

■ ELEVED.AI / FLAGSHIP FRAMEWORK

Atlas.

The AI operating map for higher education

DECIDE · PROTECT · EDUCATE · SERVE · RUN · EQUIP

[Institution Name] — [Date]

THE MAP, NOT THE GPS

One map. Six groups. Twenty-four domains.

The Map

- About this framework
- How the map is organized
- The three instruments
- Where to start: the first three moves
- How to use this document

Group 1 • Decide

FOUNDATION

- 1.1 Governance & Organizational Structure
- 1.2 Policy & Acceptable Use
- 1.3 Board Governance
- 1.4 Monitoring & Evaluation

Group 2 • Protect

DEFENSE

- 2.1 Data Governance for AI
- 2.2 Security & Risk
- 2.3 Compliance & Legal
- 2.4 Vendor & Procurement

Group 3 • Educate

MISSION

- 3.1 Teaching & Learning
- 3.2 Assessment & Academic Integrity
- 3.3 AI Literacy, Curriculum & Credentials
- 3.4 Research & Scholarship

Group 4 • Serve

OFFENSE

- 4.1 Attract — Enrollment Marketing & Recruitment
- 4.2 Enroll — Admission, Aid & Onboarding
- 4.3 Succeed — Retention, Support & Wellbeing
- 4.4 Launch & Return — Career, Alumni & Lifelong Learning

Group 5 • Run

CAPACITY

- 5.1 Administrative Operations & Efficiency
- 5.2 Infrastructure, Data & Technology
- 5.3 Financial Planning & Institutional Sustainability
- 5.4 Advancement & Fundraising
- 5.5 Community, Partnerships & External Relations

Group 6 • Equip

CULTURE

- 6.1 AI Fluency & Professional Development
- 6.2 Change, Culture & Communications
- 6.3 Workforce, Roles & Labor Relations

The Three Lenses

- A Equity & Ethics
- B Agentic AI
- C Horizon

Appendices

- A Default sequencing at a glance
- B Domain ownership & maturity scorecard
- C Standards alignment

About This Framework

Atlas was developed by [elevated.ai](#), an AI strategy and solutions practice specializing in higher education. It is institution-agnostic — adaptable to any college or university regardless of size, mission, or Carnegie classification. Its center of gravity is the teaching and access mission; research-intensive universities can use the map as written but should extend Domain 3.4, whose research-intensive section flags the additional territory (including the infrastructure extension into Domain 5.2).

Most AI frameworks in higher education are **maturity models**: they tell you how far along you are. This is something different. It is an **operating map**: it tells you whether you are looking at the whole territory in the first place.

You cannot assess maturity in domains you didn't know existed. Institutions rarely fail at AI because they moved too slowly in the areas they were watching. They fail because of the areas nobody was watching — the embedded AI feature no one evaluated, the department that wrote its own policy, the vendor contract no one read for data rights, the assessment model that quietly stopped measuring learning.

This map exists so that nothing falls through the cracks.

To use this framework: Replace all bracketed placeholders (e.g., [Institution Name]) with your institution's specific information. Customize ownership assignments, risk tiers, timelines, and priorities to fit your context.

This is not a strategy or a policy. It is the instrument that ensures your strategy and policies are complete.

How This Map Is Organized

The map has two layers.

The Map is the executive view: six groups, each answering one question a president actually asks, plus three lenses that cut across all of them. Anyone in leadership should be able to hold the six verbs in their head and repeat them in a board meeting.

The Territory is the working view: 24 domains beneath the six groups, each presenting the key questions your institution needs a position on — grouped in themed clusters — and the observable signals that tell you the domain is under control.

■ THE SIX GROUPS

VERB	THE QUESTION IT ANSWERS	POSTURE
1. DECIDE	How do we govern this?	Foundation
2. PROTECT	How do we avoid getting hurt?	Defense
3. EDUCATE	How does the academic core change?	Mission
4. SERVE	How do we win, keep, and launch students?	Offense
5. RUN	How do we operate and sustain the enterprise?	Capacity
6. EQUIP	How do we bring our people with us?	Culture

The order is deliberate. It encodes a soft sequencing logic without imposing a rigid staircase: an institution that tries to **Serve** with AI before it can **Decide** and **Protect** is taking risks it cannot see. An institution that invests in **Run** without **Equip** will buy tools nobody adopts. But the groups are not phases — mature institutions work all six simultaneously.

Note also what the postures make visible: **Protect** is defensive spending (avoiding harm, liability, and reputational damage), while **Serve** is offensive spending (enrollment, retention, revenue). Boards and CFOs sort investments this way instinctively; the map lets you present AI work in the language they already use.

■ THE THREE LENSES

Three considerations are deliberately **not** domains, because confining them to a single chapter is how institutions get them wrong. They are lenses applied to every group:

LENS	WHY IT CUTS ACROSS EVERYTHING
Lens A: Equity & Ethics	Every domain contains an equity question. Quarantining ethics in one committee's chapter is how biased systems ship.
Lens B: Agentic AI	Autonomous AI is a technology wave, not a department. It changes the risk profile of assessment, operations, security, and governance simultaneously.
Lens C: Horizon	The landscape shifts faster than annual planning cycles. Horizon scanning is a standing <i>practice</i> owned by governance, not a static list of predictions.

Each lens has its own chapter at the end of the Territory, and each group includes lens callouts where the intersection is sharpest.

The Three Instruments

Beyond the map itself, this framework gives you three instruments that turn a completeness map into a working management tool.

■ INSTRUMENT 1: THE MATURITY SCALE

Every domain in the Territory can be scored on the same four-level scale:

LEVEL	NAME	WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE
1	Unaware	The institution has not recognized this domain as an area requiring decisions. Activity, if any, is invisible to leadership.
2	Reactive	The institution responds to incidents, questions, or external pressure as they arise. No standing owner, policy, or process.
3	Governed	The domain has a named owner, a written position, a working process, and a review cadence. Decisions are intentional.
4	Strategic	The domain is not just controlled but leveraged — it feeds institutional strategy, differentiation, and measurable outcomes.

The goal is **not** Level 4 everywhere. For some domains (e.g., vendor management), Level 3 is the appropriate ceiling; spending to reach Level 4 would be waste. Part of strategy is deciding your *target* maturity per domain. The unacceptable level anywhere is Level 1.

Scoring rule: Level 3 requires substantially all of a domain's "What Governed Looks Like" signals, with evidence a third party could check. Some signals but no named owner is Level 2; a named owner still working toward the signals is a strong 2, not a 3. In the offense-oriented groups (Serve, and much of Run), Governed measures the quality of the *decision*, not the presence of deployment — where a signal presumes deployment, read it as "deployed, or a documented and reviewed decision not to." One more floor rule: an intentional, documented deferral is never Level 1. Recognition plus a decision is at least Level 2; Level 1 is reserved for domains the institution has not seen.

■ INSTRUMENT 2: RISK TIERS

Risk-based classification is the most durable foundation available. The EU AI Act classifies AI used in student assessment, admissions screening, and test monitoring as high-risk; the U.S. picture is fragmented and contested — some states advancing risk-based statutes, others taking different approaches, with federal preemption efforts in play. Tiered governance is the posture that holds up under any of those outcomes: build it now and you will not have to rebuild it whichever regime arrives.

TIER	NAME	DEFINITION	OVERSIGHT EXPECTATION
T0	Prohibited	Uses the institution rules out entirely — starter list: emotion inference on students or employees, fully automated adverse decisions with no human in the loop, covert monitoring, and anything the institution's values or applicable law forbids.	Not approved for any use. The list is published, reviewed annually, and changes only by governance action.
T1	Consequential	AI that influences decisions about individual people: admissions, financial aid, grading, academic standing, hiring, discipline, monitoring, or the targeting of interventions and outreach at individuals.	Human accountability for every decision. Bias testing before deployment and on a schedule. Explainability. Contestability. Central approval required.
T2	Operational	AI that touches institutional data or official processes but does not influence decisions about individuals: reporting, content drafting, scheduling, knowledge management, communications.	Approved tools only. Data classification rules apply. Human review before official use. Local approval within central guardrails.
T3	Exploratory	AI used with public or synthetic data, in sandboxes, or for personal productivity where nothing above Public-tier data enters the tool.	Light-touch. Awareness of acceptable-use policy. Encourage experimentation.

Three rules make the tiers workable:

- **Classification attaches to the use case, not the tool.** The same assistant can be T3 for brainstorming and T1 for aid packaging; the system inventory (Domain 1.4) records the highest tier of any approved use.
- **Ambiguity resolves up.** A use that *influences* but does not *decide* takes the higher tier until the governance body rules otherwise — the seam between T1 and T2 is exactly where units will argue themselves out of oversight.

- **Every domain is tagged with the tier(s) of the AI uses it governs** (for oversight domains like 1.3, the tiers of the activity they oversee). Tier tags tell you which oversight question to ask without a meeting.

■ INSTRUMENT 3: SEQUENCING — NOW / NEXT / LATER

"Not everything requires an immediate answer" is true but unhelpful without a starting point. Each domain carries a default sequence tag, which your institution should adjust to its context:

- **NOW** — The clock is running. The three entry moves (see "Where to Start") belong in the first 90 days; the remaining NOW domains define the first year's core agenda. These are domains where inaction is itself a high-risk decision.
- **NEXT** — Address within the first year. Important, but they depend on NOW-domain foundations.
- **LATER** — Address as capacity matures. Deferring these is a legitimate choice *if made intentionally*.
- **ALWAYS** — The three lenses. They apply from day one and never complete.

A one-page view of the default sequencing appears in Appendix A.

