, it expands professional preparation with questions of prediction and bias – “Are AI-driven prediction

software changing the types of films being produced? Can AI tools encourage a more diverse and equitable film industry?”(Farinacci 2024).

AIAL’s relevance to text-to-video AIGC is particularly pronounced. Text-to-video models like Runway Gen-2 have made it possible to generate short films or video sequences directly from written descriptions. In practical terms, this means students and amateurs can create storyboarded scenes or experimental visuals without a camera, simply by engineering the right prompt. While this democratizes content creation, it also amplifies the need for literacy: without guidance, learners might use such tools uncritically, unaware of the biases in the training data or the legal/ethical issues of generated content. AIAL provides that guidance by framing text-to-video AIGC within critical questions. For instance, AIAL’s aesthetic dimension encourages students to ask whether an AI-generated video truly introduces new creative expressions or merely recombines tropes from its dataset. Early examples have shown that AIGC often works by pastiche – a recent AI-created trailer for *The Lord of the Rings* in the style of Wes Anderson circulated online, astonishing viewers with its whimsy and symmetry, yet on inspection it was “cast” by ChatGPT and visualized through Midjourney, drawing heavily on Anderson’s established aesthetic signatures. Such a case vividly illustrates AIAL’s importance: students should be able to deconstruct why the AI trailer feels recognizable (it distilled an auteur’s trademarks), and debate whether this constitutes creative homage, algorithmic mimicry, or even cultural appropriation. The framework’s critical and ethical dimensions push learners to consider questions of bias and representation in AIGC as well. As Farinacci notes, an AI’s outputs are only as diverse as its inputs – currently, many generative models are trained on predominantly Western data, raising concerns that they “primarily consist of remixes” that could perpetuate cultural stereotypes. AIAL asks: “Do the filmic representations generated by AI adequately reflect diversity and show sensitivity to cultural distinctions? Are these representations mindful of cultural difference or biased?”(Farinacci 2024). These questions are crucial when using text-to-video AI, which might, for example, default to Eurocentric settings or male protagonists unless explicitly prompted otherwise.

In defining AIAL, it is also useful to position it relative to broader discussions of AI literacy. Educational theorists Kalantzis and Cope emphasize that literacy in the AI era is not just about technical skill but about understanding how meaning is made with AI and developing a “critical AI literacy”(Kalantzis 2025) . AIAL can be seen as a domain-specific application of AI literacy to the audiovisual field. It aligns with David Buckingham’s call for a media education approach to AI – one that encourages critical inquiry rather than techno-utopian adoption. Buckingham argues that educators

should treat AI as an opportunity to deepen critical media literacy, examining how AI reshapes issues of power, representation, and identity (Buckingham 2022). The AIAL framework operationalizes this by embedding those critical considerations into day-to-day film education practice.

In summary, by defining AIAL and situating it in the context of text-to-video AIGC, we set the stage for examining how this framework prompts significant pedagogical and theoretical shifts, which the following sections will explore.

AIAL and Pedagogical Shifts

Implementing AIAL in film and television education entails significant changes in pedagogy. The traditional film school paradigm – where students learn by doing (shooting, lighting, editing) and by analyzing classic works – is being upended by the introduction of AI tools that can do many of these tasks autonomously or semi-autonomously. Educators thus face a dual challenge: integrating new technological competencies (like prompt engineering, AI-based editing, and data literacy) while also rethinking teaching methods to maintain a focus on critical thinking and creativity. A key insight of AIAL is that simply grafting AI training onto existing curricula is not enough; a more fundamental shift is required in how we teach and what we expect students to learn.

One major shift is the need to emphasize process and experimentation over fixed outcomes. AI tools often operate on principles of trial-and-error – for instance, a student might iterate a prompt several times to get a desired image or tweak parameters to refine a video effect. This iterative, somewhat stochastic creative process differs from the more linear workflows of traditional filmmaking. Farinacci observes that the incorporation of AI “introduces a paradigm shift in the laboratory and experimental aspects [of education], highlighting the importance of proficiency in devising effective prompts and programming, rather than solely relying on creative authorship” (Farinacci 2024). In practice, this means instructors should encourage students to treat AI as a collaborator with which they must co-create through experimentation. Class assignments might shift from static tasks (e.g., “shoot and edit a 3-minute scene”) to dynamic ones (e.g., “use an AI tool to generate visuals for a 3-minute scene, then refine and critique the results”). The evaluation criteria also shift, rewarding the process – how thoughtfully and creatively students engage with the AI – not just the end product.

