El Camino College



THE GOVERNING AI TOOLKIT

A Practical Framework for
AI Fluency, Risk & Institutional Governance

Companion toolkit to:

Governing AI Before It Governs You:

Building Role-Based AI Fluency Across a Community College

ACCT LEADERSHIP CONGRESS

OCTOBER 2026

About this toolkit

El Camino College developed these resources to answer a practical governance question: how does an institution adopt AI without delegating the judgment that institutions exist to exercise?

The toolkit collects four working parts of that answer: a framework for classifying AI risk, a review instrument for evaluating AI initiatives, the architecture of a role-based AI fluency program, and condensed examples of how that program changes by institutional role.

Use it in that order. Classify the risk before debating the tool. Establish who is accountable before approving the initiative. Build fluency where decision authority and operational leverage are highest. Scale only what has been measured.

DESIGNED TO BE USED, NOT FILED

Two resources are built to work on their own, printed and carried into a meeting:

05 AI Governance Risk Classification Framework

08 Board AI Initiative Review Form (2 pages)

Everything else explains the institutional architecture that makes those two instruments meaningful - and shows, in enough detail to adapt, how one community college translated governance principles into role-specific professional development.

HOW THE TOOLKIT SEQUENCES THE WORK

GOVERN
Classify risk and set the boundaries of acceptable use.

→

EVALUATE
Ask fiduciary questions of every proposed initiative.

→

BUILD FLUENCY
Match training depth to decision authority and leverage.

→

SCALE RESPONSIBLY
Pilot, measure, then scale, modify, or stop.

Contents

01 GOVERNANCE AT A GLANCE 04

AI Governance Risk Classification Framework · standalone reference 05

Classification examples by institutional function 06

02 BOARD AI INITIATIVE REVIEW TOOL 07

The Five Fiduciary Questions 07

Board AI Initiative Review Form · standalone worksheet 08–09

03 THE ECC AI FLUENCY MODEL 10

The three-tier architecture 11

Literacy, fluency, strategy 12

The 4D framework: Delegation, Description, Discernment, Diligence 13

04 GOVERNANCE & EXECUTIVE FLUENCY · Tier 1 14

4.1 Board of Trustees · Tier 1A 14–15

4.2 Executive Cabinet · Tier 1B 16–17

Board vs. Cabinet: role differentiation 18

05 OPERATIONAL AI FLUENCY · Tier 2 19

The 90-day cohort model 19

5.1 Administrative Assistants 20

5.2 HR & Fiscal Services 21

5.3 ITS / IRP / Data 22

Role differentiation across the model 23

06 STRATEGIC AMPLIFICATION · Tier 3 24

6.1 Marketing & Communications 25

6.2 Student Services 26

6.3 Facilities / Operations 27

07 PUTTING THE MODEL INTO PRACTICE 28

Closing · accessibility notes · resources 29

01 GOVERNANCE AT A GLANCE

The goal is to classify risk and establish appropriate levels of human oversight - not to prohibit AI nor allow unrestricted use.

Risk classification, not prohibition, is what enables responsible governance. Blanket bans push AI underground. Blanket approvals create liability.

The framework on the facing page sorts institutional AI use into three levels of risk, each with its own oversight requirement. It is the first instrument in this toolkit because every other decision - which initiatives to fund, which roles to train, what to write into policy - depends on knowing which category a use case falls into.

IN THIS SECTION

AI Governance Risk Classification Framework
Three risk levels, their defining characteristics, and the oversight each requires. Page 05.

Classification examples by function
Representative uses across academic, student, fiscal, HR, and operational areas. Page 06.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE

Acceptable risk should be **enabled**.
Mitigated risk should be **governed**.
Unacceptable risk should remain **human**.

AI Governance Risk Classification Framework

Classify the risk and establish the appropriate level of human oversight. Each level is identified by symbol and label as well as color, so the framework remains usable in grayscale and in print.

✓ LEVEL 1

ACCEPTABLE RISK

Enable it.

AI assists with routine, low-risk work under human supervision.

CHARACTERISTICS

- Low sensitivity
- Human review present
- No final decisions delegated
- Limited regulatory exposure

Representative uses: meeting summaries and minutes · email drafting and report formatting · rubrics and discussion questions · accessibility support · FAQ chatbots and reminders · procedure documentation.

! LEVEL 2

MITIGATED RISK

Govern it.

AI supports analysis and preparation, but humans remain accountable.

CHARACTERISTICS

- Human authorization required
- Verification checkpoints established
- Audit trail maintained
- Accountability clearly assigned

Representative uses: budget scenario modeling and variance analysis · contract summarization · job description drafting and classification comparisons · enrollment forecasting and early alerts · program review and accreditation documentation · preventive maintenance forecasting.

✕ LEVEL 3

UNACCEPTABLE RISK

Keep it human.

AI must not make or materially influence high-stakes decisions.

CHARACTERISTICS

- Delegates human judgment
- Creates due process concerns
- High legal and reputational exposure
- Incompatible with fiduciary responsibility

Representative uses: final grades, probation, degree conferral, financial aid eligibility, admissions and discipline · hiring, firing, promotion, tenure, evaluation, compensation · payroll release, expenditure approval, contract execution · legal opinions, Title IX and ADA determinations · emergency response and threat assessment · Board votes and policy approval.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE

Acceptable risk should be **enabled**. Mitigated risk should be **governed**. Unacceptable risk should remain **human**.

USING THIS SHEET

Classify first, then decide. If a proposed use falls in Level 2, name the human who authorizes the outcome and the checkpoint at which they do so. Full example inventory on the following page.

Classification examples by institutional function

Representative uses drawn from the ECC framework. The list is illustrative, not exhaustive: the test is the characteristics on page 05, not the presence of a use case on this page.

