



BITA

ARC Training Centre for Behavioural
Insights for Technology Adoption

SUPPORTING GEN AI ADOPTION BY WORKERS: THE ROLE OF EMPLOYERS

Project Deliverable:

Final Report, Rev. B

Project Team:

Dr Steve Bickley (Project Lead)

Dr Ho Fai Chan

Ms Jennifer Petley

Dr Stephen Whyte

Industry Partners:



**FUTURE SKILLS
ORGANISATION**
Finance Technology Business



**Queensland
University
of Technology**



BITA

ARC Training Centre for Behavioural
Insights for Technology Adoption

Date of Revision:

6 February 2026

Executive Summary

This final project report outlines the findings of a project undertaken by the ARC Training Centre for Behavioural Insights for Technology Adoption (ARC BITA) at Queensland University of Technology (QUT), in partnership with FSO. This evidence-based and industry-validated work has resulted in Guide and a range of tools to support safe and effective GenAI adoption by workers, with a specific focus on employers' role in enabling adoption across Finance, Technology and Business (FTB) occupations.

This report documents the delivery of the project. The report provides a consolidated narrative of (i) the project rationale and objectives, (ii) the scope, deliverables, and method of delivery, (iii) the key stakeholder feedback received through the AI Research Working Group (the 'Working Group') workshops and co-design/testing activities, and (iv) how that feedback was incorporated into the final employer support resources and associated handover materials.

What was delivered:

- **Behavioural Insights (BI) Report** identifying key cognitive, social, and organisational drivers/barriers influencing GenAI adoption.
- **Employer Support Resources** (static toolkit/templates and user guide), iteratively co-designed and refined through the Working Group and beta testing.
- **Interactive web app** (developed as an additional/complementary deliverable¹) to operationalise the static toolkit in an accessible, "low friction" web-based format.
- **Working Group Workshop 1 & 2 summary reports** capturing stakeholder feedback and implications for resources.
- **Facilitation of stakeholder engagement opportunities** including the DEWR emerging findings showcase (30 September), two AI working group roundtables (14 October 2025 and 25 November 2025), two co-design/beta testing sessions (12 November 2025, 10 December 2025), and a series of knowledge transfer/handover activities from late December 2025 through February 2026, including a final targeted user/stakeholder engagement session on 28 January 2026.

Outcomes:

- Validated and translated BI findings into practical employer-facing tools (i.e. static employer support resources and interactive web app).
- Incorporated stakeholder feedback on aspects such as security/privacy, practical workflow fit, inclusion/digital literacy, SME usability, and framing/language to better match employer audiences.

Acknowledgements

All errors remain the responsibility of the authors.

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of Prof. Benno Torgler, Dr. Tony Beaton and Jennifer Petley from ARC BITA along with Michelle Circelli, Tim Burt and Dr. Peta Skujins from Future Skills Organisation. Their inputs to the project, its research direction, and feedback were invaluable. I (Dr. Steve Bickley) also wish to thank my partner, Alana, whose insights into the Transtheoretical Model of Behaviour Change and motivational interviewing techniques, as well as our many conversations on gender rights and broader social issues, have significantly shaped the thinking and direction behind this work.

¹ The interactive web app was developed as a minimum viable product (MVP) to demonstrate and test usability of the employer resources. It is provided as a complementary artefact.

Table of Contents

<i>Executive Summary</i>	2
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	2
<i>Table of Contents</i>	3
<i>Glossary</i>	4
<i>Introduction</i>	5
Project Background	5
Project Aim	5
Project Scope and Deliverables	6
<i>Project Approach and Methods</i>	6
Delivery Approach	6
Stakeholder Engagement Mechanisms	8
Timeline and Key Milestones	8
<i>Key Findings and How They Informed the Resources</i>	10
Key Findings from the Behavioural Insights Report	10
Working Group Workshop 1 feedback	10
Co-Design/Beta Testing Session 1 feedback	11
Working Group Workshop 2 feedback	11
Co-Design/Beta Testing Session 2 feedback	13
Final Targeted User/Stakeholder Engagement Session	13
Note on Theoretical Grounding and Reframing	14
<i>Handover and Knowledge Transfer</i>	14
Contents of Handover Package	14
Whole-of-Life / Sustainability Considerations	14
Risks, Issues and Mitigations	16
Future Considerations for Rollout, On-Going Maintenance & Impact	17
<i>Conclusion</i>	19
<i>Appendices</i>	20
Appendix A: Project Deliverables List	20
Appendix B: AI Research Working Group Membership	26
Appendix C: Project Milestones List	27
Appendix D: Stages of Change/Adoption Terminology Crosswalk	29
Appendix E: Operational Notes for Web App	30

Glossary

Term / Abbreviation	Definition
AI	Artificial Intelligence
API	Application Programming Interface
ARC BITA	Australian Industrial Transformation Training Centre for Behavioural Insights for Technology Adoption
BI	Behavioural Insights
DEWR	Department of Employment and Workplace Relations
FinOps	Financial Operations
FSO	Future Skills Organisation
FTB	Finance Technology Business
GenAI	Generative Artificial Intelligence
HR	Human Resources
HTTPS	Hypertext Transfer Protocol Secure
IP	Intellectual Property
L&D	Learning and Development
LMS	Learning Management System
LTI	Learning Tools Interoperability
MI	Motivational Interviewing
MVP	Minimum Viable Product
NAIC	National Artificial Intelligence Centre
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NoSQL	Not Only Structured Query Language
PII	Personally Identifiable Information
QA	Quality Assurance
QUT	Queensland University of Technology
RBAC	Role-Based Access Control
RTO	Registered Training Organisation
SCORM	Sharable Content Object Reference Mode
SDK	Software Development Kit
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SPA	Single Page Application
SSO	Single Sign On
TTM	The Transtheoretical Model of Change (a.k.a. Stages of Change Model)
UI	User Interface
URL	Uniform Resource Locator
UX	User Experience
WG	Working Group
xAPI	Experience Application Programming Interface

Introduction

This final project report documents the delivery of the project “Supporting Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) Adoption by Workers: The Role of Employers”, delivered by ARC BITA at QUT in partnership with FSO. The report provides a consolidated narrative of (i) the project background and aims, (ii) the scope, deliverables, and approach/method of delivery, (iii) a synthesis of the key stakeholder feedback received through Working Group workshops and co-design/testing activities, and (iv) how that feedback was incorporated into the final employer support resources and associated handover materials.

The project was intentionally designed as an applied research project with a clear evidence-to-implementation pipeline. It began with Behavioural Insights (BI) analysis to identify cognitive, social, and economic drivers of GenAI adoption, and then translated those insights into a set of employer-facing resources. The resources were then validated and refined through structured stakeholder engagement with the Working Group² and various co-design/beta testing activities before finalisation and handover of the resources back to FSO.

This report focuses primarily on documenting the process that was followed and the evidence trail for decisions taken. Particularly, the way in which stakeholder feedback was captured and actioned during resource development and finalisation.

Project Background

The ARC BITA Centre at QUT, in partnership with FSO, undertook this program of work to support employers to lift safe and effective adoption of GenAI by workers across Finance, Technology and Business (FTB) occupations. The starting point for the project was the recognition that worker adoption is variable and is shaped not only by the availability of tools, but by employer-led conditions such as workforce capability, governance, access arrangements, and norms about safe and appropriate use.

The project was structured around three inter-linked components:

1. Behavioural Insights (BI) analysis to identify cognitive, social, and economic drivers of GenAI adoption among workers.
2. Co-design and development of employer support resources, including change management tools, playbooks, and case studies.
3. Validation and refinement through the Working Group and beta testing prior to finalisation.

This structure ensured the project outputs were both evidence-based (grounded in the BI analysis) and implementation-ready (iteratively stress-tested with employers and relevant stakeholders in realistic organisational contexts).

Project Aim

The overall project aim was to produce a set of practical, employer-facing resources to support organisations to implement GenAI safely and effectively, informed by Behavioural Insights and validated through co-design and testing with industry.

At a delivery level, the aim also included ensuring the resources were:

- Usable and accessible (low friction, “meets users where they are”),

² Details about the membership and role of the AI Research Working Group are provided later in this report.

- Appropriately governed (guardrails that balance innovation with accountability),
- Relevant across employer contexts (including differences in workforce size, capability, and sector constraints), and
- Grounded in stakeholder realities surfaced via Working Group discussion and co-design/beta testing activities.

Project Scope and Deliverables

The project covered the end-to-end pathway from behavioural insights through to employer-facing resources, including iterative stakeholder validation. This included:

- Completion of a BI analysis identifying key drivers/barriers and adoption dynamics relevant to GenAI uptake among workers.
- Translation of BI findings into a draft set of employer support resources (tools/templates/playbooks) and development of case study materials (with case study materials collected/facilitated by FSO via the Working Group membership).
- Delivery of Working Group workshops, co-design workshops, and structured testing sessions to validate and refine the draft resources.
- Preparation of workshop summary reports documenting stakeholder feedback and implications.
- Finalisation, quality assurance, and handover planning (including consolidation of stakeholder feedback into a formal register for sign-off).