This ties to the broader pedagogical movement from a content delivery model to a learning paradigm, where the focus is on student engagement and discovery. Monserrat and Srnc̃ec’s classroom research found that students initially approached AI

tools with anxiety and misconceptions, requiring instructors to reframe the learning environment. The activity they introduced was explicitly framed within a “learning paradigm, where students were informed that participation, not success, was the goal – and that mistakes would not be penalized” (Monserrat 2025). This approach helped alleviate the fear of failure and encouraged students to play with AI tools more freely. Notably, Monserrat et al. report that many students greatly underestimated the time and effort needed for creative work with AI, assuming tasks could be completed almost instantaneously. Such attitudes reflect the “cultural shift toward immediacy” in the digital age, likely reinforced by AI tools that promise quick results. The pedagogical response, as AIAL suggests, is to explicitly teach persistence and iterative development. Educators might, for example, require students to document multiple drafts of an AI-generated project to show how it evolved, thereby underscoring that meaningful creative outcomes still demand time, revision, and critical feedback – even when using AI. By “embracing failure – repeatedly – and helping students manage the frustration that inevitably accompanies creative growth” (Monserrat 2025), teachers can counteract the false impression that AI’s efficiency replaces the need for diligent practice.

Film education is also beginning to reflect these pedagogical shifts at an institutional level. Several leading programs have started pilot courses focused on AI in filmmaking, providing models for AIAL-oriented teaching. Chapman University, for example, offered an experimental course titled “AI: Pioneering the Future of Entertainment” that exposed students to AI applications across the filmmaking process. Students responded positively, gaining skills valued by employers, but importantly the course also fostered an analytical understanding of AI’s role. Loyola Marymount University (LMU) is launching a course on “Producing and Screenwriting with AI,” explicitly balancing practical experimentation with ethical and artistic inquiry (Pixela 2024). The instructor, Justin Trevor Winters, raises questions about cheating and the “essence of creativity” in the context of AI assistance – precisely the kind of reflective dialogue AIAL encourages in the classroom. Meanwhile, the University of Southern California’s School of Cinematic Arts is investing in an AI lab to stimulate interdisciplinary collaboration (film students working with computer scientists and ethicists), signaling that the future of film pedagogy lies in cross-pollination of fields. These developments show that the pedagogical landscape is shifting from treating AI as an external topic (perhaps discussed in a media theory class) to embedding it in the fabric of practical film training and scholarly inquiry.

In implementing AIAL, educators should also be guided by research in general education about AI. Kalantzis and Cope stress an approach they term “cyber-social

learning,” where AI is used not to replace human thought but to augment a feedback loop between learner and machine (Kalantzis 2024). Applied to film education, this suggests pedagogies where students use AI as a kind of intellectual partner. For example, students might use an AI editing assistant to assemble a rough cut of footage, then evaluate and refine it by applying human judgment – treating the AI’s output as a “Socratic opponent” or “possibility engine”(Sharpley, 2023: 3–5) that challenges them to think deeper about their editing choices. Such pedagogical designs align with AIAL by cultivating an environment in which human creativity and AI interactivity are in constant “interaction and dialogue”(Niels 2021).

Institutional Implementation and Policy Implications

Adopting AI Audiovisual Literacy as a formal pedagogical framework in higher education film programs is not a trivial add-on; it requires deliberate strategy, resource allocation, and policy development at the institutional level. As AI becomes woven into the fabric of film production and creative media, universities and film schools must proactively update their curricula, train faculty, and possibly even redefine certain educational policies to ensure that AIAL principles are effectively integrated. In this section, we discuss practical strategies for institutions and the broader policy implications of embracing AIAL in film and media education.

Curriculum and Program Development: The most immediate step is curriculum redesign. Film programs should introduce dedicated modules or courses on AI in media production – not as isolated electives but as integral parts of the course sequence. Leading institutions are already moving in this direction. For example, Loyola Marymount University’s School of Film and Television has begun offering a course titled “Producing and Screenwriting with AI” signaling recognition that writing and producing can no longer be taught without including AI tools and their ramifications. The University of Southern California (USC) has gone further by investing \$10 million to establish an AI Institute within their cinematic arts school, aimed at fostering interdisciplinary collaboration across film, journalism, gaming, and other domains. This indicates a policy of embedding AI research and pedagogy at the heart of the institution. Such initiatives provide models for others: a film school might establish an “AI and Creative Media Lab” where students from different tracks (production, animation, screenwriting, etc.) work with computer science or design students on AI-related projects. This breaks down silos and prepares students for real-world environments where collaboration with technologists is common.

