

## Curricular Program Self-Assessment & Leadership Review Tool

Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_ | Program: \_\_\_\_\_ | Department Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ | Date: \_\_\_\_\_

| Category                                                                                                                                    | Level 3<br>Integrating (3 pts)                                                                                                                                                    | Level 2<br>Developing (2 pts)                                                                                                                                     | Level 2<br>Developing (2 pts)                                                                                                                                 | Level 0<br>Not Started (0 pts)                                                                                                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>1. Faculty AI Readiness</b><br>Faculty have participated in AI 101 and 201                                                               | ≥75% of faculty have completed AI training.                                                                                                                                       | ≥50% of faculty have completed AI training                                                                                                                        | ≥25% of program faculty have completed AI 101 for Faculty or equivalent training.                                                                             | Not started or not tracked.                                                                                                   |
| <b>2. Workforce Readiness (Industry Alignment)</b><br>Dept. conducts an AI skill gap analysis performed with industry partners or job data. | A formal AI skill gap analysis has been completed using industry partner input AND/OR verified job posting data. Findings are documented and shared with all faculty in the dept. | Program has conducted at least 1 documented conversation or survey with ≥2 industry partners about AI skill expectations. Summary of findings on file.            | Program has identified relevant industry partners OR reviewed publicly available job posting data for AI skill trends in the field. Notes or summary on file. | An AI-focused industry alignment process has not yet been initiated.                                                          |
| <b>3. Program AI. Policy</b><br>The program has created an AI policy to be shared across courses.                                           | The program has an AI policy that has been discussed, debated, and approved by the faculty.                                                                                       | The program has an AI policy in draft form and is currently discussing and revising the policy                                                                    | The program's AI policy is currently being written.                                                                                                           | A documented AI policy for the program has not yet been created.                                                              |
| <b>4. AI / Syllabus Integration</b><br>Every course syllabus has statements on AI ethics and expectations.                                  | ≥75% of courses include an AI ethics and/or expectations statement.                                                                                                               | ≥25% of courses include an AI ethics and/or expectations statement.                                                                                               | At least 1 course includes a syllabus AI ethics and/or expectations statement.                                                                                | Not started or not tracked.                                                                                                   |
| <b>5. AI Literacy Progression Plan</b><br>Program has documented AI literacy progression plan.                                              | ≥50% of courses include AI literacy outcomes. Program has a documented AI literacy progression from entry to capstone with a published outcome map.                               | ≥25% of courses include a documented AI literacy learning outcome AND students are required to complete AI 101/201. Curriculum map shows AI literacy touchpoints. | At least 1 course includes AI literacy content OR students are directed to AI 101/201. Syllabus or catalog language referencing AI literacy exists.           | AI literacy has not yet been introduced into program coursework. No outcomes, syllabi, or assignments currently reference AI. |

| Category                                                                                                                                                     | Level 3<br>Integrating (3 pts)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Level 2<br>Developing (2 pts)                                                                                                                                                                      | Level 2<br>Developing (2 pts)                                                                                                                                                                  | Level 0<br>Not Started (0 pts)                                                                                                                                               |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>6. Course Outcomes</b><br><b>BYU-Idaho AI Skills Rubric</b><br>Course outcomes revisited and AI outcomes written using the BYU-Idaho AI Skills Framework. | ≥50% of courses have outcomes written using the BYU-Idaho AI Skills Rubric. Revised outcomes entered in Quali.                                                                                                                                                                | ≥25% of courses have outcomes written or revised using the BYU-Idaho AI Skills Rubric. Revised outcome entered in Quali.                                                                           | At least 1 faculty member has used the BYU-Idaho AI Skills Rubric to evaluate or rewrite a course outcome. Revised outcome(s) entered in Quali.                                                | Course outcomes have not yet been reviewed or revised with AI in mind.                                                                                                       |
| <b>7. Assessment Redesign</b><br>Key assessments redesigned for a world with AI using the BYU-Idaho 3-Lane Approach.                                         | ≥50% of courses have key assessments redesigned using the BYU-Idaho 3-Lane Approach. Redesign documentation submitted to Dept. Chair or Curr. Council.                                                                                                                        | ≥25% of courses have at least 1 key assessment redesigned using the BYU-Idaho 3-Lane Approach.                                                                                                     | At least 1 faculty member has reviewed a key assessment using the BYU-Idaho 3-Lane Approach.                                                                                                   | Key assessments have not yet been reviewed or redesigned with AI in mind.                                                                                                    |
| <b>8. AI in Pedagogy</b><br>AI is used intentionally to strengthen learning when, and only when, it supports the primary instructional objective.            | The program demonstrates shared pedagogical judgment: AI is integrated selectively, consistently, and transparently where it measurably improves learning outcomes, and intentionally excluded where it does not. Decisions are documented and reviewed at the program level. | The program has articulated clear pedagogical criteria for when AI is appropriate. Multiple courses document intentional decisions to use or deliberately not use AI based on learning objectives. | The program has identified specific instructional contexts where AI may support learning (and where it should not). At least 1 course documents a pedagogical rationale for AI use or non use. | The program has not articulated how AI should (or should not) be used pedagogically. AI use decisions are implicit, inconsistent, or left entirely to individual preference. |

## Scoring Summary

### Instructions:

Each category is scored from 0–3 points based on the descriptors above.

