



**Programme: BA (Hons) Business Management**

**Module: Principles of Human Resource Management**

**Module code: LCBB5012**

**Assignment title:**

**Component 1:**

**Practical: ACADEMIC INTERVIEW FOR HR PROCESSES**

**Graduate AI Strategist Responsible AI and Student Futures**

**JOB DESCRIPTION AND PERSON SPECIFICATION**

**Student: MANDICA GABRIEL STOCHITA - 2230353**

**Lecturer: DR. ERIC OSEI**

## PART A — JOB DESCRIPTION

|                     |                                                                                                          |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Job title           | Graduate AI Strategist – Responsible AI and Student Futures                                              |
| Employer / team     | University of Wales Trinity Saint David (UWTSD); proposed cross-university digital education function    |
| Reports to          | Designated Academic / Digital Education Lead                                                             |
| Hours and location  | 37 hours per week; based at a designated UWTSD campus in Wales, with occasional travel to other campuses |
| Work arrangement    | Onsite (proposed), subject to UWTSD confirmation                                                         |
| Salary and contract | Indicative £32,000–£40,000 per year; fixed-term, 24 months                                               |
| Role scope          | Student and staff AI literacy, responsible-use guidance, stakeholder coordination and evaluation         |

### Role purpose

To help students and staff use generative artificial intelligence (AI) critically, effectively and responsibly. The postholder will design accessible AI-literacy activities, support academic integrity and evidence verification, and coordinate advice on appropriate AI use with relevant university teams. This proposed human-centred approach is informed by UNESCO (2023).

### Key duties and responsibilities

1. Identify training needs through consultation with students, academic schools, learner developers, library and careers staff, including barriers related to digital confidence and accessibility.
2. Design and deliver introductory and discipline-sensitive AI-literacy workshops covering capabilities, limitations, critical prompting, verification and appropriate disclosure.
3. Teach practical verification of AI-generated facts, quotations and references against credible academic sources and library databases.
4. Work with academic leads to develop examples of acceptable AI-assisted learning and assessment, subject to existing institutional rules and academic judgement.

5. Prepare accessible guidance, briefing materials and practical scenarios for academic and professional-services staff.
6. Coordinate with library and careers services to embed responsible AI use in research, study skills and employability support.
7. Identify and record potential risks involving personal data, bias, misleading outputs, accessibility and over-reliance; refer decisions to authorised governance teams.
8. Consult students, staff, digital services, accessibility and information-governance specialists before proposing changes to guidance.
9. Evaluate workshops using baseline and follow-up exercises, source-checking tasks, accessibility feedback and participation data.
10. Produce an annual report on progress, outstanding risks, stakeholder feedback and priorities for the following year.

### **Proposed AI literacy and institutional readiness programme**

Student foundation: introduce generative AI, limitations, academic integrity, privacy and source verification through short accessible workshops. Applied learning: offer subject-specific scenarios, including identifying fabricated references and explaining when AI use is inappropriate. Institutional readiness: collaborate with academic staff, management, learner developers, library and careers teams to provide consistent guidance and staff briefings. These are proposed activities, informed by UNESCO's (2023) human-centred education guidance, not existing UWTSD programmes.

### **Reporting, authority and first-year outcomes**

The postholder will report to the designated lead and collaborate across university services. The role will not independently authorise AI procurement, student-data processing or assessment policy changes. Specialist matters will be escalated to relevant institutional decision-makers. First-year outputs will include a training-needs review, accessible resources, pilot workshops, staff briefings and an evaluation report.

Performance targets will be set after establishing a baseline; illustrative indicators include improved source-verification performance and participant accessibility feedback.

## PART B — PERSON SPECIFICATION

The selection criteria are linked to the duties of the proposed role. Essential criteria are required for effective performance; desirable criteria may strengthen an application but are not mandatory. This reflects the role-based recruitment approach discussed in Armstrong and Taylor (2026), without attributing the assessment framework below to the authors.

