

AI Employment Navigator

Lincoln demonstration -> dedicated implementation -> evidence -> replication

A proposed City of Lincoln / American Job Center Lincoln pathway to translate AI-literacy direction into a practical workforce service, prove it locally, build accountable implementation capacity, and - if evidence supports it - document a model other American Job Centers can evaluate and adapt.

PROJECT ORIGIN & PROPOSED LEADERSHIP

The AI Employment Navigator concept, participant workflow, prototypes, implementation framework and initial pilot model were developed by Ryan Uher within American Job Center Lincoln as a proposed workforce innovation.

Proposed role: Ryan Uher - Project Lead & Framework Developer. Institutional roles, legal ownership, branding and external use remain subject to City/AJC review and approval.

The full proposal in one view

Stage	Duration / status	Purpose
Phase I	30-day demonstration	Test workflow, safeguards, usability, lead quality, staff impact and early outcomes.
Decision Gate	Executive review	Continue, modify or stop based on evidence, risk, cost and governance readiness.
Phase II	12-18 month implementation pilot	Dedicated implementation capacity; staff training; standardization; expanded measurement; sustainability.
Replication Gate	Readiness review	Determine whether evidence, documentation, cost and governance support external replication.
Future	Voluntary replication	Package a locally configurable AJC toolkit and share lessons with interested workforce-system partners.

Proposed institutional positioning

Stakeholder	Proposed role
City of Lincoln / AJC Lincoln	Proposed originating organization and pilot environment
Greater Lincoln Workforce Development Board	Potential governance, strategy and scaling partner
Ryan Uher	Proposed Project Lead & Framework Developer
DOL / ETA	Potential guidance, alignment and technical-assistance partner
Future participating AJCs	Potential replication and local-adaptation sites after evidence is established

PROJECT ORIGIN, ATTRIBUTION & GOVERNANCE

Preserve institutional credibility and a clear development record

As the initiative moves through additional City, Workforce Board, state and federal discussions, the project should gain institutional governance without losing the documented record of who originated and developed the framework.

Recommended attribution on executive materials

AI Employment Navigator - a proposed City of Lincoln / American Job Center Lincoln workforce innovation.

Concept, Framework & Prototype Development: Ryan Uher

Proposed Project Lead & Framework Developer: Ryan Uher

Development record

Development element	Origin / development	Record
Original concept	Ryan Uher	AI-enabled employment navigation as a practical AJC service model.
Participant workflow	Ryan Uher	Candidate profile, privacy choice, master resume, qualified job search, application tailoring and interview preparation.
Working prototypes	Ryan Uher	Participant-facing Navigator and supporting implementation/leadership websites.
Implementation framework	Ryan Uher	Staff workflow, training approach, safeguards, pilot design and operating documentation.
Pilot / evaluation architecture	Ryan Uher	30-day demonstration, measures, risk controls and decision gates.
Replication concept	Ryan Uher	Lincoln-first pathway and locally configurable AJC replication framework.

Governance principle

Additional stakeholders should strengthen the initiative through governance, subject-matter expertise, funding, evaluation and authorization. The project record should continue to distinguish institutional sponsorship from individual concept/framework development.

Recommended documentation practices

- Keep Ryan Uher's project role on executive briefs, pilot charters, implementation plans and replication materials.
- Use version dates and maintain a controlled project archive of proposals, prototypes, guides and pilot materials.
- Create a formal pilot charter that names the executive sponsor, governance partners, Project Lead and decision rights.
- Document material changes to the framework and who approved them.
- Before making legal ownership or intellectual-property claims, obtain the appropriate City/legal guidance; authorship/contribution and legal ownership are separate questions.

Why now: AI literacy is becoming a workforce-system responsibility

DOL/ETA's February 2026 AI Literacy Framework is directed to American Job Centers, state and local workforce boards, workforce agencies and ETA grantees. It encourages expanded AI education and training and provides a framework for integrating AI literacy into program design.

Navigator alignment with the DOL framework

Framework element	Proposed operationalization
Understand AI principles	Orientation explains capabilities, limits and verification.
Explore AI uses	Participants apply AI to real employment tasks.
Direct AI effectively	Structured Navigator context replaces ad hoc prompting.
Evaluate AI outputs	Participants and staff verify jobs, fit and application content.
Use AI responsibly	Privacy choice, minimum-data rules, truthful content and human accountability.
Experiential learning	AI literacy is learned through the participant's actual job search.
Contextual learning	Learning is embedded in employment-service delivery.
Human skills	Judgment, communication, self-advocacy and decision-making remain central.
Enabling roles	Career planners receive standardized guidance and training.
Agility	Platform-flexible architecture can evolve with technology and policy.

