JO

The Green Ledger of Education:

A Leadership Guide for AI-Era Structural Change

Jeffrey Ober

Ober Solutions Group

Contents

Why Structures Change: The Coming Green Ledger Moment

Everyone can remember the old green ledgers. Every business had one (or a stack of them). Business students learned with them. Computer students used them for learning alignment and columns. Accounting students learned how to enter the debits and the credits. Nearly everyone saw them, used them, or at least knew what was happening when someone was using one.

So, what happened?

Where are they?

Why don't we see them today?

The green ledger did not disappear overnight. When computers appeared, first they simply copied the form, layout, design, and function. We built exact copies of the green ledger on the computer. And that worked for a time. This pattern matters: it is what happens often with new technology: we imitate the old form but use new technology.

Over time, business, accounting and computers found a better way. While the idea of debits and credits still exists; and the accounting methods all exist; we simply changed the structure. The structure of the green ledger itself vanished. New workflows appeared and new, more efficient, ways of business advanced. And as they did, the need for the green ledger was reduced to the point of disappearing.

Higher education is right now in its own Green Ledger moment.

Higher Education and the Green Ledger

Higher education finds itself in the same place today. We are learning about AI and having discussions around how to use AI. I see and hear stories about institutions that are banning AI use for students and spending time trying to detect AI use by students. I see institutions scrambling to find out how they can use AI *to do the same things they are doing now*. Institutions are finding ways to use AI as a tool to help them complete their tasks. And there's nothing wrong with that.

Higher education today is still in that imitation phase: using AI to improve existing workflow. But the real transformation takes place when higher education can look at, see, and change the actual structure behind the work. This is what happened to the Green Ledger, and this is what is going to happen to higher education. Higher education leaders need to see this coming and be prepared to change and adapt.

When this happens, the real, significant changes happen: some practices and work no longer need to be done. This isn't change just to make change; it's

change because the rules have changed. The support has changed. The structures have changed, so the work needs to change.

Some practices will not get faster or more efficient with AI: they will stop needing to be done at all. This is the change coming to higher education with AI and leaders need to be prepared to change and adapt with significant change; not just speed things up with new technology that makes the same processes faster.

> This guide focuses on structural change; not tools.

So how can leaders tell which practices are green legacy structures that need to be replaced and which need to be protected?

Leadership and Framework

The natural reaction of the education industry is “policy first.” When policy is based on outdated processes, this causes problems. And policy reacts to whatever structure exists. So, if the structure is wrong, policy pushes in the wrong direction. Education leaders need to know how to tell what work is green legacy work and what work becomes unnecessary, regardless of policy. These new guidelines around work should guide changes to policy. The green legacy framework can help delineate and define what processes need to change. So how can leaders tell which practices are green legacy structures?

Three Signals

Green legacy structures can be seen when looking for patterns. Three patterns can reliably reveal when a practice is a Green Ledger candidate. As a leader in education, you have seen these signals before, but never had a name for them. These patterns existed long before AI, but AI has helped expose them because they are structural signals, not technological. Seeing these patterns can help define and describe what must retire, what can be retained, and what can change.

Consequences

Without structural, widespread, functional change, the gap between old structures and new capabilities widens quickly. When the Green Ledger disappears, if you’re still using it, you’re lost. Without removing Green Ledger structures, your institution will be stuck with:

- Assessment models built around scalable manual review
- Queue-based advising
- Faculty workload based on manual review
- Governance layers designed for human bottlenecks

- Identity practices tied to format instead of judgment

Leadership

This guide is designed to help educational leaders prepare for these changes that are coming in education and ensure they are not left holding a Green Ledger while the world moves forward. The journey begins with diagnosis, giving leaders a way to call legacy work by its name, then moves to situational awareness, showing where pressure predictably accumulates. After that, the guide identifies and clarifies displacement which is then translated into design of replacement without losing human value, then ends with a practical 60-day plan to work through the Green Ledger processes at your institution.

The Three Signals of Green Ledger Practices

To effectively work with Green Ledger practices, we need to make a diagnosis before we attempt to redesign to avoid keeping outdated policies and engaging in wasted effort that leads to structural misalignment. Education leaders can see the signals and now we need to give them clarity and alignment. The next section of this guide will enable leaders to identify three signals of the Green Ledger practices before they harden into bottlenecks.

Signal 1: The Human Role is Supervisory, Not Relational

> When people are acting as controllers and directors of a process instead of professionals in human relationships, the practice is a Green Ledger process.

