Executive Brief | 6-min read | May 2026 | The Sainth Advisory Intelligence Series

Measuring AI Readiness, Adoption, and ROI

What leaders should measure beyond licenses, pilot counts, and training completion.

By Cedric-Joel Kwindja | Brittney Hannah

6-min read

IN THIS BRIEF

Most organizations know they are not measuring AI the right way. They continue doing it anyway.

The metrics that dominate enterprise AI reporting were designed for procurement, not performance. They track what was purchased, what was deployed, and how many people completed a training module. They do not track whether AI is changing how work gets done, whether adoption is spreading or stalling, or whether the investment is generating the outcomes it was designed to produce.

This is not a measurement problem. It is a strategic visibility problem. And leaders who cannot see clearly cannot steer.

> *The organizations that will extract durable value from AI are the ones that build measurement systems designed for outcomes, not activity.*

01 THE MEASUREMENT PROBLEM IN ENTERPRISE AI

When enterprise AI programs are asked to demonstrate value, most produce the same set of numbers: licenses purchased, pilots completed, employees trained, tools deployed. These numbers are real. They are also largely meaningless as indicators of strategic progress.

They measure inputs. Enterprise AI value is an output. And the gap between those two things is where billions of dollars in AI investment disappear without a clear accounting.

The measurement problem is not accidental. Organizations default to input metrics because they are easy to collect, easy to report, and easy to defend. They require no baseline. They demand no outcome definition. They carry no accountability for what the investment was supposed to produce.

The result is a reporting structure that creates the appearance of progress while making it structurally impossible to evaluate whether progress is actually occurring.

Leaders cannot manage what they cannot measure. And right now, most are managing an AI program with the equivalent of a receipt, not a scorecard.

02 WHAT MOST ORGANIZATIONS ARE MEASURING

The metrics most commonly used to report on enterprise AI programs fall into three categories, all of which measure the wrong things.

Activity metrics track what the organization has done: tools deployed, use cases launched, pilots initiated, vendor contracts signed. Activity is necessary but not sufficient. An organization can produce significant activity with no measurable impact on performance.

Access metrics track what the organization has made available: licenses issued, platforms provisioned, training content published. Access is a precondition for adoption, not adoption itself. Measuring access as a proxy for adoption is one of the most common and most costly errors in enterprise AI reporting.

Completion metrics track what the organization has finished: training modules completed, pilots concluded, implementations signed off. Completion measures the end of a process, not the beginning of a behavior change. A workforce that has completed AI training is not necessarily a workforce that is using AI.

None of these metrics answer the question that matters: Is AI changing how the organization operates, and is that change producing measurable value?

DIMENSION	WHAT MOST MEASURE	WHAT ACTUALLY MATTERS
Readiness	Checklist completion, tool availability	Strategic clarity, governance structure, workforce capability
Adoption	Licenses issued, training completions	Active utilization rate, workflow integration depth, adoption spread
ROI	Cost of deployment, pilot count	Operational outcomes, decision quality, workforce productivity, strategic positioning

03 WHAT ACTUALLY MATTERS: READINESS INDICATORS

AI readiness is not a state an organization achieves before it deploys. It is a condition the organization builds and maintains over time. Measuring it accurately requires moving beyond checklists and self-assessments toward indicators that reflect genuine organizational capability.

Strategic clarity. Does the organization have a defined AI strategy connected to specific operational and mission objectives? Can leaders at every level articulate what AI is expected to contribute to their function? Strategic clarity is a prerequisite for everything that follows. Organizations without it are not ready to scale, regardless of what technology they have deployed.

Data and infrastructure readiness. Is the data required to power intended use cases accessible, clean, and governed? Are the technical systems capable of supporting the integrations AI adoption requires? Infrastructure readiness is the foundation on which all other readiness rests. Organizations that skip this assessment consistently encounter avoidable barriers at the point of deployment.

Governance readiness. Are the decision rights, accountability structures, risk frameworks, and compliance processes in place to govern AI responsibly? Governance readiness is not a legal or compliance checkbox. It is the organizational architecture that determines whether AI can be trusted at scale.

Workforce readiness. Do teams have the skills, language, and confidence to use AI in their specific roles? Workforce readiness is not measured by training completion. It is measured by demonstrated capability and behavioral change. Organizations that conflate the two will consistently overestimate how ready their workforce actually is.

04 WHAT ACTUALLY MATTERS: ADOPTION INDICATORS

Adoption is the bridge between deployment and value. It is also the most underinstructed and undermeasured dimension of enterprise AI programs. Measuring adoption accurately requires indicators that reflect actual behavior change, not system access.

Active utilization rate. What percentage of the workforce with access to AI tools is actively using them in their daily work? Not logging in. Not completing onboarding. Using them to do work. Active utilization is the most direct measure of whether adoption is occurring and the most revealing indicator of where it is stalling.

