

Intuition Compliance and Risk Guide

Using AI in learning with evidence a reviewer can examine.

REVIEW POINTS

Four, with records

VENDOR QUESTIONS

Ten, for your
colleagues

FOR

Risk, compliance,
infosec, audit

SECTION ONE

Where did this content come from

An AI-assisted compliance course can look convincing and still leave a reviewer with basic questions.

Which source supports the explanation?

Was it current when the course was approved?

Who checked the scenario?

What record shows the final decision?

Those questions belong in the design. If the team waits until release to reconstruct the evidence, a polished course may be harder to review than the original material.

Know-How Intelligence's approved-source approach connects learning assistance to selected material. For a compliance use case, the important discussion is how that approach works in the proposed deployment: which sources are permitted, how an answer identifies them, and what happens when they don't resolve the question.

WHAT A CITATION NEEDS TO MAKE POSSIBLE

Find the source, and check the claim

A reviewer should be able to find the source, identify the relevant passage, and check whether it supports the claim being made. The source's owner and version matter. A citation to a policy that's been replaced doesn't settle the question, and a citation to a real document can still accompany an unsupported interpretation.

WHERE THE BOUNDARY SITS

Consider a scenario about a colleague handling an exception. The policy may describe the normal process but leave some judgment to the role. The course needs to make that boundary clear. Its feedback shouldn't turn one plausible response into a firmwide rule unless the approved source supports it.

An evidence trail worth discussing

The content review needs the approved source set, the relevant versions, the draft being reviewed, and the decision made about it. For an AI-enabled learning interaction, the technical review also needs to establish which prompts, answers, citations, and review actions can be retained and retrieved.

Source lineage and audit logs should be examined in the actual configuration. Their scope, access, and retention need agreement with the institution's owners, including a clear account of any gaps in the records.

A QUESTION FOR YOUR REVIEWER

What would your reviewer need to see to reconstruct one answer or one scenario six months after it was approved?

SECTION TWO

Review through the development process

The useful question is who checks what, when, and against which source. A named reviewer needs the expertise, authority, and time to examine the material; adding a person's name to the final slide doesn't create that review.

POINT IN THE WORK	REVIEW	RECORD TO KEEP UNDER AGREED RULES
Before drafting	The content owner confirms source scope, versions, and permitted tools	Approved source inventory and task scope
During development	A subject expert checks claims, scenarios, and feedback against the sources	Corrections, unresolved questions, and affected draft versions
Before release	The authorized approver reviews the final learning and required changes	Approval decision, version, owner, and date
After a source or process change	The owner examines affected learning and tests revised material	Change record and replacement or withdrawal decision

A PUBLIC EXAMPLE OF THE BUILD

AHA Episode 6, From Rules to Judgment

In AHA Episode 6, From Rules to Judgment, IKN describes building a compliance course using AI tools across the narrative, dialogue, visual direction, audio, branching, and feedback. The published episode offers a concrete example of the development process to examine with your own team.

Narrative

Dialogue

Visual direction

Audio

Branching

Feedback

A USEFUL DESIGN QUESTION

The build raises a useful design question. If AI can help produce the different parts of a scenario, where should the human team's attention go? Source accuracy is one part. The choices offered to a learner, the consequences attached to them, and the quality of the feedback need equally careful judgment.

Practice that reveals the reasoning

A recall question can show whether someone remembers a rule. A scenario can ask them to recognize uncertainty, seek information, and explain when they would escalate. In a fictional exception case, for example, a learner could be asked what is missing before a decision can be made and who should be involved.

AI may help generate variations for review, but the learning value depends on the decisions those variations let people practice. The team's review should examine whether the case is realistic and whether its feedback develops sound judgment. Faster production alone won't answer either question.

SECTION THREE

Questions for the risk and audit conversation

A useful vendor discussion leaves room for questions that are inconvenient to answer. The set below is intended for your risk, compliance, information security, and audit colleagues to put to Intuition or any provider proposing AI-assisted learning.

Sources and answers

- 01** Which sources can the system use, and how is that boundary enforced?

- 02** Can we inspect the passage behind an answer and identify its version?

- 03** What does the system do when sources disagree, are out of date, or don't answer the question?

- 04** How are changes to approved content reflected in the learning and tested before release?

Records and responsibility

- 05** Which records can we retrieve for a sampled interaction or course version, and what isn't recorded?
- 06** Who can access those records, where are they held, and what retention and deletion rules apply?
- 07** Where is human review required, who can approve the result, and how is that decision recorded?
- 08** How do we correct or withdraw material if a problem is found after release?

Practice and evidence

- 09** How do you test whether scenarios reflect the decisions our people actually face?
- 10** What evidence will show better judgment or behavior, and which claims would the evaluation be unable to support?

Making the meeting useful. One representative scenario and one sample record can make the discussion more concrete than a general product presentation. Your colleagues can follow the source into the content, inspect the review decision, and see where a further answer is needed.

TWO PUBLIC RESOURCES TO BRING INTO THE DISCUSSION

Watch, then work through the questions

RESOURCE ONE

AHA Episode 6, From Rules to Judgment

Explores the compliance-course build.

RESOURCE TWO

Risk Culture in the Age of AI

Opens a related discussion about the human capabilities involved in responsible decisions.

Both are available through IKN's public resources and event library.

HOW TO USE THEM

Watch the course-build episode with a subject expert, then use the questions above to identify what your own institution would need to review. The Risk Culture in the Age of AI recording offers a second perspective for that discussion.

Both outcomes are useful. The outcome may be a narrow, controlled pilot or a set of conditions to resolve before proceeding. Both are useful results if they make the next decision clear.

TAKE THIS INTO THE ROOM

FREE FROM IKN

One scenario, one sample record, ten questions.

Watch the course-build episode with a subject expert, then use the questions to identify what your own institution would need to review.

SOURCES

Permitted, versioned, cited

RECORDS

Retrievable, with named gaps

REVIEW

Named, resourced, recorded