Supervisory processes are when people check a box when students take an action, or when a standard routing and approval process is repeated; often in a queue governed by policies that were created decades ago. By contrast, moments that involve thought and expert judgment are relational; and that is where human value is highest. Supervisory tasks are easiest to automate while relational work concentrates distinct human value.

Supervisory work creates bottlenecks because it piles up wherever humans are acting as gatekeepers instead of experts. These tasks inflate workload, slow down decision cycles, and divert professional attention away from moments that actually require judgment or relationship. As AI compresses this layer, the bottlenecks become even more visible. Recognizing supervisory patterns early helps institutions avoid redesigning around the wrong work.

In assessment, if the first pass is verifying process or information, we are supervising; if we are judging learning ability and content, we are relational. If advisors are spending time repeatedly providing the same information, we are supervising; if we are resolving complex student issues related to their life situation, we are relational.

As supervisory steps compress under automation, policies that were written to enforce those steps become visible: leading directly to Signal 2.

Signal 2: The Policy Exists To Preserve a Manual Constraint

Educational institutions have a policy for everything. And when that policy was created, it made sense. But many policies were written around yesterday's manual processes that caused bottlenecks. If those bottlenecks vanish, the policy becomes the bottleneck.

Does your institution have any policies that require sequential approvals, physical signatures, carbonless paper copies, people hand-carrying forms from one office

to another? These are all candidates for the Green Ledger. When these processes are built into policies, this solidifies the structure. When the structure cannot change, new structural redesign is slowed down and restricted by artificial constraints, so attempting to integrate AI without policy changes just repeats the problem.

Ask of any rule or process, “Which manual constraint is this protecting? Does that constraint still exist today?”

Policies were often written to manage manual constraints such as sequential handoffs, manual signatures, desk-to-desk routing; so when those constraints fade, the policy itself becomes the bottleneck. That doesn’t make the policy “wrong”; it means the context changed, and leaders can (and should) change policy to match the new structure. In practice, that can look like risk-tiering (only high-risk items require full approvals), sampling rather than universal sign-offs, or sunsetting attestations that existed solely to police manual steps. The principle is simple: policy follows purpose and design—not the other way around—so when structure evolves, policy must move to enable it.

Look at course or program approvals: are there stages that exist because forms once moved from one desk to another in sequence? Creating risk tiers and sampling might replace sequential, universal, manual signoffs.

In academic integrity: are there rules designed around manual grading workflows? When review evidence shifts to authentic demonstration of capabilities, the old rules no longer fit.

Policy should follow purpose and design, not preserve legacy steps. But even with better policies, some evidence-based practices still miss the point: and that leads directly to signal 3.

Signal 3: The Outcome Can Be Evidenced More Authentically Elsewhere

Another signal that points to a Green Ledger process is when the outcome that is being measured can be demonstrated more directly and easily another way. This is not about AI detection, policy, or tools: it is about structure.

For example, typical legacy assessment often proves that something was completed without measuring competence. AI merely exposes this mismatch faster by trivializing products that prove completion rather than competence. Authentic evidence that shows application, context, demonstration, or a portfolio is harder to trivialize with AI completing the assignment. When this authentic evidence is available, the old legacy practice is revealed.

The question for leaders is not whether AI was used, but whether the evidence requires judgment to be demonstrated. If a tool can produce the artifact without the learner demonstrating judgment, redesign the evidence.

This isn't just allowing a student to use AI or teaching them how to use another tool. This is changing the structure: instead of writing a three page essay, the assignment becomes an oral defense, a discussion, or an interactive application with a real stakeholder.

An assessment that requires specific, detailed citations and narrow formatting becomes an overall analysis with resources listed combined with an oral discussion and check for reasoning and support.

> One signal suggests, two confirm, three demand action.

Authentic evidence reframes the workflow that surrounds it.

Pulling the Signals Together

Use these signals together to find the Green Ledger processes: one may suggest, two confirm, and three demand action. These signals, jointly, form a clear filter for finding legacy work. The next section applies these filters to five domains to show what lights up for Green Ledger candidates.

Where the Ledger Lights Up First: Five High-Pressure Domains

When leaders look, you will start to see areas where the Green Ledger candidates start to gather. These domains are not the only place where you can see Green Ledger candidates, but they often appear here first and are most visible. These patterns in domains appear early, before the workflows collapse.

