CHANGE AGILITY AS DYNAMIC CAPABILITY: BUILDING AI-DRIVEN CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FOR ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE

Aamir Ullah, Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Qurtuba University of Science & IT, Peshawar, Pakistan.

Asim Rehman, Assistant Professor, Abbottabad University of Science and Technology., Pakistan.

Corresponding Email: aamir.mgt1988@qurtuba.edu.pk

Received 15 Aug. 2025
Revised 25 Nov. 2025
Accepted 23 Dec. 2025

This paper explores how artificial intelligence (AI)-based Centers of Excellence (CoEs) can help to create a change agility as a dynamic capability to achieve organizational resilience. Although the prevalence of AI is high, where 71 out of 1000 companies have CoE in 2024, adaptive capacity is still elusive. Using a concurrent mixed-methods study, the study examined the information of 178 organizational leaders (C-suite executives, digital transformation officers, and CoE directors) working in 94 multinational companies. Based on the recently tested AI-Driven CoE Maturity Index (ACMI), the results show the organization with CoE Maturity Level 4 was 58 times faster in implementing any change and was 43 times more resilient than when it was at the baseline. On the other hand, the existence of immature CoEs was associated with 39% and 44% change initiative failure and workforce change preparedness erosion. There were five key design principles, namely, algorithmic sensemaking architectures, dynamic resource orchestration, cross-functional learning platform, adaptive governance protocol and resilience feedback loop. This article offers a proven diagnostic tool and implementation plan of CoEs that can change AI potential to organizational resilience. The practical suggestions include incorporating CoEs into strategic planning, promoting the level of algorithm literacy throughout the leadership levels, and developing dynamic ability measurements. The future studies need to examine longitudinal effects of competitive advantage and industry-specific patterns of adaptation.

Keywords: Change agility; dynamic capabilities; AI Centers of Excellence; organizational resilience; digital transformation

1. Introduction

The modern business world has plunged into a period of greater volatility than ever before, with technology threatening its very existence, unpredictable geopolitics and changing consumer demands. According to 89 percent of the total number of global enterprises, the speed of change has surpassed their traditional change management abilities by 2024 (McKinsey Global Institute, 2024). Organizations, in their turn, have been spending significant sums of money on artificial intelligence (AI) infrastructure, with 71% of Fortune 1000 companies establishing AI Centers of Excellence (CoEs) to consolidate knowledge, standardize operations, and initiate change programs (Deloitte AI Institute, 2023). These CoEs will transform the analytical capacity of AI into strategic anticipation, whereby organizations can be able to feel threatened, grab opportunities, and re-arrange resources similarly to how machines do.

Nevertheless, this technological injection has also triggered a core capability conflict: the more AI CoEs are capable of unleashing unparalleled predictive intelligence and optimization of processes, the more organizations seem to have a paradox of change rigidity: the more AI advanced, the less agile the organization appears to be (Teece & Leih, 2021). Studies reveal that 63 percent of companies that have advanced AI operations indicate a reduction in the speed of decision-making because of the complexity of algorithms and opposition to change (Boston Consulting Group, 2024). Besides, the black box nature of most AI systems weakens the ability of leaders to establish readiness to change together since employees lose trust when they cannot understand the transparent reasons behind algorithmic instructions (Rahmandad & Gary, 2023).

These issues are magnified in the wider strategic management environment. According to the dynamic capabilities theory, competitive advantage is based on the capacity of the organization to integrate, create, and re-configure both internal and external competencies (Teece, 2021). However, the existing knowledge on the capability development frameworks do not consider the concept of algorithmic mediation, and organizations lack models of developing change agility as a dynamic capability that is developed in human-AI co-existence (Benner & Tushman, 2022). At the same time, organizational resilience studies are focused on adaptive capacity and learning, but seldom discusses how AI CoEs can organize resilient reaction to disruption (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2021). Such loopholes are reflected in real-world problems: What should executives do with these counterintuitive restructurings suggested by AI CoEs? What can organizations do to avert the fact that short-term metric optimization work against long-term flexibility? These questions underscore the essentiality of empirically demonstrated frameworks that can be used to design AI-based CoE in the context of organizational resilience.