☑ ACCEPTABLE

Level 1 · enable with supervision

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

Meeting summaries and minutes · email drafting and report formatting · scheduling assistance and agenda preparation

TEACHING & LEARNING

Brainstorming assignments and activities · generating rubrics and discussion questions · drafting syllabi and course materials · accessibility support (alt text, transcripts) · study guides and practice quizzes

STUDENT SERVICES

FAQ chatbots and appointment reminders · general information responses · website content generation

OPERATIONS

Procedure documentation · knowledge base articles · project plans and timelines

! MITIGATED

Level 2 · govern with authorization

FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION

Budget scenario modeling and variance analysis · forecasting and trend analysis · procurement and contract summarization · first-pass policy review

HUMAN RESOURCES

Job description drafting · classification comparisons · interview question generation · bias detection in job postings

STUDENT SUCCESS

Enrollment forecasting and predictive analytics · early-alert systems and outreach prioritization

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Dashboard narratives and pattern identification · survey analysis and strategic planning support

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Program review and curriculum mapping · learning outcomes and accreditation documentation

FACILITIES & OPERATIONS

Preventive maintenance forecasting · work order prioritization and capital planning

☒ UNACCEPTABLE

Level 3 · must remain human

STUDENT OUTCOMES

Final grade determinations · academic probation and degree conferral · financial aid eligibility decisions · admissions decisions without human review · student discipline and conduct rulings

PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Hiring, firing, or promotion decisions · tenure decisions and performance evaluations · employee discipline and compensation

FISCAL AUTHORITY

Payroll release and expenditure approvals · contract execution and purchasing authority

LEGAL & COMPLIANCE

Legal opinions and regulatory determinations · public records, Title IX, and ADA decisions

SAFETY & SECURITY

Emergency response and threat assessments · police use-of-force and building safety

GOVERNANCE

Board votes and policy approval · strategic priorities and accreditation judgments

02 BOARD AI INITIATIVE REVIEW TOOL

Governance becomes practical when leaders know what questions to ask. These five are asked of every AI proposal.

1 What specific measurable outcome does this produce - and by when?

Demand clearer success criteria without micromanaging the work.

2 What happens if this fails? What is our exit strategy?

Vendor lock-in, portability, and stop-loss criteria are fiduciary questions.

3 Who is accountable for the results - a person, not a system?

Human accountability cannot be delegated to AI, even when a process is automated.

4 What data goes into this AI - and who owns it?

Student, employee, and vendor data flows each carry distinct exposure.

5 Is this a pilot, or are we committing to ongoing operational cost?

One-time pilots and recurring commitments require different approvals.

GOVERNANCE QUESTION

What AI decisions belong to the Board, and what belongs to administration? When does AI use require Board policy rather than administrative procedure?

THE WORKSHEET

The two pages that follow are the review form itself, sized for use during a Board meeting. Print pages 08 and 09 back to back.

Board AI Initiative Review

El Camino College · Board of Trustees Decision Template

INITIATIVE IDENTIFICATION

Initiative Name

Date Presented

Presented By

Estimated Investment

Department(s)

Timeline

FIVE FIDUCIARY QUESTIONS

Ask about every AI proposal

1 What specific measurable outcome does this produce - and by when?

2 What happens if this fails? What is our exit strategy?

3 Who is accountable for the results - a person, not a system?

4 What data goes into this AI - and who owns it?

5 Is this a pilot, or are we committing to ongoing operational cost?

RISK CLASSIFICATION

Check one - see framework, page 05

☐ ✓ **ACCEPTABLE**

Low sensitivity, human review, no final decisions delegated

☐ ! **MITIGATED**

Human authorization required, verification checkpoints, audit trail

☐ ✕ **UNACCEPTABLE**

Delegates judgment, due process concerns, high legal exposure

If the initiative classifies as unacceptable risk, the review ends here: the decision belongs to a person, not a system. Continue to page 2 for the 4D governance assessment and Board decision.

Board AI Initiative Review

El Camino College · Board of Trustees Decision Template

4D GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENT

Board concerns - Description is largely operational

Delegation

BOARD CONCERN

· What is being delegated to AI?
· What must remain human-only?
· Is there a clear prohibition list?

Discernment

BOARD CONCERN

· How will outputs be validated?
· What verification checkpoints exist?
· How are hallucinations detected?

Diligence

BOARD CONCERN

· Who is accountable for AI-assisted outputs?
· Is AI use transparent and documented?
· Is there a human in the loop?

BOARD DECISION

☐ Approve ☐ Approve with Conditions ☐ Stage / Pilot First ☐ Redirect ☐ Decline

CONDITIONS / REQUIRED GUARDRAILS

REQUIRED SUCCESS METRICS

Board Member Name

Date

GUIDING PRINCIPLE

Acceptable risk should be **enabled**. Mitigated risk should be **governed**. Unacceptable risk should remain **human**.

03 THE ECC AI FLUENCY MODEL

The ECC AI Fluency Professional Development Framework is a tiered, role-based program designed to maximize institutional impact by aligning training depth with decision-making authority and operational leverage.

Its structure progresses deliberately: from governance-level orientation, to high-ROI operational pilots, and finally to advanced strategic amplification. Each tier is calibrated to build shared foundational understanding, enable practical application in daily work, and position AI as a force multiplier for governance, operations, and long-term institutional strategy - rather than as a standalone technology initiative.

The pages that follow distill the architecture: the three tiers and who sits in them, the distinction between literacy, fluency, and strategy, and the 4D framework that gives every role a common vocabulary for judgment.

IN THIS SECTION

The three-tier architecture · 11
Who is trained, in what sequence, and why.

Literacy, fluency, strategy · 12
Three different capabilities, three different audiences.

The 4D framework · 13
Delegation, Description, Discernment, Diligence - and how emphasis shifts by role.

THE CENTRAL DESIGN DECISION

AI fluency is ***not*** delivered as identical training for every employee. Different institutional roles require different levels and types of fluency.

The three-tier architecture

Training depth and emphasis change according to institutional role. The sequence is intentional: govern first, then prove return where operational leverage is highest, then amplify strategically.

TIER 1 · A & B

Governance & Direction Setters

Board of Trustees · Executive Cabinet

Two distinct tracks, aligned to statutory roles, fiduciary responsibilities, and decision authority. Delivered as AI Fluency Special Study Sessions.

Emphasis: governance judgment, risk boundaries, policy authority, execution discipline.

FORMAT

2 half-day or 1 full-day study sessions · in-person recommended · asynchronous pre-reads

↓

TIER 2

Higher Institutional ROI

Pilot tracks

Administrative Assistants · HR / Fiscal Services · ITS / IRP / Data

A 90-day AI Fluency Pilot Program with three cohorts, each moving through common core foundations, role-specific application, and a capstone.

Emphasis: workflow redesign, verification, internal controls, governed enablement.

FORMAT

90 days · three phases of 4–6 weeks · cohorts of 20–25 · monthly full-day sessions, bi-weekly check-ins, weekly asynchronous modules

↓

TIER 3

Strategic Amplifiers

Marketing & Communication Track · Student Services Track · Facilities / Operations Track

A 90-day AI Fluency Strategic Program with three cohorts, following the same three phases: Common Core, Role-Specific Tracks, and Capstone.

Emphasis: scaling reach, service capacity, and preventive operations without diluting institutional voice, care, or safety judgment.

FORMAT

90 days · three cohorts · three phases of 4–6 weeks each

WHAT DETERMINES A ROLE'S TIER AND TRAINING DEPTH

Decision authority

What this role can approve, and with what consequence.

Operational leverage

How much institutional throughput the role touches daily.