Where there are high volumes of transactions and manual constraints based on policy, this builds Green Ledger candidates into roadblocks. When policy drives and requires supervisory work instead of relational work, this layers Green Ledger candidates and prevents progress.

These are institutional structures that share common themes:

- High volume of transactions or processes
- Policy-reinforced manual constraints (we have to do it that way)
- Reliance on supervisory work (repetitive, non-relational)
- Weak support for decision-making pathways (that's how we've always done it)

The three signals rarely appear in isolation: they cluster in domains. These five domains are where to start your search for your institution's Green Ledger candidates. Each domain shows the Green Ledger pattern in a different way.

Domain 1: Assessment & Evidence of Learning

Most executive pain is in this domain. This is where tremendous effort is being spent today to detect use of AI or ban AI or to convince students how to use AI to complete the same assignments that have always been used to determine learning. This is where imitation leading to displacement shows up first.

This domain usually lights up first because it is heavy supervisory work: checking format, layout, and checking point totals for each assignment. This is evidence that was built around manual constraints: before AI students had to complete the assignments and faculty had to manually grade the assignments. Policies in this area were written around that need for faculty to spend time grading each assignment individually. When there is a high degree of scalability, there is a high degree of fragility as well.

When leaders look for the Green Ledger candidates in this domain, the three signals show up here quickly. Signal one: supervisory work dominates this domain. This is seen when time is spent examining detailed formatting and layout (is there one space after each period?) and when there is a rubric that is a checklist (did the student include this item and that item?). Signal two: policy

requires steps because of the manual review. Policies that require certain types of grading and certain narrow specifications that force manual and physical grading of assignments (such as requiring a rubric checklist) light up signal two quickly. Signal three: better evidence exists. Is there a better way for a student to show their learned knowledge, such as oral reports or demonstrations that may be constrained by policy? Do we have policies that require time in a seat that does not actually increase learning but could be replaced with demonstrations that more effectively illustrate learning?

The traditional essay is an example of a Green Ledger candidate, and it often lights up all three signals at one time. A student uses AI to meet the strict formatting and word count requirements and the faculty member is required to spend their time in supervisory work, checking the assignment for detailed key points and formatting (signal one). The faculty member is required to give this assignment because policy specifically requires that a student write a certain number of words in each course (signal two). And since the student used AI to complete the assignment, there is no way to measure whether the student learned anything during the assignment. A simple oral report or discussion would be a better way to evaluate the level of learning for the student (signal three).

> Assessment redesign isn't about banning or detecting AI — it's about replacing evidence structures that no longer fit their outcomes.

Domain 2: Advising and Student Support Workflows

Advising lights up bright with the Green Ledger because of the high volume of information and scripts that are repeated. Advising collapses faster than almost any other domain because it has large volume, it reacts to enrollment cycles, many requirements are tied to policies that protect manual constraints, and it has built-in queues and bottlenecks.

Advising that is scripted to primarily provide information to students is supervisory, not relational. Systems that use a queue enforce artificial manual constraints (supervisory). And policies based on previous manual procedures like holds, manual signoffs, and mandatory advising enforce bottlenecks that become Green Ledger candidates.

Signal one: advisors repeating information that exists on web pages and catalogs. That's supervisory. Signal two: policy requires advisors to manually check off meetings and contact points with students in order to enroll in programs or classes. That's manual and is residual from an older time and process. Signal three: Having a conversation with a student may be more accurate in determining their desires, goals, and life pathway. Building a relationship can lead to more knowledge than simply checking boxes and requirements.

Does your institution have multi-step advising processes that are based on academic holds due only to policies? Do your advisors spend time registering students for a common set of courses, especially in the first semester, without talking to them and building a relationship? Are your students required to visit with advisors to obtain information that could be found in a catalog or FAQ? If so, you can now see the Green Ledger candidates lighting up.

This isn't to suggest that advisors aren't needed in education. However, advisors' real value is relational and contextual: coaching, guidance, and planning, not scripted information.

Domain 3: Faculty Workload and Course Operations

Faculty workload and course operations have not substantially changed in decades of development in the education industry. That's one reason it includes a large amount of supervisory load that AI can really trivialize.

This domain lights up quickly because faculty often have large amounts of mechanical work like grading and checking. This domain also usually has policies around contact hours and assignment minimums that protect and preserve legacy tasks. High volume plus high repetition equals early displacement.

When faculty are assigned, they often inherit course structures that were designed for a previous time. The assignment patterns are repeated from one semester to another, often forever. Copying from previous LMS patterns helps reinforce the old patterns and design.

