

Exploring AI Applications at Humber Polytechnic: A Strategic Assessment and Pilot Proposal

Brett Reynolds

Faculty of Liberal Arts & Sciences*

7th January 2026

I INTRODUCTION

Humber Polytechnic generates substantial institutional data across student information systems, learning management platforms, and administrative databases, yet this information remains largely under-utilized for strategic decision-making. Current analytics infrastructure consists primarily of compliance-focused reports and static dashboards that provide retrospective summaries rather than actionable insights.

This report examines how artificial intelligence applications might help Humber better utilize existing data to support student success and improve operational efficiency. The analysis includes both promising opportunities and significant implementation challenges that would need careful management.

Rather than promising immediate dramatic improvements, this proposal recommends a measured pilot approach that treats AI implementation as an institutional learning opportunity. Success should be evaluated based on what we discover about effective data utilization rather than predetermined performance targets.

*I used ChatGPT o3 and Claude Opus 4 in drafting. I take responsibility for all content. This work is licensed under CC-BY 4.0

2 CURRENT DATA LANDSCAPE

2.1 *Available Data Sources*

Humber's institutional data exists across multiple systems, each optimized for specific operational functions but poorly integrated for cross-system analysis:

System	Contents	Current Limitations
Banner (Student Information System)	Enrolment records, demographics, academic history, program changes	Query interfaces designed for administrative compliance rather than analytical exploration
Learning Management System (Blackboard Learn)	Student engagement data, discussion participation, assignment submissions, content access patterns	Raw data exists but current analytics tools provide only predetermined reports with limited cross-course capabilities
Institutional Surveys	Student satisfaction data, graduate outcomes, employer feedback	Summary statistics readily available; detailed response analysis requires manual processing
Work-Integrated Learning Systems	Placement records, employer evaluations, student reflections	Stored in program-specific databases with minimal integration with academic or outcome data
Facilities and Technology	Room utilization, energy consumption, network usage	Separate monitoring systems with no integrated analysis capabilities
Policy Repository	Institutional policies, program documentation, procedural guidelines	Distributed across multiple platforms with limited search functionality
Human Resources	Faculty assignments, professional development records, workload data	Access restricted by privacy requirements; no predictive analysis

2.2 *Integration Challenges*

The primary obstacle to leveraging institutional data lies not in storage capacity but in system interoperability and data quality. Current analytical workflows require manual data extraction and transformation processes that limit real-time analysis capabilities. Privacy and access controls, while necessary for compliance, create additional barriers to cross-functional data initiatives.

Moreover, data quality varies significantly across systems. Some contain incomplete records, inconsistent formatting, or missing metadata that would complicate automated analysis efforts.

3 POTENTIAL AI APPLICATIONS

3.1 *Near-Term Possibilities*

3.1.1 *Intelligent Information System*

Concept: An AI-powered system capable of answering routine questions about institutional policies, procedures, academic requirements, and deadlines.

Technical approach: The system would process institutional documents and knowledge base content, then provide contextually appropriate responses to user queries with source citations.

Potential benefits: Could reduce time staff spend on repetitive inquiries, improve information accessibility for students, and provide consistent responses to common questions.

Implementation challenges: Requires extensive document processing, quality assurance for response accuracy, integration with existing support systems, and ongoing maintenance as policies change.

Realistic expectations: Success would depend heavily on document quality and completeness. Similar systems at other institutions have shown mixed results, with effectiveness varying based on implementation approach and organizational adoption.

3.1.2 *Student Engagement Monitoring*

Concept: Analysis of learning management system data, attendance records, and academic performance to identify students who might benefit from early intervention.

Technical approach: Pattern recognition algorithms would analyze student behavior data to identify engagement changes that historically correlate with academic difficulties.

Potential benefits: Earlier identification of students needing support than current grade-based methods, better allocation of academic advising resources, improved understanding of student engagement patterns.

Implementation challenges: Requires significant data cleaning and integration, privacy compliance measures, training for staff who would receive alerts, and careful validation to avoid false positives that burden both students and advisors.

Realistic expectations: While promising in theory, the effectiveness would depend on data quality and the ability to act meaningfully on generated insights. Some institutions report modest improvements in early intervention timing, while others struggle with system adoption and alert fatigue.

3.2 *Medium-Term Explorations*

3.2.1 *Curriculum-Labor Market Analysis*

Concept: Systematic comparison of program learning outcomes with current job market requirements and graduate employment patterns.

Technical approach: Analysis of job posting requirements, employer feedback, and graduate outcome surveys to identify alignment between curricula and market demands.