Governance responsibility

Whether the role sets direction, executes it, or applies it.

Risk exposure

The regulatory, fiscal, and reputational surface of the work.

Literacy, fluency, strategy

Every Tier 1 track opens by distinguishing these three, because Board-level and Cabinet-level engagement must focus on the latter two. Conflating them is what produces either over-restriction or unchecked risk.

AI Literacy

Knowing what AI is and is not in plain, non-technical terms: its current capabilities, its limitations, and its likely trajectory over the next three to five years.

Baseline for everyone. Established in asynchronous pre-reads so live sessions are spent on governance, not definitions.

→

AI Fluency

Applying judgment in practice: deciding what to delegate, how to validate outputs, and where accountability sits. Fluency is exercised through the 4Ds.

Cabinet and operational tiers. The working competency that changes how decisions and workflows are made.

→

AI Strategy

Treating AI as a structural force affecting cost models, workforce design, enrollment management, student services, compliance, and competitiveness - not a discrete IT initiative.

Board-level concern. AI becomes a standing strategic variable, not a special agenda item.

SHARED ACROSS EVERY TRACK

Each track begins with a **role reframing** module - AI as capacity extension rather than replacement - and ends with a **behavior change** statement describing how work or decisions are made differently afterward.

Each track also states explicitly **what it is not**. Across the framework, no track aims to turn participants into technologists, to delegate accountability to AI systems, or to promote experimentation without guardrails.

Human accountability cannot be delegated to AI, even when a process is automated. That principle is the constant across all three tiers.

COMMON SHAPE OF A TIER 1 SESSION

PRE-WORK	30–45 minutes asynchronous: what AI fluency means at ECC; AI as automation, augmentation, and agency; a one-page overview of the 4Ds.
SESSION 1	Reality check and the 4Ds as a decision lens, with an interactive case discussion.
SESSION 2	Investment, risk, compliance, and governance mechanisms, with an applied exercise.
SESSION 3	Workforce, strategy, and competitive positioning.
CAPSTONE	A decision simulation on a composite AI initiative.

REPLICATION TAKEAWAY

Sequence the audiences, not just the content. ECC begins with the bodies that set direction and hold fiduciary responsibility, then trains the roles with the highest operational leverage, and only then extends to strategic amplification. Establishing shared language asynchronously keeps scarce live time on judgment rather than definitions.

The 4D framework

One vocabulary, used at every level of the institution. For the Board it is an oversight lens; for Cabinet it is the evaluation rubric applied to every AI proposal; in the operational tiers it is a working habit.

D1 Delegation

What gets automated, augmented, or prohibited. What is being delegated to AI - and what must remain human-only? Is there a clear prohibition list?

Board: sets the boundary. **Cabinet:** enforces it divisionally. **Staff:** decides when to involve AI at all.

D2 Description

Whether prompts and use cases are bounded safely: providing sufficient context, and defining audience, tone, scope, assumptions, and constraints.

Largely operational - and not a Board concern. Practiced intensively in Tier 2 and Tier 3 tracks.

D3 Discernment

Why AI outputs cannot be treated as authority. What validation standards exist, how outputs are checked, and how hallucinations, omissions, and misinterpretations are detected.

Board: asks how outputs are validated. **Staff:** treats output as draft, not authority.

D4 Diligence

Why accountability always remains human. Who owns the result, whether AI use is transparent and documented, and whether a human remains in the loop.

Board: a governance requirement. **Cabinet:** assigns named ownership. **Staff:** documents approval points.

HOW EMPHASIS SHIFTS BY ROLE

ROLE	DELEGATION	DESCRIPTION	DISCERNMENT	DILIGENCE
Board of Trustees	Primary - what must never be delegated	Operational; not a Board concern	Primary - outputs are not authority	Primary - accountability stays human
Executive Cabinet	Automate, augment, or prohibit	Are use cases bounded safely?	What validation standards exist	Who owns accountability

Emphasis as stated in each track's syllabus. The four concepts do not change; the questions each role asks of them do.

Used as intended, the 4Ds are a reusable governance instrument. A trustee can evaluate an AI initiative through them without understanding the technology, and recognize when a staff proposal lacks adequate human accountability.

04 GOVERNANCE & EXECUTIVE FLUENCY

The same institutional framework, differentiated for the body that sets direction and the body that executes it.

4.1 Tier 1A - Board of Trustees

AI Fluency for Governance, Fiduciary Oversight & ***Institutional Stewardship***

AUDIENCE	FORMAT	MODALITY	FOCUS
Board of Trustees	1 full-day study session, or 2 half-day sessions	In-person recommended	Governance judgment, fiduciary oversight, strategic foresight

STRATEGIC PURPOSE

Enable Trustees to govern AI as a structural institutional capability - not as a technology initiative - with clarity regarding fiduciary oversight, risk boundaries, policy authority, workforce implications at the strategic level, and long-term competitive positioning.

The track ensures the Board governs AI through direction-setting and guardrails rather than operational involvement. Trustees should be able to discuss AI in public meetings without relying on staff to translate basic concepts, and to govern AI investments through outcomes and risk tolerance.

WHAT THIS TRACK IS NOT

- ✕ Tool training or prompting workshops
- ✕ Operational implementation
- ✕ Vendor demonstrations or platform advocacy
- ✕ Turning Trustees into technologists
- ✕ Involvement in day-to-day AI operations

PRE-SESSION PREPARATION · ASYNCHRONOUS, 30–45 MINUTES

Purpose: establish shared language and baseline conceptual grounding so live time is spent on governance, not definitions.

CURATED PRE-READS

· What "AI Fluency" means at ECC (1–2 pages)
· AI as Automation, Augmentation, and Agency (executive brief)
· One-page overview of the 4Ds

OPTIONAL REFLECTION PROMPT

"Where do you believe AI could most materially affect ECC's cost structure, workforce model, or student outcomes in the next five years?"

Seven modules across three sessions, plus a Board-level decision simulation. Continued on page 15.

Program design

SESSION 1 - AI AS A GOVERNANCE ISSUE

Module 1
45 minutes

AI Reality Check for Trustees

What modern AI does well and poorly; the difference between AI literacy, fluency, and strategy; why AI is a structural capability rather than an IT tool. Governance lens: misunderstanding AI leads to either over-restriction or unchecked risk.

Module 2
60 minutes

The AI Fluency Framework (4Ds) - for oversight, not execution

Delegation boundaries, why outputs are not authority, why accountability remains human, and why Description is largely operational. Interactive case discussion on a hypothetical initiative. Outcome: evaluate AI initiatives without understanding the technology.

