The Impact of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning on the Future of Program Management

A. Ybarra[1], J. Figueroa[1], J. Trujillo[1], D. Robertson[1], and E. N. Caraveo[1]

[1] Anderson School of Management, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA

Abstract

Rapid technological change and increasing organizational complexity have transformed modern program management. Programs now operate across digital ecosystems that generate large data sets while requiring faster decision-making under uncertain conditions. Traditional governance structures and manual reporting systems often struggle to convert these amounts of data into timely insights which limits program leaders' ability to respond proactively.

The authors examine how artificial intelligence and machine learning can support program managers in navigating complex environments in this paper. Using structured conceptual frameworks and literature review, the capabilities of AI were analyzed through Brown's *Chaos to Clarity* concept. The author contribute to program management literature by mapping AI-enabled tools to the business, program, and project levels, demonstrating how predictive analytics and automation enhance visibility, coordination, and decision-making while augmenting rather than replacing human leadership.

Keywords

Artificial Intelligence (AI), Machine Learning (ML), Program Management, Capabilities, Adaptation

Introduction

Over the past decade, program management has evolved (Martinsuo and Hoverfält 2018). While project management focuses on delivering specific outputs within defined constraints, program management handles multiple interrelated projects to achieve strategic organizational goals. As programs expand in terms of teams, technology, and stakeholders' complexity has also increased, making it harder for program managers to maintain alignment, visibility, and control across the board (Carreño 2024). Traditional governance structures and reporting methods are often too slow and rigid to support timely, informed decision-making at the program level. This has created a disconnect between strategic intent and operational execution. Program leaders may have access to extensive data but lack the tools to convert the data into timely, actionable insights. This condition reinforces reactive management behaviors, where risks and performance issues are addressed only after they materialize rather than being anticipated in advance. (Snowden & Boone, 2007).

One of the most pressing challenges that program managers face is the large amounts of data that are generated at the program level. Program managers must synthesize financial metrics, schedules, risk indicators, performance dashboards, and stakeholder input. Traditional Program Management tools cannot handle this level of data in real time. Thus, it leads to delayed insight and reactive responses rather than proactive management (Davenport & Ronanki 2018).

Modern programs operate under extreme pressure to make faster decisions from incomplete data and information. Market conditions, regulatory requirements, and technological dependencies change rapidly, creating uncertainty that traditional governance models struggle to absorb. (Snowden & Boone. 2007) Data overload further compounds to this challenge. While organizations collect more data than ever before, the ability to convert the data into actionable insight has not kept pace. As a result, program managers often face a major problem; they have access to abundant information but limited clarity. Decisions may be based on outdated reports, intuition, or fragmented views of program health. This increases the risk of misalignment, going over budget, and strategic drift (Morningmate Team 2025).

Simultaneously Artificial Intelligence (AI) (McAfee and Brynjolfsson 2017) and Machine Learning are now important to program managers because they□ face□. AI-driven tools can analyze vast datasets, identify patterns, and generate insights far faster than humans can. At the program level, this enables predictive analytics, automation in reporting, and real-time risk identification. AI capabilities are increasingly essential for a program manager (Polaski and Brienza, 2023).

Rather than AI/ML replacing human program managers, these technologies have human ability to manage complexities, enabling leaders to focus on strategic decision-making, stakeholder engagement, and organizational alignment. In a sense, AI represents a mechanism that helps program leaders transition from managing complexity to proactively creating clarity within complex environments (Brown 2014, Gonen 2019).

Contributions and Research Question

The authors contribute to the program management literature by integrating Brown's Chaos into Clarity framework with emerging AI/ML learning capabilities to explain how these technologies can support decision-making at different levels of program complexity. (Brown 2014) By framing the capabilities of AI within Brown's structured framework, a tiered approach showing how AI supports strategic alignment, program coordination, and project execution without replacing human leadership. This approach advances existing discussions of AI in program and project management by providing a guided lens for understanding how technology can help program managers navigate complexity rather than simply automate tasks. As organizations adopt AI-driven dashboards, automated data integration, and predictive risk models, governance processes are becoming more continuous and forward-looking. (Kerzner. 2022) AI/ML present promising solutions, but their integration into program governance raised important concerns. The central question guiding the research was: *How can artificial intelligence and machine learning support program managers in transforming complexity into clarity across the business, program, and project levels of organizational governance?*

Methodology

The authors adopt a structured conceptual literature review to examine how artificial intelligence and machine learning are influencing program management, governance, and decision-making. Rather than presenting empirical data, the study synthesizes existing research and professional literature to identify patterns in how AI capabilities support leadership in complex environments. A structured search of academic and professional databases was conducted to identify relevant literature. Our Sources included Google Scholar, Harvard Business Review, and Project Management Institute publications. The literature search focuses on peer-reviewed articles, industry reports, and texts that were foundational to program management and emerging technologies. Search terms included combinations of the following keywords:

- "Artificial Intelligence" and "Program Management"
- "Machine Learning and "Governance"
- "Predictive Analytics" and "Program reporting"
- "AI and ML in Program Management"

The first foundational paper on AI and Program management was in 2011 (Lewandrowski et al. 2011). However, the vast majority of AI articles focused on Program Management came after 2017. The first mention in PMI standards came in 2017 (PMI 2017). To be inclusive we focused on literature published between 2007 and 2025. This timeline showed us the rapid expansion of AI applications in organizational decision-making alongside foundational works on complexity and governance. Key inclusion criteria included sources that addressed either AI/ML in organizational decision-making or program and project management frameworks related to complexity and governance. Foundational works such as Snowden and Boone's research on complexity and Brown's Chaos to Clarity framework were included to provide conceptual grounding. (Snowden and Boone, 2007; Brown, 2014, PMI. 2012).

