

Original Research Article

Dilemmas and mitigation paths of aesthetic education governance in design majors under AIGC ethical risks——Based on the dual educational management models of "three integrations, two emphases and one optimization"

Xiaoxu Han

Yanching Institute of Technology, Sanhe, Hebei, 065201, China

Abstract: As Generative Artificial Intelligence evolves continuously, aesthetic education for design-related majors in higher institutions is undergoing comprehensive digital reshaping. Misutilization of AIGC as a mere utility tool triggers latent ethical perils. These cover uniform design outputs, warped aesthetic perceptions, unclear demarcation over intellectual property rights, illicit misappropriation of data, and diminished humanistic competence among learners, all of which corrode the core moral-cultivation mission carried by university-run aesthetic education. This paper introduces an independently constructed educational governance model titled the "Three Integrations, Two Emphases and One Optimization" resource governance model. Focusing on institutional building, educators' instructional leadership, and supervision over classroom procedures, it investigates systemic deficiencies and functional weaknesses existing in AIGC-empowered aesthetic education for design majors. It delivers practically feasible governance insights to help higher-education institutes regulate smart aesthetic-education activities and boost cultivation performance for innovative design-focused talents.

Keywords: educational governance and leadership; university aesthetic pedagogy; design disciplines; AIGC ethical norms

1. Educational management dilemmas of design aesthetic education under AIGC ethical risks

Vacant Top-level Governance: University Aesthetic Education System Lags Behind Technological Development. Vacant Top-level Governance: University Aesthetic Education System Lags Behind Technological Development. Higher-education institutions are confronted with ambiguous managerial benchmarks, undefined power-duty boundaries and deficient oversight mechanisms when implementing intelligent aesthetic education. In the absence of shared ethical guidelines and intellectual-property clauses for AI-assisted creation, unauthorized reproduction and rights-infringing acts take place frequently. Insufficient top-level institutional arrangements lie at the root of expanding ethical risks and deteriorated teaching outcomes within AIGC-integrated aesthetic education.

Insufficient Teaching Leadership: Weak Teachers' Educational Management and Empowerment Capabilities. Insufficient Teaching Leadership: Weak Teachers' Educational Management and Empowerment Capabilities. Over-reliance on generative-AI tools may undermine teachers' practical instructional capabilities. Overusing AI-produced teaching resources weakens teachers' leading role in classroom activities and turns them into simple technical executors. Educators prioritize technical outputs over value-shaping and literacy cultivation. Under such circumstances, the moral-shaping mission of aesthetic education cannot be accomplished, further exacerbating irregular phenomena in smart teaching activities.

Imbalanced Evaluation System: Result-oriented Deviation of Valuing Technological Achievements Over Ethical Literacy. Imbalanced Evaluation System: Result-oriented Deviation of Valuing Technological Achievements Over Ethical Literacy. Modern aesthetic-teaching assessment frameworks overemphasize tangible technical outputs while adopting narrow evaluation dimensions.. The exclusion of assessment items covering ethics, creative authenticity and copyright validity gives rise to technology misuse and

content appropriation. Prevailing utility-oriented template-driven learning triggers technologization and homogenization in smart aesthetic education and hinders learners' comprehensive advancement in aesthetic competence.

2. Core concepts and construction of educational management models

2.1. Connotation of AIGC aesthetic education ethics and educational governance

AIGC aesthetic education ethics refers to a set of standardized behavioral criteria and value norms applicable to intelligent aesthetic education in higher education institutions. It serves to standardize the teaching and creative behaviors of teachers and students in AI-assisted scenarios and maintain the normative bottom line of modern aesthetic education. This ethical norm runs through the whole teaching process of design aesthetic education, including lesson preparation design, classroom teaching implementation, practical creative training, work quality evaluation and academic achievement output^[1].

Different from traditional micro teaching research which focuses on classroom teaching methods and individual student learning behaviors, aesthetic education governance under the framework of educational leadership and management belongs to macro systematic institutional governance^[2]. It relies on university top-level strategic design, institutional system improvement, organizational operation optimization and whole-process quality supervision to carry out educational standardized construction. Intelligent aesthetic education governance aims not to constrain legitimate educational adoption of AIGC, but to regulate the full workflow of AI-empowered aesthetic teaching so as to tackle hidden ethical risks triggered by new technologies. Balance the instrumental value of intelligent technology and the educational value of aesthetic education, and realize the deep integration of technological empowerment and moral cultivation goals.

