iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

FROM SKILLS VERIFICATION TO WORKFORCE INTELLIGENCE A RESPONSIBLE AI FRAMEWORK FOR COMPETENCY-BASED WORKFORCE DECISION-MAKING

Rita Ebele Maduanusi
Chief Innovation Officer, Turner Innovations Limited, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT
Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly used to support recruitment, skills analysis, learning, performance management and workforce planning. Yet many workforce decisions still depend heavily on static qualifications, curriculum vitae data, self-reported experience and periodic assessments. These sources remain valuable, but they may provide an incomplete or outdated representation of an individual's current, demonstrable capability.
This conceptual paper proposes the Responsible AI Workforce Competency Intelligence Framework (RAI-WCIF), an applied architecture for transforming competency assessment from episodic verification into a governed source of workforce intelligence. The framework integrates five dimensions: competency evidence, workforce intelligence, AI-assisted analysis, digital trust and human governance. It positions AI primarily as decision support rather than as an autonomous authority over consequential employment outcomes.
Drawing on responsible-AI governance principles, contemporary workforce research and regulatory developments, the paper develops a staged implementation model covering evidence provenance, role and skills mapping, skills-gap analysis, AI-readiness indicators, explainability, fairness, privacy, human oversight and continuous monitoring. The framework is intentionally designed to distinguish absence of evidence from evidence of absence and to preserve meaningful human review at consequential decision points.
The paper contributes a practical bridge between competency-based workforce management and responsible AI governance. It argues that the value of workforce AI depends not only on predictive or generative capability, but also on evidence quality, traceability, proportionality, contestability and accountable organisational decision-making. The framework is conceptual and requires empirical validation across industries, occupations and labour-market contexts.

Keywords:
Responsible AI; Workforce Intelligence; Artificial Intelligence; Competency Assessment; Skills Intelligence; AI Readiness; Workforce Analytics; Digital Trust; Human Oversight.

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence is changing the architecture of work. Organisations increasingly use digital systems to support recruitment, workforce planning, learning and development, performance management, skills analysis and organisational decision-making. The acceleration of generative AI has widened the range of tasks that can be supported computationally, while simultaneously increasing the importance of governance, verification and human accountability.
An important information problem nevertheless remains. Organisations often know more about the historical credentials of applicants and employees than about their current demonstrable capabilities. A curriculum vitae can indicate prior experience; a qualification can establish completion of a programme of study; and a professional certificate can evidence a defined learning or assessment process. These signals are useful, but none is a complete representation of present capability.
This distinction matters in labour markets where technologies, occupations and skill requirements are changing quickly. The World Economic Forum's Future of Jobs Report 2025, based on responses from more than 1,000 employers representing over 14 million workers, identifies AI and information-processing technologies among the major forces expected to transform business and work through 2030 (World Economic Forum, 2025). This environment increases the strategic value of timely and interpretable skills information.
The central research question of this paper is therefore: How can organisations use AI to develop a more current, evidence-informed understanding of workforce capability without allowing algorithmic outputs to become an unaccountable substitute for professional judgement?

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

This paper addresses that question by proposing the Responsible AI Workforce Competency Intelligence Framework (RAI-WCIF). Its central proposition is that responsible workforce AI should strengthen human decision-making by improving the organisation, quality and interpretation of competency evidence rather than removing accountable human judgement.

2. CONCEPTUAL METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a conceptual and integrative research design. It does not report a primary empirical experiment, survey or organisational trial. Instead, it develops a framework through synthesis of four bodies of knowledge: competency and skills intelligence; AI-enabled human-resource and workforce decision support; responsible-AI governance; and human–AI decision-making.

The framework was constructed through a problem-to-governance logic. First, the workforce information problem was defined as a gap between static credential signals and current evidence of capability. Second, potential AI functions were separated from consequential decision authority. Third, governance requirements were mapped to the lifecycle of competency evidence: collection, verification, interpretation, recommendation, human review, decision and feedback. Fourth, regulatory and standards-based controls were incorporated as design constraints rather than post-deployment additions.

