

LAB OVERVIEW

The Capital Allocation Lab

A practical starting point for executive programs preparing leaders to manage work contributed by AI agents.

For executive education directors, faculty and corporate academy leaders who want to add accountable practice with AI agents to an existing program.

What the Lab adds to a program

- Participants manage work contributed by AI agents.
- Faculty can inspect how each decision was reached.
- The school can extend selected practice through its existing curriculum.

A STANDALONE FIRST ENGAGEMENT

The Lab can stand on its own. Broader work begins only if the school decides it would add value.

The management decision

€40M available. €65M requested. The board meets in nine days.

A manufacturer must choose among three requests and explain which risks it is willing to accept.

REQUEST	AMOUNT	WHAT IT FUNDS
A	€22M	Build a service-parts operation in Southeast Asia
B	€18M	Automate the second European plant
C	€25M	Acquire a customer-diagnostics software firm

The same decision, two rounds

01 PEOPLE ONLY: Make and seal the first recommendation

Participants read the business cases, board minutes and market brief. They allocate the €40 million and sign a one-page recommendation before the second round begins.

02 PEOPLE AND AI AGENTS: Repeat the decision with named AI agent roles

AI agents rebuild the cases, check an approved evidence set, argue against each request and keep the record. Participants decide what to delegate, which claims to verify and where a person must intervene.

03 FACULTY REFLECTION: Compare the two decision records

Faculty and participants examine changes in delegation, evidence checks, disagreement, handoffs and decision ownership. The group also records what it would change before using the approach elsewhere.

AI AGENT ROLES IN ROUND TWO

- Analyst: Rebuilds each business case from the packet.
- Scout: Checks one approved public evidence set.
- Red team: Builds the strongest case against each request.
- Recorder: Keeps every claim, source, owner and decision visible.

What participants do and faculty assess

The Lab makes individual judgment visible inside a team exercise. It also gives program directors a bounded example of where current assignments, assessment or AI-use rules may need attention.

VIEW	WHAT BECOMES OBSERVABLE
Practice with accountable AI work	Participants specify work for AI agents, open the sources behind material claims and explain why their recommendation changed or stayed.
Evidence for the debrief	Faculty can review who delegated what, which sources were checked, how disagreement was handled and who owned the final decision.
A tested point of departure	The school sees which parts of one management task changed when AI agents joined the work, and which parts still required human judgment.

What faculty can inspect from one participant's contribution

This example was written by 8Hats Lab to show the shape of the record. It is not a result from a real cohort.

RECORD FIELD	ILLUSTRATIVE ENTRY
Original recommendation	Fund A at €22M and B at €18M. Decline C.
AI input	Scout reports that a tariff schedule adds 11% to request A.
Participant source check	The participant opens the schedule, notes its 2023 date and finds a later schedule in the approved source set.
Decision record	Keep the allocation for now and remove the 11% claim. Reopen the decision if the schedule in force at the board date does add 11% to request A.
Faculty feedback	The observable contribution is the source check, the reason for retaining the recommendation and the named condition for reconsideration.

ILLUSTRATIVE CRITERIA, PENDING FACULTY APPROVAL

Illustrative assessment criteria, subject to faculty approval: material claims are opened at source by a named person; the participant explains why a recommendation changed or stayed; the record names what would reopen the decision; a person owns the final call.

LIMITS OF THE COMPARISON

The second recommendation is not expected to be better. Participants already know the case, so familiarity may affect the second round. The comparison shows how the work changed. It does not establish a causal AI effect.

What the school receives

A faculty-reviewed Lab design

A configured, approved workspace

Decision-record and debrief materials

A readout of observations from the exercise

8HATS LAB PROVIDES	FACULTY AND THE SCHOOL OWN
Approved course materials prepared for AI use	The framework, case, assignment and rubric
Configured AI agent roles, tools, permissions and approval points	Approved sources and participant or employer data boundaries

8HATS LAB PROVIDES

FACULTY AND THE SCHOOL OWN

A faculty-tested exercise and rehearsal

Acceptable AI use and human decision rights

Decision-record templates and a proposed assessment process

Academic delivery, assessment and curriculum ownership

Support for the agreed delivery and follow-through

APPROVED BOUNDARIES

Preparing an AI agent means configuring approved knowledge, instructions, examples, tools and tests. It does not mean retraining a foundation model.

How the Lab can inform the rest of your program.

If the school chooses to continue, we work with faculty to apply relevant observations from the Lab. Faculty retain academic control and ownership of the curriculum.

- Identify modules where AI agents change the management task.
- Adapt assignments and learning activities around those changes.
- Make delegation, verification and judgment assessable.
- Prepare approved AI workspaces and course materials.
- Agree rules for data, acceptable AI use and decision authority.
- Plan follow-through where it supports the program.

Reasons to trust the delivery team

This experience supports our ability to design and deliver the Lab. It is not evidence that the Lab improves participant or program outcomes.

- Assessment and operating experience: Dmitriy Istomin founded and led Examus, an AI assessment company acquired by Constructor Tech. Taras Pustovoy co-founded the National Platform of Open Education, used by 2.7 million learners, and was a Coursera content partner.
- Learning and AI system design: Alexander Volkov, PhD leads our Human-AI Learning Architecture and research design. Mariam Mamedli, PhD turns research questions into AI agent systems that can be tested.
- Institutional learning advice: Dale P. Johnson, PhD, Director of Digital Innovation at Arizona State University's University Design Institute, advises on institutional learning design and adoption.

NEXT STEP

Discuss running the Lab in one existing module.

Bring the program, the management task, the framework participants apply and any constraints on tools or data. We will use the call to map the exercise, the approval boundary and what faculty need to inspect.

[Book a 20-minute call](#) · **di@8hats.ai**