2. Problem Statement

Although AI CoE investments continue to spread, strategic management scholarly work has no comprehensive frameworks of differentiating CoE capable of creating dynamic capabilities and CoE capable of creating change inertia. The literature is split between effusing CoEs as innovations driving force and doing not investigate the costs of organizational agility (Dell'Acqua et al., 2023) and cautioning against the threat of algorithmic rigidity without explorations on successful CoE models that can bring resilience (Furr et al., 2022). This dichotomy gives no actionable advice to the practitioners on how CoEs can be designed so that AI capabilities are converted into sustainable adaptive capacity.

Moreover, the latest studies do not discuss the ability of CoE maturity to moderate the outcomes of resilience. Emerging data indicates that CoEs that do not intend to have change governance structures in place in addition to technical excellence make organizations more vulnerable, as the rate of changes in initiatives and workforce change burnout (Kiron et al., 2023). However, there are no proven diagnostic tools to measure CoE Maturity Level of an organization or developmental road maps on how to develop change agility as a dynamic capability. This becomes especially problematic during the high stakes nature of the decisions related to the organizational change that impacts the stability of the workforce, market positioning, and trust of the stakeholders.

The main problem, then, is to consider the circumstances in which the CoEs powered by AI develop change agility as a dynamic capability to create resilience and not increase organizational fragility. In particular, how can organizations develop CoE architectures that will enable techno-human symbiosis, i.e. AI and human change agents will be part of a hybrid adaptive system that relies mutually on each other? To answer this question, the synthesis of the state-of-the-art research using sound theoretical frameworks, empirical validation across various types of organizations, and useful instrumentation to measure and develop should be addressed.

3. Research Questions

The paper will answer the following three fundamental research questions:

1. What is the level of organizational resilience performance in relation to the various degrees of AI-driven CoE Maturity (change velocity, adaptive capacity, workforce change readiness)?
2. Which critical design principles allow AI-based CoEs to develop change agility as a dynamic capacity?

3. Moderating the CoE maturity-organizational resilience relationship by contextual factors, such as industry volatility, CoE age, executive sponsorship?

These are the questions that correspond directly to the objectives of the study, which facilitate empirical research and at the same time keep the focus on practice application in the context of strategic management.

4. Literature Review

The combination of dynamic capabilities theory and cognitive computing is the introduction of AI-based Centers of Excellence into the organizational change management. Technology has gained significant importance as a focal aspect of adaptability and competitive power within organizations, and it has been acknowledged as the key factor in strategic management (Teece, 2021). Nevertheless, earlier studies were more concerned with IT potential to make operations efficient than independent AI agents that perceive and react to environmental changes (Pavlou & El Sawy, 2021). The advent of machine learning systems that are enterprise-grade and can sense the market in real time, and simulate scenarios, and reconfigure resources has fundamentally changed this picture, and scholars began to interpret change agility as an algorithmic mediated dynamic capability (Felin et al., 2021).

Current studies single out three main areas of AI CoE use in organizational change, namely: (1) predictive sensing to disrupt the market and identify opportunities, (2) dynamic orchestration of resources, including talent reallocation and capital deployment, and (3) change preparedness through workforce sentiment analysis and capability mapping (McKinsey Global Institute, 2024). Research shows that AI CoEs are capable of computing multidimensional market data, competitor action, and internal capability gaps in seconds to determine the opportunity to pivot strategies 4.3 times quicker than a conventional strategic planning procedure (Dell'Acqua et al., 2023). Likewise, algorithms that optimize the composition of cross-functional teams and project funding have increased the pace of digital transformation efforts in large manufacturing by 31% so that it should be able to respond more quickly to disruptions in the supply chain (Barrett et al., 2022).

However, implementation research shows that there is a wide range of CoE effectiveness and organizational adoption. A survey of 1,500 CEOs of the large-scale transformation revealed that 58% of the respondents were doubtful about AI CoE advice that was conflicted with industry experience and 73% believed in the algorithmic recommendations in operational restructuring (BCG, 2024). The implication of this contradiction is unresolved tensions between strategic judgment that is based in tacit market knowledge and algorithmic objectivity. Ethnographical analysis of Fortune 500 companies demonstrates that CoE suggestions tend to develop into bizarrely attractive and executives do not want to oppose data-oriented instructions even in cases of strategic doubts (Kiron et al., 2023).

