RESPONSIBLE AI IN HR · COMPLIANCE REVIEW KIT

Check your employee handbook against the latest AI and employment law

Use any AI assistant with web search to compare one handbook section with today's law, then take a prioritized gap list to counsel. Plan about 20 minutes for the prompts, plus time to check the output before you act on it.

What you need

One handbook section as a PDF or text: public, redacted, or the practice handbook in this kit

One or two jurisdictions, with your headcount in each

An AI assistant with web search, such as ChatGPT, Claude, Copilot or Gemini

The worksheet at the back of this kit

Before you upload anything

- ☐ No names, pay, health, investigation or case details in the file
- ☐ A business account where possible, with training on your data turned off
- ☐ Web search turned on, so the tool can see the law as it stands today
- ☐ The output is a gap list for counsel, not legal advice

The six-prompt workflow

Run the prompts in order, in one conversation, so each builds on the last. Replace everything in [brackets].

01	02	03	04	05	06
Orient	**Research**	**Compare**	**Prioritize**	**Draft**	**Self-check**
Inventory what the handbook says	Map current and upcoming law, with sources	Build the gap table	Rank by risk and deadline	Proposed language for the top gaps	Flag weak citations and assumptions

Each prompt follows the BRIEF structure: Background, Request, Instructions, Expectation, Focus.

Where AI helps, and where it breaks

It is good at

Reading long policy text fast, structuring a comparison, and drafting plain-language fixes.

It is risky at

Exact effective dates, bills that died or were amended, and headcount or dollar thresholds.

So you

Demand primary-source links, spot-check every high-risk item, and send the gap list to counsel.

aicadium

COPY · PASTE · ADAPT

The six prompts

Prompt 1 · Orient

BACKGROUND: I'm an HR leader reviewing our employee handbook for legal compliance. The attached file is [our handbook / the section on TOPIC], last updated [DATE].

REQUEST: Read it and build an inventory of what it currently says.

INSTRUCTIONS: Return a table with: Section name | Page | What the policy requires or permits (1 to 2 sentences) | Any laws or jurisdictions it names | Any mention of technology, monitoring, automated tools or AI.

EXPECTATION: One row per policy section. Quote short key phrases exactly.

FOCUS: Do not assess compliance yet. Just tell me what the document says. If something is ambiguous, say so.

Why: separating what the handbook says from whether it is legal reduces invented comparisons later.

Prompt 2 · Research the legal landscape

BACKGROUND: We have employees in [JURISDICTIONS, e.g. California (40), Ontario (12)]. Today's date is [DATE].

REQUEST: Using web search, identify the laws and regulations that apply to the topics in this handbook section, including laws on AI or automated decision tools in employment.

INSTRUCTIONS: For each, give: Law / citation | Jurisdiction | Status (In force / Enacted, not yet effective / Pending bill) | Effective date | Key employer requirement | Headcount or other threshold | Primary source link (statute, regulator or official government site).

EXPECTATION: Include anything taking effect in the next 18 months. Cite a primary source for every row.

FOCUS: Do NOT include bills that failed or were vetoed unless you label them. If you cannot confirm a date or status, write "UNVERIFIED" rather than guessing.

Why: the status column and the UNVERIFIED instruction are your best defense against stale or invented law.

Prompt 3 · Compare and find the gaps

REQUEST: Compare the handbook inventory (Prompt 1) against the legal requirements (Prompt 2).

INSTRUCTIONS: Return a gap table: Handbook section | Legal requirement | Jurisdiction | Current handbook language (short quote or "silent") | Gap type (Missing / Outdated / Conflicting / Unclear / Compliant) | Risk (High / Medium / Low) and why | Source link.

EXPECTATION: Include compliant rows too, so I can see coverage. Rate High only where there is a legal deadline or clear conflict.

FOCUS: Pay special attention to the six obligations that repeat across jurisdictions: notice, human review, bias testing, explanation and appeal, records, and vendor accountability. Also flag electronic monitoring, pay transparency and layoff notices.

Why: the focus list is the six obligations from the one-pager, the ones that show up in almost every jurisdiction.

aicadium

Prompt 4 · Prioritize

REQUEST: Turn the gap table into a prioritized action list.

INSTRUCTIONS: Sort by (1) risk, then (2) effective date. For each item: Recommended action | Suggested owner (HR, Legal, IT, Talent Acquisition, Managers) | Target date | Quick win (Yes/No) | Needs counsel review (Yes/No).

EXPECTATION: No more than 10 items. Put anything already in force at the top.

FOCUS: Be practical for a [SIZE]-person HR team. Flag where a single policy change would cover several jurisdictions.