When revamping curricula, it’s essential to balance technical, theoretical, and ethical components. Holly Willis of USC emphasizes that “teaching AI does not mean

promoting it” uncritically; the aim is to produce “future leaders who will influence industry practices and regulations”, which entails a strong grounding in ethics and critical thinking. Program learning outcomes might explicitly state that graduates will be able to not only use AI tools in content creation but also articulate the ethical considerations and engage in shaping the discourse around AI in the industry. This could be enforced by requiring capstone projects or theses on AI-related topics, or by integrating questions of AI into comprehensive exams or portfolio reviews. For instance, a directing student’s final project could come with a reflection paper on how AI was used and what creative or ethical decisions it prompted. Policy-wise, departments may formalize such requirements to ensure consistency and depth of engagement with AI across all students.

Faculty Training and Support: The successful implementation of AIAL depends on instructors who are themselves comfortable with AI tools and conversant in the surrounding issues. Institutions should invest in faculty development programs – workshops, sabbaticals, or partnerships – to upskill their educators. This could include inviting AI experts to give crash courses to film faculty, or sending faculty to interdisciplinary conferences on AI and education. Monserrat and Srnec highlight that without institutional support for instructors, integration of AI can falter and even exacerbate inequalities (with some teachers forging ahead and others lagging). Policies might therefore allocate specific funding or time for faculty to experiment with AI in their pedagogy. For example, a university could offer internal grants for course innovation, encouraging teachers to redesign a syllabus to incorporate AIAL principles (perhaps funding a graduate assistant to help implement new tech in class). Additionally, hiring policies might evolve: film programs might seek new hires with dual expertise in media production and data science or AI, or at least include literacy in digital tools as a desired qualification.

Another crucial aspect is providing forums for faculty to share best practices. Early adopters can mentor others. A policy could be instituted where any faculty member who attends an AI workshop presents a colloquium to the department afterwards, creating a multiplier effect. Over time, building an internal community of practice around AIAL will help sustain momentum and keep the curriculum current as technology evolves.

Resource Allocation and Infrastructure: Embracing AIAL has financial and infrastructural implications. AI tools, especially cutting-edge ones for video generation or machine learning, may require significant computing power or paid licenses. Institutions must plan for these costs – whether through budgeting for software subscriptions (Runway, Adobe’s AI offerings, etc.), investing in on-premise

hardware like GPU servers for rendering AI content, or ensuring robust cloud computing access for students. Equity considerations are paramount: all students should have access to these tools, not just those who can afford personal subscriptions or high-end computers. This might mean equipping computer labs with the necessary software and hardware, and allowing remote access when possible (especially important in the context of any hybrid or remote learning scenarios). Some universities might strike deals with AI service providers for educational licenses, which is a policy negotiation at the administrative level.

Institutions also need to update their technical support and library resources to include AI. For instance, the campus library could curate a repository of AI-ready media datasets or host workshops on data literacy for film students, complementing classroom activities. IT departments might need new protocols to handle the large datasets or storage needs that come with AI media projects.

Ethical Guidelines and Academic Policy: With students and faculty increasingly engaging in AI-generated content creation, universities should establish clear guidelines on ethical and acceptable use. This touches multiple areas: academic integrity, intellectual property, consent, and representation. For example, if a student uses AI to generate a piece of a film (say, a realistic image of a person or a voice-over), how should that be credited? Many institutions have started updating their academic integrity policies to address AI (initially in the context of AI text generators like GPT for essays). Film schools similarly should craft policies stating when and how AI assistance should be acknowledged in student work. Perhaps a policy might require a disclosure section in project credits detailing AI contributions (e.g., “This film used AI software X for Y purpose”). Such transparency not only habituates students to ethical practice but also dovetails with industry conversations – indeed, attribution of AI work is a hot topic in media circles.

