

Human-in-the-Loop Review Guide

A Practical Guide for Reviewing and Designing AI-Supported Learning Materials

Purpose

The Sheridan Human-in-the-Loop Review Guide provides faculty with a practical and repeatable process for reviewing AI-generated content before sharing with students.

While AI can support efficiency and idea generation, faculty remain responsible for ensuring the quality, relevance, and appropriateness of all materials used in their courses.

The goal is not simply to correct AI-generated content, **the goal is to design better learning experiences.**

When to Use This Guide

Use this guide when creating or reviewing:

- Assessment instructions and materials
- Presentation slides
- Case studies and examples
- Feedback comments
- Learning activities
- Student-facing communications
- AI-generated teaching resources

Review and Evaluate

Accuracy & Disciplinary Integrity	☐ Information is factually accurate and current ☐ Content aligns with disciplinary standards and practices ☐ Claims are supported by evidence and/or resources ☐ No AI hallucinations, inaccuracies, or misleading information are present Reflection Question Would I confidently stand behind this content within my discipline?
Inclusion, Equity & Representation	☐ Language is respectful and inclusive ☐ Examples reflect diverse perspectives and experiences ☐ Content avoids stereotypes, bias and/or assumptions ☐ Material is accessible to a broad range of learners ☐ No student group is excluded or disadvantaged Reflection Question Whose perspectives may be missing, oversimplified, or misrepresented?
Learning & Pedagogical Alignment	☐ Content supports intended learning outcomes

	☐ Activities encourage meaningful learning ☐ Students are expected to think, apply, reflect, and/or create ☐ Materials support learning rather than simple task completion ☐ Content is aligned with credential level and learner context Reflection Question Would this content help students think, apply, reflect, create, or deepen their understanding?
Transparency & Trustworthiness	☐ Sources are identified, verifiable, or reasonably inferable ☐ Limitations or uncertainty are acknowledged where appropriate ☐ Content can be explained and defended if questioned ☐ Students can understand and trust the information provided Reflection Question Would students understand where this information comes from and why they should trust it?
Risk, Ethics & Institutional Alignment	☐ Content is free from harmful or misleading information ☐ Ethical implications have been considered ☐ Risk of misuse or misinterpretation is low ☐ Content reflects Sheridan's values and expectations ☐ Materials align with relevant institutional policies and practices Reflection Question Does this reflect the quality, professionalism, and values I expect from Sheridan learning materials?

Sheridan Reflection

Before sharing this material with students, ask:

Would I feel comfortable attaching my name, my course, and Sheridan's name to this content?

If the answer is no, revise, review and/or regenerate before sharing.