Where to Start: The First Three Moves

Twelve domains carry a NOW tag, and no institution can stand up twelve workstreams in ninety days. NOW means *the clock is running*, not *do everything at once*. The entry point is three moves, in order:

- 1 **Name the owner.** Designate the executive owner of AI strategy and charter the governance body with real authority (Domain 1.1). Brief the board that this is happening (Domain 1.3) — a board that learns about AI governance a year in reads it as being managed around.
- 2 **Inventory what is already running.** Embedded features, shadow tools, personal accounts, vendor AI switched on by default (Domains 1.4 and 2.1 — the inventory itself starts now; 1.4's full assurance practice is sequenced NEXT). You cannot govern what you have not seen, and every institution that looks finds more than it expected.
- 3 **Set the floor.** Publish an interim acceptable-use position and one bright-line data rule people can remember (Domains 1.2 and 2.1). Interim and imperfect beats polished and absent — the ungoverned use is happening today.

Everything else in the NOW tier grows from these three moves. The remaining NOW domains define the first year's core agenda, not the first quarter's. For a working group: session one is the Appendix B scoring exercise; the three moves are what the institution does while the scoring is underway.

■ RESOURCING THE MAP

Operating this map is not free: named owners, a living inventory, scheduled bias validation, tiered training. At a large institution that is realistically two to four FTE of coordination capacity plus tooling; at a small one it is a fraction of several people's jobs, honestly assigned. A resource-constrained institution should run the three moves above, cover Domain 2.3's NOW items (FERPA, GLBA, accessibility), and put a named owner on Domain 3.2 — then sequence everything else deliberately. That is a legitimate, defensible posture. Pretending to run all 24 domains with no capacity is not.

How to Use This Document

Use the map to:

- **Audit** what your institution has addressed and what remains open — score every domain on the maturity scale and let the gaps set the agenda
- **Assign** a named owner to every domain (Appendix B) — the single highest-leverage act in this entire framework
- **Prioritize** using the risk tiers and sequence tags, adjusted to your context
- **Brief** leadership, committees, and working groups using the six-verb Map layer
- **Defend** decisions to boards, accreditors, and regulators — the governance this map produces is the evidence base, and Appendix C crosswalks the instruments to the standards auditors cite (NIST AI RMF, ISO/IEC 42001)
- **Revisit** on a cadence — the Horizon lens defines the practice

Each domain presents its key questions in themed clusters. These are the questions your institution needs a position on. Not all require immediate answers — but all require an intentional decision about when and how they will be addressed. Each domain closes with **"What Governed Looks Like"** — the observable signals that the domain has reached Level 3.

One warning before you begin, because it is the most consistently reported failure mode in the sector: **fragmentation is the enemy**. Across higher education, the default outcome — the thing that happens when no one decides otherwise — is that every department, college, and unit develops its own AI posture independently. The result is inconsistent student experiences, ungoverned data exposure, duplicated spending, and an institution that cannot answer basic questions about its own AI use. Nearly every domain in this Territory is, at bottom, a defense against fragmentation. If you take only one thing from this framework, take this: someone must own the whole map.

■ ATLAS / PART TWO

The Territory.

The working view: 24 domains beneath the six groups — the key questions your institution needs a position on, and the observable signals that each domain is under control.

Decide.

How do we govern this?

Everything else in this map depends on this group. AI governance is not bureaucracy — it is the mechanism by which an institution makes AI decisions *on purpose* instead of by accident. The four domains here establish who decides, what the rules are, how the board engages, and — the piece most institutions skip — how you know whether any of it is working.

1.1 Governance & Organizational Structure

1.2 Policy & Acceptable Use

1.3 Board Governance

1.4 Monitoring & Evaluation

1.1

Governance & Organizational Structure

Who decides what, and how fast?

■ GOVERNANCE BODIES & AUTHORITY

- Who is the institutional owner of AI strategy? (CIO, Provost, CDO, CDAIO, shared — designate based on your structure)
- What governance body oversees AI decisions? Does one exist, or does it need to be created?
- What is the governance body's authority? Advisory only, or binding decision-making power?
- Who sits on it? IT, academic affairs, student affairs, enrollment, finance, legal, HR, the library, the registrar, disability services, faculty — and students? (Student representation is shifting from nice-to-have to expected; student-facing AI rights frameworks and state legislation increasingly assume it)
- How often does it meet — and is that frequent enough given the pace of AI change?
- Is there a tactical layer beneath the strategic layer? (Who handles day-to-day tool evaluation vs. big-picture direction?)
- Who handles AI issues that cut across divisions? (An AI tool used by both enrollment and academics)
- What is the escalation path when someone has an AI concern or question?

■ SHARED GOVERNANCE & ACADEMIC AUTHORITY

- Which AI decisions are administrative, which belong to the faculty senate and curriculum committee, and which are subjects of collective bargaining — mapped *before* the first policy ships, not litigated after?
- For the academic domains in Group 3, is the faculty governance body the authority of record — with the AI governance body coordinating rather than deciding?
- Where bargaining units exist, which items on this map trigger notification and bargaining obligations? (AI in evaluation, hiring, monitoring, and job design typically do — see Domain 6.3)

■ ANTI-FRAGMENTATION

- Does the institution have a mechanism to detect when units are developing independent AI policies, tools, or vendor relationships?
- Is there a stated principle about the institutional floor (what every unit must do) versus local latitude (what units may decide for themselves)?
- When a college or department wants to move faster than the institution, what is the sanctioned path — and is it fast enough that people actually use it?

■ ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

- Does your institution need a dedicated AI leadership role? (Chief AI Officer, Chief Data & AI Officer, Director of AI?)
- Who is accountable if an AI system causes harm, produces biased outcomes, or breaches data?
- Should there be departmental AI point-people? (AI Champions, AI Liaisons?)
- Who owns the relationship with AI vendors?
- Who is responsible for monitoring the external AI landscape? (This is the Horizon lens — it needs an owner, not just interest)

■ DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

- How does a new AI tool or use case get evaluated and approved?
- Is the process tiered by risk? (T3 uses need only acceptable-use awareness; T2 uses approved locally in days; T1 uses approved centrally with full review)
- How fast can a decision be made? If approval takes six months, people will work around the process — and shadow AI is a governance failure, not a user failure
- How are AI-related budget decisions made?
- Who can say "no" to an AI deployment, and on what grounds?
- How are cross-institutional AI disputes resolved?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ A named executive owner of AI strategy, and a governance body with defined authority that has met more than twice
- ✓ A published, tiered approval process with turnaround-time targets
- ✓ The institutional floor is published and every unit has acknowledged it; no unit is writing its own independent AI policy
- ✓ The administrative/senate/bargaining boundary map exists and has survived contact with at least one real decision
- ✓ Students and faculty have seats at the governance table

EQUITY & ETHICS LENS

Governance composition is an equity decision. If the people affected by AI systems (students, front-line staff, adjuncts) are not represented in the bodies approving them, bias enters through the org chart before it enters through the model.

AGENTIC AI LENS

Decide now whether autonomous AI systems require a separate approval track. The default answer should be yes: agentic deployments are T1 by default until proven otherwise.

1.2

Policy & Acceptable Use

What are the rules, and do people actually know them?

The sector's defining gap is not the absence of policy — it is the gap between adoption and awareness. Sector surveys consistently find that most faculty and staff now use AI at work while only about half can point to the institutional policy that governs it. A policy nobody knows is a liability document, not a governance instrument.

■ INSTITUTIONAL AI POLICY

- Does your institution have a unified AI policy covering all institutional contexts — not just the classroom?
- Does it cover faculty use, staff use, student use, vendor use, research use?
- Is it written in plain language that non-technical people can follow?
- How is it communicated — one-time announcement, or ongoing reinforcement woven into onboarding, training, and tooling?
- How often is it reviewed? (Annual is the ceiling, not the floor, at the current pace of change)
- What happens when someone violates it? Are consequences clear, proportional, and actually applied?

■ CLASSROOM & COURSE-LEVEL POLICY

- Does your institution have an institutional AI philosophy for teaching and learning, and has it been updated for agentic AI?
- Are faculty required to state AI expectations in their syllabi?
- Do faculty have autonomy over AI rules in their courses, or is there an institutional floor/ceiling?
- Is there a standardized scale for specifying AI use levels per assignment? (This lives — and is scored — in Domain 3.2; verify policy alignment here)
- How does policy differ across modalities? (In-person vs. online vs. hybrid — critical for institutions with significant online enrollment)

■ STAFF & ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY

- Which AI tools can staff use for their work?
- What institutional data can and cannot be used with which tools? (Cross-reference Domain 2.1, Data Governance)
- Must AI-generated outputs be reviewed by a human before official use?
- Can staff use personal AI accounts for work tasks? (If the institution provides no governed alternative, the honest answer is "they already are")
- Are there bright-line prohibited uses — the published T0 list? (AI drafting disciplinary letters, making hiring decisions, determining aid)

■ STUDENT POLICY

- What are students allowed and not allowed to do with AI in their coursework?
- How does AI policy connect to the academic integrity policy?
- Are students required to disclose AI use? In what format?
- Does your institution provide students with access to AI tools, or are they on their own? (This is also an equity question — see the lens)
- Do students have a voice in shaping the policies that govern them?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ One unified policy, findable in under a minute, written for humans
- ✓ Awareness is measured, not assumed — the institution knows what percentage of employees and students can locate and paraphrase the policy
- ✓ Every syllabus states an AI position; every new employee encounters the policy in onboarding
- ✓ The policy has a version number and a next-review date

EQUITY & ETHICS LENS

Policies that only prohibit — without providing governed alternatives — punish the students and staff least able to afford premium tools, while the well-resourced work around the rules invisibly.

1.3

Board Governance

Does the board understand AI well enough to oversee it?

