

BONUS WORKBOOK

CENTAUR DEVELOPMENT AUDIT

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT WORKBOOK

100 diagnostic items | Fillable 1-5 ratings | Evidence fields

HERBERT J. KELLNER, Ph.D. | USOU PUBLISHING

HOW TO USE THIS WORKBOOK

Complete the audit independently before discussing ratings with colleagues. Rate each statement from 1 to 5. Use the Evidence / Notes fields to record the documents, practices, observations, or data that support your judgment. Do not select a high score because a policy exists on paper; rate the practice that is actually visible in the organization.

THE 1-5 MATURITY SCALE

1	The practice is largely absent or remains primarily based on traditional training activity.
2	Initial structures exist, but practice is inconsistent, fragmented, or mainly learning-oriented.
3	The practice is systematically established and meaningfully connected to competency and performance.
4	Human and AI capabilities are deliberately integrated into the development architecture where relevant.
5	The practice is embedded, evidence-based, strategically governed, continuously adapted, and contributes to organizational capability.

Participant (optional)

Role

Date

DIMENSION 1

STRATEGIC CAPABILITY DIAGNOSIS

DEFINITION
Strategic Capability Diagnosis is the systematic identification of the capabilities an organization requires to execute its strategy, including the changing allocation of work among Human Intelligence, Artificial Intelligence, and Human-AI collaboration.

WHY THIS DIMENSION MATTERS
It begins with performance requirements rather than training demand. The purpose is to distinguish a capability problem from a training request before resources are committed.

EVIDENCE TO LOOK FOR
Strategic plans, capability maps, role analyses, performance-gap analyses, AI workflow analyses, competency assessments, business metrics, manager interviews, task analyses, workforce-planning data.

RATE EACH STATEMENT		1 = low maturity 5 = embedded maturity				
1	Major HRD initiatives begin with a clearly defined business or performance requirement.	1	2	3	4	5
2	We distinguish performance gaps from training or learning gaps before recommending development.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Strategic capability requirements are reviewed when business strategy changes.	1	2	3	4	5
4	We analyze how AI is changing tasks within strategically important roles.	1	2	3	4	5
5	We identify which critical tasks should be human-led, AI-led, or jointly performed.	1	2	3	4	5

STRATEGIC CAPABILITY DIAGNOSIS

6	Important capability gaps are supported by performance evidence rather than primarily by stakeholder opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Managers and subject-matter experts participate systematically in capability diagnosis.	1	2	3	4	5
8	We identify capabilities that employees should retain independently even when AI assistance exists.	1	2	3	4	5
9	We distinguish temporary tool proficiency from durable and transferable capability.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Capability diagnosis directly influences HRD investment priorities.	1	2	3	4	5
EVIDENCE / NOTES						

TOTAL POINTS	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE (total / 10)	MATURITY
--------------	------	------------------------------	----------

DIMENSION 2

PERFORMANCE & CAPABILITY TARGETS

DEFINITION
Performance & Capability Targets describe what people must be able to do, under which conditions, and to what standard.

WHY THIS DIMENSION MATTERS
They move development beyond broad learning objectives toward observable professional performance and make Human-AI contribution explicit where relevant.

EVIDENCE TO LOOK FOR
behavioral indicators, performance standards, competency criteria, assessment rubrics, scenario specifications, role expectations, certification standards, AI-use protocols.

RATE EACH STATEMENT 1 = low maturity 5 = embedded maturity

11	Major development initiatives define what participants should be able to perform differently afterward.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Performance targets are observable and sufficiently specific to be assessed.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Development targets are directly linked to required organizational performance.	1	2	3	4	5
14	The conditions under which competence must be demonstrated are specified where relevant.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Critical performance standards include quality criteria rather than only activity measures.	1	2	3	4	5

PERFORMANCE & CAPABILITY TARGETS

16	We distinguish knowledge acquisition from demonstrated capability.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Where AI is involved, the required human contribution is defined explicitly.	1	2	3	4	5
18	We identify when independent human performance must remain available.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Human-AI performance standards include appropriate judgment, verification, and accountability.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Development targets are revised when the underlying work changes.	1	2	3	4	5
EVIDENCE / NOTES						

TOTAL POINTS	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE (total / 10)	MATURITY
--------------	------	------------------------------	----------

DIMENSION 3

CENTAUR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

DEFINITION
Centaur Development Strategy is the deliberate alignment of organizational strategy, Human Intelligence, AI capability, competency development, and performance improvement.