Signal one: Mechanical feedback is supervisory. When faculty spend hours checking boxes and checking for checked boxes, that's a signal you have a Green Ledger candidate. Signal two: When policy requires faculty to require certain types of assignments, assignment lengths, or formatting, that preserves legacy expectations and prevents progress. Contact hours, assignment minimums, and mandatory grading frequencies are all manual constraints. Signal three: Policies may require assignments and work that do not accurately measure actual learning. When there are better ways to measure whether learning is happening, that's a Green Ledger candidate.

A great example of this is strict formatting requirements around specific reference types. Some reference types want sentence case, others want a period followed by a space. Faculty spending time measuring spaces and formatting takes a great deal of time: and it can be completed instantly with AI.

Faculty time must be reallocated toward relational and high judgment work, not forced supervisory repetition.

Domain 4: Governance and Policy Structures

This domain is not where leaders look first, and these policies that were built for manual processes often surprise leaders as those policies tend to protect forms and systems that no longer matter.

Policies were designed by well-meaning people and were useful and efficient for bottlenecks that were created in a time of manual supervisory processes: but those bottlenecks no longer exist. Many policies that support sequential routing were created to build around physical routing, not actual risk or compliance. Policy is slow to change and risk-averse. Policy-first reaction creates drift towards the past and towards Green Ledger processes.

Signal One: Humans acting as gatekeepers is a supervisory role and is a clear Green Ledger candidate. Signal Two: Policies that replicate manual constraints and support manual processing provide resistance to needed changes. Signal Three: Compliance can be shown through other forms of evidence, such as reporting or dashboards, instead of following exact policies.

One example is the manual, multi-step approval change. Do you have policies in place that requires three or four people to manually approve a ten-dollar expenditure? Do you have policies that route physical pieces of paper for signatures or carbonless paper copies for signature, approval, and filing? These are Green Ledger processes, even if your policy requires them.

The classic line in the education industry is, “This is how we’ve always done it.” Yes. And for a time, that was certainly the right way to do it. But the education industry is changing and evolving. Leaders need to spot these Green Ledger practices and be the ones that say, “And now it’s time to change.” Policies can create unintended risk when they enforce workflows that no longer reflect how work is being done.

This is the turning point leaders must name: policy must follow purpose and design, not protect legacy mechanics.

Domain 5: Institutional Identity and Human Value

With all the talk around AI replacing humans, sometimes the role of the human can be lost. People find security and value in their work and can feel threatened by suggestions of AI “doing their job.” This domain is not about using AI to replace people.

This domain looks at what areas need protection and continuity, even during the process of locating the Green Ledger processes. The Green Ledger process does not propose that everything needs to change: some areas need protection as the education industry evolves into the future.

Institutions, and leaders, need clarity on what processes need to remain distinctively human. At the same time, AI exposes mechanical work, and that can be threatening to people, making them question their identity and usefulness. People spend decades being rewarded for supervisory work. People provide tremendous value in the education industry with judgment, nuance, ethical stewardship, context, and human relationships. Despite this, there are still areas that are candidates for the Green Ledger.

Signal One: When professionals are reduced to supervisory roles, their own identity tends to erode. Is every advisor taught to say the same thing to every student? Signal Two: Policies often enforce roles that limit human judgment. Do your policies require students to take a specific sequence, no matter their experience or what they explain to advisors? Signal Three: Authentic evidence of human work appears outside legacy structure. How are your advisors enabled to build, create, and engage with students' direct needs?

Faculty identity is the clearest example of this. Many faculty have their identity rooted in evaluation and grading systems. They have, for years, asked questions and graded the papers and exams, showing their knowledge and providing value. Faculty identity is deeply entwined with evaluation history. To make this change, the identity needs to change. Leaders need to show faculty have value in different ways at different times.

Advisors experience a similar drift. Advisors are often keepers of the knowledge related to registration and systems. Students need to seek out advisors and advisors provide the information that students need. This is supervisory action. Advisors' identity drifts towards supervision when their job is defined by artificial institutional bottlenecks. Leaders need to find ways to help advising roles change to that of relationships: advisors need to know the student and the life situation of the student more than the advisors need to memorize knowledge related to course sequencing.

This domain is where leaders define what work stays human, what is protected, and what is redesigned. This is the heart of the Green Ledger philosophy.