Conceptual Anchor: Chaos to Clarity

Brown's *"Chaos to Clarity"* concept provides a useful lens for understanding program management in the age of AI /ML. Due to the scale, interdependencies, and strategic nature, programs often operate in uncertain environments (Brown 2014). Unlike projects which have defined beginnings and endings, programs evolve over time and must adapt to changing organizational priorities.

Within this framework, chaos does not imply disorder but rather complexity in which information is incomplete; relationships between variables are unclear, and decision-making becomes more difficult. Program managers must navigate competing demands, incomplete information, and evolving stakeholder expectations (Brown, 2014). Without effective mechanisms to create clarity, chaos overwhelms the decision-making process.

Brown's framework also reinforces the distinction between project and program management. Project management is primarily focused on delivering specific outputs and defined deliverables within clearly established constraints. Project management typically operates within a fixed scope, schedule, and budget. Success is measured by projects' ability to meet these predefined targets. (PMI, 2012). Program management is oriented toward achieving broader strategic organizational outcomes and coordinating multiple related initiatives. Because programs span interconnected efforts and evolving business priorities, they operate in a more complex and uncertain environment.

AI/ML Role in Program Management

Machine learning–based predictive analytics can significantly improve project and program management by using historical data to forecast schedules, costs, and risks (Shenhar and Dvir 2007). Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) allow organizations to analyze large volumes of project data and identify patterns that humans may overlook. By detecting early indicators of delays, cost overruns, or resource conflicts, predictive analytics enable program managers to anticipate problems and respond proactively. AI-enhanced project management uses machine learning techniques from past project datasets to identify hidden patterns in task delays and resource conflicts, enabling automated risk detection and proactive mitigation strategies (Ajibade 2025) and provides a more proactive and data-driven approach to improving outcomes by analyzing historical project data before risks materialize (Bauskar 2024).

These systems can reveal subtle relationships between task duration, staffing levels, procurement timelines, and project performance. By recognizing these patterns, AI-enabled tools can generate more accurate schedules and budget forecasts than traditional estimation methods. This gives program managers earlier visibility into bottlenecks and allows them to take corrective action before small issues become major disruptions (Ajibade, 2025). Further Artificial intelligence technologies power advanced decision-making dashboards and interactive scenario modeling allowing program managers to view current project KPIs alongside AI forecasts. Analyses such as these could be achieved without any specialized expertise. AI-enabled dashboards integrate artificial intelligence techniques with traditional data visualization systems transforming static reporting tools into dynamic, predictive, and adaptive decision-support systems. Scenario modeling complements this by allowing users to simulate future outcomes under different conditions. AI ranks the simulated outcomes by probability and strategic impact, enabling executives to choose options not just based on feasibility but alignment with organizational goals (Ajibade 2025). AI enabled dashboards and scenario modeling will become tools that will be essential across sectors such as finance, healthcare, supply chain, and public administration.

Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning are being applied to portfolio-level decisions about the different projects or programs to fund or abandon with AI initiatives expanding across different industries. Organizations face increasing pressure to evaluate which projects deserve investment and how to manage them throughout the lifecycle (Nordesjö, 2024). Portfolio prioritization and go/no-go decision frameworks provide structured methods for aligning AI initiatives that offer Program Managers with new tools that address organizational strategy, risk management and ensuring responsible deployment. AI initiatives must also account for data readiness, model performance potential, ethical implications, and integration complexity. Using a defined prioritization process helps align projects with strategic goals. AI programs are tools designed to help managers make better decisions and often involve uncertainty, data dependencies, and ethical considerations, these decision processes require adaptation from traditional program management approaches (Marques and Ferreira, 2020). Portfolio prioritization involves ranking AI initiatives based on their strategic value, feasibility, and risk profile.

Costanza Mariani and Mauro Mancini used supervised ML on a decade of project data to predict which continuous improvement projects would succeed. They found that their ML model (a neural network) could accurately forecast project ROI category, yielding a decision support tool that helps managers prioritize projects and enhance strategic alignment (Mariani & Mancini 2025). ML can utilize organizational knowledge in historical data to rank and select projects more objectively. Effective AI governance requires combining portfolio prioritization with lifecycle gating. Strategic prioritization identifies which projects should begin, while go/no-go decisions ensure only viable, responsible projects advance. Portfolio prioritization and go/no-go frameworks serve as complementary decision tools that enhance the management of AI initiatives. When properly implemented, they increase strategic alignment, reduce risk, and enable sustainable AI value creation.

Artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping program management (Job 2025) (Mahajan 2025). A machine learning system can continuously relate to project KPIs and immediately highlight discrepancies or trends and assist managers to make decisions in minutes rather than days (Mahajan 2025). AI supports stronger governance structures by introducing transparency, consistency, and automated oversight mechanisms. Governance becomes more predictive rather than reactive, improving the organization's ability to maintain alignment with strategic objectives.

