

QBS Procedural Self-Audit

Assessing Your Organization's Readiness to Turn AI Policy into Practice

From Policy to Practice · AI4MN Summit, St. Cloud, June 15 to 16, 2026 · 60-minute session · Quantum Bridge Solutions · v2

This audit supports Learning Target 2: assess current-state maturity across the core procedural areas. Work through the eight procedures below, rate each on the 0 to 3 maturity scale, and carry your lowest scores into the gap-prioritization page. There are no wrong answers; an honest baseline is the point. Most organizations score lower than they expect, and that is exactly the gap this session is designed to close.

A. Orientation

Organization / Role	Sector (circle)	Approx. size	Date
Foley Public Schools	PK-12 Education	1700	09/17/2026

B. Foundations Pre-Check

Before rating procedures, confirm the prerequisites are in place. Check each box that is true today.

- X A board- or executive-level AI policy has been formally adopted (the "what").
- ☐ A companion procedural manual or guide exists and is current (the "how").
- X The H-AI-H / human-in-the-loop principle is named and understood as the operating base.
- ☐ An AI Committee (or equivalent governing body) is chartered and meeting.
- X A single accountable owner (AI Coordinator or designee) has been named.

C. Maturity Scale

0 - None / Shadow	1 - Emerging / Ad hoc	2 - Defined / Documented	3 - Operational / Reviewed
No procedure exists; use is happening informally and unmanaged.	Some practice exists but is inconsistent, undocumented, or owned by no one.	Written, approved, and communicated, but not yet routinely used or measured.	Used in daily practice, owned, trained on, and reviewed on a set cadence.

D. The Eight Load-Bearing Procedures

For each procedure: read what "good" looks like, consider the diagnostic prompts, then enter one maturity score (0 to 3) and a note on your evidence or your biggest gap.

1. Staff / Employee Use Guidelines	Maturity (0-3)
<i>Anchored in: Policy 625 Art. VIII; Guide Sec. VIII & Appendix 16</i>	
What good looks like: Clear, communicated rules for everyday responsible use: what is permitted, attribution expectations, the limits of AI for work involving people, and the data that may never be entered.	1
Diagnostic prompts: • Could a new employee find and understand the rules in under five minutes? • Do staff know AI may not be the sole basis for decisions about a person? • Is supervisory direction defined, not just employee rules? Evidence / biggest gap: There is currently a lack of processes and procedures for employees to utilize AI in the school district. Currently, Gemini is disabled, and the official means of accessing an LLM is restricted to staff only when not using the school Google account. Without this centralized process, student images and other materials are being entered into public LLMs, leading to possible data exposure and leaking of private information. Additionally, there is no attribution being used when LLM or AI is utilized to create material, leading to reliability and fact-checking concerns.	