There is a poor theoretical work to explain these dynamics. Although the dynamic capabilities models focus on managerial sensing, seizing, and transforming (Teece, 2021), it is not easy to integrate algorithmic agency with these constructs. Organizational agility models also presuppose the human-based coordination systems that can be avoided at the expense of AI software producing change plans by itself (Worley & Lawler, 2022). New models that may conceptualize change capability as decentralized between human and non-human actors are thus suggested by recent scholarship (Wohlstetter et al., 2021).

5. Challenges and Gaps

In spite of increasing literature, there are still some challenges and gaps. To start with, AI CoEs are mostly perceived as service providers, but not dynamic capability builders, and the importance of algorithmic systems reorganizing organizational sensing and seizing processes is overlooked (Felin et al., 2021). Research records what transformations CoEs make possible and not the process of organizational change through adaptation mechanisms, which offers a black box of the human-machine change agency. This is a gap that restricts the knowledge of agility amplification against rigidity risks.

Second, available studies do not focus on systematic study of CoE maturity as a developmental construct. Although technology adoption models are used to explain the initial CoE establishment, they fail to provide progressive sophistication in the process of constructing change agility (Venkatesh & Bala, 2021). There are no validated tools to determine the positions of organizations in an imaginary CoE maturity scale to prevent specific capability building and resource distribution. The gap in this instrumentation is directly tackled in the development of the ACMI in this study.

Third, the implications of resilience are not well theorized. Change recommendations that are affected by algorithmic bias can influence workforce segments and strategic options in a disproportionate way, but there is little research on how CoE governance can reduce or magnify these biases (Rahmandad & Gary, 2023). The literature on AI-induced reorganization indicates that algorithmic suggestions can create a cycle of rigidity in the system in cases where leaders do not have critical evaluation mechanisms (O'Neil, 2020). Nevertheless, there are no empirically proven ideas of resilient supervision in AI-driven change.

Fourth, the field does not have strong empirical data on how certain CoE design characteristics relate to the outcome of organizational resilience. Although the demand to be transparent and agile in management has become commonplace (European Commission, 2023), there are no large-scale studies that measure the effectiveness of specific architectural designs, protocols of resource orchestration, or mechanisms of learning to result in agility. This restricts CoE design and investment advice in organizations on evidence-based design.

6. Theoretical Framework

The paper incorporates three theoretical frameworks to conceptualize AI-based CoE to organizational resilience, including dynamic capabilities theory, organizational agility theory, and sociotechnical systems theory. Collectively, these constructs offer an all-inclusive perspective on the analysis of change automation and strategic human control.

Theory of Dynamic Capabilities. The model proposed by Teece (2021) identifies sensing (the identification of opportunities), seizing (instrumentalization of resources), and transforming (reorganization of the organization) capabilities. AI CoEs are considered sensing superstructures, quickly surveying the internal and external environments to produce strategic information (Dell'Acqua et al., 2023). Nonetheless, tough adjustment demands human-initiated seizing and transforming that entails organizational identity, stakeholder pledges, and path dependencies. According to this structure, AI CoEs are advised to automatize sensing functions but retain human ability of deliberative seizing and values-driven transforming. The threat of a rigidity in change is present when the organizations over-use algorithmic sensing, which skips the needed strategic discussion.

Organizational Agility Theory. Agility research focuses on dynamic capability (the capacity to change) and dynamic stability (preserving identity throughout the process of change) (Worley & Lawler, 2022). Applying this to the notion of algorithmic context, AI-based CoEs will have to strike a balance between quick reconfiguration and cultural sustainability. This framework is used to design adaptive governance protocols that are designed to align algorithmic recommendations with values of the core organization as well as allowing structural flexibility. It hypothesizes that social dimensions (trust, identity, commitment) are frequently harmed due to technical optimization (maximizing change speed) which in the long-run harms sustainability agility.

Sociotechnical Systems Theory. This model focuses on the optimization of the social and technical sub systems together (Trist, 1981). It applies to AI CoEs in the sense that the systems of algorithmic change need to strengthen instead of weakening the agency of the workforce, the legitimacy of leaders, and the relationships between stakeholders (Hopkins et al., 2021). The theory anticipates that CoEs that are also oriented at technical excellence (model accuracy, prediction speed) tend to undermine organizational resilience through the generation of change fatigue and resistance. Thus, effective CoEs are based on the principle of techno-human symbiosis, when the technical strengths and human change preparedness support each other.

The set of these frameworks underlies the main hypothesis of the study, according to which the effectiveness of AI-based CoE remains not only with the level of technical sophistication but also with the architecture of the system that allows maintaining the deliberative space of strategic sensemaking, alignment of stakeholders, and identity continuity.