Refer to Appendix A for the full project deliverables list and submission dates.

Project Approach and Methods

Delivery Approach

The project followed an iterative **“evidence → co-design → test → refine”** approach, designed to ensure outputs were both empirically informed and practically usable. In practice, the sequencing was intentionally staged so that the Behavioural Insights (BI) findings were validated first, and only then translated into employer-facing resources that were progressively tested and refined through multiple stakeholder touchpoints.

Step 1: Project initiation and scope alignment

The project commenced with a formal kick-off meeting on 4 July 2025 to confirm objectives, scope, governance and deliverables, with scope re-confirmed and aligned via the briefing with Patrick Kidd, FSO CEO, in the first progress meeting on 15 July 2025.

Step 2: Behavioural Insights (BI) analysis

The ARC BITA team completed a targeted scoping review, drawing on academic/peer-reviewed and grey literature (i.e., government/policy and regulator reports, industry peak/association publications, union/NGO briefs, and relevant organisational guidance) to synthesise the cognitive, social and economic factors shaping GenAI adoption. The review applied a behavioural and systems lens across the Finance, Technology and Business sectors, drawing on both Australian and international evidence and interpreting implications through an Australian workplace, regulatory, and labour market context. Findings were structured across four levels (technology, individual/employee, organisation/employer, and systemic) to provide a clear evidence structure for identifying drivers/barriers, mapping them to employer actions, and translating the evidence into practical employer support resource components. Therefore, forming the empirical foundation for the resources and subsequent engagement program.

Step 3: Government stakeholder validation and alignment

Emerging findings and early resource directions were presented to the Department of Employment and Workplace Relations (DEWR) through the Emerging Findings Showcase to validate policy relevance, identify gaps, and strengthen alignment ahead of Working Group engagement.

Step 4: Working Group Workshop 1

The first Working Group workshop focused primarily on validating the BI findings and surfacing “lived experience” insights about constraints, risks, and implementation realities that may not be fully captured in a BI-only framing. This workshop therefore functioned as a structured “sense-check” and enrichment step, ensuring the BI report themes were aligned with stakeholder experience prior to the toolkit being developed and subsequently stress-tested in applied settings.

Step 5: Translation of BI findings into draft employer resources

Following Working Group Workshop 1, the validated BI themes were translated into a draft set of employer-facing resources intended to support safe and effective GenAI implementation (e.g., change management tools, playbooks, templates, and case studies). This translation phase focused on converting the BI evidence base into actionable organisational supports that employers could realistically implement.

Step 6: Co-Design / Beta Testing Session 1

An initial co-design/beta testing session was then conducted with a small, select group of stakeholders in mid-November to test early versions of the employer support resources for clarity, usability, and fit-for-purpose applicability. This session was used to identify practical frictions (e.g., language, navigation, context-fit, and perceived burden) and to prioritise high-value refinements ahead of wider Working Group exposure.

Step 7: Iteration following Session 1

The employer support resources were then iterated based on the Session 1 feedback. In parallel, the QUT team developed an interactive web app as an additional/complementary deliverable, designed to operationalise the resources in a more accessible, “in-the-flow-of-work” format. This interactive format was developed specifically in response to stakeholder needs for usability, engagement, and practical adoption support, and was subsequently used as part of the next testing stage.

Step 8: Working Group Workshop 2

Working Group Workshop 2 occurred after the initial co-design/beta testing cycle and served as the primary forum for structured testing of the revised employer support resources and the interactive web app. Feedback at this stage focused on (i) usability and accessibility, (ii) governance integration and policy alignment, and (iii) roll-out and engagement considerations (including how employers would actually operationalise the toolkit within their organisational context).

Step 9: Co-Design / Beta Testing Session 2

A second co-design/beta testing session followed in early December, using the revised resources and updated web app informed by Working Group Workshop 2 feedback. This session provided an additional opportunity to test refinements, check portability across employer contexts, and confirm that key changes (e.g., language/framing, governance usability, accessibility) improved fit-for-purpose use.

Step 10: Finalisation and QA

During the final phase, we consolidated all feedback received from FSO, Working Group members, and the two co-design/beta testing sessions, developed the draft of this final report, and issued the draft report for review and sign-off by FSO project stakeholders on 6 December 2025. We also facilitated a final targeted user/stakeholder engagement session on 28 January 2026 to confirm how feedback had been addressed across the static resources and web app, including a brief demo of the updated app. Any new feedback or feature requests raised were captured in the Final Report under the Future

Considerations section. Following the review by FSO project stakeholders, final updates were completed prior to submission of the final outputs on 20 February 2026.

Stakeholder Engagement Mechanisms

Stakeholder engagement occurred through multiple, complementary mechanisms:

1. **Government stakeholder validation and alignment**
 - **Emerging Findings Showcase (30 September 2025):** Presented emerging behavioural insights and early resource directions to DEWR to validate policy relevance, identify gaps, and strengthen alignment for downstream adoption ahead of Working Group and beta testing activities.
2. **AI Research Working Group**
 - **Overview:** A cross-section of representatives from employers, unions, and industry peaks/associations – alongside selected individuals with relevant expertise and sector knowledge, supported by FSO subject matter experts – convened to review/validate BI findings and co-design the employer support resources (see Appendix B for the full stakeholder group and list of organisations).
 - **Workshop 1 (14 October 2025):** Validated the completed BI analysis and captured additional employer-relevant insights, including through polls and an open forum discussion format.
 - **Workshop 2 (26 November 2025):** Gathered broad feedback on the draft employer support resources, using a structure that included both survey-style inputs (to enable independent feedback separate from group discussion) and a facilitated open forum to capture collective insights.
3. **Co-design / beta testing sessions**
 - **Overview:** Co-design/beta testing involved select AI Working Group members and additional employer/employee representatives recruited through members' sector networks, to test and strengthen the five-part Employer Support Resources for real-world adoption – validating what was clear vs confusing/missing, where the resources best fit into existing workflows, and ensuring they are safe-by-design, inclusive, and scalable across sectors and different organisation types/sizes (including SMEs and micro-firms).
 - **Beta testing 1 (12 November 2025):** First-look testing of the initial (static) employer support resources with a small, targeted stakeholder group, structured as survey-style inputs plus a facilitated open forum.
 - **Beta testing 2 (10 December 2025):** Hands-on testing with a larger group (including broader AI Working Group participation) of the revised resources and the new interactive web app, gathering a similar set of survey-style inputs coupled with a facilitated open forum approach.
 - **Final Targeted User/Stakeholder Engagement Session (28 January 2026):** Final walkthrough to confirm how feedback was addressed across the static resources and web app, covering key changes since prior feedback, a brief demo of the updated web app, and an open forum discussion to capture any final comments/feature requests.
4. **Iterative review and consolidation loops**
 - Key deliverables (including the BI Report and Employer Support Resources) progressed through structured written review and revision cycles via consolidated Client Feedback Registers, complemented by weekly to fortnightly project progress meetings, and targeted ad-hoc consultations with FSO subject matter experts, FSO comms/engagement leads, and external industry/government experts (including Beth Worrall and colleagues from the National AI Centre).

Timeline and Key Milestones

July 2025 – Project kick-off

- **4 July 2025:** Project formally commenced (kick-off and initial planning to confirm scope, deliverables, and delivery approach).

August 2025 – Behavioural insights analysis begins

- Behavioural insights analysis commenced, including review/analysis of relevant national and international secondary evidence to identify key factors shaping GenAI adoption (e.g., cognitive biases, social influences, and organisational/economic incentives).
- Initial concepts for employer support resources commenced in parallel (early translation of BI themes into draft resource concepts).

September 2025 – Draft BI report and early resource concepts shared

- **15 Sept 2025:** Draft Behavioural Insights Report (Rev B) submitted to FSO for client review.
- **30 Sept 2025:** DEWR Emerging Findings Showcase delivered (including early concepts/frames for draft employer support resources).

October 2025 – Working Group validation of BI findings

- **14 Oct 2025:** Working Group Workshop #1 held, focusing on review and validation of the BI findings and surfacing implementation considerations to inform the employer resources.

November 2025 – Employer support resources drafted and tested

- Employer support resources developed and iterated (static toolkit drafts prepared).
- **12 Nov 2025:** Co-design / Beta Testing Session #1 held (first targeted testing of draft employer support resources with a small/select group).
- **25 Nov 2025:** Working Group Workshop #2 held, focusing on review and validation of the revised draft employer support resources (including testing of the interactive web app concept/link shared with the Working Group).

December 2025 – Further testing and handover initiation

- **10 Dec 2025:** Co-design / Beta Testing Session #2 held (second testing round based on refinements from Working Group #2 feedback, including updates to the resources and web app).
- **17 Dec 2025:** Internal FSO engagement/comms integration/handover meeting held to support FSO's communications/engagement and technical integration planning.

January to February 2026 – Finalisation, QA, and sign-off

- Consolidation of stakeholder feedback on employer support resources.
- Final refinements to employer support resources (static toolkit + user guide + interactive web app) and development of final report and related handover materials.
- **28 Jan 2026:** Facilitation of final targeted user/stakeholder engagement session.
- **6 Feb 2026:** Submission of draft final report and finalised employer support resources (static toolkit + user guide + web app).
- Final review and consolidation of FSO project stakeholder feedback (including completion/sign-off workflow via Client Feedback Register).
- **20 Feb 2026:** Final sign-off / acceptance of outputs by FSO.

