EXECUTIVE INSIGHTS · AI GOVERNANCE SERIES

Executive AI Governance Maturity Assessment

A Companion Resource to Building an AI Governance Program

By Alison Stokes, CRCM

This assessment is a self-evaluation tool intended to support internal governance discussions. It does not constitute legal advice, an audit, a certification, or a substitute for a regulatory examination.

Purpose

This assessment is designed to help financial institutions evaluate the maturity of their AI governance program using the framework introduced in Building an AI Governance Program. It is a practical, self-assessment tool intended to help executives, Chief Compliance Officers, Chief Risk Officers, AI governance committees, and Boards of Directors evaluate current governance capabilities, identify strengths, and prioritize areas for improvement.

Instructions

For each statement below, select the rating that best reflects your organization's current practice, from 1 (Initial) to 5 (Optimized), using the Maturity Scale as a reference. Calculate a Domain Score for each of the eleven governance domains, then use the Domain Score Summary and Overall Assessment sections to determine your organization's Overall Maturity Score.

Maturity Scale

Level	Description
1 – Initial	AI governance practices are largely absent, informal, or applied inconsistently.
2 – Developing	Foundational practices exist but are not yet formalized, documented, or consistently applied.
3 – Defined	Practices are formally documented, approved, and applied consistently across the organization.
4 – Managed	Practices are actively monitored, measured, and reinforced through governance oversight.
5 – Optimized	Practices are mature, continuously refined, and fully integrated into the organization's governance culture.

Assessment Domains

The domains below correspond directly to the governance components described in Building an AI Governance Program.

1. Governance

Reflects the organization's overall governance structure, executive sponsorship, and oversight of Artificial Intelligence, consistent with Chapter 4 of Building an AI Governance Program.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
A formal AI governance framework has been established, with defined ownership and escalation paths.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Executive leadership actively sponsors and supports AI governance.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The Board or an executive committee receives regular reporting on AI governance activities and emerging risks.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Roles, responsibilities, and decision-making authority for AI governance are clearly documented.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cross-functional stakeholders, including Compliance, Risk Management, Legal, Technology, and business leadership, participate in AI governance.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
An inventory of AI systems, use cases, and third-party AI solutions is maintained and periodically reviewed.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

2. Policies & Procedures

Reflects whether governance expectations have been translated into documented, consistently applied practices, consistent with Chapter 5.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
AI governance policies have been established and formally approved.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Supporting standards and procedures translate policy expectations into consistent practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Controls are aligned to identified risks, with clearly defined ownership.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Policies, standards, and controls are periodically reviewed and updated.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Employees have access to current AI governance documentation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

3. Risk Assessment

Reflects whether AI-related risk is identified and evaluated before and throughout implementation, consistent with Chapter 6.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
AI use cases undergo a risk assessment before implementation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Risk assessments consider consumer, regulatory, operational, and reputational impact.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Risk-based decisions, including risk exceptions, are documented and supported by governance.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Risk assessments are reassessed when material changes occur.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

4. Regulatory Change Management

Reflects the organization's ability to identify, evaluate, and respond to evolving AI-related regulatory expectations, consistent with Chapter 7.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
Regulatory developments affecting AI are actively monitored.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The business impact of regulatory changes is evaluated and prioritized based on risk.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Policies, procedures, and controls are updated to reflect regulatory change.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Implementation of regulatory changes is validated and reported to leadership.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

5. Testing & Monitoring

Reflects whether the organization validates that AI governance controls are designed appropriately and operating effectively, consistent with Chapter 8.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
AI controls are tested using a risk-based approach.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Testing evaluates both control design and operating effectiveness.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ongoing monitoring identifies emerging risks between testing cycles.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Significant findings are escalated, remediated, and validated.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

6. Complaint Management

Reflects whether customer feedback is used to identify emerging AI-related risk, consistent with Chapter 9.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
Customers have accessible channels for raising AI-related concerns.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Complaints are investigated consistently, with root cause analysis performed.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Complaint trends are analyzed to identify emerging governance risks.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Significant complaints receive executive visibility and drive governance improvements.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