Bringing the Domains Together

These five areas consistently contain legacy structures that are ripe with Green Ledger candidates. When two or more signals appear in a domain at an institution, displacement is likely already under way. These patterns and signals give leaders a clear starting point for identifying what must change and what should be protected. Next is how Green Ledger practices evolve from imitation to displacement to redesign.

From Imitation to Redesign: Understanding Structural Displacement

Imitation is normal. It's expected. I've worked a great deal in IT and I've seen every new IT tool come in and simply replace the exact process with a computerized version of the exact same process. Was it faster? Sometimes. Was it worse? Ask the auto industry. Before the auto sales process was "computerized," it would take about 10 minutes to complete the paperwork and there were 4 pages. In the heyday of computerized forms, it took hours and there was an entire book of paper printed out (complete with manual signatures). The higher education industry isn't immune: we find a tool and use the tool without ever changing the process. This pattern always break eventually and higher education is now entering the breaking point.

How Displacement Works (Structurally, not Emotionally)

When a form is designed, a person has assumptions and limitations. They are usually created based on specific rules at a certain time. However, over time those rules can change, and the form seldom does. When there is a structural impact like this, it can lead to inefficiency and collapse. And when AI is added to this structure, the AI exposes the fragility that was already there: it didn't cause it. Displacement signals that the structure has changed, even if the workflow has not.

Good leaders can see when structures are reaching this displacement stage: when the old workflow is no longer stable; when the form doesn't match the function, when people are trying to fix the wrong thing. When people are working harder and longer hours, but the outcomes aren't improving, this is displacement. When staff or faculty complain about processes that feel pointless, these processes are likely in the displacement phase.

Do you have forms where people type things in fields that don't make sense because "there's nowhere else to put it on the form?" Do you store data in fields where the value doesn't make sense, but it's stored because "that's where we store that information?" Do you have areas that are developing shadow workflows or systems? This is a clear sign that you have systems in the displacement phase.

> If people are building shadow systems, displacement is already underway.

When this happens, the underlying structure has already shifted and displacement is already happening, even if no one is saying so. When structures are in the displacement phase, they are ripe for redesign.

What Redesign Actually Means

Redesign does not mean to take the paper form and make a pdf. It does not mean changing the paper routing process and making it an email chain. Redesign means looking at the full process, determining the reasoning behind it, and finding the required outcomes. Only then, redesign looks at the capabilities and restrictions in place today to find the most efficient and useful way that will result in a better outcome. Once displacement is visible, redesign becomes the only viable path forward.

The temptation today, especially in the education industry, is to simply use AI as a tool to "change" processes. When you take a process, provide the same inputs, and have the same outcomes, but you just change how it's processed, you haven't changed the process. You may have made the process faster, but the process will still be based on artificial, out of date bottlenecks that do not apply today.

A redesign starts with the question, "Why?" The redesign needs to look not at the process, but what are the requirements of the process. There may be new evidence that requires changes to the process. There may be changes to policy that have never been fully implemented in the process. There may simply be a better way to complete the process or the process may not actually be needed at all. Carefully looking at the "why" will reveal Green Ledger processes very quickly.

Mini-Case: Governance

This pattern becomes clear when we look at a real workflow process. One college where we looked at Green Ledger practices had a process where approvals were routed via email. The college had recently "upgraded" and "changed" their process to include fillable pdf forms in those email chains. Of course, this fillable pdf matched the exact form that had been routed via internal mail just a few years before. Each person in the chain also had to review, manually, to determine where to send the email next. Very often emails were lost or sent to the wrong person and time would be spent trying to track down who had the latest version of the form and who signed it last.

When asked why this process was followed, of course the answer was, "that's how we've always done it." There were suggestions that there was policy around the complex routing of approvals and signatures, but no one was able to find those policies. Many forms were being routed for many levels of signatures, and it was discovered that in many cases, the people who were supposed to be approving were not even doing the approving: their office staff were forwarding the emails.

This is where the real displacement started: people were finding ways to work around the structures. Later it was discovered that some divisions were finding

ways to attempt to automate some of these systems with shadow systems, keeping track of the data and information on their own, apart from the forwarded emails because “it was more accurate.” If AI had been added to these emails and processes, it is likely that the entire process could have been fully automated.

When the “why” here revealed that no one really knew why, the structure could change. Yes, there were approvals that were required. But a system could quickly be developed that would use the current systems to determine basic information (select an employee’s name from a list instead of typing it manually in a pdf), then use a set of rules, based on current policy, that would route the approval to the required person.