SESSION 2 - FIDUCIARY OVERSIGHT, RISK, AND ROI

Module 3
75 minutes

Evaluating AI investments through a fiduciary lens

ROI vs. cost avoidance · capacity extension vs. headcount growth · pilots vs. recurring commitments · build vs. buy · vendor lock-in and exit risk · data ownership and sustainability. Applied exercise on a sample pilot proposal. Shifts the question from "Is this safe?" to "Is this the right investment now?"

Module 4
60 minutes

Risk, compliance, and ethical stewardship

The AI risk surface specific to a California community college: data privacy, algorithmic bias and equity, automation vs. judgment, reputational exposure, regulatory and audit implications - and the distinction between acceptable, mitigated, and unacceptable risk. Outcome: give principled direction without blanket bans.

SESSION 3 - GOVERNANCE, WORKFORCE, AND STRATEGY

Module 5
60 minutes

Policy authority & decision rights

What belongs to the Board vs. administration; when AI requires policy rather than procedure; how AI is embedded into existing policies; why transparency and auditability matter more than restriction.

Module 6
60 minutes

Workforce & labor implications (strategic view)

Capacity extension vs. job elimination · role evolution and skill reclassification · professional development as labor stability · intersection with collective bargaining.

Module 7
45 minutes

Institutional strategy & competitive positioning

Student success and retention · curriculum speed-to-market · enrollment management and service scalability · reputation and employer relevance. Peer framing: is ECC falling behind, keeping pace, or leading regionally?

CAPSTONE · 45–60 MINUTES

Board-level decision simulation. Trustees review a composite AI initiative affecting budget, workforce, student services, and risk, then decide whether to approve, modify, stage, or redirect it - identifying the success metrics and guardrails they would require.

POST-SESSION BEHAVIOR CHANGE

- Ask sharper, AI-aware questions during discussions
- Interpret staff recommendations through a strategic AI lens
- Support pilots while insisting on accountability
- Shift from reactive governance to anticipatory leadership

Govern with **foresight** instead of hindsight.

AI becomes a normal strategic variable, not a special agenda item.

4.2 Tier 1B - Executive Cabinet

AI Fluency for Executive Authority, Operational Alignment & ***Institutional Capacity***

AUDIENCE	FORMAT	MODALITY	FOCUS
President and Executive Cabinet	1 full-day or 2 half-day sessions	In-person recommended	Strategic execution, proposal evaluation, governance implementation

STRATEGIC PURPOSE

Enable the President and Cabinet to exercise informed executive authority over AI strategy, prioritization, and institutional use, consistent with Board-set direction and policy. The track treats AI as a management, capacity, and execution issue rather than a technology concern.

- AI prioritization
- Pilot approval and staging
- Risk mitigation
- Governance enforcement
- Workforce enablement
- Institutional scaling

This track focuses on execution discipline, not just oversight.

WHAT THIS TRACK IS NOT

- ✕ Tool-specific technical training
- ✕ Turning Cabinet members into technologists
- ✕ Replacing existing management judgment
- ✕ Delegating accountability to AI systems

EXECUTIVE LEARNING OUTCOMES

OPERATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

Read AI as a lever for capacity extension, decision acceleration, and service scalability - and translate Board direction into operational priorities and guardrails.

EVALUATION DISCIPLINE

Judge proposals on ROI vs. cost avoidance, capacity vs. staffing growth, pilots vs. scalable capabilities - defining success metrics, stop-loss criteria, and escalation thresholds.

GOVERNANCE EXECUTION

Design and enforce mechanisms that enable safe experimentation, prevent shadow AI, and preserve auditability - aligned to procurement, HR, and data governance.

WORKFORCE LEADERSHIP

Lead adoption as a professional development and capacity strategy, anticipating labor implications without delegating responsibility to technology.

Capstone outcome. Cabinet members can approve, challenge, or redirect AI initiatives based on strategic value, fiduciary responsibility, ethical stewardship, and long-term institutional impact - and present defensible AI recommendations to the Board.

Program design

SESSION 1 - STRATEGIC EXECUTION

Module 1
45 minutes

AI Reality Check for Executives

What AI does well operationally - analysis compression, drafting, pattern surfacing - and where it fails: assumption errors, hallucination, reasoning gaps. Why over-trust reduces executive discernment, and why confidence does not equal capability. Outcome: calibrate expectations and set divisional guardrails.

Module 2
90 minutes

The 4Ds as an executive decision model

Delegation: what gets automated, augmented, prohibited. Discernment: what validation standards exist. Diligence: who owns accountability. Description: whether prompts and use cases are bounded safely. Case discussion identifies success metrics, stop-loss thresholds, scaling criteria, resource implications, and operational sustainability. Outcome: the 4Ds become the evaluation rubric for all AI proposals.

SESSION 2 - RISK MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE ENFORCEMENT

Module 3
60 minutes

Operational risk management in AI-enabled environments

Five risk classes examined before they escalate into compliance failures, audit findings, public controversy, bargaining disputes, or reputational damage: **data risk** (FERPA, personnel, payroll, vendor, fiscal assumptions) · **decision risk** (where output influences high-stakes decisions; mandatory vs. discretionary review; escalation thresholds) · **bias and equity risk** · **operational overreach** (automation beyond intent, shadow AI, inconsistent divisional standards) · **reputational risk**. Applied exercise: a division proposes AI to triage student inquiries, summarize HR complaints, and draft budget variance explanations.

Module 4
60 minutes

Governance execution & internal controls

Translating Board-approved direction into enforceable mechanisms that are transparent, auditable, sustainable, and divisionally consistent - embedded in procurement and vendor management, HR and workforce governance, fiscal oversight, data governance, and Board reporting. Applied exercise: design a lightweight governance structure that avoids bureaucracy while establishing who approves pilots, who monitors performance, who documents controls, and when a matter escalates to the Board.

SESSION 3 - WORKFORCE LEADERSHIP, CAPACITY & COMPETITIVE POSITIONING

Module 5
60 minutes

Workforce enablement, labor stability & role evolution

Capacity extension vs. job elimination · role evolution and required development · labor relations, consultation, and communication sequencing · retention and morale. Applied exercise: budget pressure suggests either hiring two analysts or using AI to extend current team capacity.

Module 6
60 minutes

Institutional strategy & competitive acceleration

Strategic enrollment management · fiscal agility and scenario modeling · operational scalability without headcount growth · regional competitive position. Cabinet identifies one initiative to scale, one to avoid, and one workforce investment necessary for sustainability.

POST-SESSION BEHAVIOR CHANGE

- Govern AI operationally with discipline
- Scale innovation with guardrails
- Reduce unmanaged risk
- Extend institutional capacity under fiscal constraint
- Strengthen professional judgment rather than dilute it
- Move from reactive management to anticipatory leadership

AI is no longer treated as a technology initiative. It functions as an **embedded executive competency** shaping institutional decisions.