Federal conversation posture

Ask DOL/ETA for guidance on responsible implementation and evaluation - not endorsement. The objective is to make Lincoln's demonstration useful to the broader workforce system while preserving local governance.

PROGRAM LOGIC MODEL

How the intervention is expected to create value

Logic model component	Proposed model
Need	Job seekers face an AI-shaped labor market but vary widely in AI literacy, job-search strategy and access to individualized support.
Inputs	AJC staff; Resource Room; approved AI tools; Navigator methodology; NEworks/public job sources; training; governance support.
Activities	AI-literacy orientation; profile; master resume; realistic job matching; application tailoring; interview preparation; staff review.
Outputs	Profiles; master resumes; qualified leads; applications; interview-prep sessions; staff trained; workflows documented; referrals.
Short-term outcomes	AI-literacy confidence; stronger materials; better fit decisions; safer and more independent AI use.
Intermediate outcomes	More qualified applications/interviews; appropriate referrals; staff capacity shifted toward higher-value coaching.
Long-term outcomes	Employment/retention indicators; sustainable implementation model; documented framework for replication.

Core hypotheses

- Contextual AI literacy can be delivered effectively through real employment tasks.
- A structured Navigator can improve output quality compared with unstructured prompting.
- Qualification-based screening can reduce low-value leads without removing participant choice.
- Human review and minimum-data rules can support responsible use in a public-workforce setting.
- A platform-flexible model can reduce dependence on a single vendor.
- Dedicated implementation ownership can improve consistency, adoption, measurement and continuous improvement.

PHASE I | 30-DAY DEMONSTRATION

Prove the service model before committing to scale

Track	Illustrative size	Population	Service
Track A - Universal Access	~10	Walk-in / Resource Room job seekers	Navigator setup, AI literacy, master resume, job search, application support
Track B - Program Supported	~10	Selected participants where appropriate	Navigator integrated into ongoing career-planner support

Four-week cycle

Period	Primary activity
Week 1 - Build	Governance checklist; staff orientation; baseline; profile/Navigator creation.
Week 2 - Pilot	Job discovery; lead verification; applications; workflow observations.
Week 3 - Apply	Tailored materials; interview preparation; participant/staff feedback.
Week 4 - Measure	Analyze implementation, early outcomes, risk events, time, cost and decision criteria.

Decision gate after Phase I

Decision domain	Evidence reviewed
Participant value	Completion, usability, AI-literacy change and participant feedback
Employment-service quality	Lead quality, application usefulness and early conversion indicators
Operational feasibility	Staff time, workflow consistency, accessibility and technology reliability
Safety/governance	Privacy, accuracy, bias, misuse and compliance issues
Cost	Actual incremental cost and projected cost of continued implementation
Strategic value	Evidence that a longer implementation phase could produce meaningful learning

Decision rule

Advance to Phase II only if leadership determines that participant value, governance readiness and implementation feasibility justify a longer pilot. Otherwise modify or stop.

PHASE II | 12-18 MONTH IMPLEMENTATION PILOT

AI implementation is not a one-time training event. It requires ownership.

If Phase I warrants continuation, the implementation-pilot concept adds the operating layer needed to move from prototype to repeatable service.

Proposed implementation lead: Ryan Uher

Proposed function: AI Workforce Implementation & Employment Specialist

A workforce-development implementation function - not a software-engineering role. Proposed as dedicated capacity during a 12-18 month implementation pilot, subject to organizational approval, classification and funding.

Responsibility	Phase II function
Implement	Lead Navigator, Job Watch and approved AI-assisted career-service workflows.
Train	Teach job seekers and staff practical AI literacy, prompting, verification and responsible use.
Standardize	Create SOPs, guides, workshops, privacy boundaries and human-review procedures.
Evaluate	Test tools, document failure points and determine which capabilities create actual workforce value.
Measure	Track adoption, lead quality, applications, interviews, placements, time savings and errors.
Sustain	Develop grant, partnership and allowable-funding strategies; prepare replication documentation.
Report	Provide structured implementation updates and recommendations to executive/governance stakeholders.