Workflow integration depth. Has AI been integrated into actual workflows, or is it being used as a supplemental tool alongside existing processes? Surface-level adoption, where AI is available but optional, does not produce enterprise value. Deep integration, where AI is embedded into how core work gets done, does.

Adoption spread across functions. Is adoption concentrated in a small number of early adopters, or is it spreading across the organization? Concentrated adoption is a signal of limited organizational enablement. Broad adoption is a signal of a functioning adoption infrastructure.

Adoption sustainability over time. Is utilization growing, stable, or declining after the initial deployment period? Adoption that spikes at launch and declines over subsequent months is not adoption. It is curiosity. Sustainable adoption requires sustained enablement, and organizations that invest only at the point of launch will consistently see utilization decay.

05 WHAT ACTUALLY MATTERS: ROI INDICATORS

Return on AI investment is not a single number. It is a portfolio of outcomes measured across operational, workforce, and strategic dimensions. Organizations that look for a single ROI figure will consistently misread what their AI program is producing.

Operational efficiency outcomes. Have specific workflows improved in speed, accuracy, or cost since AI was integrated? Operational outcomes require a baseline, a defined intervention, and a measurement period. Organizations that did not establish baselines before deployment cannot demonstrate operational ROI after it. This is not a measurement problem. It is a planning failure that manifests as a measurement problem.

Decision quality outcomes. Are decisions being made faster, with better information, or with reduced error rates in functions where AI has been deployed? Decision quality is one of the highest-value outcomes of enterprise AI and one of the least measured. It requires organizations to define what a better decision looks like before AI is deployed, not after.

Workforce productivity outcomes. Are employees accomplishing more, with greater accuracy, in less time? Are they redirecting capacity from routine work toward higher-value work? Workforce productivity outcomes are the most visible ROI signal for most organizations and the most likely to be reported anecdotally rather than measured systematically.

Strategic positioning outcomes. Is the organization moving faster, competing more effectively, or serving its stakeholders with greater capability as a result of AI adoption? Strategic outcomes are the hardest to measure and the most important to track. Organizations that measure only operational efficiency will undercount the full return on their AI investment.

06 BUILDING A MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK THAT HOLDS

A measurement framework for enterprise AI is not a dashboard. It is a decision-making infrastructure that tells leadership what the program is producing, where it is performing, where it is stalling, and what adjustments are required.

An effective framework has four characteristics.

It is outcome-anchored. Every metric connects to a defined outcome, not an activity. The framework answers: Are we achieving what we said we would achieve? That question requires outcomes to have been defined before measurement began.

It is layered across dimensions. Readiness, adoption, and ROI are distinct dimensions that require distinct measurement approaches. A framework that conflates them will produce misleading signals. Each dimension requires its own indicators, baselines, and reporting cadence.

It is actionable. Measurement exists to inform decisions. A framework that produces data no one acts on is not a measurement system. It is a reporting exercise. Every indicator in the framework should be connected to a decision: If this metric declines, what do we do? Who is accountable for the response?

It is maintained over time. Enterprise AI programs evolve. Measurement frameworks must evolve with them. Use cases change. Workforce capability grows. Governance requirements shift. A framework built at

the point of deployment and never updated will quickly become disconnected from what the program is actually doing.

07 WHAT LEADERS SHOULD DO NOW

The measurement gap in enterprise AI is not a technical problem. It is a leadership decision. Organizations measure what their leaders decide to hold themselves accountable for.

The leaders of organizations that are extracting durable value from AI have made a deliberate decision to measure outcomes, not activity. They have defined success before deployment, built measurement systems before they were needed, and maintained accountability for results at the leadership level.

The leaders of organizations that are not extracting that value have, in most cases, made a different decision: to measure what is easy, report what is available, and defer the harder work of outcome definition and accountability until results become impossible to ignore.

By then, the cost of deferral has already accumulated.

The right time to build a measurement framework for enterprise AI is before the next deployment. The right time to close the gap between what is being measured and what actually matters is now.

The Sainth builds measurement frameworks that connect AI investment to the outcomes that determine whether that investment was worth making.

ABOUT THE SAINTH

The Sainth partners with organizations across government and regulated industries to define enterprise AI strategy, build the governance and workforce structures required for responsible adoption, and translate AI capability into measurable operational and competitive advantage. Visit thesainth.com or contact us directly to explore how we work with organizations at this stage of their AI journey.

RELATED READING FROM THE SAINTH

- Beyond the Proof of Concept
- Why AI Adoption Fails Before the Technology Does
- Positioning AI for Enterprise Adoption
- Why AI Change Management Cannot Be an Afterthought