Board vs. Cabinet

Same framework, same vocabulary, different responsibility. The Board sets direction and tolerance; the Cabinet executes within it. Neither is a hierarchy of importance; it is a division of accountability.

BOARD

GOVERNANCE JUDGMENT · TIER 1A

Direction. Sets institutional posture on AI.

Fiduciary oversight. Governs investments through outcomes.

Risk tolerance. Defines where AI must not be used.

Policy. Approves policy that enables innovation with control.

Strategic questions. Asks sharper, forward-looking questions.

Institutional stewardship. Balances innovation with stewardship.

CABINET

EXECUTIVE EXECUTION · TIER 1B

Execution. Translates direction into operational priorities.

Prioritization. Sequences initiatives against constraints.

Pilot approval and staging. Decides what is staged, scaled, or stopped.

Internal controls. Preserves auditability; prevents shadow AI.

Risk mitigation. Operationalizes privacy, bias, and review controls.

Workforce enablement. Leads adoption as capacity strategy.

Operational sustainability and scaling.

THE HANDOFF

The Board asks whether an initiative is the right investment and where the boundaries lie. The Cabinet answers with staged pilots, named accountability, defined success metrics, stop-loss criteria, and escalation thresholds - then reports back on the metrics the Board required.

SHARED BY BOTH

The 4Ds, the risk classification levels, the refusal to delegate accountability to a system, and a common non-technical vocabulary. Both tracks explicitly decline to become tool training.

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Differentiate by decision authority, not by seniority. The Board and Cabinet tracks share pre-reads, vocabulary, and case material; what changes is the question each body is asked to answer. That single design choice is what makes the model portable to another institution's governance structure.

05 OPERATIONAL AI FLUENCY

Tier 2 is where institutional AI principles become role-specific operational capability. All three cohorts are summarized here: Administrative Assistants, HR & Fiscal Services, and ITS / IRP / Data.

THE 90-DAY COHORT MODEL

PHASE 1 — Weeks 1–4

Common Core - Foundations

Role reframing, practical fluency for core functions, discernment and accuracy, and the ethical and legal guardrails specific to the cohort's function. Shared vocabulary before any workflow is touched.

↓

PHASE 2 — Weeks 5–8

Role-Specific Application & Workflow Redesign

Participants map a real, high-friction workflow, identify repetition, bottlenecks, and error-prone steps, then redesign the workflow with AI embedded naturally rather than layered on as an extra step.

↓

PHASE 3 — Weeks 9–12

Capstone - Measurable Impact

Each participant presents a redesigned workflow showing the before state, the AI-enabled version, and the measured gain - with accuracy, professionalism, and clear human accountability preserved.

THE ARC OF THE 90 DAYS

LEARN → APPLY → REDESIGN → DEMONSTRATE IMPACT

The objective is not to teach individual AI tasks. It is to move participants from isolated AI use toward workflow-level redesign, while professional judgment stays with the professional.

DELIVERY MODEL

- Cohort size 20–25
- Monthly in-person full-day sessions (3 total)
- Bi-weekly in-person check-ins (2 hours)
- Weekly asynchronous modules via Canvas
- Duration 90 days

IMPLEMENTATION NOTE

Every cohort ends in a presented capstone with an evaluation rubric: measurable gain, maintained quality, clear human accountability, reusability across units. Requiring a demonstrated workflow, rather than a completion certificate, is what turns training into institutional return.

5.1 Administrative Assistants

AI Fluency for Operational Excellence & ***Capacity Extension***

AUDIENCE	COHORT	DURATION
Administrative Assistants: Academic Affairs, Student Services, Administrative Services, ITS, President's Office	20–25 participants	90 days · 3 phases

Strategic purpose. Enable Administrative Assistants to use AI safely and confidently to reduce administrative burden, improve quality, and increase influence - while maintaining professional judgment and institutional trust.

PHASE 1 · COMMON CORE

M1 · Role reframing (90 min). Why ECC is investing in people, not automation. What stays human-led: judgment, institutional context, relationship management.

M2 · Practical fluency (3 hrs, hands-on). Drafting and refining communications; summarizing meetings, policies, and long threads; agendas, minutes, timelines, briefing notes; turning unstructured notes into executive-ready documents.

M3 · Discernment & accuracy. Hallucinations, missing context, tone mismatch; validating output efficiently; when to escalate.

M4 · Ethical and safe use. Enforceable rules for student data, personnel information, and confidential communications - and what must never be entered into AI tools.

PHASE 2 · APPLICATION & REDESIGN

M5 · Workflow integration (4-hr design workshop). Map a real high-friction workflow, identify repetition, bottlenecks, and cognitive overload, then redesign it with AI embedded naturally. Example workflows: meeting prep through follow-up · executive calendar coordination · committee support · program scheduling and tracking.

M6 · Professional growth. Communicating AI-enabled value to supervisors; becoming process improvers, information synthesizers, and operational connectors.

M7 · Behavior change. Start tasks by asking how AI can help; use AI for preparation, not judgment; spend less time drafting and more time coordinating.

PHASE 3 · CAPSTONE

Each participant demonstrates a redesigned, AI-enabled version of one core administrative workflow - before state, redesign, and the resulting time savings, clarity gains, or service improvement - while maintaining accuracy, professionalism, and ethical responsibility. Evaluated on measurable efficiency gain, maintained or improved quality, clear human accountability, and reusability across units.

4D ALIGNMENT

Delegation: deciding when to involve AI · **Description:** context, audience, tone, constraints · **Discernment:** recognizing draft vs. final · **Diligence:** accountability remains human

INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES

- Assistants reclaim significant time
- Bottlenecks decrease across departments
- Service quality improves without added headcount
- Assistants act as force multipliers, not task processors

FROM

"Is AI going to replace me?"

→ TO

"AI frees me to do higher-value work."

5.2 HR & Fiscal Services

AI Fluency for Compliance-Centered Decision Support & ***Institutional Control***

AUDIENCE	COHORT	DURATION
Human Resources; Fiscal Services (Budget, Payroll, Accounting); Procurement & Contracts	20–25 participants	90 days · 3 phases

Strategic purpose. Enable HR and Fiscal Services staff to use AI to strengthen controls, reduce error risk, accelerate analysis, and improve documentation quality - without automating approvals or introducing compliance exposure.

AI-SUPPORTED PREPARATION & ANALYSIS

Drafting, summarization, reconciliation support, triage, scenario modeling, variance explanation, audit documentation, first-pass contract and policy review.

NEVER CROSSED

HUMAN AUTHORIZATION & ACCOUNTABILITY

Final approvals, payroll release, personnel actions, disciplinary decisions. AI must never operate independently here.

