SnapSkill

TEAM DIAGNOSTIC TOOL

AI Skills Gap Assessment

Where Does Your Team Actually Stand?

A self-assessment for L&D heads, CHROs, and business unit leaders evaluating their team's AI readiness. Answer based on honest observation — not where you'd like them to be.

How to Use This Assessment

Answer each question based on your honest observation of your team — not where you'd like them to be, and not based on the one or two enthusiasts who skew your perception. Think about the median employee in the role you're assessing.

If you manage a mixed team, complete the assessment separately for each role group (e.g., analysts vs. managers vs. senior specialists).

SCORING KEY

A = Ad-hoc

B = Developing

C = Proficient

D = Advanced

Q1 AI Tool Usage

How does the typical person on your team currently use AI tools in their work?

- **A** They don't use AI tools as part of their regular workflow, or use them only occasionally for personal tasks.
- **B** They use general AI tools (ChatGPT, Copilot) reactively — when something comes to mind — but not as a consistent part of how they work.
- **C** They have identified 2–3 specific workflows where AI tools save meaningful time, and they use them consistently for those tasks.
- **D** AI tools are embedded in how they approach most knowledge work. They've built personal workflows, prompting habits, or automations that others on the team are starting to adopt.

Q2 Critical Evaluation of AI Outputs

When your team uses AI to help with analysis, writing, or research, how do they engage with the output?

- **A** They tend to accept AI outputs at face value, or they're uncertain how to evaluate whether the output is accurate or appropriate.
- **B** They know to check AI outputs but do so inconsistently, and the checking is more intuitive than systematic.
- **C** They apply consistent scepticism — they verify factual claims, check reasoning, and recognise when an AI output looks plausible but is likely wrong.
- **D** They can articulate specific failure modes (hallucination, context loss, sycophancy) and build verification into their workflow as a habit, not an afterthought.

Q3

Prompt Engineering

How does your team craft prompts when working with AI tools?

- **A** They type questions the way they'd type a Google search, and iterate by trial and error when results aren't useful.
- **B** They've learned some basics — adding context, being more specific — but their prompting is ad-hoc rather than intentional.
- **C** They use structured prompting techniques: role assignment, step-by-step reasoning requests, output format specification. They can improve a bad output by changing the prompt rather than giving up.
- **D** They can design prompts for multi-step workflows, write system prompts for specific use cases, and teach prompting techniques to others.

Q4

Understanding AI Limitations

How does your team understand what AI tools can and cannot do reliably?

- **A** Limitations are vague — they know AI "sometimes makes mistakes" but can't predict when or why.
- **B** They're aware of common limitations (hallucination, knowledge cutoffs) but apply this knowledge inconsistently.
- **C** They have a working model of AI limitations relevant to their domain — they know which tasks in their role are high-risk for AI errors and which are lower risk.
- **D** They can brief colleagues on AI limitations in their specific domain, have encountered and explained specific failure cases, and factor limitations into how they design AI-assisted workflows.

Q5

Workflow Integration

To what degree has AI been integrated into how your team's core work gets done?

A AI is not part of any standardised workflow. Individual use is scattered and undocumented.

B A few team members have integrated AI into parts of their work, but there's no shared approach and no attempt to spread these practices.

C Your team has mapped 2–4 specific workflows where AI creates measurable time savings, and these are used consistently — not just by enthusiasts.

D AI-assisted processes are documented, onboarded to new team members, and regularly reviewed for improvement. Team output has measurably changed since AI integration.

Q6

Data Literacy in an AI Context

How does your team understand the relationship between data quality and AI output quality?

A Data considerations don't feature in how they think about using AI. They treat AI tools as general-purpose assistants without thinking about input quality.

B They understand the concept ("garbage in, garbage out") but haven't applied it systematically — they don't audit what they're feeding into AI workflows.

C They apply basic data hygiene to AI workflows — they check the quality of inputs before using AI to process them, and they're aware of when sensitive data should not be used with external AI tools.