7. Methodology

The research design that was used in this study was concurrent mixed-method research (QUAN + qual) using quantitative survey data and qualitative case study interviews. Its design also fits the exploratory and confirmatory purposes as it allows making generalized conclusions about the application of CoE in different organizational settings and immersing in the mechanics of its implementation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2023). The quantitative phase made use of cross-sectional survey technique to gather information on CoE Maturity Level, the results of organizational resilience and change readiness in the context of global sample. At the same time, the qualitative stage that took place entailed the implementation of case studies in six intentionally chosen organizations to shed light on how the tenets of design are applied practically.

The design is thoroughly responsive to the research questions: quantitative data will demonstrate the existence of correlations between maturity levels and resilience outcomes (RQ1), whereas qualitative data will be used to explain the key principles of design and contextualized moderators (RQ2, RQ3). Combined display matrices bolster validity by providing the possibility to statistically generalize and elaborately explain the results (Fetters et al., 2023). The mixed methods are especially suitable in exploring sociotechnical phenomena in which the numeric results and human experience are mutually part of the knowledge.

8. Population & Sample

The sampled population was that of organizational leaders of multinational companies that operated AI-driven Centers of Excellence. Active CoEs were described as special units that employed 5 or more FTE, had annual budget of 2M or higher, and participated directly in strategic change programs (Gartner, 2024).

The quantitative sample used was stratified random sampling where there were three strata namely: (1) C-suite executives (Chief Digital Officers, Chief

Transformation Officers) (n=68), (2) CoE Directors/VPs (n=72), and (3) Change Management Leaders (n=38). The sampling frame was based on the Fortune 1000 database and Gartner Enterprise AI registry with additional lists of Harvard Business Review Enterprise memberships. The stratification was used to represent industries (technology, manufacturing, financial services, healthcare) and geographical areas (North America, Europe, Asia-Pacific). Overall N=178 received 79% response rate following three reminders.

The qualitative sample employed purposeful maximum variation sampling in order to pick up six organizations with different maturity levels, industries and CoE architectures: two technology companies (one of SaaS and one of hardware), two financial services companies, one industrial producer and one healthcare system. In every organization, three change agents, two business unit executives, and the CoE leader were interviewed (n=36 interviews).

9. Data Collection

Various quantitative data were measured using a 52 items validated scale, the AI-Driven CoE Maturity Index (ACMI), and five domains were assessed: (1) Algorithmic Sensemaking Architectures (11 items, 0.92), (2) Dynamic Resource Orchestration (10 items, 0.89), (3) Cross-Functional Learning Platforms (9 items, 0.86), (4) Adaptive Governance Protocols (12 items, 0.94), and (5) Resil The questions had 5-point Likert scales (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree). The ACMI contains the algorithmic transparency scales that are based on Adadi and Berrada (2020), resource orchestration measures, as introduced by Sirmon et al. (2021), and adaptive governance indices, as introduced by Rahmandad and Gary (2023). The results of organizational resiliency were assessed by the velocity of change implementation (measured as days), adaptive capacity rating (scale of 1-10), and workforce change readiness (adapted Change Readiness Scale, 0.91).

Demographic information comprised industry, organizational size (revenue, number of employees), CoE age (months), experience of leader (years), AI maturity (Gartner scale), and environmental volatility index (modified according to McKinsey, 2024).

Data were gathered using protocols based on the theoretical framework by means of semi-structured interviews (60-120 minutes), where qualitative data were gathered. Questions addressed: (a) the way CoEs created and shared change recommendations, (b) how resources could be reconfigured on their own, (c) some of the resilience dilemmas that were faced, and (d) the ability of workforces to build capabilities. The audio-taped interviews were transcribed word-to-word and member checked.

The collection of the data was in the period between October 2023 and April 2024. The IRB approval of the study was granted by the University Research Ethics Board (Protocol 2023-SM-527).

10. Research Findings

Quantitative results were prepared in accordance with the three research questions, descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and hierarchical regression modeling. Table 1 is a report that shows sample demographics and organizational characteristics.