Refer to Appendix C for the full list of key project milestones extracted from the monthly progress reports.

Key Findings and How They Informed the Resources

Key Findings from the Behavioural Insights Report

The BI analysis identified key drivers and barriers across four levels (technology, individual/employee, organisation/employer, and systemic), with the following headline implications for the employer support resources:

1. **Technology: capability is high, but reliability, transparency and risk controls are uneven.** GenAI can materially lift productivity, but “black box” outputs, variable accuracy, vendor lock-in/opaque pricing, and privacy/security and bias risks increase error and overreliance – supporting practical verification habits, clear task-fit guidance, and uncertainty-aware use.
2. **Individual / employees: shadow adoption is already occurring, shaped by trust and confidence.** Many workers are using already GenAI informally; adoption depends less on hype and more on usability, perceived safety, and workers' ability to judge output quality – reinforcing simple, accessible training and confidence-building supports, particularly for priority cohorts and digitally excluded groups.
3. **Organisation / employers: enablement and governance determine whether benefits scale.** Employers influence outcomes through approved access, workflow integration, role-appropriate guardrails, and resourcing/skills supports (especially for SMEs) – pointing to lightweight, standards-aligned governance (e.g., task risk tiers, human-in-the-loop for higher-risk use) and “safe-to-try” pilots that are measurable and reversible.
4. **Systemic: broader conditions shape the speed and safety of adoption.** Digital divide and structural inequities, governance lag/uncertainty, vendor concentration, and labour-market mismatches can either accelerate or constrain uptake; these factors were categorised and summarised at a higher level given the project's focus on employer action, and may be shared with FSO to inform broader, national policy work.

Two cross-cutting hazards also emerged that can erode trust, learning transfer and safety if unaddressed: (i) illusions of understanding (users over-credit AI outputs and underdevelop their own competences), and (ii) risks from agentic misalignment (advanced systems behaving in unexpected ways under conditions of stress/pressure), reinforcing the need for adaptive, standards-aligned oversight.

For full detail, readers are referred to the published Behavioural Insights Report available via: <https://www.futureskillsorganisation.com.au/supporting-generative-ai-adoption-by-workers-the-role-of-employers/>.

Working Group Workshop 1 feedback

In addition to the “headline” BI themes in the previous section, the Working Group Workshop 1 summary report also highlighted implementation-relevant considerations that shaped the resource design direction – particularly concerns about perceived vs actual risks, cost containment/FinOps considerations for SMEs, and barriers created by organisational “veto players” across IT/security/procurement/legal functions.

The summary report explicitly outlined that the next phase of the project would translate validated BI analysis and Workshop 1 feedback into practical, standards-aligned employer resources and case studies, drawing particularly on open forum discussion insights and ensuring alignment between the final BI report and employer-facing materials.

Co-Design/Beta Testing Session 1 feedback

Co-design/beta testing session 1 was intended to focus on fit-for-purpose usability/applicability and clarity. Key feedback was that the resources were too complex/academic for general SME/employer audiences, would benefit from a more visual-first, plain-language rewrite, and that the static pack was difficult to translate into “what do I do next?” in practice (including a need for clearer, practical guidance on “where to start” pathways and sector-relevant examples).

Outputs following this cycle included (a) a revised/Rev B resource submission incorporating a plain-language/tone reset and the user guide/overview document with visual process flow diagrams, and (b) a demo web app developed as an interactive tool based on feedback from the 12 November session that an app-first experience would make the toolkit easier to apply than static resources alone.

Working Group Workshop 2 feedback

The Working Group Workshop 2 summary report documents feedback across four resource-feature areas:

1) Usability and accessibility

Valued elements

- Participants valued the practical, low-friction design – particularly the safe-to-try menu, self-assessment, and downloadable templates that “meet users where they are” and make early experimentation feel safe.
- Mobile and low-bandwidth options were seen as essential for reaching regional and digitally excluded cohorts.

Areas for improvement/consideration

- Some cautioned that clinical terms (e.g., “pre-contemplation”) could alienate users and requested plainer, human-centred language and infographic-supported variants.
- Digital literacy gaps were flagged, with requests for microlearning videos and mobile-first delivery to avoid excluding regional/frontline cohorts.

In response, we prioritised plain-language and workplace-neutral terminology and ensured that both the static resources (downloadable templates) and the web app could be used on mobile devices, with mobile-friendly layouts. Low-bandwidth access needs were addressed by releasing the static resources alongside the web app, providing downloadable/offline-friendly templates for users with limited connectivity. Requests for microlearning/how-to support videos were captured as a future consideration (out of scope under the current MVP delivery).

2) Policy integration and governance

Valued elements

- Participants supported embedding guardrails “in context” and welcomed role-based policies clarifying when AI can be used and when a person must review.
- The resources were discussed in relation to standards-aligned framing (the report references National AI Centre guidance for adoption in the discussion of guardrails/context).

Areas for improvement/consideration

- Participants cautioned against governance overload for SMEs and noted SMEs would prefer simple house rules.
- Data sovereignty/privacy concerns were raised (who hosts the data and how it might be used).
- Participants requested a short legal checklist alongside policy templates, including workplace surveillance/device monitoring consent (state-based variations), disclosure and record-keeping expectations, IP handling (prompt/output ownership), and basic contract protections.

In response, we implemented an “AI Policy” module in the web app to help employers generate a practical first-draft policy, including high-level legal/ethical guidance and checklist elements (e.g., surveillance/monitoring consent considerations, disclosure/record keeping expectations, IP handling guidance). A key future consideration is for these elements to be reviewed/validated through appropriate legal advice and/or FSO’s internal legal/compliance processes. Separately, privacy/custodianship clarity (what data is captured, where it is hosted, who can access it, retention, and permitted uses) is treated as a rollout requirement for FSO to finalise and communicate clearly.

3) Training, change management and support

Valued elements

- “Training the trainers” and peer learning (including reverse mentoring) were viewed as valuable for normalising AI use and supporting less confident users.

Areas for improvement/consideration

- Change fatigue was flagged; participants requested staged rollouts and “in-the-moment” aids inside existing tools (e.g., Copilot/Teams) so support appears where work happens.
- Some raised whether users could upload their own training modules to tailor content to context.

In response, we strengthened the framing around staged adoption and confidence-building with the app and static resources, and added practical features support within the MVP, including the ability for employers to add/link their own training modules and create/add their own “safe-to-try” tasks within the web app. We also added mentor-mentee assignment functionality (supporting peer learning/reverse mentoring) which is also reflected in the static resources as a recommended practice for users in earlier- (e.g. unaware or unengaged, considering or curious) and later-stage (e.g. established or routine) stages of adoption/behaviour change. Broader “in-the-moment” integration inside external AI systems (e.g., Copilot/Teams, ChatGPT, Claude, Google Workspace/Gemini, etc.), while valuable, was out of scope for the current MVP because deep integrations require enterprise security review (identity/SSO, data access boundaries, tenant controls), vendor-specific integration work (e.g., APIs, connectors, permissions), and governance/audit design that goes beyond what a general-purpose web app can safely provide. As such, this has been captured as a follow-on option in the Future Considerations section.

4) Communication, engagement and roll-out

Valued elements

- The iterative co-design approach and the web app demo were well received.
- Some felt the resources could work “as-is” with clear sponsorship, training, and simple success criteria.
- Gamification and case studies were suggested as engagement mechanisms.

Areas for improvement/consideration

- Market saturation and trust were raised as issues: the need to position the resources clearly among many tools and anchor them to recognised training and standards.
- Sustainability beyond the project end was raised explicitly.

In response, we prioritised clearer “where this fits” positioning within the employer support resources user guide/overview document (anchored to recognised standards/training where relevant) and treated additional case studies and sustainability/ownership as key rollout considerations to be resolved by FSO for ongoing maintenance and impact.

Co-Design/Beta Testing Session 2 feedback

The second-round co-design / beta testing session was designed to validate portability and practical fit across contexts. Key feedback reinforced Workshop 2 themes (plain language, governance, and sustainability), while adding late-stage priorities around reducing first-use friction (preference for no-login “sandbox” access), clearer persona-based journeys (so employee vs employer/governance content is not mixed), and trust/privacy clarity (consent, visibility, retention, portability, and “not used against employees”).

In response, we prioritised persona-based navigation and related security/privacy/data controls (role-appropriate access and clearer UX journeys). To support ongoing maintenance and future iterations, we also added an in-app feature request/feedback form so users can submit structured feedback, report issues, and log enhancement requests into a prioritised backlog. We confirmed that a PII-light/no-login “sandbox” entry option would be valuable but was deemed out of scope under the current MVP delivery and is captured as a Future Consideration for FSO as part of rollout planning. Additional privacy/trust explainers (consent, visibility, retention, and “not used against employees”) have also been captured as a key rollout consideration.