PHASE 1 · COMMON CORE

M1 · Role reframing (90 min). AI as a control-enhancing partner: why HR and fiscal functions are strong use cases when the separation above is respected.

M2 · Practical fluency (3 hrs, hands-on). HR guidance and procedures; summarizing contracts, MOUs, policies, and regulations; first-pass budget narratives and variance explanations; audit support materials.

M3 · Discernment & verification. Incorrect assumptions, misapplied rules, over-generalized interpretations; cross-checking against source systems; independent validation triggers and escalation thresholds.

M4 · Legal and regulatory guardrails. Employee and personnel data; payroll, benefits, compensation; vendor, procurement, and contract data; financial reporting and audit materials.

PHASE 2 · CONTROLS & PROCESS OPTIMIZATION

M5 · Process optimization (4 hrs). Map an existing workflow; identify repetition, error-prone steps, and manual reconciliation pain; redesign so AI performs triage and preparation, flags anomalies and exceptions, and supports but never replaces approvals. Example workflows: budget variance analysis · contract and policy review · audit preparation · classification and compensation comparisons.

M6 · Strategic capacity extension. Running multiple budget or staffing scenarios quickly; identifying anomalies earlier; clearer documentation for leadership; AI as a burnout-reduction strategy.

M7 · Behavior change. First-pass analysis by AI rather than manual line-by-line review; scenario testing instead of single-point projections; time shifted from reconciliation to interpretation.

PHASE 3 · CAPSTONE

Participants or teams present a redesigned HR or fiscal workflow showing before and after, measurable time savings, and reduced error or risk exposure - documenting human approval points, verification steps, and accountability ownership. Evaluated on compliance integrity, control strength, documentation clarity, and reusability.

INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES

· Operations run faster and safer
· Error rates and rework decrease
· Audit preparation becomes continuous, not episodic
· Leadership receives clearer, more defensible analysis

FROM

"AI increases audit risk."

→ TO

"AI reduces error rates and improves defensibility."

5.3 ITS / IRP / Data

AI Fluency for Responsible Enablement at Scale & ***Governed Enterprise Capability***

AUDIENCE	COHORT	DURATION
Information Technology Services; Institutional Research & Planning; Data	20–25 participants	90 days · 3 phases

Strategic purpose. Shift ITS and IRP staff from tool managers to architects of scalable, governed AI capability. AI is treated as an enterprise capability that must be architected, governed, and supported, not merely deployed - and these roles act as enablers and stewards of AI fluency across the District rather than sole owners of AI use.

Experimentation
One-off use cases, tested in the open with guardrails.

→

Operational deployment
Reusable services integrated into real pipelines.

→

Institutionalized services
Enterprise-grade capability: scalable, auditable, maintainable.

PHASE 1 · COMMON CORE

Role reframing. AI as an institutional capability rather than a standalone tool; ITS and IRP as enablers, not sole owners.

Practical fluency. Data exploration, summarization, and pattern identification; rapid prototyping of dashboards, reports, and analytic narratives; documentation of systems, integrations, and workflows; technical guidance and user-facing explanations.

Discernment & analytic integrity. Statistical validity and methodological soundness; data lineage, completeness, and bias; overconfidence in generated insights. Findings validated against source systems and established metrics, with uncertainty and assumptions communicated plainly to non-technical stakeholders.

PHASE 2 · GOVERNANCE, ARCHITECTURE & SCALE

Governance and responsible enablement. Defining and enforcing guardrails: approved tools and models, data access boundaries, and security, privacy, and retention standards - against the risks of shadow AI and unsanctioned tools, model drift and output variability, data leakage, and vendor dependency.

Architecture and integration. Embedding AI into enterprise systems (ERP, SIS, HRIS), reporting and analytics pipelines, and workflow orchestration - distinguishing one-off use cases from reusable services and enterprise-grade capabilities.

Decision velocity. Faster scenario modeling, more timely performance indicators, and predictive or leading indicators rather than lagging reports - supporting proactive enrollment management, early risk detection, and adaptive resource allocation.

PHASE 3 · CAPSTONE

Participants present an AI-enabled institutional capability - a governed analytics accelerator, a decision-support prototype, or an AI-enabled workflow service - demonstrating improved decision velocity, maintained data integrity, clear governance, and scalability beyond a single use case.

WHAT THIS TRACK IS NOT

Turning staff into AI researchers or model developers · centralizing all AI usage within ITS or IRP · sacrificing data governance for speed · promoting uncontrolled experimentation.

INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES

· Data-to-insight cycles compress while rigor holds
· Governance and guardrails are designed in, not added after
· Pilots become sustainable institutional assets
· ITS and IRP act as strategic accelerators, not bottlenecks

FROM
"AI is a tool we deploy."

→ TO
"AI is a capability we architect and govern."

Role differentiation across the model

One framework, seven audiences. What changes is not the vocabulary but the question each role is trained to answer - and what each role must never hand over.

AUDIENCE	FLUENCY EMPHASIS	WHAT THE ROLE DOES WITH AI	WHAT MUST REMAIN HUMAN
Board of Trustees Tier 1A	Governance judgment	Sets direction, risk tolerance, and policy; evaluates initiatives through fiduciary questions and the 4Ds without needing technical depth.	Board votes, policy approval, strategic priorities, accreditation judgments.
Executive Cabinet Tier 1B	Executive decision-making and institutional control	Prioritizes, stages pilots, sets guardrails and success metrics, enforces auditability, and reports to the Board.	Management judgment, accountability ownership, decisions on where AI will and will not be used.
Administrative Assistants Tier 2	Operational capacity and workflow redesign	Drafts, summarizes, organizes, and prepares - then redesigns whole workflows rather than single tasks.	Judgment, institutional context, relationship management; final review before work reaches leadership.
HR & Fiscal Services Tier 2	Compliance-centered analysis and control	Performs first-pass analysis, triage, reconciliation support, scenario testing, and audit documentation; flags anomalies.	Final approvals, payroll release, personnel actions, disciplinary decisions; legal and professional review.
ITS / IRP / Data Tier 2	Governed enablement and enterprise capability	Compresses data-to-insight cycles; prototypes decision support; architects reusable, auditable AI services and their guardrails.	Methodological validity, data governance, and which tools, models, and data are approved at all.
Marketing & Communications Tier 3	Reach and consistency at brand integrity	Drafts, adapts, and repurposes content across channels and audiences; tests messaging before release.	Institutional voice, narrative ownership, and every public messaging decision.
Student Services Tier 3	Service capacity with preserved equity	Handles transactional interactions, triage, and outreach prioritization; surfaces students at risk earlier.	Counseling, advising, case management, and any high-stakes academic or financial decision.
Facilities / Operations Tier 3	Operational intelligence and preventive planning	Summarizes logs and inspections, forecasts failures and resource needs, triages and prioritizes work orders.	Physical work, safety-critical decisions, and licensed professional judgment.