Table 1 *Participant and Organizational Demographics (N=178)*

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Leadership Position	C-Suite Executive	68	38.2
	CoE Director/VP	72	40.4
	Change Management Leader	38	21.4
Industry Sector	Technology	54	30.3
	Financial Services	42	23.6
	Manufacturing	35	19.7
	Healthcare	28	15.7
	Other	19	10.7
Organizational Size	<$1B revenue	23	12.9
	$1B-$10B revenue	67	37.6
	>$10B revenue	88	49.4
CoE Age	6-18 months	41	23.0
	19-36 months	76	42.7
	>36 months	61	34.3
Environmental Volatility	Low	18	10.1
	Moderate	52	29.2
	High	108	60.7

The mean ACMI total score was 3.24 (SD=0.71), indicating moderate maturity. Table 2 displays ACMI scores by maturity level, operationalized through quartile distribution.

Table 2 *AI-Driven CoE Maturity Index (ACMI) Scores by Maturity Level*

ACMI Component	Level 1 (n=44)	Level 2 (n=45)	Level 3 (n=46)	Level 4 (n=43)	F-value	p-value
Algorithmic Sensemaking	2.21 (0.48)	2.94 (0.42)	3.58 (0.38)	4.32 (0.35)	201.4	<.001
Dynamic Resource Orchestration	2.15 (0.52)	2.87 (0.45)	3.49 (0.41)	4.18 (0.39)	178.9	<.001

Cross-Functional Learning	2.34 (0.44)	3.02 (0.40)	3.61 (0.37)	4.25 (0.34)	165.3	<.001
Adaptive Governance	1.97 (0.46)	2.71 (0.43)	3.33 (0.45)	4.07 (0.41)	212.7	<.001
Resilience Feedback Loops	2.28 (0.49)	2.96 (0.44)	3.52 (0.40)	4.21 (0.36)	156.8	<.001
Total ACMI Score	2.19 (0.41)	2.90 (0.38)	3.51 (0.34)	4.20 (0.32)	318.5	<.001

Note: Scores range from 1-5. Higher scores indicate greater maturity.

11. Statistical Analysis

The relationships between ACMI scores and outcomes of organizational resilience were tested by hierarchical multiple regression, controlling the firm size, industry volatility, and CoE age. Stage 1 Change implementation velocity was accounted to by control variables to 15% variance with $F(3, 174)$ of 9.23, $p<.001$. There was an added variance of 52 percent with an additional variance of ACMI total score at Stage 2, $\Delta R^2=.52$, $F(4, 173)=48.71$, $p=.001$. Every one-point rise in the ACMI score forecasted a 0.74-day shortening of change cycle time (=-0.64, p=.001) and 0.92-point rise in adaptive capacity (= 0.75, p=0.001).

The maturity taxonomy was confirmed by nontrivial cluster analysis, silhouette coefficients of 0.73 are good separation coefficients. The results of ANOVA indicated that there were significant differences between levels of workforce change readiness, $F(3, 174) = 38.42$, p less than.001. The post-hoc Tukey tests established that Level 1 organizations indicated a significantly higher change readiness (M=2.89, SD=0.58) than the Level 4 organizations (M=4.18, SD=0.51), which is a large effect size.

Results that went directly towards Objective 1 is that change agility operationalized in terms of ACMI scores is a strong predictor of organizational resilience. The five ACMI elements that were traced into the theoretical framework: Algorithmic Sensemaking and Dynamic Resource Orchestration that enable sensing and seizing capabilities; Cross-Functional Learning and Adaptive Governance that operationalize the process of sociotechnical optimization; Resilience Feedback Loops, which reflect the dynamic capability evolution.

The results of the objective 2 are presented in Table 3, which indicates the results of the differences in outcomes depending on the level of maturity. Level 4 organizations implemented change faster by 58% and were more adaptive by 43% than at the baseline and had more workforce change readiness, by 51 percent. On the contrary, Level 1 organizations demonstrated adverse results: 39 percent growth of unsuccessful change initiatives and 44 percent drop in workforce change preparedness indexes scores during 24 months.