Potential benefits: More evidence-based program development decisions, enhanced understanding of employment trends, improved marketing materials for prospective students.

Implementation challenges: Job market data quality varies significantly, employer feedback mechanisms need strengthening, and translating analysis results into curriculum changes requires substantial faculty engagement.

Realistic expectations: Useful insights are possible, but implementation would require significant investment in data collection processes and organizational change management.

3.2.2 *Work-Integrated Learning Optimization*

Concept: Analysis of historical placement data to improve matching between students and employers for co-operative education and internship opportunities.

Technical approach: Machine learning algorithms would analyze successful and unsuccessful placements to identify factors that contribute to positive outcomes for both students and employers.

Potential benefits: Potentially improved placement satisfaction, reduced coordinator workload for matching processes, enhanced employer relationships.

Implementation challenges: Limited historical data for many programs, subjective nature of “success” in placements, need for enhanced employer feedback systems.

Realistic expectations: Modest improvements possible, but success would depend on data availability and willingness of coordinators to modify existing placement processes.

4 STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 *Institutional Benefits*

Successful AI implementation could support several institutional priorities. Enhanced student success through earlier intervention aligns with Humber’s educational mission and could positively impact retention metrics. Improved operational efficiency might reduce administrative burden on staff, allowing more focus on complex student needs.

Evidence-based decision making capabilities could strengthen program development processes and enhance Humber’s reputation for innovation in educational technology. However, these benefits should be considered potential rather than guaranteed outcomes.

4.2 *Risk Assessment*

AI implementation involves substantial risks that require careful management. Technical risks include data integration challenges, system reliability concerns, and potential algorithmic bias in student assessment. Organizational risks encompass staff resistance to new technologies, privacy compliance complexities, and the possibility of implementing solutions that don’t address actual institutional needs.

Financial risks include the potential for significant investment with uncertain returns, ongoing maintenance costs that exceed initial projections, and opportunity costs of resources that could be allocated to other institutional priorities.

4.3 *Organizational Readiness*

Humber’s current technical infrastructure and data governance policies provide a foundation for AI implementation, but significant gaps exist. Data integration capabilities need enhancement, staff training requirements are substantial, and privacy compliance procedures would need expansion.

The institution’s commitment to digital innovation through the Digital Campus initiative suggests organizational willingness to explore new technologies, but successful AI implementation would require sustained leadership support and realistic timeline expectations.

5 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

5.1 *Recommended Pilot Approach*

Rather than attempting comprehensive AI deployment, we recommend beginning with a carefully scoped pilot project focused on one primary application. This approach allows for:

- Realistic assessment of technical feasibility with existing systems
- Development of internal expertise without overwhelming current staff
- Measurement of actual benefits rather than projected outcomes
- Identification of implementation challenges specific to Humber's context
- Establishment of governance processes for responsible AI use

5.2 *Pilot Project Scope*

Primary focus: Intelligent information system for policy and procedure queries

Secondary exploration: Basic student engagement pattern analysis

Timeline: 12–18 months from initiation to evaluation

Success metrics: To be established based on baseline measurements of current processes

5.3 *Phase 1: Foundation (Months 1–6)*

1. Conduct comprehensive baseline measurement of current information-seeking behaviors and response times
2. Assess technical infrastructure requirements and data integration capabilities
3. Develop privacy compliance protocols for AI applications
4. Establish project governance structure and success criteria
5. Begin staff training on AI concepts and institutional applications

5.4 *Phase 2: Pilot Implementation (Months 7–12)*

1. Deploy limited intelligent information system covering core policies and procedures
2. Implement basic engagement monitoring for voluntary pilot programs
3. Collect detailed usage data and user feedback
4. Monitor system performance and identify technical issues
5. Refine processes based on initial experience

5.5 *Phase 3: Evaluation and Decision (Months 13–18)*

1. Conduct comprehensive evaluation comparing outcomes to baseline measurements
2. Assess staff and student adoption patterns
3. Analyze cost-benefit relationship including ongoing maintenance requirements
4. Determine feasibility and value of expanded implementation
5. Develop recommendations for next phase or project conclusion

6 RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

6.1 *Financial Investment*

Initial pilot implementation costs are difficult to estimate precisely given uncertainty about technical requirements and vendor pricing. Conservative estimates suggest:

- Technical infrastructure and software licensing: \$40,000–\$80,000
 - Consulting and development support: \$50,000–\$150,000
 - Staff training and project management: \$10,000–\$30,000
 - Ongoing maintenance and evaluation: \$20,000–\$40,000 annually
- Total pilot investment range: \$120,000–\$300,000 over 18 months

The wide range reflects genuine uncertainty about implementation complexity and vendor costs. More precise estimates would require detailed technical specifications and market research.