Assessment key: A = application evidence; I = structured interview; T = brief accessible scenario task. These methods are proposed for this simulation.

| Selection criterion               | Priority  | Evidence expected / link to duties                                                                       | Method  |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Graduate-level analytical ability | Essential | Degree or equivalent demonstrated capacity to research, communicate and analyse complex information.     | A       |
| AI literacy and verification      | Essential | Explain AI strengths and limits; identify fabricated sources and verify outputs (duties 2–3).            | A, I, T |
| Ethical and privacy judgement     | Essential | Recognise integrity, bias, privacy and oversight risks and know when to escalate (duties 4, 7–8).        | I, T    |
| Communication and facilitation    | Essential | Explain complex concepts clearly to diverse students and staff (duties 2, 5–6).                          | A, I    |
| Research and critical appraisal   | Essential | Find, assess and synthesise credible research and guidance (duties 3, 8–10).                             | A, I, T |
| Inclusive learning design         | Essential | Adapt training for varied confidence and accessibility needs; offer non-AI alternatives (duties 1–2, 9). | I, T    |
| Stakeholder collaboration         | Essential | Manage differing views constructively and respect decision-making boundaries (duties 4, 7–8).            | I       |
| Planning and evaluation           | Essential | Plan feasible activities and assess learning outcomes rather than attendance alone (duties 1, 9–10).     | I, T    |

|                                  |           |                                                                                |      |
|----------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Training or support experience   | Desirable | Workshop, mentoring, tutoring or student-support experience.                   | A, I |
| Higher education awareness       | Desirable | Familiarity with academic integrity, assessment or library practice.           | A, I |
| Information governance knowledge | Desirable | Awareness of approved tools, data minimisation or organisational risk reviews. | A, I |

### **Fair and proportionate selection**

Applications will be assessed against the essential, job-related criteria using documented evidence. Shortlisted candidates will answer the same eight core interview questions, with consistent prompts and predetermined scoring descriptors.

Each answer will be rated on a five-point scale: 1 = insufficient evidence, 2 = limited evidence, 3 = adequate evidence, 4 = good evidence and 5 = strong, specific evidence. The interview has a maximum score of 40 points. Where a scenario task is included, it will assess the same published competencies and be evaluated consistently; its score will be reported separately from the interview total.

Reasonable adjustments and accessible assessment formats will be offered as appropriate, while maintaining the job-related competencies assessed. Candidates will be evaluated on transferable AI literacy, critical thinking, ethical judgement and communication rather than familiarity with any single commercial AI product. This approach draws on general principles of role-based recruitment and selection (Armstrong and Taylor, 2026); the question set, assessment key and scoring scale are proposed specifically for this simulation.

### **Academic rationale for selection criteria**

UNESCO (2023) advocates a human-centred approach to generative AI in education, supporting the proposed emphasis on academic integrity, source verification, privacy and ethical judgement. Huang et al. (2026) propose a Humanistic HRM framework concerned with human dignity, employee well-being and the common good in AI-driven digital transformation. Although developed for organisational HRM, this framework offers a conceptual rationale for inclusive communication and stakeholder engagement. Patel et al. (2026) develop a theoretical account of how AI integration may disrupt alignment between HR practices, employee capabilities and organisational strategy; this informs the proposed criteria for collaborative judgement and coordination. Xia (2026) examines AI adoption in HRM using the Technology–Organization–Environment framework, including technological compatibility, organisational readiness and contextual factors such as regulation and leadership support. Because these HRM studies do not evaluate the proposed UWTSD post, their relevance is conceptual or indirect rather than evidence of its effectiveness.

## REFERENCES

- Armstrong, M. and Taylor, S. (2026) *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice: A guide to the theory and practice of people management*. 17th edn. London: Kogan Page.
- Huang, B.E., Kang, H., Zur, E. and Liang, L.H. (2026) 'Humanistic human resource management for digital transformation: Addressing the challenges of AI advancement in the workplace', *Human Resource Management Review*, 36(3), article 101151. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2026.101151>.
- Patel, P., Rofcanin, Y., Kamasak, R. and Belitski, M. (2026) 'The alignment paradox: A theory of AI-driven misalignment in HR systems', *Human Resource Management*, advance online publication. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.70099>.
- UNESCO (2023) *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. Paris: UNESCO. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>.
- Xia, Z. (2026) 'Mapping and testing AI adoption in human resource management: A bibliometric review and TOE-based quantitative analysis', *Quality & Quantity*, 60(5), pp. 19121–19149. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-026-02926-4>.