Final Targeted User/Stakeholder Engagement Session

The final targeted user/stakeholder engagement session was held to validate how prior feedback had been addressed across both the static resources and the web app. The session provided a brief walkthrough of key changes since earlier co-design/beta testing, a short demo of the updated web app, and an open forum to capture any final comments or feature requests to be captured in the Final Report under Future Considerations for FSO’s follow-on planning.

Key feedback highlighted three follow-on opportunities beyond the current MVP scope: (1) integration with external learning management systems (LMS) to embed modules within existing training ecosystems and support certification/credentialing evidence (completion tracking, audit-ready records, and credential workflows), (2) extending role-based access controls beyond the flat SME-oriented model to better reflect real organisational hierarchies and delegated authority in larger organisations and industry bodies, and (3) improving onboarding administration through an email-based invite token workflow (auto-generated, time-limited, single-use) rather than manual invite handling. A further point raised was the potential value of aggregated, de-identified whole-of-system insights which could be produced across participating organisations (e.g., adoption patterns, common capability gaps, and which supports/resources are most useful), noting FSO stakeholders emphasised this would require careful privacy and purpose design (clear governance, consent/notice, data minimisation, and agreed boundaries on what is collected, why it is collected, and who can access it).

Note on Theoretical Grounding and Reframing

The employer support resources were initially inspired by the Transtheoretical Model of Change (TTM) and related Motivational Interviewing (MI) techniques, specifically drawing on:

1. Prochaska & Norcross (2018, 9th ed., Oxford University Press, LCCN 2017057060)
2. Miller & Rollnick (2002, 2nd ed., Guilford Press, LCCN 2001051250)

Working Group feedback indicated that clinical stage labels (e.g., “pre-contemplation”) risked being perceived as overly clinical or misaligned with employer contexts, prompting a shift to plainer, human-centred adoption language while retaining the underlying intent (staged readiness, practical supports matched to context). Therefore, while the final toolkit does not foreground TTM terminology, the staged adoption logic (readiness, capability scaffolding, and tailored supports) remains embedded in the resource design.

Refer Appendix D for the full terminology crosswalk (i.e., original TTM stage labels mapped to the workplace-neutral adoption labels, with plain-language definitions) and an indicative alignment to the Singapore organisational AI maturity stages currently under consideration by Australia’s National AI Centre.

Handover and Knowledge Transfer

Contents of Handover Package

1. **Final employer support resources (static toolkit + user guide)**
 - Final versions of the employer resources (and any templates/tools included), with clear versioning and dates.
2. **Interactive demo web app artefacts and handover notes**
 - Link/location of the final web app version.
 - Basic operational notes required for FSO integration/handover (e.g., what the web app is, what it does, and what is required to host or share it through FSO channels), provided in Appendix E of this report.
3. **Case study pack**
 - Completed case study(ies) available at handover time.
4. **Client Feedback Register and sign-off evidence**
 - The consolidated client feedback register capturing feedback from FSO, Working Group members, and beta testing sessions, with QUT responses and remediation actions, and an explicit sign-off/closure status per item.
5. **Final project report**
 - The final report (this document).

Whole-of-Life / Sustainability Considerations

Sustainability and “whole-of-life” considerations were raised explicitly in Workshop 2, alongside concerns about market saturation and the need to clearly position the resources among many tools and anchor them to recognised training and standards.

These considerations have practical implications for how FSO maintains and updates the resources over time.

Key sustainability considerations evidenced in the stakeholder feedback include:

1. Positioning, trust, and discoverability

- Stakeholders noted a crowded ecosystem (“market saturation”) and emphasised trust and positioning as critical – i.e., resources should be clearly framed so employers understand what the toolkit is for, how it should be used, and why it is credible.
- Anchoring to recognised training/standards was identified as a way to strengthen trust and coherence.

2. Accessibility across employer contexts (including regional and digitally excluded cohorts)

- Mobile and low-bandwidth options were emphasised as essential for reaching regional and digitally excluded cohorts.
- Digital literacy gaps were flagged, with requests for microlearning and mobile-first delivery approaches to avoid unintentional exclusion.

3. Governance scalability, especially for SMEs

- Stakeholders cautioned against governance overload for SMEs and preferred simpler “house rules”.
- This creates an ongoing sustainability requirement: resources should remain usable without requiring high administrative overhead, while still reflecting safe practice.

4. Keeping content current as tools and risks evolve

- Workshop 1 highlighted rapid change and churn in tools/models that increases burden on organisations.
- This implies a refresh cadence is necessary (e.g., periodic review of examples, guardrail guidance, and recommended practices) so the resources do not drift out of relevance.

5. Sustaining behaviour change supports

- Workshop 2 emphasised staged roll-outs, training-the-trainers, peer learning/reverse mentoring, and “in-the-moment” aids embedded where work happens.
- These are not one-off interventions; sustaining them requires clarity on ownership (i.e., who maintains training assets, updates guidance over time, and manages emerging risks).

6. Ownership and accountability

- Assign a dedicated internal FSO champion to deeply review this project’s resources, to brief and advocate to other key FSO stakeholders, and own the delivery of the “future considerations” rollout/maintenance/impact actions (pp. 16-17) and ongoing risk management (pp. 15-16, and related risks), including coordination, accountability, and continuous improvement over time.

Importantly: Workshop 2 also flagged the value of plain language and avoidance of clinical terminology for employer audiences. This has sustainability implications because

future updates should preserve the same communication style and accessibility principles to avoid reintroducing barriers.

Risks, Issues and Mitigations

The risks below are limited to those explicitly evidenced in the AI Working Group Workshop 1 and Workshop 2 documentation.

1) Risk: Privacy/security concerns and uncertainty about safe use (trust and governance risk)

- **Evidence:** Workshop 1 emphasised trust-by-design, data governance, and the importance of knowing where data is stored and who has access. Workshop 2 raised data sovereignty/privacy concerns and requested policy-linked guardrails and a short legal checklist.
- **Mitigation:** Embed guardrails in context; provide role-based policies clarifying when AI can be used and when human review is required; include legal touchpoint checklist content.

2) Risk: Misalignment of language/framing with employer audiences (engagement/usability risk)

- **Evidence:** Workshop 2 cautioned that clinical terms (e.g., “pre-contemplation”) could alienate users and requested plainer, human-centred language and infographic-supported variants.
- **Mitigation:** Replace clinical terminology with plain-language framing while maintaining the staged-support logic in the resource design (this aligns with your note about modifying framing and removing explicit TTM references).

3) Risk: Excluding regional/frontline or digitally excluded cohorts (equity/access risk)

- **Evidence:** Workshop 1 identified steeper barriers for SMEs and priority cohorts and highlighted digital literacy gaps. Workshop 2 reinforced that mobile/low-bandwidth delivery is essential and flagged digital literacy gaps with microlearning/video requests.
- **Mitigation:** Mobile and low-bandwidth options; staged digital foundations checklist and micro-learning signposts.

4) Risk: Governance overload for SMEs (adoption drop-off risk)

- **Evidence:** Workshop 2 explicitly cautioned against governance overload for SMEs and stated SMEs prefer simple house rules.
- **Mitigation:** Provide lightweight governance variants appropriate for SMEs; ensure guardrails are usable and not administratively burdensome.

5) Risk: “Perceived vs actual” risk driving resistance (change management risk)

- **Evidence:** Workshop 1 flagged perceived risk as a major barrier and critical for change management.
- **Mitigation:** Ensure guidance addresses both actual safeguards and perception management (communications, clarity, confidence-building mechanisms).

6) Risk: Cost containment / licensing/data/energy costs (viability risk, especially for SMEs)

- **Evidence:** Workshop 1 raised concerns about rising costs and calls for FinOps guidance for SMEs.
- **Mitigation:** Include a simple FinOps appendix covering model sizing, licence tier trade-offs, usage dashboards, and energy/water awareness tips.

7) Risk: Complacency and “polished but wrong” outputs (quality/safety risk)

- **Evidence:** Workshop 1 noted the risk of organisations becoming complacent and accepting polished outputs without review.
- **Mitigation:** Maintain human-in-the-loop expectations for higher risk tasks; provide clear guidance on review, verification, and when to take control back.

8) Issue: Ecosystem crowding and sustainability beyond project end (maintenance/uptake risk)

- **Evidence:** Workshop 2 raised market saturation/trust and sustainability beyond project end.
- **Mitigation:** Clear positioning; anchoring to recognised training/standards; establishing ownership and refresh mechanisms during handover.

