



Trainer and Assessor Guidelines: Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Status: Internal guidelines for trainers, assessors, supervisors, and the training team (not publicly published)

Relationship to AI Governance Policy: These Guidelines sit under, and must be read alongside, the [Mi Artificial Intelligence \(AI\) Policy \(Governance and Values Framework\)](#), available on the Mediation Institute website. The Governance Policy sets Mi's values, boundaries, and oversight arrangements. These Guidelines explain how those principles apply to you as a trainer and/or assessor.

1. Purpose

These Guidelines are intended to support trainers and assessors to:

- use artificial intelligence (AI) ethically and consistently in their professional role,
- maintain assessment integrity and educational quality,
- model appropriate professional use of AI for students,
- apply the intent-and-effect approach in practice, and
- align trainer practice with Mi's governance, privacy, and transparency commitments.

AI is recognised as an emerging professional tool. Trainers remain fully responsible for all educational, assessment, and supervisory decisions.

2. AI as an Assistive Tool for Trainers

AI may be used by trainers and assessors as an assistive tool to support professional work. It must not replace educator responsibility, professional judgment, or assessment decision-making.

Appropriate uses may include:

- drafting or refining feedback for clarity, tone, or accessibility,

- benchmarking student work against unit requirements or competency standards,
- supporting moderation and consistency across assessments,
- identifying themes or learning needs across cohorts,
- supporting reflective supervision questions, and
- assisting with preparation of learning materials or resources.

AI must not be used to:

- make final assessment decisions,
- determine competence or non-competence,
- replace direct engagement with student work or performance,
- automate professional judgment, or
- provide legal, clinical, or professional advice.

See sections 3, 4.1, and 4.3 of the Mi Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy.

3. Assessment Integrity and Applied Competence

Mi places strong emphasis on applied assessment, including role plays simulations, observed practice, and reflective discussion.

When using AI in assessment-related tasks, trainers and assessors must ensure that:

- assessment decisions are based on direct observation and review of student work and performance,
- role plays and applied assessments remain the primary indicators of competence,
- AI-assisted feedback does not mask or dilute assessment judgments, and
- assessment outcomes can be clearly explained and justified independent of AI tools.

Trainers should remain alert to discrepancies between:

- written work and applied performance,
- polished submissions and limited understanding demonstrated in practice, and
- repeated patterns of weak application following formative feedback.

These indicators may inform educational conversations under the intent-and-effect framework.

See sections 4.3 and 4.4 of the Mi Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy.

4. Intent-and-Effect Approach in Practice

Concerns about student or trainer use of AI are considered by reference to intent and effect, not by speculation or automated detection.

In applying this approach, trainers may consider:

- how AI appears to have been used (support versus substitution),
- the student's explanation or reflection about their learning process,
- consistency between written material and demonstrated application,
- responsiveness to feedback and willingness to engage in learning, and
- whether concerns are isolated and corrected or form a broader pattern.

Where concerns arise:

- the initial response should be educational and developmental,
- clarification, feedback, and learning support should be prioritised, and
- escalation should be considered where patterns persist or learning integrity is materially undermined.

This approach aligns with professional supervision and reflective practice models rather than punitive compliance frameworks.

See section 4.4 of the Mi Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy.

5. Confidentiality, Privacy, and AI Use

Trainers and assessors operate in a family law and dispute resolution context where confidentiality is critical.

Accordingly:

- identifiable or reasonably identifiable personal or sensitive information must **never** be entered into public or open AI tools,
- care must be taken with contextual detail, even where names are removed,
- placement-related information, case examples, and role-play material must be treated with particular caution, and

- where doubt exists about identifiability, information must be treated as identifiable.

Where AI is used within Mi's internal or enterprise systems, trainers must ensure that:

- use aligns with organisational safeguards and access controls,
- outputs are advisory or analytical only, and
- human review and judgment are always applied.

See sections 4.5 and 4.6 of the Mi Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy.

6. Use of Mi-Developed AI Tools

Mi may develop or provide AI tools (such as the **MiAi Mediation Coach** and **MiAi FDR Coach**) to support learning, reflective practice, and professional development.

When using Mi-developed AI tools, trainers should:

- understand that these tools are assistive resources, not assessment instruments,
- ensure that student engagement with these tools supports, rather than replaces, learning,
- avoid treating AI outputs as determinative or authoritative, and
- continue to apply independent professional judgment in all assessment and supervision activities.

All Mi-developed AI tools are governed by the Mi Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy.

www.mediationinstitute.edu.au/mi-ai

7. Transparency and Modelling Professional Practice

Mi is transparent at an institutional level about the use of AI. Trainers are not required to disclose individual AI use to students on an artefact-by-artefact basis.

However, trainers are encouraged to:

- model thoughtful and ethical engagement with AI where appropriate,
- respond openly to student questions about AI use within the boundaries of the Governance Policy,
- reinforce that AI supports learning but does not replace understanding, skill, or judgment, and
- align messaging consistently with the Student AI Use Guidelines.

This approach supports trust without creating surveillance-based learning environments.

See section 4.7 of the Mi Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy.

8. Moderation, Supervision, and Audit Readiness

Use of AI by trainers and assessors should be capable of withstanding:

- internal moderation,
- professional supervision, and
- external audit or regulatory review.

Trainers should be able to demonstrate that:

- assessment decisions were made independently,
- if AI was used it was as a support tool only, and
- judgments are grounded in observable evidence and professional reasoning.

Documentation, moderation notes, and reflective supervision discussions may support this where required.

9. Professional Responsibility and Ongoing Learning

AI use is an evolving area of professional practice. Trainers and assessors are expected to:

- remain informed about Mi's AI governance arrangements,
- engage in ongoing reflection about ethical and effective use,
- raise questions or concerns about AI use through appropriate channels, and
- contribute to continuous improvement of practice and policy.

These Guidelines are intended to support consistent, ethical, and confident trainer practice in line with Mi's values and professional obligations.

10. Policy and other Guidelines

The Policy and Guidelines for Students, Trainers and Practitioners are publicly available on this web page - [Mediation Institute Guides And Forms](#)