



**AAB**

**AAB-STD-005**

---

**AI Education Assessment Alignment Framework  
Comparison Method for Assessments, Resources, Tools, Curricula,  
and External Frameworks**

Version: Draft v0.1

Status: Draft for External Review

Classification: Foundational Alignment Framework

Approval Authority: AAB Standards Council / Authorized Approval Body

Effective Date: 10/13/2025

Next Systematic Review: 12 months, or earlier when assessment-review criteria change



## Document Control

Document title	AI Education Assessment Alignment Framework	Document ID	AAB-STD-005
Version	Draft v0.1	Status	Draft for AAB Review
Owner	AI Assessment Board (AAB)	Framework family	Assessment and Framework Alignment
Applies to	Assessment, curriculum, tool, framework, policy, and resource alignment reviews	Companion / related volume	AAB Foundational Standards Series
Supersedes	New draft	Review cycle	12 months, or earlier when assessment-review criteria change

## Foreword

Prepared as a formal AAB alignment framework for comparing external evidence objects against AAB AI literacy outcomes and safeguards.

This document is a draft for AAB review. It shall not be treated as a final AAB position, public standard, certification basis, or endorsement until approved through the applicable human review and Standards Council process.

## 1. Scope

This draft framework defines how AAB should compare assessments, curricula, resources, tools, and external frameworks against AAB AI literacy learning outcomes, evidence categories, safeguards, and maturity levels.

It is designed for comparison and transparency. It is not a ranking system, certification decision, or endorsement.

## 2. Purpose

The AI education field includes many resources and assessments that claim to support AI literacy. AAB needs a common alignment process to answer:

- What does this assessment or resource actually measure or teach?
- Which learner group is it designed for?
- Which AI literacy domains are covered?
- Which domains are missing?
- What evidence supports its use?
- What privacy, safety, accessibility, or validity limitations exist?
- How does it relate to AAB cases, pilots, and standards?



### 3. Alignment Objects

This framework may be used to analyze:

- Formal assessments
- Informal quizzes
- Rubrics
- Portfolios
- Performance tasks
- Student artifacts
- Learning analytics signals
- Curriculum units
- AI literacy courses
- Tool-based learning activities
- External frameworks
- Public resources
- Policy-required competencies

Examples named for future alignment work include TuLIP, ETS, Code.org, aiEDU, UNESCO, AI4K12, OECD, NIST, and U.S. Department of Labor materials. These examples should be treated as candidate alignment objects until reviewed.

### 4. AAB Alignment Dimensions

Each alignment review should evaluate:

Audience and grade band

Learning context

AI literacy domain coverage

Observable learner action

Assessment or evidence format

AI role

Human role

Data and privacy exposure

Accessibility and language access

Evidence strength

Limitations

Relationship to AAB standards



## 5. Alignment Strength Labels

Use the following labels:

- Exact alignment: the item directly measures or supports the AAB outcome.
- Close alignment: the item substantially supports the outcome but uses different wording or scope.
- Partial alignment: the item covers part of the outcome.
- Gap: the AAB outcome is not addressed.
- Conflict: the item conflicts with AAB safety, evidence, or learning principles.
- Not applicable: the outcome is outside the intended scope.

## 6. Assessment Evidence Fields

Each assessment record should include:

- Assessment ID
- Title
- Provider
- Source
- Version or date
- Target audience
- Grade band or level
- Delivery mode
- Construct or competency measured
- Item/task type
- Scoring method
- Evidence of validity or review, if available
- Evidence of reliability or consistency, if available
- Accessibility notes
- Privacy notes
- Data retention notes
- AI tool role, if any
- Human scoring or supervision role
- AAB outcome alignment
- Limitations
- Review status

## 7. Matrix Template

Alignment object	Audience	AAB domain	Grade band	Evidence format	Alignment strength	Safeguard notes	Limitation
------------------	----------	------------	------------	-----------------	--------------------	-----------------	------------



Alignment object	Audience	AAB domain	Grade band	Evidence format	Alignment strength	Safeguard notes	Limitation
Example assessment/resource	Grades 6-8	Data, Models, and Evidence	6-8	Performance task	Partial	Teacher review required	Does not evaluate privacy reasoning

## 8. Relationship to Case and Pilot Evidence

Case records may include weak or descriptive assessment signals such as post-activity reflection, facilitator observation, student artifacts, or informal quizzes.

Pilot records should provide stronger assessment evidence when they include planned outcomes, pre/post measures, rubrics, implementation notes, and summary reports.

AAB should distinguish:

- Activity documentation
- Learner artifact evidence
- Facilitator observation
- Formative assessment
- Summative assessment
- Validated assessment
- Longitudinal evidence

## 9. Minimum Rule for Public Claims

AAB should not claim that an assessment measures AI literacy broadly unless the assessment has been mapped to specific AAB domains and limitations have been documented.

Public wording should prefer:

This assessment aligns with selected AAB AI literacy domains.

instead of:

This assessment proves AI literacy.

## 10. Open Review Questions

- Which AI literacy domains require performance-based evidence rather than self-report?
- Should AAB maintain separate alignment scales for curriculum, assessment, and policy documents?
- How should AAB handle proprietary assessments with limited public documentation?
- What minimum evidence should be required before an assessment can support certification or badge claims?



**AAB** AAB Standards Series

- Should assessment alignment be reviewed by an assessment specialist before publication?