D They think systematically about data provenance, sensitivity classification, and quality in AI workflows. They've flagged data risk concerns and contributed to shaping how their team handles data in AI contexts.

Q7

Comfort with AI-Assisted Decision-Making

> *How does your team approach decisions that are supported by AI-generated analysis or recommendations?*

A They either distrust AI outputs entirely and discount them, or they over-rely on them without interrogating the reasoning.

B They use AI-generated analysis as input but are uncertain about how much weight to give it relative to their own judgement.

C They apply a consistent framework: AI input is one input among several, weighted by the task's risk level, their ability to verify the output, and their confidence in the data behind it.

D They can model this decision-making framework explicitly for others. They've made better decisions because of AI-assisted analysis and can articulate specifically why.

PART 2 — SCORING & INTERPRETATION

Count your A, B, C, and D answers and find your dominant pattern below.

Profile 1

AI Curious

`Mostly A and B answers`

What this means

Your team knows AI exists and some individuals are experimenting, but there's no shared capability, no systematic use, and no measurable impact on how work gets done. This is the majority position for enterprise teams in 2025.

What risks it creates

Teams at this stage are increasingly exposed to a capability gap — their peers at competitor organisations are starting to work materially faster and produce higher-quality outputs. AI-curious teams also tend to misuse AI tools when they do use them: over-trusting outputs, sharing sensitive data inadvertently, or attempting tasks AI does poorly.

Recommended starting point

Don't start with a technology rollout. Start with **role-specific capability building** that connects AI tools directly to the tasks your team does every day. A procurement analyst needs to understand how AI can help process supplier data — not what a transformer architecture is.

Profile 2

AI Enabled

Mostly B and C answers

What this means

Your team has genuine capability and some of it is being applied productively. The risk here is that capability is uneven — clustered among a few enthusiasts, inconsistently applied, and not yet embedded in how work systematically gets done.

Where the gaps typically are

The hardest transitions at this stage are from individual use to team-level workflows, and from using AI tools to evaluating AI outputs critically. Teams that are AI-enabled often have optimistic assessments of AI output quality because they've mostly seen it work.

What to build next

Focus on **workflow formalisation** (documenting and standardising what's working), **critical evaluation skills** (building systematic habits for verifying outputs), and **management capability** (ensuring people managers understand how to redesign work around AI tools, not just use them personally).

Profile 3

AI Native

Mostly C and D answers

What this means

Your team has genuine, embedded capability. AI is part of how they work, they apply it critically, and they've produced measurable output improvements.

How to maintain the edge

Teams at this level face a different challenge — keeping pace as AI tools evolve rapidly, avoiding complacency about model limitations, and exporting capability to the rest of the organisation. AI native individuals often struggle to train others because their intuitions have become implicit.

What advanced programmes look like

Custom AI tool development, **model evaluation**, **AI-assisted decision frameworks for senior roles**, and **train-the-trainer programmes** that make your team's capability replicable across the organisation.

What to Do With Your Results

1. **Map the gap to your highest-value workflows.**

   Don't build AI capability in the abstract. Look at your team's 3–5 most time-consuming workflows and ask: where would moving from Ad-hoc to Proficient on question 5 (Workflow Integration) create the most measurable impact? Start there.

2. **Don't train everyone the same way.**

   A score of mostly B across 7 questions still tells you that different questions have different scores. The gap in data literacy (Q6) is a different programme from the gap in critical evaluation (Q2). Targeted, role-specific training produces behaviour change. Generic AI awareness workshops don't.

3. **Build measurement in before you start.**

   If you run a training programme and can only report completion rates afterward, you won't know whether it worked. Define before you start: what does "Proficient" on questions 3 and 5 look like in your team's actual daily work? How will you know in 60 days whether behaviour has changed?

> *"Targeted, role-specific training produces behaviour change. Generic AI awareness workshops don't."*