■ BOARD AI LITERACY

- Does your Board of Trustees understand AI's impact on higher education — both the risk side and the existential-competition side?
- Has there been a structured board education session on AI? Is one scheduled annually?
- Can the board provide meaningful strategic oversight of AI investments, or does it defer entirely to administration?

■ BOARD REPORTING

- What AI metrics and updates does the board receive, and on what cadence?
- Do board materials distinguish defensive AI investment (Protect) from offensive AI investment (Serve)?
- Does the board see the institution's AI risk register, or only its success stories?

■ BOARD POLICY

- Which AI-related policies require board approval, and which are delegated to administration?
- Does the board have a stated position on AI ethics, equity, and risk tolerance?
- Has the board considered AI in its fiduciary context — competitive positioning, enrollment sustainability, and mission alignment?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ The board has completed at least one structured AI education session and receives AI updates on a defined cadence
- ✓ Board-level risk appetite for AI is documented and guides administrative decisions
- ✓ Board minutes show AI as a discussed agenda item, with at least one recorded decision, directive, or risk-appetite statement in the past year

1.4

Monitoring & Evaluation

How do we know our AI is working — and still safe — over time?

Most frameworks treat evaluation as a footnote inside other topics. It deserves its own domain, because AI systems are not static: models drift, vendors change terms, accuracy degrades, and a system that was fair at deployment can become biased in production. Approval is a moment; assurance is a practice.

■ THE AI SYSTEM INVENTORY

- Does your institution maintain a living registry of all AI tools and systems in use — including AI features embedded silently in existing platforms (LMS, CRM, SIS, productivity suites)?
- Is each system classified by risk tier, with a named owner and a review date?
- Is the registry accessible to governance bodies, and is it actually current?

■ ONGOING ASSURANCE

- Is risk assessment a one-time gate or an ongoing process?
- How are deployed systems monitored for bias drift, accuracy degradation, and unintended consequences?
- Who reviews vendor model updates and terms-of-service changes for already-approved tools? (The contractual right to notice lives in Domain 2.4; the review practice lives here)
- Is there a pause-and-fix protocol when a system misbehaves — and has it ever been invoked? (A protocol never invoked is a protocol never tested)

■ MEASURING VALUE

- How does your institution measure the return on AI investments? (Retention lift, enrollment yield, operational savings, time savings, satisfaction?)
- Are pilots evaluated against pre-stated success criteria before scaling?
- Is there a standard business case template for AI initiatives?
- What is the sunset process for AI investments that don't deliver? (Institutions are better at starting pilots than ending them)

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ A complete, current AI inventory with owners, tiers, and review dates
- ✓ Post-deployment monitoring exists for every T1 system, with documented review results
- ✓ At least one AI initiative has been sunset based on evaluation — proof the evaluation function has teeth
- ✓ ROI reporting reaches the board (Domain 1.3) in a consistent format

AGENTIC AI LENS

Autonomous systems require continuous logging and audit trails, not periodic review. If an agent acts hourly, quarterly review is not oversight — it's archaeology.

Protect.

How do we avoid getting hurt?

This is the defensive posture: data, security, law, and vendors. Nothing in this group generates revenue, and everything in it prevents the incident that ends careers, triggers lawsuits, and dominates a news cycle. The domains here are also where regulation will arrive first — institutions that build risk-tiered protection now are pre-complying with rules that don't yet have names.

2.1 Data Governance for AI

2.2 Security & Risk

2.3 Compliance & Legal

2.4 Vendor & Procurement

2.1

Data Governance for AI

What data can be used with AI, and under what conditions?

■ DATA CLASSIFICATION

- Has your institution classified its data into tiers based on sensitivity? (Public, Internal, Sensitive, Restricted)
- Is it clear which tier applies to common data types — student records, grades, advising notes, enrollment data, financial aid data, employee data, donor data?
- Do employees know how to classify data *before* using it with an AI tool — is the classification usable in the moment, not just documented in a policy?
- Who is the authority when classification is ambiguous?

■ DATA USE RULES

- What data can be entered into which AI tools? Is there a simple, memorable bright-line rule for consumer-grade tools? (e.g., "nothing above Public in free AI tools")
- What about AI features embedded in existing platforms — your LMS, CRM, and SIS all now include AI processing. Do employees know these exist and what data they touch?
- Can AI tools be used to analyze student data? Employee data? Donor data? Under what conditions and approvals?

■ AI-GENERATED DATA

- Are AI-generated outputs (recommendations, predictions, summaries) treated as institutional records?
- Are they subject to FERPA when they relate to students?
- What are the retention requirements for AI-generated content?
- Is data lineage traceable — can you identify what data fed an AI decision, and when?

■ SHADOW AI & DATA LEAKAGE

- Has your institution audited what AI tools are *actually* in use — including personal accounts, browser extensions, and embedded features?
- How does your institution detect unauthorized data exposure through AI tools?
- Is the strategy punitive (catch and discipline) or constructive (provide governed alternatives that are genuinely better)? In practice, only the second one works.

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ A data classification scheme that a staff member can apply correctly in under ten seconds
- ✓ Every approved AI tool is mapped to the data tiers it may touch
- ✓ Shadow AI is measured periodically, and the trend line is down because governed alternatives exist
- ✓ AI-generated records have a stated retention and FERPA position

EQUITY & ETHICS LENS

Data about vulnerable students (financial hardship, disability accommodations, mental health interactions) carries the highest classification — and predictive systems are hungriest for exactly this data. The tension is permanent; govern it explicitly.

2.2

Security & Risk

What can go wrong, and how do we manage it?

■ AI-SPECIFIC SECURITY THREATS

- Has your institution assessed AI-specific cybersecurity risks — as distinct from general cybersecurity?
- Is there a position on prompt injection attacks? (Manipulating AI systems through crafted inputs — increasingly relevant as institutions deploy chatbots and agents connected to live data)
- Is there a position on data exfiltration through AI tools?
- Has your institution considered adversarial AI threats — bad actors using AI to attack institutional systems, including AI-powered phishing and social engineering at a quality level that defeats traditional training?
- Does the threat model cover the AI supply chain — compromised or poisoned models, poisoned knowledge bases feeding student-facing assistants, and insecure handling of AI outputs downstream?
- Is AI-enabled fraud on the radar — synthetic "ghost student" enrollment fraud targeting aid funds (cross-reference Domain 4.2), and denial-of-wallet abuse (deliberately running up per-query AI bills)?
- Has cyber liability insurance been reviewed for AI exclusions — and can the institution truthfully make the AI-governance representations that renewal applications now ask for?
- Are AI systems included in incident response plans, and has an AI-involved incident been tabletop-exercised?

■ RISK ASSESSMENT

- Is there a standardized process for assessing AI risks before deployment, scaled by risk tier?
- What dimensions does it cover? (Bias, privacy, security, transparency, academic integrity, workforce impact, reliability)
- Who conducts the assessment, and who reviews it?
- How do assessment requirements differ between T1, T2, and T3 uses? (One-size-fits-all assessment guarantees either bottleneck or box-checking)

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ AI-specific threats appear in the institutional risk register with owners and mitigations
- ✓ T1 deployments cannot go live without a completed risk assessment — and there is evidence the gate has actually stopped or modified at least one deployment
- ✓ Incident response plans name AI scenarios, and one has been exercised

AGENTIC AI LENS

Agents multiply the attack surface — an agent with credentials to multiple systems is a new class of insider risk. Scope-of-action limits, credential isolation, and kill switches belong in the deployment requirements, not the postmortem.

2.3

Compliance & Legal

What are our regulatory obligations — today and on the visible horizon?

■ FERPA

- Are all AI systems processing student education records FERPA-compliant?
- Do AI vendors qualify as "school officials" with legitimate educational interest? Has that determination actually been made, tool by tool — against the operative test: direct institutional control over the records, use limited to the contracted purpose, no re-disclosure? (A vendor that trains on your data or retains prompts for "service improvement" fails direct control — this is the legal engine behind Domain 2.4's no-training clause)
- Is the school-official designation reflected in the annual FERPA notification?
- Are students notified about AI use involving their educational records?
- Can AI-generated student data be shared with third parties, and under what conditions?

■ GLBA & OTHER REGULATED DATA

- Financial aid data sits under the GLBA (Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act) Safeguards Rule — is every AI system touching aid data inside the written information security program, the risk assessment owned by the Rule's designated security lead (its "Qualified Individual"), and the Rule's vendor-oversight obligations? (This is tested in the annual audit; cross-reference Domain 4.2)
- Campus health and counseling records: which AI uses fall under FERPA treatment records, HIPAA, or 42 CFR Part 2 — and has that been mapped *before* an AI scribe or triage tool enters the counseling center?
- Minors: dual enrollment, pre-college pipelines, and camps put under-18 (and occasionally under-13) users in front of institutional AI — what do COPPA, state student-privacy laws, and parental-consent requirements demand?

■ RECORDS, RETENTION & LEGAL PROCESS

- Are AI prompts, outputs, chat transcripts, and agent logs mapped to the records retention schedule? They are a new record class, and the logging this framework requires creates them at volume
- At public institutions: which AI interactions are responsive to open-records requests — and does anyone know before the request arrives?
- Can your AI vendors support litigation holds and defensible export of AI-generated records? (Most currently cannot — make it a Domain 2.4 evaluation criterion)

■ ACCESSIBILITY (ADA / SECTION 508)

- Do all student-facing AI interfaces meet WCAG 2.1 AA (the standard the DOJ's ADA Title II web rule cites as of this writing)?
- Has your institution assessed AI tools against accessibility obligations now in force — Title II deadlines have already arrived for larger public institutions; privates carry Title III and Section 504 obligations?
- Are AI-generated communications accessible — alt text, screen-reader compatibility, plain language?