The approval now became a simple button press, and all records, dates, and times of action were visible to everyone. The redesigned workflow reduced time, eliminated routing errors, and clarified where human judgment was required. This wasn’t just automating the approval process; it was redefining the process around the current environment.

When structure changes, the workflow must change with it.

What Replaces What: Designing the New Workflow

When looking at the workflows, it is critical to find and describe the replacement and not just automate the current process. Once displacement appears, redesign requires naming what replaces the old work, not automating it. When the Green Ledger process is discovered, leaders need to replace the legacy workflow. Automation can speed up legacy work, but when you do, the legacy work is still there.

The Replacement Template

> Start with outcomes. Evidence reveals the workflow, not vice-versa.

The key to replacement design is outcome. Do not focus on what the current workflow does, focus on the needed outcome. The outcome can help be defined with evidence. Ask what evidence is needed to show the outcome that's desired in this case. This evidence can help define the best workflow. Once you define the outcome and see the evidence, you can check your work with verification. Ask how you can verify the evidence that supports the outcome.

Verification clarifies what steps should be included in the workflow and which steps can be removed. Keep the outcomes in mind as primary when defining a workflow. This should be a new sequence and not based on the Green Ledger legacy practices. When working through the sketch and design, note where there is supervisory work that can be automated, and where there are relationship tasks that need human intervention. Define these roles early in the process without basing them on legacy work.

When this design is in place, this is the time to look at policy. Your design might not match policy: that means it's time to change policy, not modify the workflow. Legacy policy reflects constraints; a redesigned workflow reflects current reality. Policies need to be updated from time to time and during a solid workflow design is an appropriate time.

Mini Case Study

Assessment via the written word (essay) is an area that often creates conflict between Green Ledger practices and modern realities. To redesign:

- Outcome: The outcome should be learning. This is the point of asking the student to write an essay and what we want to happen. Today, with AI, writing an essay does not demonstrate learning.
- Evidence: An oral discussion can more effectively provide authentic evidence of learning. This oral discussion/defense can help students see and reveal reasoning and understanding.

- Verification: To verify that learning, faculty can create short rubrics around specific points of learning that can be discussed and determine if the student has, indeed, learned specific ideas. This will make the evaluation and the learning process clear to both the student and the faculty.
- Workflow: The new sequence now appears more visible: the faculty need to design time in the class and prepare for discussions with students *instead of* asking them to write essays. This changes the classroom, the syllabus, interactions, and time management for the faculty: significant changes in the legacy workflow.
- Roles: Creating the new workflow illustrates how the human value is there in judgment of the information and facts, whether AI was used in the learning process or not. AI can help with prompts and practice, but people make the judgment on reasoning and transfer of information.
- Policy: Policy needs to be adjusted to allow the faculty to measure learning using this new workflow instead of restricting them to requiring that students write a certain number of words in the class.

Leadership Guidance for Replacement

Leaders need to provide clear guidance through the replacement process:

- Insist on clear design of replacement workflows, not just automating the current processes. Every design needs to be directly connected to outcomes.
- Define roles early: With the new workflow design, the roles of humans and the roles of AI must be clearly defined. Specifically, the new jobs for people should be clear and well-defined so people can see their own value and work to change their definitions of value.
- Change policy late: If design and policy conflict after the design is complete, policy should change, not the new workflow.
- Create a crosswalk: A crosswalk can be created to show the change process, but only after the design is complete to ensure that the new design is not based on green legacy practices.

Leaders remove friction by naming the replacement and protecting the parts of work that are distinctively human.

A 60-Day Leadership Plan

In the education industry it is easy to default to committees, subcommittees, and long review cycles. That's not a process that works with Green Ledger practices. Structural redesign, even on a small scale, requires time cycles and continuous, visible progress. Each block results in a clear artifact to measure progress (meetings do not count as progress or artifacts). This is why the 60-day leadership plan is broken down into four 15-day blocks. This will not feel like traditional higher education change management, and it shouldn't.

> Ship artifacts, not meetings.

Days 1-15: Audit one practice

Start small and focused: pick one practice, not a whole department. Select a process or procedure that is happening in your institution. Map the practice. Talk to the people involved in carrying out the practice, don't base the map only on what administration thinks is happening. Do not base the map on policy. Find out exactly what is happening and how. Who does what and when?

Look at the map and apply the three signals.

