NSPA 2026 CONTINUITY
October 19–22 | San Antonio, TX

Trust, Transparency, and AI

Session takeaways

1. **Assign authority and human checks**
    - Sort tasks into ASSIST, CHECK, or HUMAN. Organizing files can be assisted. Verify quotations and rubric matches. People decide awards, exceptions, and appeals.
    - For each task, name a safeguard and the person who can correct or stop the work. Follow receive, minimize, prepare, verify, and decide.
    - Before upload, satisfy both gates: approved use and only the information the task needs. Check tool, access, retention, reuse, and response plans.

2. **Write requests and audit the evidence**
    - Name the task, source, evidence requirement, and limit. Use one excerpt and the actual published criterion and anchors. Ask for quotations, source locations, gaps, and a neutral question.
    - In fictional A17, paragraph 2 supports 12 tutoring sessions and two recruited volunteers. It does not establish 120 students served, improved grades, or an unsupported leadership trait.
    - The teaching rubric supports a provisional 2/3 for a specific contribution without result evidence. Keep the quotation, source pointer, and open question in the handoff.

3. **Calibrate with the same anchors**
    - Score equivalent evidence with the same rubric. Both tutoring excerpts describe the same contribution and support 2/3 under the fictional teaching anchor.
    - Do not substitute vocabulary, polish, or prestige for evidence. A score of 3 in this example needs a specific contribution and a supported result.
    - One comparison does not prove fairness. Test varied fictional cases, compare unsupported claims and omissions, discuss judgments, correct, and retest.

NSPA 2026 CONTINUITY
October 19–22 | San Antonio, TX

Trust, Transparency, and AI

Session takeaways continued

4. **Publish applicant boundaries and fair responses**
    - Decide rules for proofreading, translation, and drafting from truthful notes. Invented achievements conflict with truthful claims. Specify disclosure before applications open.
    - A detector can flag human writing or miss AI-generated text. A score alone cannot establish authorship, a policy violation, or eligibility.
    - Pause automatic penalties, check evidence and the published rule, invite clarification when appropriate, and record human reasons and the reconsideration route.

5. **Draft three usable policy sentences**
    - Applicants: Name allowed help, responsibility for the statement and claims, and when and how to disclose. Make unresolved choices explicit.
    - Reviewers: Name the approved task and service, the person who verifies quotations and sources, and when that check occurs.
    - Concerns: Explain evidence review, clarification, and reconsideration. Specify a contact, review steps, and response timeline. Adapt workshop samples locally.

6. **Plan and review a four-week pilot**
    - Week 1: scope one task and owner. Week 2: test fictional cases and log errors. Week 3: compare, correct, and retest. Week 4: decide to proceed, revise, or stop.
    - Set success criteria before testing. Confirm authorization for the service and data, verification ownership, retention, and policy readiness before any real use.
    - Write one task, one specific human check, an owner, and a date. Name the evidence needed to continue and an error that would pause the pilot.

Miguel Guhlin · October 21, 2026 · mguhlin.github.io/nspa/2026/