Another ethical aspect is content usage and data consent. If students feed data (like images of people) into AI systems, are they aware of the privacy and consent implications? A policy could explicitly forbid using private or sensitive images for AI projects without consent, akin to rules about filming people. Or consider training an AI on a corpus of films: are there copyright issues? Institutions might consult with legal advisors to create guidelines so that in teaching AIAL, they don’t inadvertently lead students to infringe on intellectual property rights. Some universities may opt to use only open-source or ethically sourced datasets for classroom AI activities, as a matter of policy aligning with academic values of respect for creators’ rights and cultural sensitivity.

Inclusivity and Access: At a policy level, schools must mind the digital divide and avoid creating a two-tier education system. Kalantzis and Cope warn that “only some schools and students but not others will be able to afford the better versions” of AI tools, highlighting that wealth disparities could lead to uneven learning opportunities. To mitigate this, institutions (and, ideally, education policy-makers at higher levels) should push for affordable access. This might involve lobbying for educational pricing models from AI companies or even developing open-source tools as alternatives. Policy could also address accommodations: ensuring that the push towards AI doesn’t disadvantage students with disabilities. On one hand, AI might assist accessibility (e.g., automatic captioning, script-to-storyboard for students with limited drawing ability), but on the other, some AI tools are not yet optimized for assistive use. Universities should strive to choose tools that are accessible and provide alternatives or assistance where needed.

Collaboration with Industry and Policy Bodies: Finally, adopting AIAL has outward-facing implications. Film schools traditionally interact closely with the film industry; now tech companies and AI startups are part of that ecosystem. Institutions might establish partnerships or internship pipelines with companies working on AI in entertainment (for instance, studios developing AI for VFX or streaming services with AI recommendation teams). This gives students real-world exposure and ensures the curriculum stays relevant. Additionally, higher education institutions can play a role in shaping broader policy. Representatives from academic programs could join industry and government committees on AI and creative industries, bringing an educational perspective to discussions about standards, regulations, and ethics. The Writers Guild of America (WGA) and other guilds are already in debates about AI’s role in content creation; film educators aligning with AIAL might contribute research or position papers on how to integrate AI in ways that augment rather than replace human creativity and labor – effectively lobbying for a stance that protects students’ future job prospects and creative rights in an AI-mediated industry.

In essence, the policy implication of AIAL can be summarized as the need for a comprehensive institutional response to AI’s emergence in media. It’s not enough for one enthusiastic professor to tweak their course; the entire program and even the university’s leadership should recognize AI literacy as a strategic priority. This might even be reflected in mission statements or strategic plans (e.g., “to lead in innovative pedagogy for emerging media technologies”). The investment now will pay off by producing graduates who are not only employable in a shifting industry but who are prepared to be thoughtful, ethical leaders in shaping how AI is used in storytelling and society at large.

To implement AIAL effectively, institutions should craft policies that ensure: curricula remain current (with periodic reviews to update content as AI tech evolves); pedagogy remains student-centered and ethical (with guidelines that emphasize critical thinking and responsible use); and resources are equitably distributed (so all students benefit from AI learning opportunities). By doing so, higher education can turn the challenge of AI in film and television into an opportunity – graduating media professionals who are adept with new tools and deeply aware of the cultural and epistemological stakes of their use.

Conclusion

The advent of generative AI – from text-to-video systems that conjure moving images from written prompts to algorithms that assist in editing, sound design, and even storytelling – is reshaping the foundation of film and television production. In parallel, it compels a transformation in how we educate the next generation of filmmakers and media scholars. This paper has argued that AI Audiovisual Literacy (AIAL) provides a robust framework for guiding this transformation. By expanding traditional media literacy to encompass AI’s technical, creative, and ethical dimensions, AIAL ensures that students are not only proficient with the latest tools but are also equipped to critically analyze and influence the use of AI in the cinematic arts.

Throughout our exploration, we maintained the structure of an academic inquiry while integrating new insights and extensive literature support. We began by defining AIAL and situating its urgency in the context of text-to-video AIGC, noting how tools like Runway Gen-2 have already made it possible for anyone to generate audiovisual content in unprecedented ways. This set the stage for understanding why a new literacy is needed: when AI can generate a film trailer at the click of a button, the skills of interpretation and critique must evolve accordingly. We then delved into pedagogical shifts, drawing from both theoretical perspectives and practical classroom studies. We saw that while AI can accelerate and augment the learning process, educators must re-emphasize fundamentals like creativity, critical thinking, and ethical reflection. Indeed, rather than diminishing the educator’s role, AI’s complexity amplifies the need for teachers who can mentor students through ambivalence – as Monserrat and Srnc observed, students are at once excited and uneasy about AI – and channel their engagement into productive inquiry and innovation.

