

Example: Stand-EUVI ILOs for AI Engineering – Human Oversight (Master course; standardisation element targeted at EQF 7)

Illustrative example using the CWA competence framework, the Stand-EUVI ILOs Quick Guide, and the Stand-EUVI 5-step form

Example focus: master-level AI engineering course on human oversight. Learners first examine whether existing legal and standardisation materials sufficiently operationalise the requirement of meaningful human oversight for high-risk AI systems. Where justified gaps remain, they refine or draft a standard element in line with European values and European interests. This example also illustrates that the overall level of a course and the target level of a specific standardisation-related Stand-EUVI component need not always be identical; in the present example, both are set at EQF level 7.

Step 1

WHAT TO DEFINE

Course context, course or programme level, target level for the standardisation element, and Stand-EUVI focus

GUIDING QUESTIONS

Who are the learners? What is the overall course or programme level? Which EQF level is targeted for the specific standardisation-related Stand-EUVI ILOs? Which European values and European interests are central, secondary or in tension for this standardisation topic?

FILL IN

Course/module: AI Engineering: Human Oversight, Standards and Stand-EUVI.

Overall course/programme level: Master course; overall programme level corresponding to EQF level 7.

Learners: Master students in AI or software engineering.

Target EQF level for the standardisation element / Stand-EUVI ILOs: EQF level 7 in this example.

Stand-EUVI focus: critical assessment and design of human-oversight requirements for high-risk AI systems.

Central European values: human dignity and fundamental rights; equality and non-discrimination; democracy and the rule of law.

Relevant European interests: trustworthy AI, innovation, competitiveness, legal certainty, safety and protection of affected persons.

Main value / interest tensions: automation efficiency versus meaningful human control; innovation versus risk prevention; transparency and logging versus privacy, security and intellectual property; human judgement versus automation bias.

Step 2

WHAT TO DEFINE

Standardisation starting point

GUIDING QUESTIONS

Is there an existing standard, draft standard, harmonised standard or standardisation case? Should learners question, apply, compare, refine or draft a standard or standard element?

FILL IN

Standardisation topic: Human oversight for high-risk AI systems in AI engineering.

Existing standard(s) / case(s): Article 14 AI Act as legal anchor; relevant European AI standardisation work and selected management-system or risk-management materials where accessible.

Task for learners: compare legal requirements with existing or draft standardisation approaches and refine or draft a standard clause or checklist for one concrete AI use case.

Justified gap, if relevant: existing materials do not yet fully operationalise human oversight in engineering terms such as role, competence, authority, interface information, intervention, override, escalation, logging and review.

Step 3

WHAT TO DEFINE

Relevant European values and European interests

GUIDING QUESTIONS

Which values are affected? Which interests are relevant? Which are central, secondary or less relevant? Are there tensions between them?

FILL IN

Central European values: human dignity and human rights; equality and non-discrimination; democracy and the rule of law.

Relevant European interests: trustworthy AI, safety, legal certainty, innovation capacity, European standardisation capability and market uptake.

Secondary or less relevant interests: interoperability, auditability, competitiveness and administrative feasibility.

Tensions to address: too little oversight creates safety and rights risks; excessive or unclear oversight can become symbolic, slow innovation or shift responsibility to operators without real authority.

Step 4

WHAT TO DEFINE

Teaching methods, materials and learner tasks

GUIDING QUESTIONS

Which inputs, standards, cases, exercises, simulations or drafting tasks support the ILOs? How will learners engage actively with standardisation and Stand-EUVI?

FILL IN

Inputs / readings: legal basis on human oversight; short input on harmonised standards and presumption of conformity; selected background on responsible AI and human-AI interaction.

Standards / cases: high-risk AI use case such as recruitment, credit scoring, medical triage or public-sector decision support; accessible standardisation or draft-standard materials where available.

Methods: standards search; requirement mapping; gap analysis; group drafting sprint; peer review against Stand-EUVI criteria.

ITCoS / materials: oversight checklist; Stand-EUVI matrix; drafting template; case documentation pack.