WHY THIS DIMENSION MATTERS
AI changes work. Changed work changes capability requirements. Capability requirements should therefore change development strategy.

EVIDENCE TO LOOK FOR
HRD strategy documents, capability priorities, technology strategy, AI adoption plans, workforce strategy, Corporate University strategy, development investment plans.

RATE EACH STATEMENT		1 = low maturity 5 = embedded maturity				
21	Our HRD strategy is explicitly linked to organizational strategy.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Strategic capability priorities are more influential than course demand in determining HRD investment.	1	2	3	4	5
23	HRD participates early enough in major AI or work-transformation initiatives to influence capability design.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Our strategy identifies human capabilities likely to become more important as AI expands.	1	2	3	4	5
25	AI development is treated as more than tool training or AI literacy.	1	2	3	4	5

CENTAUR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

26	HRD strategy addresses the development of genuine Human-AI performance.	1	2	3	4	5
27	Business leaders understand HRD's role in capability architecture.	1	2	3	4	5
28	HRD investment decisions are connected to defined capability priorities.	1	2	3	4	5
29	The strategy includes mechanisms for measuring whether capability actually changes.	1	2	3	4	5
30	HRD strategy is reviewed when technological or strategic conditions materially change.	1	2	3	4	5
EVIDENCE / NOTES						

TOTAL POINTS	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE (total / 10)	MATURITY
--------------	------	------------------------------	----------

DIMENSION 4

COMPETENCY ARCHITECTURE

DEFINITION
Competency Architecture converts broad capability requirements into observable and developable components. Complex performance may be represented through Competency Clusters rather than a single generic label.

WHY THIS DIMENSION MATTERS
Granularity allows HRD to diagnose the actual developmental need when similar weak results have different underlying causes.

EVIDENCE TO LOOK FOR
competency models, competency clusters, behavioral indicators, role profiles, assessments, proficiency definitions, simulation criteria, capability maps.

RATE EACH STATEMENT		1 = low maturity 5 = embedded maturity				
31	Strategically important capabilities are translated into defined competencies.	1	2	3	4	5
32	Competencies are described through observable performance rather than vague labels.	1	2	3	4	5
33	Complex capabilities are decomposed when different developmental causes may produce similar weak performance.	1	2	3	4	5
34	Competency models reflect actual work rather than generic corporate language alone.	1	2	3	4	5
35	Assessment evidence is used to identify which competency component requires development.	1	2	3	4	5

COMPETENCY ARCHITECTURE

36	Our competency architecture distinguishes knowledge, skill, behavior, judgment, and broader capability where relevant.	1	2	3	4	5
37	AI-related competencies include judgment and verification, not merely system usage.	1	2	3	4	5
38	Human-AI task allocation is reflected in relevant competency definitions.	1	2	3	4	5
39	Competency models are updated when work changes substantially.	1	2	3	4	5
40	Competency evidence influences individualized development decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
EVIDENCE / NOTES						

TOTAL POINTS	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE (total / 10)	MATURITY
--------------	------	------------------------------	----------

DIMENSION 5

DEVELOPMENT ARCHITECTURE

DEFINITION

Development Architecture is the systematic selection and combination of experiences required to build a target capability.

WHY THIS DIMENSION MATTERS

Training is one possible intervention. Diagnosis determines whether the best response is information, practice, coaching, simulation, workplace experience, system redesign, or another intervention.

EVIDENCE TO LOOK FOR

development pathways, intervention-selection criteria, coaching systems, practice plans, adaptive learning approaches, workplace assignments, diagnostic processes.