7. Third-Party Risk Management

Reflects governance and oversight of vendors, cloud providers, and other external parties supporting AI capabilities, consistent with Chapter 10.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
Third-party AI relationships are identified and risk-assessed before onboarding.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Contracts define governance, security, and performance expectations.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Third-party AI performance and risk are monitored on an ongoing basis.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The organization maintains accountability for third-party AI outcomes.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

8. Training & Awareness

Reflects whether employees and leadership understand their AI governance responsibilities, consistent with Chapter 11.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
Role-based AI governance training is provided to relevant employees and leadership.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Employees understand their AI governance responsibilities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Governance expectations are reinforced through ongoing awareness activities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Training is reviewed and updated as technology and regulations evolve.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

9. Board & Executive Reporting

Reflects whether leadership receives meaningful, decision-ready information about AI governance, consistent with Chapter 12.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
Executive and Board reporting includes AI governance information.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Reporting focuses on material risks, trends, and governance effectiveness.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Reporting clearly identifies ownership and accountability for significant issues.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Reporting supports informed, risk-based decision-making.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

10. Issue Management

Reflects whether AI-related issues are addressed through the organization's existing enterprise governance processes, consistent with Chapter 14.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
AI-related issues are managed through existing enterprise issue management processes.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Material AI-related issues receive appropriate executive visibility.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Business continuity and operational resilience programs consider AI-related events, where appropriate.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lessons learned from AI-related issues strengthen governance.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

11. Continuous Improvement

Reflects whether the AI governance program evolves and matures over time, consistent with Chapter 13.

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
The AI governance program is periodically evaluated for effectiveness.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Governance evolves in response to regulatory, technological, and organizational change.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lessons learned across the governance program are incorporated into improvements.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Continuous improvement is embedded in the organization's governance culture.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Domain Score (average of statement ratings): _________

Domain Score Summary

Transfer each Domain Score calculated above into the summary table below.

Domain	Score
Governance	________
Policies & Procedures	________
Risk Assessment	________
Regulatory Change Management	________
Testing & Monitoring	________
Complaint Management	________
Third-Party Risk Management	________
Training & Awareness	________
Board & Executive Reporting	________
Issue Management	________
Continuous Improvement	________

Overall Assessment

Overall Maturity Score is the average of the eleven Domain Scores above, not the average of every individual statement. This keeps domains with different numbers of statements equally weighted in the final result.

Sum of Domain Scores: ________

Overall Maturity Score (Sum ÷ 11): ________

Overall Maturity Level: __________________________

Overall Maturity Rating

Overall Score	Maturity Level
1.0 – 1.9	Initial
2.0 – 2.9	Developing
3.0 – 3.9	Defined
4.0 – 4.4	Managed
4.5 – 5.0	Optimized

Score Interpretation

Initial (1.0 – 1.9): AI governance is not yet formalized. The organization faces elevated exposure to regulatory, operational, and reputational risk from AI activities that are not governed consistently.

Developing (2.0 – 2.9): Foundational governance elements exist but are applied inconsistently. Leadership should expect uneven risk visibility across the organization.

Defined (3.0 – 3.9): Governance is formally established and consistently applied. The organization has a credible foundation to demonstrate accountability to regulators, boards, and other stakeholders.

Managed (4.0 – 4.4): Governance is actively monitored and reinforced. Leadership has reliable visibility into AI-related risk and governance effectiveness.

Optimized (4.5 – 5.0): Governance is mature and continuously improving. AI governance functions as a durable strategic capability rather than a compliance obligation.

How to Use the Results

- Use domain scores, not only the overall rating, to identify the specific governance areas of greatest strength and greatest exposure.
- Share results with the Board, executive leadership, or the AI governance committee to support informed oversight discussions.
- Revisit the assessment periodically, since AI governance maturity changes as the organization, technology, and regulatory expectations evolve.
- Treat the results as a starting point for governance conversations, not as a substitute for a regulatory examination, audit, or independent assessment.