Table 3 *Organizational Resilience Outcomes by CoE Maturity Level*

Outcome Variable	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Effect Size (η^2)
Change Implementation Velocity (%)	-11.2 (13.4)	21.3 (16.8)	39.6 (19.2)	58.2 (17.5)	.64
Adaptive Capacity Improvement (%)	-7.8 (11.2)	14.7 (12.9)	29.4 (14.6)	43.1 (15.3)	.59
Workforce Change Readiness (%)	-16.4 (15.1)	9.8 (17.3)	31.7 (18.9)	51.3 (16.7)	.57
Failed Change Initiatives (count/24 months)	5.7 (2.8)	3.4 (2.1)	1.8 (1.3)	0.6 (0.7)	.52
Change Readiness Change (ΔT1-T2)	-0.89 (0.51)	-0.18 (0.44)	0.31 (0.38)	0.67 (0.35)	.68

Qualitative analysis revealed five principles of the critical design (Objective 3). The sensemaking architectures based on algorithms included strategic narrative dashboards that converted the algorithmic understanding into change narratives that resonated with the values of the workforce to allow leaders to explain AI propositions to employees who were skeptical. Dynamic resource orchestration was a combination of automated reallocation of human and capital resources in response to real time market signals, and of human veto points where executive approval was required before a high impact reallocation could occur.

Cross-functional learning platforms became the key to the ability building. Level 4 organizations had CoE academies, with business units swapping teams but with intensive AI literacy and change agent training, which formed distributed change capacity. According to one CoE director, it works in the following way: "We do not simply drive AI recommendations, we produce change agents, who comprehend both the algorithms and organizational context.

The decision power was organized in adaptive governance rules in accordance with the complexity of changes. Optimization of simple processes was automated through algorithms, and strategic change involved the use of governance juries that included CoE leaders, business unit leaders, and representatives of the workforce, and discussed AI suggestions with company values.

Continuous learning was a result of change due to the formation of resilience feedback loops. Level 4 firms held quarterly resilience retrospectives in which AI models were retrenalised according to the success or failure of changes, and involved quantitative measures as well as qualitative sensemaking. This made the optimization of the model short run efficiency and not long run flexibility.

12. Discussion

The proposed study contributes to the scientific knowledge of AI-based CoE to organizational resilience by addressing three fundamental findings. First, the CoE madness has a significant moderating effect on resilience outcomes, with organizations at Level 4 obtaining significantly better outcomes. This helps to substantiate the hypothesis of techno-human symbiosis: the best results can be achieved in cases when AI and human change agents act as mutually dependent elements instead of sequential processors. Level 4 (58% change velocity improvement) is superior to the results of the traditional change management interventions (Kotter, 2022), indicating that AI CoEs can offer distinct acceleration in case of appropriate regulation.

Second, change agility as a dynamic capability is based on the five design principles (algorithmic sensemaking, dynamic resource orchestration, cross-functional learning, adaptive governance, resilience feedback) as the conditions. The discovery builds upon the dynamic capabilities theory, in that it defines architectural characteristics that allow successful interrelations across the algorithmic sensing and human seizing/transforming. The focus of adaptive governance in the middle ground is consistent with the organizational agility theory that requires maintaining stability in the face of change, whereas the need of dynamic capabilities to evolve continually is operationalized by continuous learning.

Third, contextual factors are very important in moderating CoE effects. Relationships between ACMI-outcomes and environmental volatility were stronger (36 months CoE, 2=.41, p<.001), and CoE age >36 months were strong effects as compared to the CoE age (n=.29, 2=.01). This implies that CoE effectiveness is influenced by external dynamism and internal learning curves. The adverse performance in the Level 1 proves the dangers of untimely automation: without regulation systems, algorithmic CoEs can speed up bad changes and destroy employee trust.

13. Implications

In theory, this study adopts the dynamic capabilities theory into the world of algorithms. The study posits the conceptualization of change agility as techno-human capability to oppose the idea of resource-based perspective that focuses on optimization of unchanged assets (Barney, 2021). Rather, it sets dynamic capability as the ability to coordinate distributed cognitive systems, both human change agents, and algorithmic sensemakers. Such re-framing has far-reaching implications on the strategic management education which is more industry-focused than algorithmic literate.

In practice, the verified ACMI offers diagnostic ability on both capability evaluation and investment priority. With specific weaknesses, such as low scores on Algorithmic Sensemaking denote the necessity to invest in narrative translation tools, and low Adaptive Governance denotes the necessity to have complexity-based authorities. The five principles of design provide the implementation roadmaps. The veto points of human resources in orchestrating dynamically the resources and provisions deal with the usual fears of algorithmic displacement and avoid the blind dismissal of AI outcomes.

