

Joint Intelligence

Leading Project Work in the Age of AI

This session presents a psychology-grounded framework for leading project work in which human judgment and artificial intelligence reinforce each other. When organizations encode judgment into rigid process, automate practitioners out of the loop, and reduce projects to metrics, the resulting plans hold under expected conditions but break under the novel ones every project eventually meets—producing workarounds, blind spots, and new risks the controls themselves create. Drawing on my research into how project leaders think and decide, and how people and AI work together, the talk shows how to structure delivery so people and technology strengthen one another, through a clear division of labor: algorithms supply scale, pattern detection, and tireless vigilance, while people supply what no algorithm can—deciding what is relevant, framing the right question, judging meaning, and remaining accountable.

Major Subjects Covered

- **The brittleness trap** — why rigid process and full automation create fragility, and why complex projects are not merely complicated.
- **The human aperture** — relevance, framing the right question, and the judgment that must precede any algorithmic analysis.
- **Complementarity and calibrated trust** — where AI outperforms, where people remain essential, and the psychology of algorithm aversion and over-reliance.
- **Meaningful human control** — override, modifiability, and human-on-the-loop authority over agentic tools.
- **The measurement problem** — surrogation, Goodhart's law, and the McNamara fallacy applied to project metrics such as velocity and percent complete.
- **Prompting and pressure-testing AI output** — framing useful questions and checking what returns for bias, gaps, and overfitting before it enters the record.
- **Designing for resilience and individuality** — anticipate, monitor, respond, and learn; building a human–AI partnership that amplifies judgment rather than flattening it.

Learning Objectives

By the end of this program, participants will be able to:

1. Distinguish complex from merely complicated project problems, and recognize when rigid process or automation introduces brittleness rather than resilience.
2. Allocate deliberately between people and machines—framing, relevance, and judgment for people; scale and pattern detection for algorithms.
3. Recognize where judgment goes passive or overconfident around AI, and apply augmented judgment to keep human insight central.
4. Recognize algorithm aversion and over-reliance, and apply meaningful-human-control principles, including override and human-on-the-loop authority over agentic tools.
5. Evaluate project metrics for surrogation and the gap between a measure and the outcome it represents.

6. Construct effective prompts and pressure-test AI output for bias, gaps, and overfitting before it informs a decision.

Program Information

Field of Study: Business Management & Organization

Program Level: Intermediate to Advanced

Prerequisites: Familiarity with core project management processes; no data-science background required.

Advance Preparation: None

Delivery Method: Group Live (also available Group Internet Based)

Recommended CPE Credits: 1–4, based on session length

© *Toby Groves, PhD*