■ ACCREDITATION

- Is your institution proactively engaging with your accreditor (HLC, SACSCOC, MSCHE, WSCUC, NECHE) on AI governance expectations — and with specialized accreditors (nursing, engineering, business, education), whose program-level AI expectations arrive separately?
- Does the governance this framework produces generate the evidence accreditors ask for? (Accreditors credit implemented governance, not possession of a document)
- Are self-study processes being updated to include AI governance?

■ THE REGULATORY HORIZON

- Who monitors AI legislation in your operating states? (State-level activity is accelerating: AI transparency requirements, student AI rights bills, vendor certification mandates)
- Is your institution tracking the EU AI Act's risk-classification approach — binding if you enroll EU-resident online students, instructive regardless — without betting that U.S. regulation will copy it?

- If your institution operates internationally or enrolls international online students, which foreign AI regulations already apply to you?

■ COPYRIGHT & INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

- Who owns AI-generated content created using institutional tools and data?
- Who owns AI-assisted course materials? (This intersects with faculty IP policy and collective bargaining where applicable)
- Can faculty copyright AI-assisted scholarly works, and what do publishers and funders require?
- What are the IP rights for AI tools developed in-house?
- Where does your institution stand on publishers and platforms licensing faculty-authored work to AI companies? (A live faculty grievance that arrives through the library and the senate at the same time)

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ A completed FERPA determination exists for every AI tool touching student records
- ✓ Every AI system touching aid data appears in the GLBA information security program's inventory
- ✓ AI records have a retention class, a public-records position, and a legal-hold answer
- ✓ Accessibility review is part of the standard AI approval workflow, not an afterthought
- ✓ A named person owns regulatory monitoring, and the governance body receives horizon updates on a cadence
- ✓ The institution has a written position on AI and IP that faculty can find and understand

2.4

Vendor & Procurement

How do we evaluate, select, and govern the companies whose AI we run on?

■ VENDOR EVALUATION

- Is there a standardized process for evaluating AI vendors, with criteria beyond functionality and cost? (Data governance, FERPA posture, bias testing, model transparency, financial stability, contract flexibility)
- Who participates in evaluation — IT alone, or academic, student-success, accessibility, and governance perspectives?
- Is the sector-standard assessment in use (HECVAT — the Higher Education Community Vendor Assessment Toolkit, with its AI-specific content — plus SOC 2 or equivalent attestations) rather than a homegrown questionnaire?
- Are pilot periods with defined success criteria required before full commitment?

■ VENDOR DATA AGREEMENTS

- Do all AI vendors have data processing agreements in place?
- Do agreements confirm institutional data is **not** used to train vendor models?
- Do they specify data residency, breach notification, retention, and deletion?
- Do they include data portability and exit provisions? (Vendor lock-in in a market moving this fast is a strategic risk, not just a procurement annoyance)
- Do they address liability for AI errors and bias?
- Do they disclose subprocessors — and flow the no-training clause down to the foundation-model provider underneath? (Your edtech vendor's promise is worthless if its model supplier retains your data)
- Do you have the contractual right to advance notice of model changes and new AI features, with the option to test before they activate in your tenant? (The pattern that has burned institutions repeatedly: features switching on without notice)
- Do they cover IP indemnification for AI outputs, liability caps sized against breach reality, service-level commitments, and legal-hold/export capability (Domain 2.3)?

■ VENDOR RISK & CONCENTRATION

- What happens if a vendor is acquired, shuts down, or changes its terms mid-contract?
- Is your institution over-dependent on any single AI vendor or platform ecosystem?
- Who reviews pricing changes for tools already deployed? (Model-update and terms-of-service review is Domain 1.4's practice; the contractual right to notice lives here)

■ EMBEDDED AI

- Are staff aware of AI features embedded in platforms they already use — and have those features been evaluated against this framework rather than grandfathered in?
- Are embedded AI features on by default? Should they be?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ A standard AI vendor rubric exists and every new contract has been scored against it
- ✓ No AI vendor contract lacks a data processing agreement and a no-training clause (or a documented, risk-accepted exception)
- ✓ A concentration-risk review has been done; the institution knows its single points of failure
- ✓ Embedded AI features have been inventoried (feeding Domain 1.4) and intentionally enabled or disabled

Educate.

How does the academic core change?

This is the mission group. Everything else on the map exists so that this part — teaching, learning, assessing, credentialing, and creating knowledge — can adapt without losing its integrity. The central tension of the group: AI simultaneously threatens how we've always verified learning and expands what learning can be. Institutions that only play defense here (detection, prohibition) lose twice.

Two principles bind everything in this group. **Academic freedom** governs how individual faculty teach. **Shared governance** means curriculum, assessment standards, and graduation requirements run through the faculty senate and curriculum committee — the AI governance body coordinates these decisions; it does not make them.

3.1 Teaching & Learning

3.2 Assessment & Academic Integrity

3.3 AI Literacy, Curriculum & Credentials

3.4 Research & Scholarship

3.1

Teaching & Learning

How does AI change what and how we teach?

■ AI IN PEDAGOGY

- How should faculty integrate AI into their teaching practice — and who supports them in figuring that out?
- Is AI a tool students use, a subject students study, or both? (For nearly every program, the honest answer is both)
- What are the discipline-specific considerations? AI in nursing, accounting, creative writing, and computer science are four different conversations
- How does AI change the role of the instructor — from content deliverer toward learning architect, coach, and evaluator of judgment?
- What AI-augmented methods should be explored? (Personalized practice generation, adaptive learning paths, automated formative feedback, AI tutoring with guardrails)
- How does your institution support faculty who are resistant or anxious — without treating skepticism as a defect? (Skeptics often see real problems early; see Group 6, Equip)

■ THE ACADEMIC SUPPORT ECOSYSTEM

- How do academic advising, tutoring centers, and writing centers — ground zero for AI's impact on academic support — adapt their models, and who is helping them?
- Graduate education: are TAs trained on AI policy for the courses they teach and grade? Do comprehensive exams and thesis supervision need redesign? (Cross-reference Domain 3.2)
- Do support units have a governed AI posture, or is each tutor improvising?

■ AI IN COURSE DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT

- Can AI be used to develop course materials, and under what quality-assurance conditions?
- Who reviews AI-generated course content for accuracy, currency, and bias?
- How does AI-assisted course development affect intellectual property and workload agreements?

■ MODALITY CONSIDERATIONS

- How does AI impact online courses differently from in-person? (Online assessment is dramatically more exposed — see Domain 3.2)
- What AI features does your LMS already offer, and are they governed and used intentionally?
- For accelerated or cohort-based models: how does AI intersect with structured pacing, coaching relationships, and small-class designs?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ The center for teaching and learning has a current AI philosophy and the staffing to support it
- ✓ Discipline-level AI conversations are documented in every college — minutes, briefs, or curriculum-committee records — not just the enthusiastic ones
- ✓ AI-assisted course materials have a stated review standard
- ✓ Online-modality AI exposure has been explicitly assessed

3.2

Assessment & Academic Integrity

How do we know what students actually learned?

This is the domain where the agentic wave hits the academic core hardest. AI agents have publicly demonstrated the ability to complete entire online courses autonomously — enrolling in the LMS, participating in discussions, submitting work, taking quizzes. For institutions with significant online enrollment, this is not a future scenario; it is a present capability. The strategic insight: **detection is a losing arms race; assessment design is the durable response.**

■ THE AGENTIC THREAT

- Does leadership understand that autonomous course completion is a current capability, not a projection?
- Given your online enrollment percentage, how urgent is this for you specifically?
- Which of your assessment types are most vulnerable? (Asynchronous discussions, take-home essays, online quizzes, standard research papers)
- Which are most resilient? (Oral exams, live presentations, applied projects, process portfolios, in-person and synchronous demonstrations)
- What do resilient formats cost — and who bears it? Oral exams and live demonstrations disadvantage students with anxiety and some disabilities, strain non-native speakers, and don't scale to large sections or asynchronous programs without real faculty workload investment (Domain 6.3). Redesign without resourcing is a mandate without a plan
- Does your assessment mix need to shift — and who owns that shift?

■ AI USE LEVELS

- Has your institution adopted a standard scale for specifying permitted AI use per assignment? (e.g., the AI Assessment Scale, in its current revision, spanning no-AI to full-AI collaboration)
- Are faculty trained to specify and enforce these levels? Are students clear on expectations per assignment?
- How is the gray area handled — use that is technically permitted but undermines the learning goal?

■ DETECTION & ENFORCEMENT

- Does your institution use AI detection tools — and does everyone involved understand their false-positive problem, which falls disproportionately on non-native English speakers? (This is an equity issue with legal exposure, not a technicality)
- What is the process when a faculty member suspects misuse? Is it consistent across colleges?
- Are consequences proportional, equitable, and survivable for a first offense rooted in confusion rather than intent?

■ PROCTORING & MONITORING

- If the instinctive response to the agentic threat is remote proctoring, has the institution weighed the record honestly? Facial-recognition bias, disability discrimination complaints, privacy litigation over room scans, and student trust costs are all established — this is the most likely purchase and the most contested one
- If proctoring is used: what data does it collect, who sees it, how long is it kept, and does the vendor pass Domain 2.4's rubric? (Emotion-inference features are T0 — prohibited)
- What is the path when an approved assistive-AI accommodation collides with a no-AI assignment rule — and who adjudicates? (Disability services must be in the room)

■ FACULTY USE OF AI IN GRADING & FEEDBACK

- Can faculty use AI to grade or draft feedback — under what disclosure, quality, and data conditions? (Pasting student work into a consumer tool is among the most common real incidents on any campus — cross-reference Domain 2.1)
- Grading is a T1 use: who reviews AI-assisted grading practices for accuracy and fairness, and can students contest an AI-assisted grade?