RATE EACH STATEMENT

1 = low maturity 5 = embedded maturity

41	Development solutions are selected only after the cause of the performance gap has been examined.	1	2	3	4	5
42	Courses are treated as one intervention among several rather than the automatic response.	1	2	3	4	5
43	Development pathways include practice, feedback, coaching, workplace application, or other experiences where appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
44	Different employees can receive different development experiences when their underlying competency gaps differ.	1	2	3	4	5
45	Prior knowledge and current performance influence the developmental pathway.	1	2	3	4	5

DEVELOPMENT ARCHITECTURE

46	Development includes opportunities to retrieve and apply capability rather than only recognize information.	1	2	3	4	5
47	AI is used where it improves developmental precision, practice, feedback, or access.	1	2	3	4	5
48	AI assistance is sometimes reduced or removed when independent capability needs to be assessed or strengthened.	1	2	3	4	5
49	Development experiences are adjusted when evidence shows that progress has stalled.	1	2	3	4	5
50	The development architecture is connected explicitly to required performance.	1	2	3	4	5
EVIDENCE / NOTES						

TOTAL POINTS	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE (total / 10)	MATURITY
--------------	------	------------------------------	----------

DIMENSION 6

PRACTICE & SIMULATION

DEFINITION

Practice & Simulation refers to structured opportunities to perform important professional behaviors repeatedly, receive useful feedback, encounter variation, and improve before failure becomes expensive.

WHY THIS DIMENSION MATTERS

Information can create understanding. Capability requires performance. The objective is not more simulation; it is better practice.

EVIDENCE TO LOOK FOR

simulation environments, scenario libraries, role practices, assessment centers, coaching simulations, deliberate-practice protocols, AI-based scenario generation, debriefing standards.

RATE EACH STATEMENT

1 = low maturity 5 = embedded maturity

51 Important competencies are practiced rather than primarily explained. 1 2 3 4 5

52 Practice requires participants to generate a response rather than merely recognize a correct answer. 1 2 3 4 5

53 Learners receive feedback connected directly to another opportunity to perform. 1 2 3 4 5

54 Safe error is used as developmental information rather than avoided entirely. 1 2 3 4 5

55 Practice difficulty can increase as capability improves. 1 2 3 4 5

PRACTICE & SIMULATION

56	Critical competencies are practiced across different contexts or scenario variations.	1	2	3	4	5
57	Simulations approximate meaningful workplace demands rather than functioning mainly as entertainment.	1	2	3	4	5
58	AI is used to generate challenge, variation, feedback, or dynamic interaction where it adds value.	1	2	3	4	5
59	Relevant capabilities are practiced both with and without AI assistance where appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
60	Simulation evidence contributes to later development decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
EVIDENCE / NOTES						

TOTAL POINTS	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE (total / 10)	MATURITY
--------------	------	------------------------------	----------

DIMENSION 7

TRANSFER & PERFORMANCE INTEGRATION

DEFINITION
Transfer & Performance Integration is the degree to which newly developed capability survives beyond the learning environment and becomes usable in real work.

WHY THIS DIMENSION MATTERS
Transfer is not the final administrative step of a program. It is part of development architecture itself.

EVIDENCE TO LOOK FOR
workplace assignments, manager involvement, transfer contracts, follow-up assessments, coaching, performance-support systems, transfer measurements, competency-profile updates.

RATE EACH STATEMENT 1 = low maturity 5 = embedded maturity

61	Major development initiatives include explicit plans for workplace application.	1	2	3	4	5
62	Managers understand their responsibility for supporting capability transfer.	1	2	3	4	5
63	Employees receive real opportunities to perform newly developed behaviors at work.	1	2	3	4	5
64	Feedback continues after formal learning has ended.	1	2	3	4	5
65	Transfer is assessed through behavior or performance evidence where feasible.	1	2	3	4	5

TRANSFER & PERFORMANCE INTEGRATION

66	Capability is tested in conditions different from those in which it was learned.	1	2	3	4	5
67	Follow-up occurs after enough time has passed to test retention rather than only immediate performance.	1	2	3	4	5
68	Performance support is available at the point of work when appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
69	AI support is designed to strengthen performance without unnecessarily weakening capabilities the organization still requires.	1	2	3	4	5
70	Transfer evidence influences future development design.	1	2	3	4	5
EVIDENCE / NOTES						

TOTAL POINTS	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE (total / 10)	MATURITY
--------------	------	------------------------------	----------

DIMENSION 8

HUMAN-AI PERFORMANCE

DEFINITION
Human-AI Performance assesses whether the organization can develop and govern the deliberate combination of Human Intelligence and Artificial Intelligence rather than treating AI adoption as technology access alone.

