MODULE OVERVIEW

Who decides when AI is on the team: Roles and accountability

Adaptive module | ~20 min

When AI sorts job applications, replies to a customer, or triggers an order, one question is unavoidable: who decided, and who is accountable if it goes wrong? As rigid job descriptions become less common and AI enters the decision loop, this module goes beyond the slogan “humans decide” and gives managers and team members the tools for that accountability: the RAPID model, the in/on/out-of-the-loop slider, and European AI Act requirements.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

01 Distinguish three models for clarifying roles (detailed job description, self-management, and mission and goals with RAPID) and when each one applies.

02 Place each decision on the human–AI slider: in the loop, on the loop, or out of the loop, based on the stakes and reversibility.

03 Recognize the traps that hollow out human accountability: automation bias and being a mere “fuse” who takes the blame.

04 Create the conditions for a real human decision: understand, check, and be able to challenge AI while following the rules for its use.

WHO IT’S FOR

Managers who want to choose their decision model with AI, and team members who want to be fully accountable for what they approve.

- **Prerequisite:** none

HOW THE MODULE WORKS

Self-paced, with practice tailored to each learner.

1. **Self-assessment**: on 9 dimensions, to gauge current habits and guide the practice.
2. **Expert video**: 10 minutes, with 3 pauses for reflection.
3. **Practice scenarios**: the first 2 chosen from the self-assessment, then 16 optional ones. Every answer gets feedback: what it leads to, and one way to improve.
4. **Dated commitment**: one action to try, written by the learner or picked from the suggestions.
5. **Memo to download**: key takeaways, questions, commitment, personal notes and checklists.

A SAMPLE PRACTICE SCENARIO

Since a tool started writing the minutes and managing calendars, Farah, an executive assistant, has been filling her days with the tasks no one else takes on. Her job description hasn’t changed, and the decision follow-up she used to handle is no longer done by anyone. What can Farah do?

ASSESSMENT AND COMPLETION

Pass mark: 80%

The score takes into account your answers to the practice scenarios, your commitment and, where relevant, any additional learning activities. Passing requires a commitment and a score of at least 80%.

METHODS & MODELS

- RAPID, 5 decision roles – Bain, Rogers & Blenko, HBR (2006)
- Self-management (Frédéric Laloux, Reinventing Organizations, 2014); OKRs (A. Grove & J. Doerr)
- Moral crumple zone (M. C. Elish, 2019); automation bias (Mosier & Skitka, 1999)
- Stakes × reversibility grid for the human-AI slider – Afthonios method

SOURCES & REFERENCES

- Gartner, 2025: 40% of enterprise applications will include task-specific AI agents by the end of 2026, up from less than 5% in 2025
- EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689) – Article 14: effective human oversight of high-risk systems; Article 50: transparency
- Buurtzorg (Netherlands, J. de Blok, 2006) – home care organized in autonomous teams with no middle managers
- M. C. Elish, “Moral Crumple Zones,” Engaging STS, 2019

Module created by Afthonios.com.

Content reviewed on 11 September 2026