■ RETHINKING ASSESSMENT

- Should your institution move toward "human + AI" assessment models, where students demonstrate mastery by directing, critiquing, and improving AI output?
- Should process-based assessment (documenting the learning journey) supplement or replace product-based assessment?
- What role can oral examination, live defense, and presentation play — including in online programs via synchronous sessions?
- Can experiential and applied assessment (workplace projects, clinical practice, community engagement) expand? Hands-on demonstration is inherently AI-resilient — programs built on it are a model for everyone else

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ An institutional AI-use scale is adopted and appears on assignments as routinely as due dates
- ✓ The institution has an explicit, evidence-based position on detection tools — including their limits
- ✓ An assessment-redesign initiative exists with academic leadership ownership and resources
- ✓ Integrity cases involving AI follow one documented, equitable process

EQUITY & ETHICS LENS

Every integrity enforcement mechanism must be audited for differential impact. False accusations cluster on international students, non-native English speakers, and students with disabilities who use assistive tools.

AGENTIC AI LENS

This is where Lens B lands hardest on the academic core — autonomous course completion is the forcing function behind every question above. The strategic posture is set here; the technical guardrails live in Lens B.

3.3

AI Literacy, Curriculum & Credentials

What must every graduate know about AI — and what new value can we credential?

AI literacy has graduated from an elective concern to a core learning outcome — and employers increasingly treat it as a hiring signal. This domain is also where the library enters the map: at many institutions, libraries are the natural leaders of AI literacy work, with deep expertise in information evaluation and long histories teaching data and digital literacy — yet they are absent from most AI frameworks and many campus AI committees.

■ AI LITERACY AS A LEARNING OUTCOME

- Should AI literacy be a graduation requirement? What does it mean at your institution — tool fluency, critical evaluation of AI outputs, understanding of ethics and bias, understanding of how AI is transforming the student's own profession?
- Is it a standalone course, a competency embedded across the curriculum, or both? How is it assessed?
- How does it differ by program and level?
- Is AI literacy a marketable differentiator for your graduates — and are you marketing it?

■ THE LIBRARY'S ROLE

- Is the library at the table in AI literacy planning and AI governance?
- Can the library's information-literacy infrastructure (instruction programs, embedded librarians, research support) become the delivery backbone for AI literacy?
- Is the library resourced for this expanded role, or merely expected to absorb it?

■ AI-NATIVE PROGRAMS & CREDENTIALS

- Should your institution develop degree programs, concentrations, or certificates centered on AI — particularly AI applied within your signature disciplines?
- Are there micro-credential and badge opportunities, including an AI competency credential alongside existing degrees?
- Could AI professional development for working adults become both mission delivery and a revenue stream? (See Domain 5.3)

■ STUDENT-BUILT AI

- Students are building their own AI tools. Is your institution prepared — with policy, sandbox infrastructure (Domain 5.2), and celebration rather than just restriction?
- Should there be a student AI innovation incubator?
- How do you handle student-built tools that interact with institutional systems?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ An institutional definition of AI literacy exists, with named curricular homes
- ✓ The library has an explicit role and a seat in governance
- ✓ At least one AI-related credential is live or in development
- ✓ Student AI builders have a sanctioned path

3.4

Research & Scholarship

How does AI change how faculty and students create knowledge?

■ AI AS A RESEARCH TOOL

- Can faculty use AI for literature review, data analysis, writing assistance, and citation work — and what are the disclosure requirements? (Journals, conferences, and funders increasingly mandate disclosure)
- Can students use AI in thesis and dissertation research, and under what conditions?
- How is research integrity assured when AI is involved in analysis or writing?

■ AI AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT

- Is there institutional interest in studying AI itself — AI in education, AI equity, AI ethics? (For teaching-focused institutions, studying your own AI practice is publishable scholarship and reputational capital)
- Are there IRB considerations for research involving AI systems or AI-generated data — and has the IRB been trained on them?

■ AUTHORSHIP & EVALUATION

- Does your institution have a position on AI co-authorship, recognizing that disciplinary norms differ sharply?
- How does AI-assisted research factor into tenure and promotion evaluation? (Silence here chills legitimate use and rewards concealment)

■ FOR RESEARCH-INTENSIVE INSTITUTIONS

The questions above cover the teaching-institution core. Research universities must extend the domain:

- Federal sponsor rules: NSF and NIH AI-disclosure policies, NIH's prohibition on AI in peer review, and agency-by-agency variance
- Export controls and controlled research data: what happens when an AI tool touches ITAR/EAR-controlled technical data, and how does foreign-national access interact with AI tooling?
- Research security obligations (NSPM-33) and data-management plans that now must answer AI questions
- Research computing: GPU/HPC capacity and secure enclaves for restricted-data AI work (extend Domain 5.2)
- Tech transfer: AI inventorship and ownership of AI-assisted discoveries

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ A research-AI disclosure standard exists, aligned with major funders and publishers
- ✓ The IRB has an AI protocol
- ✓ Tenure and promotion guidance addresses AI-assisted work explicitly

Serve.

How do we win, keep, and launch students?

This is the offensive group — where AI creates enrollment, retention, and lifetime-relationship value. It is organized as a journey, because that is how students experience the institution: **Attract → Enroll → Succeed → Launch & Return**. Three questions run through every stage: What can AI do here today? What should we build or buy? And where is the line between service and surveillance?

4.1 Attract — Enrollment Marketing & Recruitment

4.3 Succeed — Retention, Support & Wellbeing

4.2 Enroll — Admission, Aid & Onboarding

4.4 Launch & Return — Career, Alumni & Lifelong Learning

4.1

Attract — Enrollment Marketing & Recruitment

How does AI help the right students find us?

■ RECRUITMENT & LEAD INTELLIGENCE

- Is your institution using AI in its enrollment CRM — lead scoring, predictive yield modeling, melt prediction?
- Can AI identify which prospects are most likely to enroll, which need intervention, and which messages, channels, and timing work for which segments?
- Can AI identify entirely new student populations and markets your current recruitment doesn't reach? (In a demographic-cliff environment, market discovery may matter more than conversion optimization)

■ SPEED TO RESPONSE

- How fast does your institution respond to inquiries? The first institution to respond often wins the enrollment
- Can AI provide instant, accurate responses to common questions — including after hours, when working adults actually research programs?

■ PERSONALIZED COMMUNICATIONS

- Has your institution moved from batch-and-blast to personalized multi-channel journeys?
- Can AI generate and adapt personalized messaging at scale based on prospect behavior?
- What guardrails prevent AI-generated recruitment content from becoming misleading or manipulative? (Marketing claims made by an AI are still the institution's claims — legally and ethically)

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ Inquiry response time is measured in minutes, with AI handling first response under human oversight
- ✓ Predictive enrollment models are validated for accuracy and bias
- ✓ A guardrail review exists for AI-generated recruitment content

4.2

Enroll — Admission, Aid & Onboarding

How does AI remove friction from the front door?

This is the highest-stakes stage of the journey: nearly everything here is a T1 consequential use, because it shapes decisions about individual people's access and money.

■ APPLICATION INTEGRITY

- AI-written essays, AI-coached interviews, and synthetic applicants are now part of the admission landscape — what is your posture on AI in applications, and is it published to applicants?
- Are fraud controls tuned for AI-enabled "ghost student" schemes targeting aid funds? (Cross-reference Domain 2.2)

■ TRANSFER & CREDIT MOBILITY

- Given your transfer population, can AI accelerate transfer credit evaluation toward near-instant articulation and degree audit?
- Is speed of transfer evaluation a competitive differentiator you should build and market? (For transfer-heavy institutions, this may be the single highest-ROI AI application on the entire map)

■ FINANCIAL AID

- Can AI optimize aid packaging for both yield and retention?
- What are the ethical guardrails? Optimizing aid for institutional benefit and for student benefit can conflict — whose side is the algorithm on, and who decided?
- How do you ensure AI-driven aid decisions don't systematically disadvantage already-underserved students? (This is the canonical T1 bias-audit case)
- Aid data sits under the GLBA Safeguards Rule — is every AI touchpoint inside the information security program? (Domain 2.3)

■ ONBOARDING

- Can AI personalize the first-30-days journey based on first-gen status, transfer status, program, modality, work schedule, and family situation?
- Can AI assist registration, course selection, and orientation without replacing the human relationships that drive belonging?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ AI-influenced admission and aid processes have documented human accountability, bias testing, and appeal paths
- ✓ Transfer evaluation time is measured and improving
- ✓ Onboarding personalization is opt-out transparent — students know what is being personalized and why

EQUITY & ETHICS LENS

This is the canonical T1 stage: aid optimization, admission screening, and onboarding personalization all shape access and money for individual people. Bias testing here is not a best practice — it is the difference between widening the door and automating its narrowing.

4.3

Succeed — Retention, Support & Wellbeing

How does AI help students persist, learn, and graduate?

■ PREDICTIVE ANALYTICS & EARLY WARNING

- What predictive capability does your retention system offer today, and what is the next evolution?
- Can you identify at-risk students before visible disengagement? What signals feed the model — LMS engagement, assignment completion, login patterns, aid status, advising interactions?
- How are predictions communicated to advisors — as intelligence that empowers human judgment, or as scores that replace it?
- Do faculty see early-warning data on students in their own courses — and under what rules? (A routine flashpoint: advisors, faculty, and students often hold three different understandings of who sees the scores)
- What safeguards exist against biased predictions, and how often are models re-validated across demographic groups?