WHY THIS DIMENSION MATTERS
The professional must determine where Human Intelligence should lead, where AI should lead, where collaboration is useful, how output should be verified, and who remains accountable.

EVIDENCE TO LOOK FOR
AI competency models, task-delegation standards, Human-AI workflows, verification protocols, AI simulations, independent-performance assessments, risk standards, governance frameworks.

RATE EACH STATEMENT 1 = low maturity 5 = embedded maturity

71	Our development system distinguishes AI literacy from AI competency.	1	2	3	4	5
72	We explicitly develop the ability to decide what should and should not be delegated to AI.	1	2	3	4	5
73	Employees learn how to verify AI outputs in proportion to task risk.	1	2	3	4	5
74	Domain expertise is maintained where it is necessary to evaluate AI-generated output.	1	2	3	4	5
75	Employees practice identifying uncertainty, missing information, and weak assumptions in AI output.	1	2	3	4	5

HUMAN-AI PERFORMANCE

76	Relevant programs assess Human-AI interaction rather than only tool proficiency.	1	2	3	4	5
77	We distinguish Independent Human Performance from AI-Assisted Performance.	1	2	3	4	5
78	Centaur Performance is assessed as the quality of Human-AI orchestration, not merely final output.	1	2	3	4	5
79	Employees understand where accountability remains human even when cognition is AI-assisted.	1	2	3	4	5
80	Human-AI capability requirements are updated as technologies and workflows change.	1	2	3	4	5
EVIDENCE / NOTES						

TOTAL POINTS	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE (total / 10)	MATURITY
--------------	------	------------------------------	----------

DIMENSION 9

EVIDENCE & ORGANIZATIONAL VALUE

DEFINITION

Evidence & Organizational Value assesses whether HRD can demonstrate changes in capability and connect those changes responsibly to performance and meaningful organizational outcomes.

WHY THIS DIMENSION MATTERS

Completion is not capability. Satisfaction is not performance. Learning is not automatically value.

EVIDENCE TO LOOK FOR

baselines, competency assessments, simulations, performance data, transfer data, evaluation reports, ROI/VOI studies, business indicators, qualitative evidence, capability dashboards.

RATE EACH STATEMENT

1 = low maturity 5 = embedded maturity

81	Important development initiatives define in advance what evidence would indicate capability improvement.	1	2	3	4	5
----	--	---	---	---	---	---

82	Baseline performance is established when feasible before major interventions begin.	1	2	3	4	5
----	---	---	---	---	---	---

83	The measure used to evaluate development resembles the capability being developed.	1	2	3	4	5
----	--	---	---	---	---	---

84	We distinguish learning evidence from behavior and performance evidence.	1	2	3	4	5
----	--	---	---	---	---	---

85	Transfer and retention are assessed for strategically important capabilities where feasible.	1	2	3	4	5
----	--	---	---	---	---	---

EVIDENCE & ORGANIZATIONAL VALUE

86	AI-Assisted Performance is not automatically treated as proof of independent human capability.	1	2	3	4	5
87	Human-AI orchestration can be assessed where Centaur Performance is strategically important.	1	2	3	4	5
88	Development evidence is connected to relevant organizational outcomes without overstating causality.	1	2	3	4	5
89	ROI, VOI, or other value measures are selected according to the nature of the outcome rather than used ritualistically.	1	2	3	4	5
90	Capability evidence informs leadership decisions and future HRD investment.	1	2	3	4	5
EVIDENCE / NOTES						

TOTAL POINTS	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE (total / 10)	MATURITY
--------------	------	------------------------------	----------

DIMENSION 10

CONTINUOUS CAPABILITY ADAPTATION

DEFINITION
Continuous Capability Adaptation is the organization's ability to update its competency models, development systems, Human-AI task architecture, and performance standards as work changes.

WHY THIS DIMENSION MATTERS
An excellent development system can become obsolete. A static competency model eventually describes yesterday's organization.

