

# Responsible AI Policy Review Standard

Coverage clarity accountability and implementation evidence

Use this qualitative standard to review whether an AI policy can guide real institutional work. Review the policy together with linked procedures and evidence. Distinguish a documented rule from demonstrated implementation.

## Four review lenses

### Coverage

Does the policy address the issue? Locate the relevant provision and linked procedure. A missing web page is not proof that an institution has no rule.

### Clarity

Can people apply the rule? Name the trigger, permitted or required action and any limits. Test a realistic exception.

### Accountability

Who owns the decision? Identify authority, review, escalation and the route to correction. A committee name alone may be insufficient.

### Implementation

What shows that it works? Look for current approvals, tested controls, prepared people and evidence from actual operation.

## A worked privacy example

### General intention

Users must protect confidential information when using AI.

### A more actionable provision

Protected institutional information may be used only in AI tools and use cases approved for that information. Approval must identify permitted data, access, retention, vendor reuse and incident responsibilities.

The second provision still needs an actual approval process, named owners and evidence that its controls work. A stronger sentence is not proof of implementation.

# Review the model against the decision areas

## Purpose & institutional value

Policy sections: 1, 7, 10, 11. Review question: What should AI help your institution accomplish?

Implementation evidence: A purpose statement that explains the need in ordinary language. A baseline or reasoned comparison against current practice. Measures of benefit, error and effects on affected people.

## Tools, use cases & vendors

Policy sections: 4, 5, 9, 12. Review question: What exactly does an approval authorize? Implementation

evidence: An accessible list of approved uses and restrictions. Contract and technical review proportionate to the deployment. A named owner, review date and exit arrangement.

## Data privacy & security

Policy sections: 5, 9, 11. Review question: What information can enter which AI systems?

Implementation evidence: An information-flow description covering inputs, retrieval, output and logs. Documented authority and relevant contractual and security controls. A tested incident route and an owner who can contain exposure.

## Human judgment & automated action

Policy sections: 6, 9, 11. Review question: When may AI assist, recommend or act? Implementation

evidence: A named reviewer with relevant expertise and authority. Records showing substantive review of representative difficult cases. A usable human reconsideration route and tested stop mechanism.

## Teaching, learning & assessment

Policy sections: 7, 8, 10. Review question: What must students learn to do, with and without AI?

Implementation evidence: Clear assignment expectations available in advance. Assessment evidence of student reasoning or performance. A supported route for access barriers and accommodations.

## Academic integrity & authorship

Policy sections: 7, 8, 10. Review question: How should the institution handle concerns about AI-assisted

work? Implementation evidence: Published rules describing permitted assistance and disclosure. A documented evidence-based inquiry and response opportunity. A consistent review route and staff preparation for using it.

## Access, accessibility & equitable treatment

Policy sections: 6, 7, 10. Review question: Can the people affected participate and obtain effective

help? Implementation evidence: Task-based accessibility and participation checks. An effective support and accommodation route. Documented response to material barriers or differential effects.

## Notice, disclosure & intellectual property

Policy sections: 5, 8, 10. Review question: When should someone know AI is involved? Implementation

evidence: Examples of acceptable notices for different uses. A clear process for rights and permissions questions. Communications that accurately represent the human involvement.

## **Governance & institutional authority**

Policy sections: 3, 4, 12. Review question: Who recommends, who decides and who remains accountable? Implementation evidence: A mandate with authority, deliverables and review dates. Named decision owners and approval routes. A record of resolved and escalated decisions.

## **Human capability & workforce relevance**

Policy sections: 7, 10, 12. Review question: What do people need to be able to do responsibly? Implementation evidence: Role-specific capability expectations. Practice and feedback using relevant scenarios. Evidence of performance and a route for additional support.

## **Incidents, concerns & remedies**

Policy sections: 6, 9, 11. Review question: What happens when an AI-supported service gets something wrong? Implementation evidence: A visible reporting route with accountable triage. A response exercise covering more than a cybersecurity breach. A record of correction, communication and restart conditions.

## **Monitoring & policy renewal**

Policy sections: 4, 11, 12. Review question: What should trigger a new decision? Implementation evidence: A current inventory with owners and review conditions. Documented review of outcomes, incidents and material changes. Explicit decisions to continue, change or retire uses.

# **Write findings that lead to action**

## **Clear in the reviewed material**

Identify the provision and linked process establishing the arrangement. Record any operating verification still required.

## **A decision is needed**

Specify the ambiguity in authority, conditions, exceptions or the practical rule and identify who should resolve it.

## **Evidence is missing**

Distinguish a provision not found, material unavailable for review and implementation not demonstrated. Do not treat these as equivalent findings.

# **Limits of the review**

This is a HumanSkills qualitative review standard. It is not a nationally normed score, certification or legal-compliance determination. Independent calibration is needed before comparative scoring is offered. Institutions retain approval responsibility and must obtain appropriate specialist review.