2.2. "Three integrations, two emphases and one optimization" resource management model (educational resource governance dimension)

Three Integrations: Resource Integration, Discipline Coupling, and Knowledge-Practice Alignment. Serving as the core governance criterion for intelligent aesthetic education resources, the three-dimensional integration mechanism solves the practical management dilemmas of resource segmentation and teaching disconnection through top-level overall planning and systematic optimization. First, resource integration. University teaching management departments break the isolated barriers between traditional aesthetic teaching resources, intelligent technical resources and professional discipline resources. The study systematically integrates AIGC creative resources, digital teaching materials, traditional Chinese aesthetic cultural resources, regional characteristic art resources, design professional practical training resources and school-enterprise cooperative educational resources. Second, discipline coupling. In view of the interdisciplinary characteristics of design majors, the model promotes deep fusion of professional skill teaching, aesthetic quality cultivation, curriculum ideological and political education, intelligent technology application and professional literacy training. Third, knowledge-practice alignment. Adhering to the teaching principle of integrating theory with practice, the model organically combines theoretical teaching of design aesthetic education, AIGC intelligent creative practice, offline artistic training and aesthetic literacy cultivation.

Two Emphases: Emphasis on Ethical Standardization and Emphasis on Process Management. As the core institutional guarantee and management tool for the standardized implementation of intelligent aesthetic education, the dual emphasis mechanism builds a solid ethical risk defense line for AIGC-enabled aesthetic teaching through institutional standardization and whole-process refined supervision. First, emphasis on ethical standardization. Aiming at the current governance vacuum of missing unified normative standards and behavioral constraints in intelligent aesthetic education, college management departments formulate targeted institutional documents including standardized management specifications for AIGC aesthetic teaching, ethical guidelines for intelligent creative practice, and copyright management measures for AI design works. These institutional norms clearly define the applicable scenarios, usage boundaries, creative specifications, copyright requirements and prohibitive clauses of AIGC tools,

unify the standardized behavioral criteria for teachers and students in intelligent teaching and creative practice. Second, emphasis on process management. The model subverts the extensive outcome-oriented management mode of traditional aesthetic education, and constructs a full-process refined supervision mechanism covering pre-class preparation, in-class teaching and after-class practice links. Teaching and research offices and school teaching supervision teams implement whole-process supervision over teachers' AI-assisted lesson preparation, in-class intelligent teaching organization and students' after-class AI creation and work polishing.

One Optimization: Dynamic Optimization of Educational Management System. The dynamic optimization principle requires university educational administrators to establish precise and iterative governance concepts. Combined with the latest AIGC technological progress, practical pain points of intelligent aesthetic teaching, students' professional development needs and industrial talent training standards, administrators regularly sort out institutional deficiencies, governance loopholes and teaching deviation problems. Targeted dynamic optimization and upgrading are carried out on educational management systems, teaching implementation procedures, supervision mechanisms, quality evaluation standards and resource supply systems, so as to realize the adaptive and refined development of aesthetic education governance systems and continuously meet the high-quality developmental needs of intelligent aesthetic education for design majors.

3. Mitigation paths for aesthetic education governance based on the "three integrations, two emphases and one optimization" model

3.1. Optimize top-level educational governance based on three integrations resource integration

Aiming at the core governance dilemmas of vacant top-level institutional construction, fragmented teaching resources and lagging management systems in current university aesthetic education, this study optimizes the top-level governance system of intelligent aesthetic education based on the resource integration, discipline coupling and knowledge-practice alignment logic of the three-integration model, so as to make up for institutional and resource governance deficiencies. First, promote integrated development of diversified teaching resources. University academic affairs departments and college teaching management teams take the lead in integrating AIGC intelligent creative resources, digital teaching materials, traditional artistic aesthetic resources, excellent traditional Chinese cultural resources, design professional training resources and school-enterprise cooperative educational resources. A professional resource review team is set up to curb aesthetic and ethical risks from the source. Second, implement interdisciplinary coupling optimization. Educational administrators optimize talent training schemes and curriculum systems, break the disciplinary isolation barriers between professional teaching, aesthetic education, ideological and political education and intelligent technology application. The study promotes the deep integration of design skill training, AIGC technical application, aesthetic literacy cultivation, value guidance and professional quality improvement, embedding original creative spirit, copyright awareness, aesthetic morality and cultural confidence into the whole intelligent aesthetic education system, which thoroughly resolves the disconnection between technology and education and between professional training and aesthetic cultivation. Third, realize knowledge-practice interactive alignment. Construct an integrated educational system of theoretical exploration, intelligent creative practice, offline practical training and literacy sublimation, integrate classroom theoretical teaching, online intelligent training, offline artistic creation and extracurricular aesthetic activities.