EVIDENCE TO LOOK FOR
scheduled capability reviews, competency-model revisions, emerging-skills analysis, program retirement criteria, AI workflow reviews, horizon scanning, performance trend analysis, capability dashboards.

RATE EACH STATEMENT 1 = low maturity 5 = embedded maturity

91	Our organization systematically reviews whether important capability requirements have changed.	1	2	3	4	5
92	Competency models are revised when roles or workflows change substantially.	1	2	3	4	5
93	Development programs are retired or fundamentally redesigned when they no longer contribute to required capability.	1	2	3	4	5
94	HRD monitors emerging Human-AI capability requirements rather than reacting only after gaps become visible.	1	2	3	4	5
95	Changes in AI capability trigger review of the appropriate human contribution.	1	2	3	4	5

CONTINUOUS CAPABILITY ADAPTATION

96	Capability evidence is used to identify emerging organizational vulnerabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
97	High-performing new Human-AI practices are identified and shared across the organization where appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
98	Development standards are updated as evidence, technology, and professional practice evolve.	1	2	3	4	5
99	HRD has a defined process for anticipating future capability needs.	1	2	3	4	5
100	Continuous capability adaptation is treated as an ongoing strategic process rather than an occasional curriculum update.	1	2	3	4	5
EVIDENCE / NOTES						

TOTAL POINTS	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE (total / 10)	MATURITY
--------------	------	------------------------------	----------

YOUR CENTAUR DEVELOPMENT PROFILE

Transfer the ten Dimension Scores here after completing the assessment. The overall score provides orientation, but the pattern across dimensions matters more than the average.

1. Strategic Capability Diagnosis	Score	Level
2. Performance & Capability Targets	Score	Level
3. Centaur Development Strategy	Score	Level
4. Competency Architecture	Score	Level
5. Development Architecture	Score	Level
6. Practice & Simulation	Score	Level
7. Transfer & Performance Integration	Score	Level
8. Human-AI Performance	Score	Level
9. Evidence & Organizational Value	Score	Level
10. Continuous Capability Adaptation	Score	Level

OVERALL MATURITY SCORE

OVERALL LEVEL

KEY OBSERVATIONS

BONUS WORKBOOK

CENTAUR DEVELOPMENT AUDIT

TEAM CONSOLIDATION WORKBOOK

Evidence-based group discussion | Agreed team ratings | Alignment diagnosis

HERBERT J. KELLNER, Ph.D. | USOU PUBLISHING

TEAM CONSOLIDATION PROCESS

Complete the Individual Assessment first. Then compare ratings as a team. Do not average major disagreements away. Discuss why ratings differ, review available evidence, and record one Agreed Team Rating for each item. The goal is not harmony. The goal is a rating the group can defend.

DISAGREEMENT IS DATA.

Large differences may reveal inconsistent practice, unequal implementation, unclear standards, fragmented governance, or different assumptions about HRD.

TEAM MEMBERS

Member 1

Member 2

Member 3

Member 4

Member 5

Member 6

Member 7

Member 8

DIMENSION 1

STRATEGIC CAPABILITY DIAGNOSIS

Record the lowest and highest individual ratings before agreeing the team rating.

No.	Diagnostic statement	Low	High	Agreed	Evidence / note
1	Major HRD initiatives begin with a clearly defined business or performance requirement.				
2	We distinguish performance gaps from training or learning gaps before recommending development.				
3	Strategic capability requirements are reviewed when business strategy changes.				
4	We analyze how AI is changing tasks within strategically important roles.				
5	We identify which critical tasks should be human-led, AI-led, or jointly performed.				
6	Important capability gaps are supported by performance evidence rather than primarily by stakeholder opinion.				
7	Managers and subject-matter experts participate systematically in capability diagnosis.				
8	We identify capabilities that employees should retain independently even when AI assistance exists.				
9	We distinguish temporary tool proficiency from durable and transferable capability.				
10	Capability diagnosis directly influences HRD investment priorities.				

TEAM TOTAL	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE	LEVEL	MAX SPREAD
------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------

DIMENSION 2

PERFORMANCE & CAPABILITY TARGETS

Record the lowest and highest individual ratings before agreeing the team rating.