Artificial intelligence reduces uncertainty across projects by constantly monitoring data and predicting outcomes. Machine learning (ML) risk models turn risk reviews into continuous assessments. ML based predictive analytics in risk management enhance the identification and management of risks, and provide a proactive, data driven approach that was not possible with traditional methods (Bauskar 2024). Large programs include multiple interdependent projects whose interactions generate uncertainty. (Roehrich et. al. 2024). AI improves visibility in these relationships by applying network analytics and real-time data integration (Alonge, et. al, 2023). In terms of cost, AI can spot early signs of trouble like budget creep and supplier delays long before they can manifest. The transparency of AI algorithms can increase confidence in forecasts. Mahajan cautions that this requires vigilant human oversight. Program managers must critically assess AI outputs and the assumptions behind them to ensure biases are caught (Mahajan, 2025). This allows program managers to turn uncertainty into quantifiable risk and reliable metrics. These improvements reduce volatility and improve predictability across complex program environments, making AI a strategic enabler of more reliable program outcomes. As AI adoption increases, organizations that leverage these capabilities will achieve greater stability, strategic alignment, and long-term value.

Data-driven trade-off analysis is a decision-making approach that uses quantitative data, analytical models, and predictive methods to compare alternative options based on how they impact key objectives (Rahmani et. al, 2024). Advanced scenario modeling can simultaneously compute the impact on scope, cost, schedule, and risk of different choices. Simulation engines use techniques like Monte Carlo and Bayesian networks to model tradeoffs with high accuracy (Ajibade 2025). The Bayesian model uses "Bayes theorem" to update the probability of a hypothesis based on new data and prior knowledge. Data-driven trade-off analysis helps leaders make informed decisions when no option is perfect, and each choice involves advantages and disadvantages.

Brown (2014) believes that effective integration requires balancing strategic and tactical focus. Leaders must ensure tactical execution is dependable and disciplined, and ensure strategic alignment consistently guides decisions, trade-off, and integration activities. AI excels in routine, data-driven tasks, which frees program managers to focus on strategic, relational, and ethical dimensions (Mahajan, 2025). Setting priorities and defining strategic objectives remains a human role. The 2024 PMI Program Management Standard (PMI 2024) has even added "Collaboration" as a performance domain to acknowledge integrated human and AI partnerships (Mahajan, 2025). Strategic versus tactical focus are balanced through an AI and human teaming where each does what they know best.

Brown (2014) emphasizes that program success depends on recognizing that risk is never isolated. Instead, risk emerges and spreads across both business and technical domains, often in unpredictable ways. Brown (2014) argues that one of the core responsibilities of a program manager is to be a design integrator. This is the crucial point where information intersects; risks are synthesized, and strategic decisions are made. The leadership role is essential for managing complexity and maintaining alignment across all levels. AI/ML tools can help compute technical risks by analyzing patterns in data. Understanding these patterns requires human insight. Augmented intelligence systems produce forecasts, and the program manager reviews challenges, or accepts these insights in a continuous loop (Mahajan, 2025). The program manager must function as a decision integrator, synthesizing diverse information, balancing competing priorities, and ensuring decisions support strategic goals. This integrative leadership role is essential for managing complexity, reducing cross-domain risk, and enabling program success.

Machine learning and predictive analytics are transforming project and program management by improving forecasting accuracy, strengthening risk management, supporting portfolio prioritization, and enhancing governance. By analyzing historical project data and identifying hidden performance patterns, AI-based systems enable program managers to detect problems earlier and make better-informed decisions. However, predictive analytics does not replace human leadership. Instead, it complements the expertise of program managers by providing deeper insights into complex program environments. As organizations increasingly adopt advanced analytics technologies, program managers who can effectively integrate predictive insights into leadership practice will be better positioned to deliver successful programs and achieve strategic objectives.

AI, Governance, and Program Control in Modern Program Management

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly transforming the way organizations manage complex programs. As programs grow larger and more technologically sophisticated, program managers must rely on advanced tools to process large amounts of information and identify risks quickly (Project Management Institute, 2017). However, while AI provides powerful analytical capabilities, it must be integrated within strong governance structures and disciplined program management practices. Effective program management requires balancing AI-driven insights with human oversight, accountability, and strategic leadership (Chaudhry, 2024). By integrating AI capabilities with strong governance and structured risk management frameworks, organizations can improve decision-making, reinforce accountability, and enhance overall program performance (Adekunle et. al, 2024).

Decision Authority in AI-Supported Program Management

AI can analyze large datasets, detect patterns, and generate predictive insights that support program decision-making (Rachakatla, et. al, 2023). Through data-driven analytics, AI can evaluate cost trends, performance metrics, risk indicators, and schedule forecasts faster than traditional manual analysis. This allows program managers to gain deeper insight into program performance and potential challenges before they escalate. AI systems can also identify correlations and emerging risks that might not be immediately visible through human observation alone (Bengio, et. al 2024).

Despite these advantages, AI should be viewed as a decision-support tool rather than a decision-maker. Program managers and leadership must retain final decision authority. Human judgment remains essential because program decisions often involve strategic considerations, ethical implications, stakeholder relationships, and organizational priorities that AI cannot fully interpret. Although AI can recommend actions based on predictive models, the authority to approve and implement those decisions must remain with program leadership.