Future Considerations for Rollout, On-Going Maintenance & Impact

The following items are recommended considerations for FSO to support rollout, ongoing maintenance, and sustained impact beyond the current MVP delivery:

- **Clarify overlap with FSO governance tooling:** Confirm whether the web app’s AI Policy module (and related governance/legal content in the static pack) should be retained as an optional add-on or removed to avoid duplication with FSO’s existing [AI Governance & Adoption Starter Toolkit](#), developed through the FSO Skills Accelerator-AI, and keep these resources focused on employee enablement. This is a product/portfolio decision for FSO, noting the module currently provides a first-draft policy plus high-level checklist elements that may require further alignment.
- **Legal/compliance validation of governance content:** The AI Policy module includes high-level legal/ethical checklist elements (e.g., surveillance/monitoring consent considerations, disclosure/record keeping expectations, IP/prompt output handling). A key next step is formal review/validation via legal advice and/or FSO’s internal legal/compliance processes prior to broad release.
- **Define privacy, custodianship and trust settings for rollout:** Finalise and clearly communicate the privacy/trust posture for end users and employers (what data is captured, where it is hosted, who can access it, retention/deletion, portability/export, permitted uses, and “not used against employees”), including how consent is obtained and how this is reflected in comms/onboarding materials.
- **Define the web app access model (PII-free vs authenticated):** Feedback supports a no-login “sandbox” experience alongside an authenticated organisational mode, but delivering both materially increases scope (two journeys, data flows, consent patterns, and UX). For the current MVP, we prioritised the authenticated model to ensure key employer/organisational features were retained (e.g., employer-added safe-to-try tasks and training modules, tailoring of employee learning and development pathways, and employee adoption stage/status reporting). If FSO wants both modes, this would require additional funding/time and a clear design decision on what outputs/data are available in each mode (e.g., a PII-free/PII-light “sandbox” focused primarily on self-assessment and guidance, without organisation-level features such as employer-managed task/training assignment and tracking, tailored pathways, or adoption reporting).
- **Accessibility and low-bandwidth reach:** A dual-channel approach is recommended to ensure the static downloadable templates are made available alongside the web app (supporting offline/low-bandwidth access).
- **Develop microlearning/how-to videos (resource usage + deployment):** A key follow-on uplift is the development of short microlearning/how-to videos that show users how to use, apply, and deploy the employer support resources in practice (covering both the static toolkit/templates and the web app). This could be packaged as role-specific microlearning/micro-credential style modules (e.g., employers/business owners, HR, people managers, and trusted advisors) to support lower digital literacy cohorts and improve adoption confidence.

- Several valuable enhancements exceed current scope and should be managed via a prioritised roadmap/backlog (must-have vs next release). Examples include: prompting techniques module, human-in-the-loop verification package, trusted advisor playbook, deeper role/industry tailoring, richer export/assign/track features, and additional case studies. The in-app feature request/feedback form provides a structured mechanism to capture issues and requests to support ongoing maintenance and prioritisation.
- **In-the-moment support inside external AI tools:** Integration of “in-the-moment” aids within third-party systems (e.g., Copilot/Teams, ChatGPT, Claude, Google Workspace/Gemini, etc.) was out of scope for the MVP but is a meaningful follow-on opportunity to improve uptake by surfacing support where work happens.
- **Post-project ownership and ongoing maintenance:** Confirm post-project ownership and resourcing for ongoing maintenance of the MVP (including update cadence, issue triage, bugfix responsibilities, content/link upkeep, and governance for incorporating user feedback via the in-app feature request/feedback form) to ensure the tool remains credible, supported, and usable over time.
- **Pilot with Skills Accelerator RTO cohort to generate case studies:** During the 17 December 2025 meeting it was noted that a structured pilot (e.g., ~25 RTOs) could generate comparable implementation case studies, refine usability, and strengthen rollout evidence. This requires internal FSO scoping first (pilot design, resourcing, timeline, deliverables, data/consent approach), then confirmation of feasibility/costs with any external delivery partner (e.g., ARC BITA/QUT).
- **LMS integration and certification evidence workflows for industry bodies and/or organisations:** A key follow-on opportunity is integration with external LMS environments so the modules can be delivered within existing training ecosystems and support certification/credentialing needs (e.g., completion tracking, SCORM/xAPI/LTI-style packaging where relevant, audit-ready records, and optional issuance of completion evidence/badges). In the current MVP, the “Safe-to-Try” tasks and training modules include only a stubbed “task tracking would start here” interaction (and optional external link launch) to demonstrate the intended workflow and user experience, rather than a fully implemented tracking, reporting, or certification evidence layer. Extending this would, at a minimum (as a starting basis), require scoping the target LMS platforms, defining the minimum viable tracking/evidence requirements, and confirming the governance model for certification sign-off (including what is recorded, who can view it, and how completion is verified).
- **RBAC aligned to real organisational structures (beyond flat roles):** The MVP’s initial RBAC model intentionally used a simple, flat structure (i.e., org admin / manager / employee / advisor, refer to Appendix E for more detail) that suits SMEs and supports rapid deployment. However, the final stakeholder session provided strong feedback that this approach could be extended for larger organisations and/or industry bodies where permissions need to reflect real organisational charts and delegated authority (e.g., division/business unit segmentation, multi-layer manager hierarchies, delegated “module admins”, and approval/visibility rules by team or function). Implementing this would likely require a light “org structure” model (teams/units and reporting lines) and a permissions matrix (who can assign, view progress, export, approve), with careful attention to privacy boundaries.
- **Invite flow uplift via email-based tokens (reduced manual handling):** Consider moving from manual invite distribution to an email-based invite token workflow (auto-generated, time-limited, single-use) to reduce friction and administration, improve traceability/auditability (e.g., invite sent/accepted timestamps), and support safer onboarding (revocation/expiry, resend, and domain restrictions where needed). This would also enable cleaner self-serve onboarding for larger rollouts.
- **Optional aggregated “whole-of-system” insights layer (cross-organisation, de-identified):** If FSO wishes to understand adoption trends at a program/system level (e.g., common capability gaps, uptake patterns by role/industry, and which supports/resources are most useful), an optional analytics layer could be designed to produce aggregated, de-identified insights across participating organisations.

FSO stakeholders noted this would require careful privacy and purpose design (clear governance, consent/notice, data minimisation, retention/deletion, and strict boundaries on what is collected, why it is collected, and who can access it). Delivering this capability is also dependent on foundational uplift items – particularly RBAC aligned to real organisational structures (to correctly scope visibility and reporting boundaries), a stronger invite/onboarding workflow (email-based tokens to support traceability and scale), and clear decisions on the access model (PII-free vs authenticated) and hosting/custodianship settings.

Conclusion

This project delivered an end-to-end, evidence-based pathway from BI analysis to practical employer-facing support resources to help organisations enable safe and effective GenAI adoption by workers across Finance, Technology and Business occupations. The work deliberately combined (i) an applied BI evidence base, (ii) structured validation through AI Working Group Workshop 1 (focused on confirming the BI findings and surfacing implementation realities), and (iii) iterative development and testing of the employer support resources through two rounds of co-design/beta testing and AI Working Group Workshop 2 (focused on usability, accessibility, governance integration, and roll-out considerations).

A key strength of the delivery approach was the transparent feedback-to-change process. Stakeholder input was captured through workshop summary reports, supported by monthly progress reporting, and consolidated for final QA and sign-off via Client Feedback Registers. This provided a clear evidence trail showing how feedback – particularly around trust and governance, SME usability, accessibility for priority cohorts, plain-language framing, and sustainability beyond the project end – was incorporated into successive resource revisions, including the development of an interactive web app to complement the static toolkit and better support “in-the-flow-of-work” use.

The project concluded with a structured handover process to enable FSO to integrate, publish, and maintain the resources. Finalisation activities in January-February 2026 centred on consolidation and sign-off of outstanding feedback, completion of final refinements to the static resources and web app, and delivery of the final handover package, with final acceptance targeted for 20 February 2026.

Appendices

Appendix A: Project Deliverables List

#	Deliverable	File Name	Version / Rev	Date delivered to FSO	Purpose / content summary	Feedback / QA mechanism & evidence
1	Monthly Progress Report – July 2025	DCN-RGS-0001_B_MonthlyProgressReport.xlsx	Rev B	1 Aug 2025	Monthly progress update (scope / status / next steps).	Project governance / monthly reporting cycle.
2	Monthly Progress Report – August 2025	DCN-RGS-0002_B_MonthlyProgressReport.xlsx	Rev B	4 Sep 2025	“	“
3	Monthly Progress Report – September 2025	DCN-RGS-0003_B_MonthlyProgressReport.xlsx	Rev B	1 Oct 2025	“	“
4	Monthly Progress Report – October 2025	DCN-RGS-0004_B_MonthlyProgressReport.xlsx	Rev B	6 Nov 2025	“	“
5	Monthly Progress Report – November 2025	DCN-RGS-0005_B_MonthlyProgressReport.xlsx	Rev B	3 Dec 2025	“	“
6	Monthly Progress Report – December 2025	DCN-RGS-0006_B_MonthlyProgressReport.xlsx	Rev B	7 Jan 2026	“	“
7	Monthly Progress Report – January 2026	DCN-RGS-0007_B_MonthlyProgressReport.xlsx	Rev B	2 Feb 2026	“	“
8	Client Feedback Register – Behavioural Insights Report	Behavioural-Insights-Report_Client-Feedback-Register.xlsx	N/A	15 Sep 2025 (issued to client for feedback) / 23 Sep 2025	Consolidated FSO stakeholder feedback on the Behavioural Insights Report (Rev B) +	Client review cycle with tracked register: feedback

