

# Decision Capture: Applying the AI Capability Framework

## 1. Purpose of This Scenario

This scenario supports **capturing decisions made during meetings** in a way that is clear, accountable, and defensible. It focuses on the moment where discussion becomes commitment — what was decided, by whom, on what basis, and with what next steps.

Decision capture is often treated as an administrative afterthought. When AI is introduced to summarise or formalise outcomes, there is a risk that nuance, dissent, or conditionality is lost. Poor capture can later undermine trust, accountability, and implementation.

The purpose of this scenario is to help professionals **use AI, if at all, to support accurate and transparent decision records**, while ensuring that responsibility for decisions remains human and explicit.

This scenario is designed to support:

- Meeting chairs and facilitators
  - Committee secretaries and governance officers
  - Project and programme leads
  - Academic and professional services staff
-

## 2. Situation & Context

A meeting has concluded, or is moving toward closure. During the meeting:

- multiple options may have been discussed
- agreement may have been partial or conditional
- dissent or uncertainty may have been expressed

At this point, there is pressure to:

- move quickly to action
- produce a clear record
- avoid reopening debate

AI may be used to draft minutes, summarise decisions, or extract actions. How this is done will shape **future accountability and interpretation** of the meeting.

---

## 3. Where AI Might Be Used (and Why That Matters)

AI is commonly used in decision capture to:

- summarise meeting discussions
- extract decisions and actions
- standardise meeting records

These uses matter because:

- summaries can flatten disagreement
- inferred decisions may not reflect actual agreement
- automated phrasing can obscure responsibility

This scenario treats AI use in decision capture as **medium- to high-risk**, depending on governance context.

---

## 4. Applying the AI Capability Framework

### 4.1 Awareness

Before capturing decisions, clarify:

- what was explicitly decided versus discussed
- whether decisions were final or conditional
- who holds decision authority

Key awareness questions:

- Are we recording a decision or a recommendation?
- Was consensus reached, or was a chair's decision made?
- What uncertainty remains?

AI should not be used to infer decisions that were not clearly made.

---

### 4.2 Human–AI Co-Agency

In decision capture:

- humans define what counts as a decision
- AI may assist with structuring and wording

Good co-agency means:

- the chair validates all captured decisions
- AI outputs are reviewed and corrected
- accountability is named explicitly

Avoid:

- allowing AI to interpret intent
  - delegating responsibility attribution
-

## 4.3 Applied Practice

Appropriate AI uses include:

- drafting structured decision records from agreed inputs
- separating decisions, actions, and discussion points
- standardising language for clarity

Inappropriate uses include:

- generating decisions from discussion transcripts
- resolving ambiguity through AI inference
- removing dissent or conditions for clarity

AI should support **faithful representation**, not simplification.

---

## 4.4 Ethics, Equity & Impact

Decision capture has ethical implications.

Use the Framework to ask:

- Are minority views or concerns being erased?
- Does the record accurately reflect power dynamics?
- Could this wording disadvantage certain groups or teams?

Ethical decision records respect **complexity and dissent**.

---

## 4.5 Decision-Making & Governance

Strong governance practices include:

- clear attribution of decisions and actions
- retention of records appropriate to the decision's significance
- alignment with organisational governance requirements

If AI is used:

- note its role in drafting
- ensure final approval is human
- retain original records where required

This ensures auditability and trust.

---

## 4.6 Reflection, Learning & Renewal

After decision capture, reflect:

- Did the record accurately reflect what occurred?
- Were any assumptions introduced during summarisation?
- How could capture be improved next time?

Reflection strengthens institutional decision-making practices.

---

## 5. In-the-Moment Prompts & Checks

### Human reflection prompts

- What exactly are we committing to?
- Who is accountable for each decision?
- What conditions or risks need to be noted?

### Optional AI prompts

- “Draft a decision record distinguishing decisions, actions, and open questions without inferring intent.”
- “Identify any ambiguities in this draft decision summary.”

### Pause & check

- Would all participants recognise this as an accurate record?
  - Could this record be misinterpreted later?
- 

## 6. After-Action Reflection

Once decisions are captured:

- Were participants clear about what was decided?
- Did the record support or hinder follow-through?
- Where did AI use add or reduce clarity?

Use learning to refine future decision capture processes.

---

## 7. What This Scenario Delivers

This scenario helps organisations:

- capture decisions clearly and defensibly
  - avoid AI-driven misrepresentation of intent
  - strengthen accountability and governance
  - respect dissent and complexity
  - build reliable decision records over time
-

## About CloudPedagogy

CloudPedagogy develops practical, ethical, and future-ready AI capability across education, research, and public service.

This scenario is part of the AI Capability Framework Scenario Library, supporting applied, context-sensitive practice using the CloudPedagogy AI Capability Framework (2026 Edition).

**Framework:** <https://www.cloudpedagogy.com/pages/ai-capability-framework>

**Licence:** CC BY-NC-SA 4.0