For this reason, organizations must establish clear governance structures defining roles and responsibilities when AI is involved in decision-making. Program teams should clearly define who has the authority to approve AI-influenced recommendations and how those recommendations are reviewed. By clearly outlining these decision rights, organizations can ensure that AI enhances program management without replacing human accountability (Rodgers, et. al., 2023).

Accountability and Escalation Processes

Program managers must ensure that decisions influenced by AI align with program goals, organizational strategy, and stakeholder expectations (Carreno, 2024). To maintain accountability, organizations should establish clear escalation processes for situations where AI identifies potential issues or risks. When AI systems detect anomalies, cost overruns, schedule delays, or performance irregularities, predefined escalation paths should guide how those issues are reported and addressed (National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2023).

Regular audits of AI systems are also necessary to maintain accountability and trust ensuring that program managers make the final decision. AI models must be monitored to ensure their output remains accurate, fair, and aligned with organizational objectives and ethics. Routine audits allow organizations to verify that AI tools continue to provide reliable insights to program managers and that they operate within ethical and governance standards. By combining strong leadership oversight with systematic AI monitoring, organizations can maintain accountability while benefiting AI-driven program insights.

Avoiding “Black Box” Management

One of the major concerns associated with AI systems is the risk of “black box” management. This occurs when decision-making relies heavily on complex algorithms that stakeholders do not fully understand. When program managers blindly trust AI output without questioning how conclusions were reached, it can lead to poor decisions and a loss of transparency. To avoid this problem, organizations must ensure that AI systems are transparent, and that program managers make the final decision. For example, proactive AI generated automated alerts are useful. These alerts allow program managers to respond quickly and implement corrective actions before problems escalate. The goal is to use AI to facilitate rapid decision-making and timely risk mitigation while maintaining transparency and human oversight.

Program Risk Management with AI

Risk management is one of the most critical responsibilities of program managers (Yaraghi and Langhe 2011). Traditionally, risk assessments have relied on expert judgment, periodic reviews, and historical experience. While these methods remain valuable, they can sometimes be limited in their ability to detect emerging risks in rapidly changing environments. By analyzing historical data and applying machine learning models, AI systems can assist program managers to forecast potential risks before they materialize. For example, AI systems can assist by analyzing large datasets related to cost performance, supply chain delays, workforce productivity, and technological dependencies highlighting potential risk areas that may not be immediately obvious (Attah, et. al., 2024).

Early Warning Signals and Real-Time Monitoring

AI systems also provide powerful early warning capabilities. When thresholds are exceeded or unusual patterns emerge, automated alerts notify program managers and stakeholders immediately (Adepoju, et. al., 2022). These early warning signals allow organizations to address issues before they escalate into major program disruptions. With continuous data analysis and automated alerts, program managers can respond to emerging risks in real time reducing the likelihood of costly delays or failures (Rane, et. al., 2024).

Comparison of Traditional Risk Management Methods

Traditional risk management methods are reactive in nature. AI-driven risk management is continuous, data-driven, and predictive (Bughin et al., 2018). This enables program managers to detect emerging threats earlier and implement mitigation strategies more effectively. However, the most effective approach combines both traditional expertise and AI capabilities. Human experience provides context, strategic thinking, and ethical judgment, while AI contributes to advanced analytics and pattern recognition. By integrating these strengths, organizations can create a more robust and comprehensive risk management framework.

Brown Integration: Governance Discipline and Cultural Alignment

The concept of Brown Integration emphasizes the importance of governance discipline in successful program management (Brown, 2014). Without oversight of governance, technology can become misaligned with strategic objectives. Perhaps most importantly, Organizations sometimes assume that new technology will automatically solve complex management problems (Richardson, K.A., 2008.) However, technology alone cannot replace strong leadership, effective communication, and ethical decision-making.

AI has the potential to significantly enhance program management by improving decision support, risk identification, and real-time monitoring. However, the effectiveness of AI depends on how well it is integrated within strong governance frameworks and leadership structures. Program managers must retain decision authority, maintain accountability, and ensure transparency when using AI systems. By avoiding black box management, implementing predictive risk analysis, and establishing clear escalation processes, organizations can leverage AI to strengthen program performance. Ultimately, the most successful programs will be those that combine human expertise with advanced analytical tools.

Risk Analysis of AI & Machine Learning (ML)

Program and project managers have identified several categories of risk that organizations must consider when integrating AI-enabled systems into program governance structures. These risks include algorithmic bias, model drift, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, regulatory uncertainty, and organizational resistance to automated decision-support tools (Badmus, 2023; Polaski & Brienza, 2023). Further, AI governance researchers have highlighted concerns related to data security, ethical accountability, and overreliance on automated decision-making (IBM, 2023; MIT AI Risk Repository, 2024; Shaw, 2025).

Specific AI-Risks posed towards Program Management

Cybersecurity emerges as a significant concern in the context of implementing AI within program management. This dependence on centralized data sources inherently increases the program's exposure to cyber threats and the risk of unauthorized access (IBM, 2023 a or b). The literature on AI risk management underscores the necessity for organizations to establish robust security controls and continuous monitoring to ensure that AI platforms do not introduce additional vulnerabilities into enterprise systems. Regulatory policy and program manager governance are essential elements when adopting AI technologies (Davenport, and Ronanki, 2018). These emergent regulations are evolving (Shaw, 2025) and therefore organizations implementing AI-enabled systems must remain vigilant.