Continuity principle

If the project advances, maintaining continuity between original framework development and implementation leadership reduces knowledge loss and preserves accountability while governance expands around the project.

EVALUATION & EVIDENCE

Measure it like a workforce project, not an AI demo

Domain	Measure	Source	Cadence
Reach	Participants served / Navigator completion	Pilot log	Weekly
Adoption	Staff trained / approved workflows used	Training + workflow log	Monthly
AI literacy	Pre/post confidence and evaluation skills	Participant survey	Entry/exit
Quality	Qualified leads vs. poor matches	Staff review log	Weekly
Conversion	Applications -> interviews -> offers	Follow-up log	Monthly + follow-up
Employment	Placements / retention indicators where available	Approved records/follow-up	30/60/90 days
Efficiency	Staff/client time by workflow stage	Time sample	Monthly
Safety	AI errors, privacy issues and corrective actions	Issue register	Continuous
Cost	Incremental cost per participant / site	Fiscal + staff time	Quarterly
Sustainability	Funding, staffing and operational readiness	Implementation review	Quarterly
Replication	Deviations, barriers and local adaptations	Implementation log	Quarterly

The 30-day phase should be treated primarily as an implementation and early-outcome study, not proof that the Navigator caused employment outcomes. Phase II creates enough time to examine adoption, sustainability, longer-term outcomes and replication readiness more credibly.

GOVERNANCE & RISK

Responsible AI requires explicit controls

Risk	Control	Accountability
Hallucinated/outdated information	Verify against original job posting/source before action.	Staff + participant
Fabricated resume content	Truthfulness rule; master resume only from participant-provided information.	Staff + participant
PII / sensitive data	Minimum-data design; privacy mode; approved-platform policy; prohibit unnecessary case data.	Privacy / IT
Bias / inappropriate screening	Job-related must-have criteria; participant choice; human review; issue logging.	Governance / staff
Eligibility/program errors	AI does not make eligibility, benefit, sanction or service-access decisions.	Program leadership
Accessibility	Accessibility review; staff-assisted alternative; plain-language materials.	Accessibility / IT
Vendor dependence	Platform-flexible methodology; approved-platform list maintained locally.	IT / Project Lead
Staff inconsistency	Training, SOPs, demo mode, calibration and quality checks.	Implementation lead
Public overstatement	Central communications approval; distinguish proposal, pilot, evidence and replication.	City/AJC communications
Security/policy issue	Approved devices/platforms; escalation path; authority to pause.	IT / security

Governance gates

- Executive sponsor and decision rights
- Privacy/security review
- Approved-platform position
- Accessibility review
- Program/compliance boundaries
- Fiscal/cost-allocation review
- Participant notice/consent approach
- Communications/branding approval
- Issue escalation and stop-work process

FUNDING & SUSTAINABILITY

Fund the implementation project - not simply a position

The longer-term case is that responsible AI workforce implementation requires defined activities, deliverables and accountability. Dedicated staffing is an implementation cost needed to train, standardize, govern, measure and document the work.

Funding pathway	Approach
Existing infrastructure	AJC staff, computers, Resource Room, NEworks and public job sources - use first where allowable.
Existing workforce funds	Explore WIOA, Employment Service, One-Stop/Resource Room or other program costs only after fiscal/compliance review.
State innovation	Monitor Nebraska workforce innovation, digital-literacy and technology opportunities.
Competitive grants	Evaluate DOL/ETA, reemployment, AI-literacy, workforce-technology and public-sector innovation opportunities.
Partners	Higher education, foundations, employers or community organizations may support curriculum, evaluation or technology access.

Funding guardrail

Funding allowability is not assumed. Each cost must be mapped to the underlying service function and reviewed by the appropriate City/AJC fiscal, program, legal and grant-management staff.

Sustainability questions Phase II must answer

- What is the true cost per participant and per site?
- What staff capacity is required after the pilot?
- Which functions can be embedded in existing roles and which require dedicated capacity?
- Which technology/licensing costs are necessary?
- What governance functions must remain permanent?
- What evidence is strong enough to justify continued or external investment?

REPLICATION ARCHITECTURE

Standardize the framework. Localize the service.