1. Signal One: Are there supervisory practices? Are there manual processes that may be linked to a previous way of doing things?
2. Signal Two: Are there policies in place that direct the practice? Are those policies based on today's situation? Are people finding "ways around" those policies because they find it easier to adjust what they are doing?
3. Signal Three: Is this the best way to see evidence of the outcome? Is there a better way to measure or complete the outcome than how it is being done today?

Identify the constraints in place around the process now. Are these constraints real or artificial? For example, do you use pdf forms for signatures "because that's the way we've always done it?" Identify better evidence: how can you achieve the outcome that's needed in a better way? Are there more efficient ways to complete the task? Does the task really need that many levels of approval or review?

In the end, produce a one-page audit summary. This isn't judgment over what anyone is or is not doing: this is a review of the process and what the process is doing. If it's a Green Ledger process, this will be simple and by the end of the audit you will see the parts of the process that are based on legacy practices and how the outcome can be measured more efficiently with a different workflow.

Days 16–30: Replacement Design Sprint

On day 16, take the one-page audit summary you created and redesign it using the replacement template described in the previous section:

- Define the outcome
- Define the evidence
- Define the verification
- Sketch the workflow
- Define the roles
- Identify needed policy changes
- Plan a small pilot

If you have a full audit summary, these tasks should be logical and follow the flow easily. For each step, make sure you have a clear, written artifact that answers the questions for the step. Each step of the template must result in its own artifact. Be sure that you use the audit and do not refer to "what we've always done." This is a short sprint, but you should involve the people who do the work to get their input on what makes sense from their viewpoint. Engage with people and integrate their views on the specific steps listed in this template.

When you reach the last step, plan a small pilot, you should have a clear view of the green legacy practice and a clear view of the new, well-defined, based on today's reality process. You should be able to use that to design a small pilot program. A pilot should be intentionally small and low-risk, perhaps implementing in one area or one division, to test out the new workflow. A good pilot includes a simple way to verify whether the new workflow produces the outcome and evidence that you defined.

Days 31–45: Policy Fast Track

When you worked through the redesign, you likely noticed legacy policies that were bottlenecks and restrictions to the redesign. As part of the redesign, you should have a written artifact defining those policies and what needs to change for the new workflow to be effective. Remember, policy follows workflow design, never the other way around.

This step requires leadership to review those policies. All policies were put in place for a reason. Those reasons may no longer match today's capabilities or constraints. At this point, you want to find policies that restrict changes and determine how to change them. Each potential policy change should be measured for risk. Each party involved in the policy should review potential changes and determine if the suggested changes would introduce more risk or change the current risk profile.

As the risks are identified, alternative wording and policies can be proposed. Discussions should be had over the changes to the risk profile and the potential benefits of the new workflow. And when agreement is reached, interim guidance can be drafted to implement the new workflow and replace the Green Ledger process without creating a full rewrite from the start. Once the new workflow has been in place and fully evaluated with interim guidance, full implementation of the new policies can be put in place.

Days 46-60: Human Value & Role Reallocation

This is where the full implementation of the new workflow begins. Staff and faculty can be taught how and where to reallocate hours from supervisory, manual processes to relational processes, saving time, effort, and truly showing value for the human input and process. Staff and teams involved can be trained on the new workflow in a way that shows it is a replacement and not simply “more work” for one group at the expense of another.

Where possible, dashboards with information can be created and implemented to help show team members where time has been saved and where work is clearly more efficient. There is tremendous value in people seeing concrete evidence that their work is valued and can be quantified in ways they understand. Role clarity reduces anxiety and helps people understand how their own contribution increases in value.

Finally, a 90-day review should be planned. The first redesign of a workflow may not be perfect. Once people start using it, they may see edge cases that were missed, or users might see efficiencies that can improve the process even more. This might be unfamiliar territory for many in the educational industry, but this is how leaders can change the industry to make it more responsive and more effective.

Leading With Clarity in a Time of Acceleration

The education industry is changing. It is going to continue to change, despite all the traditions and bureaucracy embedded in the system. The question is not whether we will change, but whether we will lead the change. The Green Ledger lens gives leaders a way to name what must end, design what replaces it, and protect what stays human. This isn't an option: the Green Ledger practices will disappear, just like the Green Ledger did. Educational leaders need to be prepared to move first with clarity.