Applicable Risk Environments

At the business level, AI generated risks frequently originate from external factors, including regulatory changes, technological disruption, and shifts in the market environment (Shaw 2025). At the program level, AI risks are often associated with the coordination of multiple projects and organizational units. AI analytics platforms typically aggregate data from various projects to produce program-level insights, which can enhance overall visibility (Badmus, 2023). However, if algorithms are inaccurate or data is incomplete, these tools may introduce risks that have implications for the entire program (Polaski & Brienza, 2023). At the project level, AI risks often relate to the practical challenges of implementing AI tools. within daily operations, including workflow changes, staff training, and integration with existing systems.

Qualitative Risk Matrix Assessment for AI implementation in Program Management

After identifying potential risks, program managers must evaluate their relative significance. Qualitative risk assessment matrix approach (Brown 2014) was used to evaluate both likelihood and impact of potential AI based risks require immediate attention, and those which can be monitored over time. Risks that have high probability and have significant potential consequences are considered the most critical and should be addressed proactively to safeguard program performance. Risks such as algorithmic bias, model drift, and cybersecurity vulnerabilities would likely receive the highest priority due to their potential to significantly influence decision-making and program governance (MIT, 2024). Other risks, including regulatory uncertainty and internal resistance, may be less immediate but still warrant ongoing monitoring as AI adoption expands.

Probability					
	Very High (4)		Regulatory Uncertanity (8)		Algorithmic Bias (16)
	High (3)		Ethical Accountability (6)	Automation Overreliance (9)	Cybersecutiry Vulnerabilites & Model Drift (12)
	Medium (2)		Organizational Resistance (4)	Legacy System Integration Failure (6)	
	Low (1)				
Impact		Low(1)	Medium (2)	High (3)	Very high (4)

Figure 1. *Qualitative Risk Matrix 4x4 for AI and Program Management (Adapted from Brown, 2014)*

The risk matrix presented in Fig 1-1 illustrates the relative significance of various AI-related risks within program management. Following Brown's methodology, program managers assess risk by multiplying likelihood and impact to generate an overall risk score, which informs prioritization. Cybersecurity vulnerabilities and algorithmic bias often receive the highest scores, as they are both probable and capable of substantially affecting governance and decision-making. The relative scores assigned within the risk matrix are grounded in findings from the literature on AI governance and technology risk. Algorithmic bias and cybersecurity vulnerabilities were evaluated as the highest priority risks because both have the potential to directly influence program-level decision making and expose sensitive organizational information. Research on artificial intelligence systems notes that machine learning models often reflect biases embedded in historical data, while centralized data environments used by AI platforms can increase exposure to cyber threats (IBM, 2023; MIT AI Risk Repository, 2024). Model drift was also assessed as a high priority risk because predictive models may lose reliability as operational conditions change, requiring ongoing monitoring and recalibration to maintain accuracy (Polaski & Brienza, 2023). Regulatory uncertainty, organizational resistance, and legacy system integration challenges, were assigned lower scores because they are more likely to influence implementation processes rather than directly altering program governance outcomes. Model drift also represents considerable concern, given that models may lose reliability as conditions evolve. Other risks, such as staff resistance or challenges with legacy system integration, may be assigned lower scores but still require ongoing management and oversight during AI implementation.

Risk Response Matrix & Strategies

Brown outlines several common risk response approaches that organizations can use to address program uncertainty: avoidance, mitigation, transfer, and acceptance (Brown, 2014).
Risk avoidance involves eliminating a risk by altering program plans or limiting the use of certain technologies. For instance, organizations may restrict the use of AI systems in high-risk decision environments until governance frameworks are fully established. (Shaw, 2025).

Risk mitigation focuses on reducing either the likelihood or impact of a risk. In the context of AI adoption, mitigation strategies may include enhancing data governance practices, implement independent model validation procedures, and continuously monitor system performance to detect algorithmic bias or model drift (IBM, 2023).

Risk transfer involves shifting responsibility for certain risks to external partners, such as technology vendors or cybersecurity service providers (Polaski & Brienza, 2023). Risk acceptance occurs when program leaders acknowledge the existence of a risk but determine that its potential impact is manageable within existing governance structures.

Employing structured response strategies ensures that the adoption of AI does not compromise program governance or accountability. When appropriate strategies are implemented, organizations can leverage AI-generated insights while maintaining robust oversight and effective leadership within their programs.

Risk	Avoid	Mitigate	Transfer	Accept

Algorithmic Bias	Limit AI use in critical decisions	Bias testing and model validation	Vendor Accountability	Minor residual bias
Model Drift	Delay deployment until stable	Continuous monitoring	Vendor service agreements	Monitor-low impact models
Legacy System Integration Failure	Avoid Integration with AI	System testing and research	Vendor support	Accept minor issues
Cybersecurity Vulnerabilities	Restrict access to sensitive data	Audits and established protocols	Cybersecurity insurance	Accept minimal exposure
Regulatory Uncertainty	Avoid high risk jurisdictions	Compliance monitoring	Legal risk transfer	Accept evolving regulations
Organizational Resistance	--	Training	--	Accept minor resistance
Automation Overreliance	Avoid full automation for vital program decisions	Human checkpoints	--	Accept automation for standard analytics
Ethical Accountability	Avoid use of AI in ethically sensitive decisions	Governance policies and requirements	Vendor Compliance Agreements	Accept minimal ethical risks with monitoring

Figure 2. *Risk Response Matrix*

The strategies outlined in Figure 2 (above) demonstrate how organizations can apply structured risk management to address AI-related risks. In alignment with Brown's framework, risks with higher scores necessitate more rigorous controls and frequent monitoring. For instance, cybersecurity vulnerabilities and algorithmic bias may require system audits, data validation, and independent testing. Conversely, challenges such as staff resistance or difficulties with legacy systems are often best managed through change management initiatives, targeted training, and phased implementation of new technologies. By employing these approaches, program managers can realize the benefits of AI while preserving accountability and oversight.