ALSO IN THE FRAMEWORK

All seven tracks share one three-phase, capstone-evaluated structure. Sections 04 and 05 cover the governance, executive, and Tier 2 operational tracks; Section 06 covers the three Tier 3 strategic tracks. The rows below hold the whole model in one view.

WHY THIS IS THE ARCHITECTURE

Role-based differentiation is not a scheduling convenience. It is what allows a single institution to give a trustee, an executive, and an administrative professional the same principles - classify risk, verify output, keep accountability human - expressed in the terms each of them actually works in.

REPLICATION TAKEAWAY

Build the matrix before the curriculum. Naming what each role decides, and what it must never delegate, determines the training content - not the reverse. An institution with different division structures can redraw the rows and keep the model intact.

06 STRATEGIC AMPLIFICATION

Tier 3 extends AI fluency to the functions that carry the institution's voice, its student relationships, and its physical operations. A 90-day AI Fluency Strategic Program with three cohorts, following the same three phases as Tier 2: Common Core, Role-Specific Tracks, and Capstone, at 4–6 weeks each.

6.1

Marketing & Communication

Scaling reach and consistency while preserving authenticity and public trust.

6.2

Student Services

Reaching more students more effectively without losing the human connection.

6.3

Facilities / Operations

Improving reliability and reducing crisis-driven, reactive work.

THE SHARED BOUNDARY IN EVERY TIER 3 TRACK

AI AMPLIFIES

Drafting, adaptation, and repurposing across channels · plain-language summaries of complex policy · triage, routing, and prioritization · trend and backlog analysis · preparation, documentation, and reporting.

HUMANS LEAD

Institutional voice and narrative ownership · relational, high-stakes student interactions · counseling, advising, and case management · safety-critical decisions and licensed professional judgment · physical work.

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Each Tier 3 track names the thing AI must not touch before it names what AI can do. Marketing scales authenticity rather than manufacturing it; Student Services scales care rather than commoditizing it; Facilities augments expertise rather than automating responsibility. Stating the limit first is what makes the amplification safe.

6.1 Marketing & Communications

AI Fluency for Creative Acceleration & ***Institutional Voice***

AUDIENCE	COHORT	DURATION
Marketing & Communications	One of three Tier 3 cohorts	90 days · 3 phases

Strategic purpose. Treat AI as a creative acceleration and amplification tool rather than a substitute for institutional voice, judgment, or values - distinguishing AI-assisted content generation from human-led narrative ownership, so the College extends capacity without diluting its voice or credibility.

PHASE 1 · COMMON CORE

Practical fluency. Drafting and iterating content for web, email, social media, and print; adapting messages for students, parents, community, Board, and media; summarizing complex initiatives, policies, or reports into accessible narratives; generating campaign concepts, content calendars, and messaging frameworks - with prompting that specifies tone, audience, channel, and constraints while holding to brand standards.

Discernment & message integrity. Checking factual accuracy and clarity, tone and alignment with institutional values, and the risk of misinterpretation or overstatement - identifying where output requires fact-checking, editorial refinement, or legal, leadership, and policy review.

Reputational guardrails. Transparency and disclosure expectations; avoidance of misleading or synthetic representations; equity and accessibility; rules for AI use in storytelling, imagery, personalization, and crisis communications. Reputational risk differs from operational risk and requires heightened scrutiny.

PHASE 2 · SCALABILITY & POSITIONING

Workflow integration. First drafts and outlines, content repurposing across channels, localization and audience adaptation, and performance summaries redesigned so AI handles preparation and variation - freeing staff for strategy, storytelling, and stakeholder alignment, and increasing campaign throughput without increasing burnout.

Strategic storytelling. Identifying emerging themes from institutional activity, translating strategic initiatives into compelling public stories, and supporting enrollment, reputation, and community engagement goals - aligned to institutional priorities, equity and inclusion commitments, and long-term brand positioning.

Behavior change. Content development starts with AI-assisted ideation and structuring; messages are tested and refined before public release; less time on first drafts and more on narrative strategy.

PHASE 3 · CAPSTONE

Participants present an AI-enabled campaign or communication workflow - a multi-channel initiative, a content repurposing pipeline, or a messaging framework - demonstrating increased output, maintained brand integrity, verified accuracy, and improved engagement metrics.

WHAT THIS TRACK IS NOT

Automating institutional voice or messaging decisions · replacing human editors, strategists, or spokespersons · generating deceptive or undisclosed AI-created content · sacrificing trust for speed or volume.

INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES

- Content cycles shorten while alignment improves
- Marketing operations scale without added burnout
- Messaging becomes proactive and data-informed
- Marketing shifts to strategic narrative leadership

THE LINE THIS TRACK HOLDS

AI accelerates drafting.

→

Humans safeguard meaning, accuracy, and trust.

6.2 Student Services

AI Fluency for Service Capacity, Equity & ***Human Care***

AUDIENCE	COHORT	DURATION
Student Services	One of three Tier 3 cohorts	90 days · 3 phases

Strategic purpose. Use AI as a service capacity multiplier that enhances access and responsiveness without replacing human empathy, judgment, or care - separating transactional student interactions that can be augmented from relational, high-stakes interactions that must remain human-led.

TRANSACTIONAL · MAY BE AUGMENTED

First-pass responses to common questions, appointment scheduling and reminders, documentation and case summaries, routing and prioritization of student requests.

NEVER CROSSED

RELATIONAL · MUST REMAIN HUMAN-LED

Counseling, advising, and case management; high-stakes academic and financial decisions; any interaction where care, context, or consequence is central.

PHASE 1 · COMMON CORE

Practical fluency. Drafting and tailoring student communications; summarizing policies, procedures, and requirements in plain language; preparing outreach lists, reminders, and follow-ups; supporting intake, triage, and routing - with prompting that specifies student context and service goals and adapts messaging across populations and needs.

Discernment & student-centered judgment. Evaluating outputs for accuracy and alignment with current policy, for tone, clarity, and inclusivity, and for potential misunderstanding or harm - and recognizing where AI assistance is inappropriate and human intervention is required.

Equity and privacy guardrails. Student privacy (FERPA); sensitive personal, academic, and financial information; equity impacts across diverse populations. Rules cover data minimization and anonymization, avoiding automated decisions with high-stakes outcomes, and mitigating bias or unequal service outcomes.

PHASE 2 · SCALABILITY & EARLY INTERVENTION

Workflow integration. High-volume service tasks redesigned so AI handles preparation and triage, freeing staff for complex, relational cases - improving service availability without increasing staff burnout.