No.	Diagnostic statement	Low	High	Agreed	Evidence / note
11	Major development initiatives define what participants should be able to perform differently afterward.				
12	Performance targets are observable and sufficiently specific to be assessed.				
13	Development targets are directly linked to required organizational performance.				
14	The conditions under which competence must be demonstrated are specified where relevant.				
15	Critical performance standards include quality criteria rather than only activity measures.				
16	We distinguish knowledge acquisition from demonstrated capability.				
17	Where AI is involved, the required human contribution is defined explicitly.				
18	We identify when independent human performance must remain available.				
19	Human-AI performance standards include appropriate judgment, verification, and accountability.				
20	Development targets are revised when the underlying work changes.				

TEAM TOTAL	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE	LEVEL	MAX SPREAD
------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------

DIMENSION 3

CENTAUR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Record the lowest and highest individual ratings before agreeing the team rating.

No.	Diagnostic statement	Low	High	Agreed	Evidence / note
21	Our HRD strategy is explicitly linked to organizational strategy.				
22	Strategic capability priorities are more influential than course demand in determining HRD investment.				
23	HRD participates early enough in major AI or work-transformation initiatives to influence capability design.				
24	Our strategy identifies human capabilities likely to become more important as AI expands.				
25	AI development is treated as more than tool training or AI literacy.				
26	HRD strategy addresses the development of genuine Human-AI performance.				
27	Business leaders understand HRD's role in capability architecture.				
28	HRD investment decisions are connected to defined capability priorities.				
29	The strategy includes mechanisms for measuring whether capability actually changes.				
30	HRD strategy is reviewed when technological or strategic conditions materially change.				

TEAM TOTAL	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE	LEVEL	MAX SPREAD
------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------

DIMENSION 4

COMPETENCY ARCHITECTURE

Record the lowest and highest individual ratings before agreeing the team rating.

No.	Diagnostic statement	Low	High	Agreed	Evidence / note
31	Strategically important capabilities are translated into defined competencies.				
32	Competencies are described through observable performance rather than vague labels.				
33	Complex capabilities are decomposed when different developmental causes may produce similar weak performance.				
34	Competency models reflect actual work rather than generic corporate language alone.				
35	Assessment evidence is used to identify which competency component requires development.				
36	Our competency architecture distinguishes knowledge, skill, behavior, judgment, and broader capability where relevant.				
37	AI-related competencies include judgment and verification, not merely system usage.				
38	Human-AI task allocation is reflected in relevant competency definitions.				
39	Competency models are updated when work changes substantially.				
40	Competency evidence influences individualized development decisions.				

TEAM TOTAL	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE	LEVEL	MAX SPREAD
------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------

DIMENSION 5

DEVELOPMENT ARCHITECTURE

Record the lowest and highest individual ratings before agreeing the team rating.

No.	Diagnostic statement	Low	High	Agreed	Evidence / note
41	Development solutions are selected only after the cause of the performance gap has been examined.				
42	Courses are treated as one intervention among several rather than the automatic response.				
43	Development pathways include practice, feedback, coaching, workplace application, or other experiences where appropriate.				
44	Different employees can receive different development experiences when their underlying competency gaps differ.				
45	Prior knowledge and current performance influence the developmental pathway.				
46	Development includes opportunities to retrieve and apply capability rather than only recognize information.				
47	AI is used where it improves developmental precision, practice, feedback, or access.				
48	AI assistance is sometimes reduced or removed when independent capability needs to be assessed or strengthened.				
49	Development experiences are adjusted when evidence shows that progress has stalled.				
50	The development architecture is connected explicitly to required performance.				

TEAM TOTAL	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE	LEVEL	MAX SPREAD
------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------

DIMENSION 6

PRACTICE & SIMULATION

Record the lowest and highest individual ratings before agreeing the team rating.

No.	Diagnostic statement	Low	High	Agreed	Evidence / note
51	Important competencies are practiced rather than primarily explained.				
52	Practice requires participants to generate a response rather than merely recognize a correct answer.				
53	Learners receive feedback connected directly to another opportunity to perform.				
54	Safe error is used as developmental information rather than avoided entirely.				
55	Practice difficulty can increase as capability improves.				
56	Critical competencies are practiced across different contexts or scenario variations.				
57	Simulations approximate meaningful workplace demands rather than functioning mainly as entertainment.				
58	AI is used to generate challenge, variation, feedback, or dynamic interaction where it adds value.				
59	Relevant capabilities are practiced both with and without AI assistance where appropriate.				
60	Simulation evidence contributes to later development decisions.				

