

Start here — a map of the pack

This guide provides an overview of the Institutional AI Readiness Pack, explaining what each instrument is designed to do and how to get started.

The Institutional AI Readiness Pack is a university-wide assessment and implementation toolkit designed for the responsible use of AI in academic research. It spans practice, people, policy, systems, procurement, data, disclosure, and oversight. It serves as a practical companion to *Responsible AI in Academic Research: A Competency Framework for Research Training*, which defines five core dimensions of institutional readiness along with the underlying capabilities needed to support them.

This pack translates that framework into practical instruments that your university can use to build an evidence-based picture of how AI is actually used and governed across your research environment. It also gives you ways to track improvements over time. By doing this, it connects high-level institutional policy and strategic priorities directly with the everyday practices, skills, and experiences of researchers and graduate students.

[Browse the full online instrument catalogue](#) to read or download every resource in HTML, Word, PDF, and spreadsheet formats.

What's in it

Start with the main document. *The Institutional AI Readiness Pack* is the foundation for everything here. It explains how the report's framework is used across the pack, walks you through how to run an assessment and interpret your results, and illustrates the entire process using a fictional university from its initial assessment to its first concrete actions. I recommend reading it once before you begin, and keeping it on hand as a reference while you run the assessment.

Thirteen instruments across four groups.

	Instrument	What it does	Who completes it
A1	Maturity self-assessment	Scores your institution across twenty cells against documentary evidence	A convened group, half a day
A2	Doctoral student survey	Captures how doctoral students report using AI in their research	Doctoral students, 10 min
A3	Supervisor survey	Asks advisors and supervisors the same core questions to compare perspectives	Advisors and supervisors, 10–12 min
A4	Gap analysis + action ladder	Turns your assessment results into prioritized work packages toward target rungs, with named owners	Assessment owner
A5	Board reporting page	Summarizes the findings and next steps on a single page for executive leadership or the board	Assessment owner
B1	Briefing for research leadership	Outlines five key decisions owned by the chief research officer (VPR/DVC-R) and five questions to ask	Read only

	Instrument	What it does	Who completes it
B2	Briefing for deans	Focuses on translating university policy into school and college-level practices	Read only
B3	Briefing for graduate schools	Covers admissions, supervision, research training, and thesis examination	Read only
B4	Briefing for integrity committees	Clarifies what constitutes a genuine research integrity issue versus routine tool use	Read only
B5	Briefing for student bodies	Outlines what graduate students can reasonably expect and request from the university	Read only
G1	Supervisor–student agreement	A template to establish, task by task, what AI tools may and may not be used for in a student's research	Advisor and student together, 30 min
P1	Model AI-in-research policy	A practical template and starting point for drafting your institutional policy	Research office, adapt
P2	Disclosure standard	Defines what researchers must declare, with ready-to-use disclosure statements	Research office, adapt

Table 1. Overview of thirteen instruments detailing their functions and designated respondents.

A companion scoring workbook. I also provide a spreadsheet that handles all the calculations. Once you enter your A1 self-assessment responses, the workbook automatically generates your institutional profile, highlights the specific axis holding each dimension back, and identifies the single dimension that is constraining your overall progress.

Three things to know before you start

The assessment uses a triangulated design. Research leadership completes the maturity self-assessment (A1), doctoral students complete the student survey (A2), and advisors and supervisors complete the supervisor survey (A3). The surveys for students and supervisors include parallel questions that ask the anonymous cohorts about the same institutional artifacts and practices, alongside questions specific to each role. You will want to account for differences in response scales before comparing their answers directly. Comparing these different perspectives is essential because the gap between what leadership can document and what graduate students and supervisors report experiencing is where the most valuable insights emerge. An institution that only surveys central administrators will only confirm what it already assumes.

A1 requires documentary evidence for every answer. Each A1 indicator asks whether a specific, verifiable artifact exists, such as an approved policy clause, a designated role with a current occupant, an active software register, or a verified training record. If the evidence establishes that the requirement is not met, record No. If the evidence is unavailable or unresolved, leave the item unanswered rather than treating the blank as a documented No. A2 and A3 collect respondent evidence and do not require a documentary artifact for every response.

I intentionally avoid reducing your institution to a single overall score. Instead, the assessment produces individual maturity levels across five distinct dimensions and identifies the specific bottleneck or constraint that is holding your institution back. Combining everything into a single average score would allow a well-written policy document to mask an untrained student cohort or an unmonitored IT environment. In practice, that kind of averaging is the most common way universities mislead themselves about their actual AI readiness.

Where to begin

1. **Read the briefing tailored to your role (B1 to B5).** This takes about ten minutes and outlines the primary responsibilities and strategic decisions that sit with you.
2. **Convene your working group to complete the maturity self-assessment (A1).** This typically takes half a day. Your group should include representatives from the research office, research integrity, the graduate school, central IT, the library, and at least two active researchers. This breadth is necessary because no single office holds all the required documentary evidence.
3. **Field the student and supervisor surveys (A2 and A3).** You can run these surveys while A1 is being completed. Invite the full eligible cohorts, report the achieved response rates, and avoid describing respondents as representative without comparing them with the eligible populations.
4. **Work through the gap analysis and action ladder (A4).** This instrument organizes required improvements into priority work packages toward target rungs. For each package, it identifies a concrete action, a named owner, and the artifact used in the next A1 rescore.

In my experience, most universities can complete the full assessment cycle over one academic quarter, requiring roughly twenty-two to twenty-five person-days of effort across the working group, alongside the time contributed by survey respondents.

Adapt all of it

Everything here is licensed **CC BY 4.0**. You may rewrite it, shorten it, translate it, rename it, and adopt it as your own institutional document (including commercially). You do not need to ask permission, and you do not need to notify Instats. Attribution is the only condition: *Adapted from The Institutional AI Readiness Pack (Instats, 2026), CC BY 4.0.*

Every university operates in a distinct regulatory and operational environment, so a toolkit that you cannot legally customize would not be very helpful. These instruments are designed to be adapted to fit your institution's specific needs.

Questions: support@instats.org · instats.org

instats

Michael J. Zyphur, PhD · Professor and Director, Instats · instats.org · support@instats.org

Cite the pack. Zyphur, M. J. (2026). *The Institutional AI Readiness Pack: Self-Assessment and Implementation Tools for Responsible AI in Academic Research*. Instats Policy Series. <https://doi.org/10.61700/bv2nulyhht>

Companion report. Zyphur, M. J. (2026). *Responsible AI in Academic Research: A Competency Framework for Research Training*. Instats Policy Series. <https://doi.org/10.61700/t31oy23grr>

License. The pack and its instruments are licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). You may adapt them for institutional use with attribution.