

Responsible AI Task Force Meeting Pack

A focused agenda discussion cases and decision communication

Use this pack to run a focused task-force meeting and communicate a recommendation to the people authorized to decide. It includes an agenda, discussion cases, a completed example and an editable decision-summary structure.

Prepare before the meeting

- Choose one decision and identify the deciding authority.
- Circulate the relevant decision chapter, model policy provisions and current institutional rules.
- Invite the people who hold the necessary academic, operational and specialist responsibilities.
- State the outcome sought: clarification, a recommendation, a pilot boundary or an approval request.

A sixty minute agenda

10 minutes Agree on the purpose

State the institutional problem and the decision this meeting should advance.

10 minutes Confirm authority and constraints

Identify the applicable rules, the deciding authority and the people whose review is necessary.

20 minutes Work through the case

Use one chapter's campus scenario. Test the recommended position and examine the alternatives.

15 minutes Form the recommendation

Agree on proposed language, unresolved issues, evidence needed and the decision to request.

5 minutes Assign the next step

Confirm the owner, approval route, next date and communication responsibilities.

Three cases for discussion

An advising assistant can change a schedule.

The same product can explain course requirements, recommend an individual schedule and change an enrollment record.

Decision to resolve: When may AI assist, recommend or act?

Consider: Those functions require different approval and accountability arrangements.

Produce: An authorization that distinguishes advice from action and identifies the responsible owner.

A technical student produces a polished troubleshooting plan.

A student uses AI to prepare an equipment-diagnosis plan. The written result is convincing, but the instructor needs to know whether the student can recognize an unsafe recommendation.

Decision to resolve: What must students learn to do, with and without AI?

Consider: The assessment must reveal the student's judgment, not only the quality of the submitted plan.

Produce: An assignment rule, assessment method and explanation of the capability being assessed.

An AI note-taker joins a student-support meeting.

A staff member invites a note-taker to help prepare an action summary. The conversation includes disability accommodations, academic progress and a partner placement.

Decision to resolve: What information can enter which AI systems?

Consider: Convenience does not resolve who may receive the information, how the recording is used or what participants were told.

Produce: A usable meeting rule and a documented information-handling decision.

A completed decision summary example

Illustrative recommendation for an advising pilot. This is not a record of an actual institutional approval.

Recommendation

Authorize a bounded pilot that explains published program requirements. Exclude personalized enrollment changes until the relevant academic, records, privacy and technical authorities have reviewed that expanded use.

Rationale

The initial scope allows the institution to evaluate accuracy, access and escalation without granting authority to change student records.

Conditions

Assign a service owner. Use current approved information. Test representative and difficult questions. Make limitations and the route to an advisor visible. Define monitoring, incident handling, pilot duration and a continuation decision.

Decision requested

Ask the authorized service and institutional approval owners to confirm the pilot scope and conditions. Route any unresolved information or accessibility issue to the relevant specialist before deployment.

Open matter

Determine whether staffing can meet the published human-support expectation. The pilot should not promise a response the institution cannot provide.

An editable decision communication

Subject

[Decision topic and the institutional action requested]

Institution and workstream

[Institution, responsible group, date and version]

Recommendation

[What the team recommends and the permitted scope]

Why this is the recommended position

[Purpose, evidence, affected people and rationale]

Alternatives considered

[Credible alternatives and the reasons for choosing this position]

Applicable constraints

[Existing policies, requirements, agreements and specialist review]

Unresolved questions

[What remains uncertain and who must resolve it]

Decision and authority

[Approval or direction requested and the person or body authorized to decide]

Implementation

[Owner, actions, resources, communication and target dates]

Review conditions

[Evidence to monitor, review date and triggers for reconsideration]

Close the loop

Return the approved decision and rationale to the contributors. Update the canonical policy or guidance, identify implementation responsibilities and retire conflicting drafts. Preserve the record in the institution's approved system.