The conceptual synthesis is informed by the NIST AI Risk Management Framework, which organises AI risk management around Govern, Map, Measure and Manage functions and is intended to support trustworthy and responsible AI across sectors (Tabassi, 2023). It also draws on ISO/IEC 42001:2023, which specifies requirements for an organisational AI management system, and on the OECD AI Principles concerning human rights, fairness, privacy, transparency, explainability, robustness and accountability (ISO/IEC, 2023; OECD, 2024).

Because employment uses of AI can materially affect livelihoods and rights, the framework also considers the European Union Artificial Intelligence Act. The Act treats specified AI systems used in recruitment, worker management, promotion, termination, task allocation and worker monitoring as high-risk use cases, subject to the Regulation's classification rules and exceptions (European Union, 2024). This regulatory context reinforces the need for risk management, competent human oversight and traceability.

The methodology is therefore normative and design-oriented: it asks what organisational and technical conditions should exist for competency intelligence to support workforce decisions responsibly. The resulting framework should be treated as a testable proposition for subsequent empirical research, not as a claim of demonstrated causal effectiveness.

3. FROM CREDENTIALS TO DYNAMIC CAPABILITY EVIDENCE

Qualifications and professional credentials remain important labour-market signals. The argument for competency intelligence is not an argument against formal education. Rather, it recognises that credentials, professional experience, work samples, simulations, licences, observed performance and structured competency assessments can represent different forms of evidence within a broader capability profile.

Traditional workforce information has several limitations. Job descriptions may lag behind actual work practices. Skills inventories may rely on self-report. Annual reviews provide periodic rather than continuous insight. Training-completion records demonstrate participation but do not necessarily establish application. CV data is difficult to standardise and may privilege the ability to describe experience rather than the ability to demonstrate capability.

This produces a workforce evidence gap: the difference between information an organisation possesses about its people and the evidence required for a particular workforce decision. AI may help organise heterogeneous evidence at scale, but it cannot repair weak evidence merely by analysing it more efficiently. If inputs are inaccurate, incomplete, biased or stale, computational sophistication can make weak information appear undeservedly authoritative.

Responsible workforce intelligence should therefore begin with evidence quality. The relevant question is not simply 'What qualification does this person hold?' but 'What capability is relevant to this decision, what evidence supports it, how current is that evidence, and what uncertainty remains?'

4. AI IN WORKFORCE DECISION-MAKING

AI-supported workforce systems can assist with skills extraction, role matching, development recommendations, workforce planning, competency-gap analysis and organisational capability forecasting. These applications can increase analytical capacity, but they also introduce governance risks because employment decisions can affect income, career progression, reputation and access to opportunity.

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

Evidence on human–AI collaboration cautions against assuming that adding a human reviewer automatically produces superior outcomes. Vaccaro, Almaatouq and Malone (2024), in a preregistered meta-analysis of 106 experimental studies, found that human–AI combinations were on average better than humans alone but did not outperform the better of the human or AI acting alone; decision tasks were particularly challenging. This finding supports a more careful view of 'human in the loop': oversight must be designed, resourced and evaluated rather than treated as a ceremonial safeguard.

Automation bias is another concern. Reviewers may over-rely on system recommendations, particularly when outputs appear precise or authoritative. Recent review literature emphasises that explainable-AI interfaces and workflow design must account for this behavioural tendency (Romeo & Conti, 2026). Meaningful oversight therefore requires reviewers who understand system limitations, can inspect supporting evidence and have authority to reject recommendations.

The appropriate boundary proposed here is simple: AI may generate, organise and prioritise workforce intelligence; authorised humans retain decision authority for consequential outcomes. The boundary should be embedded in workflow permissions, documentation and audit controls rather than expressed only as a policy statement.

5. THE RAI-WCIF FRAMEWORK

The RAI-WCIF consists of five interconnected dimensions: competency evidence, workforce intelligence, AI-assisted analysis, digital trust and human governance. These dimensions form a socio-technical system in which data, models, organisational rules and professional judgement interact.

Dimension 1 — Competency Evidence. Evidence may include structured assessments, practical demonstrations, work samples, simulations, verified qualifications, licences, workplace observations, validated performance evidence, learning records and appropriately governed self-assessment. Each item should carry contextual metadata such as source, date, assessment method, competency standard, verification status and, where appropriate, confidence or validity period.

