

Monitoring and policy renewal

What should trigger a new decision?

A policy can remain stable while the systems, uses and responsibilities beneath it change.

Recommended starting position

Set regular review and event-based triggers. Evaluate whether benefits, safeguards and human support remain effective. Time-limit pilots and exceptions, and record a decision to continue, change, restrict or retire the use.

An annual review alone can miss a consequential midyear feature change. A pilot can become permanent through inaction. Monitoring should examine the intended outcomes and difficult cases without creating unnecessary surveillance.

What the evidence supports

Carteret and RPCC call for policy review. NIST provides a voluntary framework covering AI use and evaluation. Our recommendation combines periodic review with specific triggers and accountable continuation decisions.

Establish these foundations

- Assign an owner and a review date.
- Monitor benefits, harms, access and support in the actual use.
- Define material changes that require reassessment before expansion.

The choices to make locally

Routine review

Consider this when: The use is stable and monitoring provides adequate assurance.

Tradeoff: Match frequency and depth to consequences; do not substitute a date for substantive review.

Triggered reassessment

Consider this when: The purpose, data, population, vendor or ability to act changes materially.

Tradeoff: Make triggers understandable and assign someone to identify and escalate them.

Retire or replace

Consider this when: Benefits are not demonstrated or safeguards cannot be maintained.

Tradeoff: Plan continuity, information disposition, contracts and communication with affected people.

Illustrative campus case

A successful pilot quietly becomes a permanent service.

A department's pilot has passed its review date. Staff rely on it, the vendor has changed features and nobody has made a continuation decision.

Usefulness does not remove the need for an accountable decision about the changed service.

1. Review the pilot evidence, current configuration and unresolved issues.
2. Assess continued benefit, support capacity and any material changes.
3. Record a decision with conditions and the next review, or implement a controlled exit.

What the team produces: A continuation, restriction or retirement decision supported by current evidence.

Who is responsible

Board and trustees: Ask whether leadership can account for significant deployments, unresolved issues and changes over time.

Institutional leaders: Assign ongoing ownership after the task force's initial work is complete.

AI task force: Design the handover, review triggers and reporting arrangements for standing governance.

Illustrative language to adapt

AI deployments, pilots and exceptions must have an accountable owner and defined review conditions. Material changes require reassessment. Continued use must be supported by appropriate evidence of benefit, effective safeguards and available human support. Expired pilots and exceptions do not renew automatically.

Read alongside model policy sections 4, 11, 12. Reconcile local authority and requirements before adoption.

Evidence of implementation

- A current inventory with owners and review conditions.
- Documented review of outcomes, incidents and material changes.
- Explicit decisions to continue, change or retire uses.

Reconsider when: Trigger reassessment for new capabilities, data, populations, terms, incidents, complaints or loss of responsible capacity.

Supporting sources

[Carteret Community College / Artificial Intelligence Policy](#)

[River Parishes Community College / Use of Artificial Intelligence](#)

[National Institute of Standards and Technology / AI Risk Management Framework](#)