3.2. Build ethical defense lines based on two emphases supervision mechanism

Centering on the dual core management mechanisms of ethical standardization and whole-process supervision, this study constructs a dual risk prevention system integrating institutional standardization and full-process refined supervision to comprehensively rectify various ethical anomie phenomena in AIGC-enabled aesthetic education. On the one hand, improve the top-level ethical standard system. College management departments formulate targeted institutional norms in combination with the disciplinary characteristics of design majors and practical AIGC teaching scenarios. The norms clearly define the

access criteria, classroom application scope, creative boundary specifications, material copyright standards, creative originality requirements and prohibitive clauses of AIGC tools, unifying the standardized behavioral criteria for teachers and students in intelligent teaching and creative practice. Supporting assessment and restraint mechanisms are established to incorporate AI creation ethical compliance, copyright standardization and creative originality into students' academic assessment and teachers' teaching evaluation indicators, imposing targeted constraints and rectification measures on technological abuse, copyright infringement and aesthetic anomie to strengthen institutional binding force^[3]. On the other hand, build a full-process refined supervision mechanism. Transform the traditional extensive outcome-oriented management mode, and construct a three-level collaborative supervision system led by teaching supervisors, implemented by teaching and research offices and undertaken by frontline teachers. Carry out pre-class inspection on the standardization of teachers' AI lesson preparation to avoid excessive technological dependence; implement in-class dynamic supervision to correct students' blind template application and abandonment of independent thinking; conduct after-class comprehensive review on the originality, copyright compliance and aesthetic orientation of students' AI works, requiring rectification and re-creation for homogenized, vulgar and infringing creative outputs.

3.3. Improve diversified evaluation system based on dynamic optimization mechanism

Based on the dynamic optimization governance concept, this study reconstructs a diversified comprehensive evaluation system adapted to the AIGC intelligent era, aiming to reverse the biased orientation of traditional outcome-oriented evaluation and give full play to the positive guiding role of evaluation in teaching and learning. First, completely abandon the single outcome-oriented evaluation mode, and construct a five-dimensional comprehensive evaluation system covering technological application compliance, creative ethical standardization, work originality level, aesthetic literacy quality and humanistic value connotation. The new system incorporates standardized AI usage behaviors, reduces the evaluation weight of superficial indicators such as visual effect and technical proficiency, and thoroughly corrects the utilitarian evaluation orientation. Second, implement whole-process multi-dimensional evaluation. Replace the traditional one-time final evaluation mode with full-cycle evaluation covering pre-class preparation status, classroom learning performance, creative practice process, final work achievements and comprehensive literacy improvement, realizing the balanced evaluation of process and result, technology and education, skill training and moral cultivation. Third, build a dynamic evaluation optimization mechanism. Educational administrators regularly optimize evaluation indicators, scoring standards and evaluation methods according to AIGC technological iteration, updated educational demands and practical teaching pain points, and continuously improve the quality management system of intelligent aesthetic education.

4. Conclusion

The popularization and continuous upgrading of generative-AI technologies unlock unprecedented innovative chances for digital transformation, pedagogical reform and quality improvement of design-oriented aesthetic education in tertiary institutions. Nevertheless, they also pose disruptive challenges to conventional aesthetic-education governance frameworks, classroom administrative patterns and talent-cultivation logic. From the perspective of educational leadership and institutional governance, this paper develops original governance models. It dissects practical governance bottlenecks and underlying contributing factors within smart aesthetic education across five dimensions: Resource governance, institutional refinement, leadership capacity building, procedural oversight and assessment upgrading. Furthermore, it establishes a holistic, implementable governance framework to mitigate relevant risks. It can furnish robust support for the modernization of higher-level aesthetic-education governance as well as high-caliber artistic talent cultivation in the new era.

About the author

Xiaoxu Han(1993-), lecturer at Yanching Institute of Technology. His research interests cover cultural heritage and teaching reform. Corresponding author: 897177543@qq.com.

References

- [1] Li J. Ethical Risks and Standardized Governance of AIGC Technology Empowering Art Design Education[J]. 2025.
- [2] Wang H Y. Research on University Teaching Leadership and the Improvement Mechanism of Aesthetic Education Quality[J]. 2024.
- [3] Liu Y. Ethical Dilemmas and Institutional Norms of Generative Artificial Intelligence Empowering Art Education[J]. 2024.