				(returned from client) / 7 Oct 2025 (responses to feedback issued to client)	QUT/ARC BITA responses and planned actions.	logged, triaged, and responded to.
9	Behavioural Insights Report	ARCBITA_BehaviouralInsightsReport_rev1_ForUse_clean-version.docx	Rev B / Rev 0 / Rev 1	15 Sep 2025 / 7 Oct 2025 / 20 Nov 2025	Draft BI report for client review / Revised BI report / Final BI report	Feedback captured via Client Feedback Register for Rev B and comments embedded in docx file for BI Report Rev B and Rev 0.
10	Client Feedback Register – Final Report & Employer Support Resources	Final-Report-and-Resources_Client-Feedback-Register.xlsx	N/A	6 Feb 2026	Consolidated FSO stakeholder feedback on the Final Report and Employer Support Resources + QUT/ARC BITA responses and planned actions.	Client review cycle with tracked register: feedback logged, triaged, and responded to.
11	Employer Support Resources – Overview / User Guide	Employer_Support_Resources_User_Guide.docx	Rev A / Rev B / Rev C / Rev 0	4 Nov 2025 / 18 Nov 2025 / 27 Jan 2026 / 20 Feb 2026	Overview and “how to use” guide for the full static employer support resource suite.	Co-design/Beta #1 feedback (12 Nov), Working Group #2 feedback (25

						Nov), Co-design/Beta #2 feedback (10 Dec); Client Feedback Register for Final Report and Employer Support Resources (Rev B) + embedded comments in working files.
12	Resource A: Stages of Change Mapping Guide	A_Stages_of_Change_Mapping_Guide.pptx	Rev A / Rev B / Rev C / Rev 0	4 Nov 2025 / 18 Nov 2025 / 27 Jan 2026 / 20 Feb 2026	Mapping guide to support staged adoption planning and employer/employee positioning.	As above (feedback via sessions + consolidated feedback register for sign-off).
13	Resource B: Stages of Change Playbooks + Employee Coaching Guide	B_Playbooks_and_Coaching_Guide.pptx	Rev A / Rev B / Rev C / Rev 0	4 Nov 2025 / 18 Nov 2025 / 27 Jan 2026 / 20 Feb 2026	Playbooks and coaching guidance to support employer-led implementation and employee enablement.	As above (feedback via sessions + consolidated register for sign-off).
14	Resource C: Stages of Change Self-Assessment Tool + Scoring Guide	C_Self_Assessment_Tool_and_Scoring_Guide.pptx	Rev A / Rev B / Rev C / Rev 0	4 Nov 2025 / 18 Nov 2025 / 27 Jan 2026 /	Self-assessment instrument and scoring guidance to assess readiness / adoption posture.	As above (feedback via sessions + consolidated feedback

				20 Feb 2026		register for sign-off).
15	Resource D: Stages of Change Team Rollup / Reporting Worksheet	D_Team_Rollup_Worksheet.pptx	Rev A / Rev B / Rev C / Rev 0	4 Nov 2025 / 18 Nov 2025 / 27 Jan 2026 / 20 Feb 2026	Team-level roll-up worksheet to aggregate assessment inputs and support reporting.	As above (feedback via sessions + consolidated feedback register for sign-off).
16	Resource E: Stages of Change Safe-to-Try Menu	E_Safe_to_Try_Menu.pptx	Rev A / Rev B / Rev C / Rev 0	4 Nov 2025 / 18 Nov 2025 / 27 Jan 2026 / 20 Feb 2026	Practical “safe-to-try” tasks/menu to support low-friction experimentation and early value discovery.	As above (feedback via sessions + consolidated feedback register for sign-off).
17	Interactive Web App (deployable codebase hosted/transferred to FSO as GitHub repo)	FSO GenAI Adoption Pathway – Interactive Web App (<i>GitHub repo: fso-pathway</i>)	Rev A / Rev B / Rev C / Rev 0	24 Nov 2025 / 5 Dec 2025 / 28 Jan 2026 / 20 Feb 2026	Interactive version of the employer support resources (developed in response to co-design feedback to make resources easier to apply in practice).	As above (feedback via sessions + consolidated feedback register for sign-off).
18	Slides – DEWR Emerging Findings Showcase	20250930_T2 AI Research - Update 3 - QUT_V4.pptx	Final	29 Sep 2025 (submitted) / 30 Sep 2025 (presented)	Slide deck presenting emerging findings and early concepts/frames for the employer support resources.	Informal feedback loop noted in milestone log (draft review prior to delivery).
19	Slides – AI Working Group Workshop #1	2025-10-09 - Working Group Slides - QUT_FSO_V3.pptx	Final	13 Oct 2025 (submitted) / 14 Oct	Facilitation deck for Working Group #1 (validation of BI findings; surfaced	Workshop outputs documented in WG#1

				2025 (presented)	implementation constraints).	Summary Report.
20	AI Working Group Workshop #1 Summary Report	20251110_Workshop1_Summary Report_Final.pdf	Final	20 Oct 2025	High-level summary of Working Group #1 feedback, including validation of BI findings and implications for resource development and testing.	Primary evidence artefact for WG#1 feedback capture.
21	Slides – Co-Design / Beta Testing Session #1	20251112_Co-Design Workshop 1_QUT-FSO_final.pptx	Final	12 Nov 2025 (submitted + presented)	Facilitation deck for first targeted co-design/beta test of draft employer resources (clarity, usability, applicability).	Session feedback used to iterate resources and inform development of the interactive web app.
22	Slides – AI Working Group Workshop #2	2025-11-25 Working Group Slides - QUT_FSO_V2.pptx	Final	24 Nov 2025 (submitted) / 25 Nov 2025 (presented)	Facilitation deck for Working Group #2 testing of revised employer resources + interactive demo app.	Workshop outputs documented in WG#2 Summary Report.
23	AI Working Group Workshop #2 Summary Report	20251204_Workshop 2_Summary Report.pdf	Final	4 Dec 2025	High-level summary of Working Group #2 feedback across usability/accessibility, governance integration, training/change support, roll-out/sustainability.	Primary evidence artefact for WG#2 feedback capture.

24	Slides – Co-Design / Beta Testing Session #2	2025-12-10 - Co-design workshop 2 - QUT_FSO_v1.pptx	Final	5 Dec 2025 (submitted) / 10 Dec 2025 (presented)	Facilitation deck for second co-design/beta test of revised employer resources + updated web app (portability and fit across contexts).	Session feedback used to iterate resources (static + web app).
25	Final Project Report (this document)	ARCBITA_FinalReport.docx	Rev B / Rev 0	6 Feb 2026 / 20 Feb 2026	Consolidated report of delivery process, stakeholder feedback, evidence trail, and handover/knowledge transfer.	Feedback captured via Client Feedback Register and comments embedded in files. Final acceptance and sign-off by FSO on/before 20 Feb 2026 (per plan).

Appendix B: AI Research Working Group Membership

Stakeholder group	Organisations (state/territory/national coverage)
Unions	Finance Sector Union (National) Australian Education Union (National) Australian Council of Trade Unions (National) Communications Workers Union of Australia (National) Professionals Australia (National) Australian Services Union (ASU) (National)
Small employer peaks	Council of Small Business Organisations Australia (National) Small Business Association of Australia (National)
Large employers	Woolworths Group (National) Commonwealth Bank of Australia (National) Suncorp (National) Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (National)
Industry employer peaks and associations	Australian Industry Group (Ai Group) (National) SA Chamber of Commerce (South Australia) Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Tasmania) Victorian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Victoria) Business NSW (New South Wales) Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand (CAANZ) (National) Tech Council of Australia (TCA) (National) The Institute of Certified Bookkeepers (ICB) (National) Industry Skills Advisory Council NT (ISACNT) (Northern Territory) Financial, Administrative and Professional Services Training Council Inc. (FAPSTC) (Western Australia) Business Skills Viability (Victoria) Australian Computer Society / Qld Dept Trade, Employment and Training (National/Queensland) Australian Women in Security Network (AWSN) (National)
Government	Digital Transformation Agency (National) Australian Government Department of Industry, Science and Resources (National) Australian Government Department of Finance (National) National Artificial Intelligence Centre (National)
Diversity, Equity, Inclusion Focused	Tranby Aboriginal Cooperative (National) Australian Digital Inclusion Alliance (National)
AI / Training and Development Experts	Getmee.ai (National) Scentia (National) Stratentia (National) University of Technology Sydney (National) William Angliss Institute (Victoria)

For full detail, readers are referred to the published AI Research Working Group membership available via: <https://www.futureskillsorganisation.com.au/supporting-generative-ai-adoption-by-workers-the-role-of-employers/>.

Appendix C: Project Milestones List

July 2025

- 4 Jul: Formal project commencement with kick-off meeting.
- 10-14 Jul: Early diagnostic prototype shared.
- 15 Jul: Briefed FSO Executive Leadership Team.
- 17 Jul: Master Services Agreement cleared by QUT; returned to FSO for final signature.
- 17 Jul: Ethics Waiver granted by QUT Office of Research Ethics & Integrity.
- 22 Jul: Behavioural Insights Report initial template/placeholder developed.
- 23 Jul: Literature review and draft Behavioural Insights report commenced.