Layer	Examples
Standardized core	Responsible-AI principles; truthfulness; human review; Navigator methodology; minimum metrics; SOP; training; issue logging; fidelity checklist.
Locally configurable	Approved AI platforms; state workforce links; local job sources; industries; workshops; contact information; supportive-service pathways; branding.
Locally governed	Privacy/security; accessibility; participant notices; program/fiscal use; retention; procurement; public communications.

Replication toolkit after successful implementation

- Executive adoption brief and readiness assessment
- Implementation playbook
- Staff training curriculum and demonstration
- Participant quick-start materials
- Privacy/responsible-AI templates
- Local configuration guide
- Evaluation dashboard and metric dictionary
- Cost model and staffing assumptions
- Lessons-learned report
- Pilot fidelity / quality-assurance checklist

Expansion sequence

Lincoln demonstration -> Lincoln implementation pilot -> evidence and refinement -> selected Nebraska/partner validation -> replication toolkit -> voluntary sharing with interested American Job Centers and workforce-system partners.

Attribution in replication materials

If the framework advances to replication, retain a project-origin statement identifying Ryan Uher as the original Concept, Framework & Prototype Developer and, if approved, the Project Lead for the Lincoln implementation.

A potential civic-innovation story - if the evidence earns it

Audience	Potential value
City of Lincoln	Practical public-service modernization; workforce access; measurable responsible-AI implementation.
Mayor's Office	Potential future-ready workforce narrative centered on opportunity, skills and responsible innovation.
AJC Lincoln	A repeatable service layer for contextual AI literacy and employment navigation.
Workforce Development Board	A locally testable response to changing employment/training needs with measurable outcomes.
DOL / ETA	A local implementation example that may generate useful evidence about AI literacy in the public workforce system.
Job seekers	A guided, portable way to build AI literacy while improving job-search materials and decisions.

Potential future communications

After pilot authorization

Lincoln pilots a locally developed, human-led AI employment model designed to help job seekers build AI literacy and navigate an evolving labor market.

If replication follows

A workforce-service framework developed and first tested in Lincoln is being evaluated for use by additional American Job Centers.

Any reference to the City, Mayor, Workforce Board, DOL, 'pioneering,' 'first,' or national significance should be cleared through the appropriate communications and governance process before public use.

Project attribution for public-facing materials

Where appropriate and approved, communications should distinguish the institutional initiative from its development record:

City of Lincoln / American Job Center Lincoln - proposed originating organization and pilot site
Ryan Uher - Concept, Framework & Prototype Developer; Proposed Project Lead

EXECUTIVE ACTION & DOL CONVERSATION

Recommended decisions and next steps

1. Identify an executive sponsor and cross-functional governance reviewers.
2. Recognize the documented project origin and proposed Project Lead role in the pilot charter and executive materials.
3. Authorize completion of the final 30-day pilot protocol and readiness checklist.
4. Confirm implementation decision rights and reporting structure.
5. Engage the appropriate DOL/ETA Regional Office for guidance.
6. Brief appropriate City and Workforce Board stakeholders on the demonstration opportunity.
7. Complete privacy, security, accessibility, compliance, fiscal and communications review.
8. Launch only after governance gates are satisfied.
9. Return with a written Phase I report before deciding on the 12-18 month implementation phase.
10. If Phase II is approved, formalize dedicated implementation capacity, role responsibilities, measures and funding.
11. Consider replication only after evidence and readiness criteria are met.

Suggested DOL / ETA framing

Conversation opener

Lincoln is considering a controlled demonstration of a human-led AI employment-service framework that embeds AI literacy into job-search preparation. The concept and initial framework were developed locally within AJC Lincoln. We are seeking guidance on responsible implementation, evaluation, applicable workforce-system requirements, and how lessons could be shared if the demonstration produces value.

Authoritative reference basis

- U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration - Training and Employment Notice 07-25, AI Literacy Framework (February 13, 2026).
- U.S. Department of Labor / ETA workforce-innovation evaluation materials addressing implementation, logic models, outputs, outcomes, sustainability, replication and lessons learned.
- American Job Center Lincoln / City of Lincoln Future-Ready Workforce materials for local workforce context.

LINCOLN FIRST. EVIDENCE FIRST. REPLICATION BY DESIGN.

Concept, Framework & Prototype Development: Ryan Uher