Governance Implications

Examining AI-related risks underscores the critical importance of strong governance when organizations integrate intelligent systems into program management. Although AI can enhance forecasting and monitoring capabilities, it does not eliminate the need for program managers to exercise strategic leadership. Human oversight remains essential for interpreting insights, managing stakeholder relationships, and ensuring that automated systems are aligned with organizational objectives. Risk management frameworks, such as those described by Brown, provide organizations with structured approaches for integrating new technologies while maintaining accountability within their programs.

The Evolving Role of the Program Manager in an AI-Enabled Environment

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) are quickly changing how organizations collect, analyze, and utilize information to support strategic decision-making (Dwivedi et al., 2021, Davenport & Ronanki, 2018, Kerzner, 2022). Program managers typically work in environments defined by vast data, predictive analytics, and real-time performance visibility. Although these developments are significant, they do not eliminate the need for program managers. Instead, they transform their responsibilities and the competencies required for success. In AI-enabled organizations, program managers must take technological insights and turn this information into strategic action, ensure accountability across programs, and maintain the organizational culture necessary for sustained performance (Brown, 2014).

Artificial Intelligence and Program-Level Decision Making

Artificial intelligence is becoming more relevant and widely used in project management practices (Shrestha et al., 2019). Machine learning algorithms and AI can analyze historical performance data, identify patterns, and provide predictive insights that assist with forecasting, risk identification (Dwivedi et al., 2021) and resource allocation (Kerzner, 2022). Raisch and Krakowski (2021) describe this scenario as the "automation–augmentation paradox," meaning advanced technologies improve analytical capabilities but still require management to interpret results and make strategic decisions. AI systems can process large amounts of information, but they can't determine organizational priorities, manage stakeholder relationships, or account for factors that influence program outcomes (Shrestha et al., 2019). Program managers remain responsible for interpreting output and determining how that information aligns with organizational goals and desired outcomes.

Furthermore, program management requires a systems-level perspective that integrates multiple projects, organizational functions, and strategic goals (Kerzner, 2022). AI tools can strengthen this perspective by providing improved data integration and overall visibility within the program (Dwivedi et al., 2021). These types of capabilities allow program managers to evaluate potential issues and opportunities more quickly and make informed decisions based on program priorities. However, the effectiveness of these tools will always depend on leadership oversight and the ability of program managers to interpret data within the strategic circumstances of the organization (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

Leadership and Accountability in AI-Enabled Programs

While AI technologies increase and improve the availability of information, they do not eliminate the leadership responsibilities associated with program management. Program managers must find ways to simplify and translate AI-produced information into actionable strategies and ensure that decision-making processes remain aligned with organizational objectives. AI and other machine learning tools can generate forecasts or risk predictions, but the outputs are only as reliable as the existing data used to obtain those desired outputs (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018). Inaccurate data generate false and inaccurate conclusions. Program managers need to maintain strict oversight of the analytical processes used within the organization and ensure that AI systems support rather than replace disciplined program management competencies and practices (Shrestha et al., 2019).

Finally, program managers must maintain strong communication and stakeholder alignment, especially in data-driven environments that are becoming more complex. AI-generated data can sometimes interfere with existing assumptions or shift previous priorities. Effective leaders must be able to communicate these changes clearly and maintain stakeholder buy-in and confidence throughout the decision-making process. As Brown mentions, successful program environments depend on trust, accountability, and a culture that supports disciplined execution (Brown, 2014). These cultural factors remain essential even as organizations implement new and advanced technological tools.

Competencies for Future Program Managers

AI and ML technologies continue to evolve and increase complexity, program managers must develop new competencies and skills to work effectively within data-driven environments (Dwivedi et al., 2021). One of the most important competencies is data literacy. Program managers do not need to become data wizards, but they must be able to understand how analytical models create predictions, what assumptions are in those models, and how to interpret the results correctly to utilize outputs efficiently (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018).

Another essential competency involves strategic questioning and systems perspective. Program managers must be able to evaluate AI-generated insights within the extensive organizational circumstances. Rather than accepting algorithmic outputs at face value, leaders should ask questions such as, what data sources informed this prediction? What assumptions were used in the model? How might external factors influence these projections? Program managers must also maintain ethical oversight and governance discipline when implementing AI technologies.

As AI becomes more prevalent and integrated into organizational processes, concerns related to transparency, algorithmic bias, and regulatory compliance become situations that leadership must think about or consider (Dwivedi et al., 2021). Davenport and Ronanki note that organizations frequently struggle to integrate AI into decision-making processes without appropriate governance structures (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018). Finally, stakeholder leadership and communication remain in critical competencies for program managers operating in AI-enabled environments, and in general. Program success heavily depends on collaboration among multiple teams, departments, and stakeholders. AI technologies may improve analytical capabilities, but they cannot replace the leadership required to build trust and maintain alignment. Effective program management depends on leadership that integrates technical insight with organizational coordination and strategic vision. (Kerzner, 2022).