August 2025

- 1 Aug: Monthly Progress Report #1 submitted.
- 27 Aug: First QUT Internal Draft of Behavioural Insights Report for early feedback.
- 28 Aug: Synthesis of Barriers & Drivers for Behavioural Insights Report Commenced.
- 28 Aug: Draft Initial Concepts of Employer Support Resources Commenced in Parallel.

September 2025

- 4 Sep: Working Group planning meeting (FSO + QUT).
- 15 Sep: Draft BI report (Rev B) submitted to FSO for client review.
- 23–24 Sep: Consolidated client feedback on Draft BI Report received and discussed.
- 24 Sep: Early concepts of Employer Support Resources/Toolkit shared informally.
- 29 Sep: DEWR showcase slides + Early concepts for Employer Resources submitted.
- 30 Sep: DEWR showcase delivered.

October 2025

- 7 Oct: BI report Rev 0 submitted after addressing client feedback.
- 8 Oct: Practice Working Group #1 facilitated by QUT.
- 14 Oct: Working Group Workshop 1 facilitated.
- 16 Oct: Workshop 1 summary report submitted.
- 22 Oct: Case study template circulated to Working Group by FSO.
- 23 Oct: Co-design workshop agenda + registration recommendations submitted by QUT.
- 31 Oct: "Systemic factors" commentary memo (Rev A) submitted by QUT.

November 2025

- 4 Nov: Draft employer support resources (Rev A) submitted to FSO.
- 6 Nov: Meeting with NAIC re: project cross-overs/complementary work.
- 11 Nov: Co-design/beta testing session #1 practice.
- 11 Nov: Co-design/beta testing session #1 facilitated + slides submission to FSO.
- 18 Nov: Employer support resources (Rev B) + WG#2 agenda submitted after addressing co-design/beta testing session #1 feedback.
- 20 Nov: BI report finalised (Rev 1) after addressing minor feedback on Rev 0.
- 24 Nov: Working Group #2 slides + demo app link submitted to FSO.
- 25 Nov: Working Group Workshop 2 facilitated.
- 27 Nov: Email response to NAIC technical queries submitted by QUT team.

December 2025

- 4 Dec: Workshop 2 summary report submitted.
- 5 Dec: Meeting with QUT, FSO, NAIC on next steps.
- 5 Dec: Co-design/beta testing session #2 slides + updated demo app link submitted.
- 10 Dec: Co-design/beta testing session #2 delivered.
- 17 Dec: FSO internal engagement/comms integration/handover meeting.
- 19 Dec: Christmas/New Year leave period.

January to February 2026

- 5 Jan: QUT Project Lead back from holiday break and begin working on consolidating and actioning feedback on support resources.
- 15 Jan: First progress meeting (FSO + ARC BITA/QUT) in the new year.
- 22 Jan: Second progress meeting (FSO + ARC BITA/QUT) in the new year.
- 27 Jan: Early submission of Rev C (for approval) employer support resources (static resources + user guide) to FSO, including additional 3-page “what changed” snapshot memorandum.
- 28 Jan: Facilitation of final targeted user/stakeholder engagement session with select AI Working Group members, representatives from NAIC, and key FSO project stakeholders and early submission of link to Rev C (for approval) web app.
- 6 Feb: Submission of draft final report (Rev B) + finalised (Rev C) employer support resources (static resources + user guide + link to web app).
- 20 Feb: Project close-out on submission of final report and employer support resources.

Appendix D: Stages of Change/Adoption Terminology Crosswalk

Original TTM stage label	Recommended workplace-neutral label*	Plain-language definition (individual/employee level)	Indicative alignment to Singapore org-level stages*
Precontemplation ("Not for me yet")	Unaware or Unengaged [†]	Not currently using AI; may avoid it, feel it's irrelevant, risky, or "not for my role"; sees more costs than benefits.	AI Unaware
Contemplation ("Maybe... but unsure")	Considering or Curious [†]	Interested and weighing pros/cons; may have tried once or twice but doesn't have confidence, clarity, or a safe way to proceed.	AI Aware
Preparation ("Getting ready")	Preparing [†] or Setting Up	Intends to start soon; taking small steps (e.g. learning basics, asking peers, setting up access, identifying a first task) and needs a simple plan.	Transition from AI Aware → AI Ready
Action ("Doing the thing")	Executing or Applying [†]	Actively using AI for a few clear, low-risk tasks; still building skill and task-fit judgment (i.e. knowing when AI is a good fit and when it isn't); benefits visible but mistakes/overreliance still possible.	AI Ready
Maintenance ("It's part of my workflow")	Established [†] or Routine	Using AI routinely with sensible checks; has good habits, guardrails, and task-fit judgment; still benefits from refreshers as tools and rules/policy change.	AI Competent
Relapse/Recycle ("Pause, slip, or loss of confidence")	Rebuilding [†] or Revisiting	Use drops off due to a bad experience, time pressure, tool changes, or rule/policy uncertainty; not a failure – just shows where support/guardrails need strengthening.	Not a "stage" in the org model but can occur at any maturity level.

***Notes:**

1. The Singapore model³ defines organisational-level maturity, while this toolkit's stages of change/adoption are focused on individual/employee-level readiness and confidence behaviours. The alignment above is therefore approximate/indicative, intended only to help readers translate concepts across levels (6 individual stages vs 4 organisational stages).
2. The National AI Centre is currently considering the adoption of the Singapore model, with the exception of "AI Competent" being referred to as "AI Capable".
3. For the web app, we adopted a simplified approach by utilising a single workplace-neutral adoption stage label (as marked by [†] in the table above) for each stage.

³ Available at: <https://aisingapore.org/innovation/airi/>.

Appendix E: Operational Notes for Web App

This appendix is ostensibly provided for operational handover and technical continuity purposes.

Overview of the Application

The application is a web-based implementation of the static Employer Support Resources pack. It provides an interactive, guided workflow that helps organisations assess, plan, and apply responsible GenAI adoption practices to enable employees to build the skills and confidence to use GenAI tools productively and safely in their day-to-day work.

From a technical perspective, the app is a React single-page application (SPA) using React Router for client-side navigation, built with modern tooling (Vite) and deployed as static frontend assets (e.g., via npm run build). In production, hosting must be configured for SPA route rewrites so deep links and query-parameter routes resolve to the app entry point. The app is backed by Base44's managed backend service, which provides built-in user authentication, a managed NoSQL database organised around "entities" (MongoDB-compatible), real-time updates/sync (via WebSocket/subscriptions), and serverless backend functions (TypeScript on a Deno runtime). The frontend integrates with these backend capabilities primarily via the Base44 SDK, with backend entity security rules and function authorisation checks acting as the source of truth for tenancy isolation and permissions.⁴

Functionally, the application uses role-based access control (RBAC) to determine what each user can see, what pages they can navigate to, and what actions they can perform, based on their assigned role within their organisation. This ensures each role receives an experience aligned to their responsibilities, and prevents non-authorised users from accessing administrative or organisation-wide functions.

Employees primarily access the self-assessment workflow and the resulting outputs (e.g., personalised learning and development plans generated based on their adoption stage and identified skill/learning gaps). Employees also have access to the employee-view of the AI policy page, which provides guidance relevant to day-to-day use and expected behaviours. Employee navigation and actions are intentionally limited to individual-level activities and resources, rather than organisation-level controls or other users' data.

Managers receive access to people-leadership features and team support tooling. This typically includes a team dashboard (a roll-up view of self-assessment data for employees within their organisation or team scope), the ability to assign mentors (where enabled), and manager-facing coaching guidance tailored to each employee's stage of AI adoption / behaviour change. Managers also access the manager-view of the AI policy page, which emphasises oversight, coaching expectations, and team-level guardrails and escalation pathways (rather than policy editing).

Org Admins / Owners have the broadest organisation-level capabilities. They can access the team dashboard and a User Management portal to invite users to the organisation, remove users, and manage roles and access. Org Admins also access an Admin Setup area used to configure organisational content – such as safe-to-try tasks, training modules, and other resources by adoption stage – which then forms the basis of the automatically generated, personalised learning and development plans presented to employees. For policy management, Org Admins can access the AI Policy Editor to define and maintain organisation policy content, including the employee-view, manager-view, and organisation-wide guardrails (e.g., what is allowed vs not allowed, approval/review requirements, and practical usage rules). Org Admins also have access to the guided AI

⁴ For more information, refer to base44 documentation: <https://docs.base44.com/developers/app-code/overview/introduction>, <https://docs.base44.com/developers/backend/overview/introduction>, <https://docs.base44.com/developers/backend/quickstart/quickstart-with-react>, and <https://base44.com/blog/application-security>.

policy checklist modules that walk them through the process of developing and implementing an organisational AI policy.

Trusted Advisors are designed as an external or specialist support role. They have access to the team dashboard to support organisational guidance, plus view-only access to AI policy versions (employee-view, manager-view, and organisation-wide policy) for review and advisory support. Trusted Advisors are not able to modify organisational configuration, edit policy content, or manage users unless explicitly granted via an org admin/owner role.

Where used, a Platform Admin role may also exist for operational oversight and support across organisations. This role is separate from organisation roles, and is intended for platform-level administration (e.g., monitoring, troubleshooting, and maintenance) rather than day-to-day organisational operations – unless explicitly configured to also permit policy editing or administrative access for support purposes.

