

Action Map

AI Literacy for the Modern Workforce

Following Cathy Moore's action mapping method¹, organized by the 4D competency taxonomy of Delegation, Description, Discernment, and Diligence².

Delivery note. Each practice activity below is mapped to two deliverables: a custom-coded platform component (Component 4) and a corporate Articulate (Rise 360 / Storyline) component (Component 5). The program was designed against both contexts to demonstrate that the instructional design transfers across a bespoke build and a standard authoring stack. The custom platform was built and shipped (ritchot.me/courses/ai-literacy); the Articulate build was specified but not produced, a deliberate scope decision for an independent portfolio project without enterprise funding. The Component 5 mappings are retained because the interaction-fidelity tradeoffs they record are part of the design analysis.

CENTER – MEASURABLE BUSINESS GOAL

Within 90 days of program completion, participants consistently select appropriate tasks for AI use, apply structured evaluation to AI-generated outputs before incorporation into business deliverables, and use a shared competency vocabulary to make their AI practices visible to colleagues and managers, with measurable gains in productive AI utilization and reductions in unverified AI output across participating teams.

Specific performance targets (e.g., percentage reduction in unverified outputs, increase in task range) are calibrated to organizational baselines during deployment. The directional commitment is fixed; the threshold is context-dependent. Level 4 measures this goal: productive utilization through the efficiency KPIs (E1–E3), unverified output through the AI-related error rate (Q1), and visible practice through the transparency and concealment KPIs (A1–A2); see [Level 4: Results](#).

Ring 1 – Observable Behaviors

Ring 2 – Practice Activities

Ring 3 – Reference Information

Delegation

Setting goals and deciding whether, when, and how to engage with AI

3

D1 Define task goals and appropriate AI components

D2 Distinguish augmentation from human-only tasks

D3 Identify AI capability boundaries before delegating

Description

Effectively describing goals to prompt useful AI behaviors and outputs

3

D4 Provide context, constraints, and specifications

D5 Specify format, audience, and quality criteria

D6 Iterate through multi-turn refinement

Discernment

Accurately assessing the usefulness of AI outputs and behaviors

3

D7 Verify factual claims against independent sources

D8 Recognize hallucination and capability-range failures

D9 Evaluate reasoning process, not just final output

Diligence

Taking responsibility for what we do with AI and how we do it

3

D10 Document AI's role in deliverables

D11 Full accountability before sharing AI-assisted output

D12 Discuss AI practices openly using 4D vocabulary

Competency definitions after Dakan & Feller (2025)³, in the form used by Anthropic’s AI Fluency course⁴.

RING 2 – PRACTICE ACTIVITIES (12)

P1 Interactive Data Narrative

Module 1 · 4C / 5B

P2 Stigma Data Reflection

Module 1 · 4C / 5B

P3 Dashboard: Augmentation vs. Automation

Module 2 · 4A / 5B

P4 Dashboard: Productivity Distributions

Module 2 · 4A / 5B

P5 Tokenizer Playground

Module 3 · 4C / 5A

P6 Next-Token Prediction Demo

Module 3 · 4C / 5A

P7 Context Window Scenario

Module 3 · 4C / 5A

P8 Task Decomposition Exercise

Module 4 · 4B / 5A

P9 Prompt Reformulation Comparison

Module 4 · 4B / 5A

P10 Output Verification Scenario

Module 4 · 4B / 5A

P11 Iterative Refinement Exercise

Module 4 · 4B / 5A

P12 Diligence Statement Practice

Module 4 · 4B / 5A

RING 3 - REFERENCE INFORMATION (7)

R14D Competency Quick-Reference Card

R4Output Verification Checklist

R7Organizational AI Use Policy Starter

R2Task Delegation Decision Guide

R5AI Capability Boundary Reference

R3Prompt Structure Template

R6AI Diligence Statement Template

Traceability Summary

Every Ring 1 behavior (D1–D12) maps to at least one practice activity (P1–P12) and at least one reference item (R1–R7). Every practice activity maps to a specific component deliverable in both the custom platform (Component 4) and the Articulate platform (Component 5). Every reference item is designed as a job aid that sustains the behavior after the learning experience ends. The metadata (gap traces, module traces, sub-component alignment) is the verification scaffold and feeds directly into the program's alignment matrix.

Traceability verification (all six tests pass):

1. Every behavior traces backward to a documented gap in the capability gap analysis or the learner persona (12/12)
2. Every behavior traces forward to at least one practice activity (12/12)
3. Every practice activity traces to a specific Component 4 and Component 5 deliverable (12/12)
4. Every reference item supports at least one behavior (7/7)
5. Every behavior is supported by at least one reference item (12/12)
6. No orphaned elements in any ring (pass)

Scope and Feasibility Notes

- Practice activity distribution is intentionally weighted toward Modules 3 and 4 (seven of twelve activities) where skill-building occurs. Modules 1 and 2 carry awareness and motivation work.
- High-priority behaviors (D3, D8) are covered by multiple activities across modules, creating spaced repetition consistent with the transfer research.
- Each activity has both a custom platform deliverable (Component 4) and an Articulate deliverable (Component 5), though interaction fidelity will differ by platform: sandbox activities will be richer on the custom platform. (As noted above, the Articulate build was scoped but not produced.)
- If scope cuts become necessary: P7 (context window scenario) and P2 (stigma reflection) are lowest-risk cuts. P7's concept can be covered in explanatory content; P2's reflection can be embedded within P1. The remaining activities are essential. R7 (Organizational AI Use Policy Starter) is cuttable without breaking the behavior-to-reference chain.

Notes

1. Cathy Moore, “Map It: The Hands-On Guide to Strategic Training Design,” Montesa Press, 2017, <https://books.google.com/books?vid=ISBN9780999174500>
2. Rick Dakan and Joseph Feller, “Framework for AI Fluency: Practical Overview Document (Version 1.1),” Ringling College of Art and Design; University College Cork, January 2025, p. 3, <https://ringling.libguides.com/ai/framework>
3. Rick Dakan and Joseph Feller, “Framework for AI Fluency: Practical Overview Document (Version 1.1),” Ringling College of Art and Design; University College Cork, January 2025, pp. 3–6, <https://ringling.libguides.com/ai/framework>
4. Rick Dakan, Joseph Feller, and Anthropic, “AI Fluency: Framework & Foundations (course),” Anthropic Academy, 2025, <https://anthropic.skilljar.com/ai-fluency-framework-foundations>

© Michael Ritchot. Code licensed under the MIT License. Instructional content licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0.