■ AI-POWERED STUDENT SUPPORT

- Should your institution deploy an AI assistant for student inquiries — and what should it handle? (Admissions, registration, aid questions, academic policies, tech support)
- What should it *never* handle? (Mental health crises, disciplinary matters, complex aid appeals) — and how does it recognize those moments and hand off to a human?
- Must it operate in the languages your students actually speak? Should it be available 24/7 for students who study nights and weekends?
- How does it integrate with your SIS, CRM, and LMS so its answers are true?

■ THE WHOLE-LIFE STUDENT

- If your students are predominantly working adults, can AI help them manage the intersection of work, family, and education?
- Can AI detect life events (job loss, family crisis, health issues) from engagement patterns and trigger proactive human outreach — and *should* it? Where is your line between care and surveillance?
- Can AI help with non-academic barriers — childcare, transportation, food security, emergency aid navigation?

■ MENTAL HEALTH & WELLBEING

- Can AI help identify students in distress — and what are the ethical boundaries you will not cross? (T0's prohibition on emotion inference is the floor, not the debate)
- What is AI's permitted role around counseling? (Triage and access navigation: maybe. Replacing the therapeutic relationship: no)
- If an AI system surfaces a possible crisis, who is accountable for the human response, and how fast does it happen?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ Predictive models have documented bias validation on a schedule, and advisors are trained to treat scores as signals, not sentences
- ✓ The student-facing assistant has hard handoff rules for sensitive situations, and they have been tested
- ✓ The institution has a written position on the personalization/surveillance line
- ✓ Wellbeing-related AI has clinical and legal review, not just technical review

EQUITY & ETHICS LENS

An early-warning system that disproportionately flags students from particular demographics is not an early-warning system — it is an automated bias pipeline with a dashboard. Validation across populations is not optional at T1.

4.4

Launch & Return — Career, Alumni & Lifelong Learning

How does AI extend the relationship beyond graduation?

■ GRADUATION & CAREER LAUNCH

- Can AI optimize completion pathways and degree audits in the final year?
- Can AI support career preparation, employer matching, and job-search coaching — including interview practice and application tailoring?
- Should graduates leave with an AI competency credential that employers recognize? (Cross-reference Domain 3.3)

■ ALUMNI & LIFELONG LEARNING

- Can AI drive personalized lifelong-learning recommendations as alumni careers evolve — turning alumni into recurring learners?
- Can AI match alumni mentors to current students at scale?
- How does your institution help alumni upskill as AI transforms their professions? (This is both mission and market: the institution that reskills its own alumni owns that relationship for decades)

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ Career services uses AI tools with the same governance as academic tools
- ✓ A lifelong-learning re-engagement strategy exists with AI-driven personalization
- ✓ Alumni data use follows the same classification rules as student data

Run.

How do we operate and sustain the enterprise?

The institutional machinery: operations, technology, money, advancement, and external relations. This group is where AI's efficiency case lives — and where the sustainability question gets asked honestly. For tuition-dependent institutions facing the demographic cliff, AI-driven efficiency is not an optimization project; it may be an existential one.

5.1 Administrative Operations & Efficiency

5.3 Financial Planning & Institutional
Sustainability

5.5 Community, Partnerships & External
Relations

5.2 Infrastructure, Data & Technology

5.4 Advancement & Fundraising

5.1

Administrative Operations & Efficiency

Where can AI save time, reduce cost, and improve quality?

■ PROCESS AUTOMATION

- Has your institution systematically audited administrative processes for AI suitability — highest-volume, most rule-based first? (Document processing, scheduling, compliance reporting, help desk, HR onboarding, accounts payable, meeting documentation)
- For each candidate: what's the ROI, the risk, and the impact on staff?
- Is the stated goal headcount reduction or reallocation of human talent to higher-value work — and does leadership's behavior match the message? (This single consistency question determines whether Group 6 succeeds)

■ ENTERPRISE AI TOOLS

- Does your institution provide licensed, governed AI tools for staff productivity — or are staff using personal, ungoverned tools by default?
- What training and support accompanies deployment? (A license without training is shelfware with a data-leakage bonus)

■ REPORTING & DECISION SUPPORT

- Can administrators query institutional data in natural language?
- Can AI generate real-time dashboards and support scenario modeling for budget, enrollment, and resource planning?

■ SCHEDULING, SPACE & ACCREDITATION OPERATIONS

- Can AI optimize course scheduling across modalities and locations, and improve space utilization?
- Can AI help assemble accreditation evidence and continuous-improvement documentation, track regulatory compliance, and monitor institutional effectiveness metrics in real time?

■ INSTITUTIONAL KNOWLEDGE

- Has staff turnover created knowledge gaps? Can AI-powered knowledge bases capture documented processes, expertise, and institutional memory before it walks out the door?
- Can AI improve onboarding by making institutional knowledge queryable?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ A process-automation portfolio exists with ROI tracking (feeding Domain 1.4)
- ✓ Every staff member has access to a governed AI tool and knows the rules for it
- ✓ At least one knowledge-preservation initiative is live

AGENTIC AI LENS

Operations is where agents arrive first — enrollment workflows, IT ticketing, compliance monitoring. Every agent deployed here needs the Lens B guardrails: bounded scope, logging, a kill switch, and an owner who can answer for its actions.

5.2

Infrastructure, Data & Technology

Do we have the technical foundation for AI at scale?

■ PLATFORM STRATEGY

- What is your institution's primary AI platform ecosystem — and is that a deliberate decision or an accumulation of defaults?
- What are the selection criteria? (Compliance posture, data residency, cost model, integration, in-house development capability)
- How do you avoid lock-in in a rapidly changing market? Does your institution maintain the capability to build in-house where it's strategic?
- Open-weight models you host versus proprietary APIs: for restricted-tier data, is self-hosting on the table — and do you have the capability to run it?

■ DATA INFRASTRUCTURE & READINESS

- Is institutional data AI-ready — quality, completeness, freshness, accessibility?
- Where are the integration gaps between your LMS, SIS, degree audit, and CRM that limit AI effectiveness?
- Do you need a data lake (a central raw-data store), a feature store (curated model inputs), or a stronger API layer? Are your data pipelines suitable for AI consumption?
- Is real-time data access available for time-sensitive applications (student-facing assistants, early warning)?
- Who governs which data from institutional repositories can be exposed to which AI tools?

■ INTEGRATION ARCHITECTURE

- Do institutional systems expose data and functionality through APIs?
- Can AI tools — and eventually AI agents — interact with multiple systems to complete cross-functional tasks, under governance?

■ IDENTITY & ACCESS

- Are AI tools behind single sign-on with automated provisioning and deprovisioning — or does a departed employee's chatbot account live on?
- Do AI agents have their own identity class — scoped credentials, isolation from human accounts, and a lifecycle (created, rotated, revoked)? (Lens B's credential isolation has to live somewhere; it lives here)

■ COMPUTE, COST & SANDBOX

- Can current infrastructure handle planned AI workloads, and what's the cost model? (Per-query, subscription, fixed)
- What happens when a critical AI vendor has an outage or deprecates a model your workflows depend on? AI dependencies belong in the business continuity plan (cross-reference Domain 2.4)
- Is there a governed sandbox where faculty, staff, and students can experiment without risk to production systems — with nothing above Public-tier data entering it (the T3 boundary)? (This is the sandbox Domains 3.3 and 6.1 refer to — one sandbox, one owner)
- Research-intensive institutions: GPU/HPC capacity and secure enclaves for restricted-data AI work — see Domain 3.4's research-enterprise extension

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ A written platform strategy exists, with lock-in risk assessed
- ✓ A data-readiness assessment has been done and the gaps have owners
- ✓ AI tools are inside the identity system — provisioned, deprovisioned, and auditable
- ✓ A sandbox exists and is used

AGENTIC AI LENS

Agents are infrastructure consumers with insider access. The integration architecture that lets agents work across systems is the same architecture that must constrain them — build the constraint in, not on.

5.3

Financial Planning & Institutional Sustainability

What does AI cost, how does it pay for itself, and what happens if we don't move?

■ INVESTMENT

- What is the total cost of your AI initiatives — technology, people, training, process redesign, consulting?
- Is there a phased investment plan, and are costs centralized or distributed?

■ ROI & FUNDING

- Is every significant initiative tied to the measurement discipline in Domain 1.4?
- What funding sources apply? (Internal reallocation, federal grants including Title III/V for eligible institutions, foundation grants, employer co-investment, revenue-generating AI programming)
- Can AI initiatives themselves generate revenue — professional development, credentials, employer partnerships, consulting for peer institutions?

■ THE COMPETITIVE & EXISTENTIAL FRAME

- The demographic enrollment cliff is here. Can AI help your institution compete for a shrinking pool — and reach populations it currently doesn't?
- What happens if peer competitors adopt AI meaningfully faster? What happens if student expectations for AI-enhanced experiences outpace your delivery?
- Does every AI initiative have a credible path to ROI given your tuition model — and a sunset plan if it fails?

■ ENVIRONMENTAL & RESOURCE COST

- Has your institution considered the environmental footprint of its AI use — energy and water costs of large-scale inference — within its sustainability commitments?
- Do platform and vendor selections weigh efficiency? Does your public AI story square with your public sustainability story? (Students increasingly ask; have an answer)

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ AI spending is visible as a portfolio with a total number a CFO can state
- ✓ Funding strategy includes at least one non-tuition source
- ✓ The board has heard the competitive-risk framing, not just the innovation framing
- ✓ Sustainability commitments mention AI

5.4

Advancement & Fundraising

Can AI grow philanthropic support?