Dimension 2 — Workforce Intelligence. Evidence is translated into role-capability profiles, skills inventories, team capability maps, development priorities, mobility signals, succession-readiness indicators and organisational capability trends. The objective is not to generate more dashboards but to answer operational questions about capability gaps, emerging skills, concentration risks and development priorities.

Dimension 3 — AI-Assisted Analysis. AI may classify evidence, extract skills, compare capability profiles with role requirements, identify gaps, detect patterns and generate decision-support recommendations. It should communicate uncertainty and distinguish 'insufficient evidence' from 'demonstrated deficiency'. Missing data must not automatically become a negative judgement.

Dimension 4 — Digital Trust. Trust mechanisms should make evidence provenance and integrity visible. Appropriate controls may include identity and credential verification, assessment provenance, timestamps, version histories, access logs, validation status and flags for expired or superseded evidence.

Dimension 5 — Human Governance. Governance determines legitimate purpose, authorised users, prohibited uses, decision rights, escalation routes, audit responsibilities, monitoring requirements and mechanisms for individuals to query or correct material information. Human governance surrounds all other dimensions because no technical component can make an organization accountable by itself.

6. RESPONSIBLE AI CONTROL PRINCIPLES

Explainability. Workforce decision support should provide an explanation appropriate to the user and consequence. A numerical suitability score is rarely sufficient. A more responsible output identifies supporting evidence, unmet requirements, evidence age, uncertainty and required human action.

Fairness. Removing protected characteristics from a dataset does not by itself create fairness. Historical outcomes may encode unequal opportunity, while apparently neutral variables can act as proxies. Fairness evaluation should therefore examine evidence collection, assessment design, model behaviour, human interpretation and downstream outcomes.

Privacy and data minimisation. Competency intelligence can become an unusually detailed repository of professional information. Organisations should define explicit purposes for collection, minimise data to what is necessary, implement role-based access and establish retention and correction processes. Competency intelligence should not drift into continuous employee surveillance.

Accountability. A named organisational role or function should remain accountable for consequential decisions. Managers should not be able to attribute an adverse outcome to 'the algorithm' when they are responsible for using the system.

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

Robustness and monitoring. AI risk management is continuous. NIST's AI RMF emphasises ongoing governance, mapping, measurement and management, while ISO/IEC 42001 embeds continual improvement within an AI management system (Tabassi, 2023; ISO/IEC, 2023). Workforce models should therefore be monitored for drift, error patterns, data-quality problems, disparate outcomes and inappropriate use.

7. SKILLS-GAP AND AI-READINESS INTELLIGENCE

A major application of RAI-WCIF is evidence-based skills-gap analysis. For a defined role, an organisation can establish a capability profile containing essential competencies, expected proficiency, regulatory requirements and emerging skills. Individual evidence can then be mapped against those requirements.

Outputs should use evidence-sensitive categories such as demonstrated capability, partially demonstrated capability, evidence requiring renewal, development opportunity and insufficient evidence. The wording matters because absence of evidence is not equivalent to evidence of incompetence.

AI readiness is an increasingly important capability domain. It should not be reduced to the ability to operate a chatbot. A broader model can include AI literacy, understanding of limitations, effective human–AI collaboration, verification of generated outputs, data awareness, privacy and confidentiality, ethical use, domain-specific application and escalation when automated outputs may be unreliable.

AI-readiness expectations should remain role-sensitive. The capabilities required of a software engineer, care-sector manager, recruiter and senior executive will differ. A universal score detached from occupational context risks producing misleading comparisons.

8. HUMAN-IN-THE-LOOP ARCHITECTURE

Meaningful human oversight requires more than inserting a person at the end of an automated process. Four minimum conditions are proposed. First, the reviewer must know that the output is AI-assisted and probabilistic or inferential where applicable. Second, the reviewer must have access to relevant supporting evidence. Third, the reviewer must have authority to disagree. Fourth, the organisation should monitor patterns of acceptance, rejection and override.

Near-universal acceptance of algorithmic recommendations may indicate excellent performance, but it may also indicate automation bias or weak review. Conversely, frequent rejection may reveal poor calibration, missing context or an inappropriate use case. Human review itself should therefore generate governance data.