Programs should score themselves honestly based on documented evidence, not intent or aspiration.

| #                      | Category                                     | Score (0–3) |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1                      | Faculty AI Readiness                         |             |
| 2                      | Workforce Readiness — Industry Alignment     |             |
| 3                      | AI Dept. Policy                              |             |
| 4                      | Course Outcomes — BYU-Idaho AI Skills Rubric |             |
| 5                      | AI / Syllabus Integration                    |             |
| 6                      | AI Literacy Integration                      |             |
| 7                      | Assessment Redesign                          |             |
| 8                      | AI in Pedagogy                               |             |
| TOTAL SCORE (Max = 24) |                                              |             |

## Overall Rating & Interpretation

**Important:** This scorecard is a developmental progress tool, not a ranking mechanism.

Scores are intended to help programs understand where they are and what to focus on next.

| Total Score | Stage       | What This Means                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 0–5         | Beginning   | The program has not yet engaged in coordinated AI integration. Focus should be on faculty readiness, department level policy, and baseline AI literacy. This stage is expected for many programs.                                                    |
| 6–11        | Emerging    | Initial structures are forming. Faculty training, early policy work, or isolated course level efforts are underway. The next focus should be program level coherence (policy, outcomes, and literacy progression).                                   |
| 12–17       | Developing  | The program is making intentional progress. Outcomes, assessments, and syllabi are beginning to reflect AI realities. The next focus should be industry alignment, assessment redesign, and shared pedagogical judgment.                             |
| 18–24       | Integrating | AI integration is intentional, principled, and aligned with institutional priorities. The program demonstrates faculty readiness, curricular coherence, ethical grounding, and pedagogical restraint. These programs may serve as models for others. |

## Data, Reporting, and Review Framework

This section clarifies how each category in the AI Readiness Scorecard is interpreted, measured, and reviewed. The intent is to ensure shared understanding, consistent reporting, and predictable review cycles across all programs. Each category includes:

**Primary Expectation** — What the university is asking programs to do

**Reporting Mechanism** — How evidence is gathered or verified

**Reporting Cadence** — How often the data is reviewed or updated

### 1. Faculty AI Readiness

#### Primary Expectation

Program faculty are developing baseline AI literacy and pedagogical fluency through completion of **AI 101 and AI 201 (or approved equivalents)**.

#### Reporting Mechanism

- Completion data pulled from the AI 101 / AI 201 courses (Canvas LMS)
- Aggregated participation reports provided to departments and deans

#### Reporting Cadence

- Reported each semester

### 2. Workforce Readiness — Industry Alignment

#### Primary Expectation

Programs conduct AI Skills gap analysis with industry partner(s). The analysis report is shared with all faculty within the program.

#### Reporting Mechanism

- Program review
- Written summaries of industry conversations, surveys, or job posting analyses
- Documentation maintained at the department or college level

#### Reporting Cadence

**Every year**, or in conjunction with formal program review cycles

### 3. AI Department Policy

#### Primary Expectation

Departments establish a **shared, faculty approved policy** that articulates expectations for AI use in teaching, learning, and assessment.

#### Reporting Mechanism

- Department level AI policy document on file
- Confirmation of faculty discussion and approval (meeting notes or vote record)

#### Reporting Cadence

- **Reviewed every 2 years**, or sooner if institutional guidance changes

## 4. AI / Syllabus Integration

### Primary Expectation

Courses clearly communicate AI expectations and ethical guidance to students, grounded in gospel principles and institutional direction. AI expectations are posted in the course syllabus

### Reporting Mechanism

- FTC Syllabus review (spot checks or sampled audits)
- Department reported counts of courses with AI statements

### Reporting Cadence

- Week 3, each Semester.

## 5. AI Literacy Progression Plan

### Primary Expectation

Programs define a **progression of AI literacy** from entry level coursework through capstone or advanced experiences.

### Reporting Mechanism

- Annual Program Review
- Program level AI literacy map or curriculum documentation

### Reporting Cadence

- Annually, aligned with program reporting.

## 6. Course Outcomes — BYU-Idaho AI Skills Rubric

### Primary Expectation

Course outcomes are intentionally reviewed and, where appropriate, revised using the BYU-Idaho AI Skills Rubric, aligned to the Learning Model.

### Reporting Mechanism

- Program Review

### Reporting Cadence

- Annually, aligned with program reporting.

## 7. Assessment Redesign

### Primary Expectation

Key assessments are redesigned to remain valid, authentic, and meaningful in a world where AI is widely available, using the BYU-Idaho 3 Lane Approach.

### Reporting Mechanism

- Program Review

### Reporting Cadence

- Annually, aligned with program reporting.

## 8. AI in Pedagogy

### Primary Expectation

Programs discuss and share **pedagogical practices**, using AI intentionally when it strengthens learning and deliberately excluding it when it does not.

### Reporting Mechanism

- Program Review

### Reporting Cadence

- Annually, aligned with program reporting.

## How Leadership Should Read These Results

**Low scores are not failures** — they indicate where support is needed.

**High scores do not mean “more AI”** — they indicate better judgment about when and how AI belongs.

A strong program is not one that uses AI everywhere, but one that:

- Prepares faculty thoughtfully
- Aligns with workforce realities
- Grounds decisions in gospel principles
- Redesigns assessment honestly
- Uses AI only when it strengthens learning