Proactive support. AI-supported insights used to identify students at risk earlier, prioritize outreach based on need, and coordinate interventions across services - supporting, never replacing, human-led case management and advising.

Behavior change. AI is used to prepare and prioritize before engaging with students; low-risk transactional steps are automated to protect time for meaningful interactions; services are designed around student experience rather than staff capacity constraints.

PHASE 3 · CAPSTONE

Participants present an AI-enabled student service workflow - an intake triage model, an outreach campaign, or a support routing process - demonstrating improved response times, maintained equity, clear human oversight, and measurable improvements in student access or satisfaction.

WHAT THIS TRACK IS NOT

Replacing counselors, advisors, or case managers · automating high-stakes academic or financial decisions · reducing services to scripted or impersonal interactions · treating students as data points rather than individuals.

INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES

- Routine interactions become faster and more consistent
- Service scales sustainably while quality and care hold
- Support shifts from reactive to proactive engagement
- Access improves without compromising equity or trust

THE LINE THIS TRACK HOLDS

This track is about scaling care. → **Not commoditizing it.**

6.3 Facilities / Operations

AI Fluency for Operational Intelligence & ***Asset Stewardship***

AUDIENCE	COHORT	DURATION
Facilities and Operations	One of three Tier 3 cohorts	90 days · 3 phases

Strategic purpose. Treat AI as an operational intelligence and coordination tool that enhances planning, prioritization, and reliability rather than replacing trades expertise or on-the-ground judgment - separating tasks suitable for augmentation (planning, forecasting, triage, documentation) from tasks that must remain human-performed (physical work, safety-critical decisions).

PHASE 1 · COMMON CORE

Practical fluency. Summarizing work orders, inspections, and maintenance logs; drafting scopes of work, schedules, and project updates; analyzing maintenance trends, downtime, and backlog drivers; preparing reports for leadership, regulators, or the Board - with prompting that clarifies operational context and constraints and translates technical information into executive-ready summaries.

Discernment & safety-critical judgment. Evaluating outputs for technical accuracy and applicability, compliance with codes, standards, and safety requirements, and feasibility given site conditions - identifying where suggestions require verification by licensed professionals, field validation, or escalation. AI never substitutes for professional or safety judgment.

Risk and stewardship guardrails. Inaccurate technical assumptions, over-automation of safety-sensitive processes, and data quality or integration risks. Rules cover AI use in safety, emergency, and compliance contexts, the handling of drawings, specifications, and sensitive infrastructure data, and documentation of AI-assisted planning decisions.

PHASE 2 · PREVENTIVE OPERATIONS

Workflow integration. Work order triage and prioritization, preventive maintenance scheduling, project status tracking and reporting, and vendor and contractor coordination redesigned so AI flags risks and patterns early, supports preventive rather than reactive maintenance, and improves communication across departments.

Capacity extension. AI-supported insights used to optimize staffing and scheduling, prioritize capital and deferred maintenance investments, and forecast resource needs and system failures - extending team capacity without increasing headcount while improving service levels, asset longevity, and energy efficiency.

Behavior change. Trends are analyzed before problems escalate; recommendations to leadership are clearer and data-supported; manual documentation and reporting burden falls; coordination across trades, vendors, and departments improves.

PHASE 3 · CAPSTONE

Participants present an AI-enabled operational improvement - a preventive maintenance prioritization model, a work order triage redesign, or a reporting workflow - demonstrating reduced response times, improved asset reliability, clearer decision-making, and maintained safety and compliance.

WHAT THIS TRACK IS NOT

Replacing skilled trades or licensed professionals · automating safety-critical decisions · substituting AI for field experience and judgment · introducing unvetted technical guidance into operations.

INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES

· Planning and administrative work is faster and clearer
· Operations shift from firefighting to preventive execution
· Resource and capital decisions become more predictive
· Reliability improves while safety accountability holds

THE LINE THIS TRACK HOLDS

This track is about augmenting expertise. → **Not automating responsibility.**

07 PUTTING THE MODEL INTO PRACTICE

The four resources in this toolkit are not four separate documents. They are one operating sequence: boundaries, then questions, then capability, then evidence.

01 Classify the risk
Acceptable, mitigated, or unacceptable. Page 05.

02 Define human accountability
Name the person, not the system, and the checkpoint at which they act.

03 Evaluate the initiative
Five fiduciary questions and the 4D assessment. Pages 07–09.

04 Determine governance and decision rights
Board policy or administrative procedure? Approve, stage, redirect, or decline.

05 Build role-appropriate fluency
Match depth to decision authority and operational leverage. Pages 10–13.

06 Pilot
Stage it. Define stop-loss criteria and escalation thresholds before launch.

07 Measure
Against the success metrics the Board required - not against enthusiasm.

08 Scale, modify, or stop
All three remain legitimate outcomes. Stopping is a governance success, not a failure.

HOW THE COMPONENTS FIT TOGETHER

Risk classification establishes the boundaries of acceptable institutional use.

Board review provides the governance questions asked of every proposal.

The AI Fluency Framework establishes the institutional capability to act on those answers.

Role-specific training translates the framework into daily practice and measurable results.

GOVERNANCE QUESTION

Which of these eight steps does your institution currently perform, and which does it assume? Most colleges can point to a tool inventory and a policy statement; fewer can name the person accountable for a specific AI-assisted output, or the metric that would cause them to stop.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE

Acceptable risk should be **enabled**. Mitigated risk should be **governed**. Unacceptable risk should remain **human**.

PRESENTATION

Governing AI Before It Governs You: *Building Role-Based AI Fluency Across a Community College*

El Camino College

ACCT Leadership Congress · October 2026

Loïc Audusseau
Chief Technology Officer
laudusseau@elcamino.edu

Attendees leave with three things: a practical way to classify AI risk, a practical way to evaluate AI initiatives, and a replicable model for building role-based AI fluency across an institution.

Scan for ECC AI resources and presentation materials.

ai.elcamino.edu

ACCESSIBILITY NOTES

Risk levels are identified by symbol (✓ acceptable, ! mitigated, × unacceptable), label, and position as well as color, and remain legible in grayscale. Diagrams carry descriptive labels for screen readers; recommended alt text for the four principal diagrams: the four-step sequence (p. 02), the three-tier architecture (p. 11), the Board–Cabinet comparison (p. 18), and the three-phase 90-day model (p. 19).

SOURCE MATERIALS

Content in this toolkit is drawn from the ECC AI Governance Risk Classification Framework, the Board AI Initiative Review template, the ECC AI Fluency Professional Development Framework, and and the Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 track objectives. Program summaries are condensed; the full framework and syllabi remain the authoritative source.