Our examination of machine-assisted creativity and posthuman authorship highlighted a central paradox: AI can generate content, but it lacks human intentionality and emotion. It falls on the human creator to supply meaning, context, and moral judgment. The AIAL framework, informed by voices like Kalantzis and Cope and

Farinacci, encourages a symbiotic relationship where the machine's strengths (speed, pattern recognition) complement human strengths (imagination, empathy, critical discernment). Students learn to be conductors in an orchestra of human and AI creativity, taking responsibility for the final composition. They are taught, for example, to leverage AI's ability to suggest a dozen versions of a scene, but then to apply their own directorial vision in choosing and refining one – thereby maintaining authorship even in a posthuman collaboration.

In discussing cinematic temporality, we underscored that AI's promise of instantaneity should not erode the appreciation of time in both creation and narrative. AIAL reminds us that the time invested in artistic creation – the pauses, the iterations, the slow growth of an idea – is often as important as the time depicted on screen. Educators implementing AIAL will strive to prevent a mindset where art is expected to be as immediate as an AI output. Instead, students are taught to use AI's speed tactically (to prototype or experiment), while ultimately dedicating the necessary time to polish, to inject personal style, and sometimes to intentionally deviate from what the algorithm deems optimal for the sake of originality or emotional truth. Likewise, by exploring how AI can manipulate cinematic time (resurrecting voices from the past, compressing historical events into new narratives), students become more vigilant interpreters of media and more conscientious storytellers who clarify to their audience what is real, what is imagined, and why those distinctions matter.

The sections on ontology and epistemology of AI-generated images reinforced that AIAL is as much about raising critical consciousness as it is about building skills. In an era of “deepfakes” and AI hallucinations, the line between reality and illusion in media has never been thinner. The ontology section showed that students must grapple with the philosophical implications of images that have no indexical link to reality – images that are, in a sense, ghosts of data. The epistemology section then built on that, stressing the necessity of critical media literacy practices such as source verification, bias detection, and understanding the political economy behind AI tools. An AI-literate filmmaker, in our vision, is someone who, when using an AI to generate a sequence, is thinking not just “How cool does this look?” but also “What biases might this reflect? Am I inadvertently misleading my audience? How can I use this tool responsibly to support the truth of my story?” By engaging with works like Kalantzis and Cope (who enumerate key critical questions for AI output) and Buckingham, Holmes et al., and others who frame AI in the context of civic values, we illustrated that AIAL carries forward the torch of critical pedagogy into the domain of AI.

In adding a section on institutional implementation, we acknowledged that making AIAL a reality goes beyond the classroom. It calls for leadership and policy. We discussed how film schools like Chapman, LMU, and USC are already pioneering AI-inclusive curricula and resources, and we extrapolated broader strategies: continuous faculty training, cross-disciplinary collaboration, equity in resource distribution, and clear ethical guidelines. The implication is that AIAL can serve as an organizing principle for program development. A film school that adopts AIAL formally might, for example, advertise itself as offering a “cutting-edge program in AI and film”(Reddy 2024) – turning what some fear as a threat into a competitive advantage, and more importantly, sending a message that human creativity augmented by AI is the new normal, and we are preparing our students to lead that normal in thoughtful ways(Douglas 2024). Policy support, from internal guidelines to potential contributions to industry standards, completes the picture. By influencing how AI is approached in educational and professional settings (for instance, advocating that AI tools should be transparent and inclusive), academia can help ensure that AI develops in alignment with humanistic and democratic values, not just technical or commercial imperatives.

In closing, the impact of text-to-video AIGC and related AI technologies on film and television education is profound, but through the lens of AIAL, it is not insurmountable or inimical to the artistic spirit – rather, it is a catalyst for evolution. The same way sound, color, and digital editing each revolutionized filmmaking and spurred new pedagogies in their time, AI challenges us to expand our conception of literacy and creativity. This expanded academic paper has aimed to map the contours of that challenge and suggest concrete pathways forward, backed by emerging research and examples.