Strategic Program Leadership in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

The integration of AI and machine learning into organizational processes represents a significant change in how programs are managed and evaluated (Dwivedi et al., 2021). AI enhances clarity by providing predictive insights and improved visibility across programs. However, Program Management leadership remains the mechanism through which those insights are translated into meaningful action (Raisch and Krakowski, 2021).

Conclusion and Future research

In conclusion, AI and ML are changing operational environments that program managers operate in. AI accelerates the shift from complexity to clarity by allowing leaders to recognize patterns, risks, and opportunities that would remain hidden within large volumes of data. Program managers remain responsible for interpreting results, aligning them with organizational priorities, and ensuring that analytical outputs translate into coordinated action across programs. Organizations with weak data infrastructure, weak information systems, or low levels of digital maturity may struggle to create reliable analytical insights from AI tools. Predictive models trained on biased or incomplete historical data can produce misleading or inaccurate recommendations that are detrimental to decision quality. Highly politicized organizational environments may also resist AI-generated insights.

Future research should explore how AI integration affects program performance across different organizational components. For example, comparative case studies could examine programs that use AI-enabled analytics dashboards versus those relying on traditional reporting systems to determine whether AI improves the speed of risk identification or decision-making accuracy. Surveys of program managers could also investigate how AI integration influences leadership competencies such as data literacy, strategic questioning, and systems thinking. This type of research would provide evidence to better understand how AI technologies change program management and what capabilities organizations must develop to effectively utilize them.

References

Adekunle, B. I., Chukwuma-Eke, E. C., Balogun, E. D., and Ogunsola, K. O. (**2023**). Integrating AI-Driven Risk Assessment Frameworks in Financial Operations: A Model for Enhanced Corporate Governance. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology*, *9*(6), 445–464.

Adepoju, A. H., Austin-Gabriel, B., Hamza, O., and Collins, A. (**2022**). Advancing Monitoring and Alert Systems: A Proactive Approach to Improving Reliability in Complex Data Ecosystems. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*, *5*(11), 281–298.

Ajibade, O. (**2025**). AI Enhanced Project Management: Leveraging Predictive Analytics and Intelligent Automation. *International Journal of Research Publication and Review*, *17*.

Alonge, E. O., Eyo-Udo, N. L., Ubanadu, B. C., Daraojimba, A. I., Balogun, E. D., and Ogunsola, K. O. (**2023**). Real-Time Data Analytics for Enhancing Supply Chain Efficiency. *Journal of Supply Chain Management and Analytics*, *10*(1), 49–60.

Attah, R. U., Garba, B. M. P., Gil-Ozoudeh, I., and Iwuanyanwu, O. (**2024**). Enhancing Supply Chain Resilience through Artificial Intelligence: Analyzing Problem-Solving Approaches in Logistics Management. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, *5*(12), 3248–3265.

Badmus, T. (**2023**). Application of Artificial Intelligence Technology in Program and Project Management. https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/121239171/1902-libre.pdf

Bauskar, S. M. (**2024**). Predictive Analytics for Project Risk Management Using Machine Learning. *Journal of Data Analysis and Information Processing*.

Bengio, Y., Hinton, G., Yao, A., Song, D., Abbeel, P., Darrell, T., Harari, Y. N., Zhang, Y. Q., Xue, L., Shalev-Shwartz, S., and Hadfield, G. (**2024**). Managing Extreme AI Risks amid Rapid Progress. *Science*, *384*(6698), 842–845.

Brown, J. T. (**2014**). *The Handbook of Program Management: How to Facilitate Project Success with Optimal Program Management* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Bughin, J., Seong, J., Manyika, J., Chui, M., and Joshi, R. (**2018**). *Notes from the AI Frontier: Modeling the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the World Economy*. McKinsey Global Institute.

Carreño, A. M. (**2024**). Strategic Alignment in Program Management: A Framework for Sustainable Business Transformation. Institute for Change Leadership and Business Transformation. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13922003

Chaudhry, F. A. (**2024**). AI-Powered Decision-Making: Balancing Automation and Human Oversight in Corporate Governance. *International Journal of Business & Computational Science*, *1*(1).

Davenport, T. H., and Ronanki, R. (**2018**). Artificial Intelligence for the Real World. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2018/01/artificial-intelligence-for-the-real-world

Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., Duan, Y., Dwivedi, R., Edwards, J., Eirug, A., Galanos, V., Ilavarasan, P. V., Janssen, M., Jones, P., Kar, A. K., Kizgin, H., Kronemann, B., Lal, B., Lucini, B., and Williams, M. D. (**2021**). Artificial Intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Emerging Challenges and Opportunities. *International Journal of Information Management*, *57*, 101994. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.002

Gonen, E. (**2019**). Tim Brown, Change by Design: How Design Thinking Transforms Organizations and Inspires Innovation (2009). *Markets, Globalization & Development Review*, *4*(2), Article 8. https://doi.org/10.23860/MGDR-2019-04-02-08

IBM. (**2023a**). 10 AI Dangers and Risks and How to Manage Them. *IBM Think Insights*. https://www.ibm.com/think/insights/10-ai-dangers-and-risks-and-how-to-manage-them

IBM. (**2023b**). AI Risk Management. *IBM Think Insights*. https://www.ibm.com/think/insights/ai-risk-management

Job, G. (**2025**). Evolving Role of IT Program Managers in the Age of AI and Automation. *IPHO Journal of Advance Research in Science and Engineering*, *3*(11), 39–47.