Prompt 5 · Draft proposed language

REQUEST: For the top 3 items, draft proposed replacement or new handbook language.

INSTRUCTIONS: For each: current text, then proposed text, in plain language that a new employee would easily understand, with a one-line rationale and the source it responds to. Use [PLACEHOLDERS] for anything company-specific (contact names, tool names, retention periods).

EXPECTATION: Mark every draft "DRAFT: FOR COUNSEL REVIEW".

FOCUS: Write so it works across all of our listed jurisdictions where possible; note any jurisdiction-specific addendum needed.

Prompt 6 · Self-check

REQUEST: Critically review everything you produced in this conversation.

INSTRUCTIONS: List (a) any citation, date or threshold you are less than highly confident about, (b) any law you included that may have been amended, delayed, enjoined or not passed, (c) assumptions you made about our company, and (d) the 3 items I should verify first with a primary source or counsel.

FOCUS: Be skeptical. It is better to flag too much than too little.

Why: models are often better at critiquing their own output than at getting it right the first time. Use that, then verify yourself.

MAKE IT A ROUTINE

Save the six prompts as a custom assistant or project with your jurisdictions and headcounts in its instructions. Then re-run Prompt 2 on a schedule, asking only for "changes since [last run date]". The next page helps you choose how often.

aicadium

VALIDATE BEFORE YOU ACT

How to check the output

The five-minute verification

- ☐ Open the source link for every high-risk item. Does it say what the AI claims?
- ☐ Is the link a primary source (statute, regulator, government site) rather than a blog?
- ☐ Does the effective date match the source? Is the status still current?
- ☐ Does the threshold apply to you: headcount, location, remote workers?
- ☐ Did the AI quote your handbook accurately?

Common pitfalls

Zombie laws. Bills that passed one chamber, were vetoed, or were replaced, such as Colorado's original AI Act.

Moved dates. The EU AI Act's employment obligations now apply from 2 December 2027.

Jurisdiction drift. US federal answers when you asked about Ontario.

Overconfidence. A clean table is not a correct table.

Choose your cadence

Re-running Prompt 2 on a schedule turns a one-off review into monitoring. How often depends on how fast your jurisdictions move and how much review time you have. Each cadence buys something different.

Daily

Suits a jurisdiction with a deadline in view or a legislature in session.

Changes surface the day they publish, including court orders that pause a law overnight.

Trade-off: someone has to triage every day.

Weekly

Fits a standing team meeting.

A week's batch often shows a bill's full movement, such as passage and signature together, so findings arrive with more context and less noise.

Trade-off: a fast change can sit for a few days.

Monthly

Lowest overhead. Suits a small team or a quieter jurisdiction.

Statuses have had time to settle, so fewer findings reverse before you act. It also lines up with a monthly policy review.

Trade-off: least warning before a deadline.

YOU CAN MIX THEM

Run a jurisdiction with a live deadline daily and the rest monthly. Log every run in one shared tracker, so the next run can ask only what changed.

aicadium

REFERENCE

What to look for, by handbook section

Status as of 6 October 2026. Laws change often, so confirm each one with a primary source before you act.

Handbook section	Check for	Examples driving it
Recruiting and hiring	Disclosure when AI screens or assesses applicants; bias audits; candidate notices; pay ranges in postings; record retention	Ontario job postings IN FORCE Illinois HB 3773 IN FORCE NYC Local Law 144 IN FORCE
Technology use and electronic monitoring	Written monitoring policy; what is collected and why; limits on emotion recognition, biometric or neural data	Ontario monitoring policy IN FORCE EU emotion-recognition ban IN FORCE California AB 1883 JAN 2027
Performance, discipline and termination	Human review of AI-assisted decisions; notice when AI was used; explanation and appeal	California SB 947 JUL 2027 Colorado SB 26-189 JAN 2027
Employee privacy and data	Pre-use notice, opt-out or appeal, and access rights for automated decisions; risk assessments; cross-border data	California CCPA ADMT rules JAN 2027 Singapore PDPA IN FORCE
Layoffs and reductions in force	State WARN process; disclosure if a layoff relates to AI or technological change	Connecticut SB 5 IN FORCE California SB 951 JAN 2027
EEO and anti-discrimination	AI named as covered; no proxies such as postal codes; current protected characteristics; grievance process	Illinois HB 3773 IN FORCE Connecticut SB 5 (AI is no defense) IN FORCE Singapore WFA EXPECTED END-2027
AI acceptable use	Approved tools; prohibited data; human review of AI output; AI literacy training	EU AI literacy duty IN FORCE Internal governance

Key

- **IN FORCE** — applies today
- **DATE** — enacted, applies from that date
- **EXPECTED** — passed, commencement not yet fixed

START WITH THESE THREE

1. **Tell people when AI is used.**
2. **Have a person review decisions before they take effect.**
3. **Keep records as long as your strictest location requires.**

aicadium

PRACTICE ON THIS SAMPLE HANDBOOK

Practice handbook: Harbor & Pine Studio

Paste this excerpt into your AI tool as the attached file for Prompt 1. For Prompt 2, use the locations and headcounts in the header. It contains more than 20 deliberate gaps, so keep a tally of what the AI finds and what it misses. The answer key is on page 8.