As users move through the workflow, the app can capture and display outputs such as module completion status and progress indicators, and – where organisation configuration is enabled – store and apply settings at the tenant level so each organisation only sees and uses its own data. Depending on which backend entities are implemented, the app may also support optional usage roll-ups or lightweight engagement records (e.g., counts or summaries) to inform follow-up support, continuous improvement, and reporting.

Security and Tenancy Summary

The application is designed as a multi-tenant system: it serves multiple organisations (tenants) while ensuring that each organisation's data remains isolated from all others. In practice, this means organisation-scoped records are associated with an organisation identifier (i.e., `org_id`) and are treated as belonging to a specific tenant. The operational “source of truth” for tenancy isolation must be the backend – i.e., the backend must enforce that authenticated users can only read or write data that belongs to their own organisation scope (unless they hold an explicitly privileged platform-level role). UI-level checks and hidden navigation are helpful for user experience, but they are not sufficient security controls on their own because client-side logic can be bypassed.

Role-based access control (RBAC) has therefore been implemented as a two-layer model. First, the UI and routing layer determines what each user can see and which pages/actions are available based on the user's role (e.g., Employee, Manager, Org Admin, Trusted Advisor, and optionally Platform Admin). Second – and critically – the backend layer enforces permissions at the data and operation level (e.g., entity-level read/write permissions and any serverless function authorization checks). Operationally, this ensures that even if a user attempts to directly access a restricted route (such as via a copied URL) or manipulate client requests, the backend still prevents unauthorised access to tenant data or admin-only operations.

For the AI Policy Editor specifically, access must be restricted to Org Admins and, if configured for operational support, Platform Admins. This restriction exists in both places: (1) at the UI/routing level (the editor view is not rendered or reachable for non-admin roles), and (2) at the backend permission level (only Org Admin/Platform Admin can write/update policy configuration records or invoke any policy-edit related backend operations). As a minimum go-live validation, FSO should verify that (a) tenant isolation rules are active for every organisation-scoped entity, (b) role restrictions prevent non-admin reads/writes for admin-only entities and functions, and (c) attempts to access editor functionality as a non-admin fail safely (redirected/blocked without data leakage or partial rendering).

Data Captured and Access Controls

To deliver the guided workflow and role-specific experiences, the application captures and stores a structured set of data categories. At a minimum, this includes user account and authentication information (currently managed via Base44), organisation

membership and role assignment (which tenant the user belongs to, and whether they are an Employee, Manager, Org Admin, Trusted Advisor, and/or Platform Admin), and workflow interaction data such as self-assessment responses and Safe-to-Try task/training module completion/progress indicators. Where the personalised learning and development (L&D) pathway functionality is enabled, the system may also store derived outputs such as recommended learning actions, identified skill/learning gaps, adoption stage indicators, and other structured plan artefacts shown back to the user. Where organisation configuration is enabled, the system also stores organisation-level setup data (e.g., safe-to-try tasks, training modules, mappings by adoption stage) and policy configuration content (employee-view, manager-view, and organisation-wide guardrails), which are tenant-scoped and intended to be editable only by authorised admin roles.

Access to these data categories is governed by RBAC and tenant scope. Employees are restricted to their own individual-level data (e.g., their self-assessment inputs, their progress/completion status, and the L&D outputs generated for them) and view-only access to the employee-facing AI policy guidance. Managers can access team-relevant roll-ups derived from employee activity within their organisation or assigned scope (e.g., dashboard summaries, coaching guidance inputs, mentor assignment data if enabled), but they should not be able to edit organisation-wide configuration or policy content. Org Admins/Owners have organisation-wide access within their tenant: they can manage users/roles, view dashboards, configure organisational resources used by the workflow (e.g., modules/tasks by adoption stage), and edit policy content via the Policy Editor. Trusted Advisors are intended to support organisations without having edit power; they typically have dashboard access and view-only access to the various policy views for review and advisory purposes, but cannot modify organisational configuration, policy content, or user accounts. If a Platform Admin role is used, it should be tightly controlled and scoped to operational support needs; where platform-level access exists, it must be explicitly governed and audited because it can imply cross-tenant visibility depending on configuration.

Retention and export should be treated as an FSO governance decision and documented as part of go-live: FSO should define (a) how long workflow data and policy/configuration records are retained, (b) whether tenants can request export of their organisation's data (and in what format), and (c) what the process is for deletion or deprovisioning when an organisation or user leaves the platform.

Hosting and Deployment Options

Option 1: Default pathway via Base44 hosting and managed backend

Under the default model, both the frontend and backend remain on Base44, with Base44 providing the managed backend service (auth, database/entities, realtime sync/subscriptions, and serverless functions) and also hosting the built frontend as static SPA assets. Operationally, this is the simplest arrangement for FSO because there is no separate infrastructure to provision or maintain beyond normal app administration, domain configuration (if desired), and access governance (roles, tenant provisioning, admin accounts).

In this model, there are two equivalent ways to manage the frontend build and deploy, but both end up deploying to Base44 hosting and continue to use the Base44 managed backend:

1. Build/deploy via Base44's standard workflow: maintainers use the Base44 project workflow (commonly through Base44 tooling) to develop, build, and publish updates to the hosted app.
2. Build locally, deploy to Base44 hosting: maintainers run the React/Vite app locally for development (`npm run dev`), produce production build artifacts locally (`npm run build`), and then deploy those artifacts to Base44 hosting using the standard Base44 deployment mechanism.

The key operational requirement for either approach is that the hosted environment must be configured correctly for an SPA, so that all routes and route-like URLs are served

the SPA entry point (rather than being treated as “real” server paths). This matters because React Router handles navigation client-side, including query parameters like `?view=editor`. If SPA rewrites aren't correctly configured, users can experience “blank page” symptoms or inconsistent route transitions when navigating between views. With Base44 hosting, this is typically handled in the hosting configuration, but it's still worth treating as a go-live acceptance check: confirm that navigation between guided modules and editor views works reliably without manual refresh.

From an FSO handover perspective, this option mainly requires clarity on: (a) who owns release/deployment credentials and change approvals, (b) how tenants are provisioned and roles assigned (Org Admin vs Manager vs Employee vs Trusted Advisor, plus any Platform Admin), and (c) what the escalation path is if Base44 service issues occur. If FSO wants the app surfaced through FSO channels, the typical approach is to use an FSO-owned domain/subdomain routed to Base44 hosting with HTTPS so users see a stable, branded URL while Base44 remains the underlying platform.

Option 2: Migrate the backend off Base44 to an FSO-managed backend

The alternative pathway is to treat Base44 as an initial rapid build platform and then migrate the backend to infrastructure that FSO (or an appointed maintainer) operates and governs directly (e.g., Supabase). This model can make sense where FSO requires greater control over data residency, operational governance, security posture, vendor dependencies, or integration constraints. However, it is a materially larger piece of work than “hosting changes” alone, because Base44 is not just hosting – it provides core backend primitives that would need to be replaced.

In practical terms, migrating the backend means replacing (or re-implementing) the following Base44-provided capabilities: authentication, data entities (database + access rules), realtime subscriptions, and serverless functions. The frontend would also need to be updated to talk to the new backend – either by replacing Base44 SDK usage with Supabase SDK usage, or by inserting a compatibility layer that maps the existing Base44-style calls onto Supabase equivalents.⁵

Operationally, FSO should treat this option as a “replatforming” effort with explicit design decisions required up front: how tenants are represented (tenant tables / org_id scoping), how row-level security is implemented and tested in Supabase, how role models are persisted and enforced, how policy content/config is stored per tenant, how audit/monitoring and backups are handled, and how any backend functions are implemented (Supabase Edge Functions or another functions runtime). This option can improve long-run control and governance, but it introduces the need for FSO-owned operational responsibility for uptime, security configuration, incident response, and ongoing backend maintenance.

Overview of Operating Model Options

A practical framing for FSO is as follows:

- Option 1 (Base44 managed backend) is a handover-ready operating model suitable for both pilot and production, provided Base44 is an acceptable managed service provider within FSO's governance and risk settings. Under this option, the app continues to rely on Base44 for core backend services (authentication, database/entities, real-time sync/subscriptions, and serverless functions), and the frontend is deployed to Base44 hosting. This model also carries ongoing Base44 subscription/licensing fees, alongside normal internal operational ownership for user onboarding, role/tenant administration, content updates, and escalation to Base44 support if required.
- Option 2 (migrate backend to an FSO-managed platform) is a strategic migration pathway if FSO requires direct control over backend operations and data

⁵ If FSO is considering Supabase specifically, there is an emerging community migration approach intended to reduce rewrite effort. The referenced project below is an example of a compatibility/migration aid that aims to help map Base44 SDK usage patterns to Supabase: <https://github.com/Ai-Automators/base44-to-supabase-sdk>.

governance (e.g., security posture, residency, vendor dependency, integration constraints). This option provides greater long-term control, but comes with additional engineering effort and operational overhead to replace Base44's backend capabilities and to operate, secure, and maintain the new backend environment over time.