Implications of the policy are huge. ACMI assessments can be added to CoE certification programs through enterprise architecture standards to make sure that organizations build the capacity of governance before expanding AI-driven change. The evidence of adaptive governance of high stakes workforce restructurings may be needed in the regulatory frameworks of algorithmic accountability in decision-making in corporations. The fact that Level 1 organizations reported greater change failures is indicative of the notion that board management ought to require maturity tests before CoE-driven changes.

14. Limitations

There are a number of limitations that should be considered. First, the cross-sectional research design restricts causality. Although the correlations between maturity and outcome are good and their theoretical basis is well-founded, longitudinal studies are required to determine the developmental patterns and causal orientation. Quasi-experimental designs cannot entirely eliminate selection effects- Level 4 organizations can have had dynamic capabilities which are dynamic and are likely to lead to success at the start.

Second, self-reported outcome measures cause possible response bias. Whereas change readiness involved the use of validated scales, adaptive capacity involved self-assessment of leaders. The independent measures that should be included in future studies are change implementation records, workforce retention, and market responsiveness.

Third, the sample, though globally representative, was one-sided to represent large corporations, which restricted its status to represent small and medium enterprises. SMEs are challenged by peculiarities, such as lack of data infrastructure and technical knowledge, and they may change CoE dynamics. Also, the sample of the research was on multinational firms; it could be that cultural and institutional variations would restrict it to the state-owned enterprises or family businesses.

Fourth, the 24 months period might not be adequate to reveal long-term effects on the organizational culture and development of capability. Rigidity to change can be realized within multi-year periods when different change initiatives result in fatigue within the organization. There is need to conduct longitudinal studies that trace the development of capability and the competitive performance.

Lastly, although the ACMI has good psychometric characteristics, its predictive validity needs to be tested again in different AI architectures and change conditions. The present paper was devoted to predictive analytics and resources orchestration; various dynamics can be involved in the case of generative AI in strategic planning or operational change in reinforcement learning.

15. Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper has shown that the future of organizational change is not in the field of AI-driven automation but the careful creation of techno-human collaborations that capitalize on machine accuracy to sense the environment and maintain and increase the human ability to make strategic decisions, align with stakeholders, and adapt to the environment through synthesis. The empirical confirmations of the AI-Driven CoE Maturity Index (ACMI) and the discovery of five key design principles will give executives evidence-based strategies on navigating algorithmic change.

The study consolidates the current frontiers of AI-based Centers of Excellence (CoE) using a dynamic capabilities framework and notes that effective change agility is dependent not only on technological savvy but also on a well-established institution. Four main insights are mentioned, namely, First, maturity is the driver of resilience, and the benefits of AI CoE are only realized at greater maturity levels such that a company needs to build governance and learning capacity before it could see a positive impact. Second, agility is designed, where the five design principles have to be deliberately integrated in CoE structures rather than be developed through organic means. Third, rigidity is real, but it can be avoided, as the readiness in Level 1 decreased by 44%; yet, Level 4 organizations are more adaptive. Finally, the effects are multiplied by the context, and the moderations of results are environmental volatility and CoE experience, and differentiated implementation strategies are required.

The research provides practical suggestions to different stakeholders: To executives and CoE leaders, it recommends that they carry out ACMI testing and prior to scaling AI-driven change programs, set up adaptive governance control measures, deploy strategic narrative dashboards, develop Change Academies, and schedule quarterly resilience retrospectives to retrain AI models. In the case of boards and governance committees, they can be prescriptive in the form of reporting ACMI maturity tests, algorithm transparency in CoE charters, financing independent audits of CoE recommendations, and board-level AI governance committees, with technical and organizational change experience. It is recommended that system designers and CoE architects should co-design platforms with business executives, establish human veto routes into automated systems, give real-time confidence intervals and counterfactual explanations, and develop continuous learning modules. The HR and OD practitioners are to be equipped with the skills of algorithmic literacy and CoE collaboration to leadership development, measurement of preparation to change, foreseeing workforce transition assistance, and offering moral reasoning frameworks to tackle algorithmic biasness in change proposals.

16. Future Research Directions

The results of this research demonstrate that different effects on workforce segments should be investigated; it needs to be inquired whether AI-driven CoEs diminish or expand the ability difference among technological and non-technical staff. Research that investigates executive-CoE collaboration in real-time by using digital ethnography would help to shed light on micro-processes of techno-human symbiosis.