Group or individual tasks: group draft of a human-oversight standard element plus individual reflection on value and interest tensions and responsibility allocation.

Step 5

WHAT TO DEFINE

Evidence of learning and assessment

GUIDING QUESTIONS

What must learners produce: a critique, comparison, refinement proposal or draft standard element? How will knowledge, skills and attitudes / responsibility and autonomy be assessed?

FILL IN

Learner output: Stand-EUVI oversight package consisting of a standards gap analysis, a draft standard clause or checklist, and a short justification.

Assessment format: group submission plus individual reflection; optional short presentation or defence.

Minimum achievement: identifies the legal and standardisation starting point, explains the main gap, maps oversight requirements coherently, and proposes a justified basic checklist.

Stronger achievement: turns oversight requirements into measurable engineering and governance criteria; addresses competence, authority, human-machine interface, logging, override and escalation; and explicitly resolves Stand-EUVI tensions.

Feedback / assessment criteria: accuracy of standardisation analysis; depth expected at EQF 7; feasibility of the draft clause; quality of Stand-EUVI justification; clarity of evidence and responsibility allocation.

Compact Stand-EUVI K-S-A box

K-S-A	Fillable ILO
Knowledge (K)	Learners explain the human-oversight requirement, the role of standardisation, the relevant current standardisation landscape, and why human oversight must be designed rather than merely declared.
Skills (S)	Learners analyse an AI engineering use case, compare legal requirements with existing or draft standardisation approaches, identify gaps, and refine or draft a human-oversight standard element.
Attitudes / responsibility and autonomy (A)	Learners justify oversight choices in light of Stand-EUVI, reflect on tensions between rights, safety, innovation and feasibility, and take responsibility for avoiding symbolic or ineffective oversight

Final check

Check question	Yes / No / Notes
Is the standardisation starting point clear: existing standard, gap, refinement or new draft?	Yes - existing legal and standardisation materials are checked first; justified gaps lead to refinement or drafting.
Are the ILOs appropriate for the selected target EQF level for the standardisation element?	Yes - in this example, the standardisation element itself is set at EQF 7, with a focus on critical assessment, design and justification.
Are European values and European interests explicitly included?	Yes - European values and European interests are explicit in the form and in the K-S-A box.
Are possible tensions between values and interests addressed?	Yes - the example addresses automation versus oversight, innovation versus risk prevention, and transparency versus privacy or security.
Are teaching methods aligned with the ILOs?	Yes - standards search, mapping, gap analysis and drafting are aligned with the ILOs.
Is there clear learner evidence for knowledge, skills and attitudes / responsibility and autonomy?	Yes - learner evidence includes a gap analysis, a draft standard element and an individual reflection

EQF orientation

EQF level	Focus	Competence orientation
0-2	Awareness	Recognise basic concepts and begin reflecting on standards, European values and European interests.
3-4	Orientation	Identify standardisation elements and recognise their relation to European values and European interests.
5	Application	Apply standardisation knowledge in known contexts and contribute to structured discussion.
6	Integrazione	Integrate standards into practice and address value- and interest-related issues in context.
7	Evaluation	Critically analyse, assess and design standardisation approaches in line with Stand-EUVI.
8	Strategia	Lead and influence standardisation processes in line with Stand-EUVI in complex settings.

Source note

This example remains illustrative. It is intended to show how a teacher or trainer may operationalise the competence framework, the Stand-EUVI focus, and the five-step form in one concrete field. The exact legal and standardisation materials used in a real course should be updated and verified for the relevant teaching context.



EDU4
Standards.eu

Follow us



linkedin.com/company/edu4standards



bsky.app/profile/edu4standards.bsky.social



youtube.com/@edu4standards



Funded by
the European Union

Official Guide 2.1

Example: Stand-EUVI ILOs for AI Engineering – Human Oversight (Master course; standardisation element targeted at EQF 7)

Authors

Elisabeth Staudegger, University of Graz
(elisabeth.staudegger@uni-graz.at)