Kerzner, H. (**2022**). *Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling* (13th ed.). Wiley.

Lewandrowski, K., Gregory, K., and Macmillan, D. (**2011**). Assuring Quality in Point-of-Care Testing: Evolution of Technologies, Informatics, and Program Management. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine*, *135*(11), 1405–1414.

Mahajan, N. (**2025**). Augmented Intelligence in Program Management: Enhancing Human Leadership with AI. *PM World Journal*, *14*.

Mariani, C., and Ferreira, J. (**2025**). Project Portfolio Selection and Prioritization through Supervised Machine Learning in Continuous Projects. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*.

Marques, L., and Ferreira, J. (**2020**). Data-Driven Decision-Making in Project Portfolio Management: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Modern Project Management*, *8*(2), 50–67. https://doi.org/10.19255/JMPM02005

Martinsuo, M., and Hoverfält, P. (**2018**). Change Program Management: Toward a Capability for Managing Value-Oriented, Integrated Multi-Project Change in Its Context. *International Journal of Project Management*, *36*(1), 134–146.

McAfee, A., and Brynjolfsson, E. (**2017**). *Machine, Platform, Crowd: Harnessing Our Digital Revolution*. W. W. Norton & Company.

MIT AI Risk Repository. (**2024**). AI Risk Repository. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. https://airisk.mit.edu

Morningmate Team. (**2025**, May 5). Program Manager vs. Project Manager: Key Differences Guide. *Morningmate Blog*. https://morningmate.com/blog/program-manager-vs-project-manager/

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (**2023**). *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0)*. U.S. Department of Commerce.

Nordesjö, K. (**2024**). Evaluation of Paradoxes: Responding to Tensions between Stability and Change in Social Investment Evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *45*(4), 519–535.

PMI. (**2012**). Program Manager as Integrator: A James T. Brown Perspective. Project Management Institute Professional Development Series.

Polaski, A., and Brienza, D. (**2023**). Managing AI Risks and Opportunities in Program Management. *PM World Journal*, *12*(7). https://pmworldlibrary.net/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/pmwj131-Jul2023-Polaski-Brienza-managing-AI-risks-opportunities-2.pdf

Project Management Institute. (**2017**). *The Standard for Program Management* (4th ed.). Project Management Institute.

Project Management Institute. (**2024**). *The Standard for Program Management* (5th ed.). Project Management Institute.

Rachakatla, S. K., Ravichandran, P., and Machireddy, J. R. (**2023**). AI-Driven Business Analytics: Leveraging Deep Learning and Big Data for Predictive Insights. *Journal of Deep Learning in Genomic Data Analysis*, *3*(2), 1–22.

Rahmani, S., Aghalar, H., Jebreili, S., and Goli, A. (**2024**). Optimization and Computing Using Intelligent Data-Driven Approaches for Decision-Making. In *Optimization and Computing Using Intelligent Data-Driven Approaches for Decision-Making* (pp. 90–176). CRC Press.

Raisch, S., and Krakowski, S. (**2021**). Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation–Augmentation Paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, *46*(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

Rane, N., Choudhary, S., and Rane, J. (**2024**). Artificial Intelligence for Enhancing Resilience. *Journal of Applied Artificial Intelligence*, *5*(2), 1–33.

Richardson, K. A. (**2008**). Managing Complex Organizations: Complexity Thinking and the Science and Art of Management. *Emergence: Complexity & Organization*, *10*(2).

Roehrich, Jens K., et al. "Large Interorganizational Projects (LIPs): Toward an Integrative Perspective and Research Agenda on Interorganizational Governance." *Journal of Operations Management*, vol. 70, no. 1, Jan. **2024**, pp. 4–21, https://doi.org/10.1002/joom.1280.

Rodgers, W., Murray, J. M., Stefanidis, A., Degbey, W. Y., and Tarba, S. Y. (**2023**). An Artificial Intelligence Algorithmic Approach to Ethical Decision-Making in Human Resource Management Processes. *Human Resource Management Review*, *33*(1), 100925.

Shaw, T. (**2025**, July 22). Building Responsible AI: A Practical Guide to AI Risk Management and Governance. *ProjectManagement.com*. https://www.projectmanagement.com/articles/1105713/building-responsible-ai--a-practical-guide-to-ai-risk-management-and-governance

Shenhar, A. J., and Dvir, D. (**2007**). *Reinventing Project Management: The Diamond Approach to Successful Growth and Innovation*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., and von Krogh, G. (**2019**). Organizational Decision-Making Structures in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *California Management Review*, *61*(4), 66–83. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619862257

Snowden, D. J., and Boone, M. E. (**2007**). A Leader's Framework for Decision Making. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*(11), 68–76. https://hbr.org/2007/11/a-leaders-framework-for-decision-making

Yaraghi, N., and Langhe, R. G. (**2011**). Critical Success Factors for Risk Management Systems. *Journal of Risk Research*, *14*(5), 551–581.