TEAM TOTAL	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE	LEVEL	MAX SPREAD
------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------

DIMENSION 7

TRANSFER & PERFORMANCE INTEGRATION

Record the lowest and highest individual ratings before agreeing the team rating.

No.	Diagnostic statement	Low	High	Agreed	Evidence / note
61	Major development initiatives include explicit plans for workplace application.				
62	Managers understand their responsibility for supporting capability transfer.				
63	Employees receive real opportunities to perform newly developed behaviors at work.				
64	Feedback continues after formal learning has ended.				
65	Transfer is assessed through behavior or performance evidence where feasible.				
66	Capability is tested in conditions different from those in which it was learned.				
67	Follow-up occurs after enough time has passed to test retention rather than only immediate performance.				
68	Performance support is available at the point of work when appropriate.				
69	AI support is designed to strengthen performance without unnecessarily weakening capabilities the organization still requires.				
70	Transfer evidence influences future development design.				

TEAM TOTAL	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE	LEVEL	MAX SPREAD
------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------

DIMENSION 8

HUMAN-AI PERFORMANCE

Record the lowest and highest individual ratings before agreeing the team rating.

No.	Diagnostic statement	Low	High	Agreed	Evidence / note
71	Our development system distinguishes AI literacy from AI competency.				
72	We explicitly develop the ability to decide what should and should not be delegated to AI.				
73	Employees learn how to verify AI outputs in proportion to task risk.				
74	Domain expertise is maintained where it is necessary to evaluate AI-generated output.				
75	Employees practice identifying uncertainty, missing information, and weak assumptions in AI output.				
76	Relevant programs assess Human-AI interaction rather than only tool proficiency.				
77	We distinguish Independent Human Performance from AI-Assisted Performance.				
78	Centaur Performance is assessed as the quality of Human-AI orchestration, not merely final output.				
79	Employees understand where accountability remains human even when cognition is AI-assisted.				
80	Human-AI capability requirements are updated as technologies and workflows change.				

TEAM TOTAL	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE	LEVEL	MAX SPREAD
------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------

DIMENSION 9

EVIDENCE & ORGANIZATIONAL VALUE

Record the lowest and highest individual ratings before agreeing the team rating.

No.	Diagnostic statement	Low	High	Agreed	Evidence / note
81	Important development initiatives define in advance what evidence would indicate capability improvement.				
82	Baseline performance is established when feasible before major interventions begin.				
83	The measure used to evaluate development resembles the capability being developed.				
84	We distinguish learning evidence from behavior and performance evidence.				
85	Transfer and retention are assessed for strategically important capabilities where feasible.				
86	AI-Assisted Performance is not automatically treated as proof of independent human capability.				
87	Human-AI orchestration can be assessed where Centaur Performance is strategically important.				
88	Development evidence is connected to relevant organizational outcomes without overstating causality.				
89	ROI, VOI, or other value measures are selected according to the nature of the outcome rather than used ritualistically.				
90	Capability evidence informs leadership decisions and future HRD investment.				

TEAM TOTAL	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE	LEVEL	MAX SPREAD
------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------

DIMENSION 10

CONTINUOUS CAPABILITY ADAPTATION

Record the lowest and highest individual ratings before agreeing the team rating.

No.	Diagnostic statement	Low	High	Agreed	Evidence / note
91	Our organization systematically reviews whether important capability requirements have changed.				
92	Competency models are revised when roles or workflows change substantially.				
93	Development programs are retired or fundamentally redesigned when they no longer contribute to required capability.				
94	HRD monitors emerging Human-AI capability requirements rather than reacting only after gaps become visible.				
95	Changes in AI capability trigger review of the appropriate human contribution.				
96	Capability evidence is used to identify emerging organizational vulnerabilities.				
97	High-performing new Human-AI practices are identified and shared across the organization where appropriate.				
98	Development standards are updated as evidence, technology, and professional practice evolve.				
99	HRD has a defined process for anticipating future capability needs.				
100	Continuous capability adaptation is treated as an ongoing strategic process rather than an occasional curriculum update.				