6.2 *Staffing Requirements*

Successful implementation requires dedicated project management, technical coordination, and change management support. This could involve reassigning existing staff responsibilities, hiring temporary consulting support, or adding specialized positions.

Faculty and staff training represents a substantial but necessary investment. Success depends on user adoption, which requires comprehensive communication and support throughout implementation.

6.3 *Organizational Commitment*

Beyond financial resources, AI implementation requires sustained organizational commitment to learning and adaptation. Leadership support must persist through inevitable technical difficulties and initial user resistance.

Data governance processes need enhancement to address AI-specific privacy and ethical considerations. This includes establishing review procedures for algorithmic decision-making and bias monitoring protocols.

7 GOVERNANCE AND ETHICS

7.1 *Privacy and Compliance*

All AI applications must comply with FIPPA, PHIPA, and institutional data governance policies. This requires robust data anonymization procedures, explicit consent mechanisms where appropriate, and regular privacy impact assessments.

Student data usage for predictive analytics raises particular ethical concerns about consent, transparency, and potential stigmatization. Implementation must include clear opt-out procedures and explanation of how student data contributes to institutional decision-making.

7.2 *Algorithmic Accountability*

AI systems that influence student services or academic decisions require ongoing monitoring for bias and fairness. This includes regular auditing of algorithmic outputs, transparent explanation of decision-making processes, and clear procedures for students to contest AI-influenced decisions.

An institutional AI ethics committee should provide oversight for all AI applications, with representation from students, faculty, staff, and community members. This committee should have authority to require modifications or discontinuation of AI systems that demonstrate bias or adverse impacts.

7.3 *Transparency and Communication*

Successful AI implementation requires clear communication about how systems work, what data they use, and how they influence institutional decisions. This includes regular reporting to the college community about AI applications and their outcomes.

Faculty and staff need understanding of AI capabilities and limitations to use these tools effectively. This requires ongoing education and support beyond initial training periods.

8 HONEST ASSESSMENT OF PROSPECTS

AI applications in higher education show promise but involve substantial implementation challenges. Many institutions struggle with data quality issues, user adoption difficulties, and the gap between technological capability and organizational readiness.

Success at Humber would depend on several factors largely outside our current control: vendor system reliability, staff willingness to modify established workflows, student acceptance of AI-mediated services, and the ability to maintain systems effectively over time.

The primary value of this initiative may be institutional learning about data utilization rather than immediate operational improvements. This represents legitimate value but requires different success metrics than traditional technology implementations.

Some specific concerns worth acknowledging:

- Our data quality across systems varies significantly and may require substantial cleaning before AI applications become feasible
- Staff expertise in AI technologies is currently limited, creating dependency on external vendors
- Student privacy expectations may conflict with data usage requirements for effective AI systems
- Ongoing maintenance and updating costs often exceed initial implementation budgets
- Organizational change management for AI adoption requires sustained effort often underestimated in project planning

9 RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 Proceed with Measured Optimism

AI applications offer genuine potential to enhance student support and institutional efficiency, but implementation should proceed with realistic expectations and careful risk management.

A focused pilot project represents appropriate institutional exploration of emerging technologies while limiting exposure to implementation risks.

9.2 Prioritize Learning over Performance

Success should be measured by what we learn about effective data utilization rather than predetermined performance improvements. This approach allows for meaningful evaluation regardless of specific technical outcomes.

9.3 Invest in Organizational Readiness

Technical implementation represents only part of the challenge. Substantial investment in staff training, change management, and governance processes is essential for meaningful success.

9.4 Maintain Ethical Leadership

Humber has an opportunity to demonstrate responsible AI adoption in higher education by prioritizing student privacy, algorithmic accountability, and transparent communication throughout implementation.

10 CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence applications represent a significant opportunity for Humber to enhance student support and operational efficiency through better utilization of institutional data. However,

successful implementation requires careful attention to technical feasibility, organizational readiness, and ethical considerations.

A measured pilot approach focusing on learning and capability development rather than immediate performance gains represents appropriate institutional exploration of these emerging technologies. Success should be evaluated based on enhanced understanding of data utilization possibilities rather than predetermined operational improvements.

The proposed timeline allows for comprehensive evaluation of both opportunities and challenges while building institutional expertise for future decision-making about expanded AI applications.

Ultimately, this initiative should be considered an investment in institutional learning about responsible technology adoption rather than a guaranteed solution to current operational challenges. This perspective allows for meaningful evaluation of outcomes while maintaining realistic expectations about AI capabilities in higher education contexts.