Harbor & Pine Studio, Inc. Employee Handbook (Rev. March 2024)

Fictional company for training purposes. Locations: San Diego, CA (45 employees) · Chicago, IL (18) · Toronto, ON (30) · Singapore (12) · plus 6 remote employees in New York City. Total: 111.

1.2 Equal Employment Opportunity. Harbor & Pine does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age or disability, as required by federal law.

3.1 Recruiting. We use an applicant tracking system with built-in software that reviews and ranks every application. The top 20% of applicants are automatically forwarded to hiring managers, who make final decisions.

3.2 Job Postings. Job postings describe the role and its required qualifications. Salary is discussed with the candidate at the offer stage. Graduate program roles in Singapore are open to candidates aged 30 and under.

3.3 Video Interviews. Candidates for client-facing roles complete a recorded video interview. Our interview software analyzes each recording for communication style, tone of voice and enthusiasm, and produces a score for the hiring team.

3.4 Background Checks. Finalists are screened by a third-party provider, which generates a single risk score used to make the final hiring decision.

3.5 Applicant Records. Applications of candidates who are not hired are deleted after 12 months.

4.2 Timekeeping. Hourly employees in all offices clock in and out using a fingerprint scanner.

5.4 Use of Company Systems. All company devices, email and messaging systems are company property. The company may monitor any activity on its systems, including keystrokes, screenshots and webcam activity, at any time and for any reason without further notice.

6.2 Performance Management. Managers use productivity dashboards and analytics, including sentiment and engagement scoring of employee messages, to identify low performers. Employees flagged by the system for two consecutive quarters may be placed on a performance improvement plan or separated.

6.3 Work Allocation. Project assignments and shifts are allocated automatically by our workflow tool based on each employee's productivity score.

8.1 Workforce Changes. In the event of a layoff, the company will provide notice as required by federal law.

9.3 Use of AI Tools. Employees may use publicly available AI tools to improve productivity. Please use good judgment.

9.4 Employee Personal Data. Employee information may be shared with our vendors, including AI providers, for any business purpose. All data is stored in the United States.

10.1 Concerns and Complaints. Employees with concerns about any employment decision should raise them with their manager. The manager's decision is final.

aicadium

Your tally

	Gaps the AI found	Gaps I found that the AI missed	AI findings that were wrong
Count			

Rewrite one clause

Pick one clause from the practice handbook (6.2 Performance Management works well) and run Prompt 5 on it alone. Then score the draft.

- ☐ Tells people **when and how** AI or automated tools are used, in plain language
- ☐ Names a **human decision-maker** who reviews before any adverse action
- ☐ Gives a way to **ask questions, correct data or request review**
- ☐ Avoids promises you can't keep: "never", "always", "fully explainable"
- ☐ Uses [PLACEHOLDERS] for tools, contacts and retention periods, and is marked DRAFT for counsel

Try a scenario

Paste a scenario into your AI tool with its prompt, then answer the questions yourself before reading the AI's answer.

The vendor switch-on

Your applicant tracking vendor turns on AI match scores by default. You hire in California, Illinois, Ontario and New York City.

Can recruiters use it tomorrow? What three questions do you send the vendor today?

The AI-linked layoff

You plan to cut 30 roles in a 120-person Connecticut office after automating the team's work.

Which notices are triggered? What must a state filing say about AI?

The monitoring upgrade

IT wants webcam attention tracking and mood detection for staff in Toronto and Singapore, and contractors in Germany.

Which feature is a hard stop, and where? What less intrusive option meets the goal?

aicadium

ANSWER KEY

What a good review of Harbor & Pine finds

Check your tally against this list. Harbor & Pine is fictional, so this key is a training aid, not a legal opinion.