■ DONOR INTELLIGENCE

- Can AI identify prospective donors from alumni and community data, predict giving patterns, and suggest optimal ask timing?
- Can AI personalize outreach and identify which appeals work for which donor segments?
- What are the privacy boundaries for donor intelligence? (Donor data is Restricted-tier; wealth-screening plus AI inference can cross lines that damage the relationships it's meant to build)

■ GRANTS

- Can AI assist grant identification, drafting, and compliance reporting — and are there AI-specific grant opportunities, particularly for HSI/MSI-designated institutions?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ Advancement AI uses follow the same data classification and approval rules as everything else
- ✓ Donor-facing AI personalization has a stated privacy boundary, reviewed by advancement leadership
- ✓ Grant operations use AI with disclosure practices matching funder expectations

5.5

Community, Partnerships & External Relations

How does our AI work extend beyond the institution?

■ EMPLOYERS

- Can AI strengthen employer relationships — matching curriculum to skill demands, sharing labor-market intelligence, co-designing micro-credentials?
- Can AI improve placement rates and time-to-employment?

■ COMMUNITY

- Should AI literacy programming extend to the communities you serve — high school pipeline students, community partners, alumni? (This builds pipeline, goodwill, and mission impact simultaneously — and for access-mission institutions it is the mission)

■ PEERS & THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

- Can your institution collaborate with peers on AI governance, publish its frameworks as models, and join sector networks and working groups?
- Can your institution's distinctive position — mission, student population, HSI/MSI designation, equity focus — anchor a credible AI thought-leadership niche?
- Some institutions have turned early governance maturity into peer-advisory and consortium leadership roles — is that a fit for yours?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ At least one employer partnership has an explicit AI dimension
- ✓ Community AI literacy is on the roadmap with an owner
- ✓ The institution's AI story is told externally in at least one venue per year

Equip.

How do we bring our people with us?

Every AI initiative on this map is executed by humans — and most AI failures in higher education are adoption failures wearing a technology costume. Sector surveys keep finding the same thing: most institutions are effectively telling employees to learn AI on their own. This group is the difference between an institution that owns AI tools and an institution that uses them.

6.1 AI Fluency & Professional Development

6.2 Change, Culture & Communications

6.3 Workforce, Roles & Labor Relations

6.1

AI Fluency & Professional Development

How do employees actually learn this?

■ THE TRAINING ARCHITECTURE

- Does your institution have a structured AI development program — or a link to a video library and good wishes?
- Is it tiered? (Foundational literacy for everyone; role-specific application for practitioners; advanced capability for champions)
- Is it mandatory or optional, for whom, and is it ongoing rather than one-time?
- Does it include coaching and communities of practice, not just workshops? (One-off training decays in weeks; practice communities compound)

■ FACULTY-SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT

- Is there a Faculty AI Fellows program or similar to incentivize pedagogical innovation?
- Do faculty have access to the institutional sandbox (Domain 5.2) for experimentation?
- Should AI competency factor into evaluation, promotion, and tenure at all — and if so, through what faculty-governed process? (Imposing it administratively is how the whole program loses the senate)
- Are adjunct and part-time faculty included — and compensated for required training time? (At many institutions they teach the majority of sections; excluding them makes every classroom policy in Group 3 unenforceable)

■ STAFF-SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT

- Do staff get hands-on training on the approved tools relevant to their actual roles?
- Do staff understand the data governance rules (Domain 2.1) as they apply to daily work?
- Are new employees oriented to AI policies and tools during onboarding?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ A tiered program exists with participation tracked and reported to governance
- ✓ Adjuncts are included, and there is budget proof
- ✓ AI fluency appears in professional-development plans, not just policy documents

6.2

Change, Culture & Communications

How do we tell the truth about AI — inside and out?

■ HONEST CHANGE MANAGEMENT

- Has your institution acknowledged — out loud — that AI creates legitimate anxiety about job security?
- Is the institutional message clear and credible? "Augmentation, not replacement" only works if hiring, budgeting, and automation decisions visibly match it
- Are there concrete examples of roles that changed rather than disappeared? Are there visible career pathways tied to AI fluency?
- Who owns change management — by name, not by committee?

■ CULTURAL READINESS

- What is the actual attitude toward AI among faculty, staff, and students — measured, not assumed?
- Where is the resistance, and what is it protecting? (Resistance usually guards something real: academic freedom, job security, educational quality. Address the concern, not just the resistance)
- Are there influential champions who model adoption — and influential skeptics whose concerns are engaged proactively and publicly?
- Is there psychological safety for experimentation? Is it OK to try and fail — visibly?

■ INSTITUTIONAL MESSAGING & BRAND

- What is your institution's AI narrative — leading, cautious, mission-driven — and is it consistent across students, faculty, staff, board, accreditors, and public?
- Is there a communications plan for AI announcements, policy changes, and incidents? (Write the incident communication template before the incident)
- Can your institution's approach — equity-centered, human-centered, access-driven — be a brand differentiator against more technical reputations?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ Sentiment has been measured at least once, and leadership has seen the honest numbers
- ✓ The augmentation message is backed by at least one visible reallocation story (and zero contradicting quiet layoffs attributed to AI)
- ✓ An incident communications template exists

6.3

Workforce, Roles & Labor Relations

How do jobs, evaluation, and the employment relationship change — and who has a say?

AI in hiring, evaluation, and monitoring sits squarely inside the T1 definition, yet at most institutions it has no home — it is scattered across HR practice, union agreements, and vendor defaults. This domain gives it one. On unionized campuses, much of what follows is a mandatory subject of bargaining; treating it as policy rollout rather than negotiation converts an adoption challenge into a grievance pipeline.

■ ROLE EVOLUTION

- Should AI competency enter job descriptions, hiring criteria, and performance frameworks — on what timeline, communicated how far in advance, and bargained where required?
- What new roles will you need (AI specialists, data engineers, AI ethics reviewers), and which existing roles will evolve? How are those specific people being prepared, starting when?
- Can internal AI certification pathways turn workforce anxiety into workforce mobility?

■ AI IN EMPLOYMENT DECISIONS

- Is AI used in recruiting, screening, hiring, or performance evaluation of employees? These are T1 uses — the same bias testing, explainability, and contestability standards as student-facing systems
- Is AI used to analyze teaching evaluations or classroom data in ways that touch faculty employment? (T1, and senate territory — cross-reference Domain 1.1)
- Will AI monitor employee productivity? Who decided, do the monitored know, and was it bargained where required?

■ LABOR RELATIONS & WORKLOAD

- Which items on this map trigger notification and bargaining obligations — and is HR or labor counsel mapping them proactively rather than after the grievance?
- Assessment redesign (Domain 3.2), course-material review, integrity adjudication, and required training are labor. Is that work compensated, release-timed, or silently added to workload?
- Does the institution intend to use faculty-created materials to train or feed AI systems — and who agreed to that? (The IP question Domain 2.3 opens lands here as a labor question)

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ Employment-related AI uses appear in the T1 inventory with bias validation, like every other T1 system
- ✓ A bargaining-obligations map exists, reviewed with labor counsel before initiatives launch
- ✓ Role-evolution planning is happening with the affected people, not just about them
- ✓ Workload created by AI initiatives is named and resourced in at least one budget line

EQUITY & ETHICS LENS

The fairness machinery the institution demands for students applies to its own employees. An institution that bias-tests its admissions AI but not its hiring AI has an equity policy for customers, not a value.

The Three Lenses.

The lenses are not domains. They are disciplines of attention applied across every group. Each has a home chapter here; Lenses A and B also appear as callouts throughout the Territory where the intersection is sharpest, while the Horizon lens operates through the governance practice in Domain 1.1 rather than through callouts. Because each lens is a standing practice, it is scored in Appendix B on the same maturity scale as the domains — what is being scored is the practice, not a department.

A **Equity & Ethics** *is it fair, and who
— checks?*

B **Agentic** *what changes when AI starts
AI — acting?*

C **Horizon** *what's coming, and who's
— watching?*

LENS A

Equity & Ethics

Is it fair — and who checks?

Applies to every domain. Callouts appear where the stakes concentrate: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.2, 4.2, 4.3, 6.3.

AI does not create bias; it industrializes whatever bias already exists in the data and decisions it learns from. For institutions serving first-generation, Pell-eligible, adult, and minoritized students, this lens is not compliance — it is mission protection.

■ BIAS & FAIRNESS

- How does your institution ensure AI systems don't encode or amplify existing inequities — and who specifically is responsible for checking?
- Are tools tested for differential impact across demographic groups *before* deployment, and re-validated on a schedule after? (Models drift; so does fairness)
- Is there a pause-and-fix protocol when bias is detected — with authority to actually pause?
- If your institution holds HSI/MSI or similar designation, what additional equity obligations and opportunities does that create?

■ TRANSPARENCY, EXPLAINABILITY & CONTESTABILITY

- When AI contributes to a decision about a student, does the student know?
- Can the system explain its recommendation? What is your explainability standard — are black-box models acceptable, and if so, at which risk tiers?
- Can students contest AI-influenced decisions and receive a fully human review? Is the appeal path real, published, and used?
- Are faculty and staff aware when AI is used in processes that affect *them* (scheduling, evaluation, monitoring)?

■ SURVEILLANCE & PRIVACY ETHICS

- Where is your institution's line between helpful monitoring and invasive surveillance — written down, not assumed?
- Will you use AI to monitor student behavior? Employee productivity? Who decided, and do the monitored know?

■ EQUITY OF ACCESS

- Do all students have equal access to AI capability, or does capability track wealth? Can a Pell-eligible first-generation student access what an affluent peer can?
- Does your institution provide institutionally licensed tools to level the field?
- Are AI interfaces accessible (WCAG) and multilingual to match your population?

■ STUDENT VOICE & CO-GOVERNANCE

- Do students participate in AI governance — not as a survey audience but as members with standing?
- Does your institution's posture align with emerging student AI rights expectations: transparency, oversight, data sovereignty, safe use, and literacy?
- When students raise AI concerns, where do those go, and does anything happen?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ Every T1 system has pre-deployment and scheduled bias validation with documented results
- ✓ A published appeal path exists for AI-influenced decisions, and it has been exercised
- ✓ Students sit in governance; the institution can point to a decision they changed
- ✓ An institutional position on surveillance exists in writing

LENS B

Agentic AI

What changes when AI stops responding and starts acting?

