



FIELD GUIDE RESOURCE / EDITABLE WORKSHEET

AI-Assisted Engineering Experiment Canvas

Use this canvas to run one bounded AI-assisted engineering experiment without creating a shadow delivery system. Start with a real workflow, retain human accountability, use the least access and automation needed, and decide from evidence whether to keep, adapt, expand, or stop. This is a client-neutral working template: existing security, privacy, legal, procurement, and employment policies remain authoritative, and consequential uses require appropriate review.

01 FRAME THE EXPERIMENT

PROMPT**RECORD**

Workflow or job to improve

Team and accountable owner

Starting condition or friction

Intended benefit

Quality / speed / insight / risk reduction

Non-AI alternative considered

Time boundary and review date

Decision at the end

Keep / adapt / expand / hold / stop

02 SET THE BOUNDARY BEFORE ENABLING ACCESS

PROMPT**RECORD**

Tool, provider, model, or integration

Data allowed

Data prohibited

Environment or repository boundary

Permission level

Read / draft / recommend / act with approval

Who may approve an action or release?

Escalation path for unexpected access or harmful output



03 KEEP NORMAL ENGINEERING OWNERSHIP

AREA	NORMAL PRACTICE THAT STILL APPLIES	OWNER
Design and technical approach		
Code review		
Tests and acceptance		
Deployment or release		
Production monitoring and incident response		

AI output is input to accountable human work. It is not evidence of correctness merely because it is syntactically valid, confident, or fast to produce.

04 DEFINE THE EVIDENCE AND STOP CONDITIONS

EVIDENCE AREA	WHAT WILL YOU OBSERVE?	WHAT WOULD TRIGGER A PAUSE OR REDESIGN?
Value or workflow improvement		
Quality and rework		
Review burden		
Safety, access, or policy boundary		
Team capability and adoption		
Operational implication		

Do not use raw prompts, token volume, or individual tool use as a proxy for value, quality, or individual performance.

05 REVIEW AND DECIDE

1. What did the team actually use the tool for, and what did it replace or reduce?
2. Where did a human correct, reject, or rework the output?
3. Did review, test, delivery, or production evidence reveal a new failure mode?
4. Which boundary, control, or capability support should change?
5. Should this use case keep, adapt, expand, hold, or stop?

DECISION	EVIDENCE AND TRADE-OFF	ACCOUNTABLE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW DATE
----------	------------------------	-------------------	------------------