Three cues for educational leaders to remember:

1. Name endings (processes & policies)
2. Name the replacement (workflows & actions)
3. Center human judgment and community (people & relationships)

The work ahead is not about tools; it is about structure. With the Green Ledger lens, you now have a way to see legacy practices, specify what replaces them, and protect the work that must remain human. Use the Three Signals to focus your attention, the five domains to find your earliest leverage, and the 60-day plan to convert decisions into operating reality.

> Name endings openly. Specify the replacement. Center human judgment and community.

If this framework would be useful to align your leadership team or to map a first 60-day cycle to one practice, I'm available for a brief executive walkthrough and a tailored starting outline—contact details are on the final page.

Appendix: The Green Ledger Diagnostic Page

How to Use This Page (at a glance)

- Spot it: Run the Three Signals Test on a candidate practice.
- Scope it: Answer the Quick Diagnostic Questions to get a quick read.
- Move it: Use Replace / Redesign / Protect as your 30–60 day checklist.
- Prove it: Pilot small; verify outcomes; then update policy.

The Three Signals Test (quick triage)

Use all three together. One signal may suggest; two confirm; three demand action.

Signal 1: Supervisory vs. Relational

- Is most human time spent checking, routing, approving, tallying, or enforcing formats?
- Are staff/faculty repeating information already published elsewhere?
- Would the human contribution be more valuable if focused on judgment, coaching, or context?

Signal 2: Policy Preserves a Manual Constraint

- Does the policy exist to protect a manual step (sequential approvals, manual signatures, paper “fillable PDF” routing, timestamp compliance)?
- Do policies conflict with how the work actually happens now?
- Could risk-tiering, sampling, or interim guidance reduce manual steps without increasing risk?

Signal 3: Outcome Can Be Evidenced More Authentically Elsewhere

- Does the current artifact prove completion rather than competence?
- Is there a hard-to-trivialize demonstration (oral defense, applied brief, portfolio, scenario walk-through) that would show learning or performance more directly?
- If a tool can produce the artifact without the learner showing judgment, should the evidence be redesigned?

Quick Diagnostic Questions (5–7 minutes with any practice)

1. What outcome actually matters here?
   (Name the outcome in one sentence.)

2. What evidence would show that outcome clearly?
   (List 1–2 authentic demonstrations.)

3. Where does most human time go today: supervisory or relational?
   (Estimate: % supervisory / % relational.)

4. Which steps exist mainly because of policy or "how we've always done it"?
   (Circle the manual constraints.)

5. What's the smallest unit where we could try a different evidence + workflow?
   (Pick one course, team, process, or approval type.)

6. What risk actually changes if we try it?
   (Note if risk-tiering or sampling would be enough.)

7. What would success look like in 30–60 days?
   (Define 2–3 observable indicators.)

Replace / Redesign / Protect — Leader's Checklist

Replace (name what ends)

- We have named the legacy practice (form/process/policy) that is reaching its end.
- We can state why the structure no longer fits (1–2 sentences).
- We will stop measuring progress by meetings; we will ship artifacts.

Redesign (specify what replaces it)

- Outcome is written in one sentence.
- Evidence (authentic demonstration) is listed with 2–4 rubric criteria.
- Verification method is defined (how we will check).
- Workflow sketch drafted (new steps; removed steps; sequencing).
- Roles defined: what is automated vs. where human judgment is required.

- Pilot scoped small (one unit/team/segment) with start/finish dates.

Protect (what stays human)

- We have reallocated time from supervisory to relational work.
- We have role clarity so people see their value in the new workflow.
- We will use a dashboard or brief published measure to show time saved / quality gained.

Policy (follows purpose and design)

- Constraints identified that are policy-driven (not purpose-driven).
- Interim guidance drafted (risk-tiering, sampling, or clarified authority).
- Final policy changes deferred until the pilot verifies the new workflow.

Design tomorrow. Don’t automate yesterday.

The Green Ledger of Education reframes AI in higher education from “tools and tips” to institutional design. Across industries, disruption doesn’t speed up legacy routines; it replaces them. Accounting’s paper ledger didn’t modernize—it vanished. Education is entering the same moment. This executive guide gives presidents, provosts, accreditors, and state leaders a clear framework to identify legacy practices, name what replaces them, and focus human attention where it matters most. You’ll learn the Three Signals of green-ledger practices, the five domains where pressure shows first, and a 60-day plan that turns insight into action: an audit, a replacement design sprint, a policy fast-track, and a human-investment plan. The aim isn’t to automate yesterday; it’s to design tomorrow—with evidence, integrity, and human value at the center.

www.obersolutionsgroup.dev