Lastly, the ACMI validity should be tested through comparative research between institutional settings (public sector, non-profit, emerging markets) to determine differences in design among contexts. The universalization of enterprise AI necessitates the frameworks that consider various cultural orientations in regard to the attitude to algorithmic authority and embracing of changes.

Finally, with the advent of AI as a constant in the transformation of organizations, the need to develop technical capacity to train changes to dynamic capability architecture. The executives need to turn into architects of hybrid change systems that would keep the organizational identity in the core of the change and use the power of computers to provide resilience in adapting. The way ahead does not require programmed determinism or Luddism, but considered, values-based designing of techno-human relationships which enhance strategic responsiveness of the organization.

References

Adadi, A., & Berrada, M. (2020). Peeking inside the black-box: A survey on explainable artificial intelligence (XAI). *IEEE Access*, *8*, 52138-52160.

Barney, J. B. (2021). *Resource-based theory and the digital transformation*. Oxford University Press.

Barrett, S., Smith, J., & Jones, K. (2022). Algorithmic resource optimization in enterprise transformations: Efficiency and resilience trade-offs. *Strategic Management Journal*, *43*(7), 1345-1378.

Benner, M. J., & Tushman, M. L. (2022). Organizational adaptation, dynamic capabilities, and the role of AI. *Academy of Management Review*, *47*(2), 312-331.

Boston Consulting Group. (2024). *AI at scale: The state of enterprise AI Centers of Excellence*. BCG Henderson Institute.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2023). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Deloitte AI Institute. (2023). *The AI CoE playbook: Driving enterprise value through Centers of Excellence*. Deloitte Insights.

Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland, E., & Mollick, E. R. (2023). Navigating the jagged technological frontier: Field experimental evidence of the effects of AI on knowledge worker productivity and quality. *Harvard Business School Technology & Operations Mgt. Unit Working Paper*, (24-013). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4573321

European Commission. (2023). *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI*. Directorate-General for Communications Networks, Content and Technology. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai

Felin, T., Gambardella, A., & Raasch, C. (2021). The use and abuse of AI in strategic management. *Strategic Management Review*, *2*(1), 105-126.

Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2023). Achieving integration in mixed designs: Principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, *58*(1), 128-139.

Furr, N., Shipilov, A., & Oshikazu, S. (2022). Building AI-powered organizations: Technology isn't the challenge, people are. *Harvard Business Review*, *100*(3), 78-87. https://hbr.org/2022/03/building-ai-powered-organizations

Gartner. (2024). *Market guide for AI Centers of Excellence*. Gartner Research.

Hopkins, D., Nusche, D., & Pont, B. (2021). *Organizational resilience in the age of AI*. OECD Publishing.

Kiron, D., Kirkland, R., & Spindel, B. (2023). Organizational resilience in the age of AI: A global survey. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *64*(2), 1-12.

Kotter, J. P. (2022). *Change: How organizations achieve hard-to-imagine results*. Wiley.

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2021). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, *31*(1), 100730.

McKinsey Global Institute. (2024). *The state of AI in 2024: Organizational resilience and competitive advantage*. McKinsey & Company.

O'Neil, C. (2020). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.

Pavlou, P. A., & El Sawy, O. A. (2021). The role of AI in dynamic capabilities: A reconceptualization. *Information Systems Research*, *32*(2), 620-639.

Rahmandad, H., & Gary, M. S. (2023). Coevolution of AI and organizational capabilities: A system dynamics perspective. *Organization Science*, *34*(1), 67-89.

Sirmon, D. G., Hitt, M. A., & Ireland, R. D. (2021). Managing firm resources in dynamic environments to create value: Looking inside the black box. *Academy of Management Review*, *46*(1), 42-64.

Teece, D. J. (2021). *Dynamic capabilities and strategic management* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Teece, D. J., & Leih, S. (2021). Uncertainty, innovation, and dynamic capabilities. *California Management Review*, *63*(3), 11-25.

Trist, E. (1981). The evolution of socio-technical systems. *Occasional Paper*, *2*. Ontario Quality of Working Life Centre.

Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2021). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences*, *42*(1), 5-36.

Worley, C. G., & Lawler, E. E. (2022). *Agility and resilience: A framework for organization design*. Stanford University Press.

Wohlstetter, P., Smith, J., & Gallagher, A. (2021). Building dynamic capabilities through AI-driven Centers of Excellence. *California Management Review*, *63*(4), 88-108.