TEAM TOTAL	/ 50	DIMENSION SCORE	LEVEL	MAX SPREAD
------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------

TEAM CENTAUR DEVELOPMENT PROFILE

DIMENSION	SCORE	LEVEL	IMPORTANCE
1. Strategic Capability Diagnosis			
2. Performance & Capability Targets			
3. Centaur Development Strategy			
4. Competency Architecture			
5. Development Architecture			
6. Practice & Simulation			
7. Transfer & Performance Integration			
8. Human-AI Performance			
9. Evidence & Organizational Value			
10. Continuous Capability Adaptation			
OVERALL MATURITY SCORE	OVERALL LEVEL		

ALIGNMENT OBSERVATIONS

BONUS WORKBOOK

CENTAUR DEVELOPMENT AUDIT

TRANSFORMATION ROADMAP

Priority analysis | Three transformation priorities | 90-day action cycle

HERBERT J. KELLNER, Ph.D. | USOU PUBLISHING

FROM DIAGNOSIS TO TRANSFORMATION

Do not try to fix everything. Select the three gaps where improvement would create the greatest strategic leverage. Use the formula below to support judgment, not to replace it.

DEVELOPMENT GAP = 5 - DIMENSION SCORE

TRANSFORMATION PRIORITY = DEVELOPMENT GAP x STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE

Strategic Importance: 1 = Moderate 2 = High 3 = Critical

Dimension	Score	Gap	Importance	Priority
1. Strategic Capability Diagnosis				
2. Performance & Capability Targets				
3. Centaur Development Strategy				
4. Competency Architecture				
5. Development Architecture				
6. Practice & Simulation				
7. Transfer & Performance Integration				
8. Human-AI Performance				
9. Evidence & Organizational Value				
10. Continuous Capability Adaptation				

TOP THREE PRIORITIES

1.
2.
3.

TRANSFORMATION PRIORITY 1

CURRENT STATE

Dimension

Current Maturity Score

Current Level

What does the evidence show?

What appears to be the primary gap?

Why does this matter strategically?

TARGET STATE

Target score after the first transformation cycle

What should become observably different?

First intervention

Owner

Review date

90-Day Evidence - What would convince us that meaningful progress occurred?

TRANSFORMATION PRIORITY 2

CURRENT STATE

Dimension

Current Maturity Score

Current Level

What does the evidence show?

What appears to be the primary gap?

Why does this matter strategically?

TARGET STATE

Target score after the first transformation cycle

What should become observably different?

First intervention

Owner

Review date

90-Day Evidence - What would convince us that meaningful progress occurred?

TRANSFORMATION PRIORITY 3

CURRENT STATE

Dimension

Current Maturity Score

Current Level

What does the evidence show?

What appears to be the primary gap?

Why does this matter strategically?

TARGET STATE

Target score after the first transformation cycle

What should become observably different?

First intervention

Owner

Review date

90-Day Evidence - What would convince us that meaningful progress occurred?

THE 90-DAY CENTAUR DEVELOPMENT CYCLE

DAYS 1-30 - DIAGNOSE AND DEFINE

Confirm the capability or architectural gap, gather missing evidence, clarify the Human-AI work architecture where relevant, define the target state, and establish baseline evidence.

DAYS 31-60 - REDESIGN AND PILOT

Redesign the relevant element of the development architecture, pilot it with a manageable population, and observe what happens.

DAYS 61-90 - TEST AND DECIDE

Measure intended practice and performance, examine transfer, compare with baseline, identify unintended effects, and decide what should scale, adapt, or stop.

ACTION BOARD

PRIORITY 1

Owner

30-Day Deliverable

60-Day Deliverable

90-Day Evidence

Scale / Adapt / Stop

PRIORITY 2

Owner

30-Day Deliverable

60-Day Deliverable

90-Day Evidence

Scale / Adapt / Stop

PRIORITY 3

Owner

30-Day Deliverable

60-Day Deliverable

90-Day Evidence

Scale / Adapt / Stop