The final vision we present is one of empowerment: students who graduate with AIAL competencies will enter the industry not as novices intimidated by AI, nor as narrow specialists oblivious to its ramifications, but as savvy creatives who can harness AI tools, critique their outputs, and champion ethical, diverse, and innovative uses of AI in storytelling. They will be able to experiment with AI in pushing the boundaries of visual narrative, perhaps giving rise to new genres or aesthetics, while also serving as critical voices when AI is misused (for example, speaking out against AI-driven homogenization or inequality in the field). In a phrase, they will embody what it means to be “digital wisdom”(Prensky 2012) – a term Prensky Marc used to describe individuals who thoughtfully engage with digital technology, aware of its strengths and pitfalls.

As educators and scholars, our task is to lay the groundwork for this next generation. AI's presence in cinema is only going to grow, and with it will grow the need for comprehensive frameworks like AIAL to interpret and guide that presence. By continuing to refine AIAL through research (such as Farinacci's ongoing work) and practice (piloting new courses, documenting outcomes, adjusting methods), the academic community can ensure that film and television education does more than keep pace with technological change – it leads the way in integrating technology in service of deeper human creativity and understanding.

In summary, the intersection of AI and film education is a frontier rich with possibility. By expanding our literacies and updating our pedagogies, we can prepare students to be not just consumers of whatever AI generates, but critical co-creators, historians of the future who can tell the story of humanity in concert with our intelligent machines. The works cited below, spanning theoretical to practical perspectives, underscore the collaborative effort of scholars in charting this path. The conversation is dynamic and ongoing, but the consensus is clear: the literacy of the 21st-century filmmaker must encompass AI, and done right, this integration can enhance rather than diminish the art and impact of cinema.

Works Cited

Buckingham, David. Artificial intelligence in education: A media education approach. Blog de David (2022)

<https://davidbuckingham.net/2023/05/27/artificial-intelligence-in-education-a-media-education-approach/>

Douglas C Youvan. Expanding Human Thought Through Artificial Intelligence: A New Frontier in Cognitive Augmentation. researchgate. September 2024
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384399213_Expanding_Human_Thought_Through_Artificial_Intelligence_A_New_Frontier_in_Cognitive_Augmentation

Farinacci, Elisa. "Film and Audiovisual Education in the Artificial Intelligence Era: Approaches and Challenges." *Cinergie – Il cinema e le altre arti*, no. 26, 2024, pp. 121–133.

Holmes, Wayne, Jen Persson, Irene-Angelica Chounta, Barbara Wasson, and Vania Dimitrova. *Artificial Intelligence and Education: A Critical View through the Lens of Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law*. Council of Europe, 2022.

Mary Kalantzis, , and Bill Cope. Literacy in the Time of Artificial Intelligence. *Reading Research Quarterly*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2025, pp. 585–611.

CINEFORUM

ISSN: 0009-7039

Vol. 65. No. 3, 2025

Monserrat, Ana Laura, and Nahuel Matias Srnec. Reflection-AI: Artificial Intelligence as a Redefining Force for Expressive Filmmaking in Film Schools. *Frontiers in Communication*, vol. 10, 2025, article 1598376.

Niels van Berkel, Mikael B. Skov, and Jesper Kjeldskov. Human-AI interaction: intermittent, continuous, and proactive. *Interactions* 28.6 (2021): 67-71.

Pixela Nova. Artificial Intelligence Reshaping the Curriculum in Leading Film Institutions. SynthAds (blog), 19 June 2024, www.synthads.ai/post/artificial-intelligence-reshaping-the-curriculum-in-leading-film-institutions.

Prensky, Marc. *Brain gain: Technology and the quest for digital wisdom*. Macmillan, 2012.

Reddy, Vundela Sivakrishna, M. Kathiravan, and Velagalapalli Lokeswara Reddy. Revolutionizing animation: unleashing the power of artificial intelligence for cutting-edge visual effects in films. *Soft Computing* 28.1 (2024): 749-763.

Zignuts. (2023) Runway Gen-2: The AI Model for Text-to-Video Generation. www.zignuts.com/ai/runway-gen-2.

Sharples, M. (2023). Towards social generative AI for education: Theory, practices and ethics. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.10063>

Torin Anderson, Shuo Niu. Making AI-Enhanced Videos: Analyzing Generative AI Use Cases in YouTube Content Creation, CHI EA '25: Proceedings of the Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Article No.388, pp. 1 - 7.