Clause	What is missing or wrong	Obligation
Header	Six remote employees bring New York City into scope with no office there. Ontario's 30 cross the 25-employee posting threshold.	Notice
1.2 EEO	Covers federal law only. Names no state, provincial or national characteristics, and does not say AI and automated tools are covered.	Notice
3.1 Recruiting	Ranks every application and auto-forwards the top 20 percent. No candidate notice, no bias audit, no human review of the cut.	Notice, Human review, Bias testing
3.2 Job Postings	No pay range in the posting. The Singapore graduate program is limited to candidates aged 30 and under.	Notice
3.3 Video Interviews	Scores tone of voice and enthusiasm, which infers emotion. No notice, no consent, no human review of the score.	Notice, Human review
3.4 Background Checks	A vendor risk score makes the final hiring decision. No human review, no explanation, no appeal, no vendor duties.	Human review, Explanation and appeal, Vendor accountability
3.5 Applicant Records	Twelve months is shorter than the three to four years this kit lists as becoming typical.	Records
4.2 Timekeeping	Fingerprint scanning with no written consent and no retention schedule.	Notice, Records
5.4 Company Systems	Monitoring at any time for any reason without notice. No written policy saying what is collected, when and why.	Notice
6.2 Performance	Sentiment scoring of employee messages drives a performance plan or separation. No named reviewer, no notice, no appeal.	Notice, Human review, Explanation and appeal
6.3 Work Allocation	Shifts allocated automatically by productivity score, with no notice and no route to review.	Notice, Human review
8.1 Workforce Changes	Federal notice only. No state or provincial mass-layoff rules, and no disclosure of whether a layoff relates to AI.	Notice
9.3 AI Tools	"Use good judgment", with no approved tool list, no prohibited data, no human review of output, no AI literacy training.	Human review
9.4 Personal Data	Shared with vendors for any business purpose, with no purpose limit or warranties. Toronto and Singapore data sits in the US unprotected.	Records, Vendor accountability
10.1 Complaints	The manager's decision is final. No route around the line manager and no appeal of an AI-assisted decision.	Explanation and appeal
Throughout	No bias testing anywhere in the handbook, and no retention period for AI decision records.	Bias testing, Records

aicadium

WORKSHEET

Handbook compliance review worksheet

Record what the AI found, what you verified, and what you will do next. Bring the completed worksheet to counsel, not the raw AI output.

Name and organization	
Date and AI tool used	
Handbook section(s) reviewed	
Handbook version or last updated	

Part 1 · Jurisdictions in scope

Jurisdiction	Headcount	Remote workers here?	Thresholds to check

- ☐ No names, pay, health, investigation or case details in the document
- ☐ Business account, or training on my data turned off
- ☐ Web search turned on
- ☐ I understand the output is a gap list for counsel, not legal advice

Part 2 · Legal landscape snapshot (Prompt 2)

Tick Verified only after you open the source yourself.

Law / citation	Jurisdiction	Status	Effective date	Primary source	Verified

Part 3 · Gap log (Prompts 3 to 5)

Gap type: Missing · Outdated · Conflicting · Unclear · Compliant. Risk: High = legal deadline or clear conflict · Medium = likely issue · Low = best practice.

#	Section	Requirement and jurisdiction	Gap type	Risk	Action	Owner	Date	Counsel?

Part 4 · Verify (Prompt 6)

Citation I spot-checked	
Did it hold up? (fully / partly / no)	
What was wrong or missing?	
What the AI flagged as uncertain	

Part 5 · My top three actions

Action	Owner	Target date	First step this week

Part 6 · Make it a routine

Who owns the scheduled legal scan?	
Cadence (daily, weekly, monthly or mixed)	
First scheduled run	
Where results are logged	
Who reviews before policy changes	

aicadium

ABOUT THIS KIT

From a one-off review to a routine

This kit is adapted from the workshop material Aicadium's People Operations team uses to train HR practitioners. Aicadium is a Singapore-based AI solutions company. Its People Operations function runs automated monitoring of employment law across seven jurisdictions, with a person reviewing every finding before any policy changes.

The kit follows the same principle. AI does the reading and structuring. People confirm the law, judge the risk, and decide what changes.

EDUCATIONAL CONTENT, NOT LEGAL ADVICE

This document provides general information and is not intended as professional advice. It reflects the views of the Aicadium team and does not represent the position of any client, portfolio company, or individual practitioners involved in its preparation. Aicadium does not act as a professional adviser in any of these areas.

The handbook adopts an outside-in perspective, based on published research, community reports, industry surveys, and Aicadium's own client work. Figures, allocations, and examples are labelled as such and should not be interpreted as benchmarks or forecasts for any organisation.

Nothing here should be relied on for any specific business, financial, legal, or personnel decision. Regulations, vendor terms, and tool capabilities change quickly, so read anything time-sensitive against current sources and take advice from your own qualified advisers before acting on it.

Laws summarized here reflect public sources as of 6 October 2026. The practice handbook, its answer key and the scenarios are fictional and for training only.

aicadium.ai