A useful design principle is 'decision traceability': for consequential outcomes, the organisation should be able to reconstruct the relevant evidence, system recommendation, explanation presented to the reviewer, reviewer action and final decision. This supports audit, learning and contestability.

9. APPLICATION CONTEXTS

For employers, the framework can support recruitment, development, internal mobility, succession planning and strategic workforce planning. Competency evidence can complement rather than replace CVs, interviews and qualifications. Aggregated intelligence can reveal organisational capability shortages and guide targeted learning investment.

For education and training providers, competency intelligence can connect programme outcomes more transparently with workplace capability requirements. Learners may accumulate verified evidence alongside formal qualifications. However, education should not be reduced to short-term employer demand; broader educational, civic and developmental purposes remain important.

For workforce-development organisations and public bodies, appropriately aggregated and anonymised intelligence could provide a more granular view of labour-market shortages. A sector may face not only a shortage of workers with a particular job title but shortages of specific digital, technical, managerial or regulatory competencies distributed across occupations.

These uses require proportionality. The more consequential the use case, the stronger the requirements for evidence validity, human oversight, documentation, testing and rights protection.

10. IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP

Stage 1 — Define the decision problem. Identify the precise organisational question before selecting technology. A system designed for learning recommendations should not automatically be repurposed for promotion or termination decisions.

Stage 2 — Establish competency standards. Define relevant capabilities, levels and evidence expectations. Poorly designed competency models cannot be rescued by AI.

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

Stage 3 — Determine acceptable evidence. Specify which sources can support each competency and how quality, recency and verification are evaluated.
Stage 4 — Establish data and AI governance. Define ownership, access, privacy, retention, correction, security, risk classification, documentation and accountability.
Stage 5 — Introduce constrained AI assistance. Begin with bounded decision-support tasks and validate outputs against professional review.
Stage 6 — Operationalise human oversight. Train reviewers, provide explanations and evidence, and ensure genuine authority to challenge system outputs.
Stage 7 — Monitor outcomes. Track accuracy, overrides, complaints, fairness indicators, drift, security incidents and unintended effects.
Stage 8 — Improve continuously. Update competency definitions, evidence requirements, models and controls as work and technology evolve.

11. CONCEPTUAL DECISION MODEL

The full RAI-WCIF process is: Competency Evidence → Skills Intelligence → Role and Gap Analysis → AI-Assisted Workforce Intelligence → Responsible AI Controls → Human Review → Accountable Workforce Decision → Continuous Feedback.
Digital trust and governance operate across the entire process. The model intentionally prevents a single AI-generated score from becoming a workforce decision by itself. Instead, it creates a chain of evidence and accountability.
At the input layer, evidence is contextualised and verified. At the intelligence layer, evidence is mapped to roles and capability requirements. At the analytical layer, AI identifies patterns, gaps and possible actions. At the control layer, fairness, explainability, privacy, security, reliability and data quality are assessed. At the governance layer, an authorised human evaluates context and may challenge or override the recommendation. Outcomes then feed monitoring and evidence renewal.

12. DISCUSSION

The framework reframes workforce AI as an evidence and governance problem rather than primarily an automation problem. This is important because the presence of AI does not remove the need for organisational judgement; it changes the information environment in which that judgement is exercised.
Regulatory developments reinforce this position. The EU AI Act recognises that AI used in employment and worker management can affect career prospects, livelihoods and workers' rights and therefore places specified employment uses within a high-risk regulatory framework (European Union, 2024). Similarly, the OECD principles and NIST framework emphasise accountability, transparency, risk management and human-centred values (OECD, 2024; Tabassi, 2023).
The framework also challenges a simplistic assumption that human–AI collaboration is automatically superior. The meta-analysis by Vaccaro et al. (2024) shows that complementarity depends on task design and that human–AI combinations can underperform the best individual component. Responsible deployment must therefore evaluate the combined system—not only model accuracy.
The strategic transition proposed by this paper is: Skills Verification → Competency Evidence → Workforce Intelligence → Responsible Decision Support. This progression changes assessment from a terminal event into a governed source of longitudinal capability information while preserving the distinction between evidence, recommendation and decision.

13. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The framework is conceptual and has not been empirically validated by the present study. Competency itself is difficult to measure perfectly, and human capability is contextual and multidimensional. Structured assessment can provide useful evidence but cannot capture every aspect of professional performance.
Role requirements and skills taxonomies also change. Evidence may become stale, while model performance can drift. Explainability can be difficult for complex systems, and excessive quantification may undervalue leadership, creativity, empathy, judgement and adaptability.
Future research should test whether RAI-WCIF improves workforce decision quality relative to conventional approaches; which evidence types are most valid for different occupations; how workers perceive AI-assisted competency systems; which explanation formats support meaningful oversight; how fairness should be measured across heterogeneous evidence sources; and how frequently evidence should be renewed.

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

Controlled pilots, longitudinal organisational studies, comparative case studies, interviews and quantitative outcome analysis would all be appropriate. Cross-country research is especially important because employment law, educational systems, cultural expectations and labour-market structures differ substantially.

14. CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence creates significant opportunities to improve workforce intelligence, but technological capability should not be confused with decision-making legitimacy. Employment decisions affect careers, livelihoods and opportunity and therefore require a high standard of evidence, governance and accountability.

The RAI-WCIF proposed in this paper connects five dimensions: competency evidence, workforce intelligence, AI-assisted analysis, digital trust and human governance. Its central principle is that AI should strengthen the evidence available to human decision-makers without removing human accountability for consequential workforce outcomes.

The next generation of workforce AI should therefore ask not simply whether a decision can be automated, but how technology can help people make that decision more accurately, transparently, fairly and responsibly. The answer will depend as much on governance, evidence quality and organisational design as on the sophistication of the algorithm.

Table 1. RAI-WCIF Governance Matrix

Dimension	Primary Function	Principal Risk	Required Control
Competency Evidence	Capture demonstrable capability	Invalid, stale or biased evidence	Provenance, validation, recency and correction
Workforce Intelligence	Map capability to roles and needs	Over-simplification and inappropriate inference	Contextual role models and uncertainty
AI-Assisted Analysis	Identify patterns and recommendations	Bias, error, opacity and automation bias	Testing, explanation, confidence and monitoring
Digital Trust	Establish integrity and traceability	Fraud, tampering or unauthorised access	Verification, audit logs and access control
Human Governance	Authorise and review consequential use	Rubber-stamping or accountability gaps	Trained reviewers, override rights and audit

Figure 1. Responsible AI Workforce Competency Intelligence Framework

COMPETENCY EVIDENCE
↓
SKILLS & ROLE INTELLIGENCE
↓
AI-ASSISTED ANALYSIS
↓
RESPONSIBLE AI CONTROLS
↓
HUMAN REVIEW & ACCOUNTABILITY
↓
WORKFORCE DECISION
↓
CONTINUOUS FEEDBACK

Digital Trust + Governance operate across every layer.

REFERENCES

1) European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Official Journal of the European Union.
2) International Organization for Standardization & International Electrotechnical Commission. (2023). ISO/IEC 42001:2023 Information technology — Artificial intelligence — Management system. ISO.
3) National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0) (NIST AI 100-1). U.S. Department of Commerce. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

4) National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile (NIST AI 600-1). U.S. Department of Commerce. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.600-1
5) Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). OECD AI Principles. OECD.AI.
6) Romeo, G., & Conti, D. (2026). Exploring automation bias in human–AI collaboration: A review and implications for explainable AI. AI & Society, 41, 259–278. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02422-7
7) Vaccaro, M., Almaatouq, A., & Malone, T. (2024). When combinations of humans and AI are useful: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Nature Human Behaviour, 8, 2293–2303. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-02024-1
8) World Economic Forum. (2025). The Future of Jobs Report 2025. World Economic Forum.

Declarations

Funding: No external funding is declared for this conceptual paper.
Conflict of interest: The author is affiliated with Turner Innovations Limited. The paper is conceptual and does not report validation of a proprietary commercial product.
Data availability: No primary dataset was generated or analysed for this conceptual paper.
Ethics statement: The paper does not report research involving human participants or identifiable personal data.
Author contribution: The named author is responsible for the conceptual argument, framework and manuscript submitted for publication. Any publisher-required disclosure concerning editorial or AI-assisted drafting should be completed in accordance with the target journal's policy.

