

Annotated Responsible AI Policy Companion

Reasons local decisions and evidence of implementation

Read this companion alongside the Responsible AI Governance Policy. It explains why each numbered section exists, what needs local confirmation and what evidence would show that the provision works. The explanations are guidance rather than adopted policy text.

1 Purpose and commitment

This section makes institutional purpose and human outcomes the reason for using AI and requires a proactive plan to examine worthwhile opportunities and the consequences of adoption and delay.

Make it fit the institution: Confirm the mission outcomes and values that should guide implementation. Keep the permission to use AI connected to safeguards and accountability.

Evidence of implementation: An agreed institutional purpose, a mission-linked improvement plan, accountable owners and measures of benefit.

2 Scope and definitions

Scope prevents a rule from applying only to standalone chat tools while missing embedded features and connected services.

Make it fit the institution: Reconcile definitions, system authority, partner obligations and existing institutional policies. Identify who resolves conflicts.

Evidence of implementation: A clear scope and a documented route for conflicting requirements.

3 Governance and decision rights

A governance structure needs named responsibility and adequate authority, expertise and time.

Make it fit the institution: Specify the executive owner, coordinating group, reserved academic authority and relevant specialist roles.

Evidence of implementation: A mandate, authority map and current contact directory.

4 Permission and proportionate review

Proportionate review allows ordinary useful work while directing attention to consequential uses.

Make it fit the institution: Confirm review triggers, standard permissions, acknowledgement and decision timeframes, and escalation capacity. The five- and fifteen-business-day targets are proposed policy defaults for local adoption.

Evidence of implementation: Published review conditions, approved-use guidance and a functioning approval route.

5 Information security and procurement

Information safeguards must apply to the entire use, including connectors, vendor processing and generated records.

Make it fit the institution: Connect this section to institutional classifications, contracts, recording rules, access controls and incident response.

Evidence of implementation: Approved information flows and evidence that required controls are in place.

6 Human judgment and consequential decisions

Meaningful human judgment requires the ability to understand, challenge and correct consequential decisions.

Make it fit the institution: Confirm the decisions reserved to qualified people, review procedures, notice and existing appeal routes.

Evidence of implementation: Representative reviewed cases and a usable human reconsideration route.

7 Teaching learning and workforce preparation

The academic framework protects learning while allowing deliberate use of AI within faculty and program authority.

Make it fit the institution: Review the proposed learning-support default, assignment permissions, assessment requirements and program or placement obligations.

Evidence of implementation: Clear learning expectations, evidence of student performance and a periodic program review of changing work and regional preparation needs.

8 Integrity disclosure and intellectual property

Integrity involves honest representation, source verification and fair procedures when concerns arise.

Make it fit the institution: Reconcile disclosure with academic, disciplinary, employer, sponsor and publisher requirements. Confirm evidence and appeal procedures.

Evidence of implementation: Usable disclosure examples and a fair, documented integrity process.

9 Automated actions and AI agents

A system able to act needs explicit authority and recovery controls beyond those needed for drafting.

Make it fit the institution: Define permitted actions, confirmation, spending or duration limits, logging, stop conditions and accountable owners.

Evidence of implementation: Tested permissions, managed agent identity, constrained delegation, intervention and recovery of downstream effects.

10 Access learning and institutional support

Permission is ineffective when people lack accessible tools, preparation or meaningful help. Responsible implementation also needs a supported route to practical experimentation and fair transition when work changes.

Make it fit the institution: Resource access and support, involve relevant employee and student authorities, and address accommodations and vulnerable populations.

Evidence of implementation: Effective participation routes and preparation matched to responsibilities.

11 Monitoring incidents and records

Monitoring should show whether a service works and whether people are being harmed or excluded.

Make it fit the institution: Set proportionate records, outcome measures, reporting routes, retention and authority to suspend and restart.

Evidence of implementation: A current use register and evidence of monitoring and incident response.

12 Implementation exceptions and review

Implementation, exceptions and review keep policy connected to institutional practice.

Make it fit the institution: Confirm transition priorities, exception authority, review participation and sufficiently independent challenge for consequential uses.

Evidence of implementation: An implementation plan, time-limited exceptions and documented continuation decisions.

How to read this guidance

HumanSkills recommendations combine institutional precedents, official guidance and authored implementation advice. The source-linked institutional examples are selected comparisons, not a nationally representative policy census or an established overall overlap percentage. Scenarios are illustrative. Institutional approval, specialist review and implementation remain local.