Applies to every domain. Callouts appear where the stakes concentrate: 1.1, 1.4, 2.2, 3.2, 5.1, 5.2.

Generative AI responds to prompts. Agentic AI plans, executes, iterates, and acts across systems with limited supervision. The distinction is not academic: it changes the risk math everywhere at once. An institution can be reasonably governed for generative AI and completely unprepared for agents.

■ UNDERSTANDING THE SHIFT

- Does leadership understand the generative/agentic distinction — and where agents are already appearing? (Browser agents, autonomous coding tools, auto-completing course agents, agent features switching on inside enterprise platforms)
- What is your institutional posture: embrace, pilot cautiously, restrict, or ban — decided per risk tier rather than globally?

■ ACADEMIC IMPLICATIONS

- Agents can complete entire online courses autonomously. Your response lives in Domain 3.2 — and the strategic answer is assessment redesign, not a detection arms race
- Should agents be prohibited from interacting with your LMS, and can you technically enforce that? (Honest answer today: imperfectly — which is why design beats detection)

■ OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

- Where could agents deliver operational benefit — enrollment workflows, IT operations, compliance monitoring, scheduling?
- What guardrails are non-negotiable? (Bounded scope of action, human approval for consequential steps, comprehensive logging, kill switch, credential isolation)
- How do you govern agents that touch multiple institutional systems — who owns a worker that works everywhere?

■ GOVERNANCE DEFAULTS

- Should all agentic deployments be classified T1 by default until individually assessed? (Recommended: yes)
- What logging and audit requirements apply to autonomous actions?
- Who is accountable when an agent errs — and is human override always available, tested, and fast?

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ The approval process (Domain 1.1) has an explicit agentic track with T1-default classification
- ✓ Every deployed agent has bounded scope, logging, and a tested kill switch
- ✓ Assessment redesign (Domain 3.2) is resourced as the primary academic response

LENS C

Horizon

What's coming, and who's watching?

Owned by governance (Domain 1.1). Feeds every group.

Most frameworks end with a chapter of predictions that ages badly. This lens replaces predictions with a *practice*: a standing discipline of scanning, assessing, and routing what's coming into the domains where it belongs.

■ THE SCANNING PRACTICE

- Who owns horizon scanning — by name — and what sources do they watch? (Regulatory trackers, sector research organizations, accreditor communications, peer institutions, vendor roadmaps, frontier-lab releases)
- What is the cadence for reporting the horizon into governance — and does the report force a decision (act / watch / dismiss) rather than just inform?
- When something on the horizon arrives, is there a defined path from "interesting" to "assigned to a domain owner"?

■ STANDING WATCH ITEMS (ROUTE TO DOMAINS AS THEY MATURE)

- **Regulation:** Federal AI legislation, state AI rights and transparency bills, accreditor AI expectations, EU AI Act extraterritorial effects → route to Domain 2.3
- **The next capability wave:** Whatever follows agents — multimodal, embodied, persistent-memory systems — reassess Lens B assumptions on every major release cycle
- **Workforce transformation:** The careers you prepare students for are being transformed in real time; curriculum relevance is now a moving target → route to Domains 3.3 and 5.5 (student-facing) and 6.3 (employee-facing)
- **Market structure:** Vendor consolidation, pricing shifts, platform bundling → route to Domain 2.4
- **Student expectations:** Each entering cohort arrives more AI-native than the last; the experience gap between expectation and delivery is a retention variable → route to Group 4

WHAT GOVERNED LOOKS LIKE

- ✓ Horizon review is a standing governance agenda item with a named owner
- ✓ Each review produces routed decisions, not just discussion
- ✓ When the institution *is* surprised, the review asks whether scanning should have caught it, and the practice is adjusted — recurring surprises of the same kind are the failure metric

Default Sequencing at a Glance

Adjust to your context — especially your online enrollment percentage (raises 3.2 urgency), your transfer volume (raises 4.2), and your current governance maturity. Within NOW, the entry point is the three moves (see "Where to Start"): name the owner, inventory what's running, set the floor.

NOW (the clock is running — first 90 days for the three moves; first year for the rest): 1.1 Governance & Org Structure · 1.2 Policy & Acceptable Use · 1.3 Board Governance (first education session) · 2.1 Data Governance · 2.2 Security & Risk · 2.3 Compliance (FERPA, GLBA & accessibility) · 3.1 Teaching & Learning · 3.2 Assessment & Integrity · 4.3 Succeed (support infrastructure) · 5.3 Financial posture · 6.1 AI Fluency · 6.2 Change & Culture

NEXT (within the first year): 1.3 Board Governance (reporting cadence) · 1.4 Monitoring & Evaluation · 2.3 Compliance (accreditation, IP, records & retention, regulatory horizon) · 2.4 Vendor & Procurement · 3.3 AI Literacy & Credentials · 3.4 Research & Scholarship · 4.1 Attract · 4.2 Enroll · 4.3 Succeed (predictive systems) · 5.1 Administrative Operations · 5.2 Infrastructure · 5.3 Full financial planning · 6.3 Workforce, Roles & Labor Relations

LATER (as capacity matures): 4.4 Launch & Return · 5.4 Advancement · 5.5 Community & External

ALWAYS (the lenses): Equity & Ethics, Agentic AI, and Horizon apply from day one and never complete.

Domain Ownership & Maturity Scorecard

Assign a named individual as Primary Owner for every domain — for the curricular domains (3.1–3.3), the owner may be a faculty body of record, but the accountability must still be named. Supporting Stakeholders are the offices whose sign-off or labor the domain requires; name them during the scoring session. Score current and target maturity using the four-level scale: 1 Unaware · 2 Reactive · 3 Governed · 4 Strategic. Not every target is 4 — a defensible scorecard shows deliberate variation.

DOMAIN	PRIMARY OWNER	SUPPORTING STAKEHOLDERS	CURRENT MATURITY (1–4)	TARGET MATURITY (1–4)	SEQUENCE
1.1 Governance & Organizational Structure	[Designate]				NOW
1.2 Policy & Acceptable Use	[Designate]				NOW
1.3 Board Governance	[Designate]				NOW (education) / NEXT (reporting)
1.4 Monitoring & Evaluation	[Designate]				NEXT
2.1 Data Governance for AI	[Designate]				NOW
2.2 Security & Risk	[Designate]				NOW
2.3 Compliance & Legal	[Designate]				NOW (FERPA, GLBA, accessibility) / NEXT (rest)
2.4 Vendor & Procurement	[Designate]				NEXT
3.1 Teaching & Learning	[Designate]				NOW
3.2 Assessment & Academic Integrity	[Designate]				NOW
3.3 AI Literacy, Curriculum & Credentials	[Designate]				NEXT
3.4 Research & Scholarship	[Designate]				NEXT
4.1 Attract — Enrollment Marketing & Recruitment	[Designate]				NEXT
4.2 Enroll — Admission, Aid & Onboarding	[Designate]				NEXT
4.3 Succeed — Retention, Support & Wellbeing	[Designate]				NOW (support) / NEXT (predictive)
4.4 Launch & Return — Career, Alumni & Lifelong Learning	[Designate]				LATER
5.1 Administrative Operations & Efficiency	[Designate]				NEXT
5.2 Infrastructure, Data & Technology	[Designate]				NEXT
5.3 Financial Planning & Institutional Sustainability	[Designate]				NOW (posture) / NEXT (full plan)
5.4 Advancement & Fundraising	[Designate]				LATER
5.5 Community, Partnerships & External Relations	[Designate]				LATER
6.1 AI Fluency & Professional Development	[Designate]				NOW

DOMAIN	PRIMARY OWNER	SUPPORTING STAKEHOLDERS	CURRENT MATURITY (1–4)	TARGET MATURITY (1–4)	SEQUENCE
6.2 Change, Culture & Communications	[Designate]				NOW
6.3 Workforce, Roles & Labor Relations	[Designate]				NEXT
Lens A: Equity & Ethics	[Designate]				ALWAYS
Lens B: Agentic AI	[Designate]				ALWAYS
Lens C: Horizon	[Designate]				ALWAYS

Standards Alignment

The map's instruments are deliberately compatible with the frameworks auditors, insurers, and regulators cite:

ATLAS INSTRUMENT	NIST AI RMF	ISO/IEC 42001 (AI MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS)	EU AI ACT
Maturity scale + named owners (Appendix B)	GOVERN	Leadership, roles & accountability	Deployer governance expectations
Risk tiers T0–T3	MAP	Risk & impact assessment	Prohibited (≈T0) / high-risk (≈T1) classification logic
System inventory + bias validation (Domain 1.4)	MEASURE	Performance monitoring	High-risk logging & human oversight
Assurance practices — pause-and-fix, sunset, review cadence (Domain 1.4)	MANAGE	Continual improvement & corrective action	Post-market monitoring

The mapping is directional, not a certification claim — it tells an auditor where to look. When an auditor, insurer, or accreditor asks "what framework are you using?", the answer is: a higher-education operating map whose controls crosswalk to NIST AI RMF and ISO/IEC 42001 — and the completed Appendix B scorecard is the evidence.



This framework is designed to be comprehensive, not prescriptive. Not every question requires an immediate answer. The value is in knowing the questions exist — and making intentional decisions about when, how, and by whom they will be addressed.

Maturity models tell you how far you've come. The map tells you whether you're looking at the whole territory. You need both — start with the map.

Developed by [elevated.ai](#).



THE MAP, NOT THE GPS